Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- ☐ Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- ☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires: Pagination is as follows: [1], [1743]-2558, [i]-cxlv p.

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

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

THIRD SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

48-49 VICTORIÆ, 1885.

VOL. XIX.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE ELEVENTH DAY OF MAY TO THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, 1885.

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

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—48 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

MONDAY, 11th May, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHARLES STEELE.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, Why was Charles Steele removed from the office of postmaster at Maitland, in the County of Yarmouth, in the Province of Nova Scotia ?

Mr. CARLING. He was removed from office because of complaint being received that the office was badly managed, which complaint, on enquiry being made by the Post Office Inspector, appeared to be well founded.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—DUCK LAKE FIGHT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) asked, Has the Government received any official report from Col. Irvine or Major Crozier, of the Duck Lake fight? If not, has the Government called for such report? If so, when and from whom ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A report has been received from Major Crozier. It is short and imperfect, and further particulars have been demanded. When they have been obtained, all the papers will be submitted.

MANITOBA HALF-BREED MINORS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether on the application of Manitoba half-breed minors and others who were temporarily absent in North-West Territory or elsewhere during the enumeration and allotment, a Government official was directed several years ago to take their claims and evidence? And whether such claims and evidence were taken, the names entered on a supplementary list and the result reported to the Government? And when was such report made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Messrs. Ryan and Machar, who were appointed, in 1875, to make this enumeration, reported in March, 1876, that their work was incomplete; and Mr. Ryan was authorised, by Order in Council of the 14th June, 1876, to take evidence in regard to claims of this sort if offered, either at Swan River, where he was to have his headquarters as stipendiary magistrate, or any other point in the Territories where his duties as magistrate might take him. His authority was by the Order limited to a period of two years. On 9th April, 1875, the agent of Dominion lands at Winnipeg was authorised to take evidence in support of the same class of claims. Messrs. George Newcombe and Augustus Mills, agents of Dominion lands at Emerson and Portage la Prairie, respectively, were similarly authorised on 7th May, 1877.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the claims of unenumerated Manitoba half-breed minors and others have been before the Government for several years past, and whether applications have been made to Government for their settlement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no unenumerated Manitoba half-breed minors' claims before the Government, with the exception of one or two at Prince Albert, in respect of which the North-West half-breed commission has power to take evidence.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether a report was made to the Minister by the Deputy Minister, recommending a settlement of the claims of unenumerated Manitoba half-breed minors and others in the summer of 1884? And whether action was taken thereon by the Minister in that year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A report was made in the summer of 1884 by the Deputy of the Minister of the Interior, recommending a settlement of the claims of the Manitoba half-breeds, enumerated upon what is known as the supplementary list, but not as to unenumerated half-breed minors or others. As a matter of fact, there was no information in the Department to justify the assumption that any considerable number of the Manitoba half-breeds had not already been enumerated.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether on or about April, A. D. 1885, action was taken by Order in Council or Departmental Order, recognising the claims of unenumerated Manitoba half-breed minors and others, and settling them on the basis of orders or scrip for 240 acres or otherwise? And how many claims were recognised?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An Order in Council of 20th April, 1885, providing that the enumerated Manitoba half-breeds, on what is known as the supplementary list, be granted $160 in scrip to heads of families, and $240 in scrip to children of half-breeds, was passed. The Order provides that any claims of the same class not already enumerated shall be proved before the Commissioners of Dominion Lands on or before 1st May, 1886.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the settlement of the claims of unenumerated Manitoba half-breed minors and others is now proceeding?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The issue of scrip to the enumerated half-breeds of Manitoba whose claims have been proved since the reserve of 1,400,000 acres of land set apart by the Manitoba Act was exhausted, is now proceeding.

SUPERANNUATION OF J. W. PEACHY.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. LANGELIER) asked, Whether J. W. Peachy, Secretary of the Department of Customs, has been superannuated? If so, has it been done at his own request or against his wishes? On what grounds has he been superannuated? If by reason of health, whether the Government intend to add seven years to his period of service, in order to increase his retiring allowance, as they did for E. C. Barber? If the Government do not intend to adopt that course with J. W. Peachy, what is the reason? Who succeds J. W. Peachy in his position?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Peachy, Corresponning Clerk in the Customs Department, has been superannuated. It was not at his own request; it was not, so far as I know, against his wishes; but it was on the ground of disability, he having been deprived of his health by an attack of paralysis thirteen months prior to his superannuation, during which period he was unable to, and did not perform his duties. He was paid his full salary up to the date of his superannuation. It is not the intention of the Government to add seven years to Mr. Peachy's period of service. Mr. Peachy's duties are now performed by a third-class clerk, at a salary of $500 per annum.

RELIEF FOR THE NORTH-WEST SETTLERS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to ask for a vote for the relief of the settlers in the North-West who have been driven from their homes and have had their property destroyed by the insurgents?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That subject is under the earnest consideration of the Government.

RAILWAY LINES BETWEEN MONTREAL AND MARITIME PORTS.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) asked, Whether Mr. Light, C.E., has quite recently made a second report to the Government on the comparative advantages of the several lines between Montreal and the maritime ports, with a view to the selection of the shortest and most acceptable line; and whether the Government intend to bring down the said report forthwith?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Light quite recently made a second report. That has been laid on the Table of the Senate and will be printed; when printed it will be laid before this House.

Mr. LESAGE asked, Whether the Government have received the report of Mr. Wicksteed, C.E., on his survey of the valley of the Etchemin River made by order of the Department; and if so, whether it is their intention to bring it down with those already laid before the Senate, and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That report was laid before the Senate, and is now being printed; when printed it will be laid before the House.

BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO CORPS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Has the Government been informed that boots were served out at Winnipeg or elsewhere to the Toronto corps? Has the Government any information as to what has become of the six hundred pairs of boots sent up to Winnipeg for the Toronto corps?

Mr. CARON. At Lieutenant Colonel Otter's request, boots and trousers were forwarded to Winnipeg. They were shipped from Ottawa on 30th March, by special car. Colonel Otter reached Winnipeg on 7th April. The boots arrived after Colonel Otter had left, and were sent to Qu'Appelle on 10th April. I cannot give any more information about the boots.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—POSTAL AND TRANSPORT SERVICE.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, What amount has been earned by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for postal service and what amount for transport service for the Government since the 7th November, 1883? Has any, and if so, what part of these amounts been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and when? Has any, and if so, what part of these amounts been retained by the Government under the agreements in connection with the guaranty of dividends?

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman will move for this information it will be brought down.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CHANGE OF ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Was there any correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, subsequent to the 18th March, 1885, on the subject of the proposal for a change in the arrangements between the company and the Government? Was there any report from the chief engineer in connection with the matter? Was there any report from any Minister on the matter? Was there any Order in Council on the matter? Was any report from any officer of the company laid before the Government? Has the Government the balance sheets prepared by Mr. Miall, but not appended to his letter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will allow this question to stand until to-morrow, it will be answered.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY EXPENSES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What were the receipts and expenses of the Intercolonial Railway from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of May, in the years 1884 and 1885 respectively?

Mr. POPE. It is impossible for us to give the receipts for 1885, as they have not yet come in.

Mr. CAMERON. Will you give those for 1884?

Mr. POPE. That would not give you a comparative statement.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, give us the figures for 1884. Will you allow it to stand until to-morrow?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

LOANS BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What additional sum or sums (if any) have been borrowed by the Government since the 1st day of April to the date of this enquiry, and from whom and for what length of time have they been borrowed?

Mr. BOWELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow that question to stand, as I have not the data upon which to give the correct information.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—COMMUNICATION WITH THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether any communication has taken place between the Canadian and the Imperial Government on the subject of the disturbances in the North-West, with reference to any suggested action by the latter Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that on and after Tuesday next the House shall, for the remainder of the Session, meet at one o'clock in the afternoon of each day.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman would make it half-past one, it would be more convenient.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). For my own part I have no objection to the motion. I desire, and I think hon. gentlemen on this side desire, that the business of the Session should be closed at as early a period as possible, and I have no objection to our commencing now an hour or two earlier than ordinarily. I think, however, the First Minister will see that it is very inconvenient to meet at one o'clock, as he knows perfectly well that almost every member of the House lunches at that hour. If he would make it half-past one it would give us an opportunity of having the necessary refreshment before entering on the arduous labors that are now upon Parliament. As we have to remain here until one or two o'clock in the morning, I think if we begin at half-past one in the afternoon we will be putting in a long day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot resist the solicitations of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would be the last man in the world to injure their health——

Mr. MILLS. Or deprive them of their meals.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I had arranged to take my lunch at half-past twelve, but as hon. gentlemen desire it——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We are not at home like the hon. gentleman; we live at the hotels.

Sir JOHN. A. MACDONALD. As hon. gentlemen desire it, we will make the hour half past one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have two sessions a day or only one.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. Only one.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have heard a good many rumors of a battle having taken place in the North-West, and we would like to know if the Government has any information which has not yet been given to the public.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only information we have got is contained in the published reports—the reports at the command of the press.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the motion before the committee is that of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), excepting the Province of Prince Edward Island from the operation of the clause now before the consideration of the committee. I am afraid I cannot yield to that amendment, and for two reasons. In the first place, I am inclined to believe that by the time the qualifications are settled by this committee, the hon. gentleman will find that there are very few, if any, of those who have the franchise in Prince Edward Island, who will not still continue to have it, from the peculiar position of that interesting island. Then, Sir, whether I am correct or not in that opinion, I think this is the wrong time to move the amendment. This amendment excepts Prince Edward Island from the operation of the franchise clause, before we know how the franchise clause will get through the committee. We do not know what the decision of this committee may be as regards the several franchises that are given by that clause. Now, it will be quite clear that we must first settle what the general franchise is which may be adopted for the whole Dominion, and if any portion of the Dominion, or any class in the Dominion, desire to be excepted, the time to move for such exception is after the general franchise is settled. We must first settle the general franchise over the whole Dominion, and then consider any claims for exception, but until we settle the general system it is quite impossible to consider the exceptions. Then, Sir, the motion, although it is limited to Prince Edward Island, has caused a long discussion in the House which has gone over the whole Bill, and that, I think, has been felt in this discussion in the committee from the beginning. The principle of the Bill, the principle that there should be a franchise for the Dominion, passed by the Dominion Parliament, was adopted after two amendments by this House, and according to regular practice we ought to have proceeded to consider clause after clause consecutively, on their own merits, without entering into a general discussion on the whole Bill. From the importance of the Bill and the earnestness of the gentlemen who are on your left, there was no serious objection made to a renewal of the discussion in committee. However, Sir, that must, I should think, according to parliamentary practice, have its limits. At present, I am sorry to say, the question before this House and this country is not the Franchise Bill; the question is whether representative institutions—whether responsible Government—is going to continue in this country or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad to have the approbation of both sides of the House on that point. Representative institutions, if we are worthy of them, will be carried out in a proper spirit, in a constitutional spirit. And what is a constitutional spirit? It is this that after the minority of the House have had every opportunity of expressing their views, the will of the majority—the decided opinion of the majority—must prevail. If we might trust the language of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite—certainly, I cannot say of the leaders, except the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—there appears to be a regularly contrived and organised plan of obstruction. There is no doubt about it; gentlemen on the other side have stated so. The hon. member for the North Riding of York (Mr. Mulock) stated so at our last meeting in so many words. Other gentlemen have said they were going to fight out on this subject all summer. Others have told us this Bill could be fought, and it never would pass. Now, Mr. Chairman, that language is quite inconsistent with representative government, and, if acted upon, must destroy representative government—must show that we are unfit for the institutions that we have obtained from the mother country. I think that great latitude ought to be given to an Opposition; I have been in opposition, and I, with those in the same category as myself, have taken strong grounds as to the rights of an Opposition; but there must be an end to opposition, because, when it is ascertained that all the arguments, all the efforts, all the zeal of the minority in the House, have been insufficient to change the opinion of the majority, then, I think, according to the well understood principle of the British constitution, the minority should yield to the majority. With respect to this particular measure, there can be no doubt of an organisation to oppose the Bill from the beginning. The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) brought down several resolutions —half a dozen or more—against the very first clause—the very first word of the second clause, which is in fact the first clause of the Bill; and so it has been continued, and its object has not been concealed. Now, I do not impugn the motives of these hon. gentlemen; I have no parliamentary right to impugn their motives, and I do not desire to impugn the motives of their course. It may have been in their opinion highly important to oppose, by every legitimate opposition, a measure which they think is not for the benefit of the country. I would be the last to attempt in any way

to fetter the rights of the minority. I should be very sorry to see in a Canadian Parliament that such a necessity existed as appeared to exist in the minds of Mr. Gladstone's Government when they introduced certain resolutions respecting the clôture. I should be still more sorry to see here the system adopted in the United States Congress, where, on the motion for the previous question, a debate can be summarily cut off by the will of the majority. I should regret deeply to see either course taken in Canada. In England, the course taken by Mr. Gladstone, though an extreme one, is not so dangerous as it would be in this country. In England, there is a conservative feeling—I do not speak in a party sense—in the minds of the people of England and of their representatives in Parliament, against extremes. Both sides in England—those on the right and those on the left of the Speaker—know that only in the most extreme cases would the powers that Mr. Gladstone claimed and succeeded in carrying, be exercised. We are a younger country, we have not got the same steady anchorage that they have in the old country of England, and, whether we on this side continue on this side, or the hon. gentlemen opposite should succeed in ousting us, I am afraid we should not be so conservative. I am afraid that the power of closing a debate in a manner such as is now authorised in England, would be bad for us to enforce. I should be afraid of my own party; I need not say I should be still more afraid of the hon. gentlemen opposite; and therefore any suggestion of the kind that has been made to me—and the committee can well understand that in the present state of things, in the impatience of the general public against what seems to them obstruction, all kinds of suggestions have been made to me either to introduce the one system or the other, and to press it upon Parliament—I have steadily resisted, and I design to resist it. I think it is not for the permanent interest of Canada—I think it is not for the permanent interest of any Parliament of Canada—that any Government, until we are an older country and perhaps a wiser country, should have the power of shutting down the gate on the Opposition of the day. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we can only offer such resistance as the majority can offer, by stating that eventually our will must succeed, that the conclusions we have come to must eventually prevail, or all representative government is a farce, or worse than a farce; the end, Sir, is tragedy. Now, Sir, with respect to this measure which is before the House, the discussion which has been continued so long was principally on a mere detail—on the interpretation clause. There is some speciousness in that argument, I must admit, that looking at the Bill as a whole, some definitions were of more importance than merely as definitions; but I have explained, and I pressed on the consideration of the committee, that the definitions being once settled, when we came to the enacting clauses, that was the time to fight out the difference of opinion, if any existed, between the majority and the minority. Had that view been taken, we should have been far on in the progress of the Bill, and the different clauses—with respect to the different franchises, with respect to the mode of registration of voters, with respect to the selection of the proper parties to settle the voters' lists—all these would have been discussed and discussed relevantly to the several propositions; and we should have been spared the painful scene of gentlemen being deprived of their rest, and speaking—avowedly speaking—not for the purpose of advancing or defeating the measure, but simply for the purpose of obstruction. In 1871, when I first introduced this Bill, I had the joint support of the present leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend who sits opposite me (Mr. Mackenzie) on the necessity for an election Bill. Anybody who looks at the debates of that day will see that that was admitted. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), in his speech in 1870, said we should have an election Bill at once; he thought it would be well to keep the franchises, as then existing in the several Provinces, as being the proper franchises, and not the franchises which were mentioned in the Bill of 1870. In other words, he thought an election Bill should be passed, but that it should incorporate the various franchises of the four Provinces. That was the opinion of those two gentlemen as to the necessity of an election Bill, an opinion which nobody gainsaid, and which was not gainsaid by any gentleman who had studied constitutional law, except perhaps the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who has several times spoken of the measure as being unconstitutional. But the fact that these gentlemen, in 1870, took that line, and at the same time thanked me for having invited both sides of the House to consider the question of the franchise, not in a party sense, destroys the argument which has been used here, more for the purpose of discussion than for the purpose of conviction, that the measure was unconstitutional. I invited at the outset the House as a whole to consider every clause of this Bill, in order to arrive at a reasonable franchise. In the discussion which took place on the motion in amendment, when the Speaker was in the Chair, I took the same line; I invited the Opposition to discuss the several clauses of the franchises as they came up. I failed, however, to succeed in inducing them, for I forget how many days, to pass the first clause, the interpretation clause. I hope this is not going to go on. The Government desire, and I believe I speak the will and desire of those who oppose us, that the various clauses of the Bill shall be fairly discussed, that there will be give and take in opinion, and that we may arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, or at some conclusion. At all events, it is quite clear that, viewing it as I do, representative institutions are on their trial, to use Prince Albert's expression, here; it is not possible for the majority in this House to yield to the menace, the threat of obstruction of the constitution by the minority, by yielding to the obvious attempt to worry out the patience of the House, the patience of the majority, and the physical strength of some of the majority. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was quite prepared, and am quite prepared, to discuss all the various objections which have been taken to the measure as they arise; I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to join with us in trying to reach some common conclusion, or, at all events, if we do not succeed in coming to some common conclusion, that they will come to this conclusion, that they have fully done their duty, that they have called the attention of Parliament, of the public, of those to whom we are responsible, to the alleged defaults of this measure, and having done their duty in this regard, they will not destroy all respect for representative institutions by adopting the course taken continually in the South American republics, where they have a semblance of representative institutions, a semblance of Parliament, but where—in every little South American Congress or Cortes, or whatever they may call it—the minority worries the majority to the utmost extent, and when they cannot do that any more, they rise in arms and issue a pronunciamento. I hope in this House, in this northern clime, men who are accustomed to British institutions, who respect representative institutions, will not use the forms of Parliament which were devised for the purpose of enabling legislation to be made, as the means of obstructing all legislation. I speak with all earnestness, I speak with every desire to put an end to this abnormal state of things. Hon. gentlemen opposite have pressed such a strong view in opposition to this measure and its consequences, that I am willing to give them every credit for conscientious motives, but every man of common sense must know that after every possible view in opposition to a measure has been again and again given and reiterated with painful reiteration, the time has now come to allow the measure to succeed. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, I appeal

with some confidence, especially to those older members who know the value, who have studied the value of the British constitution, no longer to continue this policy.

Mr. MILLS. There is one observation made by the hon. gentleman in which I concur; I agree with him that representative institutions in Canada under this Bill, are upon their trial. I say that with all earnestness, and I believe that opinion is shared by every hon. gentleman on this side. We believe if this measure be carried a very serious blow will be struck at representative institutions; we regard it as wholly incompatible with all those principles of representative government which have hitherto prevailed in this country; and we think the course taken by the hon. gentleman in bringing forward this Bill, in endeavoring to press it through this House in such an extraordinary way, at such a late period of the Session bears a very strong resemblance to the course pursued by some political chiefs in some of the South American republics. The hon. gentleman has complained that we have discussed for a very long time the various sections of the interpretation clause. The hon. gentleman himself invited discussion upon that clause. A friend of his moved an amendment in reference to woman suffrage, on the very first portion of the second section of the clause, and we had a discussion upon that subject. That discussion the hon. gentleman himself admits was appropriately taken; there were exactly the same reasons for carrying on the discussion on the subject of the Indian franchise because it was expressed in precisely the same way as was the woman suffrage question in that same clause. It is true we have had a great deal of discussion upon this question, but it is equally true that the subject has not been considered in many of its phases, and to a large degree the discussion of which the hon. gentleman complains is due to the persistency with which the second reading of the Bill was forced at an unusual hour upon Parliament. The hon. gentleman introducedhis measure after the House had been in session nearly three months. The hon. gentleman, when he introduced the Bill at an earlier period in a former year, admitted that it was a matter of such vast importance that it would require a whole Session for its consideration, and yet the hon. gentleman, following the practice which has served his purpose for a series of years, failed to bring forward this very important measure until nearly three months had elapsed, and then, before a large number on this side of the House had any opportunity to consider the merits and principles of the Bill, insisted upon a second reading. It is only necessary to look at the published *Debates*——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House met on the 29th January, and the Bill was introduced on the 19th March.

Mr. MILLS. It is true that he gave notice on the 19th March.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was introduced on the 19th March.

Mr. MILLS. It was several weeks afterwards before the Bill was in our hands. A considerable time had gone by before he moved the second reading, and then he introduced a measure of such vast consequence in an expository speech of less than ten minutes. I hold that we have not, as the hon. gentleman has said, travelled beside the question before us in this discussion. If you look at the two amendments in your hand, you will see that every observation addressed to the Chair from this side of the House was strictly pertinent to one or the other of those two motions. We have the amendment of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, and we have the general amendment to substitute the Provincial franchises moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and we have the third clause itself. All these are before you for consideration, and the hon. gentleman on this side who addresses himself to any one of these motions, or to all of them, is acting strictly within his right. I regard this measure as one of very great importance. It proposes to take from the people of this country the control of the preparation of the voters. lists. It proposes to confer the suffrage upon women, and it proposes to confer the franchise upon every Indian over 21 years of age in any one Province of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it does not.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister says no, but the Bill itself will show the House conclusively that it does precisely what I have stated. In not one of these instances did the hon. gentleman submit the question to the people of this country; in not one instance did he ask the popular verdict. If the government of this country is to be carried on according to the well understood wishes of the people as expressed at elections, will anyone tell me what is the conclusion at which the electorate has arrived on any one of the three important propositions involved in the Bill now before us? The hon. gentleman submitted the question of woman suffrage; he told us he was in favor of that, he intimated to us that it was his anxious desire that that motion should be carried, but, as soon as it was discovered that a very considerable number of gentlemen on this side were prepared to vote for that motion, a considerable number of the hon. gentleman's supporters seem to have been instructed to oppose it, and so that portion was struck out. The hon. gentleman has not so readily yielded on this question of the Indian franchise. He seems to think that the intelligent and Christian women of this country are entitled to much less consideration than the tribal Indians who reside on the reservations in the various Provinces. We know that this question of woman suffrage was voted down by the friends of the Government, and there is little reason for doubt that the conclusion at which the majority of the House arrived met with the approval of the promotor of the Bill. The Indian suffrage, we find, is tenaciously adhered to. The public will not fail to observe that, while the one proposition has been readily abandoned, the other proposition has been supported with all the vehemence and all the pertinacity that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House command. I do not regret the course the hon. gentleman has taken. It leaves no doubt on the public mind as to the object of this Bill, it leaves no doubt that, instead of proposing to fight the battle of his Government before the electors of this country, the hon. gentleman proposes that it shall be fought in Parliament, and it is here, where there is no doubt as to the numerical strength which he commands, that he proposes to take advantage of the opportunity, and to load the dice, in order that there may be no doubt, so far as he is concerned, as to what will be the result of the elections which will follow two years hence. It is perfectly clear by this Bill that the First Minister doubts the capacity of all white men in the country to exercise the elective franchise. He says they must give evidence of their fitness to exercise it. He proposes by this clause and by the four or five subsequent clauses that a certain amount of real property shall be held in some form or other by the white man or the colored man in order to entitle him to exercise the elective franchise, but nothing of this sort is required of the Indian. He resides upon his reservation. If there is no ticket of allotment or division of the reservation, under this 6th section of the Bill there is a provision that, if the whole property taken together is worth a sufficient amount to entitle each individual Indian to a vote, he shall have the elective franchise. So, by the provision of the Bill submitted to us, every Indian who is over 21 years of age in Canada will be entitled to the elective franchise. While the question of property is of consequence to the white man, it is of no consequence to the Indian. The hon. gentleman knows that the Indian does not own his property. Why does he

ask for the ownership of property in the case of the white man? It is not to the property that the hon. gentleman proposes to give the vote, but he takes that as an evidence of the qualification, of the capacity, of the industry and frugality of the white citizen, to qualify him for the exercise of the franchise. If he is incapable of holding or retaining his property, he is not allowed to exercise the elective franchise, but loses the right to vote when he loses his property. The hon. gentleman has declared over and over again, in his report as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, that the Indian, if he were given his property, would not retain it six months in the great majority of cases. He knows that in giving the Indian possession of his property, he knows he would cease to be a voter before this Act would come into effect, he knows that he would lose that property by which alone he could be qualified. The hon. gentleman says he has no capacity to take charge of his own affairs, that he is wanting in intellectual capacity, and he therefore acts as trustee to him, he takes charge of his estate, and in consequence gives him a vote on that estate, a vote which he would not have at all if the Government did not interfere and secure the property on his behalf. Now, the hon. gentleman's Bill disfranchises a large number of white men in this country. He cannot give a single instance in the history of England where any portion of the community were disfranchised except for offences against the election law. If a man had been convicted of bribery, if he has been shown to have violated the law, he may be disfranchised. When the Reform Bill was proposed, parties who had proprietary rights in Gaton and Old Sarum, claimed it is a property, they claimed that the Government ought not to take it from them without compensation; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes, without any offence being committed by a large number of the electors, without any wrong being done, and without popular sanction in any way, to disfranchise those people; and he proposes to confer the electoral franchise upon a large number of persons who are notoriously unfit to exercise it; and he proposes to do this without appeal to the country, and without having any sanction given him by the electors. The unemancipated Indian controls no property. The hon. gentleman admits that he is unfit for citizenship. He is not allowed to make a contract, and no contract can be enforced against him. He does not serve upon a jury, he does not serve with the militia, he does not assist in bearing any of the expense of the administration of justice, and yet, while retaining the Indian in his condition of tutelage, in a condition of servitude to the Government, the hon. gentleman proposes to confer the highest franchise known to freemen upon him. The hon. gentleman knows that the Indian is not a citizen; he does not mingle with the rest of the community; he forms a member of a tribe, and they stand apart. They have their own customs and their own regulations and direct their own affairs, to a limited extent, subject to his control and to his interference. And without changing that condition, without emancipating the Indian, without conferring upon him the franchise which the Indian Act authorises him to confer, admitting that he is incapable of being enfranchised, admitting that he would lose what he possesses if he were enfranchised, the hon. gentleman proposes to take an individual who, if left to himself, would be reduced to a condition of penury, and to put in his hands the electoral franchise by which he may control and determine the destiny of this country. Now, Sir, our free institutions rest upon the habits of self-reliance existing amongst our people. It is that self-reliance which renders free institutions not only possible but practicable in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that the mere framing of a free constitution, the wide extension of the franchise, the establishment of popular government in form, will not make a free people. The history of Mexico and the South American republics evidence that.

The hon. gentleman, therefore, proposes to make a man who is without public spirit, who is without any enterprise, who is without any habits of self-reliance, who knows nothing about our institutions, who can neither read nor write, who possesses no property which he can control, a voter, and put into his hands the electoral franchise for the purpose of electing members to sit in this great council of the nation. I say he has no authority for that; I say he is not morally competent to do that thing; I say we are justified in resisting, by all the constitutional means that Parliament places at our disposal, a proposition so monstrous and so unjust in itself. Why, Sir, this measure, in this respect, is nothing less than revolutionary. It is a proposal to change the institutions and the government of this country without the sanction of the people and without the authority of the people. Sir, I admit that if the hon. gentleman chooses to go to the country, if he chooses to make that an issue, if he puts it fairly before the electors, and if he were returned with a majority to support that proposition, then he would be morally competent, as well as having the abstract legal right to deal with the subject. But he has not done so; he has taken no such course; he has no authority for what he proposes to do. It is an abuse of the power with which he is entrusted; it is a gross violation of his duty as trustee for the people of this country, to undertake to force through Parliament a measure of so extraordinary a character and so unjust as that which is now before us. Sir, it is an insult to the people of this country, it is an insult to those who have been exercising their constitutional right in resisting a measure so grossly unfair, for the hon. gentleman to complain that we are obstructing legislation of this sort. Why, Sir, a burglar might as well complain of the resistance of the man who is defending his own house and seeking to protect his own property from pillage. The hon. gentleman is bringing forward a measure which he dared not submit to the people of this country, which he knows is abhorrent to the vast majority of his own supporters; and if the hon. gentlemen who sit around him discharged their duty as loyal party men, they would reject this measure, they would oppose it as strongly as we do on this side of the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us that property is no evidence of capacity or fitness to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When? Where?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did it in this House; he did it from his seat. He instanced the case of Charles James Fox who, he said, could not manage his own affairs, who was incompetent to manage his own estate, and yet he was one of the greatest statesmen of his age and generation. The hon. gentleman argues in effect that while the Indian is incompetent to take charge of his own property and manage his own affairs, he is competent to take charge of the affairs of the nation. Why, the hon. gentleman attacks the very basis upon which he proposes to establish the electoral franchise. He says: I admit the Indian is incompetent to manage his own affairs, but his incapacity to control his own property is no evidence of unfitness to exercise the electoral franchise. Well, if it is not with the Indian, why is it with the white man? Why does the hon. gentleman put it in his Bill at all? Why does he come to this House and say: I will not allow the white man to vote, unless he possesses property of a certain amount, and yet he says: I will allow the Indian to vote whether he has any property or not, whether he is competent to control property or not; because, forsooth, the possession of property is no evidence of a man's fitness to exercise the electoral franchise. If it is not evidence why put it in his Bill? Why say a man shall have a certain amount of property before he shall exercise the electoral franchise, if property is no evidence of political intelligence? The hon. gentleman says: Oh, it is necessary to

elevate the Indian; we want to confer the electoral franchise upon the Indian in order that we may elevate him. Sir, the hon. gentleman will not elevate the Indian, but he will degrade Parliament. To the ordinary Indian the value of the vote is just the sum it will bring—its mercantile value determines its value to him. The hon. gentleman stands in the position of the patriot who addressed the needy knife-grinder. The hon. gentleman says: He knows the Indian may have a hole in his coat, but he is ready to listen to his pitiful story; he is ready to confer on him the electoral franchise; he is ready to make him a citizen of this Dominion and enable him to cast a vote at elections while he is still a ward of the Government, and under the control of the agents and superintendents of the Indian Department throughout the country. The public will understand this measure. They will understand the motives of the hon. gentleman. They know why this measure is brought forward at this time. They know that if the political outlook was as bright as it was some time ago the hon. gentleman would not have proposed this measure. It is true it has been before Parliament occasionally during the last 18 years; but there has been no such necessity for passing it as there is at the present time. The public, therefore, will certainly understand why that is being done. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposed a motion to adopt the electoral franchises of the various Provinces instead of adopting the electoral franchise suggested by section 3 and subsequent sections. The hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, moved an amendment that Prince Edward Island be exempted from the operation of this section. He proposed, in effect, that the Island should retain its provincial franchise. If the hon. gentleman had supported the motion of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and if that motion were successful, the electoral franchise in Prince Edward Island would be retained. But the hon. gentleman is not satisfied to do that. He is anxious that the Island should retain its own electoral franchise, but he is unwilling that any other Provinces should do so. The hon. gentleman is determined to force on the other Provinces a franchise that he is unwilling Parliament should force on his own Province. The hon. gentleman reminds me of some of those religious sects during the 16th century who complained loudly of persecution, and demanded toleration for themselves, while not willing to grant toleration to any other denomination. So the hon. gentleman says, we want the franchise selected by the people of Prince Edward Island, but we are opposed to other Provinces enjoying the same right. I am so much in favor of the principle of provincial rights in this matter that I will vote for whatever proposition comes first. I will vote for every proposition of this sort. If I cannot procure provincial rights for all the Provinces, I am ready to secure them for as many as I can. I regret the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, has not seen proper to deal with other hon. gentlemen as we would have them deal with him. The hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), accused us the other night of obstruction. He declared that we on this side had a right briefly to express our views on public questions; we had a right briefly to state our opposition to this measure; but beyond that we had no right to go. The hon. gentleman laid down a number of mutually destructive propositions, and I will read them to the committee. The hon. gentleman said:

"In one sense, Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government."

In what sense? Is it here to register the opinions of the Government on questions on which public opinion has not been pronounced? Is it here to register the opinions of the Government, and to change the constitution and institutions of this country? Is it here to register the opinions of the Government in favor of Indian suffrage and against woman suffrage? The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"In another sense it is not. If the proposition is that Parliament is simply to shut its eyes and stop its ears and, when the 13 members of the cabinet bring down their measures, to swallow them, without the opportunity of accepting or rejecting them, then Parliament is not here for any such purpose."

If I understand this part of the hon. gentleman's statement, Parliament is free to accept or reject any measure of the Government. It is free to criticise any measure of the Government, and free to oppose it. But he withdraws from this position and again asserts the doctrine of implicit obedience, I suppose, seeing that the Government have opposed the amendments to the Scott Act, which they thought they could do safely in the other Chamber, the hon. gentleman will be disposed to follow the Government when that measure comes back to this House. I suppose, seeing that the Government secretly sought to defeat the proposal for woman suffrage, the hon. gentleman will feel himself called on to agree with the Government and oppose woman suffrage. I suppose, as the Government are now pressing so earnestly and obstinately the question of the Indian franchise, the hon. gentleman will be prepared to support the Indian franchise, and oppose those who think the Indians who are enfranchised are not qualified to exercise the highest privilege and trust of freemen. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"But if the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, who are put in power by the majority of the people, and who have the confidence of the people, I say that Parliament is here for that and no other purpose."

This is an extraordinary doctrine. I should like to know what constitutional authorities the hon. gentleman relies upon for such a doctrine. The hon. gentleman gravely asserts that any other theory would be destructive of responsible parliamentary government. I should like to know how the hon. gentleman is free to criticise, to reject a measure, if he is here simply to register the wishes of the Government, because it is supported by a majority. I can subscribe to no such doctrine. I hold that so far from it being a doctrine consistent with parliamentary government, it would be entirely destructive of any such system. What is a political party? It is a number of men, Burke says, that are united together, agreeing in their views on questions of public policy, for the promotion of a common end. That is Burke's definition of party. These hon. gentlemen went to the country upon certain questions. They were supported by the country, and their party is bound to support in this House the principles enunciated on platform and hustings. But with respect to new questions, questions that were not before the elections, the rule is wholly different. The hon. gentleman is bound to support the National Policy, as are all those who were elected by the people for that purpose, but he is not more bound than is his leader. He is not bound because his leader supports it, but because the country has sustained himself and his leader on that question, and his leader is as much bound as he is himself. It is not a question of the servility of a number of gentlemen to a leader, but it is a question of the devotion of a number of gentlemen, leader and all, to certain principles to which they have committed themselves and which have been sanctioned by the country. But we are here to oppose their views on this question, and we are here to oppose them as much as they are here to support them. We are here to oppose them by the same authority—the authority of our constituents. We stated our views; they were in accord with the views of the electorate, and so we have seats in this House. We are here to enunciate, explain, and defend them, and make them known here and to the country, as much as are the Government and those who support them are bound to support the views they enunciated on platform and hustings. It is because of this public discus-

sion that parliamentary government is superior to any other. It is a great school of thought by which intelligence is disseminated among the electors, by which the commen standard of attainment is raised, and by which the country is made more self reliant upon questions relating to public affairs. But this question is a wholly different one. When was public opinion expressed upon this question? I read the other day, in the course of this debate, an extract from a speech of Lord Beaconsfield, upon the question of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He said that the House of Commons, without the sanction of the country, was not morally competent to deal with that question. He denied the moral competency——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did deal with it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says he did what?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did deal with it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Gladstone did deal with it, but it was after an election was had, and after the country had sustained it. Mr. Gladstone proposed some resolutions, and those resolutions were carried through the House of Commons, but no further step was taken until an election was had. The views expressed by Mr. Disraeli were acquiesced in, an election was had, and then he admitted the moral competence of Parliament, to deal with that question. Did he say that the supporters of the Government were obliged to support that measure? He said a majority were committed to the prin ciple, but beyond that the majority were not called upon to go. I will read the views of Lord Beaconsfield, and we will see what a great difference there is between the views of the hon. member for King's and his leader, and the views of the great leader of the Conservative party of Great Britain at that time. And, be it remembered, this speech was made on the second reading of the Bill, after the election were had, and after a majority of the country had voted in favor of disestablishment:

"I take the fair interpretation of the decision of the country at the general elections to be this, that it was the opinion of the country that the right hon. gentleman should have the opportunity of dealing with the question of the church in Ireland. I do not understand that the country pledged itself to support any particular measure. No particular measure was then before it; but it declared and decided, in a manner which could not be mistaken, that the right hon. gentleman should have a fair and full opportunity of dealing with the question of the church in Ireland. I cannot, therefore, take this occasion which might otherwise have been a most legitimate one, of preventing the right hon. gentleman from placing his policy before the country, and I shall advise none of those whose conduct I can influence to oppose the motion the right hon. gentleman has just made."

What does that mean? He says it would have been a legitimate and proper thing for him to prevent the passage of that measure, if an election had not been had upon it, but an election having been had upon it, the views of the country having been expressed in its favor, he had not a moral right to oppose the measure by all those resources which the rules of Parliament placed at his disposal, as he would have had, if the views of the country had not been taken. Now, Sir, those are very different views from those advanced by the First Minister, and the hon. gentlemen behind him. Why, Sir, what protection have we under our constitutional system against the conduct of an arbitrary and unprincipled Minister, and a servile majority, if the views of these hon. gentlemen are recognised as sound constitutional views? The hon. gentleman might propose the annexation of this country to the United States. He might get a majority of his supporters to support such a measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No fear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says, No fear; but I would ask him if there is any man in this House who, if he had been told two years ago that a motion to enfranchise all the Indians residing on the reservations, from ocean to ocean in this country, would be submitted, would not have indignantly repudiated such a thing. Why, Sir, the descent of Avernus is easy; hon. gentlemen are going down hill with facility; they are ready to support propositions which they would have indignantly rejected a short time ago, and I say the only protection we have against the abuse of parliamentary authority is that every proposed change in the constitution shall only be made after public sanction has been given at an election. There is no necessity for this haste, no reason for this hurry. What reason has the hon. gentleman given for taking this extraordinary course on this occasion? Why not go to the country on this question, as well as the question of the National Policy? The hon. gentleman was so anxious to obtain the views of the country, so anxious to find out whether the people had changed their minds on that question, that he dissolved Parliament two years before its time, to ascertain the views of the country; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes in this matter to carry through a measure vitally affecting our constitution, without any recourse to the people, and without giving them the opportunity of expressing their views on it at all. Sir, if the hon. member for King's, N.B., was right, there was no necessity for examining this or any other measure. All he needed was to ascertain the views of the Government to give them his earnest and active support. It is not the exercise of judgment but of implicit obedience which is sought under such a doctrine. The hon. gentleman as a political philosopher, as a disciple of the First Minister, might be anxious to know his views, to make himself conversant with them, but that would be a matter for his own individual pleasure or amusement, because a knowledge of a measure or of its merits would not at all be of any consequence to enable him to do what he says is the bounden duty of the supporters of the Government—simply to register the wishes of the Government on this and every other question. Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman's line of discussion suggests the question: To what extent a Government is entitled to the support of a party—how far ought party allegiance to go? I say that when a Government goes to the country upon a question of public policy, and the supporters of that Government go to the country taking the same views as the Administration, they are bound if sustained to give effect to the wishes of the country in that particular. But it does not at all follow that they are bound to support the Government on every other question which may come up, during the five years of its administration. Take the case of Mr. Gladstone, when he carried the United Kingdom with him, in the policy which he initiated in his Midlothian speeches. The country supported those views, and the great majority of those taking the same view were elected. But does that bind Parliament to support Mr. Gladstone's views on the Egyptian war, the war in the Soudan, or the disputed boundaries of Afghanistan? These are questions which have forced themselves on the attention of the Government and the nation, and the members who usually support the Administration are just as free to take that course, which an independent judgment suggests to them as being in the public interests, as any other portion of the community. Sir, upon this question the country was never consulted. I look at the third section of the Bill and I see there no provision that the hon. gentleman explained to the country, no provision as to which the hon. gentleman said, if I am elected I will seek to carry out these views. There was nothing of that sort enunciated; and this is not a question of emergency forcing itself on the attention of the Government, but a question which the hon. gentleman has dangled before Parliament during the last 18 years, and which no one supposed that he would undertake to force upon this House. Sir, there was in this Bill a provision relating to woman suffrage. When was that question submitted to the people of this country? When were they asked to say whether they were willing or not to enfranchise the widows and

spinsters of Canada? At what election question was that made an issue? What opportunity have the members of this House had to consult their constituents on that question? And, again, with regard to the Indian suffrage. Have the views of the people of this country been taken upon that question? Has any hon. gentleman in any election told the people of this country that if he was returned to Parliament he would vote to enfranchise the Indians on their reserves—not to enfranchise them under the Indian Act, not to make them free men, to give them control of their own affairs, but that they might vote at elections, and mark their ballots under the supervision of the deputy returning officers. Why, Sir, we know that more than 90 per cent. of those Indians cannot read or write; they cannot mark their own ballots. We know that the hon. gentleman has charge of these men; we know the class of men they are—I have had personal experience in this matter, we know the kind of men that will be appointed deputy returning officers on the Indian reserves; we know that they will take care how the Indian ballots shall be marked; we know precisely as well what will be done under the provisions of this Bill, as we shall know after the next general election. Sir, I admit that a Government has a right to deal with questions that cannot be foreseen, and that are forced upon its attention. Especially is this true of independent states in their relations with other states; and the Government must act as far as it can upon its own individual judgment, to be sustained by the independent opinion of Parliament itself. But there are various ways in which the opinions of the country are expressed, and which give to the Government, not that satisfactory aid and guidance which it can receive at a general election, but an imperfect aid—by means of the press, by public meetings, and by other means known under our constitution. But in England, when there has been a change in the constitution itself, when the institutions of the country have been altered, when the franchise has been extended or the representation has been changed, a general election has always first been held, and a majority has been returned to Parliament to support the policy that has before been enunciated. This was the case with the Reform Bill of 1832. On two occasions the views of the country were obtained before the question was dealt with; and when Parliament was dissolved the last time it was expressly stated by the King that he was proroguing Parliament with the view to its dissolution, for the purpose of ascertaining whether those who supported the Government were doing so in accordance with the wishes of the country. Now, Sir, that is a wholly different thing from acting contrary to our commission. We are here for the purpose of carrying on the Government under the constitution as it is, not for the purpose of changing the constitution or making it different from what it is; that is no part of our ordinary parliamentary duties. Let us not confound two wholly distinct and independent things. Under the English system of parliamentary government the alteration of the constitution is brought about by the same body which is entrusted with law-making power; but the alteration of the constitution is not made in the way that ordinary legislation is carried on. Ordinary legislation the Government may deal with from time to time as they may think proper; if the country does not approve, the country can change; but when you attack the constitution itself, when you undertake to alter the system of government under which we live, you can never go back to the same people again. You give no opportunity to those who entrusted you with authority of saying whether you are deserving of having continued to you the confidence they once reposed in you. I say, then, that a change in the constitution is made on a different plan and on different principles. It is made under popular sanction after the nation has been consulted, and after its approval has been obtained. Sir, we know what is thought of Captain Kidd. He was entrusted with the king's commission, he was authorised under the commission to give protection to the commerce of the nation; but, instead of acting according to his commission he became a pirate, and by the violation of his commission he made war on that commerce that it was his duty under his commission to protect. What is the hon. gentleman doing? Has he been authorised by the people of this country to make changes in the constitution? Not at all. He has been commissioned to legislate under the constitution as it is; and in violation of that trust, he is calling on his supporters to change the constitution itself, and to place the power in this country in other hands than those to which it is committed at this moment. That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. It is making war upon our rights; it is making war upon those rights which it is the bounden duty of Parliament to guard; and we are bound, in our duty to our constituents and to this country, to resist by all constitutional means, this attempt at usurpation—this revolutionary act—this proposal to change our constitution and to make it something different from what it is. Sir, let me read, for the benefit of the hon. member for King's, an extract from an essay by Lord Jeffrey on the subject of party government:

"One party, that of the rulers or the court, is necessarily formed and disciplined from the permanence of its chief, and the uniformity of the interests it has to maintain;—the party in opposition, therefore, must be marshalled in the same way. When bad men combine, good men must unite—and it would not be less hopeless for a crowd of worthy citizens to take the field without leaders or discipline, against a regular army, than for individual patriots to think of opposing the influence of the Sovereign by their separate and uncombined exertions. As to the lengths they should be permitted to go in support of the common cause, or the extent of which each ought to submit his private opinion to the general sense of his associates, it does not appear to us—though casuists may varnish over dishonor, and purists startle at shadows—either that any man of upright feelings can be often at a loss for a rule of conduct, or that, in point of fact, there has ever been any blameable excess in the maxims upon which the great parties of this country have been generally conducted.

"The leading principle is, that the man should satisfy himself that the party to which he attaches himself means well to the country, and that more substantial good will accrue to the nation from its coming into power, than from the success of any other body of men whose success is at all within the limits of probability. Upon that principle, therefore, he will support that party in all things which he approves—in all things that are indifferent—and even in some things which he partly disapproves, provided they neither touch the honor and vital interests of the country, nor imply any breach of the ordinary rule of morality. Upon the same principle, he will attack not only all that he individually disapproves in the conduct of his adversary, but all that might appear indifferent and tolerable enough to a neutral spectator. If it afford an opportunity to weaken this adversary in the public opinion, and to increase the chance of bringing that party into power from which alone he sincerely believes that any sure or systematic good is to be expected. Farther than this we do not believe that the leaders or respectable followers of any consiberable party intentionally allow themselves to go. Their zeal indeed, and the passions engendered in the course of the conflict, may sometimes hurry them into measures for which an impartial spectator cannot find this apology—but to their own conscience and honor we are persuaded that they generally stand acquitted—and, on the score of duty or morality, that is all that can be required of human beings. For the baser retainers of the party, indeed—those marauders who follow in the rear of every army, not for battle but for booty—who concern themselves in no way about the justice of the quarrel or the fairness of the field—who plunder the dead, and butcher the wounded, and desert the unprosperous, and betray the daring—for those wretches who truly belong to no party, and are a disgrace and drawback upon all, we shall assuredly make no apology or propose any measure of toleration."

Now, I think, with slight modifications, owing to the chance of circumstances in the nation, those views are still adapted to the parties in the United Kingdom, and I wish that his general description of party were equally applicable here; but if we are to be governed by the doctrines laid down by the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), that it is the bounden duty of the majority of the House to register the views of the Administration, no matter what those views may be, no matter whether the country has been consulted or not, it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite are fighting for booty rather than principle, and are seeking to promote the general well being of individuals rather

than that of the nation. We have been told again and again by hon. gentlemen opposite that this Parliament has the power to pass this Bill, that the constitution authorises us to pass it, and that therefore, because we have the power, we must necessarily have the right. I do not deny that we have the power; I admit that we have the power to pass such a Franchise Act; but I deny that it is at all expedient to deal with the question at this moment. I wholly deny that we are morally competent to pass an Act like this that radically changes our whole constitutional system. Hon. gentlemen opposite have read the clause in the British North America Act to show that the franchise existing under the law of the old Provinces was to continue to be the franchise of Canada until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provided, and they say that is conclusive evidence that it was intended Parliament should otherwise provide. If it were necessary that, by otherwise providing, a Dominion Franchise Act should be made, certainly it was the duty of Parliament otherwise to provide, and Parliament did otherwise provide. Under that law is our present franchise constituted? Under the law of the Provinces? Not at all; under the law of this Dominion. It was under the law of this Dominion, passed in 1874, that our last general election took place, and it was under that law the election in 1878 took place. Let us look for a moment at the law. The 40th election of the Dominion Election Act provides: Subject to the exceptions here and above contained all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives in the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several Provinces composing the Dominion of Canada and other, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such Provinces respectively. It is under that authority our elections are held. That is the law of the Parliament of Canada as much as the Bill you have before you would be, if it passed this House and received the sanction of the Governor General. The Provincial franchises are the electoral franchises for this Dominion, in virtue of that law under the authority of this Parliament, and therefore it is a question of expediency and convenience whether this system shall be continued or not. I do not deny that we have the power; I say we have exercised the power, but it does not follow that we are bound to exercise every power we possess. We have the power of taxing commerce out of existence, but it does not follow that it would be wise or expedient to do so. We have the power of legislating that the property of shipping shall be transferred from those who now hold it into other hands without compensation. Would it be wise to exercise that power? We have the power of doing a score of things that would be atrociously unjust. To possess a power and to justify the exercise of it are two wholly distinct things. We have the power of saying that no man over 21 years old shall exercise the franchise, that no man with blue eyes, or that no man with red hair shall have the right to vote, or that the electoral franchise shall be entrusted to persons under 21 years of age. But because we have the power to do these things, it would be preposterous to conclude that we are called upon to exercise them. The basis of the authority of the Government would be destroyed by the very exercise of such powers. This system that we now have has been in force for 18 years; we have had five general elections under it. What abuses have grown up to show that we should change it? I think it is a sound principle in legislation that Parliament ought not to legislate except where necessity can be shown, and upon every one who proposes to alter a law, the burden of proof is to show that the change in the law, is necessary. Who has undertaken this duty in this case? I listened to the expository speech of 8 or 9 minutes of the First Minister, and did not find that he attempted to justify any provision of the Bill or to discuss the merits of the question at all. He said a few words on the subject of woman suffrage, but not a word about Indian suffrage, not a word about proposing to confer votes upon unenfranchised Indians, residing on reserves and who are wards of the Government. Not a word did he say with regard to the other important features of the Bill, nor did he attempt to justify the measure, or show any necessity for it. He showed no abuse under the existing law as a justification of the change proposed. Two members on that side of the House undertook to justify these changes by a statement which applies rather to another part of the Bill than to that which is now before us, but which is strictly pertinent under the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) and the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said the change was necessary because the voters' list was improperly prepared by partisan assessors, that, in fact, the elections for municipal councils had degenerated into struggles for the appointment of an assessor. The hon. member for North Perth told us that his friends were successful in this struggle, that the majority of the assessors were on his side, but that they were partisans, that they were guilty of perjury, and were not to be trusted; that they were committing perjury throughout the country. In fact, he was so shocked at the perjury which had been committed in his own county by those who had been entrusted with the preparation of the voters' list, that he says this ought to be taken out of their hands and put into the hands of the fair-minded men whom the Government will appoint. Well, for my part, I would rather trust my case in the hands of those whom he called perjured partisans than in the hands of these fair-minded men whom the Government will appoint.

Mr. HESSON. The hon gentleman is misrepresenting me. I never used the words "perjured partisans" at all. He has no right to misrepresent what I said, and to put in my mouth language not at all implied by anything which I said. What I said is upon the record. I do not wish to waste time by reading it, but I stated that I was perfectly satisfied that the elections were carried in the counties throughout Ontario upon partisan principles, and that the Reform party were responsible for that; that it was made the cry to look after the voters' lists, to see to the voters' lists. How could you do that unless it were done at first by the election of the council, and afterwards by the appointment of the assessors, and then the Court of Revision; and then there is a final appeal to the judge, and I presume that will be the same in the present case.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that the assessor is sworn to do his duty. He represents the assessor as a partisan. He said the conduct of the assessors was so partisan that he desired to see the matter taken out of their hands and out of the hands of the council and put into the hands of the appointee of the Government. What is the inference? Is not the assessor sworn? Did he by his speech intend to imply that the assessor had acted honestly, that he had acted fairly, that he had discharged his duty and prepared a proper list, that his list was not a partisan list, that some names had not been unfairly left off and some names unfairly put on, contrary to the oath of office which the assessor had taken? If the hon. gentleman's observations did not mean that, they did not mean anything. That is precisely what his observations meant, they could not mean anything else, and I am satisfied that the assessors and the municipal councillors not only in his own county, but in every other county throughout Ontario will appreciate the slander which the hon. gentleman has here spoken against them. I know of but a single case of the character to which the hon. gentleman has referred. In my own constituency, there was a case of Mr. Craig, who was appointed assessor, and it was afterwards discovered that

about sixty names had been improperly left off in the township. He was prosecuted, and he was obliged to flee the country, but it happens that he was not a friend or a supporter of mine but belonged to that class which the hon. gentleman says did not begin this struggle for the control of the voters' lists. But the hon. gentleman should bear in mind that the adoption of the provincial franchise, as proposed by my hon. friend, is more in harmony with the genius of our constitution than the proposal of the First Minister, even though the Bill were made perfectly fair and its partisan features were wiped out. But I know, and every hon. gentleman in this House, whether on this side or on that, knows that, if those partisan features were wiped out, the First Minister would have no interest in pressing this Bill on the attention of Parliament. I say that, under our federal system, the adoption of the provincial franchise is more consistent with our system than this proposal. Under our constitution, we have the principle of representation by population. Is it applied to the whole country as a unit? Are there to be equal electoral districts? No, it is applied by Provinces. Quebec is to have sixty-five members, and all the other Provinces are to have numbers in proportion to their population according to that of the Province of Quebec. If the proportion is changed in Quebec, and the number is made something less than 65, then a different proportion is to be adopted in the other Provinces, so that the principle of represention by population between the Provinces may be preserved. If the hon. gentleman was right and if his views were sound, it would be necessary to apply the principle to the entire country as a unit and to make the electoral districts equal, to redistribute the seats in the Province of Quebec, to add to the smaller constituencies and reduce the larger constituencies, and so with every other Province of the Dominion. The House has not adopted that view. It has not attempted to deal with this country as a unit. Parliament has so far recognised the principle laid down in this constitution, that the representation by population is representation by population between the Provinces and not as between the constituencies, that the Province is the unit of which Canada is the multiple and Canada is not the unit of which the Provinces are fractions. There is not a word said about uniformity between the Provinces with a view of securing equal electoral divisions. There are some features of our legislation that, it seems to me, have been lost sight of. We have on other matters proceeded on exactly the same lines that we have proceeded heretofore in reference to the elective franchise. In 1873, the First Minister introduced a Controverted Elections Act, and he proposed to create an election court, and he proposed to constitute that court in some instances of the judges who compose the other courts, and he gave as a reason for adopting that course that we had no power to confer jurisdiction upon provincial courts. We took a different view, and in 1874 another Controverted Election Act was adopted, and by that Controverted Election Act the different courts were made election courts. The courts are specified in the Controverted Election Act, which says that the Court of Chancery, the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas and the Court of Appeals in Ontario shall be election courts for the trial of controverted elections. Some of the judges in Lower Canada took exception to this legislation. They said: You cannot adopt this rule, you cannot confer civil jurisdiction upon these courts; and the case of Vallin against Langlois was taken from the provincial courts to the Privy Council and we have the judgment of the Privy Council upon that case. What did the Lords of the council say? They said: The trial of controverted elections is not an ordinary matter of civil procedure, it is a question lying wholly within the jurisdiction of Parliament, and it was within the power of Parliament to determine for itself who should try these controverted elections. It was in the power of Parliament to confer that jurisdiction upon judges, to confer that duty upon existing provincial courts, because it was a question that lay wholly within the jurisdiction of Parliament. Now, it is just upon precisely that principle that we have proceeded in adopting the provincial franchises. The question as to who shall vote for members of this House is wholly within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. It does not rest with the Local Legislature. The Local Legislature has no power to pass an Act to say who shall be an elector for the election of members of the House of Commons. We say that we have settled that; we said it in the Act; we said that the people in the different Provinces whom the Local Legislatures say shall be electors for the election of members to the Local Legislature, shall also be electors for the election of members to the House of Commons. That is what we have said. It is by virtue of that declaration that the local law has become our law. It is not because it is a local law that it is binding upon us at this moment; it is because we have said that it shall be the law of Canada, and the jurisdiction being vested in us, we have the right to say it. Now, we have a right to say what a town clerk shall do; we have the right to say what an assessor shall do; we have the right to say who shall prepare the voters' lists; we have the right to say that those voters' lists shall be prepared by municipal officers, or any other persons acting in the capacity of municipal officers—not under any power they possess as municipal officers, but under the power we confer upon them, under the duty conferred upon them in the exercise of a power we possess. Now, that being the case, we have the same right to impose the duty upon a clerk that we have to impose a duty upon a judge. Surely no one can contend that we can impose a duty upon a judge of a superior court that would be binding upon him, and we cannot impose a duty upon an ordinary township or municipal clerk that shall be equally binding upon him. Anyone knows that in the one case we act under our authority just as we do in the other; in the one case our authority is just as binding as it is in the other. And why do we choose those officers? We choose them because they are acquainted with the locality, because they are appointed by the people themselves; because, in the preparation of the voters' lists, the people are acting in their own behalf; they are exerting their own authority. We are not putting the matter into the hands of a partisan Government that is interested in the results, but we are putting the matter into the hands of officers who are supposed to belong to neither one party or the other. The rule upon which we act is a rule of convenience. We have adopted this system because it is convenient, because it is better than the system now proposed. If the motion of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is carried, what will happen? That the ordinary mode of preparing a voters' list that prevails now in the Provinces, will be retained, that it will remain in the hands of parties who possess local knowledge; it will remain, as it is in England, in the hands of parties possessing local knowledge. But if this motion is rejected, and if the views of the right hon. gentleman prevail, what will happen? Why, the whole affair, from the first inception to the end, unlike the law in any other Government in the world where Parliamentary government exists, will be in the hands of the Minister whose position may depend upon the conduct of unscrupulous men whom he may appoint. What could be more monstrous than such a proposition? Have they any such plan as that in England? Why, sir, you find in the county of Middlesex, and in the city of London, that the appointment of the revising officer is in the hands of the Chief Justice, and that in every other county it is in the hands of the judge who is on the circuit during the summer assize. In whose hands is it in the United States? In the hands of men elected by the people, in the hands of a body in whom

both parties are represented. Look at the Australian colonies. In every one there is the recognition of the principle that the Government is an interested party and cannot be entrusted with the appointment of the officers. And yet the right hon. gentleman proposes here—what? Before the last election he had taken into his hands the appointment of returning officers, and before the next election he proposes to assume the appointment of revising officers who shall prepare as well as revise the list. Could a proposition be more monstrous? Yet the right hon. gentleman says parliamentary Government is on its trial in the discussion of this Bill. I agree with him, I say it is on trial. I say every vote given in favor of this Bill is a direct stab at the principle of Parliamentary Government. I say that no friend of Parliamentary Government, no man who is not opposed to our system of Government, can support this measure. It is utterly impossible for Parliamentary Government to endure with the adoption of such a measure. Why, Sir, look at the condition of things. Here you propose to enfranchise some 50,000 Indians who will command some 10,000 votes in the next election—all to be thrown on one side. Everyone knows that not more than two per cent. of them will be given in any other way than for the Administration for the time being. That is the position of things. You have only to look at the vote polled at the last election to see what that result must be, if that result were alone to operate. Sir, I admit that in my opinion, it will not have the disastrous effect that the Minister intends; I admit that his scheme will not succeed to as large an extent as he anticipates. I believe that there is a moral sense in the Conservative party of this country, no less than in the Reform party, that will revolt at such a proceeding. The hon. gentleman may bring his supporters in this House to accept such a proposition, but he will find that he cannot discipline the fair-minded men outside of Parliament to support this measure. It is so monstrous that if it were adopted, it is perfectly obvious that it would be impossible that Parliamentary Government could be maintained in this country; and it is perfectly obvious that it would be the duty of the majority of the electors of this country to consider what is prudent in resisting such a measure, to consider whether they were bound to obey this as an ordinary law. The member for Montreal-Centre (Mr. Curran) declared that it was right and proper to bring forward this Bill, although the country had not been consulted, because, he said, we carried the Act of Confederation without an appeal to the country. Well, sir, we did did that. I think it was a great misfortune, I think it was one of the most serious blows ever aimed at Parliamentary Government in this country. Every body knows that the union is wanting in those elements of cohesion that it would have possessed, had this measure been supported by the people of the different Provinces, had their sanction been given to it before it became law. But I was rather surprised to hear such a proposition defended by the hon. member from Montreal Centre. Why, Sir, this was the way the union between Great Britain and Ireland was carried, without an appeal to the country, and without popular sanction. Was there a single leading man among the Liberal statesmen of that day who supported that proposition? Did Gratton, Plunket, Curran support it? There was not a distinguished Irishman or statesman whose name has come down to us, who did not denounce that measure; not one who did not declare that it was a gross violation of the powers of the parliamentary majority to pass such a measure, Mr. Plunkett declared they were there not to create Legislatures but to make laws, and that no one was bound to obey such a measure. It has no other authority than that of force, and has no other support than that of bayonets. Was it a wise act? Has the result shown that it was a wise act on the part of those who carried that measure without the sanction of the nation? Everyone knows that Ireland has been a discontented member of the union from that day to this, and that until home rule is granted, Ireland will never cordially support a union; that until home rule is granted there will be discontent; that the present Legislative Union, carried by fraud, carried by the influence of the Crown and by an ambitious and servile Government, has produced one of the greatest misfortunes that has ever affected and afflicted the United Kingdom. It is rather extraordinary to find the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) justifying the course that was then taken, by declaring it was right and proper for the Government to carry this measure without popular sanction. Let me for a moment consider this question, consider the changes that have taken place in the constitution of England. There have been reforms carried from time to time; sometimes a large stride has been taken, sometimes a shorter one; but it has never gone back upon the constitutional reforms which have been effected. Each step taken has been forward and has only served as a basis for another step forward. But the hon. gentleman who leads the present Government in this House has been trying to unsettle everything. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) in 1874 went to the country upon this question. The hon. gentleman claimed that the Provincial franchises should be adopted; that the local circumstances of the different Provinces were such as to make it desirable to adopt that system. He pointed out that the municipal machinery under the control of the Local Government made it highly convenient to adopt that course, and highly inconvenient to adopt any other course. The Liberal party were returned to power by an overwhelming majority. That measure, as a consequence of an appeal to the country, was put upon the Statute Book. It has been there now for eleven years. The hon. gentleman opposite proposes to take it off; he proposes to do what was never done in England—to go back on the Parliamentary record. And by what authority? Who has sanctioned the change; Who has authorised it? Has the hon. gentleman appealed to the country? Have the people reconsidered their conclusions and decided to alter them? Not at all. So far as we know, public opinion now sanctions what was settled in 1874. Public opinion may differ from us on other questions, but not in regard to this question. I ask hon. members from Quebec who support the Government whether the electors of that Province are not satisfied with the Quebec franchise as they have it; whether they are not favorable to leaving any alteration in that franchise to the Local Government? Quebec does not want this Bill; it does not want the representatives of Ontario and the other Provinces to vote them a franchise different from that which they have adopted for themselves. The Ontario meetings tell precisely the same story. They leave no doubt in the mind of any hon. member who looks into the question that at this moment, whether public opinion agrees with the Government's fiscal policy or their policy respecting public expenditure, public opinion does not agree with them in regard to this Bill. That opinion is expressed scarcely less by Conservatives than by Reformers. There is not a gentleman on this side who has not received numerous letters from Conservatives declaring opposition to the Bill. There is not a gentleman opposite who has not had similar communications.

Mr. HESSON. I deny it. Produce your letters from Conservatives and lay them on the Table of the House. I challenge you to do it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman's challenge amounts to very little. There are gentlemen around me who have received such letters.

Mr. HESSON. Why should Conservatives write to you?

Mr. MILLS. Because some of them are my constituents. I suppose the hon. gentleman has no Reformers in his constituency.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, I have.

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

Mr. McCALLUM. Quebec is represented in this House.

Mr. MILLS. But it may be voted down.

Mr. McCALLUM. We shall see.

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

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures."

But with regard to the times and places of elections they make the following provisions:

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

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

Canada and another for Upper Canada; you had a Solicitor General for Lower Canada and another for Upper Canada —a double set of officers, each responsible to its own Province. You adopted the theory, and you carried resolutions through the Legislature adopting the principle, of double majority, but the differences did not end there. You have but to look at the great volumes of the Consolidated Statutes of old Canada to see that you had one volume of consolidated laws operating over the entire Province equally, another large volume operating only in the Province of Lower Canada, and another equally large operating exclusively in the Province of Upper Canada. This shows that the experience from 1841 to 1866 proved conclusively that you could not establish in ordinary legislation the principle of uniformity. How, then, are you going to adopt and work satisfactorily the principle of uniformity for general elections? There is only one ground of uniformity that can be taken, and that is manhood suffrage. The moment you go away from that you undertake to base the qualifications on something which is not under the control of this Government. Real property you do not control—how much shall be held, in whom it shall be invested, what shall be the interest of tenant and what the interest of occupant—all these questions upon which you base the right of the franchise is not under your control, but in the control of another Government. Why, Sir, it is preposterous to establish a franchise of our own, independently of the Provinces, and to undertake to base that franchise on property which is wholly under the control of the Provinces. If we want to deal logically and consistently with this question, there is but one basis, and that is manhood suffrage. The hon. gentleman has one class of voters whose property he does control, that is the Indians. He will not allow them to hold their property, he says they are incapable of managing or controlling it; and yet he proposes to enfranchise this class whose property he controls and he will not allow them to hold the property by which they are to be qualified. Sir, this principle of uniformity, for which the hon. gentleman contends, and which he makes the pretext for proposing a measure in the interest of his party, is one that has led to arbitrary government wherever it has been adopted. The principle of uniformity is a principle that is inconsistent with free institutions. We have only to look at France after the revolution of 1798. What was the ideal that all her statemen had in view, whether they belonged to the Girondists or to the more radical republicans? They were all worshippers of uniformity, all advocates of symmetry; and what was the result there? The result was that the revolution, like Saturn, devoured its own children. They carried but that principle until they separated the Church from the State and eliminated religion from the universe. Those attempts at symmetry led to arbitrary government, and to the overturning of those principles with which the advocates of the revolution themselves started out. What the hon. gentleman proposes here, is not to advance Parliamentary Government, but to restrain it. He proposes not to increase the liberties of the people—not to increase the free action of the people in political matters—but a measure for the purpose of controlling their action. I listened to the Conservative views expressed by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). I do not agree with them as to the extent to which the franchise might be safely entrusted to the people of this country; but, Sir, I admire their consistency, and the enlightened sentiments which they expressed. Those hon. gentlemen are ardent lovers of liberty. If they oppose the extension of the franchise in their own Province, if they were afraid to extend that franchise to the extent of manhood suffrage, it was because they were more anxious to subserve substantial freedom than they were to adopt an ideal of absolute perfectiblity and absolute uniformity. Sir, I have no doubt that the great majority of the representatives from the Province of Quebec in this House entertain the same views, and it is greatly to be regretted that these hon. gentlemen have not the courage of their convictions. It is greatly to be regretted that those gentlemen who hold to the federal principle and are anxious for its maintenance—anxious for the rights of the Provinces and for the continuance of the control the people have over the representation of this country—do not act in accordance with their convictions and cordially support the propositions of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. So far as I have been able to gather, during the past two years in this House, the great majority of those who support the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Secretary of State agree with us in our views of the constitution and in our policy with regard to it, and sympathise with us on those questions of constitutional law which have arisen between the hon. First Minister and the Opposition in this House. Holding those views, and entertaining those sympathies which they do with us, it is a misfortune for this country that these hon. gentlemen do not act with us and support us. I cannot but regard every other question as a question of minor importance—as a question of indifference—compared with the important constitutional questions which the hon. First Minister has put in issue during the past few years. The hon. First Minister has made war upon the Government of the Provinces; he has sought to destroy their influence and their autonomy; he has sought to put an end to Parliamentary Government in the Provinces; he has done this deliberately; he has declared over and over again that he is in favor of legislative union, and opposed to the principle on which our constitution is based. Does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order in discussing that question on this amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I am discussing the amendment of my hon. friend, I am pointing out why the amendment should be adopted. I say this measure is an attack on the federal system of the Government—the most serious attack that has yet been made. The hon. gentleman attacked that system when he disallowed the Streams Bill, and when he opposed the Controverted Elections Act of 1874, and the Privy Council said he was wrong. The hon. gentleman attacked that principle when he proposed the Licence Bill, and he is attacking it in proposing this Franchise Bill; and I tell my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec that this is a life and death struggle in upholding this constitution. I tell them that the hon. gentleman is making war upon the vital principle of this constitution. I tell them that if the hon. gentleman succeeds, unless the public opinion of this country politically destroys him, he will have destroyed the constitution.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. MILLS. No, the hon. gentleman must not cry carried. The Honorable First Minister has forced this question into committee before we had an opportunity of discussing the principles of the Bill on its second reading, and he must expect that these principles will be discussed in the committee on the details. We are fighting here, Sir, for Parliamentary Government, we are resisting the hon. gentleman's attempt to introduce the South American system of Government in preference to the English system of Parliamentary Government. That is the issue between us, and it is a question of whether the hon. gentleman shall succeed in introducing such a system as Santa Anna introduced into Mexico, or whether we shall retain the system we have. The question is a serious one, and let hon. gentlemen not under-estimate its importance. Let me call the attention of the House to an observation made by a great

thinker and public man of the United States upon the system of free government. I hold in my hands an essay on free institutions and Government by Senator Calhoun. I do not subscribe to his views as to State rights; I think they are altogether erroneous; but he has been pronounced by Mr. Mill, the greatest political thinker that the United States has produced, and his views on this subject are of great importance and well worthy of the serious consideration of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House; because the question we have now before us, is whether we are to continue our system of Parliamentary Government, or whether the majority in the House, for the time being, is to take control of the constitution and to so alter and amend it as to perpetuate themselves in office. Hon. gentlemen will remember, in the history of England, that after the death of Anne, when the house of Brunswick came to the throne, a Parliament that was elected for three years, changed the law and continued its existence for seven years. No one has ever undertaken to defend that measure upon any other ground than this, that it was a measure of extreme State necessity, forced upon the Government and Parliament for the time being by the intrigues of traitors and revolutionists. The hon. gentleman is proposing here a change in our constitution, without the sanction of the people, not less radical and far more dangerous than that which was proposed by Sir Robert Walpole at the period to which I referred. He is doing this in the interest of the party; he is doing this because it is possible—may I go farther and say, because it is highly probable—that the current of public opinion is running strongly in a direction contrary to his wishes, and this measure is for the purpose, not of securing uniformity —that is the pretext—but for the purpose of securing the hon. gentleman in his position of First Minister of Canada. Now, let me call the attention of the House to the views of Mr. Calhoun, to whom I referred a short time ago. He says:

"A broader position may, indeed be taken, viz.: That there is a tendency, in constitutional Governments of every form, to degenerate into their respective absolute forms; and, in all absolute Governments, into that of the monarchical form. But the tendency is much stronger in constitutional governments of the democratic form to degenerate into their respective absolute forms, than in either of the others; because, among other reasons, the distinction between the constitutional and absolute forms of our aristocratical and monarchical Governments, is far more strongly marked than in democratic Governments. The effect of this is, to make the different orders or classes in an aristocracy, or monarchy, far more jealous and watchful of encroachment on their respective rights; and more resolute and persevering in resisting attempts to concentrate powers in any one class or order. On the contrary, the line between the two forms, in popular Governments, is so imperfectly understood, that honest and sincere friends of the constitutional form not unfrequently, instead of jealously watching and arresting their tendency to degenerate into their absolute forms, not only regard it with approbation, but employ all their powers to add to its strength and to increase its impetus, in the vain hope of making the Government more perfect and popular. The numerical majority, perhaps, should usually be one of the elements of a constitutional democracy; but to make it the sole element, in order to perfect the constitution and make the Government more popular is one of the greatest and most fatal of political errors."

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. MILLS. When the House rose, I was referring to the views of a distinguished statesman on the subject of the comparative merits as a means of promoting human liberty and human progress of the federal and consolidated forms of Government. I shall read an extract from a speech from the same writer, on the same subject. He says:

"In reviewing the ground over which I have passed, it will be apparent that the question in controversy involves that most deeply important of all political questions, whether ours is a federal or a consolidated Government—a question, on the decision of which depends, as I solemnly believe, the liberty of the people, their happiness, and the place which we are destined to hold in the moral and intellectual scale of nations. Never was there a controversy in which more important consequences were involved; not excepting Persia and Greece—decided by the battles of Marathon, Platea and Salamis—which gave ascendancy to the genius of Europe over that of Asia, and which, in its consequences, has continued to effect the destiny of so large a portion of the world even to this day. There are often close analogies between events, apparently very remote, which are strikingly illustrated in this case. In the great contest between Greece and Persia, between European and Asiatic policy and civilisation, the very question between the federal and consolidated form of Government was involved. The Asiatic Governments, from the remotest time, with some exceptions on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, have been based on the principle of consolidation, which considers the whole community at but a unit, and consolidates its powers in a central point. The opposite principle has prevailed in Europe—Greece, throughout all her States, was based on a federal system. All were united in one common but loose bond, and the Governments of the several States partook, for the most part, of a conflex organisation, which distributed political powers among different members of the community. The same principles prevailed in ancient Italy; and, if we turn to the Teutonic race, our great ancestors, the race which occupies the first place in power, civilisation and science, and which possesses the largest and fairest part of Europe—we will find that their Governments were based upon federal organisation, as has been clearly illustrated by a recent and able writer on the British constitution (Mr. Palgrave) from whose works I take the following extracts."

Mr. Calhoun then reads from the able work of Mr. Palgrave the following extract:—

"In this manner the first establishment of the Teutonic States was effected. There were assemblies of septs, clans and tribes; they were confederated hosts and armies, led on by princes, magistrates and chieftains; each of whom was originally independent, and each of whom lost a portion of his pristine independence in proportion as he and his compeers became united under the supremacy of a sovereign, who was superinduced upon the State, first as a military commander, and afterwards as a king. Yet, notwithstanding his political connection, each member of the State continued to retain a considerable portion of the rights of sovereignty. Every ancient Teutonic monarchy must be considered as a federation; it is not a unit, of which the smaller bodies politic therein contained are the fractions, but they are integers, and the State is the multiple which results from them. Dukedoms and counties, burghs and baronies, towns and townships, and shires, form the kingdom; all, in a certain degree, strangers to each other, and separate in jurisdiction though all obedient to the supreme executive authority. This general description, though not always strictly applicable in terms, is always so substantially and in effect; and hence it becomes necessary to discard the language which has been very generally employed in treating of the English constitution. It has been supposed that the kingdom was reduced into a regular and gradual subordination of Government, and that the various legal districts of which it is composed, arose from the divisions and sub-divisions of the country. But this hypothesis, which tends greatly to perplex our history, cannot be supported by fact; and, instead of viewing the constitution as a whole, and then proceeding to its parts, we must examine it systematically, and assume that the supreme authorities of the State were created by the concentration of the powers originally belonging to the members and corporations of which it is composed."

It will be seen from this statement that the English Government itself had certain federal features, and anyone who has carefully studied the growth of British institutions and the British constitution knows that the practice of treating all the great documents of the constitution as not within the control of Parliament, as not subject to be altered or abolished by Parliament, has been uniform, and they are as much regarded as above the ordinary action of Parliament as our Federal Act is recognised as being above the action of this Parliament. It is because of this fact that the English Parliament has been careful not to alter the constitution without popular sanction. It has been dealt with in a way wholly different from that which has been adopted in regard to ordinary legislation, and it is in recognition of this principle that I have contended here to-day that a measure like this, altering our institutions, altering the basis upon which representation in Parliament rests, ought not to be undertaken, ought not to be dealt with without popular sanction. I have said before in this debate that the representative system of Government is in a great degree a system of forbearance. It is never the course of a Government acting upon sound constitutional principles to press their power to the utmost. They have always exercised towards the Opposition a very great degree of forbearance. The recent Representation Bill in the House of Commons in England, although it was carried through the House of Commons not only by a large majority but without any

dissent, was rejected in the House of Lords, although it was well known that the country was decidedly in its favor, although this was so much felt to be the case, that no one ventured to oppose it. Even men like Lord Randolph Churchill and Sir Stafford Northcote, who, months before, had expressed themselves in opposition to the extension of the franchise in counties, after the second reading had been defeated in the House of Lords, declared that they were in favor of the extension of the franchise, but said the Bill was not only to be used for the extension of the franchise but for the purpose of altering the constituencies and unduly increasing the strength of the Liberal party, and as a matter of protection and in order to protect the rights of their party, and for no other purpose, the House of Lords exercised its power and defeated the second reading of the Bill. What was done by the Government? The Government had an overwhelming majority in the House and in the country in their favor. Public indignation was excited to such an extent, that it was only necessary for Mr. Gladstone to have said that he would insist upon an alteration of the constitution of the House of Lords, and the whole country would have followed him.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. MILLS. One hon. gentleman says no. I think he is the only one in this country who would say no. Anyone who knows the course of English public affairs knows that that is true.

Mr. McNEILL. No, certainly not.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I differ with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McNEILL. I differ with you.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman can express his opinion when he comes to make his speech; he will allow me now to state my view. I say that public opinion in England would have sustained Mr. Gladstone if he had taken a position antagonistic to the House of Lords.

Mr. BOWELL. It would have done nothing of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. Did he do so. No, he agreed to a conference with Lord Salisbury, and they agreed; so that the plan of redistribution became a matter of treaty or compact between the leaders of the two parties, the one having an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons so great that there was no division when that Bill was read the third time, and yet Mr. Gladstone agreed with Lord Salisbury as to the plan upon which the seats in Parliament should be distributed. That was a matter of compact or arrangement. Why? Because it was felt that it would not be proper for the Government to use to the utmost the power they possessed in order, as Lord Salisbury expressed the opinion, to increase the strength of the Liberal party in the House to an extent beyond that to which it would be properly entitled in proportion to its strength in the country. An agreement was come to between the leaders of the two parties, and an assurance was given that the power of the majority would not be abused for the purpose of promoting the interest of that party against the minority. Has the hon. gentleman given any such assurance here? We say that the object of this measure is to unduly increase the strength of the Tory party in Parliament, and to take out of the hands of the people that control which they have over the voters' lists and put it into the hands of the majority. It is not representation in regard to the strength of parties, but a representation by which the Tory party is to have a majority in this House, whether it is supported by a majority of the voters in the country or not. There is a violation of every principle of Parliamentary Government in the measure now before us, and what assurance have we that this will not be abused most seriously, not only by carrying the Indian clause but by the character of the men who are to be appointed revising barristers? Has the leader of the Government approached the leader of the Opposition as Mr. Gladstone approached Lord Salisbury? It is true, the measure has not been defeated in the Senate, because the Government has a majority in both Houses, but Mr. Gladstone was supported by the nation.

Mr. McNEILL. No.

Mr. MILLS. The nation was overwhelmingly in favor of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, so much so that Lord Salisbury declared himself in favor of the extension of the franchise which twelve months before he was opposed to. We are exercising our rights here as the House of Lords did in England. Our rights are as much secured to us as the rights of a second chamber under the constitution itself, and the hon. gentleman knows that we have not abused the power which we possessed and which is our constitutional right. We have confined ourselves to a strict discussion of this question. We have pointed out its objectionable features and have sought to point them out to the country, and how are we met by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite? The organ of the Minister of Customs himself has not ventured to state the facts in regard to this measure.

Mr. BOWELL. What paper? I did not know that I had an organ.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is reputed to have one.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not occupy the position towards any journal that you do towards the London *Advertiser*.

Mr. MILLS. It is well known that the hon. gentleman, for many years while a member of this House, was connected with the *Belleville Intelligencer*.

Mr. BOWELL. No, Sir, I was not.

Mr. MILLS. Was either the editor or controlled the paper.

Mr. BOWELL. Neither the one nor the other. There is just as much truth in the assertion you have made now with reference to my connection with the *Belleville Intelligencer*, as there is in nineteen-twentieths of what you have said in the three hours' speech you have been making.

Mr. MILLS. Well, then, even if that be so, there is no doubt whatever with regard to the hon. gentleman's position on that paper.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, if you are to be judge of what constitutes the truth.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had a present connection with the paper, that he was now controlling it; I said that the hon. gentleman, when he came into this House, and for a long time afterwards, was the editor of that paper—at all events, he was reputed to be so; and when that paper was receiving advertisements from the Government, we know the hon. gentleman's seat was vacated, and we know his leader stated that he had vacated his seat under the Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I challenged you and your party to contest it, and you did not dare do it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, then, challenged his leader.

Mr. BOWELL. I had nothing to do with the leader.

Mr. MILLS. No, he had not; but the leader did have something to say with regard to the report.

Mr. BOWELL. No; these 62½ cents I received was while you were in power. You know it very well, and what is the use standing there and talking in that manner?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman received $600. I look at the Toronto *Mail*, and what does it say? It says that Mr. Laird, when Minister of the Interior, that I, with other members of the Government, supported the enfranchisement of the Indians. Well, Sir, we did favor the enfranchisement of the Indians, but we did not favor giving them votes; yet that is the impression the newspaper seeks to make upon the public mind. It conceals the fact that the enfranchisement proposed was giving the Indian the right of citizenship, and the power to make contracts for himself. It was to give him the rights of one who had obtained his majority, instead of one who was in the position of a minor. I find exactly the same representation in the Hamitton *Spectator* and the London *Free Press*. Now, if these gentlemen had a good cause, would it be necessary to misrepresent the issue between the parties in this House? And, yet, that is precisely what is done in every Tory paper that I have examined in the Province of Ontario. The only Conservative paper published in English, where a different view is presented, that has yet come under my notice, is the Montreal *Gazette*, where, I think it was one Friday, an article was published which fairly represents the issue between the parties. But not in any other Tory paper that I have seen is this the case.

Mr. MITCHELL. Has not the *Herald* done it?

Mr. MILLS. I thought the hon. gentleman claimed to be Independent. My impression was that the Montreal *Herald* claimed to stand evenly between the parties.

Mr. MITCHELL. So it does, but with a strong leaning to Conservatism, I am afraid.

Mr. MILLS. I think there is a strong leaning that way, and that the bias is so great, I would hardly be willing to accept the *Herald* as independent, and as holding the balance evenly between the Opposition and the Government. Now, the hon. member for Kings, Nova Scotia, (Mr. Foster), in discussing the question of a uniform franchise said: have we no federal rights? And he declared that provincial rights, so called, were a hydra-headed monster, that it was a disintegrating principle, that would lead to the destruction of our union if it were at all recognised. Now, I do not admit that contention at all; on the contrary, I hold that the chief element of strength in the union is the autonomy of Provinces, and the extent to which the federal principle is recognised. We had a legislative union between Upper and Lower Canada, and everyone conversant with the history of that union, knows the results. Instead of binding the Provinces more strongly together, they grew more and more antagonistic to each other. The majority of one Province was arrayed against the majority of the other, and it was only by Confederation that we escaped dissolution by revolutionary means. The hon. gentleman said the Opposition were wrong in referring to the provision of the American constitution, in which the State franchise is adopted for congressional representation. The hon. gentleman said the adoption of that franchise was under circumstances wholly different from those which prevail under our system of Government; and that, under the American system, this provision of the franchise is embraced in the State constitutions. Sir, that is not the case. There was not a State constitution that had this principle embraced within it at the time the federal constitution was adopted. The State constitutions were charters that the Provinces had received from the Crown. They had power to fix the franchise by legislative Act. It was an Act within the competence of the State Legislature, when this provision of the constitution was adopted. It was a reasonable provision, based upon the fact that the local circumstances of the population differed, and that the people of each State knew what franchise was best suited to their circumstances. That is precisely the principle that we have acted upon during the eighteen years that our union has been in existence. The hon. gentleman said we were advocates of State rights. Sir, we are not advocates of State rights in the sense in which that expression was used by the old Democratic party. We are simply contending that, under the constitution, each Province has its rights that ought not to be interfered with by this Government, and that the people of each Province, under this provision of the constitution relating to representation in Parliament, should be allowed to decide for themselves who shall possess, within their limits, the electoral franchise. The Secretary of State said, in reference to this question:

"Is it worthy of our Parliament, is it according to the dignity, which this Parliament should possess, to allow the smallest Legislature of the smallest Province, not only to dictate, but to judge at its will and sole caprice, so as to give direction to the general politics of the country by its representation in the general Parliament."

Now I say it is not beneath the dignity of this Parliament that that should be done. Who is to determine the electoral franchise? I say that primarily it ought to be determined by those who possess the franchise at an election, whether it be for members of the Local Legislature or of this House, before any change is made in the franchise, because the opinion of all the people at a general election should be taken; whether that opinion is expressed in the Legislature or in this House, it is the opinion of the people of that Province. When you propose a general franchise, you propose to take from the Province the absolute power to decide who shall be entrusted with the electoral franchise within its limits, and you put it under the control of a majority of this House. The whole representative body of Prince Edward Island may favor manhood suffrage, and if it is introduced here it may be voted down. Now, are not they the best judges of who, in that Province, shall exercise the electoral franchise? I say they are. I say it is the people who are represented in the local legislature who are best qualified to make a wise choice. The same thing may be said of every other Province. I do not know what the people of Quebec require; I am not acquainted with the circumstances of the population, but I say they are the best judges of what is necessary to qualify, in their Province, for the exercise of the electoral franchise. If you bring the question here, you take it out of the control of the sixty-five representatives of Quebec, and you put it under the control of the 210 members of this House. Every representative of Quebec might vote for one franchise, and might fail to obtain it against the will of the majority here. I say, therefore, it is right and proper that the question as to who shall exercise the electoral franchise in Quebec should be left to the people of that Province to determine, in accordance with the spirit and intent of our constitutional system. And the same thing is true of every other Province of the Dominion, and it is neither wise nor proper, nor in the public interest to take from the Provinces the power to decide this question. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said he could not accept Mowat's Act relating to the franchise, and that it would disfranchise at least 500 voters in his own county. I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman has greatly exaggerated the fact. I do not believe it will disfranchise any such number. When the Ontario Government went to the country in 1883 both parties declared themselves in favour of extending the electoral franchise. Both committed themselves to that principle. Why? Because they knew public opinion pointed in that direction. The elections took place, and the Franchise Bill passed through the Legislature as a result of those elections. Did any member propose to restrict the franchise; did the leader of the Opposition take such action? Not at all. He proposed to go further and adopt manhood suffrage, and thereby confer the franchise on a class of men who had never previously possessed it. The question was referred to the electors in Ontario, those who

elect members for this Parliament as well as for the Local Legislature. They decided not merely that the present franchise should be the electoral qualification for voters at provincial elections, but also for elections to the House of Commons. They knew what the provision of the law of 1874 was. They knew that an extension of the franchise must extend to the House of Commons as well as to the Local Legislature. The people decided that the extension should take place. With respect to the statement of the hon. member for West York, as to 500 voters being disfranchised in his constituency by the Mowat Bill, I am satisfied that not a dozen voters are disfranchised. The principle of that Bill is that there shall be one vote for one man, and that a man shall vote in the constituency where he resides and nowhere else. Why should a man holding $100,000 worth of property in one constituency have one vote, while a man holding $10,000 worth of property in ten constituencies should have ten votes. If it is not intended to give representation to wealth, then one vote only should be given to one man, or else a vote should be given for so many dollars worth of property. There is no middle principle. Either you have representation of property, as of a banking institution, or you have representation of persons. a man of ability and influence should exercise those qualifications upon other members of the community and not by having additional votes because he happens to possess half a dozen properties in as many constituencies. Under the old law if a man had ten village lots worth $200 each, in ten different constituencies, he had ten votes; but if he had $100,000 worth of property in one constituency he had only one vote. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that a law containing such anomalies ought to be perpetuated. There is nothing to prevent an amendment being made to the present Ontario law, retaining that system if it were thought that the principle is a wise one. There has been no necessity shown for the Bill now before the House, neither by the first Minister nor by any hon. gentleman opposite. No one has shown that the present law has worked unsatisfactorily, that any wrong has been done under it, that any class of the community has suffered injustice in consequence of it. The hon. gentleman has propounded a measure which is revolutionary in its character, a measure destructive of the principle of Parliamentary Government, a measure which is an act of legislation in the interests of a party and not for the purpose of correcting any defect in our constitutional system. The hon. gentleman first proposed to give certain classes of women votes. He did not, however, undertake to show the necessity of it, or that it was demanded by the women themselves, or as to how many would be enfranchised under it. Take, again, the Indian clause. Here we had a most extraordinary change proposed in our constitutional system, and yet the hon. gentleman did not say a word as to the number of Indians who would be enfranchised, nothing with respect to their intelligence, as to how many could read and write and as to the number who took newspapers. He said nothing to show that those people were demanding the franchise, or that they would be benefited if it were conferred upon them. We know the contrary. It is a proposal to enfranchise a large number of persons who are wards of the State, who are under the hon. gentleman's own personal control, who will be directly influenced by his agents and deputies; and yet there was not a word said to show that those people were demanding the suffrage or that they were qualified to exercise it. All the information which it is usual for a Minister to give under such circumstances was withheld. An attack was made upon the propriety of making property a test of the qualification of a voter; and yet notwithstanding that attack, made for the purpose of defending the proposition to give Indians votes, we find that is the basis of the Bill with respect to all other voters. In my opinion it is impossible to support such a Bill without deliberately intending to change our whole constitutional system. It is impossible to regard those who support such a proposition as other than hostile to our present system of parliamentary Government. There is a motto of the Crown, "God and my right," and that is the motto of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in opposing this monstrous proposition. We propose, Sir, to stand up for the higher law. We propose to stand up in this House for that which is right. We propose to defend the rights and liberties of the people of this country against an attempt to overturn them by the provisions of this Bill. We propose to retain to the people of Canada the right to control the elective franchise for themselves, instead of putting it in the hands of a Minister, who is resolved to keep himself in power no matter what may be the views of the people of this country. Sir, I dare say that the hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Quebec in this House, will remember the story of François Hertel, the hero of the Long Sault; how he with eighteen others, held at bay several hundred Indians, who had resolved to exterminate the French race on the St. St. Lawrence. They will remember how that small band of heroes—for they were such, no less than those who fought at Thermopylæ—how they held those savages at bay for weeks together, and by the sacrifice of their lives defended the lives and liberties of the people of Quebec. The question of whether there should be a French system or a French race in Canada was decided at the Long Sault by François Hertel and those who manfully fought with him. We are here to-day in a fight not less significant. We are here to-day in a battle upon which issues quite as important hang. We are here to-day seeking to defend the maintenance of British Government in this country, as against the South American system which the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce. We are here to-day to decide whether the people of this country shall continue to be governed under the British system, or whether they will put their liberties and rights into the hands of an ambitious Minister, to determine in the future as he may think best. That is the issue. We are here as the guardians of the people's rights and liberties. We are here to do our whole duty and nothing but our duty. We are here to inform the people of this country as to the true character of this measure, and I have no doubt as to the conslusion to which they will come. I do not believe they are ready to take sides with the burglar against the bell-man. I do not believe that those who are being warned of the danger which threatens them are indignant with the watchman who tells them of the danger, rather than with the enemy who is seeking to destroy that which they hold dear. Sir, the hon. gentleman told the House this afternoon that he had no one to complain of among the leaders on this side, except myself—that they had all acted quite fairly and legitimately except me. Well, Sir, I was somewhat at a loss to know what egregious offence I had committed. I had said very little on the Bill. I had discussed the propriety of a postponement, I think for about half an hour; I had discussed the importance of an adjournment at, I think, eight or nine u'clock in the morning. What did the hon. gentleman do? If I offended I am quite ready to justify the act. I have done nothing I regret. I have done nothing of which I am satisfied my constituents or the country will complain. I am here to do my duty and my whole duty, and there is nothing the hon. gentleman can say, whether it be offensive or otherwise, which will hinder me in the smallest degree from discharging those duties which I believe my constituents and the country require at my hand. I am satisfied corruption wins not more than honesty, and I have not the slightest fear whether the hon. gentleman will succeed or fail—and I believe he will fail, because he ought to fail, and I believe the country is coming to that conclusion very rapidly—I say whether he succeeds or fails here, I

have no doubt he will fail in the country, for our aims are our country's, our God's and truth of his power, and I care but little for the malevolence or the threats of hon. gentlemen. I am satisfied the country will sustain us in resisting to the utmost a measure which was properly characterised by the leader on this side as an infamous measure.

Mr. RYKERT. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, there are three propositions before this committee: A proposition by the First Minister that there shall be a certain franchise for cities and towns, an amendment made by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that we shall adopt the franchise of the several provinces, and an amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), that we shall make an exception in the case of that island, and leave the franchise of that Province as it is at present. As I understand parliamentary practice, it is not usual, when the House is in committee to discuss anything except simply the clause under consideration. But, Sir, that rule has been relaxed to a very great extent on this occasion. I am not sorry for it, because it enables hon. gentlemen opposite to discuss the question as frequently as they like. They have been able to repeat their speeches over and over again, to repeat them worse than in the first place, and yet they are not satisfied,—they still desire to go on and speak, no matter how obstructive they may appear. Now the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) occupied the time of this committee for something like three hours. Two hours and three quarters of that speech were occupied in quoting passages from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; a portion in speaking of the history of the United States and its institutions, a large portion devoted to giving us the history of the different franchises in the several States, a large number of extracts from Bancroft and other writers, and a long dissertation about the advantages of universal suffrage, and, Sir, what was left of the speech was a little loud-mouthed ranting against the present Government, and charges against the Administration and their supporters of violating the principles of the constitution and sacrificing the privileges and rights of the people. That is the sum and substance of that speech. In other words, strip off the Yankeeism and nothing whatever is left of it. Now, Sir, the Opposition cannot at all complain of the course we have adopted during this debate. We have allowed those gentlemen to read the speeches they prepared in the Library; we have made no objection to that, although it is contrary to Parliamentary usage. We have allowed hon. gentlemen to read their speeches, to send them in to the reporters, to send copies to their own papers and periodicals to be printed. We have allowed the utmost latitude in this debate. We have allowed them to degrade all Parliamentary rules, by their reckless assertions, by charges which no honorable men should make on the floor of any House of Parliament. We have allowed these hon. gentlemen, I say, the utmost latitude; we have allowed them to discuss this question day after day and night after night for a period of about three weeks; yet they are not satisfied. They say the country has not yet been informed upon the measure, and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) tells us that they have only entered on the threshhold of this measure, and that they intend to keep it up for a great length of time. Well, Sir, to that we have no objection, so long as they can satisfy the country that they are acting in the right way; but, Sir, I will warn those hon. gentlemen that they must recollect that this debating for a series of three or four weeks upon a question that does not require more than a day or two of discussion on different points, will involve an expenditure of a large amount of money. They must recollect that there have been 350 odd speeches made by forty-nine members of Parliament at a cost to this country of some $60,000 or $70,000 extra. While they complain of the large amount of money to be expended in preparing the voters' lists and paying the officers to be appointed under this Act, they must remember that they are causing, by this useless debate, a cost to the country larger than the preparation of all the voters' lists will cost in the first year. I am one of those who freely admits that the Parliamentary minority have the right to be respected; that they have their rights equally well with the majority in Parliament. We have conceded to them their rights, and have not endeavored to infringe on them; but I must tell these hon. gentlemen that they must conform to the rules of Parliament, to constitutional rules, and allow the majority to govern, so long as that majority expresses the will of the people; and the best proof I can give that we do express the will of the people is, that twice we have had the verdict of the people in our favor. Therefore it must be assumed that the majority in this House fairly represents the feelings of the people; and so long as they do that, according to the usages of constitutional Government, they have a right to have their will obeyed and enforced, so long as they keep within constitutional bounds; and it makes no difference whether we remain here until next December or not, the majority on this side of the House, feeling that they are representing the views of the people from one end of the country to the other, are determined to see this Bill carried, no matter what the consequences to the Opposition may be. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have made appeals to the passions and prejudices of the different classes of electors throughout the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) strongly appealed to the Lower Canadians to vote down this Bill, for fear that they might some day have woman suffrage forced upon them, and at the same time we find the hon. gentleman and his friends voting for woman suffrage and endeavoring to force it upon them whether they will or not. That is a specimen of the consistency of these hon. gentlemen. Now, Sir, the principle of this Bill has been admitted on the second reading, and hon. gentlemen opposite have an opportunity to discuss it in all its details. They could, as the right hon. First Minister said this afternoon, offer suggestions to this side of the House, and, if they were found satisfactory, they would receive favourable consideration at his hands. The hon. First Minister has not laid down a cast-iron theory, so far as the different clauses are concerned. The principle of the Bill has been adopted by a large majority of this House, and yet hon. gentlemen stand up night after night and speak on the general principle of it. If they are determined to meet this question fairly and squarely and to discuss the Bill on its merits, there will be no difficulty whatever in the way of their placing their views before the Government, and, no doubt about those views receiving full consideration at the hands of the Government. Those hon. gentlemen have shown their inconsistency all through the debate. They argue in favor of Provincial franchises; they say it is an infringement upon Provincial rights to endeavor to have a uniform franchise in all the Provinces; and while making that statement what do we find them doing? We find them deliberately, for a party purpose, advocating female suffrage when they know it is not recognised by the different Provinces; and I venture to assert that this fight in this Parliament does not come from the several Provinces of the Dominion. The whole fight comes from Ontario; there is hardly a speaker who is not an Ontario member; and these gentlemen seem determined, whether this House desires it or not, that the franchise adopted in Ontario shall be the franchise for the Dominion Parliament in the Province of Ontario. But see how inconsistent they are; while they ask us to adopt a provincial franchise for Ontario which does not recognise female suffrage, they stand up in this Legislature and argue for 48 hours that we should have female suffrage. If they had carried that resolution the other night and female suffrage had been adopted, the consequence would have been that

we should have been compelled to have our voters' lists different from the Provincial voters' lists; and yet they tell us that they desire to have provincial franchises adopted by this Legislature. But, says the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), we are prepared to accept the franchise as it now exists in Ontario, no matter how it may be changed in the future. Is that a correct principle? If you once adopt the provincial franchises, and recognize the principle that the Local Legislatures have the right to fix the franchises, then we must accept, from time to time, whatever franchises they choose to adopt. But these hon. gentlemen say, we will will meet you half way; adopt the franchise that now exists, no matter what it will be in the future. Well, Sir, we have the past record of these hon. gentlemen. We can see exactly what course they pursued in 1874. While they were strong advocates of provincial rights, they were willing then to interfere with the franchise of Prince Edward Island. I recollect well what a cry there was in this Legislature at that time, and how the Hon. Mr. Laird was abused for introducing a clause in the Bill then, before the House, by which a number of people in Prince Edward Island should be disfranchised. They were willing then to accept the franchise which was the basis of the election of members for the Upper House in Prince Edward Island, and at the same time to force on the other Provinces their provincial franchises. Another very important feature of this debate, which shows the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen opposite, is the manner in which they advocated manhood suffrage. There is hardly a gentleman from Ontario, who has spoken in this debate, who has not spoken in favor of manhood suffrage. If they are sincere in that, knowing that their own party in the Provincial Legislature refused manhood suffrage, how is it possible to adopt the provincial franchise, and to have manhood suffrage for this Parliament? That shows exactly how consistent these hon. gentlemen are, and how desirous they are to protect provincial interests. But we know that these hon. gentlemen have a record so far as the provincial franchise is concerned. I recollect that the leader of the Opposition, when making his famous Aurora speech, declared in favor of compulsory voting. He has never relinquished that view; and this shows distinctly, if we place ourselves at the mercy of Ontario, what we shall be brought to. Within the last few days, we find the *Globe*, the organ of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, advocating the same thing. We find in the paper of the 10th this statement:

"The names of the voters who had failed to vote should be struck off as a stigma for neglect of duty unless one of several recognised pleas of justification is at the proper time entered. This should be done for the purpose of emphasising the idea that in a self governing country it is a duty to vote."

That is one of those other views of the organ and of the party, and those views are in accord with the views of the leader of the Opposition which were dealt with so unmercifully by the same organ in 1874; but, as I say, if we adopt the provincial franchises, we must subject ourselves to those periodical changes which will be made according to the whims and impulses of gentlemen on the other side. We have had on this occasion as on former ones, hon. gentlemen of the Opposition prophecying what will be the result if this measure be passed. The hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who usually is good tempered and shows a considerable amount of good feeling towards members of this side, waxed wroth and warned us, if we passed this Bill, what the consequences would be. I wondered whether it was the warning that he received a short time ago from his own county that made him so angry; I wondered whether the recent return of my hon. friend (Mr. Jenkins) from Queen's County, P.E.I., by a large majority, was the reason why he treated us to so much abuse, and prophesied we were going to be defeated. No doubt the hon. gentleman feels somewhat chagrined at the position he occupies, and some excuse may be made for his uttering these prophesies. But he is not the only prophet; the poet of that party, the hon. gentleman who lately received his seat by the grace of Mr. Mowat, I mean the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), although on the female franchise question he did not know where he stood, although after speaking two hours on this question, he could not make up his mind what position he would take, but said he wanted first to see how the feeling was on this side,—he also indulged in prophecy couched in the following language:

"I do not believe any hon. gentlemen can go back and face their constituents successfully after doing that. I believe that the indignation of the constituents who will be left out, will be so great that the member will suffer the consequence of the Act."

If that be so, what is the use of all this debate? Why not allow the verdict to go by default? Why not allow the Bill to pass, if we are to be condemned by the electors at the polls? But hon. gentlemen opposite know better. They know right well that we are acting in the interests of the people, that we are not betraying their trust; and that, as in 1879 and in 1882, the verdict will again be granted in our favour should we go to the polls. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) said:

"I warn them they will be brought face to face with the people whose rights they are surrendering and violating."

We have also prophetic utterances from the organ of the party on the 6th of May, when it said:

"Let the Franchise Bill pass, with its Indian voters' clause and its lawyer-made voters' clause, and the Tory conspirators will soon learn that Canada is too hot a place for them."

Why not let the Bill pass if we are going to be condemned at the polls? Why not let the condemnation come? Let the Bill pass with all its iniquitous revising barristers and Indian clauses. But, no; they know better. Hon gentlemen opposite have repeatedly declared in their speeches, that we are invading provincial rights by passing this Act. Three or four of the gentlemen who have last spoken have declared that we have the power to pass this Act, while the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) still protests that we have not the power. It is just as well to place upon record what is the law on that subject, as determined by the founders of our constitution, to show how inconsistent these gentlemen are in their speeches, to show how various are the views they have expressed in Parliament upon that question, in order that the electors may see exactly the position we occupy in this country. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who no doubt is a high constitutional authority, and who can talk as much and say as little as any person in or out of Parliament, declared boldly that we have not the power to pass this Bill. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) says he thinks we have a technical right to pass the Bill, but he believes we have no right to infringe on the rights of the Provinces. In his speech he made this observation:—

"Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is the right of this Parliament to pass this measure. No one on this side of the House has denied that Parliament possesses the legal and technical right."

And yet the hon. gentleman goes on to say we are infringing upon provincial rights. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) says:

"No one has contended that it is not within the power of this Government to enact such a law. No, no one has disputed it. It must be admitted by everyone that it is within the power of every Parliament to regulate the franchise to elect members to that Parliament."

Then he goes on to say:

"We contend that it is not within the spirit of the constitution to have two separate bodies of electors, one for the Provinces and one for the Dominion."

He admits in one breath that we have the right, while in another he says we have not. Another high constitu-

tional authority, the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), seems to have made up his mind positively on the question, and his decided opinion is that we have not the power. He said:

"I believe that the power of regulating the franchise is rightly vested in the Province. I believe that the people in their Local Legislature are the parties who have the right to regulate the franchise, and that is one of their civil rights which may fairly be said to be under the control of the Local Legislature."

There we have the different opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I will, therefore, in order to set the matter at rest, place upon record the views of one of the founders of our constitution, a gentleman whose opinions are recognised by hon. gentlemen opposite as undoubted authority, a gentleman who on constitutional questions was looked upon as a very high authority. I refer to the Hon. George Brown. His opinion will settle the question, I believe, so far as this debate is concerned. I hope these legal luminaries who are so apt to place their views on record before the House on legal questions will see, so far as this Bill is concerned, that we have the right to pass it, whether there be necessity for it or not. The Hon. George Brown said:

"It has also been objected that though the resolutions provided that existing Parliaments of Canada shall establish the electoral divisions for the first organization of the Federal Parliament, they do not determine in whose hands the duty of distributing any additional members is to be voted. No doubt on this head need exist. The Federal Parliament will, of course, have power to regulate all arrangements for the election of its new members."

So that those who knew best what the Act really meant declared that this Parliament has the right to regulate its own franchise. Then we find that, in regard to a measure affecting the franchise which was introduced in 1869, the organ of the party used this language, showing that the Reform party was of opinion that the Dominion franchise should be settled by this Parliament and that we should not be dependent on the uncertain franchises of the Provinces:

"The Provinces moreover are constantly altering their assessment laws and it would hardly do to pass a new election law for the Dominion every time the mode of assessment changes in the Provinces. A way out of the difficulty might be found in accepting the franchise as adopted (not to be changed) in the different Provinces as the franchise of the Dominion, but that would be at the expense of uniformity. If we intend to avoid the inconsistencies in the United States [how does the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) like that?] and to have the same conditions confer the Dominion franchise on all parts of the Dominion, we cannot leave the qualification or regulation of voters to the Provinces."

So you will see that, at that time, it was fully understood and conceded that, sooner or later, they must have the franchise fixed and determined by this Parliament. Then we recollect that, when the Bill was introduced in 1870, to regulate the franchise, the leader of the Opposition who spoke long upon that question, who discussed the Bill in all its details, said not a word against this Parliament, fixing its own franchise. Those who were then in Parliament will recollect that a motion was made in 1870 by Mr. Ferguson, seconded by Mr. Drew, that the franchises of the several Provinces should be the franchise recognised by the Dominion. That resolution received no favor at the hands of the House. The leader of the Opposition did not speak in favor of it, did not recognise it; on the contrary it was lost without a division, or, as we call it, "lost on a division," the House not being divided upon it. Then, on April 22nd, 1874, the leader of the Opposition, speaking upon this subject said:

"He denied that in passing the Bill, Government were abandoning the power of regulating the franchise. The House had not exercised that franchise for many years, and if it turned out that the Province abused that power, the House had the power of taking it into their own hands."

Our justification for passing this Act is that Ontario has abused its powers and has usurped a power which it had no right to usurp. Since these gentlemen have spoken so much about our violating the provincial rights, and violating the trust of the people, I propose, though I know it is distasteful to my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), to bring these gentlemen face to face with their own record, and to show that the Reform party in this Province has studiously and systematically, since 1866, opposed the extension of the franchise, opposed the rights of the lower orders, as they call them, opposed the rights of the people, opposed the rights of the poor man, and sought to keep the franchise limited to property, and to keep it as high as possible. I am sorry I am obliged to annoy the hon. member for South Brant, by bringing him face to face with his record, but I cannot help it. I shall first take the year 1866. In the old Parliament of Canada, an effort was made to reduce the franchise in cities from $600 to $500. My hon. friend the Postmaster General, made a very strong appeal to the House in favor of that reduction, but every leading Reformer in that Parliament voted that the franchise should be kept at $600. But the hon. member was rather tenacious of his opinion. He was a member of the first Conservative Government of the Province of Ontario, and I had the pleasure of supporting him during the whole time he was in that legislature. The very first act he did, in 1868, was to reduce the franchise in cities to $500, in towns to $300, and in villages and townships to $200.

Mr. CARLING. $400 in cities.

Mr. RYKERT. No, $500 first. In 1868, he reduced it in cities to $500; the following year he followed that up by reducing it to $400, $300 and $200; but something very remarkable took place during the course of that debate. An hon. gentleman who then occupied a seat in that House for the County of Welland, who was rather democratic in his views, as these gentlemen then supposed, moved that the franchise be reduced in townships from $200 to $100. One would suppose, after hearing the speech of the leader of the Opposition and the views expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question, that the hon. the leader of the Opposition would have voted for that, but we find that he and my genial friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) voted against that proposition as an invasion upon the rights of the people. My hon. friend from South Perth will recollect that very well. Mr. Blake, I beg his pardon, the leader of the Opposition, was very indignant at that time. He used this language:

"He thought the member for Victoria (Mr. Cockburn) had let the cat out of the bag. The real difficulty was not that persons were prevented by the election law from voting who ought to vote, but that the system of assessment was defective. People were anxious, on the one hand, to vote, but were anxious, on the other hand, to pay a very small tax. The hon. gentleman said that, in the new townships, they did not care to be assessed at more than $1 per acre; because, in that case, when the county council came to equalise the assessment, injustice would be done them. The result of this feeling was that a nefarious system of sham and mock assessment was carried on in the country. The assessments were ridiculously small—a state of things degrading to the morals of the country. It might be that in a very few cases, in townships and villages, there might be a man intelligent enough to exercise the franchise, who was the owner of a lot and house on which he resided, really worth no more than $200—but this must be a God-forsaken part of the country, and the domicile must be of a peculiar description."

That was the opinion of the leader of the Opposition then. He thought it must be a God-forsaken part of the country where the franchise should be reduced lower than $200, and where a man would not have property worth that to vote upon. We find also that my hon. friend from South Perth, on that occasion, made a somewhat short speech, but to the point, as usual. He said:

"He thought the franchise low enough, but particularly in the rural districts."

That is the way he is reported in his organ of December 4th, 1868. He wanted to keep it up to $200. Then a motion was made in favor of female suffrage, and I would direct the attention of the Opposition to the views of their leader at that time. A few nights ago he spoke two or three

hours, and it would take half-a-dozen Philadelphia lawyers to tell how he was going to vote on that question. We know how he did vote. He voted by leaving the Chamber. He would not vote on the question of female suffrage. On a motion made by Mr. Coyne, then member for Peel, in favor of female suffrage, the present leader of the Opposition said:

"He hoped the sober sense of the House, of the country and of the fair sex would be arrayed, as he believed it was, against the proposition."

Thus, so far as the franchise was concerned, he was not liberal enough to grant it to females or to a man with property only worth $100. Then, on the 4th December, 1868, when the same Bill was under discussion, the leader of the Opposition used this language:

"He thought if hon. gentlemen had acted wisely they would have kept up the franchise in cities to $500. Had they done so we would not have seen hon. gentlemen urging this downward course which this reaction sought."

So you will see that, while to-day they profess to be favorable to granting the franchise to a large body of the electors, they have systematically opposed a reduction of the franchise. I think I can satisfy the House that every reduction of the franchise that has been granted by the Reform party, was at the instance of the Conservative party, and only when the Reform party was driven into the last ditch. Now, Sir, we find that the organ of the party, at that time, had the same view upon this question. On the 27th November, 1868, we find this language:

"If he (Hon. J. S. Macdonald) would take the trouble to enquire as to the practical effect of his $400 real estate franchise in Toronto, where it will include nearly all but the very poorest tenements, he would be able to see that he is enfranchising in this city alone, hundreds of persons who are, to say the least, no more worthy to be enfranchised than the class he resolutely excludes."

So that the House will see the organ was not favorable to giving the franchise to even the $400 men. On the 11th December, 1868, it goes on to say:

"If there is any danger of our drifting to universal suffrage, that danger will be enhanced by a persistence in the palpable injustice of enfranchising nearly every householder and refusing to enfranchise anybody else no matter how worthy or thrifty. There are many persons who do not in the least favor universal suffrage, who still hold that it would, in cities at all events, be no worse than the present franchise."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have seen over and over again, that the Reform party has claimed credit for the introduction of the income franchise. I am not accustomed to boast of what I have done in Parliament, but I assert that the first person who proposed the income franchise was the individual now addressing you. In 1868 I introduced a Bill into the Ontario Legislature, recognising the principle of the income franchise, and declaring at the same time that it should be extended to all university men, so that education should be represented as well as money. That did not meet with the favor of the House. Upon that occasion, in endeavoring to induce the House to accept the more liberal view, I made use of this language, as quoted by the *Globe*:

"For his own part, he would prefer that this matter be left over until a more comprehensive scheme could be adopted, by means of which not only those enjoying an income should have the right to vote, but also, that university men and others, who really take an interest in everything affecting the welfare and prosperity of this country should have some voice in choosing their representatives."

The House was not willing to accept the income franchise, and at the instance of the then member for Welland (Mr. Currie) the income franchise was struck out of the Bill. Those gentlemen came into power in December, 1871; they remained in power for a number of years, but they granted no extension of the franchise. In 1874, I introduced into the Ontario Parliament a Bill giving the franchise to men enjoying an income, and that Bill was taken up by the Government and passed just as I introduced it. While hon. gentlemen opposite claim credit for having been in favor of an income franchise, I can show that I was the one who first proposed it in the Local Legislature. Now, that clause relating to the income franchise was encumbered by a clause requiring the payment of taxes by the 14th day of December. In 1877, Mr. Meredith tried to remove that feature of that franchise. There were hundreds of persons who would like to enjoy the franchise, but were not prepared to pay the taxes, because, at that time in Ontario, as well as at present, any persons having an income under $400 were exempt from taxation; but they could not be placed upon the voters' list unless they were willing to be assessed and pay taxes. In 1877 Mr. Meredith moved that that obnoxious clause should be repealed, but his motion was rejected at the instance of the Mowat Government. In the year 1877 an agitation was got up in the Local Legislature of Ontario to give farmers' sons the franchise. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they are the champions of the farmer's son franchise. I have before me a quotation from their own organ, denouncing the franchise being extended to farmers' sons, and pointing out that they might just as well give it to the sons of mechanics and merchants as to farmers. On the 8th January, 1877, the organ said:

"If the farmer's son is to have a vote, why not anybody's son? If the farmer's son is to be enfranchised—who remains for convenience under the family roof—why is not the storekeeper's son, or the mechanic's son, or any other son for that matter, who follows the same laudable and political line of conduct to be disfranchised?"

It proceeds:

"And as every male person is the son of somebody, the real point to be decided is, what is there between giving a particular person a vote because he is a farmer's son and giving every male person a vote because he is the son of somebody not a farmer? In other words, what stands between the proposal and what is called, perhaps not very correctly, but popularly, universal suffrage?"

Now, Sir, in order to justify the legislature in not giving the franchise to farmers' sons, the organ quoted from Mr. Bright and said:

"Mr. Bright has always opposed 'fancy franchises' as merely colorable attempts to give manhood suffrage to those who did not dare to advocate it openly and honestly. Pretty hard that."

Now you will see that the farmer's sons franchise when first proposed in Ontario, was strongly opposed by the party organ. I have several articles before me in which it takes the sameview, one of February, 1877, in which it says:

"But we have never heard yet a sufficient reason given why the farmer's son should be expressly selected for the enjoyment of the privilege while the son of nobody else is to be allowed to share it. * * *

"But it is a bogus qualification nevertheless, a mere blind to hide manhood suffrage from view.

"It would be better to do in a direct manner what is thus sought to be attained in a circumlocutory fashion by this Bill. But then public opinion in this country certainly does not favor manhood suffrage or any departure from the old lines of the constitution."

Then it grew violent and a few days afterwards went on to say:

"We cannot, however, but reiterate that all which has been stated in its favor has not removed one objection to the measure which we have entertained. We still think that it is based on a wrong principle, that it is invidious, and by its very nature, can only be characterised as a piece of class legislation. We have never been able to see, nor has any of the supporters of the measure attempted to show, the reason for one man who is called a farmer, and who is possessed of twenty acres, having accorded to his son who works with him, and who may have the prospect of one day succeeding him, a vote in the election of municipal office-bearers and members of Parliament, while another man with ten acres, which with the help of a grown up son he cultivates as a market garden, and from which he raises three or four times more produce, should be denied the same privilege or honour, whichever it may be supposed to be."

"All over Ontario there is a large population of handicraftsmen who are socially, intellectually, and pecuniarily quite equal to the farmers among whom they live, and whose necessities they supply. These men are often, as far as their sons are concerned, exactly in the same position as their neighbours, the farmers. The tailor, the shoemaker, the grocer, the carpenter, and the blacksmith, to mention no others, have often one or more grown-up sons working with them on the same deliberately formed understanding as in the case of the farmers, that these sons shall succeed to the business when their fathers are laid aside either by sickness or death. Everyone who knows anything of the rural life of our country knows that as a class these young mechanics are equal to that class enfranchised by this measure."

Now, I point this out to show the House that while the

organ strongly opposed the farmer's son franchise, it was not favorable to enfranchising any others. I shall show that when we proposed giving a franchise to mechanics' sons they opposed it in the most bitter terms. Now, we find that the Conservative party in the House advocated the suffrage being given to mechanics' and merchants' sons, and the organ delivered itself in this style:

"On what principle, either in the 'British stake in the country' theory or the Democratic idea of human brotherhood and equality, are the merchants, mechanics and others to be regarded as specially entitled to vote? Only in exceptional cases is the young man whose father happens to be a merchant, tradesman, mechanic or professional man a virtual though not finally acknowledged partner in his parent's business, keeping it up for the common benefit of the family, and while there are, doubtless, good reasons for extending the franchise to include many of the young men in cities and towns at present debarred from it, the proposition to make the sons of merchants, mechanics and others a privileged caste, and to endow them with the suffrage by reason of their fathers' vocation, is altogether too absurd and untenable."

Mr. Meredith in January 1883 moved this resolution:

"That this House is of opinion that justice to large and important portions of the community demands a liberal extension of the franchise, particuliarly in the direction of conferring on the sons of mechanics, and others not now entrusted with the franchise, the same privileges as are now conferred on farmers' sons."

One would suppose that this being a very liberal measure it would have been received with favor by Mr. Mowat. But instead of replying to it himself, he put up Mr. Cascaden, M. P. for West Elgin. He said:

"It was, however, a question in which they should hasten slowly, for once it was extended they could not recede—they could not contract it—however evidently desirable it might be."

So you see that so far as the franchise was concerned, the Reformers steadily opposed it. Recollect, too, that was in the face of a resolution of the Reform convention of January, 1883, which declared that there should be a liberal extension of the franchise, and that the people should be consulted upon it. Upon that occasion a number of persons, though not the leading members of the party, discussed the question of the franchise, and two minor members of the party moved and seconded a resolution to this effect:

"That this convention rejoices in the successful operation of these extensions of the franchise, which have from time to time been placed on the Statute Book, records its opinion that a further extension should form a plank in the platform of the Reform Party at the ensuing elections, and expresses its hopes that the popular voice will endorse the proposal and will return a liberal majority, authorized to accomplish this reform."

We see that Mr. Mowat refused to extend the franchise up to that time. In January, 1883, Mr. Meredith moved again to strike out the clause imposing a tax upon income. That was voted down. He moved another motion, to reduce the income franchise from $400 to $300. That was also voted down. But Mr. Mowat, finding that he was acting against the will of the people, knowing that the desire was that the franchise should be extended, on the following day had the following resolution moved by Mr. Fraser:—

"That the Liberal party of this Province stands pledged to extend the franchise; that if this House should now legislate to extend the franchise, any law passed for that purpose could not be brought into operation in time for the coming general election; that any considerable extension of the franchise is especially a subject upon which the people ought to be consulted; that the approaching general election will afford an opportunity for so consulting and ascertaining the wishes of the people; but the House, meanwhile, does not hesitate to affirm its opinion that no such extension of the franchise will prove satisfactory which does not, with proper checks and safeguards, give the right to vote to all classes who can fairly and reasonably claim to be endowed therewith."

That was carried, because he felt that public opinion was with the motion of Mr. Meredith, and although he had voted that motion down, he was compelled to put up Mr. Fraser to move the motion I have read. During the elections of 1883, only once did Mr. Mowat speak about the franchise. When attending a meeting in West Toronto, he said he had no decided views on the subject; Mr. Meredith was able to say specifically what he had to propose; but he, Mr. Mowat, did not choose to take that position. So up to the general elections, Mr. Mowat had no idea of extending the franchise. Then we find that the Dominion Parliament met upon the 17th January, 1884; the Franchise Bill was promised by the Government in a Speech from the Throne, and the *Globe* on the 18th January, said:

"It is promised that the Franchise Bill of last Session will be again introduced."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I rise to a point of Order. There is no desire on this side to prevent the hon. gentleman from reading; but I remember that, only the other day, the hon. gentleman quoted parliamentary authorities with a great deal of zeal to prevent an hon. member from reading an extract. During the three-quarters of an hour the hon. gentleman has already spoken, not more than five minutes have been occupied by expressing his own sentiments. I am pleased to hear the extracts; I only wish to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to this point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not seen the hon. gentleman reading his speech. I noticed that he read one or two extracts.

Mr. RYKERT. The only difference is that I exercised discretion. I know that discretion is not possible with hon. gentlemen opposite. I read from an authority which laid down that, whem members read extracts, discretion must be used. I have felt that I can use discretion, and that while quotations of three or four lines are in order, extracts are not in order when they reach three or four chapters. That rule you applied, Mr. Chairman, the other day, when an hon. member was reading eight or ten pages on female suffrage. I, however, have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to hear these extracts read.

Mr. PATERSON. I do.

Mr. RYKERT. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not like to be brought face to face with the records of their party. There is not any position taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite but we can confront them with their speeches made on former occasions. When the great tariff question was under discussion in Parliament in 1879, we cited the opinions and speeches of the members for North Norfolk and South Brant to prove that we were justified in adopting the National Policy, and quoted their speeches of 1876 in answer to their argument in opposition thereto. We showed by their speeches that they had turned political somersaults. In fact, whenever they advance any arguments on any question in this House, all we have to do is to turn up former speeches in Parliament to answer them.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the hon. gentleman's own remark, not an extract.

Mr. RYKERT. When interrupted I was quoting an authority which will be recognised. On the 24th January, 1884, the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, forced by the leader of this Government, who had declared, upon the 17th January, that he would introduce a Franchise Bill, announced in the Speech from the Throne the extension of the franchise. The words were:

"In this connexion I invite your attention to the expediency of further extending the already liberal Franchise which prevails in this Province."

Upon that occasion neither the mover nor the seconder of the Address spoke a word in favor of that clause, in fact it was entirely ignored; and even the *Globe*, which anticipated the Speech, said nothing about the franchise. Notwithstanding the promises made in the speech, the Session of 1884 passed, without the Ontario Government introducing any Bill increasing the franchise in accordance with the promises made before the elections. Then we came down to 1885, the present Session. This Parliament met on the 29th January, and the Speech from the Throne promised an extension of the franchise. The Ontario Government find-

ing they were driven into a corner were compelled to do something towards redeeming their pledge. They saw that the First Minister of the Dominion was determined to go on with the Franchise Bill; then those hon. gentlemen thought they must have a new Franchise Bill, and on the 5th of March, something like six weeks after the Ontario Legislature met, the Bill was introduced; it was read the second time on the 24th of March, and was passed on the 28th of March. So those hon. gentlemen were actually forced to adopt not only an extension of the franchise, so far as property was concerned, but they were compelled to reduce the income franchise and to adopt other liberal clauses which had been advocated year after year by the Conservative party in Ontario. We find to-day that Mowatt's Bill, instead of placing the franchise at $400, has reduced it to $300; and subsequently in the Legislature it was reduced to $250. I think I have satisfactorily shown, by the record of the Reform party in this Dominion, that they have systematically opposed the extension of the franchise. We find that they never conceded one inch, until they were driven into the last ditch by the Conservative party. Now these hon. gentlemen have been discussing this Bill day after day and night after night, they have been declaring that it should not be passed because the people have not had time to consider it, that its contents are not known to the people. Well, Sir, we had a similar Bill introduced in 1869. That Bill is almost precisely similar to this, with the exception of the revising barrister clause. That Bill provided that there should be commissioners instead of revising barristers. The leader of the Opposition at that time strongly favoured that Bill, as mentioned by the First Minister to-day. On the 11th March, 1870, the leader of the Opposition said:

"The House must feel gratified at the full statement made by the hon. mover of the Bill, and also at the mode taken to discuss its provisions, as well as with the announcement that it was the intention of the Government to receive with consideration any suggestions which might be offered."

That Bill was fully discussed, it went to a second reading, it went into committee and was discussed in all its details. The *Globe* newspaper and other Reform papers, published an analysis of the Bill, giving all its leading features, and if the *Globe* had any circulation in the country the people must have been informed on the details of that measure. Yet we find hon. gentlemen still declaring unhesitatingly that the country do not know anything about the Bill; that the people are entirely ignorant of it; that the people have not had time to consider it. On the 20th May, 1869, the *Globe* referred to the details of the measure, pointed out its leading features and said it was similar to the Bill of the preceeding Session, which was identical with the Bill of to day, except as to the clause providing for revising barristers. The *Globe* said:

"The Premier's Bill proposes a franchise which, though a little complicated, and not altogether consistent, is on the whole liberal. It proposes a freehold franchise of $200 in counties, $400 in cities and $300 in towns. A tenant franchise of $20 in counties and $30 in cities, and an income franchise of $400. The income franchise is an excellent feature of the Bill."

Now, Sir, that Bill was introduced again sometime early in 1883. On April 16th, the *Globe* referred to it as a measure similar to the one introduced in 1870. When the Bill was before Parliament for a certain time the leader of the Government withdrew it, stating that he withdrew the Bill, and that it would now go before the country to be submitted next Session. Parliament was not taken by surprise, and hon. gentlemen must have known the principles of the Bill, for, as the hon. member for Brome said a few nights ago, he had thoroughly discussed the measure before his constituents, and had come back for the purpose of opposing the Bill. The hon. member for West Lambton made a similar statement; he said the Bill was before the country for some time, that it was understood by the people, and yet hon. gentlemen say the Bill should not be passed because the people have not had an opportunity of considering it. Now, on the 19th January, 1884, at the opening of Parliament, to show that the Bill was fully discussed, Mr. Blake said:

"At the opening of last Session I pointed out what I thought was the true need with reference to the Franchise Bill. I don't intend to repeat those words to-day. The Bill has been before the House and country. It has not received the advantage of vindication by its proposer."

Then he found fault with the First Minister for not entering into the details of the measure, and said he recognised the fact that the Bill was fully understood by the country. He then goes on further to make some remarks which show that the leader of the Opposition was a little at fault—that he is troubled with a treacherous memory. He spoke about the Bill of 1883, that Bill having a clause providing for revising barristers, precisely as the Bill of the present time, but on the 19th January, 1884, he said:

"At the time I spoke I did not know and could not know that the Bill would contain so objectionable or unheard of a provision as it is proposed to have in it, which proposal I hope will not be carried out, of the appointment of revising barrister."

Now, in January 1884, he noticed that clause of the Bill, although he never noticed the previous Bill, and although, as I have shown you, he discussed that Bill in all its details, and said it was well known to the country, and yet I should like to know if the Bill introduced to the House was not understood by that hon. gentleman. Now, in order to show that the hon. gentleman was mistaken, I refer you to page 594 of the *Hansard* of January 1883, where you will find that the First Minister referred particularly to the clause providing for the revising barristers, and upon the 25th January, the *Globe* newspaper said:

"Sir John A. Macdonald has introduced the Franchise Bill. It is not his practice to introduce in the early days of the Session any measure to which he attaches any importance. This is almost exactly the same Bill as last Session. One of the most objectionable features of the Bill is that which provides for a revising barrister.

Still the leader of the Opposition says he knew nothing about it—that it took him by surprise. Now, this Bill has been denounced to a very great extent, but we recollect, as I said a few minutes ago, that the same Bill was introduced in 1870, and that on that occasion the leader of the Opposition declared that they were all agreed as to the necessity of an Election Act, and although he might oppose some of the details, he had no idea of opposing a second reading of the Bill. The *Globe* of the 16th April said:

"It will be noticed that the conferring of the franchise upon unmarried women is the only liberal feature of the Bill. As to this feature, it is, we are pleased to say, a truly liberal measure, but we shall be very much surprised if the majority of the present House do not take the opportunity of eliminating a proposition which seems really out of place amid its surroundings."

These gentlemen say that the Bill is an obnoxious Bill, and still you find the the same Bill approved by the leader of the Opposition. Now, I think this House must have come to the conclusion, after listening to this debate for someting like three weeks, that the sole object of the opposition to this Bill is that there is a clause in it relating to the revising barrister. If that clause were eliminated from the Bill now, hon. gentlemen opposite would allow it to pass without a single word of opposition, although it is true hon. gentlemen have for fifty-seven hours fought upon the one word Indian. Would it not be well now to bring my hon. friend from Brant face to face with his own record on that question. I think it has already been published abroad, and no doubt the hon. gentleman has seen it, that the hon. member for South Brant and other gentlemen on that side who are now so strongly opposed to the enfranchisement of the Indians, were strongly in favor of it in 1876. I have in my hand the Bill which was introduced at that time by Mr. Laird.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). One moment. I am not opposed to Indian enfranchisement—I desire it.

Mr. RYKERT. It is a very hard to tell where the hon. gentleman stands. His speech on this Bill was condemnatory of the principle of enfranchising the Indian.

Mr. PATERSON. No, no.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, every line of it; and when brought face to face with his record we see that he would not enfranchise one Indian. The hon. member for Elgin also denounced it in unmeasured terms. These hon. gentlemen said: Why enfranchise Pie-a-Pot and Poundmaker and the others, when they knew that the Bill did not refer to the Territories at all? They knew that very well, but they thought to make a little capital out of it, a little by-play out of the remarks of the First Minister, because the First Minister in answer to some questions, in a jocular manner said yes. Was there a single hon. gentleman who raised his voice to say one word on behalf of the poor Indian—not a word until they were driven into a corner, and brought face to face with their record. Now it has gone to the country that this Government has endeavored to enfranchise the Indian, who is placed in the same position as the white man.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, the Act says so.

Mr. PATERSON. That is what we proposed and voted for and the hon. gentleman voted down.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, we shall see. I know that it is most unpalatable to these hon. gentlemen to be brought face to face with their own record. The Bill says:

"Person means a male person including an Indian."

Section 3 says:

"Every person shall, upon and after the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five, be entitled to be registered on the lists of voters."

Then it goes on to provide that he must be of the full age of 21 years, that he must be a British subject by birth or naturalisation, that he must be the owner of real property or a tenant, or have an income, and so on; and the Indian must have the same franchise and the same qualification as the white man. What were these gentlemen in favor of three years ago? They were in favor of enfranchising the Chinese and granting them every privilege that the white man enjoys; yet they say now he is no better than an Indian, and the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) says the Indian is no better than a negro. They were then in favor of the poor Chinese being included, and now they want to exclude the poor Indian. They say that they were not in favor of excluding the Indian who had the same qualifications as the white man. Well, what does this Bill say but that a person means an Indian, and that he must have the qualification required by law. Suppose the tribal Indians, as they call them, had a vote, would that be wrong? Who owns their property? Who owns the property of the Tuscorora Indians? Do the Indians, or does the Government? The Indians own that property, and no law of the land can take it from them. They have as much right to it as the hon. member for South Brant has to his; and if they have that property, which they work, and enjoy the benefits of, why should they not have the same rights as white men? What did the hon. member for South Brant say in 1875?

"Mr. Paterson desired to impress upon the hon. Minister of the Interior, the necessity that existed for the revision and codification of the Indian laws, and also with respect to the desirability of the enfranchisement of the Indians."

In 1876, the Bill I have before me was introduced, and it has these clauses:

"86. Whenever any Indian man, or unmarried woman, of the full age of twenty-one years, obtains the consent of the band of which he or she is a member to become enfranchised, and whenever such Indian has been assigned by the band a suitable allotment of land for that purpose, the local agent shall report such action of the band, and the name of the applicant to the Superintendent General; whereupon the said Superintendent General, if satisfied that the proposed allotment of land is equitable, shall authorized some competent person to report whether the applicant is an Indian who, from the degree of civilization to which he or she has attained, and the character for integrity, morality and sobriety which he or she bears, appears to be qualified to become a proprietor of land in fee simple; and upon the favorable report of such person, the Superintendent General may grant such Indian a location ticket as a probationary Indian, for the land allotted to him or her by the band.

"88. Every such Indian shall, before the issue of the letters patent mentioned in the next preceding section, declare to the Superintendent General the name and surname by which he or she wishes to be enfranchised and thereafter known, and on his or her receiving such letters patent, in such name and surname, he or she shall be held to be also enfranchised, and he or she shall thereafter be known by such name or surname, and if such Indian be a married man his wife and minor unmarried children also shall be held to be enfranchised; and from the date of such letters patent the provisions of this Act and of any Act or law making any distinction between the legal rights, privileges, disabilities and liabilities of Indians and those of Her Majesty's other subjects shall cease to apply to any Indian."

Now, the hon. First Minister declared that when we came to the enfranchising clauses he would have clauses with respect to the Indians; but, whether he does or not, the fact stares us in the face, that the Indian who has the frugality and the industry to cultivate a piece of property, and works that property, and who chooses to take advantage of this Act, can claim the right of suffrage and nothing further; and the hon. member for South Brant strongly appealed to this House, years ago, that Indians should be relieved from the tutelage and the bondage under which they then existed.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman understand the Bill to be what he said now—that only Indians who are assessed and have the same responsibilities as white men, are to have votes?

Mr. RYKERT. I understand by this Bill that a person means an Indian, or a white man, or a negro, and that that person must be an owner, tenant or an occupant or have an income.

Mr. PATERSON. Must be assessed for it; the hon. gentleman said assessed twice.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman has not read the Bill. In fact, I would judge that most hon. gentlemen opposite had not read the Bill—from the erratic manner in which they have discussed the question, and the absurd and reckless statements they have made—as they seem to know nothing at all about the Bill. The hon. gentleman also said, in 1880:

"Then the Bill does not provide for the enfranchisemant of the Indians, for according to them the rights, opportunities and privileges of citizens is, I think, the only solution of the Indian question, more especially the only solution which affects the more advanced tribes, on whose behalf and with respect to whose circumstances, I am more particularly acquainted. Any change that has been made in the law is only in the direction of still more firmly fastening the shackles of tutelage upon them—a change tending to keep the Indians in their present condition. I speak on behalf of 3,000 Indians——"

That is, the Indians of Tuskarora, the same as are going to be enfranchised by this Bill——

Mr. PATERSON. You are not enfranchising them.

Mr. RYKERT. And are going to have the right to vote and the same privileges as white men.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. RYKERT——

"——3,000 Indians, among whom six missionaries have been laboring for the past thirty years, and who have twelve public schools and an industrial institute. In that band there never has been but one enfranchised under the Act of 1868, and that Indian was unable to get the land to which he was entitled; he petitioned to be restored to his former condition as an Indian. If there is such a record after twelve years experience is it not time that some step was taken by which more progress might be made? The whole Indian law discourages the assimilation of the whites and the Indians, and the solution of the Indian

problem can only be found in wiping out the distinction which exists between the races, in giving the red man all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man, and entailing upon him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges."

Therefore, if the Indian be located upon a piece of land worth the proper value, why should he not be enfranchised?

Mr. PATERSON. He has not the responsibility.

Mr. RYKERT. What responsibility has he got? He has to work his land the same as everybody else, and he does exactly what the hon. member for South Brant does, consumes tea and coffee and sugar, and uses all the other necessaries of life, on which he pays duty.

Mr. PATERSON. So does my boy of eighteen who has not a vote.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not suppose he cares very much. So hon. gentlemen will see that the view taken by these gentlemen was that the Indian should be enfranchised. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) who was very strong on the point, said:

"I think Indians who are equal to whites in intelligence, who are superior to many whites in wealth, and who are full grown citizens of the Dominion, should not be placed in a worse condition than the negro."

So that you will see that hon. gentlemen opposite who for the last three or four weeks have been discussing the Indian question, and especially the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who devoted an hour and a-half to the Indian franchise, took the same position that the Government occupy to-day in favor of enfranchising the Indians so long as he came within the definition of the word person. These hon. gentlemen have made a great deal of argument against the revising barrister clause. I am not going to discuss the merits of that clause while we are in committee, discussing another branch of the Bill, and I do not wish to violate the rules of debate, but I simply wish to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of their own views on this question. I want to show that these same gentlemen who complain so loudly of this clause are the very ones who, a few years ago, when the First Minister proposed to appoint three commissioners, advocated it. They were, moreover, in favor of having placed in the hands of the registrar of the county, the sheriff and county attorney, or other county officials this power; these officials to be paid in the same manner as the revising barrister. In the Bill of 1869 introduced by the First Minister he appointed three commissioners from whom there was to be an appeal to the county judge. At that time the organ of the party strongly advocated that the registrar of the county or the county attorney should be appointed. The leader of the Opposition was not quite so decided on that point, he preferred having the revising barrister. In 1870 he said:

"The way to remedy the system was not the way proposed by the mover of the Bill, but the proper mode was to adopt the English system of revising barristers, who were appointed by the judges Another plan which he propose l was to appoint some one of the persons, who for the time being, he found filling the county offices, but then the hon mover said we had no jurisdiction over the county officers. He asserted there was no difficulty in the House declaring that men, who at the time, would be found filling particular offices should discharge particular functions, and should be liable to penalties if they did not discharge them."

The *Globe* also declared in favor of the revising barrister, but, in the event of his not being appointed, thought it was advisable that the registrar of the county, or the county attorney, or the sheriff, should be appointed. Hon. gentlemen opposite say this Bill interferes with provincial rights. Was there anything said about provincial rights in 1870? Not one word. Though it was the same Bill, the same clauses, everything identical, except the clause providing commissioner; instead of revising barrister; not one voice was raised on behalf of provincial rights. Again they say, this Bill is not asked for by the public. The best argument in reply to that statement is the instance quoted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He referred to the Bill extending the franchise in Great Britain, which was introduced lately by Mr. Gladstone. Were any petitions sent to the British House of Commens asking for that Bill? Did Mr. Gladstone consult the people? No; although this Bill was most revolutionary in its character, extending the privileges granted to the people, making the franchise still lower than it was, Mr. Gladstone had it passed through the House without consulting the people, and not one word was said about the people not asking for it. Was Mr. Mowat's Bill, passed a few days ago, ever discussed before the people or asked for by the people? Did the hon. member for South Brant, in stumping the country during the last election ever say a word about extending the franchise? Or, if he did, did he say in what direction he wanted it to be extended? I followed hon. gentlemen throughout many contests, and did not hear them say a word about it. Mr. Mowat was not asked to pass the Bill. True, the Reform party, driven to it by the Conservative party, had to acknowledge it as a plank in their platform, but although Mr. Mowat placed it as a plank in his platform, as laid down by the Lieutenant-Governor, he did not endorse it in Parliament, and allowed a whole Session to pass without saying a word about it. Can the hon. gentlemen opposite point to a single voter who having had a vote in 1882 or 1878 will not also have a vote in 1887 under this Bill? They cannot point to one. Yet they say we have no right to speak for the people, we who are commissioned to speak for the people by two mandates given us by large majorities in 1878 and in 1882. These hon. gentlemen, some time ago, thought it necessary, when a former Bill was passed through Parliament, to call for meetings throughout the country. That Bill was passed without consulting the people. When they went before the people did they discuss the measure? No; in 1882, when they went to the people on the Canadian Pacific Railway measure, they would not discuss it; but they went off on a side issue and talked about invading the rights of the Province, the Rivers and Streams Bill, the Boundary Award—these were the questions they discussed, and not the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. So it will be at the next election. This Bill will pass, and what will be the result? Hon. gentlemen opposite will go off on some other side wind; they will draw some other red herring across the trail, but they will not meet the people fairly. Now they say, this Bill is being hurried through Parliament. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said this Bill was introduced only three months after the House met. That statement is about as correct as any other statement he has made, and is on a par with the reckless, random statements that hon. gentlemen opposite generally make. They want it to go forth to the country that this House did nothing the first three months of the Session, so that the people will say the Government was wasting time, and three or four weeks more wasted by the Opposition would not make very much difference. What is the fact? The Bill was introduced the 19th of March.

Mr. VAIL. Ten days short of three months.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is six weeks out of his calculation again, just about as near as he can count. I have from the Clerk of the House a statement showing that the Bill was distributed the 27th of March, not two months after the House met, yet the hon. member for Bothwell deliberately says it was not brought down until three months after the House opened. I believe that when the *Hansard* report comes down to-morrow, the hon. member for Bothwell will correct that statement; but if it comes down as he delivered it, it will be seen that he deliberately stated that it was three months before the Bill came before the House, although it was but little more than seven weeks before it was actually distributed to the House. Let us

compare that with what Mr. Mowat did of whom hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of talking. We find that Mr. Mowat's Parliament was in Session six weeks before his Bill was introduced. His Parliament met on the 28th of January, and on the 5th of March the Bill was read the first time. It was not printed until the 20th, it was read the second time on the 24th, and passed on the 28th; and this was a Bill more revolutionary in its character than any previous Franchise Bill—a Bill which enfranchised the Indians and extended the franchise almost in every direction. Mr. Mowat went one better than the First Minister. The hon. gentleman was determined to go one better than the First Minister. He saw what the First Minister's Bill was, the same as the previous Session, he sits down, draws his Bill, almost all the clauses drawn in such a way as to go one better than the First Minister. This Bill had been before Parliament and had been discussed before the people as the member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) said. But one member, the hon. member for Brant, admitted that he had never heard of the Bill before. A newspaper man, a man who knows so much of what is going on in the country, says he knew nothing about the Bill. That shows what reliance can be placed on this gentleman who cannot keep a faithful record of the affairs of the country. Hon. gentlemen say the Bill is going to be too expensive. Although that is somewhat out of the record, I will simply say that the estimates made by hon. gentlemen in regard to that are something like their estimates a few years ago in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. One hon. gentleman said it would cost $500,000. Another said it would cost $715,000. When the question of the revising barrister is under discussion, I shall take the liberty to give my view of what the cost really is, but I repeat what I said before, that the cost in the first year of the revising barrister and his clerk and his constable will not be as much as what hon. gentlemen have cost the country by the unreasonable obstruction which they have exhibited in regard to this Bill, nor as much as it has cost to publish all the absurd returns which they have asked for—some 700 or 800. These gentlemen are never at home unless they are reckless in assertion. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) stated a few nights ago that, if this Bill passed, there would be 150,000 men disfranchised in the Province of Ontario, and in order to show that, he went into an estimate. The member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) went 25,000 better. The next night he said there would be 150,000 disfranchised. Let us come to the record. It may surprise the hon. gentlemen when I tell them the results from the official documents, but I want to show how reckless these gentlemen are in their random statements, how regardless they are of the facts, how economical of the truth, in fact, they kick it around in every direction. According to the last official return, there were in the Province of Ontario only 472,411 persons of the age of twenty-one years and upwards. Let us turn to the record of the Ontario Government, and see how many persons are enfranchised to-day in that Province without Mr. Mowat's new Bill, because, mark you, that is not now the law of the land, it does not come into operation till next January. According to the law in force to-day in the Province of Ontario, the franchise is $400 in cities, $300 in towns, $200 in townships and villages, and $400 income. The total number of persons enfranchised under that law to-day, is 417,112, so that there are only 55,309 persons in the Province of Ontario above twenty one years of age who had not the franchise, including lunatics, criminals, insane, deaf, dumb and blind. Yet the hon. gentleman says this Bill will disfranchise 125,000 people. How is it going to do that? The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) will say: Oh, but some of you vote twice. On his own estimate, according to his first statement, there were 15,000 who voted twice. Subsequently, he said there were 7,500. I will take his statement of 15,000, and, adding that to the 55,309, we have 70,309 against 150,000 or 125,000, the number given by the member for West Elgin and the member for West Huron respectively, and this is assuming that not one additional person will be enfranchised under this Act. You see how reckless they are. There are not, from the age of 21 years up to 99 years, more than 55,309 who have not votes to-day in the Province of Ontario, and of the voters 286,000 voted in 1883, at the last general election, and the votes unpolled were 120,153. When they deliberately told the House and the country that 150,000 men will be disfranchised by this Bill, they were talking what they know is not correct, they were making random and reckless statements for political purposes, for the purpose of casting some obloquy and some disgrace upon the First Minister, and getting the people to stir up meetings and arouse a feeling in the country against the Bill. I assert that not a gentleman on that side of the House can point to a single person in the Province of Ontario, who, to-day, has a vote who will be disfranchised by this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear. Not one.

Mr. RYKERT. When we go back to render an account of our stewardship, there will not be one who had a vote for us before who will not have a vote on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And a great many more.

Mr. RYKERT. And a great many more, as I shall show presently. These gentlemen must have a little shame when they look at the record they have made in this House. In analysing this Bill I take my own constituency. I have taken the trouble since last Friday to have all the assessment rolls of my constituency sent to this House, in order to see the effect of this Bill and of Mr. Mowat't Bill on my county. In the first place, Mr. Mowat's Bill will deprive of their votes 269 non-resident freehold voters, who have exercised the franchise for twenty-five or thirty years. I myself have voted in the county of Welland for nearly thirty years, and I am cut off from that; but, while they adopt that principle, viz., that non-residents shall not vote as far as parliamentary elections are concerned, in municipal elections it is different. I voted ten times in one day in ten different places. That shows that, while they are willing to allow that for municipal purposes, they are not willing to allow it for parliamentary purposes. I should like to know why I should have the privilege of voting in the city of St. Catharines in six wards for eighteen aldermen, and in the township of Grantham for four councillors and a reeve, and in the township of Niagara in my own county, and in the village of Merritton, and yet, when it comes to a parliamentary election, where my responsibilities are greater than in municipal affairs, I can only vote where I live, and not where I have the largest amount of property. There are in my own county 269 people disfranchised by reason of being non-resident. Taking Mr. Mowat's Bill, there are in that county of Lincoln, outside of the city of St. Catharines, only 49 persons who are assessed for an amount under $200. To-day there are only 49 persons who will gain the franchise by Mr. Mowat's Bill. I am assuming that they are only assessed for $100, but they are assessed under $200, so that while I lose 269 of non-residents, I gain 49 as voters having $100 and upwards. Now, we will take the city of St. Catharines, this shows the fact that every person assessed for property in the Province of Ontario—unless, as the leader of the Opposition says, he lives in a God-forsaken part of the country—is assessed for $200. There is hardly anyone living with a roof over his head at all, who is not worth $200. Hon. gentlemen know, in canvassing the country, that every elector tries to be assessed for an amount sufficient to give him a vote. Now, take the city of St. Catharines, with a franchise of $400. I find there are only twenty-nine persons

assessed between $300 and $400, and only twenty-six persons between $200 and $300, who will be entitled to vote. The only gain under the Mowat Bill in the city of St. Catharines, with its population of 10,000, will be twenty-six. This Bill also recognises the principle recognised years ago in the old Parliament of Canada, of what is called "tenancy franchise." Although some objection has been taken to some of the details of that section, the principle of tenant franchise is fully recognised. In Mr. Mowat's Bill a man must have property worth a certain amount, but in the present Bill a person representing a piece of property, no matter how small or how large, if he pays $2 a month, can have a vote. I would like to know where there is a tenant who pays less than $2 a month? We come now to the income franchise. In the Province of Ontario there is a large number of persons with salaries of $400, who, at the present time, claim exemption and will not be assessed. They do not appear upon the voters' lists because they are not assessed, and the courts have determined that no man can be placed upon the list after the assessment roll is revised, for income, unless he is assessed. So that, in the Province of Ontario, a man must be assessed for $400 before he can have a vote. Under this Bill a man need not be assessed for anything, he has only to have an income of $400, so there is the advantage under this Bill. In the Province of Ontario he must pay taxes and be placed upon the assessment roll, so that in these two respects this Bill is far better than the other. I have been struck with the fact, during this discussion, that some hon. gentlemen, particularly the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), have exhibited a great deal of anxiety for Nova Scotia, and have pointed out that this Bill is going to disfranchise large numbers in that Province. Well, I find that on the 7th May, 1885, the *Halifax Chronicle*, a good Grit organ, as I understand, denounced the Franchise Bill in almost as strong terms as the hon. gentlemen in this House. That paper says this:

"The difference between the proposed franchise and those now in operation are more in name than in reality. Very few of the young men who would be entitled to vote under the Dominion Act as having an income of $300 a year, would not possess $300 personal property entitling them to vote in this Province. We believe the two lists which we require to be made up, if the Dominion Bill becomes law, will, if fairly made up, be nearly identical."

I quote that as an answer to those hon. gentlemen who say this Bill is going to work great injustice in Nova Scotia. Now, the principal difference between this Bill and the Local Bill of Ontario is this: In the Local Legislature the assessment rolls are the guide, and every one knows that in townships particularly, men are assessed as low as possible, and still have the right to vote, in order to evade the taxation imposed by the county council. Hon. gentlemen who know anything about municipal affairs in Ontario, know that the rolls are equalised by the county council, and therefore in rural municipalities and towns not separated from the county, property is assessed as low as possible in order that the owners may reduce the county taxation. But in this Bill the revising barrister, or the judge, takes the actual value of the property; he does not take the assessed value at all, so that where the assessed value is $100 in the municipality, the actual value might be $250, and in cities where the value is assessed at $200, the actual value may be $400. In this Bill the revising barrister states the actual value, irrespective of the assessed value, the voter under this law not being liable to pay any taxes. Now I have briefly pointed ont the inconsistencies of hon. gentlemen in opposing this Bill. I think they have manifested a disposition to obstruct legislation in reference to this Bill. Anyone who will examine the *Hansard* will see that these hon. gentlemen have occupied something like 400 or 500 pages in the discussion of a measure that might have been discussed in 15 pages; and they have done so, not for the purpose of defending provincial rights, but with a view of obstructing this Bill so that the Government will be forced to withdraw it. The First Minister has declared that this Bill shall become law this present Session, and his supporters believe he is right. The House has affirmed the principle on the second reading by a large majority, and we would be false to our trust, and to the position we occupy as representatives of the people, if we were to allow the Opposition, simply because we might be inconvenienced by sitting here three or four months, to obstruct the Bill and prevent the legislation being carried through. Mr. Chairman, I support this Bill because I believe that we ought to have a uniform franchise that cannot be interfered with or altered by the Local Legislatures. As I have pointed out, the Local Legislature of Ontario has unjustly and unfairly disfranchised thousands of people who have heretofore enjoyed the privilege of the franchise and who voted for us in 1882, who when we go back for re-election will have no right to pass judgment on our action. For example, non-resident voters at the last election will have no right to pass judgment on our actions because they are disfranchised, and judgment will be passed upon us by a different set of men. That is not a just course to pursue. We have no guarantee that the franchise will not be altered by Mr. Mowat before the next general election; that there will not be compulsory voting, that woman suffrage will not be granted, that manhood suffrage will not be granted. Knowing all these facts, and what are the views of members of this House on these three important questions, manhood suffrage, woman suffrage and compulsory voting, and having strong views on these questions, are we to place ourselves in the hands of politicians like Oliver Mowat, who has shown his determination to fight against the interests of the Dominion? I feel as the leader of the Opposition felt in 1871, that there should be no entangling alliance between Ontario and the Dominion. The hon. member for West Durham, when leader of the Opposition in the Local House in 1871, said:

"As citizens of Ontario we are called upon to frame our own policy with reference to our Provincial rights and interests and to conduct our own affairs; and we deprecate, nay more, we protest most strongly against any interference on the part of any Government with our perfect freedom of action."

Again said Mr. Blake:

"Their position was this, that the Local Government should be perfectly independent of the Central Government and should neither be entangled by alliance nor embarrassed by hostility."

Those are true and sound principles. If they are adhered to, then I say that the Local Legislature of Ontario will occupy its true position. I am in favor of an entirely different franchise for the Provincial as compared with Dominion elections. We are sent here to advocate measures entirely different to those coming before the Local Legislature. When we have narrow-minded men who hold that local matters are paramount, when a Local Legislature arraigns itself as the Ontario Legislature has done against the interests of the Dominion, we have a right to fortify ourselves and protect ourselves, and take care not to place ourselves in the hands of such politicians as at the present time control the Legislature of Ontario.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not rise to engage in further discussion as to the amendment I placed in your hands some days ago and which is still before the House. I rise for the purpose of referring to one or two points made by the Premier, when you, Mr. Chairman, first took the Chair this afternoon. We have great satisfaction in the declaration made by that hon. gentleman that he has resisted the demands of his followers, that the cloture should be applied.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I said nothing about my followers. I said that demands had been made from various sources.

Mr. CHARLTON. They were not made from this side of the House; and if they were not made by the hon. gentleman's followers, I do not know by whom they could have been made. The reason for such a suggestion does not exist. The application of the cloture in England was after vexatious opposition by a mere faction, blocking the wheels of legislation. No mere faction in this House opposes this measure; but a great party, representing the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day, oppose a measure which the people do not want; and for that reason there is no justification for the cloture or for that gag-law, the so-called application for the previous question, which obtains in the United States House of Representatives. I rise to refer more particularly to the charge made by the hon. gentleman, that members on this side of the House had been guilty of organised obstruction. In my opinion this Bill has been discussed properly and temperately, except on one or two occasions when the House insisted on sitting past two o'clock. As to the speeches on this side of the House, we have a very fair specimen in the excellent speech delivered by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) this afternoon. Of course, some may have been somewhat diffuse. Some hon. gentlemen may not have spoken with that terseness, with that degree of parliamentary skill which old parliamentarians may possess; but all of those hon. gentlemen have addressed themselves to the discussion with a sincere desire to present their views to this House and the country. The hon. gentleman asserted that but for this obstruction the discussion would not have been kept up the week before last, and the painful scene enacted, by which members were deprived of their rest. During the week before last, the first attempt made at the Monday Session, and continued until 10 o'clock Tuesday night was against the protest of the Opposition. The Opposition demanded an adjournment at 2 o'clock on Tuesday morning. That adjournment was refused by the Government majority. We were not obstructing the proceedings at that time. The discussion was conducted in a proper manner till two o'clock, when we were entitled to an adjournment. When the House met on Thursday, an adjournment was asked at 4 o'clock on Friday morning, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), speaking for the Opposition, said, we would take a vote on the Indian clause and adjourn. That suggestion was declined, and we continued to sit through the entire day of Friday. We continued to discuss the question until Saturday morning at 1 o'clock. At that time the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) suggested that the House should take a vote on the Indian clause, pass all the sub-sections of the interpretation clauses, and adjourn. The hon. Minister of Public Works rose, and in some heat and with some warmth, refused to accede to that proposition, and the House continued to sit till Saturday at midnight, against our protest. The obstruction was against our protest. On Thursday evening the supporters of the Government came into this House supplied with pillows and bedding, and gave us notice that they intended to encamp on the field of battle. They came here with a declaration that they would wear the Opposition out, and we knew it was their intention to sit here until Saturday midnight, and so far as obstruction being practised by the Opposition, such was not the case. When two o'clock arrived we refused to proceed further with the discussion of the question, and we gave notice of our desire to adjourn, as it was perfectly proper for us to do. The hon. First Minister informed us that the minority should yield to the majority. When should they yield? Should they yield upon demand, or has the minority a right to insist on a free and full discussion by members of this House? An hon. gentleman says, yield "ere long." We will probably yield ere long. We will probably delay "ere long," as the First Minister sometimes does. But we have a right as a minority to debate every measure laid before this House and to give it full discussion; and it is a fault which has characterised this House that many important measures have been permitted to pass without receiving proper discussion. Many important measures have gone on our Statute Books without that consideration which they should have received from this House. Now a measure of the importance of the one which is before the House at this time, is one deserving of full discussion. It was introduced, Sir, at a time when full discussion was hardly possible. The second reading of this Bill was taken just twelve days short of three months of the time the House assembled. That Bill was introduced at a late period of the Session as we all know, and when the consideration of that Bill was taken up we had many important measures to take into consideration. We had, for instance the terms of the re-adjustment with Manitoba; we had the Pacific Railway resolutions to consider; we had a number of Government measures with regard to the Inland Revenue Department; we had the Supply, and we all know that the Estimates cannot possibly be put through this House in less than two or three weeks, with anything like proper discussion; we had the Bill to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877; we had another Bill to provide for the distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors; we had a Bill providing for the establishment of a court of claims; we had a Bill respecting real property in the North-West Territories; a Bill regarding the salaries of the Judges and other officers to be appointed under the Court of Claims Bill; we had a measure with regard to restricting and regulating the immigration of the Chinese; we had a Bill to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London; we had an Act respecting the Revised Statutes; we had a Bill to provide for the better preservation of the peace in the vicinity of public works; we had an Act with regard to liquor licenses, and we had an Act with regard to the North-West Mounted Police. These are a few of the important measures which were before this House when this Bill received its second reading. This Bill was not introduced at the proper time. There is no use arguing before the House that the Bill now under consideration was introduced at as early a stage of the Session as it ought to have been introduced; and it is a measure, if the evident expectation of the hon. gentleman in introducing this measure has been met, which would not have received full consideration. It would have gone through the House, as the Gerrymander Act of 1882 did—against the protest of the minority, but without that full consideration of its details which it deserved. Now, all measures deserve full consideration, and especially a measure of the great importance of the measure now before the House. I take the liberty of reading one clause from Lieber on Civil Liberty and Self Government, with regard to the degree of discussion which public measures should receive. He says:

"An election which takes place to pass judgment on a series of acts of a person, or to decide on the adoption or rejection of a fundamental law can have no value whatever, if the following conditions are not fulfilled:

"The question must have been fairly before the people for a period sufficiently long to discuss the matter fairly, and under circumstances to allow a free discussion. Neither the police restrictions of Government nor the riotous procedures of mobs, nor the tyranny of associations ought to prevent the formation of a well sifted and duly modified public opinion. The liberty of the press, therefore, is a *conditio sine qua non*. If this be not the case, a mere general opinion of the moment, a panic on the one hand or a maddened gratitude, for real or imaginary benefits, of a multitude excited for the day or a period, may hastily and unrighteously settle the fate of generations to come, and passion, fear or vain-glory may decide that which ought to be settled by the largest and freest interchange of opinions and the broadest reciprocal modification of interests. It requires time for a great subject to present itself in all the aspects in which it ought to be viewed and examined, and for a great public opinion to form itself,—the more time the vaster the subject. All the laws regulating the formation of opinion in the individual apply with greater force to the formation of public opinion.

"All elections must be superintended by election judges and officers independent of the executive or any other organized or unorganized power of Government."

Now, Sir, we have in the discussion upon and the attempt to pass upon this Bill a violation of that first principle demanding a full discussion and a careful sifting and weighing of the features of the Bill. We have in this Bill another measure which is in antagonism to that feature which requires that the Government should not have anything to do with the election officers, or the machinery which is to decide the question. We are told that we must yield to the majority. Well, Sir, does the dictum of a majority always make a thing right? Supposing a majority of this House should solemnly resolve at this moment that it was now three o'clock in the morning, would that make it three o'clock? Supposing that a majority in this House should resolve that Darwin's theory of evolution was right, would that settle the question? Supposing a majority of this House should determine the question of eternal punishment—would that settle it? I remember reading of a convention of pilgrims fathers in Massachusetts, who decided, by resolution, First, that the Saints of God should inherit the earth, and they passed a second resolution declaring that they were the Saints of God. I do not suppose that that settled the question, although a majority decided that that was the case. Here a majority are inclined to resolve that they should stay in power, and secondly, they would resolve that as they intend to stay in power, they should take the power of manipulating the voters' lists so that they should be able to do so. That is the decision which the majority are about to arrive at. The hon. gentleman told us this afternoon that their conclusions must prevail or else there will be a tragedy. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman refers, or what the character of this tragedy will be. I am at a loss to understand. I hope he has no violent designs against the Opposition; I hope we are not to be punished for our contumacy in this matter, by the condign wrath of the First Minister and his followers. Now, Sir, this measure has not been understood by this country; it has not been understood by this House.

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. This measure is not understood today by a majority of this House. The hon. member for Lincoln does not himself understand it.

Mr. RYKERT. Speak for your own side.

Mr. CHARLTON. The country is just at this moment fairly arousing itself as to the character of this measure. We hold that this measure is one of such importance that it should not be passed hastily. We hold that the opinions of the great mass of the people of Canada should be obtained upon this measure—the people who are to be affected by this measure, whose interests are at stake in this matter—a measure which will affect their interest not only this year but for all years to come, which will affect not only this generation, but all generations who may live in future in this Dominion,—we hold that this measure should be taken into consideration by the people of Canada, and that some authoritative expression of their opinion should be furnished to their representatives in this House, before a measure of this importance should pass. We believe on this side that although in a minority here, we represent the great majority of people, with regard to this measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes; no, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. We believe that we are standing here the champions of the people, the advocates of the people's rights, in resisting an attempt to perpetrate on this country a great wrong. We believe that the assertion of the hon. gentleman is correct, that representative institutions are on trial. The question is whether the defendants, the party in power, who are shortly to be arraigned before the people of this country—whether these defendants in that trial shall be permitted to pack the jury. The question is whether we shall have a free unbiased expression of the opinion, a declaration of the will of the people of this country, or whether the Government in power shall snatch a verdict by means of an improper manipulation of the voters' lists, as it is proposed to do by this Bill. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman's speech this afternoon was anything but Parliamentary and moderate in its tone and spirit. The hon. gentleman, in that speech, indicated a desire to make concessions. Well, Sir, unfortunately this is a matter where the very principle at stake is a principle on which no concession can be made. We stand on the principle that any attempt to take the fixing of the franchises from the Provincial Governments, that have enjoyed and exercised that power for eighteen years, and through five general elections, and have exercised it in a manner that has been, in the highest degree, satisfactory to the people of the various Provinces—we hold, I say, that any attempt to take that power from the Provinces, and to exercise it by the Dominion, is an infringement of a principle that we cannot permit if we can help it; and, consequently, at the very threshold, we stand face to face with a principle that prevents us from offering or accepting any concessions in this matter. We meet that issue in the resolution in your hands, and the issue presented in that resolution is one that does not admit of compromise or concession. For that reason, Sir, we cannot accept the assertion that the discussion of this great and momentous measure has been obstructive. It is our duty as an Opposition to discuss this measure fully, and we intend to discharge that duty. Now, I may, perhaps, refer to one or two personal matters in the speech of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). He asserts that I took broad ground in favor of universal suffrage. I did nothing of the kind. I took the ground that if the Dominion Government were to adopt a uniform franchise, they would be compelled to accept universal suffrage—that nothing else would be acceptable to the people of this country, because we could not consistently adopt a franchise that was less liberal in its character than the most liberal franchise in any of the Provinces. Then the hon. gentleman speaks about Yankeeism, in respect of my having made quotations from the American Constitution. Well, I pointed out that a great nation, which has grown to be a power with 56,000,000 inhabitants, originated the federal system of government; that it was the system we copied, that the Australian colonies were just adopting it, that it was likely to become very wide-spread in the world, and that, inasmuch as we had copied the institutions of that country, it was only proper that we should examine into their working, and should endeavor to learn the lesson that has been taught by the hundred years' experience of that nation. I pointed out that the United States had adopted that very system of suffrage that we have had in this country for eighteen years, that it had worked well there, and that no public man had raised his voice against it; and I think the example I quoted ought to have weight with the hon. gentleman opposite, who has not been above copying from that country. With regard to the implied charge of Yankeeism, I have this to say: I have been a resident of this country for thirty-five years; I came here a boy; and I am a British subject by birth. But leaving all personal questions to one side, if I were an annexationist, which I am not, and if I desired to see the institutions of this country changed, I would ask no better means to secure that result than to have hon. gentlemen who are now in power, stay in power for five or six years longer. The men who are involving this country in inextricable difficulties, who are driving this country into debt, who are violating the very principles of responsible Government—these are the men to drive the country into annexation, if that result is to be produced, and not the gentlemen on this side. The hon. gentleman said I

addressed myself to the French Canadians and warned them, and then voted for female suffrage. Sir, I did address myself to the French Canadians, and warned them that if they allowed this Bill to be passed, the very thing I voted for, as well as universal suffrage and perhaps other objectionable things would be forced on Quebec, and that if they wished to avoid universal suffrage or female suffrage, it behoved them to keep in their own hands the power they possessed, and not throw down the barrier that prevented the other Provinces from forcing upon them a suffrage they do not desire. Then the hon. gentleman says Ontario demands that her suffrage shall be forced on the Dominion. Ontario demands nothing of the kind. Ontario demands that her suffrage shall be respected in the Province of Ontario, and that every other Province shall have the liberty that Ontario demands of fixing the suffrage to suit the wishes of its own people. That is what we demand. We have no desire or expectation that the suffrage of Ontario shall be accepted in any Province except Ontario. Then, the hon. gentleman says no person shall be disfranchised in Ontario who has a vote to-day, and that the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature last Session will not come into force until the 1st of January next. When does this Bill come into force?—on the 1st of January following. In making the assertion he did, the hon. gentleman sought to create a false impression. The Bill now under consideration, when it comes into operation, will supplant the Bill lately passed and then in operation in Ontario and will disfranchise scores of thousands of people who will then be enfranchised by the Ontario Act. So much for the points made by the hon. gentleman. I rose just to refer to a few statements made by the hon. First Minister, and chiefly to the charge that the Opposition have obstructed legislation, which I deny.

Mr. McCRANEY. I did not intend on this occasion to say a word; but I feel that I owe a deep responsibility to my constituents and to myself to say something on this question. I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln, and I must confess that I have been somewhat surprised at some of the statements he has made. The hon. gentleman referred to the Franchise Bill that is now before the House, and to the Franchise Bill which has been passed recently in the Ontario Legislature, and drew a comparison between the two, and I think was very unfair in that comparison. He stated there would be none or very few disfranchised under this Bill. He stated also that there were only some 50,000 persons over twenty-one years of age in this Province who were not already enfranchised. I do not understand, for my part, how the hon. gentleman could come to any such conclusion. I find that, practically, under the Ontario Act, when it comes into force, we will have manhood suffrage. I know of no class of persons that will not be enfranchised if they are earning $250 per annum. Let me read some few clauses of the Ontario Act.

"*Firstly.*—Every male person entered on the revised assessment roll upon which the voters' list to be used at the election is based for any city, town, incorporated village or township, for real property of the value hereinafter mentioned, and being at the time of the final revision and correction of said assessment roll, and also at the time of the election, a resident of and domiciled within the Electoral District for which he claims to vote.

(2) Such person must (subject to the provisions hereinafter contained) have been rated on such assessment roll as the owner, tenant or occupant of real property of the actual value of not less than the following:—

In cities and towns, two hundred dollars;

In incorporated villages and townships, one hundred dollars:

(3) Where any real property is owned or occupied jointly by two or more persons, and is rated at an amount sufficient, if equally divided between them, to give a qualification to each, then each of them shall be deemed rated within this Act, otherwise none of them shall be deemed so rated.

Secondly.—Every male person who is residing at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote and has resided therein continuously since the completion of the last revised assessment roll of the municipality, and derives an income from some trade, occupation, calling, office or profession of not less than two hundred and fifty dollars annually, and has been assessed for such income in and by the assessment roll of the municipality upon which the voters' list used at the election is based.

Thirdly.—Every male person entered on the last revised assessment roll as a wage-earner who is residing at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided therein continuously since the completion of the last revised assessment roll of the municipality, and who has during the twelve months next prior to being so entered, derived or earned wages or income from some trade, occupation, calling, office, or profession of not less than two hundred and fifty dollars.

(2) In estimating or ascertaining the amount of wages or income so earned or derived by any person so entered as a wage-earner in the assessment roll of a municipality, not being a city, town or village, the fair value of any board or lodging furnished or given to or received or had by such person as or in lieu of wages or as part thereof shall be considered or included.

So that any person who is earning, any farm laborer who is earning $150 a year with his board, will be entitled to a vote. Practically this means manhood suffrage. I will also, with your permission, Sir, read the speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill in the Local House, the hon. Mr. Fraser. He said:—

"I say that this Bill is going far towards conferring the franchise upon every resident in the Province who is twenty-one years of age. The broadest basis of all is that which is included in the word householder. Hereafter if this Bill becomes law every man who is a tenant, every man who occupies a separate dwelling house, even though it only be a part of one house, so long as it has a separate entrance, no matter who occupies it, whether as a tenant, occupant or owner, no matter what its value may be, will hereafter, provided that it is his residence in the sense in which this Act requires, have the right to vote. Now, hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, will see what a vast advance that is on the law as it stands to-day. The Act now provides that no man can vote unless he has $400 worth of property in cities, $300 worth in towns, and $200 worth in incorporated villages and townships. Hereafter there will be no question of rental at all. Hereafter there will be required nothing of a voter except that he rates as a householder. Well, then, next to that the broadest basis, I think, is that which gives the right to vote to every man who has $300 by way of income or wages. Heretofore the right to vote was limited to an income of $400 and then it could only be exercised by those who were so assessed who paid the taxes to which they were liable to being assessed. So in these two features we have extended the franchise so as to make it almost equal to manhood suffrage. It would be extremely hard to find any class in this country who, under one or other of these broad provisions of which I am speaking, will not have the qualifications necessary to entitle them to vote at parliamentary elections. But we are extending the franchise in other directions. Hereafter every man who is assessed for $200 in cities and towns, whether as owner, tenant or occupant, will be entitled to vote, and in incorporated villages and townships the assessed value will be reduced to $100. The farmer's sons franchise will be no longer known by that name, but by the name of the landholder's franchise. We have broadened the basis, until not only the sons, but the grand-sons and owners, shall have the right to vote; in other words, we intend putting a premium on mothers-in-law in this country. But we propose to give a vote, also, to the sons of those who are tenants. Hitherto the franchise has been confined to the sons of farmers who owned the land. By this Bill we propose to give to the son of a farmer, even though his father is not the owner of the land, provided the father is occupying a separate dwelling. In all the municipalities, the franchise will be of the same character. That is to say, that the son, grandson, or the son-in-law, or any man who is assessed for $400 in cities or towns, or $200 in incorporated villages, will be entitled to vote with him on that property. Hon. gentlemen will see that this is a very extensive addition to the franchise, because hitherto a farmer's son could only vote provided he appeared as joint owner. In other words he could not vote unless the farm was assessed for $400, and then only one son could vote. Two sons could vote on a farm assessed for $600, three on a farm assessed for $800, and a farm had to be assessed for $1,000 to allow four to vote. This Bill will extend to every son of every father, who either owns, or who occupies land as a tenant, because it will be difficult to find any man who is not assessed for $200 upon his farm, and it will be equally difficult to find any respectable family occupying a house which is not assessed for $100 in villages, and $200 in cities and towns."

It appears to me, in comparing this Act with the one now before the House, that there are a vast number of persons who will be disfranchised by this measure. During the greater portion of my life I have been connected with the laboring class; and I have employed, and have to-day in my employ, a large number of laboring men; and, after looking into the matter carefully, I can say that not more than one-fifth of those men will be enfranchised under this Bill, while they will all be enfranchised under the Act passed last Session in the Province of Ontario. We feel

that this Act is an infringement upon the rights of our Province. I am speaking now as an Ontario man. The leader of the Government stated this afternoon that the question was whether the representative institutions of our country were to continue or not. We claim that this is a blow at our representative institutions; that the voters' lists for the Province of Ontario have been used ever since Confederation, and there has been no fault found with them, and we claim that there is no system upon which you can obtain a voters' list that is as fair as the present system. We believe that our municipal institutions in Ontario are superior, or at any rate are equal, to any municipal system in the world. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) stated a few evenings ago, in reply to a remark which I made, that, if the Tory assessors were as unfair as the Reform assessors, I ought to go in with him and pass this law. That is not my experience, and I have had considerable experience in reference to the matter. While I believe there is a certain amount of unfairness on the part of some assessors under the present system, it is not to the extent that hon. gentlemen suppose. The hon. gentleman may, perhaps, be a stronger partizan than I am, which I believe he is, but I have found the assessors, whether Conservative or Reform, usually, at any rate, moderately fair in their assessments; and, rather than see this Bill become law, I would see every assessor a Conservative in the constituency I represent, because, I believe there would be more fairness, and less danger of dishonest actions on the part, especially, of the revising officer. Under this Bill, the revising officer has the full control of the voters' lists, and is acting under instructions from the First Minister. What is to prevent the First Minister, or those who have charge of the appointment of the revising officer, saying to him: I want John Smith to come from this county, and I want Mr. Jones to come from that county, and I want the hon. member for East Durham to stay at home, and the hon. member for Huron need not apply, and so on all the way through the chapter? I think this Bill is, without exception, the most unfair and the most dishonorable that has ever been brought before this House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), spoke about the Indian clause. Either he did not understand the Bill or I do not understand it. I understand that this Bill enfranchises tribal Indians in the Provinces, Indians who are subject to the control of the agent, who have no deed for their property, who cannot buy and sell, who cannot sue and be sued. If an Indian owns his property, if he has a deed of his property, and that property is seperate from any other property, if he can buy and sell property, and can buy and sell anything else, and can sue and be sued, or can be drafted as a militiman, then an Indian has as much right to vote as a white man. But that is not the way in which I understand this Bill. I have made out a list of various industries of the Province of Ontario, and while am not prepared to say that the statement made by hon. gentlemen who spoke the other evening is correct or is not correct, I am quite satisfied that a large percentage of the men who are referred to in this list will be disqualified. Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that the difference between $250 for the wage-earners, and an income of $400, is a large amount, and that difference will exclude a large number of persons who, under the wage earners clause in the provincial Act, would be enfranchised. I find that of the following classes nearly one-third will be disenfranchised under this Bill:

"Cabmen and draymen, carders and weavers, carpenters and joiners, commercial clerks, engineers and machinists, factory operatives, farmers' sons, laborers, lumbermen and raftsmen, carriage builders, sailors, millers, painters and glaziers, plasterers, railroad employees, blacksmiths, saddlers and harness makers, sawyers and millmen, male servants, butchers, boot and shoemakers, stone masons, male teachers, edge-tool makers, teamsters and drivers, telegraph operators, foundrymen, tin and coppersmiths, tailors and clothiers."

I am certain that so far as my own knowledge goes of many of the above classes—and I have a number of men belonging to some of those classes in my employ—a large proportion of them will be disfranchised under this Bill—I believe one-third.

Mr. RYKERT. How much do you pay them a day?

Mr. MCCRANEY. I pay my men as much wages as other employers of labor; I have as good men as other men have; I have men who have remained with me longer perhaps than they would remain with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). Now, Sir, I consider that in the whole history of Canada this is the worst Bill that has ever been brought before Parliament; and I believe hon. gentlemen will find that the people of this country will speak out in such a manner as will, perhaps, surprise some of them. A few days ago a meeting was held in the city of Toronto, and resolutions were passed condemning this Bill. I am told that quite a large number of Conservatives are signing petitions against the Bill. I have several letters myself stating that certain Conservatives are strongly opposed to this Bill. For the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite I will read this resolution passed at the Toronto meeting:

"That this meeting denounces the proposal of the Dominion Government to establish a separate franchise for elections to the House of Commons:

"1. Because it is entirely unnecessary, in view of the fact that the provincial voters' lists have been always used with complete success for Dominion elections ever since Confederation.

"2. It will cause an enormous additional expense to the country to prepare and keep up a separate set of voters' lists every year in every municipality.

"3. Each Province is the best judge of the qualifications for parliamentary voters to elect its members to the House of Commons.

"4. That the proposed qualification for Dominion voters is entirely different from the qualification of the voters for the Provincial Legislature, and will create confusion and annoyance in every polling subdivision.

"5. In British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, where they now have manhood suffrage, a large number will be disfranchised.

"6. In Ontario the qualification as it now stands embraces a great number of persons whom it is proposed to exclude from the right to vote at the Dominion elections. In cities and towns owners and occupants of property worth $200 have votes, but the proposed Act will prevent them from voting unless they have property worth $300. In counties a man can now qualify on property worth $100—it is proposed to deprive him of a vote unless he has $150 worth. All who have an income of $250 can vote now; but it is proposed to exclude all who have not an income of $400. Every householder can now vote, no matter what his house is worth, but he will be excluded by the present Act, unless he can show the value required above.

"7. The Province of Ontario does not wish to dictate what shall be the qualification for voters in other Provinces, and she will not submit to have the rest of the Dominion dictate what shall be the qualification of voters within Ontario.

"And this meeting earnestly protests against the disfranchisement of the large and intelligent body of electors who have been granted the franchise by the recent Act of the Ontario Legislature."

Now, I want to show the House what the people think about giving the franchise to Indians. I think it is a great outrage to give the franchise to Indians who are now, in open rebellion against the Government of this country, whilst you refuse it to the young men, to our noble volunteers, who are fighting in defence of their country.

Mr. RYKERT. Will the hon. gentleman state what section of the Bill gives a vote to the Indians of the North-West Territories?

Mr. MCCRANEY. If the hon. gentleman will read the Bill he will find out:

"1. That the Indians have not expressed any desire to become enfranchised.

"2. That they are minors in the eyes of the law.

"3. That they are wards of the Crown.

"4. That they are declared by law to be incapable of managing their own affairs.

"5. That they are entirely under the control of the Government agents, through whom they receive their annuities from the Crown.

"6. That they do not share in the responsibilities of municipal or federal government.

"7. That they are not liable for assessment or municipal taxation.

"8. That they are not qualified to serve as jurors, or liable for service in the militia.

"9. That they have no interest, beyond the receipt of their annuities, in the government of the country.

"10. And that they can, by severing their tribal relations, and conforming to the provisions of the Indian Act of 1880, assume the duties of citizenship by accepting the responsibilities attached to the rights and privileges enjoyed by the whites, and thus secure the benefit of the franchise:

"Therefore, this meeting heartily endorses the means that have been taken by the Liberal party in the House of Commons to expose the full meaning of this measure, which, if it became law, could not, in its result, but be fraught with most serious consequences to the progress, peace and permanency of this Dominion."

Those are the opinions that are expressed throughout the country, and hon. gentlemen opposite will find they are more largely entertained than they are aware of. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) spoke in regard to assessments, remarking that assessments were frequently lower than the actual value. I know of my own knowledge that in towns and villages the assessment is frequently above the actual cash value; and so the hon. gentleman's argument is of very little value.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it in townships?

Mr. McCRANEY. I am not so well acquainted with the assessments in townships, but I believe they are about the actual cash value of the property. I look upon this Act as one of the most hateful ever submitted to Parliament. I desire to express my strongest dissent from its provisions, and I feel that this is a measure striking below the belt, that it is a measure intended to centralise the whole Conservative power of the country in one man, and in doing so, to secure control of the elections.

Mr. DAWSON. There has been a good deal said to-night about Indian enfranchisement, and all sorts of topics, and as the discussion has taken such a wide range, I suppose I shall be at liberty to refer back to what has occurred. This question of Indian enfranchisement is not understood, or at least it has been alluded to by hon. gentlemen who should understand it, and especially by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as if they did not understand it. Enfranchisement, as set out in the Indian Act, simply relates to Indians on reserves, and does not apply to Indians outside of reserves; and it provides that an Indian shall be considered enfranchised when he becomes possessed of a lot of land in his own right within the reserve, and has gone through certain forms. But this enfranchisement has nothing to do with voting. If the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell had passed it would have disfranchised the Indians who are now enfranchised. The Indians of the older Provinces, who are living outside of reserves like other people and who now vote, would, if that motion had carried, have been obliged to again go on reserves and acquire land before they could exercise the franchise. I point this out to show that some hon. gentlemen who have spoken do not exactly understand what is meant by enfranchisement under the Indian Act.

Mr. DAVIES. How many are outside of Indian reserves?

Mr. DAWSON. Not a great many; a few in all our villages and towns throughout the Dominion. I could give the number in my constituency of those who live outside the reserves. Another point to which I desire to call attention is this, that the Act, as regards Indians, contains nothing new. The same thing occurs in the Confederation Act, which in section 41 provides:

"That until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides at any election for a member of the House of Commons for the district of Algoma, in addition to persons qualified by the law of the Province of Canada to vote, every male British subject of the age of twenty-one years, or upwards, being a householder, shall have a vote."

An hon. MEMBER. This Bill cannot affect that.

Mr. DAWSON. A householder is to have a vote. The Confederation Act gives the Indian a vote if he is a householder, and all this Bill gives him is the right to vote if qualified like other people. I repeat it is plainly said in the Confederation Act that every person of twenty-one years and upwards, and being a householder, in the district of Algoma, shall have a vote at elections there. There are no exceptions made, and that is in a district covering one-half of the territory of Ontario. Some hon. members have said, and more particularly the member for Bothwell, that we have been exceedingly liberal about extending the franchise to Indians. That hon. gentleman said it would enfranchise 50,000, 10,000 of whom would vote, but he is alone in that opinion. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McCraney) has spoken very strongly on this subject, saying that it was monstrous to give Indians votes. At the same time he quoted from the Ontario Act to show how it extended the franchise and how very liberal its provisions were as compared with those of the Bill now before the House. What is the effect of that Act? It goes quite as far in giving the franchise to Indians as this Dominion Bill does. Such is the effect of the Ontario Act, which is esteemed by the Opposition as such a perfect measure. In order that the House may understand how the Legislature of Ontario deals with this matter in its election law, I will read from the revised statutes the clause relating to Indians all over the Province of Ontario. The old law of Ontario says this:

"All Indians or persons with part Indian blood who have been duly enfranchised, and all Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not reside among Indians, though they participate in the annuities, interest moneys and rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions as other persons in the electoral districts."

That law was interpreted and supposed to mean that all Indians outside of reservations and living as other people do, were at liberty to vote like other people, and also that all enfranchised Indians within the reservations were at liberty to vote. In 1882 a new election law was passed in Ontario, and it provided that all Indians might vote who did not receive interest moneys or annuities from the Government. This provision was made, notwithstanding that the annuity was something which no Government had the slightest influence over, and was money which was received from his lands, and therefore, although it has been spoken of in this House as a gratuity or a gift to these people, it is not a gift in any sense, but a payment to which they are justly entitled, a payment confirmed to them by treaty, and a payment over which no Government can exercise the slightest influence. Now, what are the provisions in the last Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature. It says:

"Where there is a voters' list, all Indians, or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not reside among Indians, though they participate in the annuities, interest, moneys and rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the electoral districts.

"But the Indians or persons with part Indian blood who are entitled to vote where there is no voters' list, shall be only the following, namely:—All Indians, or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all unenfranchised Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not participate in the annuities, interests, moneys or rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, and do not reside among Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the same electoral districts."

That, in fact, enfranchises all Indians who are qualified as other people are, or, in other words, all Indians who live like white people. Now, all Indians pay taxes to the Dominion Government. I saw a calculation not long ago by a gentleman who takes an interest in Indian matters, showing that the indirect taxes which the Indians pay are greater on the average than those paid by white men. Before now we have seen Indians in Parliament, and they have not shown themselves to be inferior to other men. I believe that at one time a large portion of the Legislature of Manitoba was composed of Indians, and they did not show any inferiority

to their white neighbors. In my opinion, the Ontario Act does not differ very materially from the Bill now before us, and on the whole, I think that the Bill is quite as liberal as the former Ontario Act, though the Act lately passed by Ontario extends the franchise a little further. It looks much as if the Ontario Government had this Bill before them and that they wished to go a step further than the Dominion Government were willing to go. I am strongly of opinion that the Dominion Parliament should regulate the franchise for the election of its own members. I heard some hon. members on the Opposition side almost agree that the Dominion Parliament should fix the franchise, if they made it suitable to the different Provinces. Probably there is a great deal of truth in that, and instead of having a uniform franchise we might make a franchise adapted to the different Provinces; but, at any rate, I think it is highly injudicious that the Provinces should regulate the franchise for the election of members to this House. I heard an hon. member the other night state his views very eloquently and clearly, and he seemed to think that the last Ontario Act was a very proper one, where it provides that residence should be a condition to a person voting who has property in different electoral districts. I think there are circumstances where that might act very harshly. Take the case of my own district. There are there a great many absentee proprietors, if you may call them so; that part of the country is divided into two separate districts, and I think it would be very hard that people, who, perhaps during the winter season live in some other part of the country, should not be allowed to record their votes where they have their property; and yet the Ontario Act would not allow them to do so. I think there are some other cases in which this provincial legislation for Dominion purposes would not be very desirable. Take one instance. Clause 19 of this Act provides for a case in which a gentleman was unseated and disqualified by the courts of the country, and yet by a clause of this very election Act, which we are called upon to adopt as a law for the Dominion—by that very Act the decision of the court is overruled. The court declared the gentleman to be unseated, and the Legislature of Ontario steps in and declares that he was legally elected, and shall take his seat in Parliament. It goes so far as to say:

"This Act may be pleaded as a bar and discharge to any petition or action pending or which may be filed or brought against the said gentleman for any matter, cause or thing mentioned in this Act, and shall also be a discharge of any judgment, decree or order for any such penalty as is mentioned in the next preceding section, with any costs in such judgment."

Here, the law of Ontario, which we are called upon to adopt, and which these hon. gentlemen admire so much, upsets a judgment of a court under the law of the land, and declares a gentleman qualified to sit in the Legislature whom the courts have declared not to be qualified. Are we to adopt a law of that kind as the law of the Dominion? If we adopt it in one of its parts we must adopt it in all, and I do not think that is desirable. Now, the hon. member for Bothwell has expressed himself in the most unmeasured terms about the Indians being incapable of exercising the franchise, and in speaking he took a very wide sweep, and referred to the Mexican and South American Republics. It is curious that it did not occur to him, when he was so speaking, that the Indians of that region showed capacity for great development, and that, at the time of the invasion of the Spaniards, they were very far advanced in civilisation; they showed that they were capable of being civilised and capable of self-government; in fact, they were equal to the people who conquered them, except in the use of firearms. If the Indians are not equal to the white man, whose fault is it? I think the white man has a great deal to answer for in connection with the degradation in which the Indians are kept. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says this question should be placed before the electors before any decision is had upon it by this House. We heard the same cry in the winter of 1881-82, when some resolutions were being passed with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway; we were dared to go to the country and see whether the people would sanction those resolutions. The Government went to the country, and what was the result? We all know they were sustained; and I have no doubt, if they went to the country on this Bill, and it was thoroughly understood by the people, they would be in like manner sustained. The hon. member for Bothwell speaks very fluently about an arbitrary Minister and a servile majority. He might apply the same remark to minorities. I think it is not becoming in a member of this House to apply these terms to those on the opposite side of the House. Members on one side, I presume, have their ideas, and are quite as independent as on the one side as on the other side; and for an hon. member to express himself in that manner, in the heat of discussion—I suppose that must account for it—is, to say the least, highly improper. The hon. gentleman went on to compare the present position with that of the Greeks before the battle of Marathon. He went over the whole wide world, and back into remote history. I think there is another battle of much older date than the battle of Marathon, and it is told of in a very philosophic strain, from which even the hon. member for Bothwell might have gained a great deal of knowledge; that is the battle of the frogs and mice. But supposing the Act, instead of including Indians, had said "excluding Indians and Chinamen," what would then have been the course of the Opposition? They would have said to the supporters of the Government: Oh, you are excluding the Indians, who are well qualified to vote; here you are bringing forward an Act which shows that you have no sympathy for the Indians; and those troubles in the North-West have been caused by your want of sympathy for them, and future trouble may arise from the Indians seeing that the Government of this country has declared that they are aliens and has placed, them by this Act, in such a position that they cannot exercise the franchise or possess the same rights as white men. That is what we should have heard from the Opposition, if the Indians had been excluded from the operation of the Act; we should have heard loud lamentations about the cruelty of excluding them. I only rose to say a few words on this subject, and I shall no longer detain the House.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) I certainly do not intend to apologise to the House for speaking on this question to-night, although perhaps under different circumstances I might have done so. When I listened to my hon. friend opposite, who hails from Lincoln, I had considerable doubt of the nature of the resolution before the Chair. I remember, on a previous occasion in this debate, we were reminded that it was confined to clause 3, and some of our friends on this side were somewhat summarily called to order when they wandered a little away from that subject. I should like to ask where that hon. gentleman travelled this evening. Why, he gave us the history of legislation in Ontario ever since Confederation. We were treated to the usual stock of extracts, which my hon. friend is so notable for collecting, displaying, as he remarked, the inconsistency of hon. gentlemen on this side, notably the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow.) These gentlemen are perfectly able to take care of themselves and their constituencies, but I wondered, when he began to discuss the revising barristers section, where it came under clause 3, and concluded he had some how or other widened out very considerably the argument. I should have, at the same time, been very sorry if some one had called the hon. gentleman to order, because it was very pleasant to hear an hon. gentleman on that side rise and express his opinion in any form on this Bill. The hon. the First Minister said this afternoon that representative insti-

tutions were on trial here ; I think they are, but I wonder if the systematic attempt, not to use a disrespectful word to hon. gentlemen opposite, by which they persistently refuse to discuss the features of the Bill, show their idea of representative institutions. I wonder if that was the mode in which representative institutions were established in this House. It seemed to me that if the hon. gentleman's argument was worth anything it lay in the direction that the minority were entirely to give up their views and sentiments in reference to any measure, the majority believed was in the political interests of their party, and tamely having that measure thrust upon them, whether they liked it or not. If I understand representative institutions at all, the power we have here is delegated by the people; we are sent here by the people for the purpose of voicing their sentiments, not for the purpose of sitting down quietly, accepting any measure that may be presented to the House by the majority, without discussing it on its merits. How many gentlemen opposite have attempted to discuss this question on its merits ? During the famous three days discussion, when they broke out from their silence and on Saturday night discussed the issues before the House, I venture to say that there is not one of those gentlemen who spoke that evening who would not gladly recall the words he then uttered. I believe representative institutions are on their trial on this occasion, because I believe the first element involved in them is that we should have a full and free opportunity of discussing the questions before the House. So far as my opinions are concerned, I do not regard this measure with any favor. The circumstances under which the hon. First Minister introduced that question to us this afternoon were not calculated to strengthen our respect for the mode in which hon. gentlemen opposite have handled the question. The hon. gentleman now suggests it is time to discuss the measure in a calm, dispassionate manner, and was willing to accept any suggestions that would make the measure perfect, and shadowed forth, as I understood him, some serious changes he proposes to introduce. How different that ground is to the ground he took up at the commencement of the debate. When the measure was first brought down we were told distinctly that it would be a measure to estsblish a uniform suffrage throughout the Dominion, that we were to have equitable representation through all parts of the Dominion, and that no longer the system of Provinces selecting their representatives under their own systems should obtain. Another distinguished feature of this measure, the woman franchise clause was abandoned by the First Minister, without a word of protest. He made no attempt to defend it, but left it to the tender mercies of his own followers. How did he deal with the next important section, the one more directly affecting Ontario ? I refer to the Indian question. Was the same freedom granted to his followers in that matter ? No, Sir. It was something remarkable, in connection with that whole discussion, to witness the persistent attempt being made by certain members in discussing that question to cover up the issues involved in the discussion of the particular word "Indian." There is another point in connection with this, to which I would like to call the attention of the committee. At first the leader of the House told us that all Indians were to be enfranchised if they came under the qualification clause. After a while, when this matter was turned over, and I suppose troubles began to spread in the North West, the Government saw it was not desirable that the Indians who are in open rebellion should be entitled to vote, and the Indians in the North-West, Manitoba and British Columbia were excluded from the op ration of this Bill. It was somewhat strange that out of the Indians that remained to be enfranchised, as this Bill calls it, over one-half are resident in Ontario, and a large portion are scattered in little bands on reserves in various sections of the other Provinces. In connection with this feature there crops up the inference that one prime object of this Bill is to reach, in certain connections, certain members of the Opposition in Ontario who otherwise could not be readily defeated. We have been told by the hon. member for Lincoln and the hon. member for Algoma that this was an enfranchisement of the Indians, and that if the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell had carried it would disfranchise all the Indians. All I have to say is, that in turning to the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) I find it reads :

"That after the word (Indian) the following words be added : who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act and has had conferred upon him the same social capacities as other persons who are qualified to vote in this country"

I give my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) credit for having the welfare of the Indian at heart, but it was not the intention of this Act to bestow upon the Indian the qualifications of citizenship in the ordinary sense of the word. He is simply to vote under the occupancy clause, by which it is not necessary that he should have any control over the portion of the reserve on which he is located, excepting that he must live in a bark hut, or a tepee, or any kind of residence which enables him to occupy a piece of ground, which the revising barrister may be satisfied is worth $150. It is not enfranchising the Indians. It is simply creating a number of voting machines. We do not enfranchise a Chinaman or a negro, or any other man, white or black, mixed or colored, unless he has qualified himself for the duties of citizenship, by taking all the responsibilities attached to it. Other men can be sued for their debts, but you cannot reach the Indian under the ordinary contracts. He is as much a minor as a child, and is absolutely under the control of the Government of the day. When we remember that more than half the Indians in the older Provinces of the Dominion are located in the Province of Ontario, on reserves which are within the bounds of existing constituencies, it is easy to see the reasons for introducing this iniquitous measure. It is a gross wrong to the electorate of those ridings. The Indians have nothing in common with the rest of the people, politically, socially or industrially. In any of those counties there is more than enough of an Indian vote to swamp the free choice of the people of the riding, and thus a great injustice is being done to the people. Hon. gentlemen say they are anxious to elevate the Indian. So are we; but will they tell us how giving him an opportunity once in five years to deposit a ballot which, in half the cases, he will not be able to deposit for himself, without the instructions to voters who cannot read or write, will have that effect ? He is still under the control of the Government of the day as much as ever. Yet they pretend to say this is enfranchising the Indian. I say it gives him no rights of citizenship whatever. He takes no responsibilities with it. It does not enable him to go out into social life and take any of the various positions that are open to every citizen. He is still an Indian on his tribal reserve, and except for the opportunity of having his ballot marked for him once in five years, he is no nearer elevation than he was before. Sir, I despair of the Indian ever being elevated if these are the elevating influences that are to surround him. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the other night, had the independence to express his opinion with reference to the quality of the Indian vote in his riding. He said one thing, which I think expresses more than anything else the feeling he had in reference to the power involved in that and one or two other clauses of this Bill. He said he wanted the leader of the Government to remain the leader of this House for many years to come, but he must say that if the Liberal party came to control the affairs of this country, and had the power conferred upon them by this Bill, he would dislike to have that applied to his own county if he were a candidate. Sir, could there be a

more emphatic condemnation of this Bill? Yet they call this elevating the Indian to a position of citizenship, and giving him equal rights and privileges with the rest of the electorate of this Dominion.

Mr. HESSON. Give us something fresh. We have had that already four times from you.

Mr. BAIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite will need to hear it four times more before they can understand it. If my hon. friend will get up and say this is placing the Indian in a position of citizenship, the same as he and I occupy, then I will abandon any attempt to make him understand this question. But he knows right well, and the leader of the Government knows right well, that the Indian's hands will be tied, and they do not expect that he will exercise the Franchise freely and independently. Sir, if intelligence should regulate the adjustment of the franchise I would ask the leader of the Government how it was that he so readily abandoned the principle of giving the franchise to women who represent property, and who show that they have the intelligence to take care of it, while he is yet so tenacious of giving the Indian a vote, when he dare not trust him with control of his own property? Is not that a proof that on this occasion intelligence does not count, and that something else made the right hon. gentleman so tenacious of the Indian vote and so easy to abandon woman suffrage. There is another feature in this Bill which shows that, after all, it does not secure a uniformity of franchise in this Dominion. I refer to Prince Edward Island, and while the hon. gentleman declined to give it the concession that its members asked for, he hoped yet to broaden out the Bill so as to qualify nearly all the people there who now exercise the suffrage. Now, Sir, I think that if the members of some of the other Provinces would speak out honestly they would rise up and object to having what, in former years, has been the parliamentary qualification of the Province of Ontario obtruded upon their Province, just as our friends from Prince Edward Island have objected to the franchise of the other Provinces being imposed upon their Province. One of the hon. members for King's, P. E. I., has shown his independence by placing an amendment in your hands that proposes to retain manhood suffrage. The provision he proposes to insert would certainly be unique if it was placed in the Bill providing for a uniform franchise in this Dominion. It is nothing less than this, that in that clause which recites the qualification in cities and towns for the various electoral districts in this Dominion, after the words "every person shall," and then the definition follows, he proposes to insert "except in the Province of Prince Edward Island." Now, if this Bill had met their approbation would these gentlemen have asked that that particular clause should be inserted in it? I confess that I felt a little amused at the report that *Hansard* has given of the hon. gentleman's remarks on moving this amendment. He is reported as saying that it was absurd to think that the various Legislatures should have power to fix the franchise of the various electoral divisions that elect representatives to this House; and he went on to say that in their island they had had manhood suffrage for twenty-five or thirty years, both with respect to the Local Legislature and with respect to this House, and that it had worked well. Yet, while in one breath he said it was absurd that the Provinces should fix the qualification for the election of members to this House, in the very next breath he says: We have a qualification different from what is proposed to be established for members of this House, and which, if he carries his amendment, will be retained, and he tells us it has worked admirably in his Province. I say there is no gentleman in this House, if he spoke the honest sentiments of his heart, who would not get up and re-echo the statement that the provincial franchises in the various Provinces had worked satisfactorily, both as respects the election of members for the Provincial Legislatures and as respects the election of members for the House of Commons. I venture to prophesy that if the Government refuse, and the leader of the Government has indicated that he will refuse, to concede to Prince Edward Island the right to have its own franchise, we shall not find the mover of the amendment to the amendment continuing his opposition to the Government Bill. He will quietly accept the situation and support the Government, although they have perpetrated this gross outrage upon the Province. It must be remembered that values vary in the different Provinces, and that $300 will not represent the same voting power in the Maritime Provinces as in British Columbia or the North-West, so there will not be uniformity. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) had a peculiar dread of the Ontario Legislature and seems to imagine that nothing should be allowed in their charge. He undertook to tell the House that the Opposition wished the Ontario franchise to be imposed on the rest of the Dominion. But if the leader of the Government copied his Franchise Bill from any Province he copied the cast-off franchise of the Province of Ontario, which he now proposes to use as a mould in which all the rest of the Dominion is to be run. We, on this side of the House, do not propose to impose the Ontario franchise on the other Provinces at all. But we say that in all the Provinces they should pursue the same course which they have pursued satisfactorily for the life-time of this Confederation—leave the various Provinces to work out their own local destinies and regulate their own franchises as they see fit. The leader of the House is not only attempting to impose the franchise of one Province on the rest, but he is attempting to resist the steps in advance which have been taken by the Province of Ontario in the matter of the franchise. His own friends in Ontario, represented by Mr. Meredith and his followers, are ultra-Librals in this matter. They do not, like this Government, propose to exclude all the wage earners of the people below $400 income from the right to have a vote. I remember when hon. gentlemen were extremely soliticious about the wage-earners and the workingmen of the Dominion. But, when it comes to the question of who shall control the destinies of the country, we find them going back to the old proposition that no man with an income of less than $400 a year should be entitled to a vote, a provision which has been left far behind by the Legislature of Ontario. I wish to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they are true to the traditions and associations of their own political party in Ontario they will step out further in this matter of the franchise, as Mr. Meredith and his followers have declared themselves in favor of manhood suffrage, as applied to provincial legislation. I say, if there is one case more than another where manhood suffrage should be applied it is not in the case of the Provinces, where they deal with local rights and the rights of property, and when they have direct taxation, but in the case of this Dominion, where our taxes are indirect, and where every man who wears clothes, consumes groceries, or, for that matter, smokes cigars or drinks liquor, contributes to the taxation. We found that the hon. member for Lincoln, with that modesty which characterises him, said that he did not wish to blow his own trumpet, but that so far back as 1868 he had advocated this income franchise, and that two or three years afterwards he introduced a Bill which the Ontario Government of the day adopted, and it became law. I would point out to him that this Dominion has made immense strides within the past fifteen years, and that the hon. gentleman, perhaps, owing to his associations since that time, has not maintained his progressive instincts, because we find him now supporting a proposition that unless a man earns $400 a year income he shall not be entitled to vote. It seems to trouble that hon.

gentleman very much that the Local Legislature of Ontario have devoted themselves to the management of their provincial affairs and the maintenance of their provincial rights. I would ask him if it was not their bounden duty to take charge of provincial affairs and to resist the encroachments of the Federal Government, or of any other Government which attempted to encroach upon their rights. I think the history of the last few years shows that their resistance has been just and equitable, and that there has been an unfair attempt on the part of the Federal Government to encroach on the rights of the Province of Ontario; and I say the leader of the Provincial Government would have been false to the interests of his Province if he had not taken every justifiable means to prevent the Dominion from overriding provincial rights. I fear that the result which was demonstrated so often, that the Province was right and that the leader of this House was wrong, is one reason why that hon. gentleman has displayed such a dislike to the Province of Ontario and its Government, and is determined that on no opportunity shall that Province have anything to say or do in vindication of its rights, where it is possible to avoid it. I say distinctly and advisedly that the action of the right hon. gentleman and his associates has done more to place the Province of Ontario in antagonism to the rest of the Dominion, that his unjust and illegal demand have done more to cultivate a feeling of dislike towards Confederation, and towards the Government now administering the affairs of the Dominion in the Province of Ontario, than anything else. I say this is only natural, and I should despise the man who was a citizen of that Province who would not stand up for the rights of his own Province against the federal authority, because I say that just in proportion as they preserve those provincial rights shall we strengthen this Dominion; and it is the best guarantee of the perpetuity of this Dominion that while we are Provinces of the Confederation each Province shall have absolute and distinct control of its own affairs. With regard to the propositions before this House, so far as my own Province is concerned, I say that no unbiased man can come to any other conclusion than that the Ontario franchise is the more liberal one. Any unbiassed individual looking at the two can only come to this conclusion, that for taking in the largest number of citizens and spreading abroad, as far as possible, the right to vote, the Ontario Act is far ahead of the Bill now proposed. All we ask is that we be allowed to administer our local affairs according to our own peculiarities. While I do not dispute, and no hon. gentleman on this side has disputed, the right of the Government to fix a uniform franchise for this Dominion, I say their action will plunge the various Provinces into many inconveniences, aside from the question of expense. The hon. member for Lincoln says we have caused more expense by this debate than the Bill will cost in one year; but the result will show differently. I never knew the class from whom the revising barristers will be taken to work for small fees if they can get better, and I do not understand that the right hon. leader of the House is going to ask his friends, to whom those positions will be given, to work for a paltry pittance. Those gentlemen are going to have extraordinary powers conferred upon them, which will make it utterly impossibly for anybody who is not in their favor to have his name placed on the voters' list. They are to have autocratic power; they are to say who shall and who shall not be on the lists, and there is no provision for an appeal; they are the final court of resort. Yet that is the mode in which hon. gentlemen opposite propose to work out free institutions. The hon. member for Lincoln knows very well how that provision will operate in many counties I could name; and, I fear, if the truth were known about this Bill, that that is one of its recommendations to the supporters of the Government. That arbitrary provision in this Bill makes it such an intolerable measure that I feel that I would be false to the best interest—not of the Opposition of the day, because that is a small matter, in view of the changes in political parties—but to the interests of the people of this whole Dominion, did I not protest against any such scheme as this being carried out. It is deliberately designed to take from the people a right that belongs to them, in which the Government step beyond the ordinary ground that the majority of a deliberative body are entitled to occupy. The provisions of this Bill are of a nature that make it a gross infringement on the liberties and rights of the people of this country; and are we to be told that we are to sit quietly here and submit, without raising a voice against it? I do not so understand my legislative duties, and I am satisfied that my people at home will not so regard them. The principles involved in this Bill, while they may bring a temporary success to the Government of the day, are grossly unjust to the people, and have in them the elements that will one day work destruction and ruin to our representative institutions.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the remarks of the hon. First Minister, this afternoon—remarks that we have not often been favored with in this discussion—doubt was expressed as to whether we were in earnest. Had I the ability or the power, I should not leave that question in any doubt, so far as I am concerned. I think, Sir, our earnestness has been to a considerable extent tested already. During the week before last it was put to the test of work day and night; there was no let-up; applications for adjournments were refused; on one occasion, some ten days ago, we saw those who evidently believed they had nothing to do, provide themselves with pillows, saying to us very distinctly: Go on, we will test your bottom. That test has been made, to some extent, and I trust that gentlemen opposite are satisfied with it. We have been charged, during this discussion, with designedly intending to destroy the health of the First Minister. That has been emphatically repudiated; for my part, I most emphatically deny it. I believe there are a number of undertakings on hand which it is very desirable the Prime Minister should carry out. This charge is reiterated in the *Mail*, under the head "Be Ready, Steady:" "The attempt to ruin Sir John A. Macdonald's health in Parliament has been accompanied with the same systematic attempt to ruin his public reputation in the Grit press." Those charges may have some weight with those who were not in this Chamber at any time during this debate, but they will have little weight with those on the floor or in the gallery, who witnessed the proceedings. They must have noticed that at an early hour the Prime Minister wound up the legislative clock, put his seal on his supporters lips, and went to, I hope, comfortable rest. Certainly, he did not experience the fatigues others did. We have been reminded of our responsibility. But it is quite possible we have a pretty distinct idea of our own responsibility. The question involved is not a question of money alone, although considerable money is involved in it. Speaking for myself, it would be a very important question indeed that would place me on my feet after one o'clock in the morning to address any committee on business questions. But we consider it to be of much more value, touching principles which our people value higher than even questions of considerable amounts of money, and I believe the question before us is one which "can only escape condemnation by avoiding observation." I believe it is our intention to do our duty in this respect, neither more nor less, let the charges come in any shape they may. Whether of obstruction, whether it unnecessarily prolongs the debate or otherwise, we intend to discharge our duty. We were glad that one member on the other side, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), obtained permission

from the First Minister to address the House. He spoke at some length of what they were going to allow. We have had illustrations of that in days gone by. We have seen attempts to cripple this debate; on one occasion we saw nearly the entire front rank hunting up authorities by which we could be kept more clearly to the finest point under consideration. The hon. member for Lincoln said that Ontario was assuming too much importance in this matter. Any one can see that this is at the bottom of the whole measure, for I believe if we could eliminate from this question the antipathy to the Mowat Administration you would take a very large element out of the Act. If Mr. Mowat would only resign or leave the country and surrender to hon. gentlemen opposite the Government he manages, one great cause of disturbance and irritation and discontent would be removed from the Ministerial benches. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) gave as a reason for this measure that the Provinces might pass new franchises. Further on, he said that Ontario had passed an Act which disfranchised non-resident property holders. Of course, that was incorrect; Ontario did not disfranchise them, but limited them in effect to one vote where they reside. I shall not follow that hon. gentleman, who went back as far as 1866, but will refer simply to his contention that the people thoroughly understood the Bill; on the contrary, I believe that not one person in a thousand in this Dominion knew anything about the franchise Bill at the beginning of this discussion. He said the statements we were making with regard to the expense were as exaggerated as those we had made with reference to the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, that may come back to the hon. gentleman before long. If the expenses under this Bill are indicated as clearly as were the estimates of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I fancy our predictions will not fall far short of the mark. In discussing the Ontario Act the hon. gentleman ignored a large number to whom it gives the franchise under the provision of householders and wage-earners. I propose to address my remarks to the question of the provincial franchise as against the franchise proposed by this Bill. Certainly, the constitution gave the Dominion Parliament the authority to choose what franchise it would have. But whether it gave them the right under existing circumstances is another question. In 1874, under Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, after the people had received notice and their support had been asked, the measure was carried under which we are now acting. In first submitting this to the people, Mr. Mackenzie acted like himself and like the party he led; in declining, first, to submit it to the people, the present action is like the party opposite. It is not urged that the measure which was then drawn by Mr. Dorion, a gentleman who possesses the respect of everyone, has not given satisfaction. It is true that the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated that the 13 members of the Government would be disfranchised under the Ontario law. It was news for us, that the 13 ministers were all from Ontario, and it is not the case in a single instance that one of those members will be disfranchised. The system which we have pursued in the past is not a new one on this continent, but has been adopted by the United States under circumstances as identical with ours as it is possible for a republican form of Government to be with that under which we live. I believe we might well consider their experience in this regard, and I shall not be debarred from the consideration by the sneers which have been made in reference to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who said of the hon. member for North Norfolk:

"The hon. gentleman can never stand up in this House, he can never speak on any subject, he can never deal with any branch of the public affairs of this country, without dragging in the United States, without dragging in the practice of the United States, without dragging in all the great and glorious beauties of the constitution, without holding up to us as models the great men of the United States, as if we had not men in our empire, and especially in our own country, whose example is worthy of being followed, as a bright shining light to guide us in the way we should go."

Sir, there are great men in the empire. Great names who never sneer at the great men of that country; that work is left for small men. The great men of England are proud of their kinsmen in the United States, and rejoice in the assistance they have given to the advancement of civilisation; they rejoice in the additions they have made to the sum of human freedom. The question of the franchise is not a new one with them. When our grandfathers were young their ablest men had given their best thought to it, and had decided it, and the result has proved that they decided it wisely. I mention no unknown name when I refer to Col. Alex. Hamilton, one of the brightest intellects this hemisphere has produced, one whom the United States desires to claim as all her own, although he was a West Indian by birth. His remarks read as if they were written during these debates. In relation to the action of the founders of their institutions, Hamilton said:

"To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been to the convention. * * * It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself."

Of those measures Bancroft has said:

"They disturb no more than was needed for the success of their work."

In those two lines there is a lesson of wisdom that we would do well to follow. Those gentlemen who are in earnest in desiring to perpetuate Confederation would do well to take those words to heart, and in the action of this Parliament disturb as little as possible the autonomy of the Provinces. "A State," said Ellsworth, "is the best judge of the circumstances and temper of its own people." Is not that equally true of us? Can we have a better maxim to go by? Are not the Provinces the best judges of their own circumstances, their own wants and peculiarities? After careful deliberation that convention came to their decision and embodied it in the second article of the constitution:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected by the people of the several States, and the qualification in each State shall be the qualification recognised for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature."

Why the most numerous branch? Because, in dealing with national matters they were dealing with matters which applied to the greatest number of people; in dealing with local matters they were dealing with property mainly; and their revenue, like ours, being derived from Customs and Excise, it was very proper that it should have the most extended franchise. They carefully avoided the error which we seem to be about to commit, of curtailing the franchise in many of the Provinces—in some regards, in every one of them—because there is not a single Province in the Dominion, as the Bill stands now, in which a considerable number of voters will not be disfranchised.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Yes; there is British Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Nova Scotia.

Mr. FAIRBANK. There is not a single Province in which this Bill does not disfranchise many.

Mr. BAKER. I take objection to the word "considerable," more particularly.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I do not attempt to say to what extent this Bill will disfranchise people in the Pacific Province, but I believe it disfranchises in that Province to almost as great as an extent as it does in any Province, and there is certainly one class of persons in that Province which I

know must be disfranchised to a large extent, and that is the miners. In the constitution of the United States there was a disfranchisement of no one. Any person who had a vote in any State retained it in the nation. Said Mr. Wilson:

"It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State Legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislatures."

Is not that equally applicable to us? Trace it through, from beginning to end, and you cannot find a point in it that is not applicable to us. If the slurs of the hon. member for Montreal Centre and the talk about Yankeeism by the hon. member for Lincoln constitute statemanship, then I do not know what it means. The proposition is that many people should have a vote in provincial matters but have nothing to do with national affairs, beyond paying taxes. It resembles the treatment some children receive when told: You can sit at the table when we have no company, but when we have you must stand behind the door and wait. That was not the way the Americans have bound their people to the nation, and the history of the last twenty-five years has shown the wisdom of their action, as there is no nation whose citizens are more attached to their country than are the Americans, not even the English or the German. Would it not be wise on our part to follow their example? Is it not desirable to give our citizens votes, and in no case to deprive them of the power of voting, which they have previously possessed? The American system has withstood severe test. It has stood the test of the country containing millions bondmen. It has stood the test of receiving an immense of body of people who were untrained in the art of civil government. But the foundation was laid broad enough and abiding enough to serve their own people, and all that came to them from across the sea. It served for the homes of hundreds of thousands of Canadians. It served as the home of millions of the race from which the member from Montreal Centre came, and yet the member for Montreal Centre sneers at reference to that nation. I do not think that when the American fathers decided those constitutional matters they were influenced by any questions as to the result of the next election. They were statesmen and patriots in the true sense. Some time ago the *Mail* newspaper remarked editorially that it did not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but "really the Opposition did not count." I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings, but the sneers of the member for Montreal Centre and the "Yankeeism" of the member for Lincoln do not count. We have reason to be thankful for the remarks made by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), and when he came down from his high pinnacle and condescended to discuss the question with this plebeian Opposition we were pleased. Discussing manhood suffrage he said:

"Neither Ontario nor Quebec have for one moment thought of adopting, but which Ontario, at the last session of its Legislature, voted down by a considerable majority."

If no one had thought of it who were the minority. With respect to the Ontario Act, it is practically manhood suffrage with the assessment roll for registration. It is true that the Government stepped just one step short of it. How long they will leave that step untaken I do not know, but I suspect not very long. The hon. member for Montreal Centre goes on to favor us with the character of those not included in this Bill. He says:

"Sir, I can say to those people, and to the people of Canada generally, that if we have not in this Bill what is commonly known as manhood suffrage, we have, at all events, that which gives a vote to everyone who deserves to be called a man in this country."

Those who are left out are not worthy of being called men. He goes on to say:

"Is it possible that you can go lower than the person who earns $300 n the country and $400 in the city, per annum? Why, Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this Bill every man who contributes in any way, by his wealth, or by his labor, to the good of the country, will be entitled to be registered under this system."

Of course, there was a little mistake there, but probably he did not read the Bill. But why should he read it, when he was simply told that it had to pass, when the decree was registered in caucus, and it was not necessary, even for a legal gentleman, to read the Bill, and therefore he fell into the error of making the qualification $300 instead of $400. He says, further:

"We are giving here the vote to every deserving man in the country, to every man who has succeeded in showing, by his industry, his activity and his energy, that he is worthy of being recognised as a man in the eyes of the law of the land."

Who are these men who are not deserving men, who are not worthy of being recognised as men in the eyes of the law. They are all those freeholders in the cities and towns in the Province of Ontario who own property valued between $200 and $300, and those in villages and townships who own real property between $100 and $150. I am prepared to discontinue my remarks if there is any intention of adjourning.

Mr. BOWELL. Better not cut it in two, because we could not follow you to-morrow.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am prepared to go on, if hon. gentlemen say so.

An hon. MEMBER. How long will it be?

Mr. FAIRBANK. If the sun gets up before I get down, it will not be my fault.

Mr. BOWELL. So much the worse for the sun, I suppose.

An hon. MEMBER. The sun has further to go than you have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we had better rise and report progress, and I move accordingly.

Committee rose and reported.

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

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House adjourns I wish to ask the First Minister if there is any further information from General Middleton.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no further information. I suppose the hon. gentleman has seen that the wires are down, but it is believed that they will be put up during the night, and that we will hear to-morrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is stated—I do not know whether on authority or not—that some further regiments have been put under orders to be ready to go to the front. Can the Minister tell us whether that is the case or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak exactly, but I believe the Minister of Militia has warned one or two regiments to be ready.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at two o'clock a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 12th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald).

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FAIRBANK. When the House adjourned at two o'clock this morning it necessarily cut my line of argument. I am therefore forced to proceed to splice the line. I do not propose a long splice, but I shall have to ask hon. gentlemen to sit quietly on deck while I make the splice. As you may remember, I had the hon. member for Montreal Centre in tow, and I shall have to make the splice sufficiently strong to continue towing him, not so much on account of the size of the vessel as on account of the shallow water I found him in. I was proceeding to review his description of the persons who would be disfranchised by this Bill, and it is not necessary to repeat the description he then gave. He alluded to them as people who were not entitled to be called men, or recognised in the eyes of the law. I was proceeding to point out who those parties were, and had called attention to the fact that in the Province of Ontario they included all those assessed for real property in cities and towns between $200 and $300; that if they were assessed for $200 they would have a vote under the Mowat Bill, and if of value of less than $300 they would not have a vote under the Bill before us, and hence they came within the class who were not entitled to consideration under the law. In villages and townships those rated between $100 and $150 come within that class, and householders who, although owning their property, do not appear on the assessment roll to the extent of $300, or is of that value in towns and cities. If, however, they are tenants of that property, no matter what its value is, if they pay a rental of $20 a year, they would be entitled to vote, and therefore this class also belonged to those who, according to the hon. member for Montreal Centre, are not entitled to consideration under the law. Again, in the matter of income; all that class of persons whose income is between $250 and $400 come within this class. Then we come to an immense class—the entire class of wage-earners, whose wages amount to over $250 a year—all such, under the Mowat Act, are entitled to the franchise. I believe there is a very prevalent mistake on this point — that wage-earners are to be included under the income provisions of this Bill. Now, Sir, I do not profess to be an expert in these things; I have not studied law, but I understand from those who have that the income franchise does not include the wage-earner. I believe that to be the correct view of it—certainly it was so considered by Mr. Mowat and his Government, and I believe this House is prepared to regard him as pretty good authority on law, including constitutional law, at the present time. They evidently considered that income did not include the wage-earners, and hence they have given the franchise to all wage-earners of $250; they have inserted a special clause, providing for wage-earners, and under that term an immense number are enfranchised who are excluded by this Bill, and who, according to the member for Montreal Centre, are not "entitled to consideration under the law." There are tens of thousands of the people in Ontario who will be disfranchised by this Bill; and I call the attention of the hon. member for Lincoln to the fact, so that he may think it advisable thoroughly to revise his figures of last night. In Quebec the disfranchisement is less than in Ontario. Those, in cities or towns, forming a part of a county, and who are assessed between $200 and $300, are excluded, and, according to the hon. gentleman, are not entitled to consideration under the law. Now, Sir, I was anxious to test the effect of the Ontario law and this law in the Province of Ontario, and I made an experiment, taking a certain class of men, twenty-five men who are employed in concerns in which I am interested. I could decide from my own knowledge of their position. I found that under the Ontario Act every one of these were enfranchised—every man of them had a vote; some of them had it on two grounds, but all had a vote under the clause which provides for the wage-earner. About half of them would also have had a vote under the householders clause, which embraces, as I remarked last night, 95 per cent. of the married men in the Province of Ontario. Under the Bill before you there are three of these twenty-five of whom I am not quite certain, as I do not know exactly their position—whether they are occupying their own property or are tenants. But eighteen I know would be disfranchised, and four would have a vote out of the twenty-five under this Bill. I submit this to the member for Lincoln as a reason for revising his figures; and I may say that there is not one of those twenty-five men who, by industry, sobriety, obedience to the law and readiness to defend the law, is not the peer of any member in this House. Now, I shall, perhaps, be asked: Are not some of these men so circumstanced that they could be given the franchise? That is not the point; the question is, does the law give it to them. Some of them are so circumstanced that their employer could give them the franchise, as some of them are householders without paying rent, some have their dwellings on leased land which does not pay a rental equal to $20 a year. That is the condition of some of these men, and so they are cut off. I do not profess to be as familiar as the members from British Columbia are with the condition of their people; but I shall be much surprised to learn if, they having manhood suffrage, this Bill does not cut off an immense number, particularly of those who are engaged with drill and blast in opening the vaults where nature has concealed her treasures—I refer to the miners. From New Brunswick I have seen an official statement from one county which shows that 500 are disfranchised there of those who hold the franchise as their fathers and grandfathers did. In Nova Scotia the disfranchisement is less, but shipowners there are disfranchised. We have to remember that in these two Provinces personal property is recognised. This Bill does not provide for personal property. Hence, those who may have been in the habit of exercising their rights as voters since they came of age, and their fathers before them, are to be disfranchised. There are thousands and tens of thousands in Ontario and in every other Province who will be disfranchised by this Bill, and who, consequently, under the law as laid down by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), are not entitled to be recognised as men. In Ontario and other Provinces there are hundreds, I do not know but thousands, of the young men who are now in the field under arms who will be disfranchised, and tens of thousands more who are ready to take the field if necessary. The member for Montreal Centre, I presume, is an excellent authority on law, but I do not think much of his arithmetic. For instance, he states that every man earning $1 a day will be enfranchised. I did not know that they had a peculiar kind of year in his section, but it is a long year in Ontario that has 400 working days in it. Even supposing the Bill did include the wage-earners, the sum is a fixture at $400. The Bill might be amended to include them; we are dealing with it as it now stands and as it came from the hands of its framers. Perhaps no rate of wages is so common all over the country as the sum of $1.25 a day. If a man receiving that wage works every day in the year he is just cut off; his wages

would amount to $391; and the man who works for $1.00 a day would, of course, be cut off. Yet, Sir, this is the kind of information that is given to the public. In the *Mail* of a day or two ago, under the heading, "Will They Define It?" the writer, speaking of a member in this House, asks:

"Was he justified in hinting that the people of Ontario would become traitors if Sir John enfranchised more of the workmen of Ontario?"

When the Bill proposes to disfranchise tens of thousands, this leading paper has the cheek to ask a question of that kind. When the gentlemen occupying seats in this House return to their constituents and stand before hundreds and thousands of those who enjoyed the franchise up to this time, but whom this Bill cuts off, or who would enjoy it but for this Bill, if they never blushed before, I think that fact will bring the blush of shame to their cheeks. I have not referred to Prince Edward Island, where every man who pays his road tax is entitled to vote. The member for Montreal Centre provided for that in his own mind. He said:

"I am pleased to find that the hon. gentleman who has just made the sub-amendment is likely to carry it in this House, and that in the Island of Prince Edward the franchise that has existed there for so many years is likely to be maintained."

Fortunate Island! What a pity it is we do not all live on an island! We should all be exempt from this Bill; I could then gladly vote for it. What deep heartrending regrets must have stolen over that member when he heard the statement of the Prime Minister yesterday that he could not consent to that exception. But I suppose he will still support the measure. The member for Montreal Centre closed his remarks with an apology to the Province of Quebec, and stated to them, by way of consolation, that their Local Government would not be interfered with. I hope, Sir, they will make the most of this consolation. I shall now cut the tow line and let the member for Montreal Centre go. Mr. Chairman, how changed is the measure now before us, even though we are only on section 3, from what it was when it came to us. As that beautiful craft came sailing in, we saw a fair spinster and a charming widow standing on the deck; the "heathen Chinee" was in the cabin, and the banded Indian was concealed in the hold. Sir, we have quickly disposed of the ladies; we have kicked them on shore; the "heathen Chinee" we have strangled; the banded Indian we have dragged from his concealment, and those of them that were of no immediate use, we have put on shore, but we will retain those in the old Provinces. We will particularly retain those that may be useful in scalping the member for Bothwell and the member for Brant. We have been surprised, from time to time, at the silence on the Ministerial benches upon these points. I have read in an old volume I was taught to respect, but which is sometimes neglected, the sentence: "Brayeth the wild ass when he hath grass, or loweth the ox when he hath fodder." In view of this silence, one is forced to enquire: Is this Bill so friendless that it has no one to defend it? Is it despised in the House of its friends? In well regulated courts, when a criminal is found to have no one to plead his case, the judge appoints some one to defend him. It would seem to be necessary to do so in this case. In the absence of defence from the Ministerial benches, we are forced to seek it elsewhere; and the next best authority we have is their organs. There are some people who do not read the *Mail*. It is a mistake. There is lots of fun in it; it aids digestion; I have tried it. I will give you an example, taken from a recent number, in defence of this measure. It says, referring to those who oppose the measure:

"They encouraged the dynamitish propagandism in every form. They had friendly words for the Nihilists. They adopted the doctrines of Henry George regarding the confiscation of land. They encouraged disaffected Nova Scotians to rebel. They encouraged British Columbia to secede. They incited the Manitoba settlers to rebel. * * * It is the intention of the Grit party to break up the Confederation if they cannot rule it."

Then the writer proceeds to give advice to the Minister. He expresses some doubts as to whether the Minister will receive it or not; I have more serious doubts than he. He advises a dissolution and proceeds to say:

"We should force through all the necessary measures, sacrificing everything not essential to public business, and drag these Grit traitors and treason-mongers to the foot of the polls, which the people of Canada would speedily convert into a gallows. That would teach them a lesson in loyalty as understood by the people of Canada, and especially by the people of Ontario."

The writer of that article is only joking. He does not mean to erect a gallows; he is not going into the hanging business. He is not ignorant of the story of Haaman and Mordecai; he is not going to stand the chance of the parties getting mixed at the gallows. He is not going to take the chance of the people enquiring who it is that defend the public treasury and who do not, who invade the people's liberties and who defend them. He asks in the same number: "What will they say at the front?"

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think you are going very far from the question before the House. You are not citing matters relevant to the question.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I understand you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that these articles are not relevant. You and I, Sir, exactly agree. I should have said this article in the *Mail* was not relevant to the question at all, but hon. gentlemen opposite would not have accepted my decision. I hope they will accept that of the Deputy Speaker. I shall, in obedience to your ruling, have nothing more to do with the *Mail* as an authority on this question, and proceed at once to show that from the beginning of this discussion to the present, there has been no attempt whatever to show dissatisfaction with the existing law. There has been no call for a change. The present system has stood the test of eighteen years successfully. From this side of the House the charge has been made and repeated that the object of this measure was to gain political advantage. That charge has not yet been denied. If it be denied, I should like to hear stated the ground of the denial. I believe this change is contrary to the wishes of the people. If you would eliminate from the question all consideration of party advantage, I do not believe one man out of a hundred in the whole Dominion will approve of it. Let us apply to it the test, whether it comes under that class of subjects with which the Dominion can deal better than the Provinces, because in the Confederation that rule should hold. Those things the Provinces can do best should be reserved to them to attend to. We have in the Dominion serious disadvantages to deal with, vastly greater than those the American States had to contend against. They were a compact succession of Provinces along the Atlantic coast, closely connected, not even a mountain range separating them, while our territory stretches from ocean to ocean with long gaps of "unbroken desolation intervening." Under any circumstances Canada is a difficult country to govern, and these geographical difficulties which cannot be overcome, add immensly to the difficulty. Each Province has its local history, its local prejudices, its local business and interests. It is exceedingly difficult to weld them into uniformity. It tends to block the advance of views in relation to the franchise, and will anyone contend that the disposition to extend the franchise is not growing? Any one who has examined the Ontario franchise must come to the conclusion that it is manhood suffrage, with the assessment roll as a registration. In fact, the opposition to it was based on the ground that it did not go far enough, and that opposition came from those who entertain the political views to hon. gentlemen opposite. If this Bill passes in its present form, and is enforced as it is possible to enforce it, it will cause a loss of a class of citizens to Canada that we do

not wish to lose, and that cannot be replaced by immigration machinery. The principles underlying this measure are of far greater importance than any mere party considerations. It strikes deeper than we can afford to go. Once it was a proud privilege to say: I am a Roman citizen; and it should be a proud privilege to say: I am a Canadian citizen; but if this Bill is put in force, that will be deprived of half its value. Party feeling is sufficiently intense in Canada, but no measure has been passed in the last thirty years which will tend to produce so intense a party feeling as this. I believe it will even create personal hatred, that it will invade church relations, business relations, and social relations, and will inflict irreparable injury upon Canada. It is claimed that, the measure having gone so far, it is difficult to withdraw it. We were told yesterday, in the mild speech of the First Minister, that representative government was on trial. We glory in our representative government, but whom does it represent? It represents the people of Canada. We claim that the people of Canada do not want this measure, and we are willing to rest our political existence on this fact, we throw down our challenge to submit it to the people. If they sanction it, our mouths are forever closed. The feeling prevails that the measure cannot be dropped without a sacrifice of dignity, but it would give the Government a claim to patriotism if they would withraw it. I should be glad to see this measure dipped in carbolic acid, sprinkled with chloride of lime, and burnt upon the altar of the Dominion in atonement for the sins of the people, and I recommend that course to be pursued.

Mr. PLATT. When the First Minister rose at the opening of the House yesterday, I cherished the hope that he was about to reveal to the House that he had realised the situation and was prepared to remove this Bill from the Orders, or place it in such a position that it would relieve the strain on those who have claimed the right and performed the duty of discussing it fairly; but the careful precision with which the hon. gentleman's statement was given to the House, soon showed that he had some object in view other than that which I have indicated. Before he had proceeded very far, his remarks led me to the conclusion that he wished to relieve himself and, to a certain extent, his followers, from a threatened censure. He had not talked very long before he referred to the word "clôture," and he took occasion to relieve himself from the censure of having suggested it by stating to the House that he had resisted the suggestions that had been made in that direction. I am very glad, for the credit of the country, that the Premier has relieved himself of the possibility of being accused of having intended to apply so odious and disgusting a measure to the people of this country, but he took occasion later in the day to relieve his followers also from the censure of having suggested it. He told the House that such a course had been suggested, and that he had resisted it, but later he said that he would not say that it was his followers who had suggested it. He did not tell us who had; he did not tell us that the people of this country had suggested the application of the clôture, or that it had come from anyone outside of this House. We know that, in the corridors, we have heard the word clôture floating in the air, and I am very glad that the Prime Minister has stated that there is no intention on his part to adopt such a means here. I am also glad that he has relieved his followers from the imputation of suggesting such an odious measure in this free country as the "clôture" or the "previous question." The people of the country would not submit to it. The opposition which this measure is receiving is not the opposition of a faction. It is the opposition of a small number of men, to be sure, but they represent as near as may be one-half the people of this country. The fact that they hold diametrically opposite views upon this question

to the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, is the reason why this discussion has been prolonged to so unusual a length. This opposition arises from a firm conviction that our duty to the people is to continue this discussion, even at the hazard of being accused of obstruction, until the Government realise the fact that a majority of the people of this country look upon this measure as unnecessary and offensive. The last speaker has given us one reason why there is no necessity for applying any of the gag-laws that have been attempted in other countries. In this country the policy of arbitration to settle disputes, is decidedly popular. We know that if this discussion were carried out to such a length as to produce a dead lock in this House, so that it would be impossible for either the Government or the Opposition to yield, we could submit the matter to arbitration, and the people of this country would be the natural arbitrators to whom we could appeal. If we cannot succeed in any other way let us adopt this suggestion and appeal to the people to decide for us. Now, the discussion, instead of being narrowed by the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, has been very considerably widened, and has taken a wider scope since the right hon. gentleman addressed the House. He, in fact, reopened the question. It almost seemed to me, from his remarks, that he wished the discussion to go on, and to take a still wider scope. Now, there is another remark of the right hon. gentleman to which I wish to enter my earnest protest, and that is that the discussion on this side of the House is the result of an organised obstruction. I presume I know as much of that matter as the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House; and I challenge them to look at the history of this debate and say if, on a single occasion during the first twelve hours of any sitting, there was the least attempt on our part to drag it to an unseemly length, or to bring in irrelevant matter. After the fatigue we endured in keeping up a legitimate debate, and after fatigue had rendered us unable to continue it, the only constitutional means we had at our command was to prolong the discussion until we could get an adjournment of the House, in order to refresh ourselves and renew a legitimate discussion; and I repeat that that cannot be called, in any sense, the result of an organised obstruction. We have succeeded in our designs thus far, and we have, from time to time, succeeded in getting an adjournment of the House, which, bear in mind, was denied us at the first. We heard the order given from hon. gentlemen opposite that there should be no adjournment of the House until such and such vote were had, that we were to sit from day to day until this measure became law. These threats were hurled across the House after the last caucus of the Government party. But we were not the men that our constituents took us to be when they sent us to Parliament if we were to yield to those threats, and allow half-a-dozen of the principal clauses of this measure to be passed at any single session of the House. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), in his short and pithy address of a few nights ago, with a great deal of precision, went over the arguments that have been adduced in favor of the Bill. He seemed to think that the arguments which he recapitulated on that occasion were sufficient to convince every member of this House of the unnecessary length to which the debate was extended. At the commencement of his speech, however, he used these words:

"I desire, before the debate reaches its termination, that my protest shall be recorded against the manner in which this discussion has been conducted, against the length of time that it has occupied, and against the heavy expense imposed on the people."

Now, I, in common with that hon. gentleman, desire to enter my protest against the manner in which discussion has been conducted. Public discussion is of very little use where one side do all the talking, as has been the case with this debate. We have met with no opposition, and the argu-

ments we have adduced have remained unanswered. Seven or eight hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have spoken consecutively, and no attempt has been made to reply to them. That weakens the debate, and, to a great extent, prevents us from receiving that benefit from discussion which usually is derived from it. I agree with the hon. gentleman also in condemning the expense to which the country is subjected by this measure. He seems to desire to curtail the expense by curtailing the length of this discussion, while we of the Opposition wish to curtail the expense by preventing a measure being forced on the country, the result of which will cost an enormous sum of money to the people. It has been pointed out that if this Bill is carried the cost of it in one year will be greater, indeed, than the cost of this entire Session of Parliament. It must be borne in mind that if this Bill becomes law, that expense will be continued from year to year, and if, at a single Session of Parliament, we can prevent its becoming law, we shall have saved the country a great sum of money. The hon. gentleman said still further:

"I think, Sir, that this discussion has been useless, unnecessary and unstatesmanlike."

Now, I cannot agree that the discussion has been useless. Has it been useless because the hon. gentlemen who support this Bill have no other duty to perform than to record the wishes and the decrees of the Government? Is it because Ephraim is joined to his idols, and that we may as well let him alone? If that be the opinion of the hon. gentleman when he used that expression, so far as he himself is concerned, he is correct in saying this discussion was useless. He said, further, that this discussion was unnecessary. The explanations made have shown that it was not unnecessary. On the contrary, it was necessary in order to obtain a true understanding of this Bill. It is said this discussion is unstatesmanlike. It is so only in so far as it has been limited to one side of the House. To the objection that this measure is being brought before the country at a time when the people were not asking or expecting it, and at an unreasonable period of the Session, the hon. gentleman replies that the measure has been three times introduced, that there has been ample time afforded to discuss its principles, and that a large number of members came to this Session with their opinions largely formed upon the question. Those hon. members who so came were members who came to register the opinions of the Government. Even the First Minister had not his opinions thoroughly ripened at the opening of the Session. The hon. gentleman had not the same opinion as to the view which would be held by the House on the woman suffrage question three or four months ago as he has to-day, otherwise he would not have inserted it in his Bill. The hon. gentleman says:

"I support the measure because Parliament has a right to say who shall elect its members."

That has been said by every hon. gentleman opposite who has spoken and has not been denied by any one on this side. It is a stock argument without force. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) did not deny the right of Parliament to construct its own electorate; but he urged that it was inexpedient and we were not obliged to do all we have power to do. We have power to disfranchise nine-tenths of the people, but it is not expedient to do so. The hon. gentleman says further:

"I support it, secondly, because I believe the measure which was adopted in 1867 was adopted as a temporary measure, that it was never designed by those who framed the constitution that the provincial franchises, or the franchises which might exist, from time to time, in the various Provinces of this Dominion, should form the franchise by which members of this Parliament should be elected; that the reasons which led to its adoption then have long ceased to exist and that therefore the system itself should be abandoned."

Although it is said this is a mere temporary measure it has continued 18 years. During that period there has been no desire for change expressed. The hon. gentleman further says:

"I support this measure, thirdly, because I believe that the present system is lacking in the essential elements of certainty, stability and permanence, and the important element of uniformity, and therefore it should not be continued."

Who wants stability? Is it intended that the measure should be unchangeable? Is there to be no advancement? The present system is not stable, because it was not the wish of the people that it should be stable, because we are constantly advancing in this age. The hon. gentleman says that the opinions of this side of the House are that the proposed measure is unnecessary, that the present system is working well and that no change is demanded. If those three assertions can be substantiated, the strongest reasons have been brought forward why this Bill must be set aside. The hon. gentleman says that these are weak arguments; but I maintain they have all possible force to show why it is necessary and desirable that this Bill should be withdrawn. If this Bill is unnecessary, if the present system is working well, there is no reason for seeking to force this measure upon Parliament and the country. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"If an evil exists are we to wait until its consequences are proved to be so disastrous that public indignation forces us to adopt remedial measures."

I answer no; but I ask where does the evil exist? The hon. gentleman has not attempted to show the evil, and yet we are asked to remove an imaginary evil and adopt a real evil. The hon. gentleman said further:

"I feel, when a reform measure is presented to this House, if the principles upon which it is based are sound, if they are just and equitable and right, if the changes which are proposed will improve the existing state of things, if the system which it is proposed to introduce is an improvement on the system which now exists, it is the duty of Parliament, under such circumstances, to adopt that measure without delay."

There is not an hon. member who does not heartily agree with the hon. gentleman in that expression. If a Reform measure is founded on principles of justice and right, then it becomes the duty of Parliament to adopt that measure without delay. But the hon. gentleman deals in generalities and in unmeaning platitudes. The hon. gentleman holds that this Franchise Bill is based upon principles of justice and equity. Such is not the fact, and the hon. gentleman has taken that for granted because the Bill was introduced by the hon. First Minister. Because it is the view of the Government of this country, he assumes that the Bill is based on principles of righteousness, justice and equity, and that there is no question about the matter. I am glad to say that a difference of opinion exists in this country on that question. I believe the majority of the people of this country think that neither of these virtues, neither of these attributes of righteousness and justice, to which the hon. gentleman alludes, have even cast a shadow on the measure which is now before the House. I believe it is looked upon, from one end of the country to the other, to be a measure just such as has been described by gentlemen on this side, and I ask hon. gentlemen if it is fair, if it in keeping with the true principles of parliamentary government that when we are face to face with an expression of public opinion, such as has already reached this House, we should attempt to force this measure through Parliament. The hon. gentleman, like a Daniel come to judgment, not only finds fault with the action of the Legislature of his own Province, with regard to the franchise, but he refers to the Province of Ontario and the other Provinces, he looks abroad over the whole Dominion to see where wrongs are to be righted in every Province. He tells the people of Ontario and New Brunswick that they do not know how to construct their own franchise. Now, Sir, I do not think it well becomes an hon. gentleman, coming from any one Province of this Dominion, to sit in judgment on

the doings and sayings of the people of some other Province. I take it, Sir, that this attack on provincial rights —for I think it is nothing less—goes further and that it becomes an absolute insult to the people of the Province so attacked. If a popular franchise does not exist in the Province of New Brunswick, who are to blame for it? Are we in this House at fault? No, it is the people of New Brunswick, and are they not sufficiently interested in the welfare of their own Province to adopt a franchise which is best suited for themselves? Hon. gentlemen may say that the Parliament or the Government of that Province are at fault, but they are the representatives of the people of that Province just as the Legislature or the Government of Ontario represent the people of Ontario, and I say that anything that is said against the recent Act passed in that Province is an insult to the people of Ontario. Have the people of that Province ever asked us to take part in this Parliament in the conduct of their own affairs? No; the people believe they are competent to do so themselves and they do not ask us to interfere. They have the power to arrange the franchise for their own Province, and if the recent Act is not what it should be, the people of that Province will find it out and they will remedy the evil by the repeal or amendment of the Act through their own representatives. The hon. member for Lincoln, who seems to have Mowat on the brain whenever he speaks, has characterised that Bill in the most odious terms. But why does he not go to the people of Ontario, who have the power to say that the Bill shall be changed, and that their wrongs, if they have wrongs, shall be made right. But whether or not it is that the hon. gentleman's influence is declining in that Province, or that he thinks he has a better chance here to say harsh words against the Premier of that Province, I do not know, but instead of exerting his influence in favor of a just and righteous franchise Bill he comes here where he has no right to deal with provincial affairs, and he speaks of Mr. Mowat in a manner insulting to the people of the Province from which he comes. The hon. member for Westmoreland says:

"Then, Sir, another important feature of the present system is its uncertain and unchanging character, the constituencies which elected us may before another election may be entirely swept away."

Well, Sir, that is a very strange theory to be proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. We know that fortunately it is not in the power of the Provinces to sweep away constituencies, but unfortunately it is in the power of this Parliament and Government, and if the hon. gentleman for Westmoreland had had a seat in this House, in 1882, he would have had a chance to see that under a measure proposed in this House it would not be impossible that before another election some of us would find that our constituencies had been swept away. He says further:

"I for one, Sir, feel that the present system is not calculated to preserve that harmony, but that it is calculated eventually to promote provincial discord and provincial strife."

And now I take issue with the hon. gentleman in that part of his remarks. I believe that the present system has been conducive to provincial harmony, and that the principle which is now sought to be forced on the people of this country will be productive of provincial discord and strife. He goes on to state, that under the existing system, members may be sent from the different Provinces, with particular parties, largely in a majority, by reason of franchise adopted to that end, and that therefore we may have parties in this House divided by provincial lines instead of on lines of public policy. Now, the very principle of our federal system is that we should have federal representation, and that the party which is in the majority in one Province should have the largest representation in this Parliament, and so on with the other Provinces. The reason why provincial discord will be produced by the measure now before us is, that it is not a measure of permanency. Before long we may have, and I believe we will have, in one Province or another, a strong feeling in favor of manhood suffrage or of woman's franchise. The feeling in favor of these measures in a particular Province, will find expression in this Parliament, and the result may be attempts to force the views and wishes of one Province on the other Provinces in the matter of the franchise; that is the manner in which strife and discord will be most likely to arise, and more strife and discord on this subject of the franchise than has existed from Confederation down to the present time. He says:

"In one Province, where one party has a large majority in the Local Legislature, an Act may be passed adopting a franchise which will give that party a large representation for that Province in this Parliament; in another Province, where another party may have a large majority in the Local House, a different franchise may be adopted, with a corresponding result; what have we then?"

I wish hon. members on both sides to listen to that remark; I am not sure that there is not something in it, and if there be anything in it so far as the Local Legislatures are concerned, what is likely to take place under the measure before us here? Is not the same thing being attempted in this Parliament? Here is an attempt made by a Government having a large majority in Parliament, to secure the adoption of a franchise that would give them more than their fair share of representation in this Chamber. Now, I do not think there is anything more in the remarks of the hon. member for Westmoreland to which I need address myself. The hon. member for Prince County, P. E. I., (Mr. Hackett) followed him a few days later, and I wish to make a few remarks concerning his address in the same manner in which I have reviewed the rather admirable address of the hon. member for Westmoreland. The hon. member for Prince says:

"It is of vital importance that this Parliament especially should not be subject to the whims and fancies of the Local Legislatures, and that we should take out of the hands of the Local Legislatures the right to fix the franchise for the election of members to the Dominion Parliament."

He strongly supports the principle of this Bill, that this Parliament should use the right of constructing its own electorate. Then, he says:

"Another reason why I support the Bill is that it provides for the registration of voters in all the Provinces of this Dominion."

That is another principle of the Bill he supports.

"Now, Sir, I ask what reason or right has this Parliament to provide for registration for the election of members to this House? If we want voters' lists, is it not the duty of this House to pay the expense of providing those voters' lists?"

That seems one of the strongest reasons the hon. gentleman gives for supporting this Bill—the fact that this Government will have to pay for the construction of the voters' lists in Prince Edward Island; for the sake of getting that small pittance from the Canadians, as I suppose he would term them, he is willing to forego the privileges and to sacrifice the franchise, which he says the people of his Province hold most near and dear to themselves. First, he says, he is in favor of the principle of this Bill, and a moment afterwards he expresses the hope that the principle of the Bill will not be applied to his own Province. Then he says:

"Another reason why I support this Bill is, that it extends the franchise in most of the other Provinces."

I daresay most of the other Provinces will be thankful to the hon. gentleman for making that discovery. Although supporting this Bill, he goes on to say:

"For the last twenty-five or thirty years we have had in the Province, Prince Edward Island, a system of manhood suffrage. Every man in that Province, twenty-one years of age, and a British subject, having paid a certain poll tax and performed a certain amount of statute labor, is entitled to a vote. That system has become very popular in the Province of Prince Edward Island; the people there have become very much attached to it; they have made great progress under it, and they

are very tenacious of their rights in that direction. There is no privilege of right that they cherish so dearly as the right of exercising this franchise."

But notwithstanding that they so highly prize and cherish that right, this hon. gentleman seems willing to sacrifice it for the paltry gain of a few dollars out of the Dominion treasury for the construction of voters' lists in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman then proceeds to pass judgment on fellow members. He tells us of an outrage that was sought to be perpetrated upon Prince Edward Island by an Act passed in 1874, which he says deserved condemnation because it sought to apply a different rule to Prince Edward Island from that applied to the other Provinces, and he says that at that time the hon. First Minister, to his honor and credit, stood up and defended the rights of the people of Prince Edward Island. Does the hon. First Minister stand up to-day to defend the rights of Prince Edward Island in the same sense? And what has the hon. member for Prince to say, who then condemned what he is asking to have done now? The hon. gentleman made an unprovoked attack on the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Yeo) who sits near me, and endeavored to arouse religious prejudices against that hon. gentleman, who has done nothing to provoke such an attack, who has deservedly obtained the respect of both sides of this House, and who during his long parliamentary career has proved himself a strong and true friend of the Province from which he comes. The hon. gentleman then proceeds to give credit to an hon. Senator who, he said, in 1874 stood up nobly in defiance of his party in defence of the rights of Prince Edward Island. But what does the hon. member for Prince do? Is he standing up in defence of the liberties that are held dear by the people of Prince Edward Island? No; he is supporting hon. gentlemen who are seeking to oppress and tyrannise over the people of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman then says:

"What will hon. gentlemen opposite say to that? How does it correspond with their idea of provincial rights, that this Parliament, that the Government of 1874, led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), should, by an Act of Parliament, endeavor to coerce Prince Edward Island into the expenditure of a large amount of money in the preparation of voters' lists to return members to this Parliament?"

Does not this Bill coerce every Province in the Dominion into the expenditure of a large amount of money in the preparation of voters' lists? The hon. gentleman can condemn the Act of 1874, which coerced only one Province, which placed one Province in the same position as the others with regard to the expense of preparing but one set of voters' lists, but with strange inconsistency he can support this measure which coerces every Province. The hon. gentleman, then speaking of the revising barrister clause which was in force in Prince Edward Island, and which was similar to the Bill now before us, said:

"The people tried it for two or three years; it worked well enough, but it cost a large amount of money; it was too expensive a plaything for them and they repealed it."

Will not this system be an expensive one as well? Will it not prove too expensive to the people of Prince Edward Island? Will they not seek to have it repealed? The present Bill will impose restrictions and penalties upon the people of Prince Edward Island far in excess of any which the Government measure in 1874 imposed, and which the hon. member for Prince Edward Island so strongly condemns. At the close the hon. gentleman becomes pathetic, having spoken so long in defence of this measure, he is afraid to see it applied to his own Province. He said: "I hope that the House will support the amendment of my hon. friend and exclude Prince Edward Island from the operation of this clause." (The disfranchising clause.) He then whispered across the floor to the Government: "We think it only proper that this Parliament should have the control of its own electorate;" but he added:

"We think that Prince Edward Island, under its peculiar circumstances, being apart, almost from the rest of the Dominion, shut out for a large portion of the year from the mainland by almost impassable barriers of ice. Having no floating population, being pretty well filled up, there would be no danger at all in continuing to it the manhood suffrage so long enjoyed by its people. While I favor manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island, I think it would hardly be right to apply to the whole country."

That is an example of—I will not say impertinence, but of an hon. gentleman extending his judgment too far. He thinks manhood suffrage is a good thing for Prince Edward Island. Let him think so and fight to maintain it there, but he has no right to express the opinion that it would not work well for the rest of the Dominion. The rest of the Dominion must have a Franchise Bill forced on it, whether it likes it or not, but Prince Edward Island must be allowed to have a law of its own. The hon. gentleman says his Province stands in the peculiar position because it is an island. Well, with all my heart, I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), for several reasons. First, because it is right that the Provinces should have the right of saying to whom the franchise should be given. Then he moved that Prince Edward Island should have that right; but by-and-bye there will be two Prince Edward Islands. Merely judging the question from that geographical point, which the hon. member for Prince, P. E. I. (Mr. Hackett), raised I may say that the county of Prince Edward, Ontario, will, by-and-bye, when the Murray Canal will be dug, will be also an island, and be entitled on that ground to regulate its own franchise. The hon. gentleman has argued so far in favor of uniformity, in favor of this Parliament saying who shall be the electors. He says:

"I support this Bill again, because it very materially extends the franchise to the different people of the different Provinces; although it restricts it, in a small degree, in the Province from which I come."

He is willing that this Bill, because it extends the franchise in the other Provinces, should apply to Prince Edward Island, although it restricts the franchise there; but repenting of this adhesion to the principle of uniformity, he goes on to say:

"I hope this House will support the amendment of my hon. friend, which would retain the present franchise in Prince Edward Island, and then I think no harm can come of it."

Then he thinks no harm can come of it. Of course not, so long as Prince Edward Island is exempted. Leave me, he says, outside, and I will assist in passing the measure for the other Provinces. He adds:

"An exception made in favor of Prince Edward Island can scarcely be called a breach of uniformity, as that Island, on account of its insular position, is, for a large portion of the year, separate from the rest of the Dominion by the ice in the Straits of Northumberland. Therefore I trust that the Government will accede to the proposition of my hon. friend. I can assure those who will vote for this amendment that they will be long remembered and long revered and respected by the people of Prince Edward Island. There is no privilege they cherish so dearly as the privilege of exercising manhood suffrage. The man who will continue that privilege to them will be held in the highest esteem by them for all time; and the man who, as in the case of the Hon. David Laird, attempts to rob them of their franchise will always be execrated by them."

The First Minister has thus received his sentence. He has said the Government could not grant the request made by hon. gentlemen. What is the answer of the hon. gentleman? Those, he says, who deny that franchise will be eternally execrated by them. What about us? We will receive the unanimious support, no doubt, of the people of Prince Edward Island, for we will, taking the ground we do, support the proposition of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald); and doing so, we are to be held in eternal grateful remembrance, while those opposed to us will receive the eternal execration of the people of that Island. The hon. gentleman goes further; and this is the first time I remember having heard a man read his own death warrant. He supports the Government here; he is going to assist the Government in depriving the people of their rights and

privileges; and he therefore expects to receive the eternal execration of the people who sent him to this House. He says that, to the credit of the hon. Senator of Prince Edward Island (Senator Haythorne), when the measure of 1874 came before the Senate, he rose superior to his party feelings and stood out like a man for the Province he represented. Will the hon. gentleman follow that noble example? Will he rise above party feelings? Will he, when he reads the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, which is a far better amendment than that moved by the hon. member for King's, which gives the same glorious privilege to all the Provinces, support that amendment and give to all the Provinces the justice which he demands for his own? Will he support that measure of justice which he demands for his own Province, or will he fold his arms and sacrifice the interests of those who sent him to Parliament? I fear that the last of the clauses which I have read will indicate that the hon. gentleman will do the latter. Why does he not rise in his might, like the hon. Senator whom he has praised, and burst the chains and fetters which bind him to his party, and, when he sees they are determined to force an obnoxious measure upon the people of his Province, why does he not stand redeemed and disenthralled and, as the immortal Curran would say, by the genius of self-emancipation? I have spoken to this amendment, because it involves the question of provincial rights. I think it may be fairly considered in connection with the claims made for Prince Edward Island. What those hon. gentlemen claim for that Province we claim for every Province in this Dominion, and, if their proposition be voted down, they are in duty bound to stand up manfully and support the Opposition and the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have heard it repeated that this is our own franchise. I do not know how Ministers may use that pronoun "our," but, if the First Minister spoke for himself and his colleagues, I think the Bill will meet what he wants and will create, a franchise for the Ministry. If the members of this House want a franchise of their own, they have one to day, because the provincial franchises were adopted by an Act of this Legislature. They speak of uniformity, but that means that the people of any one Province may be placed in a position to have forced upon them, at any time, the opinions and the prejudices of other Provinces. In the attempts to get uniformity you are paying altogether too dear for the whistle. If there is anything wrong in the provincial franchises the people of the Provinces must be held responsible, and they have the power to remedy it. This measure is unnecessary, uncalled for, and unjust. As to the expense, it must be borne in mind that this is not a Bill to be used only at election times. It is an annual expense for the preparation of these voters' lists, and involves five revisions for every general election under our Act. If, therefore, the cost of each year be estimated at the moderate amount of $400,000, each election will cost $2,000,000. There is no justification for that, as we already have lists which are prepared without any cost to the people, as represented in this Parliament. This discussion has given rise to a stronger argument in favor of manhood suffrage than any discussion which has ever taken place in this House. The very idea of a Dominion franchise gives us the idea of manhood suffrage. If we are to have uniformity at all, the only way in which it can be reached is manhood suffrage, and that fact will force itself upon the minds of hon. gentlemen in this House to such an extent that, before another year comes round, the opinion will be so largely entertained that an effort will be made to amend this Franchise Bill by giving us manhood suffrage, there is where I see the danger of provincial discord. If the Province of Quebec is not as far advanced as the other Provinces in regard to that question, what danger threatens that Province? One Province will be trying to force its opinion on another Province, and by the force of the majority the smaller Province will have to yield. It would be far better to retain our present easily worked and satisfactory system, and to leave the present Bill until the people demand it. In justification of the continued discussion which has been going on in this House, I will read the following extract from Bailey's "Political Representation":

"The peculiar advantages of oral discussion are that, from the number and variety of minds, simultaneously handling the subject, it is rapidly turned on all sides and scrutinised in every part; and, secondly that a state of clear-sightedness is produced in the understanding, which is seldom to be purposely created, and is only the occasional visitant of the closet. In the process of debate, the doubt which hung over the mind clears away, the information wanting and searched for in vain is supplied, the absurdity before unnoticed is made palpable, the fond conceit blown up by some partial experience melts into air, the attention is animated and the perception sharpened by the alternate exposition and reply, attack and defence."

I say that we should have alternate exposition and reply; we should have alternate attack and defence.

"It can hardly be questioned that if a number of men with adequate information come together and freely discuss a subject to the best of their ability, they will arrive at a truer conclusion than the same men could attain in the same time by any other means."

We have here the very strongest opinions expressed by this writer in favor of discussion. Now, Sir, as to the manner in which the people should be brought to an understanding of the provisions of this Bill, I wish to quote an expression of Hume:

"In all cases it must be advantageous to know what is most perfect in the kind, that we may be able to bring any real constitution or form of government as near it as possible, by such gentle alterations and innovations as may not give too great disturbance to society."

The author then goes on to say:

"If we narrowly examine the subject, we shall find that the condition required for the introduction of a measure, whether of abolition or positive innovation, may be comprised in two: 1st. That the measure shall be for the public good. 2nd. That the majority of the people shall have a clear and steady conviction that it is so."

Now, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they believe that the majority of the people of this country have a clear and steady conviction that this measure is in the public interest. I say we have no evidence that such is the case.

"The latter condition, indeed, is more than is absolutely required in all cases. To justify the introduction of some measures the negative condition might be alone sufficient; namely, that the majority of the people should be exempt from any prepossession against them. In laying down the second condition, therefore, in its positive form, we assume less than would probably be conceded. Either the absence of all obstacles in the way of introducing a measure is implied in these two conditions or, if there are, the absence of which is not implied, they cannot be obstacles of much resisting force. It is, for example, implied in the conviction of the majority as to the expediency of any proposed alteration that their feelings and prejudices, if they ever were, are no longer arrayed in opposition to it."

Now, Sir, we know from the opposition this measure is receiving in this House, and from the excitement it has caused outside the House, that a large number of people have feelings and prejudices against this measure.

"It is also implied in the conviction the people at large entertain of the expediency of a measure that they no longer regard it, if they ever did, as inimical to their interests. * * * * This statement of the matter, again, brings round to our view with more vividness, and in ampler magnitude, the importance of publicly discussing, incessantly repeating, and intrepidly urging, all great principles and measures of policy; certain as we are that a true knowledge of the measures will continually spread, and animated, as we cannot fail to be, by the consideration that all which is required to enable them to pass into laws, is that general conviction of their utility which public discussion will sooner or later inevitably establish."

Now, Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to assist in this discussion. If they have arguments to bring in favor of this measure, let the ablest men on that side of the House rise and explain its provisions, and show why we are called upon to pass this measure. We demand reasons, and no reasons have been given us, and because no reasons have been given in favor of this measure, the country is becoming aroused from one end to the other in such a manner as

justifies us in continuing the discussion on this Bill. I have petitions in my desk, which I shall present at the proper time, signed numerously by men of both parties, people who believe this is not a necessary measure, who know that they have never asked for it, who believe that our present system works well; and they desire that this Bill may not become law. I believe that every hon. member on this side of the House can say the same, who has received petitions at all; he will find the names of Conservatives amongst the signers. Therefore, I judge that a large portion of the people of this country see no necessity for this measure, and believe it is inimical to their interests. For these reasons I think we are justified in opposing it at every stage.

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a few remarks in answer to a statement which has been made in this House with regard to Sir George Etienne Cartier. It has been rightly said that that statesman, for whose memory we have a great deal of respect, had admitted the principle of a franchise law, which was presented in this House in 1870. But that statesman, whose energy was well known, would certainly never have consented to withdraw that measure if he had been convinced that it was necessary and indispensable to the proper working of the Government. He showed deference towards the opinion of the representatives, and he acted wisely, because eighteen years have elapsed since the establishment of Confederation, and these eighteen years have proved that no inconveniences and no abuses have resulted from the electoral system which is in force to-day. Besides, Mr. Chairman, if we read the measure which was supported by Sir George Etienne Cartier, we find that it is the condemnation of the Bill which is now before the House. Is it to be supposed that Sir George Etienne Cartier would have abandoned the principle that property ought to be the basis of the qualification of voters? Is it to be supposed that Sir George Etienne Cartier ever intended to drag the women into the electoral contests? Is it to be supposed that he ever intended to introduce into families a new element of discord, by giving the right to vote to the sons of owners who are living under the paternal roof? Is it to be supposed that that man would ever have consented to clothe the revisers with the arbitary powers which are conferred upom them by the law which is now under our consideration? Is it to be supposed that he would have put the whole electorate of Canada at the mercy of one man? No, Mr. Chairman; I do not believe it, and the measure of 1870 proves that I am right in making this supposition, because that measure did not enfranchise the women nor the sons of farmers living under the paternal roof; it did not give the right of voting to Indians who are not emancipated, to people who are not allowed to manage their own business, and who, under the new law, will be allowed to take part in the most important administration—the administration of public affairs. The motion which was made within a few days by the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald), fully justifies the position which I have taken with regard to the Franchise Bill. This Bill has hardly been introduced, it has hardly been submitted to the country, and already there has been a clashing of interest and a state of uneasiness and discontent. The motion of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I., who has given his support to the measure which we are now considering, shows that in Prince Edward Island people are not ready to submit, without grumbling, to the measure which the Dominion Parliament wishes to impose on that Province. That motion shows clearly that in a country like ours, which is composed of Provinces which are dissimilar in habits, customs, institutions and nationalities, we should not look for uniformity in legislation, and especially as regards the electoral franchise. Mr. Speaker, when I opposed this measure I did not think that a motion would be made so soon, which would give so much force to the objections I have made to this Bill. If we desire to see this Confederation remain powerful and solid, we must grant the other Provinces as many powers as it is possible to give them. The Dominion Parliament must only interfere with the legislation which affects each Province when the Provincial Parliament has no right to enact laws which specially concern that Province. Otherwise, if we use all the powers which we have, if we attempt to rule everything, we will bring to life again a state of things which existed before 1867. Before that time, a part of the country tried to rule another section of the country, and to enact laws which were not in harmony with the character of the people for whom they were destined. The result was a state of uneasiness and trouble, which had led us into political anarchy and which rendered government almost impossible. Is it that same state of things which is sought to be revived? Is it intended to do away with this spirit of contentment which exists in Canada since 1867? The moment we wander away from the federal system we are sure to give rise to clashing and discontent, such as have been manifested by the motion of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. Mr. Chairman, the citizen should be governed for his own benefit, and not for the benefit of his ruler. When we are legislating we must seek to procure advantages or to prevent misfortunes on the community. I wonder what benefit is going to result to the community from the legislation which will probably be adopted by this Parliament. The electors will certainly not reap any benefit from it. On the contrary, in order to carry out this law we will impose on the people a burden of $100,000 or $500,000. Such is the great advantage which will result to society from this electoral law. Not satisfied with depriving the people of all control in the preparation of the voters' list, not content with depriving the provincial Legislatures from a power which they have exercised until this day, and which has been recognised as belonging to them, both by the constitution and by the law of 1874, in order to crown this policy, in order to substitute for a system which works well a system which is unknown and which has not been submitted to the crucial test of experience, we are to saddle our population with an additional burden of half a million. The United States have maintained the most powerful and the most solid Republic that ever existed in the world; but in order to obtain this result, each State was allowed to govern itself according to its own notions, to pass laws which were in harmony with the character of the inhabitants of each territory. The American public men have understood that the mode of determining the qualification of voters, not only for State elections but also for Congressional elections, ought to be left with the local Government of each State; and it is this policy which has contributed to maintain this harmony which has made the Republic one of the most powerful in the world. A member of this House has pretended that we had no need to consult the constitutions and legislations of other countries, that we have here prominent statesmen, to whom we ought to give our full and entire confidence. Indeed, I admit the ability and knowledge of the leaders of both political parties in this country, but I am not ready to admit that they have, between them, the monopoly of wisdom. In order to guide ourselves in our legislation we would do well to profit by the knowledge and experience which have been acquired in other countries. In France the pernicious influence of that centralisation policy which is sought to be introduced here has been felt. I was recently asking a French Conservative how it was that the policy of the last Government in France, which is so arbitrary, so unjust, so tyrannical, was always approved of by the people at each election. The first cause, he answered is, in the cities, universal suffrage, which gives to a host of persons an electoral right, whose responsibility they do not understand, and which they use to send to Parliament men of

bad principles. The second cause is centralisation, and the great number of public officials whom the Government have under their control. These Government agents, and the candidates to public offices, prefer their personal interest to public interest, which causes the French electorate to lose that character of independence which is so necessary to give a sound judgment on the measures and policy of a Government. On that question I will take the liberty of quoting Pontalis, the author of a work on electoral laws and habits. This distinguished writer, after having studied the position in which France happens to be, and after having shown the difficulty of electing candidates who are hostile to the Government, gives the cause and reason of that state of things. He says:

"On this ground, the contest is so unequal and so perilous that at first sight it seems impossible to attempt it. The moment it is the Government who are openly fighting the electoral battles, they have in their hands a marvellous weapon which ensures victory to all the candidates in favor of whom they use it—it is the weapon of centralisation. In the face of universal suffrage, which is deprived of the most elementary means of education and deprived of training, to a certain extent, centralisation is the instrument which puts almost the whole country under the dependency of the Government. 'I have too much power. I suffer from it, and France is suffering from it with me,' said, one day, from the tribune, a great citizen, General Cavaignac, who felt preoccupied with the authority which he held in the Republic. Of course, from time to time we hear about decentralisation, but up to this day this decentralisation has only resulted in increasing, in each Department, the powers of the wardens to whom the Ministers confer a part of their powers; it has only resulted in tightening the centralisation of all the Commons of the Empire, by fixing it in place, so as to render its power more irresistible."

And further on this author adds:

"At the first call made in favor of the Government candidate, whoever fills a public office, no matter how low nor how high his functions may be, no matter how foreign to political parties these functions may be, by their nature, has his post assigned to him to cut the way to all candidatures. The passing of all routes is thus stopped * * *"

Such is the unfortunate state of things which prevails in France. If the electorate has lost its independence, if the bad causes can always succeed, if the Conservative party is always beaten in France, of late years, at all the elections which have taken place, this is due, as that author says, to centralisation and to the fact that the municipal authorities have been deprived of the powers which they formerly had; it is because the powers of the commons have been concentrated into the hands of Government officers. Is it to be desired that this state of things should be sought to be established here? No, Mr. Chairman; and it seems to me that we ought to reflect seriously before inaugurating here a state of things which has produced such deplorable results in other countries. Unfortunately, in the country of which I have just spoken, the Conservative party, before 1879, did something towards establishing that policy of centralisation, and to-day they are reaping the fruits of what they have sown; they are going from defeat to defeat; and this result is the disastrous consequence of a policy which they themselves have tried to inaugurate. The Radicals of 1879 have continued that policy of centralisation, by depriving the Provinces of privileges which they had enjoyed until then. In 1800 they substituted to the directories of the Departments the wardens who are appointed by the Government. These corrupt men said: In order to maintain ourselves in power we must necessarily corrupt the people by the exercise of patronage; we must cover up the country with public officials. The great number of Government agents and candidates to public offices will deprive the electorate from its independent character, and then it will be easier for us to escape from a condemnation. Unfortunately, they have succeeded. Unfortunately, to-day, it does not seem possible that good principles may prevail again in that country, where the source of legislation has been defiled by the corruption of the electorate. And we know what impurities have run out of that source, especially since 1871. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this measure because I think it is a dangerous weapon in the hands of a

Government. I will readily believe that the Ministers will not use that weapon, that they will not take advantage of the arbitrary powers which are put into their hands by this legislation; but the men who are to-day on the Treasury benches may be superseded, sooner or later, by men who might be fanatical and unjust, and it is then that we will see the disastrous consequences of the legislation which we are about to adopt. These men may use this weapon to tyrannise over our population, to paralyse public opinion and to prevent any resistance against abuse of powers. This is a state of things which we ought to avoid. These are misfortunes from which we should guard our country. And if there is one thing under constitutional rule which we should be anxious to keep, it is the independence of our electorate, which should be free from all undue influence on the part of the Government. I have heard several times here the Conservatives of Ontario denouncing the Mowat Government for having endeavored to establish administrative centralisation, this same kind of centralisation whose principle is consecrated in the measure we are now considering. The Mowat Government was denounced for having deprived the municipal authorities of the power of granting licenses to liquor dealers, and for having conferred that power on Government agents. It has been stated that great injustice had been the result, and that the Mowat Government used that power to promote the interest of their party. Well, if these men wish to be logical, since they condemn administrative centralisation in Ontario, they ought, for the same reason, to oppose, in this House, a measure which has the same defect. Besides, this centralisation was condemned by the First Minister himself in 1883, in connection with the license law, which enacts that the majority of the commissioners will be completely independent from any governmental influence. One is the warden of the county and the other is an officer of the Local Government. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it is dangerous to leave the granting of licenses in the hands of Government agents it is ten times more dangerous to charge them with the duty of preparing the voters' lists. As I said at the beginning of my speech, if we desire to see this Confederation of ours remain great and prosperous, we must remain faithful to the federative system; and it is by being faithful to this idea that we will avoid all causes of uneasiness and discontent. It seems to me that a part of the centralising character of this measure might have been removed from it, by having the voters' lists prepared by the secretary-treasurers of the municipalities. I may be told that the Dominion Government have no control over the municipal officers. Neither had they, in 1883, when they decided to appoint the wardens as commissioners, and left the granting of licenses in the hands of the latter. It is just, and it is in the interest of society, not to deprive the people, for that reason, from all control over the preparation of the voters' lists. The preparation of these lists should be left to the secretary-treasurers, and then the lists should be revised by a superior authority. If we take this course we will have a law about similar to that which exists in England, where the lists are prepared by officers who are absolutely independent of the Government. It is the officers of the local authorities who prepare these lists, and these lists are revised, not by Government agents, but by revisers who are appointed by judges. Besides, this is the principle which is followed by all countries whose electoral laws we have been studying, and it is that principle which I would like to have carried out in the legislation with which we are dealing to-day.

Mr. McINTYRE. Before the vote is taken on this section I wish to say a few words in reference to the manner in which it is going to affect the franchise in Prince Edward Island. As is well known to hon. members on both sides of this House, we have in Prince Edward Island two

sets of franchises, one for the Legislative Council and one for the Assembly. The franchise for the Legislative Council is that each elector shall hold freehold property to the value of £100, or $324, or a leasehold interest to the same amount. This entitles him to vote for a candidate for the Legislative Council. The candidate requires no qualification. For the Assembly we have what is known as manhood suffrage. Each elector who is 21 years of age or over, and who has performed his statute labor, or paid $1 in lieu thereof, has a right to vote. On the production of a receipt showing that the labor has been performed, or the money paid, he is entitled to vote. This system has been in force in Prince Edward Island for the last thirty years, and has given the greatest possible satisfaction to all classes. It is a franchise of which the people of Prince Edward Island are extremely jealous, and I am sure that they will be very much grieved to see that there is an attempt made in this House to deprive them of the privilege they have enjoyed, and for which they fought thirty or forty years ago. I wish to refer, for a moment, to a few of the classes who are going to be affected by this Bill—who are going to be completely disfranchised. There is that large and intelligent class—which is known to every hon. gentleman in this House—the teachers. Under this Bill, teachers of public schools will be disfranchised, for the reason that they depend on their income for a vote. Indeed, there are few, if any, teachers outside the city of Charlottetown, who receive an income of $400, and the most of them do not receive over half that amount. That large and intelligent class will be disfranchised by this Bill. There is an equally large class known as clerks in stores, young men who have no property, who are unmarried and pay no rent. Most of those young men do not receive the amount of $400 which entitles them to a vote under this Bill. They will, therefore, form another large and intelligent class who will be disfranchised. Then, again, we have young men who are learning trades. These have no qualifications under this Bill, and will be disfranchised. There are men servants in families, and laborers who are dependent on their incomes. They will also be deprived of the power of voting which they formerly had. I observe that a fisherman who has boat and tackle to the value of $150 is entitled to vote; but there is no provision under which his sons will be allowed to vote. Each and every one performing statute labor formerly had a right to vote. It is a rather lamentable state of affairs when the young men of the Island, and in fact some of the older ones, are going to be entirely disfranchised, and a new class is going to be introduced, namely Indians. In fact, under this Bill the Indian is the coming man and young white men will have to take a back seat. So far as the amandment of my colleague is concerned, I think he would have done much better had he accepted the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that amendment which has for its object to leave the provincial franchise to each Province, and the hon. gentleman would have secured all he desired, because in singling out one Province the hon. gentleman is likely to arouse a certain amount of opposition from both sides of the House. I shall vote for the amendment of the hon. gentleman, and also for the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk. I wish to refer for a moment to a speech made by the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Hackett), a few evenings ago. The hon. gentleman took occasion to refer to the election law of 1874, and he stated that the clause referring to the franchise in Prince Edward Island was introduced for the purpose of disfranchising a large body of the people, I refer to the Catholics. I believe that statement is utterly incorrect. I will read the clause, which that hon. gentleman took good care not to read, because it explains itself. We had no registration at that time, nevertheless there was a clear and distinct qualification. Every farmer knows who is the owner of 50 or 100 acres in that Province, and there is no difficulty. The Act provided for a registration. It was well known at that time that the Local Government of the day, which was a Conservative Government, was about to introduce a registration list. The clause in question reads as follows:

"In the several electoral districts in the Province of Prince Edward Island, all persons qualified to vote for the election of members of the Legislative Council of that Province, under the law in force in that Province at the passing of this Act, shall henceforth be the electors qualified to vote for the election of a member or members of the House of Commons of Canada; but whenever the Legislature of that Province shall have provided for the registration of voters and for the making of lists of qualified voters for the election of members for the House of Assembly of the said Province, and when lists of voters shall have been made and prepared, then the persons qualified to vote under such provisions for the election of a member or members of the House of Assembly of that Province, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts in the said Province; and all lists of voters so made and prepared and which, according to the laws then in force, would be used in the said several electoral districts, if the election were that of a representative or representatives to the House of Assembly for the said Province, shall be the list of voters which shall be used at the election of members of the House of Commons to be thereafter held under the provisions of this Act."

This clause was of a merely temporary character, and was inserted only to make provision until the Local Legislature passed a Registration Act, which they did the very next Session. So, whatever difficulty was caused by inserting this clause, was completely removed by the Act of the Local Legislature. This clause would never have been inserted had it not been known that the Local Legislature was about to pass a Registration Act. This was a merely temporary clause, and whether it was thrown out by the Senate or not, made no difference in regard to the Island. How very different is the present position. In this Bill we have no provision of a temporary nature, and the onus is not thrown on the Local Government. If it were, we would be very glad of it. But the present Bill is final, and, being so, will remain on the Statute Book of Canada. So far as there being any intention to disqualify any section or denomination in Prince Edward Island by the clause I have read, the charge is utterly unfounded. There was no such intention at any time, and there was no reason to do so, because the Government of that day were largely indebted for their election to the very denomination to which the hon. gentleman alluded. The Opposition, indeed, are largely indebted to-day for their seats to the same class. The hon. gentleman also made allusion to revising barristers. Probably the hon. gentleman has very good reasons for approving that provision of the Bill. He is not, however, alone in this House in that respect. I hope the Government will come to some arrangement so as to retain the franchise at present existing in Prince Edward Island. If not, they will have committed a grievous act of injustice against those people who had in former times underwent a very severe struggle in order to obtain the enfranchisement of so large a body of the people.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Macdonald, King's P.E.I.) negatived. Yeas, 51; Nays, 72.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have an additional motion to make in amendment to the main motion, and I shall read it, in order that its nature may be understood:

That all the words after "that" in the amendment, be struck out, in order to add the words: That clause number three be amended by inserting after the words "every person shall" at the beginning of the same, the words: "except in the Province of Quebec."

Now, that the nature of the amendment is known——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speak louder.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) I believe I am speaking distinctly enough to be understood. Those who are

trying to make noise will not prevent me from speaking. I believe they hear me well enough; my voice is strong enough to be understood, and I am going to continue in the same key. I wish to make a preliminary remark on this discussion, which may seem to have been a little too lengthy; but if it has been lengthy, this is due to the position taken by the Government. When I speak of the Government, I mean the leader of the Government, who is responsible, being the first promoter of the mode of discussion which has been followed. Hon. members on this side of the House have been charged with having been too long in their remarks, with having endeavored to obstruct legislation. The least that can be said of this attack is that it is unfair; and I may say here that if the discussion has been protracted it is due, to a large extent, to the position taken by the Government, and especially by the First Minister, who told us that he would pass the measure and force it upon us *de die in diem*, without leaving off. For my part, and I speak for myself only, I will never submit to any threat, to any violence, to any oppression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) As I said, we have resisted the pressure which has been brought to bear against us, and I rise again to say that I will oppose it to the bitter end. It has been attempted to wring a vote from us through length of time, by exhausting our physical strength; there was an attempt to starve us out, so to speak, but our opponents were mistaken; and if it is intended to starve us out, I believe that will be another mistake. We can perfectly well discuss the Bill as gentlemen ought to do, but not during unreasonable hours, like we did a few days ago, but during proper hours. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us consider the subject of the debate. The object of this Bill is to deprive the Province of Quebec from a right which it possesses; and I hope that the hon. members from that Province will break the silence which they have observed until now, saving two or three honorable exceptions, which I cannot help noticing with praise. But it seems to me that the other members who support the Government have observed a forced silence. Never since I am a member—and this is my fourth Parliament—have I witnessed such a silence, such crouching, as I witness now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; question.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) The best proof of what I state is that the shots take effect. The best proof is the yells I hear from the other side of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). In French.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) If the hon. member for Montmagny, instead of doing like the bird in the fable, instead of repeating what he hears, like a parrot, would himself answer the objections which have been raised against the Bill, he would do better than he does by making obstruction. But, on the other hand, if there has been obstruction, I am glad to notice—and I do not know whether a watch-word has been given—that for some time past these noises, this cock-crowing, which we were wont to hear, has ceased. But if it is intended to renew them I believe these gentlemen who are accustomed to it, who are sheep-like, will not gain much, and, for my part, it does not make a bit of difference to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question. Speak to the amendment.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Well, Mr. Chairman, I was saying, when I was interrupted, that I was in hopes that the members from the Province of Quebec, on so important a question, which concerns them directly, and with regard to which they will be called to account by the electors at the next election, and even before, because it is the custom to go before one's constituents after the Session, to give an account of one's parliamentary conduct—I say, I believe that they will have to explain the vote which they are going to give to-day. It is true the vote will not be recorded to-day, but it will be recorded ultimately, and that record will tell who supported the amendment and who opposed it. I said that a more unpopular measure in the Province of Quebec could not be brought down; and I here declare that if I had a bad wish to make to the Government, it would be to have that measure passed, which would be the crowning point of a host of other measures which are now before Parliament and which will go further than anything else towards destroying the prestige with which the First Minister has been surrounded up to this day. Now, taking public sentiment in the Province of Quebec for a basis, I openly declare that I am happy to find, even in the ranks of the Conservative party, the real expression of the sentiments of that Province, as given a moment ago by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault). That hon. member has explained in firm, calm and moderate language the position he has taken, and I completely endorse what he has said. I should like to hear from the other side of the House a reply which would be an answer to the arguments he has brought forward. His arguments appear to me to be incontrovertible. Will they be answered on the other side? I do not know; but if the obstinate silence which has been kept until now is persisted in, it is quite clear that hon. gentlemen will not try to answer them, or will refuse to answer them. I was struck—I am still struck—with the enormity of the cost which this change of system will involve. Taking, for the five years, the minimum of the costs of the preparation of the lists at $300,000 for each year, for the counties, you will have $1,500,000 of expenses, merely to have the voters' list for a new Parliament. I say this expense is entirely out of proportion to the resources of the country. I do not even add the ordinary expenses of the whole number of general elections which will take place, and which will necessitate another expense of $300,000 to $400,000. So that, if we reckon up the bye-elections, we have an amount of nearly $2,000,000. I say this is out of proportion with the resources of the country. Now, why should we change the present system? Is there any advantage whatever to do this? The only advantage is that which the Government hopes to get out of this law. There is no other for the Province of Quebec, nor for the other Provinces in Canada. As to the clause concerning qualification, a mechanic, a school teacher, a good citizen, will be deprived of their right of voting, and an Indian, who will happen to own a small property, worth $300 or $400 will be brought forward and put alongside of the civilised and reasonable man who has a direct interest in the State. Our population is going to revolt against such a proposition, and I believe that it has a perfect right to do so. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we would only give to the people of the country time enough to express their opinion we would receive, before long, a host of petitions against this Bill. The more it is known in some Provinces the more it is unpopular. And if the discussion is prolonged for some time yet, I am sure that the Province of Quebec—as the Province of Ontario has already done—will not fail to send in its protestation against the Bill which is now submitted to us. Perhaps before the end of this Parliament we will have occasion to receive a host of petitions, which will express the views of the people on this question; but still, if the people cannot be warned and informed in proper time on the true bearing of this law, at least during vacation, I have no doubt, that a host of petitions will be sent to the new Parliament, asking for the repeal of the law. Now, as the Government wanted, on this occasion, to create a precedent, by depriving Prince Edward Island of its electoral franchise, I believe I can see what is the intention of the Government towards the Pro-

vince of Quebec, and I can foresee that the effect of this precedent will also apply to the Province of Quebec. I am afraid of the weakness of the members from the Province of Quebec, who are going to give up our last safety plank. I see, by the example which I have had under my eyes, that they are going to sacrifice the Province of Quebec. Nevertheless, as far as I can protest in my own name, and on behalf of the electors of the Province which I have the honor to represent, I protest, with all my might, against this Bill, and I specially call the attention of the French Canadian Ministers who represent the Province of Quebec in the Cabinet, to this Bill; I entreat them to examine carefully the bearing of the vote they are going to give on this question, before they continue to support this Bill. I entreat them, for the sake of their personal interests and for the sake of the interests of the Province. The vote they are about to give will be a vote which will be a reproach to them hereafter, and which will always be on their conscience. But, in spite of my humble efforts, I believe that I will not be able to persuade them to retrace their steps. I know that it is difficult to give up a settled purpose, but whatever may be the result I shall have fulfilled a duty, and I am proud of fulfilling a solemn, grave and important duty towards my fellow citizens. I do not wish to be charged with taking advantage of the indulgence of the House by prolonging this debate beyond the ordinary limits, but I desire to enter here my most emphatic protest against this Bill. Many members on this side of the House have given the reasons why the Bill ought not to be adopted. I do not wish to recall a host of arguments which have been used, and which should have induced the Government not to persist in this Bill. I will simply say that one of the strongest objections is that which relates to the Government officers, who are called revising officers, and who have the control of the voters' list, while we have the municipal officers who, in good faith, legally, without any prejudices nor any preconceived ideas, prepare voters' lists which give full justice to the Province of Quebec. Consequently, I do not think that it will be beneficial to the Province of Quebec to change its franchise. On the contrary, we have the greatest possible interest to keep the present system, and I desire that it should be maintained, until there are abuses of such a serious character as to necessitate a change. Until now, not a single case has been pointed out in this House which would show that the system led to abuses. On the contrary, it has been asserted, and the fact was not denied by the other side of the House, that the system has worked perfectly well until now. I trust that we may expect that this Bill will not pass; but, on the other hand, if it passes it seems to me that it is a mental abberation on the part of the Government to insist on the adoption of such a Bill. With these few remarks I leave the amendment in your hands, and I hope it will meet with the assent of the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to embrace the privilege which has been kindly conceded to members of the House, to make a few remarks upon the amendment which has just been moved, and in doing so I shall endeavor to speak pointedly to the question under discussion. The First Minister yesterday charged members on this side of the House with obstructing the passage of the Bill. He seemed to have formed some misconception of this matter. Taking the First Minister's own definition of the latitude that pertains to a minority, I claim that we are quite within that limit. He says there should be full and ample time given to a minority to discuss the question in all its features. Sir, that is all we want, all we ask. He says after that full and ample time has been afforded for discussing a measure, and after the minority have availed themselves of the opportunity which is afforded them, the will of the majority must prevail. And so it will in this case. All that the Opposition are doing—those who are opposed to this Bill in its principle and details has been that a number of them—not the whole of them, though everyone has a perfect right to express his opinion on this Bill—but some members of the Opposition have expressed themselves with reference to the principles of the Bill, some addressing themselves to the discussion of a particular clause, and others may perhaps do so yet. While the Bill itself is objectionable in its principle, the clauses that we hold to be very objectionable, to be, in fact, almost dangerous in their nature, require ample discussion before the Bill becomes law, and so that we do confine ourselves within the limits laid down by the First Minister. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen opposite have found it necessary to charge us with a desire to destroy parliamentary institutions, and have stigmatised the course which has been taken by the Opposition in this debate as one which tends to bring parliamentary discussion and responsible government into disrepute. I do not think we are amenable to that charge. As an instance, showing the unfounded nature of the charge, let me bring a circumstance to your notice. On May 2nd, I find the following editorial in the *Mail* newspaper—and I hope you will not look so sternly at me, Mr. Chairman, because it is not very long.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope it is relevant.

Mr. PATERSON. It is pertinent, as you will see. On the 2nd May the *Mail* said: (The hon. gentleman then quoted from the Toronto *Mail*, of the 2nd May.) Now, that is the plan followed by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first place, the correspondent of the *Mail* sends to that newspaper a statement which is incorrect. I listened to the hon. leader of the Opposition criticising this Bill, and I noticed that he read largely from the Indian Act; but I do not think it can be truly said that he read that Act from beginning to end, with the other Acts amending it. Therefore, an incorrect statement is sent out: an editorial is based upon it, and it is given to us as true. Now, it must be within the knowlege of the members of this House, though some people in the country might be deceived by the editorial, that when it was charged by the hon. leader of the Opposition, when he spoke at the very introduction of this Bill——

Mr. CHAIRMAN, Order. I think the hon. gentleman is going beyond the record, when he is discussing what has taken place before. The question now is, the third clause of the Bill, Mr. Charlton's amendment, which has been read over and over again, and the amendment which Mr. Casgrain has just put into my hands; and the discussion of subjects outside of these is, I think, irregular.

Mr. PATERSON. I will bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman; but I think you will admit that, in closely replying to the arguments used by the hon. First Minister on these same propositions, I am quite within my limit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is not whether the time of the House has been delayed or not. It is the question of these amendments.

Mr. PATERSON. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that you will not find it necessary to attempt to restrain me beyond what I consider proper bounds if I convince you that I am within my rights.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. PATERSON. I feel that I am entitled to refer to this matter, and I think that the sense of the House and of the hon. First Minister himself would be against the statements he made on precisely the same motions on which I am speaking now being considered in order—proceeding with the quiet hearing and the pleased hearing we gave him on this side—and then my being told that in replying to his statements I am out of order. I am replying to the charge that in the speeches made and the course pursued by the Opposition they have endeavored to obstruct this Bill, and

the same charge might be made against him. Sir, that is not my motive or intention, and that will not be my act. I am here to speak to the amendments in your hands, and incidentally I may have occasion to refer to the sub-amendment. Now, speaking of the course of the Opposition, and having reference to the remarks I am about to make, I would challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point out how they can be considered factious or obstructive when I am addressing myself closely, as the other members of the Opposition have done, to the principles involved. Sir, the charge is as foundationless as was the charge made against the hon. leader of the Opposition, who, I think, spoke only a little over an hour altogether on that occasion. I think I have a right to allude to that charge, and I allude to it as an answer to the statements made by the other side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I admire the spirit of fair play of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), coming back from his ranches, where he has been enjoying himself.

Mr. IVES. I rise to Order. You have ruled that the hon. gentleman is not following the rules of the House. I merely called his attention to the ruling of the Chairman, and now he proposes to read me a lecture which I shall not submit to. There is no pertinency or relevancy in it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is a pertinency in referring to an impertinent interruption. The Chair is able to maintain order without suggestions from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. The hon. gentleman came back here yesterday, and he heard the hon. member for Lincoln travelling over the whole history of the Local House, from 1867 to 1878, and there never was a word of exception taken. I am speaking in precisely the same line as was taken by the hon. the First Minister himself. While there is no member who respects the Chair more than I do, and while I will endeavor to confine myself closely within the proper limit, the hon. First Minister, I am sure, will not contend that I should not be allowed to touch on the ground which he has covered himself. I am within the rules of debate when I refer to charges which have been made against myself, and which may be made against me when I sit down, that I have endeavored to obstruct the business of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. If the idea of hon. gentlemen is to break the thread of a discourse that might prove very interesting and instructive to them——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, would you kindly give me an idea of the words I should use and the sentiments which you want me to express, before I finish the sentence I was about to make. It is quite impossible, of course, to proceed if we are to be hampered in that way; it cannot be done. The hon. First Minister assured us that there was to be an opportunity given for full and ample discussion. He discussed the principle and the details of the Bill. The hon. member for Lincoln did the same.

Mr. RYKERT. No, I did not.

Mr. PATERSON. If I had spoken before on this amendment, there might be some justification in hon. members calling me to order in the summary manner in which they are disposed to do it, but I submit, under the circumstances, latitude greater than I desire to take, having been allowed to others, that it is not a very fair thing that they should avail themselves of points of order, which they really fail to maintain. Now, a resolution you have in your hands, proposes that the provincial franchises shall be retained for the Dominion elections, and, in discussing that proposition, we have been told that we are injuring representative institutions—that if a course like that is permitted, responsible government is at an end. The hon. First Minister took that line, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), took that line. Sir, responsible government is not thus easily destroyed. In order to maintain responsible government in this country, the hon. First Minister was quite right in turning, as he told us, a deaf ear to those of his supporters—for I suppose it was his supporters, it certainly was not gentlemen on this side—who intimated the desire that the clôture of some kind or other, English or American, should be applied to us. There is no danger of parliamentary institutions being brought into disrepute by this debate. The safety of responsible government in this Canada of ours rests on the good, sound, common sense of the people. If an Act is before the House that is a wise Act, an Act in the interests of the people, designed for the general good of the people, and if a party in the House, a minority, were to set themselves to prevent its passage by resisting it at every stage, such a course would be fatal to the minority. There is where the safeguard of responsible government and Parliamentary institutions rests; it rests in the fact that the people will not countenance, will not support or endorse the course of men who would offer obstruction to a measure that is in the public interest and designed for the public weal; and the people will be the judge of that. Therefore, the First Minister is safe; he need not tremble for responsible government, and the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), need not vex his righteous soul with reference to that point, because responsible government is safe in the hands of the people. If the policy which has been pursued by the Opposition were, and I deny it is, one of obstruction to a measure designed in the interests of the country, such a policy would be fatal to us, individually, and as a party, and the remedy lies in the hands of the First Minister. If the Government and their supporters believe the charges they make, let them apply the remedy that is in their own hands; let them dissolve the House and appeal to the people. Let them say: We wanted to pass a Franchise Bill, and the Opposition took occasion to debate it, clause by clause; they objected to it in principle and in detail; for days and hours they continued to debate it, though we made them sit up three days and nights continuously to wear them out. That is the course the Government should take. Will they dare to take it? Will they, as their organ advised, dissolve the House? Then, when the people pronounced on the question, we would willingly accept their decision, because they are the final arbiters. They say they should not be asked to dissolve the House. I tell you it is my fixed opinion that this is a more important question upon which to appeal to the people at the polls than the reason assigned for the premature appeal to the people in 1882, namely, that a few millions of dollars were waiting investment in this country to know what the National Policy was going to be. Is this not a more important question, when the whole control of the people, as far as election lists are concerned, is to be taken out of their hands and placed in the hands of irresponsible men, nominees of the Crown, not even responsible to the power who appointed them, with power given them to strike off or put on any name they please? A Bill which proposes to give a vote to the untutored savages of the West as well as those who are bound down under the Government of the day in the older Provinces? Is not the enlargement of the voting power to these people a question of more vital interest to the people than to ask them whether they should pronounce again on the National Policy, so that a few millions of money might come to be invested in the country, but which never came in. There is every reason—if we had

any reason in 1882—why this question should be submitted to the people. If our course be as hon. gentlemen say, if as they claim as they would feign claim, though not openly, this Bill is all that is good and fair and decent in the public interest, then let them appeal to the people to send them back and justify responsible government and secure the safety and permanence of parliamentary institutions. No; the charge does not lie. I think one great reason why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should pass is this, that if it prevails, this Bill will be disposed of virtually, and we will be enabled to proceed to the transaction of the public business of the country which is imperatively demanding attention at our hands. That leads me to look at the present condition of the country; for looking at that, I can give you a very strong reason why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail. On this point allow me to bring into the discussion the views of the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not often read extracts, but as the minority seemed to be blamed by the majority for urging the Government to drop this measure and proceed to public business, let me read some of the views of the friends of the Government outside. On April 28, the organ of the Government said:

"The illness of the Finance Minister, the preoccupation of the Premier, and the absorption of the Department of Militia, make it obvious that it will be wise to get parliamentary business finished, to drop what cannot be carried, and then to prorogue. The public have really ceased to take interest in parliamentary proceedings; and though these are not intended for public amusement, the lack of interest in them ought to render winding up easy. The Opposition may take objections; but the Opposition in times like this does not count. Indeed it is probable that there does exist a decent degree of pride and enthusiasm in our troops among the Opposition; and that the rank and file are willing to act generously towards the Government. The country would respond to generosity much more readily than to hostile criticism just now. And in any case criticism is almost useless since it can find no echoes in the press. The newspapers that published speeches now would be doomed Thus both the Government and the Opposition seem to have the same interest in a prorogation; and it is to be hoped that business will be pushed, and the Ministers left free to devote themselves to the serious duties of the situation.'

These are serious duties the Ministry have to attend to and it is desirable Parliament should be prorogued in order to do that business. If the amendment of my hon. friend from Norfolk were to prevail, one Bill that is not demanded by the public, and is not in the interest of the country would be disposed of, and we would be able to proceed to other business. On glancing at the Order paper, further reasons will be seen why this amendment should prevail. Supposing it did prevail, and that the reason was that the amount of business that had to be done. I had the curiosity to take up the journals of 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, and being in Opposition of course behaved themselves with the same noble conduct that distinguishes them as a Government majority. Anything they may have done in Opposition certainly would not be called obstruction or delay of public business; there could be no objection taken to the course they pursued. Therefore, I looked up their record, in order that I might influence hon. gentlemen opposite in coming to a determination as to the amount of business to be done and the time it would take us to discharge it even if we were not troubled with the consideration of this Bill, as we would not be if the amendment of my hon. friend were carried. I found that, in 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, we were in committee on the Estimates twenty days, apart from the days spent in debate on motions in amendment to Committee of Supply. This House has been in Committee of Supply three days. In that case seventeen days more are necessary for us to be in Supply, taking our precedent from the course of hon. gentlemen opposite when they thought it was necessary, and who will say it is not necessary now, when the Estimates embrace millions and millions more than they did in 1878. Then we have to concur in the Estimates, and I think I shall not be extravagant if I say that we ought to take three days in doing that. Then we have the Manitoba better terms, arranging terms with one Province of this Dominion, which will bring up a discussion that is very important, and may introduce the financial condition of many other Provinces that are even now asking for additional grants. I think it would not be unreasonable to say that three days would be required to do anything like justice to those resolutions. They would have to be adopted first, to be formed in a Bill which would have to pass its first, second and third readings, and to be considered clause by clause in Committee. We are still in Committee of Ways and Means. No concurrence has yet been taken in matters affecting the whole industries of the country. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that two days would elapse before we could finish the business of the Committee of Ways and Means. Then there is the Insolvency Bill. I think I shall be quite within the mark if I say that we ought to take three days in discussing that Bill, putting it through all its various readings, and settling a matter which is of the deepest interest to the mercantile people of this country, on which great diversity of opinion prevailed in the committee, and on which a similar diversity of opinion will prevail in this House. I do not think I am beyond the mark in saying that three days should be given to the discussion of that measure.

An hon. MEMBER. Six days.

Mr. PATERSON. No one would charge upon this House anything like a desire to obstruct public business if it took six days to discuss this measure, but I have only put down three days. Then we have the Insurance Act. We know the diversity of opinion that exists in regard to that measure, but I have ventured to put down only one day for that Government measure, and I think the House will agree that I have not estimated too much in that case. Then there are the resolutions respecting the Court of Claims, and the first, second and third reading of the Bill to be founded on them, and the consideration in the committee. I have put down only one day for that. Then there is the Bill in regard to the North-West Mounted Police, enlarging the force, which may bring up the whole question of the North-West. Who will say that one day will be too much to give to that subject. Then there is the Chinese Bill. An expensive commission was sent out last year to enquire into that matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking to the question. I am giving my reasons why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should pass, and the hon. gentleman is not following me closely, or he would see how pertinent my remarks are. In a measure of the magnitude of the Chinese question, which required many weeks to decide in the neighboring republic, I think I am very reasonable in limiting the discussion here to two days. Then we have the representation of Canada at the International Exhibition in London. Who will say that we should not have one day to discuss that? Certainly we should have a proper exhibition before the assembled colonies and the Indian Empire, and we require a certain amount of time to discuss that matter. Then there is the Bill for the Consolidation of the Statutes, with all the lawyers in the House anxious to speak in reference to it, and in regard to these two large volumes that are before us now. Will not two days be reasonable for the consideration of that matter? Then we have the Act suspending the operation of the McCarthy License Act, a question which has thrown the whole country into confusion, but I have only put down one day for considering that matter. Then we have the Library of Parliament, where we are putting in an extra head and changing the whole

programme; but I put down only one day for that. Then there are the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions, which are so important in their nature that it would not be a waste of time, in the interests of this country, if ten days of this House were given to debating that question, when the Company has come back, for the third time, for a re-arrangement of the terms that we made with them and of the bargain which we supposed was final.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PATERSON. Again I say that hon. gentlemen are not following the thread of my argument, which is perfectly pertinent to the question before the Chair. There are many other Acts which hon. gentlemen have to consider. There are six notices of motion by members of the Government, the resolutions for which have not yet been taken, but, leaving them out altogether, I find that there would be forty-eight days consumed in the business which I have enumerated. I am within the sense of the House when I ask whether the House should not take that time to discharge its duty in regard to these matters. You have but forty-three days from now to the 1st July, giving every day to the Government, for we will not sit on Sabbath. You have on your paper business that cannot be done satisfactorily, receiving the attention which it ought to receive at the hands of Parliament, and finished before the 10th or 15th July, even if you do not go into a discussion of the more important matters before the House, even if the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail and should relieve us from further consideration of this question. I think I have shown that there is business enough on the paper to demand the attention of the House, even on every day except Sundays, even if this amendment should prevail. Sir, I have another reason to offer why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should prevail, and that is, I believe that the people of the country desire to retain the provincial franchises as the basis for an election to the Dominion House. Why do I say so? I think so because there has been no demand from any quarter, from any Province, from any municipality, from any of the people of this land, from any individual in the land, so far as I know, asking to have the present state of things changed. If there are any, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to know it, and it will be something new for them to rise and give it to the committée. We find that no section of the press has asked for it, which is the great mouth of the people. There have been no petitions presented, there have been no requests from any direction, not only from any Province, or from any municipality, but from any individual, asking for it. Has there been any indication of the popular will on the other hand? Yes. I believe there is not an independent political paper in Canada to-day, that I know of, that does not say that this Bill is not demanded, that this Bill is not in the interests of the country, that this Bill ought not to become law. I say it ought not to pass, either, because hon. members in this House have not been able to defend this Bill. Neither in the House, nor in the country, nor in the press, have they been able to defend the Bill, or the provisions of their Bill. Any hon. gentlemen opposite who have risen to speak in reference to this Bill, have spoken aside from the question, have not confined themselves to the question, as I am doing at the present time. And their press has not dared to defend it, and whenever their press have attempted a defence of the Bill, they have misstated its provisions, and have not stated what the Bill really is, and their defence has been no defence. They have misstated the effects of the Indian clause, they have misstated the revising barristers provision, and the clauses that pertain to that. There has been no defence of the Bill, properly so called, made either in this House or by the press of hon. gentlemen opposite. And petitions are before the House demanding that it shall not become law; meetings are being held, and the people pronounce against it. Yet in face of all that, hon. gentleman, with their organ advising them to drop useless measures, and go on with the 48 days' business before us, outside of this Bill—hon. gentlemen are disposed to vote down the proposition, I suppose, of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which, if it prevails, will render this Bill unnecessary. For 18 years we have been working under the old system. In 18 years, so far as I am aware, there has never been one single complaint heard in this House or out of the House, in reference to it working unequally, with reference to it doing any injury to any of the people of the country. Under the law, as it has been in the years past, hon. members opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, find themselves in their seats as members of Parliament. The only pretension they give is that we have a right to regulate our own franchise. Granted; and we have done it. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out, in the clearest manner yesterday, how this Parliament, recognising its rights, had declared its rights, and had placed on the Statute Book its willing reference to this matter. Parliament has maintained its rights, and therefore the only argument we have heard—if argument it may be called—that we have a right to do it, was most effectually disposed of by my hon. friend. Now, Sir, we have been blamed because we do not come down to what they call the enacting clauses. The First Minister blamed us yesterday, and other members have done so, as having spent too much time discussing the interpretation clauses, saying that if we had come down to the enacting clauses and discussed them there, we might arrive at conclusions. Now, what were the facts with reference to that? We discussed the whole woman question on the interpretation clause at the request of the leader of the Government, and yet he found fault with us immediately afterwards because we discussed the Indian question on precisely the first interpretation clause. But more than that: In the very section of the interpretation clause on which we were discussing the Indian question, and for which we were rebuked for discussing the Indian question in the improper place, what did the First Minister do? It was on that very same section of the interpretation clause that the First Minister dealt with the whole Chinese question, for it was in there that he put in the words "excluding the Chinese." Such is the consistency of hon. gentlemen opposite. They undertake to lecture us for bringing on the discussion at improper places, and yet the very same gentlemen settle the whole Chinese question in precisely the same sub-section of the interpretation clause and on the previous one they settled the woman question. Now you can see how captious the objections are that we do not discuss these questions in their proper places. But hon. gentlemen say: If you go on, as you get further down, we will listen to the arguments that have to be advanced. On this point I see the right hon. gentleman is reported in his organ, the Ottawa *Citizen*—for I have not seen the *Hansard* of yesterday—as saying what I did not exactly understand him to say. I understood him to say that it could perhaps, be give and take when we got done; that he could meet the views of hon. members on this side of the House. But I see the *Citizen* reports the hon. gentleman as saying:

"If the Government and those who supported the Government desired that every clause of the Bill should be fully and fairly discussed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and that there should be a give and take in settling the details of the Bill——"

That is the whole thing. If the Governmen and their supporters desired it, there might be give and take. Well, now, that "if" there is rather an uncertain thing. I do not know, even, that if that "if" was left out, and the proposition were made by hon. gentlemen opposite to say:

We will have a little give and take on this matter. I do not know, from past procedure in Parliament, whether we would be warranted in anticipating much of the "give" on their part unless we had something a little more definite with reference to what it was to be. I am afraid their division with us would be something like the division of the man who was all the time quarrelling with his family, and who, one day, surprised his neighbors by saying that the quarrel had ceased, and that he had settled the matter satisfactorily now, because he had divided the house with his family. They asked him: How he had managed that? "O!" he says, "I gave the family the outside of the house, and I took the inside." Now I think that is about the way hon. gentlemen opposite would do in this give and take business. They would be willing to take the inside of the House and give us the outside—give it to us willingly, there is no doubt about that; because they understand that the Bill will do that for them, and that is the design of it. They mean to get us out. We have succeeded in getting back here in spite of them, under very difficult circumstances—many members of the Opposition; and now they design to make it still more difficult; they design by their Bill to secure for themselves almost the entire representation in this House for the Conservative party. Sir, we want something a little more definite about that give and take, before we could have very much faith in their offer. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read you a comment from the Montreal *Gazette* with reference to the Bill before the House. I propose to answer that, and in the answers I shall give, you will see our reasons why the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail. The Montreal *Gazette*, I quote the article from another paper—but no doubt it is correctly given—says:

"There are three principal objections urged by the Opposition against the measure: first, that it enfranchises the Indians of the plains; secondly, that it contracts the suffrage, taking the country over; thirdly, that it gives over absolutely the preparation of the voters' lists to the henchmen of the Government of the day; and we are bound to say that, if these objections were well taken, the measure would deserve to be rejected by Parliament."

As to the first question: That it enfranchises the Indians of the plains, if it is true, what will hon. gentlemen do with the definite statement made from his place by the First Minister when he said the Bill would enfranchise the Indians of the plains; when he said, in answer to a direct question put to him, that it would enfranchise Poundmaker and Big Bear. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if it is not true, how was it that the First Minister, in reply to a direct question I put to him on Monday last as to whether it would enfranchise the tribal Indians, he replied, to the amazement of many of his followers, that it did if they had the same property qualifications. It is a mere technicality to say that the North-West is not represented in this House. The North-West is to be represented. At all events, the Indians on the plains of Manitoba, dwelling on their reserves, ignorant and besotted as they are described by many, are, under the provisions of this Bill, enfranchised—that is, if you may so degrade the word; they are given the same privilege as the white man who has the responsibilities of manhood upon him. If the First Minister has subsequently, when he found himself sorely pressed, announced that he would exempt British Columbia and Manitoba from the operations of this Bill when he came to the clauses, that statement proves that under the Bill they are not exempt. They are there, and the Montreal *Gazette* can make up its mind that the Bill gives the vote to Indians on the plain. This statement has been made by the First Minister; hon. gentlemen opposite have heard it from his own lips; they can read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has given a challenge that no hon. gentleman can deny that the decision of this House as regards this Bill has been to enfranchise the Indians of the plains. That may be so; but I do not so understand it. I understand that what was done in relation to the interpretation clauses was to make a declaration in regard to the Indian that he was a person; but the House has yet to declare when it comes to the section dealing with the question whether they will enfranchise the Indians of the plains. If they enfranchise the Indians of the plains or anywhere else unless qualified as white men are qualified either by intelligence or property it will meet with my hostility, and I do not believe this House will do it.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very glad to hear it but the hon. gentleman did not catch the statement I had made. My statement was that they were enfranchised under the Bill as drawn. With the great influence of the hon. gentleman and his independent position, and with the influence of supporters of the Government who may hesitate to accept such a proposition now that it has been pointed out may lead to some change; but the very fact that any exemption needs to be put into the Bill shows it is not there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. If hon. members utter tones of derision they are deriding the explicit statements of the leader of the Government. We now come to the next point: That it contracts the suffrage, taking the country over. That has been abundantly proved by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. No one can controvert the statement. Does any one deny that this Bill contracts the franchise in British Columbia, where there is manhood suffrage, or in Prince Edward Island, when members who support the Government are moving and supporting an amendment declaring that the Act does injustice to them? The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and other speakers have abundantly proved that in Ontario it will not give the suffrage to thousands who are enfranchised under the Act passed by the Mowat Government. In Nova Scotia I am told it will contract the franchise. In New Brunswick it is claimed that the Bill will contract it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. It is very well for hon. gentlemen to say no, but let them rise and show in what particulars our statements are wrong. In the Province of Quebec the franchise is not contracted. With respect to the third proposition, which runs as follows: That it gives over absolutely the preparation of the voters' lists to the henchmen of the Government of the day. I do not use the term "henchmen;" I do not know what the connection may be. No one can deny that the clause with respect to revising barristers hands over the power to make and revise the lists to nominees of the Government. I have conclusively proved the truth of the three propositions set out in the *Gazette*, and therefore I am justified in opposing this Bill, for the editor himself says that we are bound to say that, if those objections are well taken, the measure deserves to be rejected by Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny that the Bill as drawn, without considering amendments that may have been suggested in caucus, will enfranchise tribal Indians. They cannot deny that the suffrage is contracted in Ontario, that it is contracted in Prince Edward Island, in British Columbia, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswich, and in Manitoba if they can. Until they do maintain their case we hold that our case has been proved by the statements and facts which have been elicited by hon. gentlemen on this side. With regard to the revising barrister, I would like to see a man on that side bold enough to say that the control of the list is not handed over to these gentlemen. Their newspapers, which do not feel the same responsibility that is felt by members of Parliament, may say so, but I do not think any hon. member will venture upon such a statement. I do not know what changes may be made, but changes

have been promised, because the Opposition in this House stood up for the rights of the people and pointed out to the amazement of hon. gentlemen opposite, what the provisions of the Bill are, but we have had only one amendment of those which have been promised, thus far. There may be an amendment with reference to the revising barristers, but we do not know what it is to be, we are discussing the Bill as it is now, we have no such amendment before us, and I repeat is any hon. gentleman here bold enough to say that the control of the voters' lists will not be handed over absolutely to the gentlemen who are appointed revising barristers? I say that a more shameless provision never was found in any Bill. Hon. gentlemen talk about English practice and precedents, but can you mention any English statesman who would so far forget himself and the duty he owes to his country as to introduce a Bill into Parliament to give to the nominee of a Government the control which is given by this Bill to the revising barrister? These hon. gentlemen say in their papers that it is the same system that is in force in England, but hon. gentlemen do not say so here, because they know that it is not the same system. They know that the revising barristers in England are not appointed as it is proposed to appoint them here, and have not the power entrusted to them so absolutely as these men will have it if the Bill passes. Mr. Chairman, have you thought that the gentleman who rose last night and attempted a defence of this Bill—I refer to the hon. member for Lincoln—could be appointed a revising barrister under the provisions of this Bill.

Mr CHAIRMAN. I do not think that is the clause we are discussing.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. How does it come under the clause or the amendment?

Mr. PATERSON. It comes under the amendment, because if this amendment prevails the revising barrister clause would be wiped out.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. Besides, Sir, I am only following the line of argument adopted by the hon. member for Lincoln, and so I cannot be out of order—it is impossible. I am alluding to his argument with reference to this clause, I am speaking to the same motion, and I say that it must have struck you, Mr. Chairman, that under the provisions of this Bill, that gentleman being a barrister of over five years' standing, could have himself appointed as revising barrister for Lincoln, could fix up the rolls for himself, could then resign his office, and could run as a member of Parliament. The rolls might be fixed up by himself; no one could appeal against them; and that any man should support and defend such a proposition in connection with the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, is something very difficult of comprehension. Shall it be said that it would be a shameless thing for a man to do anything of that kind? Granted; but how much more shameless would it be than that a member of Parliament should sit here and use his power along with the power of others, before a general election came on, to have Reform townships thrown off his riding and Conservative townships thrown in, in order to make his seat secure. I say there is a danger that, under this Bill, any hon. gentleman who is a barrister of over five years' standing might himself be appointed to that position, might make up the lists, might then resign, and be elected as a member of this House on those lists.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will see that we are not discussing the Bill as a whole, but the third clause, and that the revising barrister does not come up under that clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. There is the amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes, there is the amendment, but the revising barrister is not discussed in the amendment, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will observe that I have so ruled.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think, Sir, you have ruled as to whether the amendment affects the revising barrister clause or not. If the amendment of the hon. member for Norfolk carries, change must necessarily be made, and the revising barrister clause must go out with the others, so it is certainly in order to discuss that provision in connection with an amendment which proposes to substitute something else for it.

Mr. MILLS. The amendment of the hon. member for Norfolk is a proposition to adopt generally the provincial franchise, instead of the third clause of the Bill, and one of the provisions of the provincial law relates to the way in which the voters' lists are prepared. I think it is quite open to my hon. friend in arguing this question to argue that you should get rid of this objectionable feature, the revising barrister, by the adoption of the amendment. It is an argument to show why the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Under the provincial franchise we hold courts of revision whose functions are somewhat the same as those of the revising barrister, and it will be impossible to discuss this question of a provincial franchise without having to refer to the revising barrister, who is the chief functionary under this Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It seems to me that the question of the provincial franchises has nothing to do with the manner in which the lists are prepared. It has simply to do with the question of the qualification of voters under a provincial franchise. The third clause of this Bill declares what shall be the basis of the franchise in cities and towns. It is moved in amendment that the provincial franchises—that is to say, the qualifications under the provincial franchises—shall be substituted for these qualifications. That is all.

Mr. CASEY. No, no.

Mr. WHITE. That is all, as I understand it. The question therefore as to how those provincial franchises are to be embodied in voters' lists does not come up under the amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call attention to the fact that on a precisely similar amendment—unless I misunderstood it—the hon. member for Lincoln undoubtedly adopted a line of argument which would fully justify the reply of the hon. member for Brant.

Mr. RYKERT. Not at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I so understood it and others beside me understood the same. I have not *Hansard*, or I think, Mr. Chairman, I could convince you, on that question. No doubt you have not been as able as some of us to follow closely the intricacies of this discussion, but when *Hansard* comes, I think you will find that the hon. member for Lincoln took a great deal more latitude than the hon. member for Brant has taken.

Mr. CASEY. In answer to the objection of the hon. member for Cardwell, I would say that the amendment says that all persons qualified to vote shall be qualified and enrolled under this Act. Now, no person is qualified in any Province where there is a voters' list until his name is on the list and it has been revised with his name on. I think, therefore, the whole machinery of making the voters' lists comes up on this amendment.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). If you say we are all out of order in this discussion, I am perfectly satisfied to take

your ruling and to sit down; but if I understood you to invite discussion, I will go on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am ready to hear discussion.

Mr. LANDRY. Then, I think the hon. member on this side of the House has taken the proper stand. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk is in precisely the same words as the law at present. It has been copied from the Act of 1874. What it says is that all persons qualified to vote for members for the Legislative Assembly shall be those who vote for members of the House of Commons. How are we to arrive at who the persons qualified are? How are we to get the evidence? If this amendment should be adopted, cannot we establish our own tribunal for the purpose of ascertaining who are qualified? Cannot we say who shall be the tribunal to determine those who are qualified to vote, either revising barristers or municipal councils, or anybody you like? You may adopt the lists in the Province of Quebec or in the Province of New Brunswick, but that is not adopting the tribunal. Look at the law of 1874, and you will find that, in the same paragraph that contains the words of the amendment, it says:

"And all lists of voters made and prepared, and which would, according to the laws in force in the said several Provinces, be used if the election were that of a representative or representatives to the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the Province in which the election is held, shall be the lists of voters."

It was thought necessary to say what list should be used, and in this amendment nothing is said about the lists. It simply says that we shall take the qualifications in the different Provinces. If we adopted it, I claim that we could still say what tribunal shall establish, who possess those qualifications; and in view of that, it is entirely improper to discuss now the provisions of this Bill which refer to the tribunal which shall establish what persons shall vote.

Mr. RYKERT. Hon. gentlemen opposite have entirely misunderstood my argument of yesterday. In all their speeches, hon. gentlemen have complained that the revising barristers would cause a great deal of expense. In reply to that, I stated that they had always been in favor of revising barristers, and I quoted extracts from speeches to show that they had. I said nothing more nor less than that.

Mr. MILLS. In reply to what the hon. member for Kent, N.B., has said, I hold that the adoption of the amendment does necessarily imply the adoption of the voters' lists and the machinery of the Provinces. How is it possible to say that the party who is qualified under the law of the Province to exercise the franchise shall be qualified under this law unless you adopt all the machinery that the Province provides? Suppose you adopt the revising barristers under this Bill, and they came to a different conclusion from that of the provincial authorities; you would have two voters' lists different from each other. If you adopt the amendment, which provides for adopting the qualifications that prevail in the different Provinces, you adopt the lists of the Provinces. Therefore, under that clause, you have the whole question brought up as to the revising barristers, and it is an argument in favor of that policy that by the adoption of it you adopt the local machinery and save the cost of this operation.

Mr. EDGAR. Surely it will be admitted that we are discussing the qualification under the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The qualification of voters in the Province of Ontario, for example, under the present law, is entirely based upon the assessment roll; if a person's name is on the assessment roll, he is qualified, otherwise he cannot be qualified. When we are discussing that we discuss the assessment roll as against the other machinery provided in this Act for making the lists of voters. It is proposed in this new law to base the lists on something different from the assessment roll, and how we can discuss the qualifications without bringing that into the discussion I fail to see. This very clause 3 provides that a person to be entitled to vote must be registered on the lists of voters for any electoral district; and in the interpretation clause, which we have passed, we find that "lists of voters means the lists of registered voters to be prepared and revised under the provisions of this Act in each year." If there is anything that it is plain on the face of this section is to be discussed, it is the creation of that voters' list, and that can only be done by discussing the mode of revision provided by this law.

Mr. TROW. Custom should, in a great measure, govern your ruling. Members have often travelled out of the record in this debate, and you have to take their conduct into consideration in ruling upon others. The hon. member for Lincoln last night travelled all over creation and part of the States. No one can deny that he invariably travels all over the world.

Mr. BOWELL. I think any one reading this amendment must come to the conclusion that your ruling is strictly correct.

Mr. CASEY. He has not ruled yet.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood that he had ruled. However, I am ready to admit with the hon. member that nearly every speaker has travelled beyond the record; but as I understand, if the amendment to the amendment be carried, it exempts the Province of Quebec from the operation of this law so far as the qualifications for voters are concerned. If you adopt the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, it substitutes the qualifications for voters in the different Provinces for the qualifications which are contained in the clause under discussion, and nothing more. We will suppose, for argument sake, that this motion is carried, and that clause No. 3 is striken out of the Bill. That clause provides what will be the qualifications of voters in towns and cities of the Dominion. Strike it out and substitute the amendment which says:

"That all the words in section 3 be struck out and the following substituted in place thereof: Subject to the exceptions herein contained, all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives in the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several Provinces comprising the Dominion of Canada, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such Provinces respectively."

That affirms the qualification for the voters in each of the Provinces, as it exists at present in towns and cities, and nothing more. It has nothing whatever to do with, nor does it refer even incidentally to, the mode in which the lists hereafter may be made up. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says a person is not qualified to vote unless he is on the assessment roll. That is true, but he must be qualified under the law in regard to property and age and to being a British subject and in other respects before he can be placed on the assessment roll, so that the assessment roll is only evidence that the man whose name is entered upon it has all the qualifications necessary to enable him to vote. If improperly placed on that roll he can be taken off it; if it be shown that he cast an illegal vote he can be struck off in the scrutiny. I am of opinion that all that should be strictly discussed is the qualification of voters in the cities.

Mr. WELDON. The qualification is composed of two things: first of a certain amount of property, and then of the fact that the name is recorded on the assessment roll. A man must have the qualification before he can be assessed; and for the purpose of ascertaining the qualification, we have to ascertain whether he has a certain amount of property and whether he is assessed. His qualification is that he is not only an owner of property, but that he is a qualified voter on the register.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). After the voters' lists are made up, and a gentleman has managed, somehow or other, to get his name on the roll, who is not entitled to vote, through his not being a British subject, or through his being an alien, or not being of age, or from other cause, is put to his oath, his vote then can be rejected. Therefore the evidence is not the list but the qualification.

Mr. WELDON. If he is on the register, he is entitled to vote; that is not the place to test the qualification.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend says that is not the place to test the qualification. True, that is not the place the law has provided to test the qualification; but if when a man goes to vote, knowing that he is not entitled to vote, and the test is put to him, he cannot take the oath without perjuring himself, and therefore does not take it.

Mr. LANDRY. By the oath he swears he is a qualified voter, 21 years of age, and a British subject, and a resident, etc. He must swear to the three things, if called on.

Mr. WELDON. He has got to have the qualification, showing where he resides, and that he is the person named on the register. If not on the register he cannot vote.

Mr. DAVIES. The proposition is that this debate shall be confined simply to the qualification of those who have a vote. That clearly confines it in much narrower bounds than even the original proposition before the House. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has already pointed out, that by the propositions already submitted in the 3rd clause, every person shall be entitled to be registered on the list of voters if he possesses certain qualifications. What is the list? You have already passed a clause defining what that is. "The list to be prepared and revised under the provisions of this Act." In discussing the 3rd clause we must discuss therefore in what manner the lists are to be prepared and revised under the provisions of the Act. To determine whether a man can vote or not we must ascertain in what manner the list of voters is to be made up. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk deals with all persons qualified to vote. But no one can be qualified to vote unless he be on the list of voters. It is essential to be on the list of voters as to be possessed of the qualifications.

Mr. LANDRY. You may be on the list and cannot vote.

Mr. DAVIES. Unless he is on the list he cannot vote. What we must discuss is the system of putting him on the list, whether that system put in force by the Provincial Legislatures is cheaper than the one proposed. It is necessary therefore for him, before he can give an intelligent vote, to contrast the one with the other, and, if he comes to the conclusion, as he was pointing out to the House, that this system was much more extravagant than the local system, he will vote for the local on that ground alone.

Mr. MULOCK. It surely cannot be contended at this stage of the debate that any hon. gentleman could be out of order by referring, incidentally at least, to the revising officer, because there seems to have been no limit to the latitude allowed previous speakers. Yesterday, the First Minister was permitted to have as much latitude as he desired, and I think my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) was in no way controlled. If I remember rightly, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) also dealt with some matters that did not relate to the franchise in cities and towns. I think that yesterday we discussed the whole question of Indian franchise over again, and that was considered in order.

Mr. LANDRY. That is no good reason why there should be disorder to-day.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that hon. gentlemen on one side should be allowed a latitude which is not given to those on the other side.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any reason to complain of my not having allowed every latitude to any remarks which could be at all considered as having a bearing upon the question before the House. I have given that latitude from the commencement of this debate, and I have never raised a question of order in regard to any incidental reference to the revising barrister provisions, but, when the hon. gentleman took that up as the main question before the House and discussed it in that way, I think it was out of order, and therefore I have called the attention of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) to the fact that the question is not whether the persons on the lists to vote for the Provincial Legislature should be those who should be entitled to vote at the Dominion elections, but as to "all persons who are qualified to vote," not all persons who are on the lists. It does not raise the question as to the lists. Of course, the question of the manner of preparing the lists for the Local Legislatures has been fully discussed, but I think hon. members ought to consider what is the amendment mainly before the House, and should refer incidentally to other matters, but not as if they were the main questions before the committee. I thought the hon. member for Brant was addressing himself to this rather as if it were the main motion than as an incidental question arising out of the motion before the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is unfortunate that I was unable to let you see that I was alluding to the revising barrister incidentally. I was not proposing to discuss the revising barrister clause at all, but was only alluding to it incidentally and endeavoring to point out how it bore on the clause under consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. PATERSON. Time is precious, so I will speak up to six o'clock. It is something admirable to witness hon. gentlemen, who listen for one whole hour to a gentleman on one side of the subject, continually taking points of order when a gentleman on the other side is speaking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I feel that gentlemen who act in such a way deserve to be enlightened and to have information given to them. That is what such gallant and chivalrous conduct demands. I hope they will continue to maintain the proprieties of debate and will call me to order at every possible opportunity. In this way they may become educated as to the bearing of clause 3. There is a difference of opinion between the learned gentlemen from New Brunswick as to how this clause affects their lists, and that is a question which should be discussed, because, when lawyers do not agree, it can hardly be expected that laymen will. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has not spoken except on a point of Order, but I should like to hear him speak on this subject to see if he could keep in order. I think that, at this late period of the Session, every minute we have is valuable, and when, after hon. gentlemen have consumed 20 minutes of valuable time in arguing a point of order, they want to make it six o'clock at five minutes before six, that manifests a desire to waste time which should be reprehended.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) I shall have to trespass on the patience of the committee for a short time only, while I allude to one or two other points which I was unable to treat before you left the Chair at six o'clock. In doing so, I will endeavor to conform to what you have laid down as

the proper subjects that may be discussed. I desire to say a few words with reference to the Indian question; as the Indian is to be included in this word "person," and as such be entitled to be registered on the voters' list, it is pertinent that we should enquire in what condition he is found. In the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) last night on this question, I find a justification for the lengthened debate that has taken place upon that subject on the interpretation clause. It appeared from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that while we thought that question had been thoroughly discussed a week ago last Monday, we find that the hon. gentleman's mind is still in the dark as to the difference that exists between the person Indian, and the other persons that are mentioned in the Bill. My hon. friend from Lincoln also referred to some remarks of mine with reference to my advocacy of the enfranchisement of the Indians in the year 1880, and in 1876. Perhaps he was away when I went fully into that explanation of my position, which, I think, satisfied most hon. gentlemen opposite that we occupy precisely the same position now, with reference to the matter, that we have always done. It must be clear now, that in the Bill before us, the names of Indians that it is proposed to enter upon the voters' lists, are not the names of those who are in the same position as the hon. member for Lincoln thought, and are not in the same position as their white brethren. The proposition in the Bill is that the word "person" shall include an Indian, and that being so, we would find that under section 3, he would be entitled to be ranked on the list of voters. Now, if that referred to the enfranchised Indians, the House would agree with it. No one pretends to deny that the Indian who is enfranchised, and in the same position as other citizens of this country, should not have the same rights. The Bill under consideration, however, does not enfranchise the Indian; it is impossible for the Bill to enfranchise the Indian. If the Indian's name be entered upon the list of voters under the operations of this Bill, he is not thereby enfranchised, he does not thereby assume the responsibilities of other citizens. The Indian will be on the list of voters, but he will be there in a state of tutelage, a ward of the Government, his actions controlled by the Government, unable to make any contract on his own account, and unable to deal with his own property without the direction and supervision of the Superintendent General, not liable to the duties that devolve upon other classes of citizens; he will simply have his name entered upon the list of voters and be entitled to vote while he maintains his tribal relation, while he is still under the operation of the Indian Act, while he is still the ward of the Government. The clauses of the Indian Act have been read by different members of this House, and every one of those clauses declare that in almost all his actions he is subject to the control and will of the Superintendent General; and therefore, I hold, Sir, that Indians in that position are not entitled to have their names entered upon the list of voters. The Indian can only be enfranchised under the operations of the machinery provided in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act, and whenever he is thus enfranchised he is entitled to all the rights and privileges of other citizens of this country, including the right to vote. The distinctions between him and other citizens are then wiped out, and until they are wiped out, and until he has assumed those responsibilities, it is an injustice and an inequality to give him a vote. But my hon. friend from Lincoln says that the Indian pays his share of taxes by way of customs and excise revenues that are collected in this country on the goods he consumes and the clothes he wears. Granted; but, as I said to him last night, the son of the hon. member for Lincoln, my son, your son, the sons of all the whitemen and all the freemen in this country, take them at 18 years of age, pay their taxes to the general Government. They wear clothes on which duties are paid, they consume goods on which taxes are levied, they contribute as much—in the vast majority of cases, they contribute more—to the revenues of this country than the unenfranchised Indian. Who will deny that the young men of this country over 18 years of age do not contribute more to the revenue of this country than the Indian. Yet this Bill proposes to give to the unenfranchised Indian who is a minor in the eye of the law, who is a ward of the Government, whom you cannot sue, who assumes none of the responsibilities of citizenship, the right to have his name put upon the voters' list, and to exercise the franchise; but your son, and my son, and the sons of all the freemen of this country, under 21 years of age, may not be entered on that list. Your boy, Sir, 18 years of age, and the boy of every other man contributing to the revenues, is subject to the Government laying its hand upon him and saying: We want you to march to the front to defend the life and property of the citizens of this Dominion. When he is over 18 years of age he is subject to military duty, and though he contributes to the revenue of this country he is denied the franchise. Sir, if there is any effect in the argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite that the enfranchised Indian, while continuing his tribal relations, and in a state of subjection to the Government, is to be permitted to vote, I say there is no reasonable ground upon which you can stand and deny that vote to the young men over 18 years of age in this country, who pay more taxes than the unenfranchised Indian, who are liable to military duty, when the older members of the community are exempted; and yet the Bill does not propose to give the franchise to them. I suppose a proposition to that effect would be voted down by the hon. member for Lincoln, and at the same time he proposes to give a vote to unenfranchised Indians who have not so much control of their actions as have young men of 18 years of age. You cannot bind youths without the consent of their parents; but in the vast majority of cases they are allowed to make what arrangements they can with their employers, to draw their own pay, and spend their own money, and control their own actions, and such young men who have been educated in our public institutions, who are the first to volunteer in defence of the country, who read the newspapers and study political history, are not to be allowed to vote; but the unenfranchised Indians under the control of the Government to a greater degree than the boy is under the control of the father, unable to read or write, who, in many cases, take the position that they are not subjects but aliens, are to be given the franchise. These are questions that must suggest themselves to members of the committee. I desire to repeat that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House desire to see the Indian enfranchised. That is the only solution of the matter, but I agree with the First Minister that it does not do to force measures on the Indians, to declare that the unenfranchised Indians shall be enfranchised, shall have their own property and look out for themselves. That would not be a wise course when they have been so long in a state of tutelage. But there should be votes given to them under the operation of the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act, and I would be glad to assist the First Minister in such a measure, which only could be carried by amendments to the Indian Act. But this Bill gives Indians the right to vote, and still leaves them in a state of tutelage and dependence upon the Government. In respect to clause 3, members of the committee cannot have failed to observe that in the history of Parliament we have had questions of assessment rolls and assessments, and voters' lists, brought before the House for the first time. It is not to be wondered at that so many of us require so much information and discussion in order to enable us to rightly understand them. We have to get to understand the machinery, the mode of assessment and the qualifications, not in one Province, but

in all the Provinces of the Dominion. I do not yet understand the system in vogue in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and even with respect to other Provinces. When a question of this kind is discussed it is absolutely necessary that members should understand how the voters' lists are made up in every Province. The committee will therefore see there is a vast field of information with which members have to make themselves acquainted. We are now being simply trained in the matter; the question was never before Parliament at any previous time. When this Bill becomes law, when the will of the majority shall prevail, as prevail it will, after there has been reasonable and full discussion, the difficulty has not been wiped out. Every single year, for days and days, if not weeks and weeks, the attention of this House will be occupied in discussing this measure. It cannot be supposed that if the Dominion franchise is adopted and Parliament settles the matter this year, it will remain settled for all time to come. It will be quite open to every hon. member, and hon. members will avail themselves of the privilege, to propose amendments. Can it be supposed that the indomitable member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who has given notice of an amendment to adopt manhood suffrage, will not bring up, at subsequent Sessions, amendments embodying that principle, if he should fail to secure its incorporation into this Bill? Will not the First Minister, having failed to incorporate the ladies franchise into this Bill, bring up the question again? It may be that this very Chinese question, decided in this Bill, may again be brought up, and there may be a revulsion of feeling with respect to it; and any member is at liberty to bring it up as to who shall or who shall not vote, and having done so we may depend upon it that it will be discussed warmly in this House. So with your Indian proposition and your property qualification. Who will say that on some future occasion a man who believes that $250 is a high enough income franchise, will not introduce an amendment to that effect. So it must be seen that such amendments will come up, that they will be dealt with by this House, and consume the time of this House, for days if not for weeks. That is one of the certainties of the passage of this Bill and the fixing of the franchise as it is proposed. I wish to refer to the question of expense, as to which you have ruled that it is in order in the present discussion. My hon. friend from Lincoln doubted the figures which have been given with reference to the expense of this Bill, and he said that the discussion which had taken place on this Bill—the time wasted, I think he said—by the members of the Opposition, would cost the country more than one year's preparation of the voters' lists under this Act. I differ from the hon. gentleman. It is true there is some expense, but not as much as hon. gentlemen want to make the House believe. If members of the Opposition are here discussing this Bill at length, they are discussing it at the expense of their own pockets. I presume they will draw no more sessional allowance if they spend six months here than if they spend three. The officers of the House, the messengers and the vast bodies of the employés will not draw one dollar more salary if we remain here six months in the year than if we remain here three. Where, then, is the additional expense? It is not coming out of the country. There is, I suppose, a little additional sum for gas, and there will be some addition for printing, but what will be the amount? Will the hon. member for Lincoln give us the figures?

Mr. RYKERT. In due time.

Mr. PATERSON. When the hon. gentleman undertakes to say that the extra expense which the country is being put to on account of the two weeks the Opposition have been discussing the Bill comes to more than the total cost of the machinery required by this Act for a year, he should be able to give us an estimate now. Members of the Opposition are staying here at as great financial loss as hon. gentlemen opposite; but what do we care for that? We have engaged to discharge our duties as members of Parliament, and there is no fixed time by law as to when our labors shall be completed here. Do we hear any grumbling or complaining that we do not get enough for our work? We might fairly grumble at the Ministry keeping the House sitting for a total of only some sixty odd hours for several weeks at the beginning of the Session, and keeping us fifty-six hours in one continuous session on this Bill, but we do not complain or whine about it. Our business affairs demand our attention at home, and if the Ministry had brought down their measures at the proper time, we might have been at home attending to our business, But we do not complain. A majority of the House voted down the proposition that this Bill was brought in too late for a full and fair discussion of its provisions, and they declared by their vote that it was brought down in ample time, and that ample time would be given. Why, then, not give us ample time? The discussion was needed not only by the people of this country, but by the members of this House, as shown by the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln; and why, then, say that we are pursuing a policy of obstruction. We feel it our duty to remain here and discuss this Bill, as we will feel it our duty in regard to all other measures which are brought before us, and we do not stay here with a view of obstructing this Bill, or discussing it or any other Bill further than the public interests demand. How can a Bill which is not understood by hon. gentlemen in this House be understood by the people of this country, until more light is let in upon it? How can this Bill be understood by a large number of the people of the country, who take their information from one set of political organs, none of which have stated fairly and correctly the issues at stake in this Bill. Some of them declare that the Indian clause means the giving a vote to Indians who are in the same condition as white men, a statement which is absolutely incorrect, not to say untrue, and still you will find that stated in the ministerial prints. They say that the revising barrister is the same as under the English system, which is not true, and hon. gentlemen know it. So that we must either speak with tones loud enough to be heard from this House, or wait until the attention of these people who are restricted to one source of information is drawn to the provisions of this Bill by discussion with their neighbors, or until they see a copy of the Bill, as hundreds of them are now sending in requests for copies of the Bill, that they may see it for themselves. The people have a right to see and understand this Bill, which is subverting the electoral system and introducing a new system in the place of the one that has worked so long and so successfully in the Provinces. The assessor in Ontario is sworn to do his duty, and besides there is the appeal to the court of revision, the members of which are directly responsible to the people, as they are members of the municipal councils; and if they do not do justice the people have the remedy in their own hands, and can exercise it within twelve months. Besides, there is provision for an appeal to the county judge. The elector lays his case before him, and if his case is good his name is entered on the list. That is the provision we have in Ontario. Who will say it is not a wise provision, or that under it the people have not the whole control of the voters' lists in their hands? But who will say that under this Bill the people have any control over the lists at all, when the provision is that there shall be one man, nominated by the Government of the day, practically a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, who will make the list up from such sources as he pleases, and having made it, will revise it, and from his revision there will be no appeal on points of fact? If he does any injustice, the people have no remedy, because he is to be appointed for life, and they have no

control over him at all. Tell me that is a measure that ought to be introduced into a free Parliament! Tell me that is a Bill that has had ample discussion in the course of two weeks, when every man in this House and the constituents of every man in this House are so vitally interested in it! Tell me that we are obstructionists in discussing it for two weeks, when we have the statement of the First Minister, that a whole Session would be required to do justice to it! Hon. gentlemen must understand that we have a duty to perform to our constituents, and with a sense of that duty weighing upon our minds we intend to discharge it. We do not desire to tyrannise over the majority; we recognise the fact that the majority should rule in a country where representative institutions prevail; but the majority have no right to use the power placed in their hands by the electors, to take away from the people the liberty they have of pronouncing on their conduct, and fortify themselves more securely in their seats. The Bill is the more reprehensible when we find that there seems to be an intent on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, by means of it, not only to strengthen themselves in their seats, but also to strike at the safety of the seats of men who oppose them. A seat or two in this House is nothing; it matters not to a constituency what particular man may represent them in this House; we may have such an idea of our ability as we choose, but the country has before got along without us, and no man is so valuable that the country cannot do without him. If the principle embodied in the Bill is a righteous or just principle, then enact the law, no matter what man falls or what man is elected; but it does matter to the people of this country to take away their right to determine freely in the future, as they have done in the past, who shall be the men to elect their representatives. We think we discover in the provisions of this Bill, I shall not say a design, but something that will produce the effect I have pointed out. Now, having shown that the hon. member for Lincoln has overrated the expense of this debate, allow me to call your attention to the matter of expense in connection with this Bill. It has been estimated variously by gentlemen on this side; hon. gentlemen opposite have given us no estimate, and therefore we have to fall back on the estimates made on this side. And in this connection I would say that we have the satisfaction, at any rate, of feeling that if the expenditure under this Bill is reduced below half a million dollars a year, it will be due to the thorough discussion it is receiving at the hands of the members of the Opposition in this House. How many officers will be appointed under this Bill? Some gentleman told us that we shall not need to have 211 revising barristers —that one can do the work of more than one constituency. We do not know how that will be; but the hon. Minister who has the charge of the measure made a remark the other day which leads me to believe that it is the intention to have a revising officer in each riding. When he was asked if it was the intention to make the county court judges revising barristers, he said something like this: "We will endeavor to make the county judges barristers where we can, but gentlemen must remember that there are only some 40 judges in Ontario and some 92 constituencies." What was the inference from that remark, but that there are not judges enough to give one to each riding, and therefore he would appoint revising officers outside of the judges. Therefore, I judge that his idea is that there must be one for each riding—not 211, because there are some double constituencies, but something in the neighborhood of 200 revising officers, 200 more lawyers saddled on this country—unheard of, almost undreamed of. The country is satiated now with office holders, and with lawyers in positions. If the number is any less than 200 it will be due to the full and fair discussion of this measure by the Opposition. What then?—200 clerks, in addition to the revising barristers. What more?—200 bailiffs to serve the notices—600 sure; and if you have 200 constables, 800 in all, and the travelling expenses of all these officers in addition. Sir, is the estimate made on this side of the House a large one—that the salaries of 600 or 800 officials, their travelling expenses, and the printing connected with this business, will amount to half a million dollars a year? What does it mean? Is there not in the matter of expense alone a reason why the amendment of the hon. member of North Norfolk should prevail? If it prevails, what will it cost the country to get up these lists? Not one single cent, because the expenses of the municipalities are had in reference to their lists, and they will have to be had whether this Bill passes or not. What is the expense of a general election in this country? Is it not about $120,000? I think so. After every five years a Parliament has lasted the country is put to an expense of $120,000, in order that a new election may be held, and in order that a new House of representatives may be chosen; but pass this Bill and what will be the cost? Five years at $500,000 a year—$2,500,000 added to the $120,000. The cost of a Dominion election without the Bill is $120,000, with the Bill it will be $2,620,000.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. PATERSON. You will have to answer it on the platform if you do not answer it here. You will have to meet these facts before the electors. If the cost will be less it will be due to the efforts of the Opposition in pointing out the nature of the Bill and enforcing economy upon the Government. What does this $500,000 a year, capitalised at 4 per cent., mean? It is equivalent to an addition to the public debt of $12,500,000. This House will, if my figure be correct, by the passage of this Bill, by voting down the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk, cost this country some $12,500,000, for it is equivalent to voting that large addition to the public debt. It is time the committee should hesitate; it is not too late yet. I want to give an idea, by comparison, what an amount is involved in this measure. As far as I am concerned, the people shall know what it costs the country to have the views of the minority in this House voted down. No better idea can be had of the vast amount of money added to the public debt, virtually by the passage of this measure, than by a comparison of the total earnings of the wage-earners of the different cities in this country. For that reason I took the census returns for 1881, showing the wages earned by the different classes, comprising skilled labor and other labor, in all 167 different kinds, including the men who work in saw mills, ship-yards, the employés in factories, and all that are employed in manufacturing, and what is the result? It would take the combined earnings of all the wage-earners of the city of Kingston, under the head, I have spoken of, thirty-three years to make the amount that will virtually be added to the public debt if the Bill should pass. It will take the entire earnings of all the mechanics, artisans and employés in saw mills in this city twelve and three-quarter years to make up the amount; it will take ten years of the entire wages of all these classes of the city of London to wipe out the debt you propose to add to this Bill; it will take five and a-half years of the entire wages of these classes in the great manufacturing city of Hamilton to wipe it out; it will take three and one-third years of the entire earnings of the vast army of workmen, amounting to 12,708 in the great city of Toronto, to wipe it out, and yet there is to be a debt put upon these men, in order to pay the interest on which they will have to toil and sweat—for the sake of what? For the sake of disfranchising many of themselves. Let us go to our sister Provinces. In the great city of Montreal, with its immense army of 22,132 workmen, it will take one year five and a-half months of their entire earnings to cover this debt; it will take

thirteen and three-quarter years of the entire earnings of all these classes in the city of Halifax to come up to the amount involved in this Bill; it will take seventeen years of the entire earnings of the same people in the city of St. John to meet this heavy charge. In the Province of Prince Edward Island it will take fifteen and a-half years of the total earnings of all these classes in order to get the inestimable privilege of having this Bill, that is going, politically, to cut off the heads of many of the men who will have to pay for it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I want to read the hon. gentleman a decision in the English House of Commons as to the right of a man to weary the House with repetition. Mr. Speaker Brand ruled: "I have to suggest to the hon. member that he is drawing too much on the indulgence of the House in repeating observations which he has made more than once."

Mr. PATERSON. I did not look up what Mr. Speaker Brand said, but I knew the Chairman of the committee, who is now presiding, had ruled decisively the other night that the question of expense could be gone into, and he was quite sufficient authority for me; but I understand now he prefers the decision of Mr. Speaker Brand to his own.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have ruled that the hon. gentleman is repeating what he has said before in this House. That has nothing to do with previous decisions.

Mr. PATERSON. I would ask you to read the rule which prohibits a member from repeating what he has said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have read the rule, according to English practice, the rule laid down by Mr. Speaker Brand, that the Speaker occasionally appeals to hon. gentlemen not to weary the House:

"Mr. Whalley, in making a personal application, was exceeding due limits, amid cries of order. Mr. Speaker reminded the hon. member that he was exceeding the bounds of personal explanation. The hon. member continuing, and renewed cries of order being raised, Mr. Speaker: 'I have to suggest to the hon. member that he is drawing too much on the indulgence of the House in repeating observations which he has made more than once.'"

Mr. PATERSON. What proceedings were before the House at that time? Was the House in committee? Was it on a motion to adjourn? Or what was the motion?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Whether in committee or not, the hon. gentleman is exceeding the rules.

Mr. PATERSON. I had not finished my observations, but I will bring them to a close now.

Mr. FISHER. I feel called upon to say a few words on the motion before the Chair. I, to-day, voted in favor of the motion to exempt the Island of Prince Edward from the operation of this Bill, believing it to be wise and right that the provincial franchises should be adopted in place of the new franchise proposed by this Bill, and I now feel bound to support the motion of my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), to exempt the Province of Quebec—my own Province—from the operation of this Bill. In that Province we have a more restricted franchise than that now proposed, but it is not principally on that account that I support the amendment. I am not going to quarrel with the extension of the franchise, if that extension were proposed in the Provincial Parliament, which I believe is the right body to deal with the question. If the extension proposed by this Bill were proposed in the Local Legislature of Quebec I would advocate it, but finding that it is to be forced upon that Province by the majority of this House, in which the Province of Quebec is not represented in sufficient numbers to hold its own, I consider it my duty to oppose the over-riding of the desires of the Province from which I come. Propositions have been made in the Local Legislature of that Province to extend the franchise, and I believe they have generally emanated from my own political friends in that Legislature and have been voted down by the successors of the Secretary of State in the Government of that Province. Knowing the position which the Secretary of State and his friends have taken on this subject, I expect that, if they are true to their traditions, they will support the proposition of my hon. friend from L'Islet. It may by some be considered that I am inconsistent in supporting this motion when it is known that I am in favor of extending the franchise in that Province, but it is very different to have this extension forced upon the Province by the majority of this House, who do not come from that Province, and to have it adopted in the House which rules the Province and is composed altogether of members who truly represent it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that they represent the Province of Quebec as much as members of the Local Legislature. That I deny. I do not believe that, in this House, where the voice of any one Province must be more or less merged in that of the other Provinces, it is possible for the comparatively small number from any one Province to be able to represent and enforce the views of that Province so truly and energetically as they can be enforced in the Local Legislature. I contend that this law should not apply to the Province of Quebec, chiefly on the ground that in that Province, up to the present time, the holding of real estate has been the basis of the electoral qualification, while under this Bill a vote is given to farmers' sons who do not own any real estate, to people earning a certain income, and to fishermen holding personal property. This is making a radical change in the franchise of the Province of Quebec. Referring to the fishermen's qualification, I cannot refrain from wondering why, if personal property in boats and fishing tackle is to qualify a voter, other personal property, such as that of the mechanic in his tools, or of a person owning horses and carriages for hire, should not also qualify. When this thin end of the wedge is once entered I believe it must of necessity follow that personal property in other things besides fishing tackle and fishing boats will, within a short time, be given the franchise. This is creating specially a revolution in the Province of Quebec, because in that Province, at the present time, there is no such a thing as qualification on personal property. Now, there is another reason why Quebec should be exempted from the operation of this Bill. We are especially jealous of our municipal institutions. We believe that in the Province of Quebec we have a first rate municipal code, with local government in each municipality. Hon. gentlemen opposite who come from Ontario have decried the municipal institutions of their Province, and have given an account of them which I do not like to believe. Now, Sir, I am proud of the municipal institutions of my own Province, and I am glad to believe that they are worthy of the high trust which they possess in controlling the voters' lists. I am glad to know that in our municipal councillors and assessors we have men to whom we can safely confide the management of the electoral lists, and I think it is a great injustice to take away that duty from the municipalities, as is proposed by this Bill. Moreover, if you impose this Bill upon the Province of Quebec you impose a heavy tax upon the municipalities of that Province, and you impose upon the electorate a burden which they can ill afford to bear in the present state of the Dominion finances and in the present financial condition of that Province. I say, advisedly, the financial condition of that Province, because I regret to say that, just as hon. gentlemen opposite, representing the Tory party of this country, have brought the finances of this Dominion to their present deplorable condition, so also their colleagues and friends, who have for years back controlled the destines of the Province of Quebec, the Tory Local Government there, have brought the financial con-

dition of that Province to such a pass that it is even worse than the position of the Dominion finances. Now, Sir, I believe this double list of voters which this Bill is going to impose upon the Provinces is a feature that will be especially obnoxious to the people of the Province of Quebec. In that Province there are a large number of independent electors, who do not allow the wire-pullers of their respective parties to arrange how they shall vote, nor to say who shall be put upon the list and who shall not. I have been told by some hon. gentlemen opposite that in some of the Provinces, for instance, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, probably the local franchise will be assimilated with the Dominion franchise, so that there will, in time, be only one voters' list. But if hon. gentlemen opposite think that the Province of Quebec is going to do that they are very much mistaken. The Province of Quebec has peculiar institutions to which it is wedded, and which it defends with great tenacity. I believe that no greater strain can be put upon this Confederacy than to impose such a Bill as this upon the Province of Quebec, where it will, to so large an extent, interfere with our municipal institutions. There is another reason why it is especially important that this Bill should not apply to that Province. I pointed out the other night, what I believe in my inmost heart to be true, that if this Dominion franchise is made uniform over the whole Dominion it will be but very few years before we shall have manhood suffrage; within a few years, indeed, if this Bill becomes law, we shall see uniform suffrage become universal suffrage. Now, universal suffrage is particularly obnoxious to the people of the Province of Quebec. I believe those who oppose it in that Province stand upon fair ground when they say that in that Province the education of a very large number of people is not sufficiently advanced to justify the introduction of universal suffrage. Universal suffrage is obnoxious to them, also, for the reason that they have hitherto based their suffrage on the possession of real estate. Indeed, it has almost become, so to speak, a part of their religion, that the suffrage should be based upon the possession of real estate, and I believe that is the great reason why the people of that Province are so much opposed to manhood suffrage. Sir, I believe most sincerely that if this Bill becomes law it will lead, within a very few years, to universal suffrage all over the Dominion. When that time comes the Province of Quebec will have to accept universal suffrage for its Dominion elections. If hon. gentlemen opposite, coming from Quebec, will consider these points, and are prepared to go that length, which I say is a necessary conclusion, if hon. gentlemen opposite vote down this proposition, let them vote with their eyes open and seeing what is to come. But if hon. gentlemen opposite do not desire this result to come about, then I call on them, as well as hon. members on this side of the House, from the Province of Quebec, to support the amendment of the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and I sincerely trust that the Government which controls the majority of this House will not refuse this amendment, but that it will pass triumphantly.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Casgrain) negatived: yeas, 44; nays, 71.

Mr. WELDON. I beg to move the following amendment:—

That the following words be inserted in section 3: This clause shall not apply to the Province of New Brunswick, but the laws respecting the election of members from that Province to the Dominion Parliament shall be such as are now, or shall be, from time to time, provided by the Legislature of that Province for the election of members of the House of Assembly.

I move this amendment because I feel that as regards New Brunswick two leading principles of franchise legislation have been violated by the proposals of the Bill now before the House. The first is the question of assessment, and the next is the question of personal property. I have already pointed out that as regards the city and county of St. John, and also Portland, there are special circumstances, and that persons who hold long leases at nominal rents, on which valuable property has been placed, will be prevented from having an opportunity of being placed upon the assessment list and entitled to vote. The reason I ask that New Brunswick be excluded from the provision of this clause is, first, with respect to the assessment; and second, with respect to personal property. By the operation of this Bill a tenant at $20 a year will have a right to vote, while a person deriving an income from Government stock or municipal bonds will not be entitled to a voice in the representation of the country. If the principle of property is that upon which we are to base representation, surely personal property has an equal right to have a voice in the control of the country with real property. Take the position in which many of our people are placed —those who are engaged in the shipping trade. Among the boat-owners on the river St. John are a large number of people who, by the law of New Brunswick, would be entitled to vote, though they would not under this law. These boats are generally owned by farmers, or by young men who cannot qualify as farmers' sons, but who, accumulating a little money, put it into this class of property, which makes a larger return than real property. There are vessels of different kinds, some carrying cargoes to the United States, and I think if the basis of the franchise is to be property these men should have the right to vote. We have a personal property franchise in our Province, and in addition to that the person must be assessed on his property, and thus be in a position to contribute to the revenues of the country. I think it will not be disputed that taxation is the basis of representation, and that the principle on which a man is enfranchised is that, as he contributes to the revenues of the country, he should have a voice in choosing those who shall have the disposition of those revenues. That is one of the first principles adopted in the mother country, and it was upon that principle that the New England States separated from Great Britain. The system we have adopted in New Brunswick has worked well, and it is very inexpensive, the principle being, that if a man's name is on the assessment roll —and it is the duty of the assessor to see that he is placed on the roll—he shall have the right to vote. In the municipal elections we went further, and required that a man's taxes should be paid. But this does not apply to parliamentary elections. One result of this Bill will be, to a large extent, to disfranchise those who are entitled to vote on personal property. An hon. gentleman on the other side misunderstood me when he stated that I considered this Bill unconstitutional. I think it is clear, from the British North America Act, that this Parliament has the power to pass such a Bill; but I pointed out that it was not granted as a primary power, but was given, just as the veto power was given, as a check on the legislation of the Provinces, for the purpose of preserving the federal union intact and preserving harmony in all its parts. The question is not a question of legal rights, but of policy, and it seems to me that as no cogent reason has been given why so important a change should be made it would be unwise and impolitic, at this moment and at this stage of the Session, to bring forward a measure which so seriously affects the rights of the people of the Provinces. Heretofore, in the Provinces, the tendency has been not to restrict the franchise—as will be the case under this Bill, if it passes—but as different classes became more educated and intelligent, as education became more diffused, to do as they have done in the mother country—introduce new classes into the franchise—new colleges of electors. The principle of uniformity is destroyed at once by providing that a man in a city has not the same qualification as a man in a county. The representative of a county has the same rights and privileges as the representative of a city in this House; and yet we say in this very Bill that a man in

a city cannot have a vote unless he has $300 worth of real estate, while his neighbor across the boundary line has the same privilege on a property worth $150. Thus the principle of uniformity itself is destroyed; but, for the sake of a theoretical principle of uniformity, persons who have the right to vote for members in the Dominion Parliament, and who will still have the right to vote for the members of their Local Legislatures, we are going to deprive of that right. I say that any Government that brings forward a Bill that will have that effect is bound to give a special reason for it, showing that it is necessary, either in the public interest or because the present system, which has worked without a jar for eighteen years, is fraught with danger to the Dominion. When this Parliament chose to change the mode of carrying on the elections, it acted upon a principle entirely different from the principle involved in the franchise. It did not interfere with any liberty, but was simply adopting additional safeguards for the protection of the electors, and in order to secure an honest and fair vote, so that each elector would be able to exercise his privilege without being subject to bribery or other corrupt influences. But this measure touches the status of the individual; it destroys his right; and I contend that to destroy the right of any individual is not a thing to be lightly regarded; but if it is considered advisable to take away that right it must be shown that it is done upon some strong principle of public policy or because the continuance of that right is fraught with danger to the community. It is for these reasons that I press my amendment. I put it forward because I feel, so far as our Province is concerned, that this Bill is a complete revolution; that it destroys the principle on which we have acted for over a quarter of a century, a principle which I believe is sound, that taxation is the basis of representation, and that property, no matter whether it is real or personal, whether it is in land or ships, or anything else, entitles the owner of that property, if he has the amount required by law, to a voice in the election of members to this House. That right will be taken away by this Bill. The men who own our ships—the wooden boats which ply up and down our rivers, or the vessels which sail along our coasts—will be deprived of that right. The Maritime Provinces are dependent, to a great extent, upon their shipping, and it is our duty to see that it is protected. If the owner of a vessel is entitled to vote on other grounds, that is aside from the question; we have to consider his case, irrespective of any other right he has; and I say that a man who owns a ship of 1,200 or 1,500 tons, worth perhaps $50,000 or $70,000, should have a voice in the representation of the country by virtue of that property. In the Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island a large amount of capital is invested in property of that kind, and it is unfair that that property should not be represented on the floor of this Parliament. It is by the laws of this Parliament that ship-owners have to look for the protection of their vessels; and, therefore, I take the ground that a person owning personal property should have the right to the franchise equally with the man who owns 20 or 100 acres of land. By means of the assessment we can ascertain exactly who are entitled to vote. There may be defects in the assessment; a party may be rated too low, but I think a man is seldom rated too high; if he is, he takes care to rectify that error. If a man is anxious to have a vote he will see that he is placed upon the assessment roll and has sufficient qualification to enable him to vote. If, by neglect of the assessors, he is assessed at a lower rate than he is fairly and justly entitled to be assessed, and is thus deprived of his vote, he has an opportunity to rectify the error, and the result is that not only does he get the advantage of his vote but the municipality gets the benefit of the increased assessment he has to pay. Now, so far as this Bill is concerned, there is no provision of that sort at all. It simply provides that while the assessment roll may be taken as *primâ facie* evidence the party is not bound to take it. The elector has no interest in seeing that his name is put on the voters' list, nor has the country, because in the assessment list the country gets the benefit of the tax the elector is bound to pay in order to have a vote.

Mr. KING. I took occasion, some days ago, to point out that this measure, if it became law, was calculated to disfranchise a large number of my constituents, and stated that I would apply at the proper quarters for official documents that would give the facts. I have done so, and have now a statement which I obtained from the treasurer of the county I have the honor to represent. I asked him to go through the voters' lists carefully, and to send me a statement showing the number of persons who were assessed on real estate in that county for less than $150 and more than $100. I have that list before me, and according to it there will be, in the ten parishes in my county, 427 persons disfranchised who, to-day, have the right to vote on real property qualification, under the law that exists in New Brunswick. The following are the particulars: In New Brunswick, 13; Cambridge, 10; Canning, 34; Chipman, 65; Gagetown, 41; Hempstead, 10; Johnston, 20; Petersville, 58; Waterboro', 35; Wickham, 31. It is claimed that the assessment rolls in the Province of New Brunswick do not actually represent the value of real estate. That is an imputation no man has a right to make against the revising officers or assessor, who are gentlemen selected by the people, sworn to do their duty, and thoroughly posted with regard to the values of property in the several districts; and, besides, there is a check even upon them—that of the board of valuators. Then we have the assessors who make valuations for the assessment for parish purposes, and who, if they err at all, err in assessing property too high. On the whole, I think the valuation put on real estate in the county I represent will be quite as near the mark as any that could be put upon it by the persons who will be appointed to fill the positions of revising officers —barristers of five years' standing. We have barristers of twenty-five years' standing in that county, and I am quite sure no solitary individual, if they were appointed, would say they were at all qualified to value property in that county, compared with the men selected by the people themselves. I called attention, on a former occasion, to another feature of this Bill with which the hon. member for St. John had dealt at length. He pointed out that in New Brunswick we have what is known as personal qualification, under which a large number of vessel owners and other owners of personal property have the right to vote. I asked the secretary-treasurer of my county to give me a list of those who were thus qualified, so as to arrive at the number who will be disfranchised under this Bill, in which there is no such qualification. In the parish of Cambridge, alone, there will be 31 persons disfranchised, the owners of vessels ranging from 75 to 100 tons, vessels engaged in coasting service and in transport on inland waters; in Canning the number of this class that will be disfranchised is 9; in Chipman, 2; in Gagetown, 11; in Hempstead, 17; in Johnston, 7; in Petersville, 9; in Waterborough, 7; in Wickham, 5; total, 98. It might be said that these people have farms or other qualifications. I know the most of them, and I am satisfied nearly all have no qualification other than their interest in vessels property, and if they are to be deprived of their privilege of voting because personal property qualification is not recognised in this Bill, I know of no other means by which they can obtain that right. The men leave their homes generally about the 1st April, and are absent till navigation closes, so that they could not be included, as some of them might otherwise be, under the heading of farmers'

sons. I would not so much object to this measure if any complaints had arisen in my Province in regard to the working of the present law, but I have never heard of any. It is true that while this law disfranchises a large number of voters in New Brunswick it will give the right to some who have not that right to-day; but is it fair to disfranchise one individual and supply his place with another? I am very glad that there is an enlargement of the franchise, but I do not think it is necessary to come here for that. The present Government of New Brunswick are willing to extend the franchise to farmers' sons and tenants, and others in that Province who have not at present the right to vote; and if they have been prevented from giving that right, it is due to the opposition in one branch of that Legislature, of gentlemen holding the same political opinions as hon. gentlemen opposite. The First Minister is not entitled to all the credit for having introduced the woman suffrage proposition, because the local Premier of New Brunswick, last winter, carried that through one branch of that Legislature, and it is possible that next year it may become law in that Province. If there were no other reason than that of cost I would oppose this measure. The people of my county are not disposed to submit to a tax of at least $2,000 a year or $10,000 for each election of a member to this House under this Bill. They will still have to prepare the list for local purposes, in addition to this new burden. It may be said that this Government pays the cost, but though that may go down with some counties, it will not go down with the people whom I represent, who know that they pay a large share of any expenditure by this Government. I am anxious to go back to the same constituency which has hitherto returned me, and I want hon. gentlemen opposite to return to the constituences which elected them. I want the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) to go back to the same county which rejected a worthy representative and accepted him in his place. If any county in New Brunswick has been benefited by the National Policy it is the county in which that hon. gentleman resides. I think gentlemen on this side are entitled to as much credit for any amendments which may be made to this Bill as those who have sat still during this discussion. If the hon. gentleman goes back to that constituency I want him to go back to the vessel-owners and farmers of that county who elected him, and not to the town of Moncton, to appeal to the operatives in the sugar refineries and in the cotton mills, who are to be entitled to vote under this Bill, who are to be placed on the list as tenants, paying what?—$20 a year house rent. There is no great interest in the country involved in that. They can get up and leave, if times are not prosperous, while the farmers and vessel-owners and others who voted for him have to stay. These are the men whom I want to see retain the franchise. I have no objection to the extension of the franchise, but I do not want the other classes to be struck off the list and their places supplied by people who have not one-half the interest in the country that they have. Hon. members from my own Province and the other Maritime Provinces have for some time been calling the attention of the Government to the importance of securing free trade relations with the United States, and to other matters of a similar character. Now, the people who are proposed to be enfranchished by this Bill, with the exception of farmers' sons, are opposed to any such policy; they are people whose interests are bound up with the National Policy instead of with the interests of the Province. When an election comes around again I want to see the right to vote remain in the hands of the people who will vote for securing free trade relations with the United States, and for the interests of our Province. Hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps, may see some advantage in this measure for themselves that may outweigh any other consideration; if so, it is possible that they may have to assist the majority of this House in making this Bill the law of the land. I expect myself that it will become law, but I cannot allow it to pass without entering my protest against these people being disfranchised.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is well known to hon. gentlemen that several days ago I gave notice of a motion for testing a very important principle connected with this Bill; and at an early stage of this debate, as soon as the right opportunity arrives, I propose submitting that motion for the consideration of the House, and at that time I shall briefly state the reasons which have induced me to support the proposed amendment to the Bill under consideration. But I now rise simply for the purpose of explaining why I vote against excepting New Brunswick from the operation of this Bill. It is not that I approve of the Bill, though, as I have stated before, I approve of the principle of a franchise Bill emanating from this House rather than from the Local Legislatures. I hope, before this Bill gets through this committee, that this committee will, after the arguments which may be adduced, and after they have had time for reflection, see the propriety of introducing an element in this Bill which will remove a great many of the objectionable features which it possesses, and will adopt a principle that will extend to almost every man of intelligence, and of the age of 21, the right to vote, based upon manhood taxation suffrage. I shall not discuss that at the present time, but I simply rise to justify to this House and the country the vote I am now going to give against the amendment of the hon. member for the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon). I do it because I propose, at an early stage of this Bill, to introduce the amendment to which I referred, which, I think, will remove the objectionable features of this Bill, and simplify its character, especially the cost of working it, and make it more satisfactory.

Mr. GILLMOR. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is no doubt sincere in preferring a Dominion to a provincial franchise. But I would be pleased if a gentleman possessing his talents had given some reasons for that opinion. With me it is a very important question.

Mr. MITCHELL. At an early stage in the discussion of this Bill the hon. gentleman will remember I gave my reasons at length, and he will find them in the *Hansard*.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do remember that my hon. friend spoke, but if those are all the reasons he could give for the change they failed to convince me. My hon. friend was not in the House the other night when I made a few remarks. The article in the paper of which he is proprietor was to me very gratifying. I was acquainted with my hon. friend twenty-five years ago. A generation has grown up since he and I first met. I have seen him at times when I thought he was not himself, but that article, written by himself, carried me back to twenty-five years ago, and I thought he was the same man again, influenced by justice and by liberal and noble sentiments. Not perfect, but as a man I have always admired his outspoken and liberal views. That article was well worthy of consideration and worthy of the source from which it emanated. Now, with regard to this question. There is no necessity for this change. I hope to hear, before this amendment is disposed of, some arguments in its favor from those who come from New Brunswick, if any arguments there be. We are not very numerous here, but I shall want to hear some definite arguments for this change. If a man is convinced, he ought to be able to advance arguments that will have some weight to those who are anxious to hear arguments. The change contemplated in this Bill is very important. As my hon. friend from Northumberland knows, we had a great battle in New Brunswick to obtain popular rights. He knows that, for fifty years, the people of New Brunswick had not any privileges at all. He was one of the oldest men, one of the

ablest men who fought for those privileges, when we had arrived at that time of life when we could take part in public affairs. He knows that for fifty years the Legislature of New Brunswick had no control over the Crown lands of that country; he knows that commissioners were sent out from England that were not responsible to the people, and that for fifty years after Parliament was established they could not sell an acre of Crown land. He knows that delegation after delegation was sent home to England to try to get concessions. He knows that for a long time we contended for municipal powers to regulate our own local affairs, and that was another matter of twenty-five years' contest. These battles have been fought out, and now we possess a measure of self-government and a right to control our own affairs. Since we came into Confederation one right after another has been taken away; and here is a proposal to take from the people the rights which they fought for and which they now possess. Now, I think that before hon. members from New Brunswick vote to take away the right of making the voters' lists from the Provincial Government, they ought to give some reasons for it. The local authorities are better qualified than any other class of men can be to prepare the voters' lists. No one has denied the constitutional right of this Parliament to make the change proposed; but it is the expediency of this change we are discussing. A charter was asked for building a railway bridge across the falls at St. John. It was an important matter, and consent was granted, and constitutionally so. But yet it would have been constitutional if the power had been withheld, although the people would have been deprived of the right to build the bridge, which was in the public interest. It is more in accordance with the spirit of the constitution that the franchises should be left with the people of the different Provinces rather than brought under the power of this Parliament. Although the United States have had an experience of 100 years, they have not found it to be in the general interest to change their system, and it is held that the autonomy of the different States is thus preserved. This is another right hon. gentlemen opposite are taking away from the Provinces, and it is calculated, more than anything else, to create discord and cause the people to regret that they gave their interests into the hands of this Parliament. I have heard no complaint made about the working of our municipal institutions. The voters' lists could not be more simple and less expensive. I have never heard of a man being improperly put on the voters' list intentionally, or left off. Those revisers entertain various views with respect to local and Dominion politics; but we do not trouble about that circumstance. If the revisers do not do their duty they are removed. No difficulty occurs with the existing system. The very reverse will be found to be the case with respect to the proposed system. The revising barrister may be a stranger, and he will go about ascertaining the value of property and fixing the list of those entitled to vote. It will be a very objectionable system. The change is revolutionary in its character, and it deals with the dearest rights of the people of the Province. New Brunswick has sixteen members in this House, ten on one side and six on the other—one has been removed by death—and this great revolution respecting the Province will be carried by a majority of two or three men. Without wishing to point out to them their duty, it is evident that a serious responsibility attaches to them. Unless the very best reasons are given for the change, unless there is some evil to be remedied, we should hesitate before we make this change. I do not know what the change will be, as to the number of people who will be placed on the lists. Our qualifications for electors are very simple—$100 of real estate, $400 income and $400 personal property. We are asked to change that for a most intricate and difficult system to understand. The present Bill makes the qualifications $300 in cities and towns. It requires $100 under our local law; and so, instead of extending the franchise, it will be reducing it very much. Again, $20 rental per annum, that will increase the number of voters; $300, the party being a *bonâ fide* occupant. There is great chance of a difference of opinion taking place on that point. Another qualification is $400 income from real property in cities. In counties it will be $150 worth of real propety—that is to say, $50 more than the provincial qualification. Farmers' sons and sons-in-law are to be enfranchised. I do not object to that, but the sons of artisans, fishermens' sons, merchants' sons are equally entitled and there are other difficult qualifications in the Bill. By a revising barrister, whether intentionally or otherwise, injustice will be done. I most sincerely and honestly oppose the change proposed, not from party feelings at all, although I am not different from other men in having party prejudices, but because I believe it is one of the most infamous measures ever introduced into a Parliament. It is revolutionary; it is calculated to produce discord, and to give a party advantage—and that is the moving motive that prompted it, for it has been shown that there is no necessity whatever for it. With respect to the franchise, I may say that I am inclined to favor a very extended franchise. It is the spirit of the age in which we live to extend the franchise. I never yet could understand why there should be such a gulf fixed between the man who happens to have $100 worth of real estate and the man who has not $100 worth. I cannot understand why such a gulf should be fixed between the men who have property and the men who have not property in this country. We have only to look abroad to see that the hope for the future advancement and progress and greatness of this country does not depend on the money, does not depend on the wealthy men of the country, on the land-owners of the country alone, but upon the young men, with their strong right arms, their energy, their force, their ability to make the country great. We are forced to vote on this question, upon which I should like to consult my constituents, whose opinion upon the matter of manhood suffrage, for instance, I do not know. It is not fair to this Parliament or this country to bring in a measure of such importance as this, and drive it through at the rate at which it has been attempted to put through this measure, and without that consideration which ought to be given to it. And after all our consideration, it is only the consideration of 210 men. We have 5,000,000 of people in this country who ought to be consulted on this measure, and who ought to have an opportunity of discussing a measure of so much importance. Some hon. gentlemen may know by intuition the opinions of their constituents, but for my part I do not know what they want until I consult them, and I am delicate about making important changes without knowing their wishes. Should we adopt this Bill we are not going back to the same constituents who sent us here, for I know that in my own county, and in many others in New Brunswick, a large number of people who formerly had votes will be disfranchised. The hon. member for Queen's states that this Bill would reduce his voters' list 500; he may be correct. I think not so great a number in proportion would be disfranchised in my county. I do not think this measure will increase the votes of fishermen to any extent. It will disfranchise those who own $400 of personal property in vessels, and there are few who have $100 of real estate who have not $150; it will not change the vote of fishermen. I am opposed to this Bill on every principle. I am opposed to the Indian enfranchisement and to the revising barrister. I do not believe that in my county, or in any other county of New Brunswick, where the people have fought the battle for municipal institutions, they want irresponsible men to come down and take charge of their own business, and to say who shall and who shall not vote. If these men do

wrong, to whom are they responsible? Would they be responsible to the electors of Charlotte? By no means. To the Province of New Brunswick? By no means. Even this Parliament unless both branches are agreed cannot remedy the evils that may arise; they have not the power, for these men will be fixtures. This is a retrograde step. We have fought for responsibility, and now the Confederation is proposing to put on us irresponsible men, men we cannot reach, and we have had enough of irresponsible officials in New Brunswick, through family compacts, and so on. If hon. gentlemen from the Province of New Brunswick intend to support this Bill their duty is, first, to convince themselves that their Province wants it, and having satisfied themselves on that point, they would be justified in voting for it. For my part, I am justified in voting against it, because I do not want it, and I do not believe the people want it.

Mr. BURNS. It is refreshing to hear hon. gentlemen say that an attempt has been made to drive the Bill through the House. It seems to me that we have discussed this measure—and I mean by that that the House as a body has discussed the measure at great length indeed. Ever since the 21st of April the House has been in committee on this Bill, and it has been more than discussed. It has appeared to those who have listened on this side that no serious attempt was made by hon. gentlemen on the other side to discuss the measure, but that a serious attempt was made to burk the passage of it in its entirety. Had they been desirous for a measure of this kind, had they been solicitous for what I consider the best interests of the Dominion, they would have reserved all their speaking powers—all the words they have used and wasted—until such time as we came to what we might call the details of the Bill. But, Sir, that they did not do. They set out with what—I think we can truthfully say—was a policy of obstruction, an avowed policy of obstruction. That policy was shown clearly by the fact that hour after hour, day after day and night after night, hon. gentlemen on the other side treated us—not to a discussion on the merits of the Bill, but to matters totally irrelevant thereto. But I rise, not for the purpose of entering into any general argument with regard to the provisions of the Bill. The House, by a solemn vote, assented to the principles of the Bill, and now we are in committee to discuss its details and provisions. I rise to address myself to the observations made by the gentlemen from my own Province, and to treat of the resolution moved by the hon. member for St. John. I rise for the purpose of taking issue with the statement made by him, by the hon. member for Queen's, and by the hon. member for Charlotte. I rise for the purpose of stating that in my opinion the effect of this Bill would not be in any way to restrict the franchise in New Brunswick, but largely to extend it, and it is because it will extend the franchise in New Brunswick that I purpose giving my vote in support of it. The hon. gentleman from St. John stated that under the provisions of this Bill a large class of people will be disfranchised. He made particular allusion to those who own property in ships, property in wood boats on the river St. John, and other holders of personal property. To my mind—and I have carefully considered the whole question—that class of persons will not be disfranchised. Under the provisions of the Bill, any person in the receipt of $400 a year, any person earning that amount, no matter from what calling or source, will be entitled to vote, under this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BURNS. I say, Sir, that is my reading of the Bill, and I think my reading is the same as the reading of it by, at all events, all those on this side who give their support to the measure, and all on this side do give their support to the measure.

Mr. MILLS. Supposing he made no profit?

Mr. BURNS. It is not necessary that he should make a profit; it is only necessary that he should earn that sum in order to entitle him to vote. Had hon. gentlemen reserved that question until we came to discuss the particular part of the measure bearing upon it, they would be enlightened on that score; but they have not chosen to do so. They have chosen to obstruct the passage of the measure, and to my mind they have done so because they are afraid of an extension of the franchise. The very best proof I can give of that, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, is that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) knows that in his constituency, which is a large fishing constituency, a large number of fishermen would be enfranchised under the operation of this Bill. Is the hon. gentleman afraid to meet the votes of the fishermen when he goes back?

Mr. GILLMOR. I got two out of every three of them, and I expect to get them if I want them.

Mr. BURNS. If the hon. gentleman got two out of every three of them, he should respect the confidence they reposed in him, by not opposing a measure which will enfranchise a larger number of them. I can speak from personal knowledge, so far as the Province of New Brunswick is concerned, but more particularly with regard to the county I have the honor to represent. There, I know as a matter of fact, a very large number will be enfranchised. I have carefully gone through the list of voters for that county, which I have now before me, name by name—and I am familiar with the name of almost every man in the county—and I fail to find the name of one who will be disfranchised under the operation of this Bill, while I know of hundreds who will be enfranchised under it. Therefore, I can only come to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid of what they call a new constituency. They would be satisfied to get here at any time, but they are afraid, if this Bill becomes law, that the number of voters will be so increased that there will be greater danger of their being left at home. I feel no such danger. I feel confident, in going back to my constituency, that the greater the number of voters the greater my majority will be. I prefer, Sir, that this Dominion should regulate its own franchise; and because I prefer that, I shall support this measure. Hon. gentlemen opposite have claimed that while it is constitutional to pass this measure it is inexpedient to do so, because, as they say, we should go back to the electorate and ask them for an expression of opinion thereon. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if the Government of the Province of Ontario or the Government of the Province of New Brunswick thought it advisable or necessary to go back to their constituents before bringing in a Franchise Bill during the last Sessions of the Legislatures in those Provinces. No, Sir, they did not. Hon. gentlemen opposite declare that the members of this House should be sent here under the provincial franchises. I am not of that opinion. I believe this House should deal with its own composition, and not leave it to the Provincial Legislatures to declare what qualifications shall be necessary for voters to send representatives here. I do not think that is in accordance with the dignity of the Parliament of Canada. I do not think it is in accordance with the safety and independence of Parliament, that it should be in any way at the mercy or under the control of the Local Legislatures, no matter how well disposed they may be. The hon. gentleman for Charlotte made the statement, which I took down at the time, that all those who voted on income to the extent of $400 a year would be disfranchised.

Mr. GILLMOR. On personal property, I said.

Mr. BURNS. Well, for my purpose it is the same thing whether it is income or personal property. Is the hon.

gentleman serious in saying that? Does he mean to convey to this House the impression that those who vote on $400 worth of personal property in his county have no other means of subsistence—have no incomes, that they are not householders, occupants, tenants, merchants, ship-owners, fishermen, farmers, or anything else? He also stated that all those who voted on $100 of real estate would be disfranchised. Was the hon. gentleman serious in making that statement? Those statements are quite in keeping with other reckless statements hon. gentlemen opposite have made. I do not think they seriously consider, sometimes, what they are going to say, but simply aim at expressing themselves in some way that will convey to their constituents the idea that their liberties will be very much trampled upon by the operation of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen on the other side have, time after time, taunted those on this side with sitting in silence, and not discussing the Bill. It is fresh in the minds of hon. members of this committee that after a week of debating—I cannot call it debating, but after a week of reading reports and documents—after a week of lost time, one Saturday evening arrived—and I think those hon. gentlemen have a lively recollection of what occurred on that evening—a few speeches were made by members of this side, and they demolished all the arguments hon. gentlemen opposite used. We, on this side, are content to wait and perfect the measure; we do not desire unnecessarily to occupy the time of the House; we are prepared to wait until we reach those stages of the Bill under which it is proper for us to express our opinions, and we then express those opinions in a fearless and independent manner. We do what I think hon. gentlemen opposite should do, endeavor to perfect the Bill and make it workable, and to give the Dominion a franchise under which it can work.

Mr. BURPEE. I wish to make a strong and solemn protest against this Bill. I prefer the franchise of New Brunswick referred to in the amendment before you, Mr. Chairman, to the franchise indicated in this measure. I prefer it for a good many reasons, which I will endeavor to state in as few words as I can. In the first place, it is simple; it is inexpensive; it is the franchise chosen by the people of the Province. It is a franchise that has given universal satisfaction in that Province, and they have never asked for any other. To give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, of how they make up the voters' lists, and to show the House the simplicity and the fairness and the honesty of it, I will state briefly how it is done. In the first place, the county council appoint three valuators for the county. These valuators value the property in the whole county. The different parishes send two members each to the county municipality, and these three valuators are appointed by the whole municipality, so that the valuation in the whole county may be uniform, and that no parish can adopt a valuation different from another. These valuators go through the county every third year. Then assessors are appointed for each parish, who go through each parish every year and value the property. According to the law of New Brunswick, the municipality also appoints two revising officers, and these two appoint a third. They are bound, by law, to check the assessors' lists, to take from them the people who have not property enough to enable them to vote. In New Brunswick a man is entitled to vote who has $100 worth of real estate, in contrast with this proposed Bill, which proposes to make it $150. New Brunswick gives a vote also to a man who has $400 worth of personal property, or personal property and real estate combined; and as there is no personal property qualification in this Bill, in those two classes alone a large number of persons will be disfranchised. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) claimed that he prefers this Bill to the New Brunswick franchise. I read the law very differently. I believe it will disfranchise a very large number, principally of the two classes to which I have referred. This Bill readjusts and decreases the franchise. In the towns, some small tenants will be enfranchised, and in the factory towns there will be quite a number of this class, which is the only additional class that will be enfranchised under this law. In fact, this Bill will take the franchise from the bone and sinew of the country and give it to the floating population, who are the tenants in small towns and in the factory towns; it will give, practically, to the owners of factories, the parties through whom this Government are seeking to control the country, the control of the voting power, at the expense of the bone and sinew of the country. It is a revolutionary measure, a measure which I cannot characterise in fit terms. If I were to read to you some letters I have received this day, you would, Sir, declare that the language by which the writers characterise the principles of this Bill to be out of order. I assure you, that instead of obstructing the business of the House, by calling the attention of this House and the country to the objectionable features of this Bill, hon. gentlemen on this side have not done their duty; they have not sufficiently educated the country with regard to its defects, and every day proves that more and more plainly. The only great merit claimed for this Bill in the first discussion was that it would make a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. I do not think it will. It will fail to make a uniform franchise. Make the figures supposed to represent the value of the property qualification exactly the same in the different Provinces, scattered, as they are, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with so many different circumstances, conditions and values. It will not only fail to make it uniform but it will increase the friction between these different Provinces. The more latitude you give to the Provinces to do do their local business in their own way, the less friction you will have; and the stronger you endeavor to bind them together by Acts of Parliament the more friction you will have. Under this Bill the voters' list is to be made up by an officer appointed by this Government, who is not obliged to take the assessors' list for a foundation, who may put on or take off any names he thinks proper, who is not amenable to any person for having done what he thinks proper. There is no appeal on matters of fact, and though there is said to be an appeal on points of law, it can only take place with the consent of the man whose decision is to be appealed against. I regret to see the misstatement in some of the Government papers in New Brunswick—some which are said to be organs of the Government, some of which are controlled by members of this House, some of whom are contributors to them—that there is an appeal in matters of fact as well as in matters of law. I am sorry to see these misstatements reiterated, because some people will believe them. The appeal, even if it be allowed, will be so expensive that not one man in five hundred will take advantage of it. In fact, there is no appeal at all. You can suppose a Province in which there is not a member supporting the Government. Who is to appoint the revising barrister? Some outsider, perhaps, from some other Province, and you can imagine the friction that will be occasioned by this line of action. I know of several counties that have not a barrister of five years' standing qualified for the position, and in which there are no resident judges. According to the interpretation of the Prime Minister, the Government will have to send a revising barrister from another county, and the man most likely to be sent is a red-hot partisan, and you may imagine the amount of indignation that will be occasioned by these appointments. I will vote for the amendment to the amendment, and if that fails I will vote for the amendment. I believe that every Province should have the privilege of electing its own delegates in its own way. If we had a legislative union this measure would be a necessity, but this is a federal union, and my strongest

objection to the measure is that it is a direct blow at the federal union of the different Provinces. I believe this measure is sapping and mining the foundation upon which this Confederation rests. If this line of legislation is continued, no Acts of Parliament will bind these Provinces together very long. It has been asserted, and it has not been contradicted, that the Premier is not a federal unionist, but is in favor of a legislative union. I have not heard him say so in so many words, but the line of conduct followed by the party he leads certainly leads me to that conclusion. Ever since we came into the Union we have been drifting in that direction. Laws have been continually made in this House that entrenched, little by little, upon the rights of the Provinces. I know that a different construction was put upon Dominion rivers, and upon railways. Formerly, a Dominion river was a river dividing two provinces, or dividing a Province from a State; but that has been changed, and at present the Dominion takes charge of every stream and every river. Formerly, a Dominion railway was construed to be a railway that united two or more Provinces, but now the Dominion has taken charge of nearly all the railways. Acts dealing with purely local railways have been disallowed. Unconstitutional Acts regulating and licensing the liquor traffic have been passed, and so, from one thing to another, the Dominion has gone on encroaching upon provincial rights. This measure now before us appears to be an advanced measure—an advanced entrenchment—from which, I suppose, a last attack will be made upon provincial autonomy. I do think that the smaller Provinces are in danger. I will not say anything about Quebec. They are numerous enough in Quebec to take care of themselves, but I do believe that the only safety of the smaller Provinces is in keeping up the federal union. The Quebec people may take care of themselves, but if they assist the right hon. Premier gradually to encroach upon the rights of the Provinces, the time will come when Quebec will rue her present course. I am mistaken if she does not before long awake to the fact that she has gone so far in that direction that it will be impossible to recede. For instance, take this Bill. The Premier has told us very plainly that he was in favor of female franchise. We are informed that the members from the Province of Quebec are against female suffrage almost unanimously. I ask the representatives from Quebec how long it will be, if the Premier remains in power and carries out his policy, before woman suffrage will be made the law of the land. It will not be long. There are other ways in which their privileges will be encroached upon, and I ask you, gentlemen, in your own interests, to assist the smaller Provinces in resisting this encroachment upon their rights. I say it is a privilege, according to the federal constitution, for each Province to elect its own delegates, in its own way, to represent its own interests. For the last eighteen years the Provinces have enjoyed that privilege, and it has worked satisfactorily. There has been no good reason shown for changing it. I know of no reason in the world why it should be changed, excepting it be for party purposes. Now, I say that if that is the only reason it is not a good reason. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) made a serious charge of obstruction against this side of the House. He says we have obstructed the business of this House. Sir, the facts of the case contradict that assertion. What are the facts? This Bill did not receive its second reading until the 16th day of last month, after we had been in session for nearly three months, and when we ought to have been ready to wind up the affairs of the Session and go home. Then it was thrown in upon us, with only a few minutes' explanation; in fact, with no explanation at all. We were not told what the provisions of the Bill were. I say deliberately that I did not know what the provisions of the Bill were until after several days' debate, and it is my opinion that three-fourths of the members of this House did not know the full extent of the provisions of the Bill until after several days' debate. During those three days, upon which we discussed the merits of the Bill upon the second reading, I ask you if we had fair play. During one or two nights were we not kept here until six o'clock in the morning, and on other days until hours long past midnight? It was impossible for any hon. gentleman on this side to be heard. The noise, the cat-calls, the songs and the revelry of all description indulged in by supporters of the Government made it impossible for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to discuss this matter intelligently, and yet we are accused of obstruction. Sir, I ask you if that accusation is in accordance with the facts. Instead of being confined to three days in discussing the second reading of the Bill we should have had a week. On the fourth day we were limited in our discussion, for upon the motion to go into committee it was ruled that we could not discuss the merits of the Bill. The second week we went into committee. What is a committee for, either in England or here? It is where we are to deliberate as to the particular sections of a Bill, where we ask questions and ascertain the real meaning of the words contained in the several sections. Was that discussion afforded? No. After twelve o'clock on the first day it was impossible to hear anything; discussion was entirely dropped. On the second night the tactics were changed. Hon. gentlemen came here with pillows, with beds, and they said they were going to sleep. Some hon. gentlemen brought lunches with them and said they were going to eat and sleep and let us talk till we were tired. Was it possible for us to discuss the details and obtain explanations when our remarks were being drowned by cat-calls, cock-crowing, songs and revelry, during the first few days? After that hon. gentlemen opposite went to sleep. Is that obstructing? If so, it is all behind the Government. It is unfair to educate the people by the press that the Opposition have been obstructing the business of the House. I say we have not. The Premier himself declared that it would take a whole Session to satisfactorily discuss a Bill of this description. He told us, however, that this was the old Bill, with a few amendments. But when we came to look at it we found it was not the old Bill. Was the tribal Indian in the old Bill? No. It was a new provision. It is true that in the second week of the discussion, in answer to almost defiant speeches from this side, a few hon. gentlemen opposite spoke. But they did not explain anything. The hon. member for Algoma explained that he knew nothing about the Bill; he demonstrated that fact most conclusively, because he gave a construction with regard to Indians which the Premier said was not in the Bill. We have been badly and unfairly treated in accusations having been thrown across the floor which were contrary to the facts. The hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), who is generally fair-minded and always voluble, poured out a volume of speech that was overwhelming; it was a perfect torrent of words—a blizzard of words. I really was alarmed for the safety of the hon. gentleman, as he was so much in earnest. He, like the hon. member for Algoma, proved that he knew nothing about the Bill, and he had to be put right by the leader of the Government. Then the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) rose. He is always calm, deliberate, and grammatically correct, and he made a long speech, evidently timed by the clock, so as to allow the Premier to speak and him alone that night, which only terminated a few minutes before twelve, and he again proved that he knew nothing about the Bill; that he had been out of the House, though not, perhaps, asleep. I need not refer to other hon. members, because even the Secretary of State, on the very first day or two of the debate, proved that he did not understand the Bill. He explained it in a way different from its pro-

visions. I hope, therefore, hon. gentlemen opposite will not charge us with obstructing this Bill. Unless there is a change, three weeks longer will be occupied in getting this measure into their heads. We were not allowed sufficient time at the second reading; I had not then an opportunity of speaking upon the general principals of the Bill, and I shall have to protest against every section, and especially to affirm this amendment which refers to my Province; and I know that if this Bill passes a wave of indignation will sweep over that Province, such as never swept over it before, and there is quite enough indignation there already.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). When I heard hon. gentlemen from the Province of New Brunswick, previous to the last Speaker, address the Chair on this Bill, I was rather disposed to compliment them on the general tone they had adopted, and on the fact that their speeches were a contrast —without being egotistical, as coming from the same Province myself—to those of many hon. gentlemen from the other Provinces, who spoke on that side of the House, and to say that they had been eminently fair in the discussion of this Bill. I say this in the presence of hon. gentlemen on this side representing that Province; but I do not know but the last speaker has taken a little from the sincerity with which I would have uttered that remark. If he had proceeded throughout his speech as he did for the first half or three-quarters of an hour, and if he had not concluded his remarks as he did, I would have been in a position to have uttered this sentiment with more sincerity than I am able to do, after listening to his speech. But it does seem to me strange that the hon. gentleman should conclude his speech by excluding everybody on this side from those who knew anything about this Bill, and by saying that for the last three or four weeks hon. gentlemen opposite had been enlightening members on this side, including members of the Government, as to the provision of this Bill. If it is enlightenment it is really a source of the greatest inconsistency with their action with regard to the different sections of the Bill, and if it is enlightenment I must confess that I must be even more ignorant than they say, for I certainly cannot understand that kind of enlightenment. If it were necessary, their speeches could be taken up, and it could be shown that their inconsistencies and contradictions in the course of the debate were so great that there could not be a great deal of enlightenment, because one member uttered one thing and the next something entirely dfferent, and so on throngh the whole discussion. Now, a few days ago some hon. gentlemen from the other side—I will not mention them, because there were too many of them, though not all of them—found fault with the hon. member for King's, P. E. I.; they said that he was entirely inconsistent, and they asked him why he did not adopt the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, which included what he was asking for, and did the same work as his amendment. Since then we have found two more amendments, moved by these hon. gentlemen who found fault with him. They allow their colleagues and friends, those who are in sympathy and harmony with them in opposing this Bill, to go back and move similar sub-amendments as the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, with whom they found fault. I made an exception of the hon. gentleman for New Brunswick, and I do yet. I say that those gentlemen, with the exception of the hon. member for Sunbury, who did not devote himself entirely to the principles of the measure, discussed in a fair spirit; and the only fault I can find with them is, that they have too great confidence in the utterances of gentlemen on that side, and that they look with too much suspicion on anything that comes from this side. Some of them admitted, on the second reading of the Bill, that they did not know anything about it; they said that we spoke little upon the measure, but they swallowed everything that was said by speakers on that side, some of whom pronounced the Bill to be an outrageous measure. They do not use their own judgment; and, not knowing anything about the measure, as some of them admitted, they still have implicit confidence in all they are told by their leaders and colleagues, and they use the same strong words in discussing the Bill. They say it is outrageous, tyrannical, revolutionary, and they describe it by a number of other words, with which they are very familiar, but which I cannot pretend to repeat; they have swallowed all that; they repeat all these words as being absolutely true, but without advancing any argument to show that they are true. Where is the revolutionary character of this measure? How long have we been discussing it since we came to the third section. I have not kept time, but it is a long time; and what have we been discussing? We have been discussing just one clause, as to who shall be entitled to vote, who shall be put on the register, and that having reference to a person being at the full age of twenty-one years, if he be not otherwise disqualified by this Act, or some other Act of the Dominion. Now, it appears to me that if there had been no intention of obstruction—this is my candid opinion—if there only had been a desire on the part of these hon. gentlemen to perfect this Bill, to make it as perfect as it could be, to offer such amendments as they sincerely believed would have the effect of amending it, in the way of making it more perfect, they would have said: Let that go; surely we cannot say that twenty-one years of age is not the right age. Then they would come to the next part of the clause, that he must be a British subject, by birth or naturalisation, and they would say: Is that reasonable, and if it is, let that go. Then he must be the owner of real property of the value of $300; and as to that there might be some difference of opinion. If hon. gentlemen are not engaged in obstruction, if it is their purpose to amend the Bill and submit to the majority, if they are not simply obstructing it to such an extent, either to make the Government abandon it, or obstructing it in such a way that it cannot be passed at all, if that is not the object, why not let those things which are not objectionable pass, and when they come to the others, discuss them in a reasonable and rational way. Why not, if $300 is too high, say so; or, if they think it is too low, let them say so, and offer amendments accordingly, and let the majority decide whether their amendments shall be accepted. In that case we, on this side, or at all events I, myself, would come to the conclusion that it was a reasonable and legitimate discussion, a proper discussion, one which tended to enlighten the members of the House, and that they were trying to make the Bill perfect. But nothing of that kind has been done, and here we have been on a section as to whether these persons shall be twenty-one years of age, whether they shall have the other necessary qualifications—we have been kept here for three days or more——

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. LANDRY. Well, I have not kept the time, but it is a long time, at any rate, and some hon. members beside me say it is three days.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes it is.

Mr. LANDRY. The hon. member for Bothwell says no, and I do not know whether he means that I have overstated the time or not.

Mr. MILLS. What I say is, that we propose to adopt the provincial franchises. That has been the subject under discussion, and the hon. gentleman knows that if we adopt the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk we could not adopt the first clause of the Bill.

Mr. LANDRY. Let us take the first clause of this Bill, and I venture to say there is not a Province in the Dominion

which has not, as one of the qualifications of a voter, that he must be twenty-one years of age, that he must not be otherwise disqualified from voting, and therefore I say, why should not hon. gentlemen let that pass. That is my view, at any rate, and hon. gentlemen can have theirs. I have alluded to this matter and to the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, as a reason why I think this is a system of obstruction. But why are they ashamed to acknowledge that it is a system of obstruction. I wish to speak frankly and candidly, and I say that if I were on the other side of the House, if I had declared as loudly as they have declared that this Bill is an outrage, that it is an attempt at tyranny, that it is a revolutionary measure, and if I thought that, although myself and my friends were in a minority in this House, we represented the views of the majority of the people in that matter, if I were using every means to prevent the Bill from passing, even if it kept this Parliament sitting here for six or even nine months, I would admit at once that it was obstruction; that we would take every opportunity to oppose it, that we would not allow one clause, one line or one word to pass, without obstructing it. What for? For the purpose of killing it. I would stand or fall on it, and I would let the country know and believe that that was our object. I would not pretend that I was not obstructing it; I would not pretend that I was acting so simply for the purpose of making the measure better, of perfecting the measure, of enlightening the people or the House, and making the country understand it. I would simply say that I had convinced myself that it was an outrageous and a revolutionary measure.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. I say that I would say that, after being convinced of it—after being convinced that, though being in a minority, I still represented the sentiments of the country and, believing that as I do, I am going to throw myself on that sentiment in the country, and I will obstruct this Bill in every way I know how. I would not be ashamed of it; if I was obstructing it I would say so; that is the difference between hon. gentlemen opposite and me. Perhaps their course is better; I do not say anything as to that. Perhaps it is better to say, as they do: We want this thing to go on—we want legitimate and fair discussion of this measure. What does that mean? Does it mean two or three or four months? I do not know. There are partisans on both sides of this House, no doubt. There are partisans on that side strong enough to believe what they say, and there are strong partisans on this side, perhaps; but there is a sentiment in this country that is not controlled by partisans, and I believe that sentiment will come to the conclusion that the system pursued on the other side is obstruction. Hon. gentlemen may deny it, but it is not their denial that will be accepted; it is by their acts and their conduct that they will be judged. So far as New Brunswick is concerned, I think hon. gentlemen have discussed fairly the case of that Province, and have endeavored to show that New Brunswick is going to suffer under this Bill. I give them credit for sincerity, but I think they have done that, not from studying the Bill, but from hearing the incessant cry that it is so—saying that so many clever men will know, or they would not assert it, and therefore they believe it. What does the Bill do, in the matter of New Brunswick, to make is so revolutionary and to make it so objectionable? It does much to extend the franchise—is there any harm in that? Hon gentlemen say it is something outrageous, and the last speaker said it would be so resisted by the people that the Conservatives would not come back to the Parliament of Canada again. That should be all the better for them, and for the country, if they represent public sentiment. All this only goes to show what I said a little while ago, that they look with too much suspicion at what comes from this side of the House. If this same measure had come from the leader of the Government of New Brunswick there would not have been a word said against it. Look at the Bill as it passed the Lower House in New Brunswick. It would not only change the franchise for the election of members to the Legislature of New Brunswick, but the franchise for the election of members to this House also; yet these hon. gentlemen did not say a word against it. There is a little difference between that measure and this as to property; but what does it signify whether the property qualification is $40 or $50, higher or lower? It is not sufficient to say that it is a revolutionary measure; it is a small matter whether the property qualification should be $100 or $150. That Bill also provides for a revising barrister—not exactly in the same words as are used in this Bill, and not precisely with the same machinery, but the revising barrister is the tribunal of last resort, and he is an appointee of the Government, to be removed for cause only.

An hon. MEMBER. Not during pleasure.

Mr. LANDRY. Yes; during pleasure and for cause. Let the hon. gentleman read the measure again, and he will find those very words. The revising barrister is, there, not to be removed by another party but the party that appointed him. Now, if a Bill of this kind passed in this House can be used for a party purpose, surely a similar measure passed by another House can be used for a party purpose in the same way. Therefore, my hon. friends from the Province of New Brunswick would not have made that objection against the Bill if it had been proposed by some one else, but he simply does so because it was proposed on this side of the House. Another argument used by the last speaker, as well as by a large number of others, is that we ought to give to the different Provinces all the latitude we can give them. I do not agree with that idea of making these different Provinces feel that is their interest to be separate and isolated from the rest of the Dominion, and that they are not to work in harmony with the rest of the Dominion. We should teach the different Provinces that there is a community of interest and sentiment among them, that we are here representing the whole Dominion—I, representing a constituency in New Brunswick, feeling that I also represent British Columbia, and a gentleman from British Columbia, feeling that he also represents New Brunswick, we should teach the lesson that we represent a nation, a Dominion; we should teach them, by our legislation and by our speeches here, and on the hustings, that we belong to a great nationality, or to what is to be a great nationality in the future, and that their representatives come here in the interest of everybody in the country, not seeking for the interests of the particular part of the country they represent, against the interests of every other part of the country. And when we come here, representing the whole Dominion, as we do, and a question of this kind comes before the House, is it not better that the people should be taught that it is safe in the hands of their representatives—that the franchise of the Province of Nova Scotia is perfectly safe in the hands of the representatives who come from the Province of Ontario, and that the franchise of the Province of Quebec is safe in the hands of the representatives of the other Provinces, in conjunction with their own representatives, than to teach them the reverse? Is it not better to do that than to say: Don't trust the people of Nova Scotia with the franchise of Ontario; they are hostile to you and will be inimical to your interests? Do not let us teach them that. Let us teach them that we are here on an equal footing—that our interests are identical. If there be some different circumstances which require to be treated in a different way from the rest, let us have proper regard to them; but let the case be placed before Parliament as before fair-minded men. I speak of the country as a whole, and I say let us teach the people that the interests of one part of this

Dominion are safe in the hands of the representatives of another part; and when you teach the people a lesson like that, you do something of much greater importance, even, than to pass a Franchise Bill. There is no better educator than legislation; the people learn from their representatives, from the speeches they make, and from their legislation—I was going to say more than in any other way; they look up to them and pay respect to whatever opinions they express; and their representatives ought to so conduct themselves that the people will have faith in their actions and in their sincerity to serve them. In view of these considerations, is it not much better for this Dominion to have its own franchise, that is not subject to interference by another Legislature, which may be to-day a Liberal and to-morrow a Conservative Legislature? We should have the control of the franchise and make use of it in a legitimate way, not hostilely to British Columbia, or to Ontario, or to Quebec, or to Nova Scotia, or to New Brunswick, but friendly to every body. I think that is the sentiment to inculcate in the minds of the people, and not that, if Quebec only lets go what she has, she will go to the wall; that she is jealous of her rights—that was a soft spot, and they took advantage of it—and if Quebec once let this right go, Ontario would get the whole, and the people of Ontario are so hostile to the people of Quebec that if they once get a chance, if they once get a warranty to do it, they will drive the people of Quebec to the wall. It seems to me that is not a proper utterance to make in this Parliament. The proper position to take is to say that the Province of Ontario will take no advantage, will never make use of that greater strength it is possessed of for the purpose of driving the Province of Quebec, or any other Province, to the wall. Let us feel that our lot is being thrown in together and that we will deal with it in that way. That is the proper education, it seems to me, that should be given to these different Provinces, and for that reason we ought to have control of our franchise. There is nothing more calculated to create discord and animosity between Provinces than for one to feel that another has a high franchise—than, for instance, New Brunswick to feel that she sends representatives here on a high franchise, while a neighboring Province sends representatives on a low franchise.

Mr. MILLS. That is her own concern.

Mr. LANDRY. Suppose the next day New Brunswick says: We will try to equalise with our neighbors, and we will lower our franchise down to theirs; and the other Province says: We will raise ours. The one comes down to-day and the other goes up to-morrow. Do you pretend that we are here to say we do not know what are the concerns of the different Provinces? I would be ashamed to admit that I do not represent New Brunswick here as much as I would in the Local Legislature. I feel that I represent it more, because this is a more important Parliament. I would be loath to think I do not represent New Brunswick quite as much here as I would in the Local Legislature, in matters that pertain to us—I do not mean in matters that pertain to the Provinces. In matters that belong to them, in the matter of electing their own members for their own Houses, I would not have anything to say here; but in the election of members for this House I would be loath to admit that I do not know as much about that as they do. I do not mean to say that I would not take lessons from what they have done or what they say, but I would do so for the purpose of trying to equalise with the other Provinces on as equal a level as we possibly could, always remembering that if any one Province or section could show any exceptional circumstances I would have proper regard in legislating for those exceptional circumstances. I do not believe in forcing a strict, rigid measure for every body. It may be said that I have dealt in generalities and not in details, but I do not think this is the proper place to deal in details. The only details are the details of twenty-one years of age, and of naturalised British subjects, so far as this clause is concerned. If, by-and-bye, there should be an amendment, making a $300 basis, or $250, or $500, and it is necessary to discuss it, we can then discuss it; but there is no necessity now, that we should enter into every detail of the Bill. I would not have spoken at this time only I know that hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken have friends in New Brunswick; I know that they represent a large and respectable body there—I do not wish to disparage them or belittle their position in any way, or the great interest they represent—and when they spoke of this measure as such an outrageous one I felt called upon to reply. I admit these hon. gentlemen represent a large and influential and highly intelligent party, but while they do that I think it is only right, when they make utterances in this entirely one-sided manner, and their friends make it their business to publish those utterances, that they should not be published without our showing that there are two views in this House, and that when they say it is an outrageous and revolutionary measure they are not justified in so describing it by any fair comparison with any electoral measure in New Brunswick. Some of their leaders, however, have been talking about the iniquities of this Bill so long these hon. gentlemen have ultimately become convinced that, if not entirely convinced themselves, it would be a good thing to try and convince the country that the measure is of this nature, and thus, in any case, they would benefit by it. There is nothing in this Bill to justify the language used by those hon. gentlemen in its regard; and for my part I am ready to take the full responsibility of it, and discuss it at the hustings, when the time comes.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has delivered his second lecture, having delivered his first on last Saturday, and I confess he stood a little higher in my estimation before than he does now, after having given these two lectures. The lecture he has just given was a very good one, and this is the proper place to offer it, but the audience to which he ought to deliver it was not present. Before attempting again to deliver a lecture on the unity of the various members of the Confederacy—and I quite agree he can do the subject justice—he should wait until the First Minister is in his seat. Before we formed part of the Confederacy we knew something of the bickerings and troubles that existed in old Canada, and had not the slighest intention of sharing in those troubles, trials and bickerings; we had not the slighest intention, when we entered the Union, to throw fuel upon the fire which had been kindled many years ago. The hon. gentleman must know, as well as every hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House, with some of whom I have conversed upon this very subject, the real motive of this Bill. When I conversed with the hon. gentleman, as two hon. gentlemen would with one another, in reference to a uniform franchise, I stated I had no objection to it, if it was thought necessary to promote the satisfactory working out of our federal principle. He said: Do you not see the point? It is the old feud between the Mowat Government and the Federal Government; it is the old quarrel of supremacy; it is an attempt to take the control from the local authorities and place it in the Federal Parliament. It is a fight of revenge. Now, it is rather too bad that the Maritime Provinces, who have always been a law-abiding and peace-loving people, should be brought into a quarrel that concerns these two parties. We have no desire to interfere in the petty feuds between Mr. Mowat and the First Minister. As I stated, the hon. gentleman delivered a lecture, but he should have waited until the First Minister was in his seat. If he cannot get the First Minister in his place he should go to his office or to his room.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will not interrupt. We all got a fair hearing, and on this New Brunswick question we are conducting this discussion on argument, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be listened to patiently, as we were.

Mr. IRVINE. I thank the hon. gentleman for his interference. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) accused the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) of misrepresenting this question, in regard to the county of Charlotte, and said that he was afraid to have the franchise widened for fear that he would not get his proportion of votes at the next election. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's logic. I think my hon. friend from Charlotte differs from the hon. gentleman in this respect, that while the member for Charlotte wishes to have the sole control vested in the local authorities, the member for Gloucester is willing to transfer that jurisdiction to the Federal Parliament. He wishes to transfer the fixing of the franchise for New Brunswick to the British Columbians, the Nova Scotians, the Ontarians and the Quebecers. We want to keep it in the hands of our own people. I cannot say that this Franchise Bill is an old friend of mine, but I can recognise it as a very old acquaintance. I have been acquainted with it for three years, but I think older parliamentarians, who have been in the House since 1867, have had a longer acquaintance with it than I have. It made its first appearance in the very first Session of the very first Parliament of the Union, and has been a regular visitor since. It strikes me as exceedingly strange why, if it was a necessity then, as a part of the machinery required to work out the Union, it was not taken up when the people came from the various Provinces that formed the Confederacy, free of prejudice and partisanship, and when the First Minister was in the prime of life. I can only account for its not having been passed then by the fact that the hon. gentlemen who formed the first and the second and the third Parliament who were men sent by independent constituencies to maintain their independent position in this Parliament, were really independent, and that the hon. gentleman had not then the servile following of which he boasts to-day. They were men whom he could not handle, men who respected their rights, and who could not be trampled upon. In order to trace the history of the measure, I will quote a few words from the speech made by the hon. member for South Wellington a few days ago. (Extract quoted.) It was stated by the hon. member for Westmoreland that the franchise was not fixed by law. the section under which the franchise is fixed in the several Provinces I will read. (The hon. gentleman read section 40 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1874.) These were the views that the Liberal Government held, and they are the views I hold now. I believe that the people are the best judges of how the whole work should be done; therefore, I believe in retaining the present system, that has worked so well for eighteen years. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) harped a great deal upon the expense the Opposition were putting this country to in discussing this measure. Whenever the Government want anything done of a doubtful character, or of a doubtful meaning, they generally choose the hon. member for Lincoln, and there is no one can do it with a better grace then he can. He stated, in glowing terms, that we were putting this country to a great expense. I beg to say that, so far as I am concerned, I believe I am paying my own expenses. I believe my time here, and the time of the hon. gentlemen of this House, and of the messengers and reporters—of all who are paid by salary—whether we remain a longer or a shorter time, does not make any difference in the expenses of the country. I believe that all the additional expense involved is merely the printing of what we say, and I am sure, so far as I am personally concerned, I care very little whether it is printed or not; I do not care a rap about it. With how much grace does the charge of obstruction come from supporters of the Government, when that Government kept us here during the first month of the Session, and only kept Parliament sitting sixty-five hours. Were they economising time then? Surely, if they expected this Bill should be passed at this Session, would it not have been brought down earlier? It is stated here that the First Minister said, a few years ago, that to pass this Franchise Bill was the work of a Session. If he made that statement, that to pass this Bill would be the work of a Session, with what grace does the hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry) stand up and attempt to lecture this House upon obstruction? After that right hon. gentleman had made so many abortive attempts to pass a Franchise Bill, and was then obliged to withdraw it, what does he mean by bringing down this measure, after three months of the Session, minus twelve days, have passed, and expect us to pass it? After the Government and their supporters had frittered away many days of the Session, then they attempt to pass this measure, in face of the fact that all the important business of the Session still remains unattended to. It is contemptible—I use the word unhesitatingly, as the only one that describes their conduct. Besides that, if they had any respect for themselves, or the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, or the feelings of the people of this country, the blood of whose sons redden the snows of the North-West, they would have taken another opportunity to introduce this Bill. The First Minister must have known, when he said it would take a Session to pass this Bill, that it was not an easy matter to carry through; he must have known that there was a great deal of bickering and bitterness between the Ontario Government and the Federal Government; he must have known the bitter feeling this Bill would excite; he must have known that the men whom he was going to injure by this Bill would fight to the death. I would call them poltroons if they did not. If I were Paterson of Brant—excuse me for mentioning his name—if I were that hon. gentleman, before I would allow a Bill of that kind to pass I would die in my tracks. This is a measure that we have great difficulty in understanding. It is one of a very peculiar character. It is one some of the clauses of which have been very summarily dealt with. When I look at the summary manner in which the First Minister disposed of the clauses enfranchising women, I am astonished. We heard the hon. gentleman state in this House that he was in favor of enfranchising the women; that it was only a question of time. He said: This will not carry.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IRVINE. I am discussing the clause respecting the enfranchisement of women, and I say it was summarily disposed of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. IRVINE. I really think, Mr. Chairman, you should name some hon. members.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will keep order.

Mr. KIRK. Who is obstructing now?

Mr. IRVINE. I contend that this is about the way hon. gentlemen opposite obstruct the Bill. It does not add much to the dignity of this Chamber. I was discussing the summary way in which the First Minister dropped the clause to enfranchise women. I thought it was very summarily disposed of. At once he stated very plainly that the clause would be lost, and of course he anticipated that result. I do not know but that some good-looking damsel had danced before him, and had made him give a rash promise, and in order to carry out the promise he had to go so far, and no further. When the Bill was introduced he put in that clause and intended to get rid of it in the most

summary manner. I confess that the provisions of the Bill have been rather imperfectly understood. There are some clauses that I frankly confess I am unable to understand. I remember a long time was spent on the Indian clause. I was a little surprised that a week ago last Saturday, after so much had been said on that clause, there was such a misunderstanding between hon. members who ought to understand it. I heard many speeches, but I was unable to understand the clause, knowing but very little of the Indian character and of the Indian laws; of course, I knew the Indians were under the control and supervision of the federal authorities.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Another hon. MEMBER. He is tight.

Mr. IRVINE. I think men who are tight should be somewhere else. I do not think the Chamber is a place for maudlin drunkards. I stated, a week ago last Saturday, that the Indian question was not perfectly understood; perhaps it was better understood by other hon. gentlemen than by myself; but up to that day we had not a very correct knowledge of what was in the Bill. A prominent lawyer stated that while he did not know what changes were intended, the Bill as printed gave the right to vote to every Indian on the reservations in the old Provinces. That was denied by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I would refer for a moment to the speech of the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry). His speech of last Saturday did him very little credit. He very severely reprimanded hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and it turned out that the hon. gentleman had misunderstood the clause of the Bill under consideration. In that respect his remarks were similar to those of the hon. member for Algoma, the hon. member for East Grey and the hon. member for King's, N.B.

Mr. LABROSSE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. gentleman does not confine his remarks to the question which is before the Committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman has a right to reply to the observations of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. IRVINE. For the sake of brevity I will deal with those four gentlemen collectively, and not individually. They stated very distinctly that the Bill was not intended to give the right to vote to Indians, on the reservations who were not enfranchised according to law. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) explained what enfranchisement of the Indians meant: that he severed his tribal relations, received his portion of the reserve, and asumed the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. Several hon. gentlemen on that side denied that it was the intention to give these tribal Indians a vote; but when the hon. member for Brant asked the First Minister, he distinctly contradicted them, and he said it was the intention to give these tribal Indians a vote. Now, this is a serious matter; and if any hon. gentleman had stated to me that there was a man in Canada so lost to a sense of honor, or honesty, or propriety, as, under cover of a Bill like this, to give the right to vote to these tribal Indians on reservations, I would not have believed it. If it took a whole week to drill this idea into the craniums of hon. gentlemen —if I may use that expression—and if they had to go to the First Minister for an explanation, when may we expect that all the other clauses of the Bill will be drilled into their heads? Certainly, it will take fully the time which the First Minister declared a few years ago would be required to pass a Franchise Bill, and that is a whole Session. Still, when we had been here three months, minus ten days, they will rush this Bill through, and leave other measures to be unattended to. But they are a very patriotic set of men. After being here for two months, leading the people to believe they are doing the work of this country, when gentlemen are wearied and anxious to go home, they bring down this Bill, and put up one gentleman and another to lecture us on this side as to our duty, as to the need of unity, and as to the need of our being brethren united to build up this great country. They wish us to build up the country, but they want to tie our hands behind our backs. Does the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) not think this is a revolutionary measure? If there is another word in the English vocabulary which might be used to describe it I would use it; but to introduce a measure of this kind, to take the place of a system which has been in use so long, is nothing less than revolutionary—it is something serious to contemplate. And this is done at a time when there is a feeling of partisanship existing between the Tories and the Liberals of this country, and between the different members of the Confederacy, at the time when we have a war on our hands, when our sons are in the North-West trying to quell a rebellion, which some people think is the result of carelessness, and——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. IRVINE. There is one point I wish to speak of particularly, and I will not waste any words. If there is anything which I would feel disposed to fight for it would be to retain every vestige of the power which properly belongs to New Brunswick. With some hon. gentlemen it may be Ontario, Ontario; but with me it is New Brunswick, New Brunswick, first, last and forever, and sooner than have any of her rights taken away from her I would see a great gulf across our boundaries to keep us from passing to you, or you to us. One reason I am in favor of provincial franchise is, that I believe that we are the best qualified to do our own business and regulate our own franchise. Another very strong reason is, that many years ago we had to fight for our rights, for responsible government, the right to appoint those who would do our business for us; and now, when we come here to this Federal Parliament they propose to give away our liberty of appointing these officers and to take the power of appointing officers themselves, without saying by your leave, to appoint men without any recommendation and without any power to remove them. That is going back to the old family compact system. Another reason I am in favor of provincial franchise is, that for eighteen years our electoral lists have been prepared without expense to the Federal Government, and there never has been a word of complaint about that system. Surely, in introducing a system entirely different, it was necessary for the First Minister, in presenting the Bill, to have shown the House that the old system had been faulty, and had not answered its purpose. But it is singular that though this is called a uniform franchise we are not going to have a uniform franchise at all. We have a franchise for fishermen, another for tenants, another for farmers, another for laboring men, and so on. It is a mongrel franchise, a fancy franchise, as some hon. gentlemen called it. As I stated before, I can see no impropriety in having a uniform franchise, but to have such a franchise we will have to abandon everything else and adopt manhood suffrage. I can see no other suffrage that will be uniform throughout this Dominion. I am not very much opposed to that. I would rather give a worthy young man of twenty-one years of age a vote than I would to an old miser who has great wealth. I believe in intelligence and moral worth more than in property as a qualification for the franchise. I believe that no matter how much property a man has he should not have more than one vote to elect representatives to this Parliament. I believe that every intelligent and moral young man who is twenty-one years of age ought to be considered as trustworthy as the wealthiest man in the country. It is said that there are two reasons why this Bill should become

law. I think there are two reasons, but neither of them are such as would induce me to vote for the Bill. The first is—although I believe it will never become law—that it was the intention of the promoters of the Bill to give the suffrage to a number of friendly Indians in the older Provinces who are supported and cared for by the Government, to enable them to vote for the party that cares for them. What can be more reasonable than that the Indian, with his native instinct, if I may say so, will vote for the person who takes care of his property, who advises him in everything, who does not give him power to buy or sell, or to dispose of his property, either in life or in death? I object to that part of the Bill. There is another part that is not in my interest or in the interest of the country; that is, the provisions under which this Government will appoint revising barristers or persons to prepare the electoral lists, and to revise those lists. The power the Government will have over those officers would be an advantage to the Government; I do not know how far that advantage would go; it would depend on the character of those officers; but I would hesitate to give them such power. I saw, with pain and regret, that before the last election they took a similar power; they were not satisfied that the sheriffs or registrars should be the returning officers, and one of the returning officers returned a gentleman to this House who had no right to be here, and who sat here for two years; and the returning officer received a gold watch for that. I think here will be more gold watches after these revising barristers are appointed. I am opposed to that provision of the Bill; I think it is the living principle of the Bill; in fact, I think it is the head and the tail and the middle. It has an ugly look, to me. I do not like these revising barristers; I do not like to take out of the hands of the people the preparation of the voters' lists, and to place it in the hands of a creature of the Government, and I protest against that provision. If hon. members opposite, instead of lecturing hon. gentlemen on this side, would throw some light upon some of these obscure parts of the Bill and assist us in this difficult matter, we might get through with this measure. Another provision of the Bill which I do not like is the difference which it makes between the cities and the rural districts. I have the honor to represent a farming constituency, and I cannot say that there is that difference between the New Brunswick franchise and the franchise this Bill contemplates in my constituency as there is in some other constituencies. I think the difference, perhaps, is greater in cities than in the rural districts. But there is a principle, of course, which we have always contended against in New Brunswick. The farming population always contended against enfranchising the laboring classes in the cities, on the ground that there is a considerable floating population. I am not, however, against enlarging the franchise to any class, but rather like the view, though I cannot say I am very decided on that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have listened with very considerable attention to the arguments, pro and con, on this question of the New Brunswick franchise. I am perfectly certain of one thing, that the great majority of members of this House, hailing from other Provinces, had, before this discussion, very little idea indeed of the alterations proposed to be made in the constituencies of the Province of New Brunswick. It is very remarkable that, during a discussion affecting the constituencies of those Provinces, not only has the Minister who is in charge of this Act been absent during the whole of this discussion, but during the greater part of the time the only remaining Minister in the Cabinet from New Brunswick, now in Canada, I believe, has not been here either, nor has he or the First Minister vouchsafed one single word of explanation to us on this side, or to his own followers, as to the effect the introduction of this measure would have in that Province. Knowing the habits of the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, in these matters, I am tolerably well convinced that, although he may have supplied two or three of the leading ideas for the formation of this Bill, he has not bestowed half a dozen hours' serious consideration upon its details; and, more particularly, has not bestowed any consideration at all on the way in which it will affect the constituencies of the smaller Provinces in this Dominion. It is in the recollection of the members of the committee that when the First Minister introduced the Bill, he gave us the most meagre possible explanation of its details. Now, on any occasion, when a measure of this kind, involving, as my hon. friend behind me has truly said, great constitutional changes, is introduced, it has always been hitherto customary for the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to explain with reasonable fullness and minuteness what effect this measure would produce in the various Provinces affected by its provisions. That has always been done. That is done, as anybody who pays the least attention to the debates in the House of Commons knows, by English statesmen, whom the hon. gentlemen profess to set before them as authorities, when they have occasion to introduce measures of a similar character. Now, what is the consequence in this instance? Hon. gentlemen, as I have said, have discussed this measure, so far, very fairly on both sides. I did not see any hon. gentleman on the other side attempt, in the least, to meet the arguments of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King), with respect to the effect, the extraordinary effect, which the substitution of this particular measure for the Act now in force in New Brunswick would create in his own constituency. I took particular note of that hon. gentleman's remarks, and I desire to call the attention of the committee to the extraordinary results of the measure. That hon. gentleman, at his last election, was returned by about 1,100 votes, against 800 or 900 votes; in other words, about 2,000 votes were cast. My hon. friend showed in detail—from authentic official information—that of those 2,000 votes nearly 25 per cent., 420 votes, would be disfranchised by the operation of a single clause of this Bill. He also showed that a very considerable number of the remainder of his votes would be disfranchised by another clause of this Bill. The total number I do not exactly recollect, but it amounts, practically, to this: that about one-third of my hon. friend's constituency would, according to the official documents, be disfranchised if the measure now before you becomes law in its present shape. If that is at all a fair representation of the way in which this measure would affect the other sixteen or seventeen constituencies in New Brunswick, then I do not believe that a measure working such important changes was ever before introduced into a House of Commons of any country enjoying representative institutions without full and particular explanations, none of which have been given to us from the Ministerial benches, from the time this measure was introduced up to the present moment. Now, I cannot say, I have no means of knowing, how far the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) may have been correct in his view of the operation of this measure in his own particular constituency. If I followed his argument correctly, his idea was that, in his particular constituency, as many, or perhaps more, would secure a vote under this measure, in consequence, I think, of the vote bestowed upon fishermen possessing a certain amount of real property and a certain amount of personal property, as would lose it. That may be the case in that constituency; but, according to the census returns, there are only 1,854 fishermen in all New Brunswick. If those returns be correct—as to which I express no opinion—if all those fishermen were enfranchised, it would not, if the statements made by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King) are correct, more than compensate for the loss of votes in two or three constituencies. And when we remember that a great number of these fishermen are

sure to have votes, whether or no, we can judge for ourselves how vast a change is to be worked in this particular Province, if this measure becomes law. My point is, that it was the bounden duty of the First Minister, and of his colleagues from New Brunswick at any rate, to have placed this fact before the House, and to have called the attention of the House forcibly to these results. It is not fair to the House, it is not fair to the country, and least of all is it fair to those whose seats are going to be so largely affected, that important facts like these should be kept in the dark. I believe most firmly that the whole information that we have received to-night on the subject of the New Brunswick franchise would be entirely new information to the First Minister, if he had been here to get it; and I can only hope that his colleague, who has set a most excellent example of patient attention, the Minister of Public Works, will call his attention to the enormous effect which apparently will be produced in New Brunswick by the introduction of these franchises in preference to the franchise they at present enjoy, and I have no doubt that, at another time, my hon. friends, who have argued this question so well and so clearly, will call the attention of the House to the matter, and will cause the votes of all the New Brunswick members, at all events, to be put on formal record in a matter of such importance to the Province.

Mr. WALLACE (Albert). There will not be 250 altered. It is absurd.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, the hon. gentleman did not choose to refute the statements of the hon. member for Queen's, which were given in great detail, parish by parish, on the authority, I understood, of the gentleman who prepared those rolls, the secretary-treasurer of the county, an official, I suppose, exercising something like the functions of the assessors in Ontario. I call again the attention of the committee to the fact that, though hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking in regard to their own counties, may have held, perhaps rightly, that similar results would not be produced in their case, it has not been attempted to impugn or contradict these statements; and if they be true, and if they afford the slightest indication of the general effect of this measure upon New Brunswick, it is, as regards that Province, one of the largest measures of disfranchisement ever introduced into Parliament. We all know, there is no use denying so plain and patent a fact, that from various causes a great many persons in the Maritime Provinces are seriously discontented with the practical working out of Confederation. It is no secret; I am very sorry for it; because, being one of those who contributed in a small degree towards the bringing about of this Confederation, I desire, as earnestly as any man opposite can desire, to see the Confederation become a success; and therefore it is with very sincere sorrow that I say that no one can deny that in many important respects Confederation has been very far, up to the present moment, from bringing to the people of the Maritime Provinces that prosperity which we hoped and desired it should impart to them. There can be no doubt whatever, although it is largely due, I have no doubt, to questions over which the Government has no control, that the condition of those Provinces, as to their trade, as to their population, as to their future prospects, is far from being what we would desire. I will not at this moment go further than to point out how deeply that feeling has worked, from various causes, in the larger Maritime Provinces. But, assuming that it exists, and we know only too well that it does exist among a great number of the people, I ask the committee, can anything be conceived which is more likely to exasperate these people, to embitter existing relations, and to put a dangerous strain on the amicable relations which ought to exist between us and these comparatively distant Provinces, than by a measure of this kind, somewhat hastily conceived, somewhat carelessly considered, to take away from a great number of these people the right of exercising the franchise in the election of people to the Dominion Parliament. I do not see the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in his place, but I may say that, whatever I may think of the question in the abstract, I entertain no doubt whatever of these two propositions: First of all, that if you have a uniform suffrage for the whole Dominion that suffrage will become a manhood suffrage in a very short time. I entertain no doubt whatever that that will be the inevitable result of introducing a uniform suffrage. In the next place, although, as I have said more than once, for my own part, I prefer the system we now have, of allowing each Province to regulate its own franchise, still, Sir, I say that as between the project introduced by the First Minister and the amendment proposed to be introduced by the hon. member for Northumberland, I think that there can be no doubt that the latter project is infinitely the more logical and infinitely the more acceptable to the great bulk of the population. Now, one hon. gentleman—I think it was the member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), whom we always like to hear speak on this or any other question—one hon. gentleman drew an argument from the conduct of the Provincial Legislatures, and his argument was this: Because we relegated, about eleven or twelve years ago, the care of the franchise to the Provincial Legislatures, and because, in the discharge of their ordinary duties, those Provincial Legislatures have, from time to time, enlarged the borders of the franchise, therefore, he said, we might safely and properly do precisely the same thing; that there was no occasion for us to appeal to the people on such questions. Now, Sir, that is a mere technical plea; that is an evasion of the real issue. To all intents and purposes we are now proposing to make a great constitutional change. You must look, in these things, to the spirit as well as to the letter of our constitution. When, in 1864-65, we determined to create a federal union in opposition to a legislative union, we, from that time, bound ourselves to carry out the compact between the several Provinces on a federal basis; and although it may have been well—perhaps it was well; until now I rather thought myself that it was well—to have a reserved power, a reserved right, in the hands of this Parliament, in order to prevent any of the Provinces from exercising the power which we left with them in a manner calculated to diminish, largely, the number of persons whom we represent here, still it was not our intention to exercise that power needlessly. The onus lies clearly on those who propose to make the innovation, to show its necessity, to show its expediency, to show that there is a demand for it. They are not called upon to do this thing; this is wholly and entirely a voluntary act on their part. No man can say, they cannot pretend to say themselves, that they believe that a Parliament cannot be elected now which truly represents the wishes of the nation. The argument has always been dinned into our ears, on every conceivable occasion, that we, on this side of the House, are a set of factious partisans, because we will not obey the will nor recognise the well-understood wishes of the majority of the people. That is their argument. They declare that they do represent the wishes of the majority. Well, Sir, so far as my own Province is concerned, they may technically do so, but after the Act of 1882, I deny that they do, in reality, represent a fair majority of the Province of Ontario. But however that may be, I deny that they are justified in assuming that a Parliament cannot be elected now which will fairly represent the wishes of a majority of the people of Canada, and that being so, and admitted by themselves to be so, I say that they are utterly without excuse at this time in disturbing this at all. The people from whom they took their mandate expressed no wish on the matter—or, at any

rate, have had no opportunity of saying whether they wish the present system to be disturbed. Now, there can be no doubt whatever that this measure, unless the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) prevails, will, to a great extent, subvert the federative basis and substitute for it a legislative basis. It will also have the other result, which some of us deprecate, and which others of us may think a great step in advance—the result of very greatly widening the basis of representation. Now, the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) spoke, and spoke well, of the desirability of all the members of this House remembering that, besides the Provinces which they represent, they also represent the Dominion of Canada, and to a very considerable extent I agree with that sentiment. But, Sir, in remembering that, it ought to be recollected that we are bound to preserve the federal character of the present Confederation. We ought to remember now that we do not form a perfectly homogeneous body. If all these Provinces were alike; if all these Provinces were inhabited by men of the same race; if they had the same interests; if they were, in one word, a perfectly homogeneous body, then I could understand that a great deal might be said for this and many other measures of a similar character. But, Sir, there is no use whatever in our blinking the well-known fact, patent to every man who has ever paid the slightest attention to the constitution of the Canadian Confederation, that far from being a homogeneous body we are a body not only widely separated in a geographical sense but a body having widely diverse interests in many points; that in addition to those diverse interests there are diverse tastes, diverse sentiments, diverse prejudices, among large portions of our people. Now, I recollect having heard, over and over again, the present First Minister—and I think I have heard the Minister of Public Works and other public men of note—point out that real statesmanship consists, not in ignoring but in recognising these differences; that real statesmanship would lead you to pay a careful regard to the prejudices, if you choose to call them so, at any rate, the sentiments and tastes, the habits and customs, of those various races who compose the present Confederation of Canada. If you look abroad, all the world over, you will see that some of the greatest misfortunes that have ever befallen nations, situated as we are, have arisen from the attempt to force a legislative union on countries inhabited by men having different habits and modes of thought. Why, Sir, we need go no further than to our own mother country to see the result of attempting to govern countries inhabited by different races in precisely the same way. I need not remind the members of this committee that two or three years ago, we, travelling, peradventure, a little outside of our legitimate bounds, tendered our advice to the mother country practically to dissolve her legislative union and attempt a Confederation very much like our own, and having regard to the different habits and modes of thought, as I have said, of the various races who compose it. I advise that precisely the same thing should be done here, that precisely the same care should be exercised, lest we, with good intentions, perhaps, but lest we unwittingly adopt a uniform system, not merely in this matter, because this is very apt to be the stepping stone to uniformity in a good many other ways which we do not at present foresee, that we should abstain from attempting to obtain a pedantic uniformity, to quote the words of the First Minister, and that we should rather recognise, in the fullest and most extensive way we can, the indefeasible right of every Province to regulate her own affairs, and, among other things, to regulate the franchise, on which depends the character of the representation that she shall have on the floor of this Parliament. This is, I say, the sensible, practical way of dealing with this very intricate question. Theoretically, something may be said for this Bill. I am not prepared to deny that the hon. gentlemen have got the technical right to do this thing. What I do dispute is that it is expedient or wise, more particularly at this juncture; because, without going into detail to endeavor to ascertain the exact cost of this measure—although here again I may remark that it was the bounden duty of the Ministers, and more particularly of the First Minister in charge of the Bill, to have given us, at all events, an approximate estimate of what the cost of this thing will be—I say at this particular time it is inexpedient, and undesirable, to add to our already swollen expenditure the large sum which, at the lowest computation, will be necessary to put this measure into effect. Then there is another consideration which I think hon. gentlemen opposite will do well to regard. There is danger—there is no use in disguising it—that if this kind of thing be pressed too far, if it be made patent to a large portion of the population of the Dominion that one party is determined, by fair means or foul, to perpetuate its ascendency on the floor of Parliament, you may succeed, not in perpetuating that ascendency, but in practically dividing the Provinces of Canada into two hostile camps. That is a danger which statesmen ought to regard. Hon. gentlemen may say what they please or think what they please, but they know right well, in their secret hearts, that the Opposition do in certain Provinces represent a full moiety, and it may be more than a moiety, of the total population. It is not wise that that moiety in any Province, more particularly in large and important Provinces, should be led to consider that the design of the present Government and party in power is to deal unfairly with them, because this measure, on the face of it, appears to place a power in the hands of the Government which, unless they were endowed with superhuman excellencies they would be almost certain to abuse. I say, for that reason alone, if there was no other, this measure, as it stands, ought and must receive the utmost opposition of every genuine patriot, of every real lover of his country. I am not, at this late hour of the night, especially as there will be other opportunities, going to discuss this matter further, although I think I might justly do so on this clause. All I want to say is this: I want to enter my protest against the introduction of the legislative principle, which this is in reality, and the uprooting of the federative principle on which our constitution is based. These measures, I repeat again, must be judged, not according to the mere letter of an Act of Parliament, but according to the spirit of the constitution under which we live; and it is because I believe that this particular measure is in direct and utter opposition to the spirit of, not only Confederation, but of all confederative union, that I, for one will oppose it to the very utmost of my power.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have risen to take up the time of the committee to-night, as I have before spoken on the subject of the franchise, had it not been for some of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. If I believed that the measure now before the committee would be fraught with all the evils which have been so vividly pictured by hon. gentlemen opposite, I would hesitate very much before giving my vote in favor of the measure. It is because I do not believe that the evils so predicted are probable or possible, and because I have in my own mind certain strong reasons for believing directly the opposite, that I exercise my own right of judgment, and I find myself in a position to support the Bill and to vote against the amendment. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken to-night and who have, in the main, calmly discussed this matter, have been wont to say that we, on this side, have not studied the Bill, have not looked into the measure; that we do not know what it is going to do, that we are voting in the dark, and so on. They also say we have given no reasons and they ask us repeatedly for our reasons. I do

not suppose, if a man as wise as Solomon, were to rise on this side and spend an hour in giving most cogent and comprehensive arguments for the passage of this measure, we would find any hon. gentleman opposite who would admit afterwards that any reason had been given. For my own part, I have, on one or two occasions, given some reasons why I am in favor of this measure. I think hon. members from my own Province have done the same. I am quite willing, in this House or before the country, to leave the opinions which had been stated by hon. gentlemen on this side from New Brunswick and hon. gentlemen on that side from New Brunswick—to see those statements go to the country and be judged by the country, as to which have the most reason or as to which have the most cogency of argument. I am in favor of this Franchise Bill, and therefore against the proposition in the amendment to the amendment, because, as I said before, it is within the power and the constitutional right of this Parliament to pass such a measure. When hon. gentlemen rise and say that in passing a measure which we have a perfectly constitutional right to pass we are making a revolutionary change in the constitution of the country, they are saying something which it is beyond my power to understand and saying something which I cannot admit to be true. I am in favor, also, of the passage of this measure, which this Parliament has a perfectly constitutional right to pass, because I want to see a uniform franchise basis for the election of members for the House of Commons. I think that is a fair reason for any hon. gentleman to give. I think it is fair for hon. gentleman opposite to accept that as something, at least, in the way of a reason. Hon. gentlemen have said to-night that you cannot have a uniform franchise, and that you do not have one under the provisions of this Bill. I think they mistake uniformity for something else. They say: You give a labor franchise, an income franchise, a tenancy franchise, and therefore the franchise is not uniform. I do not understand that to be what we mean by a uniform franchise. What I mean by a uniform franchise, when I use the term, is this: That in every Province which makes up this Dominion, every class in each Province will, as compared with a similar class in every other Province, have similar right of franchise. We have not that uniform franchise to-day, because there are different qualifications in almost every Province of the Dominion. What I am in favor of is, that in every Province of the Dominion there shall be an equal basis of suffrage, so that we may get at a uniform franchise. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite may not believe that that is a good reason; they may get up and say that no reason has been given at all; but, to me, that is a reason, and I am willing to trust the case to the public on that, as one reason why I shall vote for the Bill. Now, to except the Province of New Brunswick from the measure which is before us, to give it a franchise which we have not given to Prince Edward Island, and which we do not propose in the Bill to give to any other Province, is to destroy that uniformity, and so to take away one of the reasons for which I support the Bill. I am in favor of this Bill, in the third place, looking to my own Province particularly, because I believe it will largely increase the number of electors in that Province. Now, a gentleman gets up on the other side, and says he does not think it will. I, from my basis of observation, from the knowlege I have of my own and some other constituencies, and from conversations I have had with other gentlemen representing other constituencies, come to the conclusion, and I cannot get rid of the conclusion, that this Bill will, when put into operation, largely increase the franchise and the exercise of the right of the suffrage, and I am prepared to go to a very considerable length towards increasing the number of the electorate who shall take part in the legislation and government of this country. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., has given a calculation. It is a remarkable calculation. I am not in a position to say that it is not correct, or that it is, simply because I have not the documents from which he has formed his conclusions; but I say, when a gentleman rises in this House, and tells us that out of a total of about 2,000 voters in his county one-fifth of those electors are voting on a real property qualification of more than $100 and less than $150, I say it is a most wonderful thing to say about any county. I cannot say that about my own county.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to misrepresent him. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says he did not say that. The hon. member for Huron said he did. I took it down, and I have it here. The hon. member for Queen's said that it would, on property qualification alone, disfranchis 432 voters. Am I right?

Mr. KING. Four hundred and twenty, and some odd.

Mr. FOSTER. We will take that; the difference is not much; it will disfranchise 420 on a real property qualification alone. Now, I say that is an extraordinary statement to make. I do not say that it is not true, but, if true, the county he represents must be an extraordinary county, and I do not think it can be taken as a rule upon which the hon. member for Huron could found a conclusion which will hold for the whole Province of New Brunswick. And I am strengthened in that, not only from my own experience, but from the statement of the hon. member for Gloucester. He said that in his county—and he had evidence on which to base that conclusion—he thought it would not disqualify any, or scarcely any, of those who at present voted, while it would add a large number to the present electorate. Why does not the hon. member for Huron take the county of Gloucester upon which to make his generalisation, and why does he simply take the one county, which, if what is stated about it is true—and I do not say it is not—must be a most exceptional county. So I say I am in favor of this franchise because I am in favor of going as far as I possibly can in enfranchising persons, and making them citizens of our country, so that the basis on which the Government of the country rests may be as broad as it can be, compatible with safety, order and good government; and I will go as far in that line as I possibly can. The hon. member for Queen's did not take into account some other facts. If it be that under the present assessment there are 420 out of the 2,000 voters who are voting on a real property qualification of more than $100 and less than $150 of assessed value there is this fact to be taken into account, that the difference in the two is, that in the present law we have the assessed value and that in the Bill before the House we have the actual value, and I do not care what the hon. gentleman says as to what the assessors are supposed to do, I go by the common experience in New Brunswick—and I think I will be borne out by hon. gentlemen representing counties there—that the actual value and the assessed value are not the same. And it may be, when the hon. gentleman comes under the revising officer to have the list arranged for voting for this House, he will find out, when the actual value is placed, that a great many of those 420 will be rated on real property of actual value sufficient to give them a vote. The hon. gentleman has not taken into account the fact that we are giving farmers' sons the franchise; that there are a good many farmers in his own county whose sons do not vote now, but who will be allowed to vote when the Bill comes into operation. He may set that off as an enlargement of the franchise, which will, to a certain extent, compensate for any who may be bereft of the franchise—if there be such—by the Bill. Then there is a tenancy and an occupation clause, and

mechanics' sons and the like will also add largely to the general roll of enfranchised persons and, therefore, to the voters. Now, Sir, when you take these things into consideration, and also take into consideration that it is quite possible that if hon. gentlemen, with the same diligence and ability they have hitherto shown, apply themselves, when they come to the details of the Bill, they may, by the force of their reason and their logic, shed such light on the subject that some of these details may be changed, and that more liberal provisions than are printed in the Bill may be found in the Bill as it is passed; for the leader of the Government, the promoter of the Bill, gave these hon. gentlemen as calm and courteous an invitation as the promoter of any Bill could, to sit down and reason with him as to what should be the ultimate character of the Bill—to stop their obstruction and go to work on the real clauses of the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; he is listening to the reasoning to-night.

Mr. FOSTER. I am in favor of the Bill for another reason, and that is, it takes no power from the Provincial Legislatures which they are at present holding. The Provincial Legislatures at present hold certain powers. One of those powers is to regulate their own franchise. This Bill does not propose to interfere with that power, and if not with that power, with what other power does it interfere? It cannot be shown that there is a single power possessed by the Legislature of any Province that the Bill interferes within the slightest degree. They are allowed to fix their own franchises; we are taking our franchise. Have not we fixed our franchise already? Upon what basis of franchise are members elected to this House? Is it on a basis fixed by the Provincial Legislature, irrespective of this Parliament? I think not. I think we took the power and exercised it, and stated what should be the franchise for election for this House; and in 1874 that power was embodied in the Statute Book. And in passing this measure we are going outside of no lines that were not gone out of in fixing the franchise as it at present exists. Let me call the attention of the hon. member for Queen's to one argument he used, which was not quite logical. He was very much concerned that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) should go back to the very same constituency which elected him—to the very same electorate which gave him his commission. Now, Sir, what happened? This very year the Provincial Government brought in a measure, and carried it through, as far as they had power to carry it—it was not their fault that it did not become law—which would have materially altered the electorate of Westmoreland, and my hon. friend would then have gone back to an electorate that was not the same as that which sent him here. Now, if there is any pertinency in that argument it is one of the strongest arguments why this Parliament should take the matter into its own hands, so that we be not obliged to go back to a constituency that may be altered in any way the Local Legislature may choose to alter it. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Huron went beyond the record a little, in his desire to exaggerate the sweeping character of this measure in the Province of New Brunswick. He made the calculation that Queen's, N.B., had 2,000 electors. He read that 420 would be disfranchised on one basis, and that 32, or about that number, would be disfranchised on another basis, making a total of some 450; and then he leaped to the conclusion—and his argument thereafter was based upon it—that one-third of the electorate of Queen's would be disfranchised; and, reasoning from that, one-third of the electorate of the Province of New Brunswick. Now 420 and 30 make 450, which is less than 25 per cent. of the whole number of voters, and when he leaps from that to one-third he leaps to exaggeration, to which the hon. gentleman is prone, and which detracts from arguments which would otherwise have greater force with the country. I am in favor of this Bill, in the next place, because it provides for a fair voters' list, and so for a fair expression of the people's voice.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. "Hear, hear," says the hon. member for Bothwell, and he is almost always "there." Now, I protest against what has been a too prevalent sentiment indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite; whether they believe it or not I am not here to say; if they do, they have a perfect right to, and I am not blaming them for it; but I say it is not the best kind of a sentiment, either for the government of this country or for promoting the confidence of the people of this country in the Government. They go upon the assumption that the moment the Government appoint any person for any object, that moment he becomes the servile tool and instrument of the Government—that, being appointed and paid by the Government, he cannot act fairly and squarely, but must become, perforce, a dishonest man, and therefore suspicion should dog his every footstep and be cast upon every one of his actions. Now, I dissent from that. I believe men can be as honest men under an appointment and a salary as they can be in trade, in their social relations or in their political relations. I hold that the inducements which are offered to men in trade, in society, and in political relations, to make them swerve from the right path, are greater than the inducements offered to a man who is appointed, for instance, as a revising barrister, who is appointed for life, during good behavior, and can only be removed from that office on an address from the House of Commons. A man so appointed and so paid can be in a position to act far more fairly and independently than almost any man of business in the country; and I entirely dissent from that idea, which is altogether too prevalent in the country, and which is made too much of in this House, that men are to become objects of suspicion and must, perforce, become servile tools of a Government from whom they hold their appointment and from whom they receive their pay. If that was the case, the same suspicion would dog the footsteps of every judge in the land, for every judge in the land is an appointee of the Government, and occupies his position during good behavior. So I say it is not to be reasoned upon—and I will not reason upon it, or base my action on this Bill upon such reasoning—that the revising barrister must become a dishonest man the moment he gets the voters' list in his hands. So I am in favor of this measure, because it takes no power from the people, because it assumes no power for the Dominion which the Dominion has not already assumed, and has power to assume, and because provision has been made for a fair voters' list and consequently for a fair expression of the voice of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have gone through the *modus operandi* of getting a voters' list arranged in one of the counties of New Brunswick, and one of the strong points they made was that it was posted up in every parish, so that the people could read it and know whether their names were on it or not. If you look through the provisions of this Bill you will find that every care is taken that all the possible publicity shall be given to the making up of the voters' lists, so that there will not be a man in a polling district who will not be advertised as to whether his rights have been served in the matter or not. All these precautions are to be taken in order that the voters' lists shall be made in a manner to secure the rights of every citizen. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have been declaring in favor of the position taken by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He must be proud to see that he has so large a following from that side of the House. They go in for a wide extension of the suffrage; and yet what did the hon gentleman from Huron say? That this Bill was but the entering wedge of

a wider suffrage. If I were in favor of a wider suffrage, and if I felt that in present circumstances it was not possible to get an affirmative vote upon that proposition, and here was a proposition which I was satisfied in my mind, if carried out, would pave the way to that wider suffrage to which I was attached, it would certainly not be a ground for me to oppose the Bill; it would rather be a ground for me to put forth the best effort I could to have it carried, and thus bring the accomplishment of the wider suffrage, of which I was in favor, a little nearer to its completion. It is stated that there is a great deal of discontent in the Maritime Provinces. That hobby horse of discontent must always be mounted and ridden by hon. gentlemen opposite when they have an object to gain. When the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) wanted to defeat this legislation, he threatened that Ontario would not remain loyal very long if it were passed; so when the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) wants to put his great spike into this gun which he professes to think is directed against his side of the House, he immediately rides out the hobby of discontent, great discontent in the Maritime Provinces since Confederation—unhappily and unfortunately so, to his great pain and sorrow of heart, for had he not a part in the establishment of this Confederation? And is not every father solicitous for the welfare of his children? The hon. gentleman is pained, but not so much pained as to prevent his coming out and talking of this discontent, as he calls it, and giving it a wider place than it occupies in reality, and setting up here, in the councils of the country and before the world, that thing which, in the Maritime Provinces themselves, hides its head, and is not a prevalent sentiment by any means. About the time of Confederation two hostile camps were formed, some in favor of and some against Confederation, and a strong, a long and a fierce battle was fought over that question. The hon. member for St. John will bear me out in saying that so keen was the contest that it became almost impossible for any one who chose to take strong sides to become convinced or to acknowledge that he was wrong; and the anti-Confederates of that time are the anti-Confederates of to-day, and they will remain so, a great many of them, until they will have been removed by a higher power. But to say that in the Maritime Provinces Confederation has been disastrous; that discontent has been widespread; that there is any considerable feeling which shows itself in the practical carrying out of that discontent with Confederation, says what is not consistent with the facts; and that is shown by this potent argument, that there is not a man in the Maritime Provinces who has run, or is willing to run, for a constituency, carrying in his hand the flag of dismemberment of the Union, and of taking Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick out of the Union. The best evidence that can be given of that, other than that which I have just mentioned, is what took place in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly this year. Hon. gentlemen who are conversant with that know what I mean, and it is not necessary for me further to mention it here. I have stated these things because of the remarks that were made by gentlemen from New Brunswick, and especially by the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who tried to make it appear that New Brunswick would be largely disfranchised by this Bill. If I believed that New Brunswick would be disfranchised to a third or a quarter of its voters I should be very careful as to how I supported this measure. I do not believe it, and therefore it does not weigh with me. On the contrary, I believe that the electorate will be broadened, that more men in the Province of New Brunswick will take their places as citizens and take their share in the election of members to this Parliament, under this Bill, when it becomes law, than under the present franchise. The hon. gentleman said the First Minister should have been in his seat to hear this astounding information, the new information which was given by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King). I am afraid the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not in his seat either, for if he had been, at a certain time, he would have heard the member for Queen's give almost the same identical information, a night or two ago here, that he gave to-night, and I have no doubt it has been conned over and largely pondered on by hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and others who have this Bill at heart.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the right hon. gentleman received any further information about the expedition in the North-West, and more particularly about the steamer *Northcote*?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; we have not heard any more news. She is supposed to be down the river, most likely making progress towards Prince Albert.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 13th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved—

That the Seventh Report of the Committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament be adopted.

He said: This report contains a recommendation for the printing of certain documents, and requests an appropriation of $20,000 towards the continuation of the printing, as it is voted at this period every year. Of course, if it is not all required it will not be used.

Motion agreed to.

ASCENSION DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved—

That when this House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned till Friday next, at half-past one o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. I desire to read an important telegram which I received this morning about five o'clock, from Major General Middleton, conveying news which I know will be welcomed by the House and the country:

"BATOCHE'S HOUSE, 11th, *via* CLARKE'S CROSSING, 12th..

"Have just made a general attack and carried the whole settlement. The men behaved splendidly. The rebels in full flight. Sorry to say have not got Riel. While I was reconnoitering this morning Mr. Ashley, one of the prisoners, galloped with a flag of truce and handed me a letttter from Riel, saying, 'If you massacre our families I shall massacre the prisoners.' I sent answer that if he would put his women and children in one place and let me know where it was, not a shot should be fired on them. I then returned to camp, and pushed on my advance parties, who were heavily fired on. I so pressed on until I saw my chance and ordered a general advance. The men responded nobly, splendidly led by their officers and Col. Straubenzie; drove the enemy out of rifle pits; after rifle pits, forced their way across the plain and seized the houses, and we are now masters of the place, and most my force will bivouac there. Right in the heat of the action Mr. Ashley came back with another missive from Riel, as follows: 'General, your prompt answer to my note shows that I was right in mentioning to you the cause of humanity. We will gather our families in one place, and as soon as

it is done we will let you know. Yours, etc. (Signed) Louis David Riel.' On the envelope he had written as follows: 'I do not like war, and if you do not retreat and refuse an interview, the question remains the same concerning the prisoners'

"Our loss, I am afraid, heavy, but not so heavy as might be expected. As yet, I find it is five killed and ten wounded.

"Killed—Capt. French, commanding scouts; Lieut. Fitch, 10th Grenadiers; Capt. Brown, Boulton's scouts; M. M. Kippen, surveyors' scouts; Private Wheeler, 90th battalion.

"Wounded—Lieut. Garden, surveyors' scouts; Lieut. Laidlaw, 10th; Major F. Dawson, 10th (slightly); Sergt.-Major Watson, 90th (slight, in ankle); Sergt. Jakes, 90th (in hand); Private Young, 90th (flesh wound in thigh); Private W. Cook, 10th (shot in arm); Bugler M. Gaughan, 10th (in finger); Private Barber (slight wound in head); Private J. W. Quigley (flesh wound in arm); Private J. Marshall, 10th (flesh wound in calf); Private W. Wildon, 10th (slight, across back); Private V. Barton, Midland (thigh and groin, seriously); Corporal Helliwell (mid-shoulder).

"This is all I know at present. Prisoners all released and safe in my camp. Among them: Jackson, white man, who was Riel's secretary, but who is mad and rather dangerous."

I also beg to read another telegram which I received shortly after, giving some information in reference to the *Northcote*:

"Steamer *Northcote* and another coming up river with Company 'C' School of Infantry, and some police, and will cut off retreat of rebels. Rebel loss is believed to be very severe, but as yet unknown. Wounded breed brought in is Ambroise Jobin, member of Riel's council."

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 31) to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884, be read the first time. He said: The amendment is only this. That a candidate, after having passed his examination, shall have the right, on paying a certain fee, to have a copy of his paper.

Mr. MILLS. On what terms? What is the fee?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The fee to be fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object at all to this Bill going through without the usual forms, but I believe the rules of the House require that Bills amended in the Senate should remain on the Table of the House two days. The distinguished leader of the Opposition, last year, on a Bill in which I was interested, took occasion to point out the propriety of the two days rule being followed. That was a proper suggestion, and I think we had better adhere to it in the future.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was informed by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill in the Senate that the amendment was but of little importance, or I would not have asked that it should go through now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object to the Bill going through to-day, only I thought it would be well to follow the rule, so as to avoid difficulties in the future.

Mr. MILLS. It would be well, instead of leaving the cost to be fixed by Order in Council, that it should be fixed by this House. We are constantly divesting ourselves of our legislative functions and handing them over to the Governor in Council, and I think this is a course we should avoid following.

Mr. MULOCK. What good purpose is to be served by allowing candidates to obtain copies of the examination papers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. A suggestion was made that candidates who complained of the result of their examinations might like to have copies of their papers, and that copies should be furnished them, the fee to be fixed by the Governor in Council. It was not to be presumed that a heavy fee will be charged.

Mr. BLAKE. If copies of the papers are to be handed to those who have not passed, the object of those who ask for the papers will, no doubt, be to scrutinise them and appeal to the public on the merits of the answers. I have endeavored, as far as I could, without success, to insure a more satisfactory method of examination than that which the hon. gentleman proposes. Those who have had some experience in examinations know that frequently unreasonable complaints are made, and if it is intended that unsuccessful candidates should have the right to get back their answers, I am afraid the hon. gentleman is going to create for himself much trouble.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think there will be any difficulty or danger. The thing is a matter of course, and I am surprised the hon. gentleman takes exception to it. These candidates have a right to get copies of their answers and should not be refused copies when they ask for them.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think it is a matter of right. I am not aware of such a practice prevailing in any institution where young men are examined. I think the Secretary of State will find that if he yields to this amendment he is going to make a lot of trouble for the board. The only object an unsuccessful candidate can have in securing copes of his answers must be to enable him to sit in judgment on the finding of the examiners. That is not a desirable state of affairs to bring about. The examiners' judgment is final. These candidates will appeal to the examiners or endeavor to appeal to some higher body, and the Government may be flooded with petitions from unsuccessful candidates, their petitions being fortified with copies of their answers, on which the Government will be asked to sit in judgment. Thus, attempts will be made to weaken the Act by making the reports of the examiners not final. How does the Secretary of State make out that an unsuccessful candidate has a right to get a copy of his papers? Is it the rule, in any public institution where young men are examined, that the unsuccessful candidates should have copies of their papers?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the bar examinations in Quebec, if a candidate asks for a copy of his answers, he has the right to have it, and he should have it.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be the rule of the bar in the Province of Quebec, but it is not the rule in examinations conducted for the bar in Ontario, nor in connection with any public system of examination in the Province of Ontario. There is not a precedent at all to be found in the Province of Ontario for such a course being adopted. It must tend to unsettle the finding of the examiners. It is putting a weapon in the hands of the candidates, with which to question the findings of the examiners. There is no right about it, and I think it is an unwise procedure. I submit that these amendments are not of the formal character that might be passed at once; but, that the proper way to deal with them is, to have the Bill with the amendments placed on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not want to force this, if the hon. gentleman wants to keep up the discussion which has been gone over three or four times, to the loss of the time of the country, and wearying the patience of hon. members. If he wants to begin over again, it is his right, and I will leave the amendment on the paper. I stated that it was an amendment of no consequence, and that, if it was not a matter of right, it should be a matter of right. If the hon. gentleman objects, I do not care at all. The matter will come on, I suppose, when the Franchise Bill is over. The hon. gentleman has been all the time fighting for the candidates, for the young men

who are submitted to such tyrannical or arbitrary treatment. If now he turns his back upon that, and says they should not have a copy of their answers, he is entitled to contradict himself again in the House, and he may take forty-eight hours to do it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not intending to contradict myself, but I say that this point has never been under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. These amendments will be put upon the paper, unless there is unanimous consent.

Mr. MITCHELL. And follow out the rule always. We will have no more Grand Trunk fiascoes.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That when the House adjourns on Friday next, it stand adjourned until Saturday following at 1:30 p. m., and that Government measures shall have precedence after Routine.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suggest to the First Minister that he would lose nothing whatever, and probably save a good deal of inconvenience to members of the House, if he made that from half-past one to six. We know that between half-past eight and twelve practically nothing can be done, or will be done, on Saturday night.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Why?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has had a great deal of experience in Saturday nights, and I think his experience is, as mine is, that in those three hours practically nothing is done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As we are getting older, we are getting wiser, and I have no doubt that we shall make good use of the time between six and twelve.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt that very much.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I rise to a question of privilege. I see in the *Globe* of yesterday a report of a speech made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in which he refers to myself. I was not in the House when he made his remarks, and the *Hansard* report of his statement is not at all in accordance with that which appeared in the *Globe*, which I must say is most incorrect and unjust towards me. It speaks in this article of my having maligned not only the assessors of the municipalities but the municipal councillors. I can say that, of what I have stated with regard to the assessors, I do not wish to retract or modify one word. I have made no assertion whatever with reference to the municipal councillors. They are a body of gentlemen for whom I have the highest respect. I do not think there is any portion of the community of Canada whose labors are so patriotic, so disinterested as the municipal councillors of this country, because they work very largely without any remuneration whatever, and perform their duties to the satisfaction of the people. The remarks that I made in reference to the assessors had no reference whatever to the municipal councillors, because we know that the assessors are as independent of the councils as the Auditor-General is of the Government of Canada. I will read the report as it appears in the *Globe* of yesterday. The hon. member for Bothwell is thus reported:

"The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) had declared that partisanship was shown by the assessors and municipal councillors in Ontario, in fact that those officers were perjured partisans, and that so gross and outrageous had been their conduct that it was necessary that the Government should place it beyond their power longer to deal with the lists of voters in elections for this Parliament."

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Now, what I did say is reported correctly in the *Hansard*, as follows:

"My own experience is that, when you get a lot of Grit assessors in your riding, you cannot have confidence that a fair result is reached, and that those who are entitled to be on the assessment roll and on the voters' list are placed there. Our experience in the West Riding of York, where we have had Grit assessors, is that we have each year to appeal against the assessment, and to get 40 to 50 names added to the voters' list which were left off by the assessors.

"Mr. McCRANEY. What about Tory assessors?

"Mr. WALLACE. If hon. gentlemen opposite have no more confidence in the Tory assessors than I have in the Grit assessors they will vote for this Bill and try to make it law."

I further stated casually a day or two afterwards that the Grit assessors very often performed their duties in a perfunctory manner, that their principal duty was to assess property, that very frequently farmers' sons, tenants', and others' names were left off, which did not affect the collection of the taxes, which was the principal object the assessors had in view. I do not wish to say more than to characterise this assertion made in the *Globe* newspaper with regard to myself as entirely untrue.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES. I propose to say a few words on the justice of the proposition contained in the amendment of the hon. member for St. John County (Mr. Weldon), to exempt the Province of New Brunswick from the operations of this Bill. It will be generally admitted by those who listened to the debate, as conducted by members on both sides, that it was an essentially practical debate.

Mr. MITCHELL. An example to all the rest.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, it was a good example to all the rest, not only upon the Franchise Bill, but upon any other proposition that may come before the House. I will venture to say that no proposition on this Bill has been maintained with stronger arguments than those which were advanced by hon. gentlemen who sit around me, with reference to the proposition under discussion, and I regret very much that the First Minister, who has charge of the Bill, was not in his place to hear those arguments. If his public duties prohibit his presence here, I wish very much he could have placed the Bill in charge of some hon. gentleman who would have listened to those arguments, and been in a position to accede to them. I listened, myself, as one who was desirous of forming a fair and honest opinion as to whether this proposition should be acceded to. I came to the conclusion that the statements made and the arguments advanced were so cogent that they ought to be acceded to. No reply of a special character was vouchsafed to those arguments. Some general remarks were made—powerful in themselves—in support of the general proposition contained in the Bill, but there was a disposition on the part of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) and Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), who took up the cudgels on behalf of the present Bill, to evade the particular arguments advanced by my hon. friends from Queen's, N B. (Mr. King) and Sunbury (Mr. Burpee). Now, the hon. member for Queen's produced a list of his electors, and showed how many there were in his district.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Was the hon. gentleman in when I spoke?

Mr. DAVIES. Not all the time.

Mr. LANDRY. Half the time?

Mr. DAVIES. I was here half the time,

Mr. LANDRY. No, not a third of the time.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member from Queen's (Mr. King) produced a list of the electors in his district, and showed on what their right to the electoral franchise was based, that it was not based entirely upon the possession of freehold property, but it was based, also, upon the possession of a certain amount of personal property. He advanced these two propositions: First, that the value of the real property which gave a man the right to vote, had been increased from $100 to $150, and that increase would disfranchise a certain number of electors, and he gave the number; secondly, that a large number of electors voted upon a personal property qualification, and that this Bill would disfranchise every one of them. The hon. gentleman went on further to say, that the mere possession of real property might be a fair test in some parts of the Dominion, but in other parts of the Dominion it was not a fair test, because in New Brunswick, for instance, the peculiar habits and business of the people led them to invest their money, not in real property, but in boats, barges, and small schooners that navigate and carry on trade on the St. John River. Now these two propositions were not answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), who spoke last when the Committee rose at two o'clock this morning, dwelt some time upon the fact that no discontent existed in the Maritime Provinces at all; that there was no such thing as discontent; if it did lurk in any secret place there was no man of any political or social position in the Province who would have the courage, or the manliness, to express his discontent in public. The hon. gentleman said so in almost those words, some of my hon. friends behind me took note of his remarks and, all of them expressed themselves as possessing knowledge that those remarks were not consistent with the facts. I will only recall to the attention of the Committee the fact that some few months ago——

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make words which I did not utter, and put them into my mouth, and upon them to base an argument, he is at perfect liberty to do so; but I warn him to day that that is his course, and it is more ingenious than ingenuous.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that it is the hon. gentleman's constant practice, when he is challenged with a statement made by him of an important character, to deny the correctness of the statement. He has done that half a dozen times since this debate on the Franchise Bill began. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to withdraw his statement that discontent does not exist, and dare not show itself in the Maritime Provinces, I shall pass on from it. But the hon. gentleman most certainly made that statement, and made it in the most solemn and emphatic manner that he was capable of. I will recall to the hon. gentleman's attention the fact that in the metropolitan city of his own Province, within the last six months, several meetings of malcontents, or discontents, were held, and these meetings embraced the leading merchants of St. John, and only did they feel discontent with the existing state of matters, but they formally expressed that discontent in resolutions which were thrown broadcast over the Dominion. When the hon. gentleman stated that no public man who gave expression to discontent with the existing political system of the Dominion, could hold up his head in Canada, I would remind him that in the metropolitan city of New Brunswick, a gentleman whom he a short time ago designated as a rebel—and the expression is now in the *Hansard*—was elected in the city of St. John to represent that city in the Local Legislature, by a very large majority, by a majority very largely in excess——

Mr. FOSTER. Will you read that in the *Hansard*?

Mr. DAVIES. Of the majority by which the Finance Minister was elected.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the hon. gentleman to read that in the *Hansard*.

Mr. DAVIES. On the 2nd May, the hon. gentleman, in addressing the House, said:

"Who is it that countenanced secession in the city of St. John?

"Some hon. MEMBERS. The Tories.

"Mr. FOSTER. Is it? Then my hon. friend who sits for the county of St. John countenances secession, but of course he is not a Tory. In the city of St. John one of the political friends of the member for West Ontario is the only man, I am thankful to say, in the Province of New Brunswick, who runs an annexation sheet. He favors secession."

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has misstated my position. He has deliberately put into my mouth words that I did not use.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen are afraid to hear me. I will take an opportunity later on.

Mr. DAVIES. I am not going to continue the debate.

Mr. CASEY. I must ask you, Mr. Chairman, to keep order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has raised the point of order has been himself guilty of a breach of order. He has been guilty of the breach of one of the best known rules, that even he, with his short experience of Parliament, should have known. He has stated that the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has been guilty of deliberately putting into his mouth words which had not been uttered. That is to say that the hon. member of whom I am speaking, knowingly made a false statement; that he deliberately put into his mouth words which he did not say—that he told a lie. I leave the hon. member for Queen's to defend himself as to the facts; I am speaking as to the point of order. On the point of order I say that language is utterly inadmissable and the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), must withdraw that statement before we proceed any further. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the hon. gentleman behind me was out of order in making that statement; but before he can be called upon to withdraw that statement, the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I., must withdraw the statement, that it was the habit of the hon. member behind me to make statements and then deny them.

Mr. CASEY. We are at present considering the point of order with respect to the hon. member for King's, N.B., and we can take up the other point of order if hon. gentlemen desire it without the interference of the Premier. After we have settled this point of order, it will be quite open to them to take up the other point of order. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I have taken.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order, in stating, as he has done, that the hon. member put words into his mouth which he did not use; at the same time I think the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., had provoked it by the language he himself had used.

Mr. CASEY. Withdraw.

Mr. FOSTER. I cheerfully withdraw those words, if they are objectionable, being sorry, at the same time, to have to withdraw the truth.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. member for Queen's will do the same.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the expression I have to withdraw?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That the hon. member is in the habit of making statements and then denying that he made them.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has said half a dozen times during the Session that he had not made use of certain language, although——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIES. If I did not make the statement, I cannot withdraw it. I say and I repeat, and if I am not in order I will withdraw it, that the hon. gentleman, not once but half a dozen times this Session, denied that he made statements which, on reference to the records of the House, it appears he did make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Queen's said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was in the habit of making statements and afterwards denying them.

Mr. DAVIES. I made that statement and I repeat it now. I am in the judgment of the House as to whether the charge made by me is not correct; as to whether the hon. gentleman has not time and again done so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think hon. gentlemen are bound to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. That is what he now says.

Mr. DAVIES. I have read from *Hansard* what the hon. gentleman said: That an hon. gentleman who is a political associate of the member for West Ontario countenances secession; that in the city of St. John, one of the political friends of the member for West Ontario is the only man in the Province of New Brunswick who runs an annexation sheet, that he favors secession. The hon. gentleman cooly stands up and says that such is the satisfaction of the people of the Maritime Provinces with the existing state of affairs, that no man who values his public position dare express discontent with it. I have disproved that statement by one of the most prominent men in his own Province, and out of his own mouth. If further evidence is required, I ask hon. members to read the reports of the meetings held in St. John in November and December, attended by the principal merchants, in which language was used expressive, not only of discontent, but of a feeling that that discontent was based upon the political injustice from which they were suffering, and calling on members of this House to remove those grievances and the injustice which caused the discontent. I do not want to take up time with irrelevant matter; but I wish to call attention to points made with regard to this amendment. What position do we occupy? We are now discussing whether any Province shall be exempted from the general operation of the Bill. We have had an amendment with respect to Prince Edward Island, before the House, and it has been voted down. What is the effect of the Bill on that Province? It has been said, not by opponents of the Government who might be accused of political exaggeration in making statements, but by supporters of the Government, by members who follow them on almost all occasions, that the effect of the Bill will be to disfranchise a very large number of electors. I heard the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) express a sentiment the other night, which I hope was entertained by others around him, that if the clause would have the effect of disfranchising a large class of persons, he would oppose it. We have proved that it will disfranchise a large class in Prince Edward Island who, for thirty years have exercised the franchise, and who, by consent of both parties, have exercised that right fairly and well, and these are now being disfranchised by this Bill. I ask that hon. gentleman, therefore, to give effect to his declaration, for no hon. gentleman has dared to deny that it is true that the effect of this Bill will be to disfranchise a large number in Prince Edward Island. We next come to New Brunswick. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., says the Bill will disfranchise 400 electors in his own constituency. Why should we single out those 400 and say: Heretofore you have exercised the franchise, but we will prevent you exercising it hereafter. Can the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), justify it? That hon. gentleman argued at some length that the House had a constitutional right to pass such a Bill. He was only flogging a dead horse in using that argument. We have admitted from the inception of the debate that the legal and technical right to pass this Bill is vested in this Parliament; but we did deny what the hon. gentleman knows we deny, that it was expedient or just to exercise that right. We told him that the onus of proving that the time had come to exercise that right lay upon him, and he would not accept that onus, and could not justify the exercise, except on special grounds, of that legal right. Is that any satisfaction to the 400 electors who are being disfranchised in Queen's County alone to tell them that we have the constitutional right to do this thing? We have the constitutional right to do many things. If we find that to exercise that right brings with it injustice, disqualification and disfranchisement, we are not justified in exercising that right. The exercise of such a right is tyranny. The hon. gentleman sneered at those who said this Bill was a revolutionary measure, and he laid down the proposition that because it was constitutional it could not be revolutionary. When did the hon. gentleman make that discovery? A number of measures are perfectly constitutional in themselves, and yet they may be revolutionary in their effects. If you transfer from one set of men the exercise of the franchise and give it to another body of men, the effect is a political revolution, more or less. If you admit to the exercise of the franchise a large mass of those who are incompetent to exercise it, and so swamp existing constituencies, as we say you are doing in the case of the tribal Indians, that amounts to a political revolution; to the transfer of the power of the people from those who have heretofore exercised it to another class—I say it amounts to a political revolution whether you have the constitutional right to exercise that power or not. The question which is before this committee, the question to which it should bend its mind is not the abstract question of constitutional rights, but whether or not the proposition before the committee is based on justice, fair play and equity. The hon. gentleman said he supported the Bill because it proposes a uniform franchise. Uniform it is in one sense—uniform on paper, but diverse in its application. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Maritime Provinces a large class exist who have invested their money in personal property and that the same class do not exist in Ontario, and to base the exercise of the franchise on one particular kind of property, and exclude a large class of people who have chosen to invest their money in other species of property, is not justice or fair play. It is not creating uniformity over the Dominion but diversity. The man who possesses a barge floating down the St. John river and carrying lumber to market, possesses just as much property in the country as the man who owns a ten acre field near Toronto, Brockville or London. The possession of a field does not augur more intelligence or more aptitude for the possession of the franchise than the ownership of the barge, and when you find statesmen framing what they call a uniform franchise for the Dominion, unless you recognise the fact that we are not a homogeneous people, that there are people engaged in various occupations, trades, and callings, unless you recognise the practical vocations of life as they exist in the Dominion, you will have a uniform franchise, not in the

broad sense of the term, but one which will be uniform on its face, while in reality it will be diverse, unfair, and unjust. The hon. gentlemen said he supported this franchise because it was uniform, but let him answer that point. Does it create that uniformity which is based on justice, excluding as it does those 400 men residing in the county of Queen's, because they do not own real property. Is uniformity to be carried out? The First Minister declared that while he was going to admit the Indians of one portion of the Dominion to the franchise, he would exclude those of another portion. Are not the Indians of British Columbia as well qualified and better qualified from their education and habits to exercise the franchise than many of those who are to be admitted? Why, then, are they to be excluded. If the principle of uniformity is to be the governing principle of the Bill why should you not apply it in that case? The hon. gentleman knows that the principle has been exploded and given up long ago. I ask him, when he claims that this Bill should be more uniform, can he, dare he, does he justify the admission of the Indians of his own Province to the exercise of the franchise? I dare him to do it. He is a practical man, he has lived most of his life there, and he knows that the Indians of that Province are unfit to exercise that franchise, unfit from their manner of life, their educational position and their whole training, unfit from their gross ignorance. The hon. gentleman knows it, his constituents know it, every man in this House from that Province knows it, and he dare not defend it in this country. Why should the hundreds of Indians from New Brunswick, who are known to be incapable of ever exercising the franchise be included while hundreds of able-bodied, well educated men, possessing a large amount of personal property, and who have exercised the franchise for years past should be disfranchised. Is that fair or just? I say this Bill is unjust in those it admits, and ten times more unjust in those it excludes. I say you take away the rights from the people of New Brunswick which they have enjoyed for half a century, and you confer those rights on Indians, who never have claimed them, who have never enjoyed them, and whom you admit are unfit to enjoy them. You call in a class who are unfit to manage their own affairs, and you call them in to assist in managing yours. Is there any justice in that? You admit that the Indians are not capable of managing their own affairs, and you take them under your wardship and control, and the argument seems to be that because they are unfit to manage their own affairs you call them in to assist in managing yours. I would like to hear hon. gentlemen from the Province of New Brunswick justifying that proposition. You heard the remarks of one of the most experienced parliamentarians from that Province. He told you that the Indians were totally unfit in that Province to exercise the franchise; still you admit them while you exclude a large number of those who have heretofore enjoyed the franchise, because, forsooth, they possess personal and not real property. How, on what principle, is this justified? On the most extraordinary argument ever advanced in this Parliament in my hearing—on the law of compensation. Where do the hon. gentlemen get that law, as applied to the politics of this country? Looking at the Bill all through, the hon. gentleman says: It is true you disfranchise a lot of men whom he dare not say are incapable of exercising the franchise, but on the other hand you confer the franchise on another class, whom he will not say are fit for the franchise, but the law of compensation comes in, and as a matter of fact the total number of voters remains the same. Why, Sir, the argument is childish. We will next have advanced in favor of this Bill the law of averages, which is trotted out so often here in financial matters. The hon. gentleman knows in his secret soul that the argument of the law of compensation is trifling with the House as a justification for the disfranchisement of a large number of people who are fit for the franchise, and the enfranchisement of another class who are incapable of exercising it. The argument is perfectly absurd. Then the hon. gentleman went so far as to say that he supported the Bill because the enlarged franchise was consistent with good government. That was a pretty and well rounded phrase, but it meant nothing, because the hon. gentleman failed to show that those who were to be brought within the scope of the new Bill were fit to exercise the franchise, that the introduction of the Indians would be the means by which better government would be obtained, and because he also failed to show that the exclusion of those from the franchise who have heretofore enjoyed it, would be conducive to good government. It is no use to indulge in generalisations of this kind, unless you show in detail that the argument is a sound one. But when the hon. gentleman closed his remarks I was prepared almost for anything. He is the first gentleman I have heard from the Maritime Provinces who has defended the revising barrister clause. Does he think that the object which we ought to have in view—the attainment of good government—is to be facilitated by making the appointment of the revising barrister a political appointment? Does he think it either justice or fair play, or that good government will result from vesting in the Government for the time being the appointment of the men who are to arrange the voters' lists from which members of this House will be elected? The hon. gentleman knows that the result must be bad in every sense. He knows that politics run so high in this country, that the several representatives from the several Provinces will insist upon the appointment of revising barristers who will advance the interests of their own party in the several constituencies. He knows that is the reason why the Bill is being supported so strongly by one party, and so fiercely opposed by this side. He knows it means political annihilation for large numbers of the members on this side, not because they have lost the confidence of their constituents, not because the majority who returned them before is not prepared to return them again, but because political machinery is to be arranged, so that when they cannot be defeated by the voice of the people, they are to be defeated by the pulling of the political wires. The hon. gentleman knows that these revising barristers are to be at the beck and call of the Government, and he knows that the very amount of money to be paid to them will be dependent on the way they please their masters. There is no provision in the Bill fixing the salaries they are to receive; they are to be dependent on the whim of the Governor in Council; but the political party that appoints them is to reward them according to their merit—according to the way in which they turn out the lists. The hon. gentleman knows that the Bill he defends has met with condemnation from one end of this Dominion to the other; he knows that there is not an impartial man who defends it; he knows that the results will be that not the people, but appointees of the Government for the time being, will elect men to Parliament; and he knows that these very men whose appointment he defends are not to be removable except by an address from the very Parliament they elect. I believe there are large numbers on that side of the House who see the injustice of that provision, and who are prepared to amend it; but when such men as the hon. member for King's get up and defend it, they weaken the hands of every fair minded and independent member in the House and in the country; he defends a scheme which is tyrannical and unjust, and puts himself outside the pale of independent men, and among those who follow blindly after the Government. I did not wonder that he defended the Bill on those general principles, because he is very fond of general principles: but when he came out boldly in defence of that proposition, which has not been defended by any independent

member of this House, I gave him up. But I look forward in the hope that that clause will yet be amended in the proper direction. Why, Sir, this is not a faction on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that the turn of the political wheel must come, and that the Liberal party of this country must rule some day. I would like to know how they would like to have applied to them this rule that they are laying down and applying to us. I would like to know how the hon. member for King's would like a revising barrister to be appointed by his opponents to prepare the lists on which he should be elected? Put yourself in his place, is a very good motto when you want to judge whether a certain action is fair or not. When he has the wire in his own hands the hon. gentleman is quite satisfied, but he would not be so well pleased if it was in the hands of his opponents. I say that proposition is unjust and indefensible, and I look forward in the hope and belief that before this debate closes, its unjustness will become apparent to the majority of the House, and that it will to some extent at least be amended.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) told us last night that he did not believe that even if as wise a man as Solomon were to address this side of the House, he would make us believe that this Bill was a good Bill. Well, Sir, for once I have some reason to agree with the hon. gentlemad, for that eventuality has occurred. At the very time the hon. gentleman was speaking we had arguments addressed to us by an individual of the description he mentioned, and those arguments did not seem to convince this side of the House very much of the goodness of the Bill. Notwithstanding that the wisdom of Solomon was expended upon us, we cling to the opinions we formerly held of the Bill, and this hon. gentleman did not appear to know much more of political necessities of Canada than Solomon did himself. Solomon was a very wise man, but he did not know much of Canadian politics. The hon. member for King's is a wise man; yet he did not show much more knowledge of Canadian politics than would Solomon if he had been present. He did not even show much knowledge of the wants and views of his own Province. He said the Bill would be acceptable in his Province and that this particular clause would largely increase the franchise there; but the array of figures shown to us by the hon. member for Queen's proved that the Bill would disfranchise a great many in that Province. I sympathise with the people of New Brunswick because the Bill seems likely to have the same effect there as it will in Ontario, in the way of disfranchising a large number of people. It will be more oppressive, however, in New Brunswick than in Ontario. It happens that the late Ontario franchise under which we were elected is practically the same as that in the Bill; but in New Brunswick the provincial qualifications appear to be so different that a large number of the very constituents of the members now sitting for that Province will be disfranchised under the Bill. A large number of the constituents of the hon. member for King's will be disfranchised. What he will say to them I do not know. He smiles at the suggestion, and I suppose he can smile in safety, because these people will not have votes at the next election, and he does not feel any necessity of securing their good will, because they will have no power to wreak political vengeance on the man who has disfranchised them. The hon. gentleman came here as an Independent member, and he still claims to be such. Yet he has on two occasions treated us to theories as to the duties of members supporting the Government, which one would suppose could only come from the mouth of a strict Government supporter. He told us it is the duty of such members to support the Government on all measures which they consider of vital importance during the five years of their reign, and let the people judge of their action at the next election. That is scarcely the language of an Independent member of Parliament. The Independent members from New Brunswick do not all adopt that tone, for the hon. member for King's is not the only Independent member from that Province. Another gentleman claims the title quite as strongly as that hon. gentleman, and it seems to me more justly. I wish to cite the opinion of one Independent member against that of the other as to the effect this clause will have upon that Province and upon the Dominion generally. One of the leading papers of the Province of Quebec and of the Dominion is known to express the views of the other Independent member from New Brunswick. I refer to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) whose views are known to be expressed in the *Herald* of Montreal. That hon. gentleman does not mince matters when he speaks through the press, and I do not think he will mince matters when he will speak to the House. It is not his way to mince matters. In the *Herald* issue of Thursday last, he says:

"It is hard to understand why the Premier will persist in forcing his Franchise Bill upon Parliament. He must see that there is no hearty sympathy with it in any quarter. The Opposition to a man are against it. This, perhaps, might be expected under party Government. But the Government's supporters are also against it—but the other Independent member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), is in favor of it. Two Provinces claim to be exempted from its operation. Some Provinces will not have one class of new voters and other Provinces reject another class or those whom Sir John would enfranchise. The Government have been obliged to submit to radical changes already, and others are imminent. It has seldom happened that a strong Government has encountered such strenuous opposition—from whom? From all sides. The time of introducing the measure, the determination to push it through regardless of consequences, as well as the provisions of the Bill itself, are all against sound party and public policy and out of harmony with skilful leadership. If it is a party advantage that is looked for in Ontario, it is just possible that to gain this the Premier may imperil the cohesion of his party as a whole; and where would the party gain in this event?"

I will skip a part of the remarks that follow, which are apt and relevant, but too long to quote *in extenso*. He goes on to say:

"He cannot be unaware of the extreme character of the demand he has made on their party fealty. Probably no leader ever had more devoted followers; certainly no party leader ever consulted his supporters less or treated them in a more autocratic fashion. But there is a point beyond which no leader can count upon his followers following."

This gentleman, who was at one time a colleague of the right hon. the First Minister, and who is one of the most important and influential members from New Brunswick to-day, who is an independent man, says there is a point beyond which the Premier cannot count on his followers following him, but it appears the point has not yet been reached when the Independent member from King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), may not be counted on to follow.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Turn over the next leaf and read the editorial of the 13th.

Mr. CASEY. I shall look at that editorial. I do not know what is in it, and I am reading what applies to my argument.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would like to know what the views of the Independent members of the Province of New Brunswick have to do with this question which is before the House.

Mr. CASEY. It appears the point has been reached when the right hon. gentleman's late colleague cannot follow him, but that point has not been reached in the case of the Independent member for King's (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) goes on to say:

"The true standing ground for him, for any party leader who has faith in the people, is manhood suffrage, and anything short of this is a delusion and a snare. If he must declare his present opposition to this principle, so equitable, so broad, so well calculated to bind the people together, let him wait until he has heard the popular demand for the application of the principle rising higher and higher, as he certainly will within the next twelve months; and if he needs inspiration, he will

probably be gratified by the roar of the multitude demanding what should have been gracefully conceded without compulsion.

"At any rate, if Sir John is as astute as his admirers would have us to believe, he will not further attempt to impose upon the public this enormous mass of patchwork which is called a Franchise Bill, in place of the genuine political clothing that is the birthright of every freeman. Our advice to Sir John is to withdraw his Bill, coupling with its retirement the amendment that the franchise of the future must be manhood suffrage."

These are the manly words of a manly man, who utters them frankly. Though I have had occasion to oppose the hon. gentleman, and will probably have occasion to do so again, I must say that he is never chary of speaking out in the House his opinions and ideas. Whatever other faults he may have, he speaks out frankly what he wishes to be laid before the House. The hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), made a suggestion which I hope will be followed. Following up the hint given by the *Mail*, he says he is quite willing that our arguments and the arguments of his side should go to the country side by side. I hope the hon. gentleman's hint will be taken. I hope the House will be dissolved and the opinion of the country taken on this matter. Let our arguments and others go before the people and let the people judge. That is the desire clearly expressed on this side of the House, but I am afraid it is far from being that of the other side.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Weldon) negatived. Yeas, 36; nays, 74.

Mr. VAIL. The proposition contained in the motion in your hands is so reasonable, and the franchise of the Province of Nova Scotia is so simple and so satisfactory to the people of that Province, that I hope, after a short explanation of the Act now in force in that Province, that I shall be more fortunate in the amendment which I am about to move than my friends from Quebec and New Brunswick have been in theirs in the same direction. With the exception of a few remarks which I made on the second reading, I have been an attentive listener to all that has been said on the subject of the elective franchise and the Bill now before the House. I have listened with a desire to hear something said in explanation of this Bill by either the Government or some of their supporters which would justify me in voting for it; but the only reasons I have heard from that side of the House in favor of this measure have been, first, that we had the power to pass this Bill under the British North America Act, and, secondly, that a uniform franchise is desirable. I fail to see that, for either of these reasons or for both, this House would be justified in making so wide a departure as this Bill proposes from the law of 1874, which has worked so satisfactorily. If it could be shown that this law would give us a more independent vote, would return more intelligent representatives to this House, or would be more satisfactory to the Dominion at large, those reasons would be sufficient to induce, at all events, a fair consideration of this measure. But it is not a question of the power to pass the Bill, but whether it is expedient to pass it, whether it will result in benefit to the Dominion at large, and, until that is shown, I do not see why this House should be called upon to remain here six weeks after the usual time of prorogation had passed to enable the Government to place this Bill on the Statute Book. I know that some hon. members on the other side will say that, if this Bill is not crystallised into law this Session, it cannot come into force for the general election of 1887. Well, we have run five elections since Confederation under the present provincial franchises, and no complaint has been made or good reason given, why we should now pass a Bill to enable the electors of the Dominion to vote upon the same franchise in all the Provinces. The House met on the 29th January, and until the 19th March we were left in doubt as to whether this Bill would be submitted to the House or not. On the 19th March it was read for the first time, but it was not really before the House until the 16th April, twelve days less than three months after the House had met. If the First Minister had been desirous of putting this House in possession of full information in regard to the Bill, what it contained, and what changes, if any, he proposed to make in it, he would, considering all that he had said in reference to its importance in former Sessions, have spent at least two hours in giving to the House full details in connection with it. He would have pointed out that the Bill was an important one, that it would probably disfranchise some men while it would enfranchise a few others. He would have stated that his only object in bringing this Bill before the House was that we might have a law that would be satisfactory and fair to all parties and classes in this Dominion. He would have said in addition to that: I know that the Opposition may, perhaps, think that this Bill has been framed with a desire to strengthen the hands of the Government, but I assure them that my only desire is to make it perfect, and to give the two great parties an equal chance under it, and, if they can make any suggestions in regard to any clause of it which will be fair and just and will improve the Bill, I shall be very happy to receive their suggestions and act upon them as far as I possibly can. If that had been done, the First Minister would have only done his duty and he would have convinced the house that he was desirous of doing what was fair and right, and would have enlisted the sympathies of the Opposition from that time; and I think I am safe in saying, that the Opposition would have given a fair and candid expression of opinion on this subject, and we would have assisted in every possible way to make the Bill perfect. I do not intend to speak very long, as I do not like to repeat myself or others, but I must ask the indulgence of the house while I compare the Nova Scotia Act passed last Session with this Bill, and point out where the two differ. Our Nova Scotia Act is a very simple one. Hitherto our franchise has been $150 of real estate, and $300 of personal estate, or $300 of real and personal estate combined. This franchise was simple and plain to everybody, and has been working well. I do not mean to say that an Act of that kind is ever so perfect that certain changes are not from time to time necessary, to bring in those who are not but ought to be covered by it. Last Session a new Bill was introduced in the Legislature of Nova Scotia. And as I have heard a great many gentleman opposite say that they could not expect fair play when a Liberal Government was in power in any of the Provinces. I am glad to be able to say that, although we have a Liberal Government in Nova Scotia, I am informed that the Premier of that Province, before he submitted his Franchise Bill, telegraphed to the Premier of the Dominion to inform him that he intended to submit a Franchise Bill, and to ask him if he desired to make any suggestions, in order that an arrangement might be made between them which would be satisfactory to both Governments. Now, I think that goes very far to show that the Local Government, although it is a Liberal Government, had no desire to take an undue advantage of the Government here, and had no desire to enfranchise anybody who ought not to vote for members for this house. They had no desire to pass an Act that would give the liberals a party advantage. I have here a summary which shows the difference between the Local Act and the present Dominion Bill. In the present Bill, the following persons will have the right to vote: Owners of real property of the value of $150; tenants paying monthly, $2; quarterly, $6; half yearly, $12; yearly, $20; occupants of real property of the value of $150; a resident, who derives an income from some mode, calling, office or profession, or from some investment or charge on real property, of not less than $400 per annum; farmers' sons, if living on a farm of sufficient value to give a vote as co-owner; the son of any owner of real property, other than a farmer, and who has been a resident contin-

uously with the father or mother after the death of the father; then there is the fisherman who is entitled to vote, provided his personal property, or the real estate he holds, amounts to $150, but no fisherman is allowed to vote unless he has real estate. If the fisherman had been allowed to vote on personal property alone, it might have been of some advantage to him, but now he must have real estate of some value, if it is only five dollars.

Mr. KIRK. He has personal property in his boats.

Mr. VAIL. That is about all the personal property a fisherman has in many cases. Under the Nova Scotia law the franchise is given to the owner of real property of the value of $150, which is the same as the Dominion Act; also, personal property of the value of $300. Now I will here point out to the House where a difference exists between the present Bill and the Nova Scotia Act. A great many people are on the list in Nova Scotia, who are the owners of $300 and over of personal property. Notwithstanding that those people may own $50,000 of personal property in the Dominion, unless they own real estate, or unless they come under the occupation clause, or the tenant clause, or some clause of that kind, they cannot vote. I think my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) will agree with me that there are a great many people in Nova Scotia who have property in various investments, and are now entitled to vote under that $300 personal property qualification, who will be entirely cut off by this Bill.

Mr. KINNEY. The hon. member forgets that there is an income clause which will cover them.

Mr. VAIL. Not at all. They are not comprised in the income clause. They do not come in under the definition of the income clause. Last night the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) stated that any man who earned $400 per annum in the Dominion at the present time would be entitled to vote under this clause. That is not so. A man may earn $600 as a day laborer, but unless he occupies a room, or a building, he cannot vote.

Mr. KINNEY. O no, not a bit of it.

Mr. VAIL. He must be a tenant of real property, and pay a monthly or yearly rent.

Mr. RYKERT. Not for income.

Mr. VAIL. I am not speakingof the income voter. I am speaking of a day laborer who will not be allowed to vote under the income clause. I may be mistaken, but that is as I understand the Bill. Now, a large number of people who own personal property in our Province, would be disfranchised. This is very unfair, for it really enfranchises the man who occupies a room twelve feet square, provided he pays $2 a month, or $20 a year, although he may not be worth a dollar in the world outside the effects he has in that small room. It is ridiculous to give such a man a vote, while you refuse it to men who may have ten thousand dollars or more of personal property. I am free to admit that in some respects this Bill reaches a few people in Nova Scotia that the local Act last year, does not reach, and I can very well understand why this class is brought in. The class who will be brought in under the tenant clause of $20 a year, are largely found in mining districts. At the mines it is a very common thing to pay workmen so much per day or so much per ton, as the case may be, for the coal raised, and to allow the workmen to live, rent free, in a house owned by the proprietors of the mine. What will be the effect? The $20 rent will be added to his wages for the year; it will be paid by the owner of the mine, and the miner will be enfranchised under this Bill. I do not think it will apply to many people in the other counties; but it will have the effect I have stated in the mining counties of Nova Scotia.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) says, "hear, hear." No doubt it will suit him, as it will add a considerable number of electors in his county. But I do not know why any members elected under a particular franchise should be unwilling to go back to their counties and seek re-election upon the same franchise under which they were elected at the last general election. I desire to go back to the same electors as in 1882, and that is the proper way of testing as to whether, in the opinion of the people the conduct of the Government has been satisfactory. The best evidence that the Government have lost the confidence of the people is the fact that they are pressing this measure; they do not intend, if they can help it, to go back to the people who elected them in 1882, and that is the explanation of this Bill being here to-day. They hope that by enfranchising Indians and a certain number of men in cities and towns who have not had the vote before to gain a verdict of the people and be returned to power for another five years. I do not pretend to say that I am in favor of universal suffrage; I would prefer a property qualification; but I believe, if we have to choose between the Bill now before the House, a complicated, expensive, unworkable Bill, and universal suffrage, I would prefer universal suffrage, and give every man who pays taxes and contributes to the revenue a right to vote. If we are driven to that as a last resort in preference to this Bill, I shall vote for the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). By adopting that amendment we shall get clear of a very objectionable feature of this Bill, and that is the expense that will be incurred in connection with revising barristers, clerks and constables. That is one of the best reasons why hon. gentlemen opposite should pause before they agree to pass a Bill of this kind. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider what they are doing, and especially to consider the financial state of the country. Surely the expenses are being piled up from year to year with sufficient rapidity without having $300,000 or $400,000 annually added? There is no reason for doing so. The present franchises have worked satisfactorily. If they have not, let hon. gentlemen opposite take more time and perfect this Bill, and see if we cannot get a fair vote of the people without incurring the expense proposed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the leaders on this side are in favor of a uniform franchise. The best answer to that is, that the Government led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) passed the Act adopting provincial franchises; they had the power to make a uniform franchise, but they did not do so. Much has been said about the powers given by the British North America Act to this Parliament to deal with this question. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) properly said that no one disputed the right of this House to deal with it. But I do not see that because we have the power, that is a sufficient excuse for dealing with it at the present time. It has been stated that Local Legislatures in fixing the franchise consider what effect it will have on Dominion elections. I do not believe this is true. They make a franchise for the election for the Local House and do not consider Dominion elections for a moment. The Act of 1874 merely adopts the franchises of the Local Legislatures from time to time. Those Legislatures have no desire, so far as I know, to interfere with the elections of members of the House of Commons. The hon. member for Kent stated last night that the Local Legislatures were not in so favorable a position to know what should be the franchise for elections for the House of Commons as are members of this House. I ask this question: Is it unreasonable to suppose that the 38 men who represent the people in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, together with 21 Legislative Councillors, are not in a better position to judge as to what the franchise of Nova Scotia should be, than a majority of the 21 members who represent that Province in this House. To-day six or

seven of those members are opposed to the present Government, and to the Bill now before the House. The 14 men who support the Government are in favor of this Bill; and those 14 will actually force upon the 7 members and on the Province of Nova Scotia a franchise which, for all we know, may not be at all suited to the circumstances of the people of that Province for electing members to this House. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has given an excellent reason why he is not the very best judge as to who should be entrusted with the franchise in Nova Scotia. He has said "hear, hear," to the statement that this law would give miners a vote and increase the voters in Pictou county. Is that an unbiassed opinion, when he is in favor of a law which increases the number of voters in his own county, when he knows that if there is any class of people in Nova Scotia who are in favor of the present Government, it is the miners of that Province? He knows that every one of those men would have voted for him before, and he knows that they will vote for him at the next election.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, the National Policy.

Mr. VAIL. Yes, they have been led astray by the National Policy; they have been led to believe that the National Policy has given them better prices for their coal and that the Government are doing all they can to favor the miners of Nova Scotia, though they refuse to buy one ton of Nova Scotia coal to heat these or any other buildings, and buy American coal exclusively. I was going on to say that the Nova Scotia Bill gives every person a vote who is in possession of real property of the value of $150. Then every person in the possession of real and personal property together of the value of $300; then the son of every owner or tenant; then the son of every widow—so you see it covers very nearly all those who are enfranchised under the Dominion law. But, Mr. Chairman, I am not so wedded to the Nova Scotia Bill that I would be disposed to object very much to the provisions of this Bill, provided that it did not bring in the Indians, and provided we were given a fair show with regard to the revisers. Our revisers have hitherto been appointed by the municipalities. They both appoint the assessors and revisers. The revisors take the assessment roll, and from that assessment roll the revision is made up. They are required to post the roll as in the other Provinces at a certain time, and if any person is wrongfully assessed he has the right of appeal to the revisers court. They receive information, they examine the assessment roll, they are well acquainted with the whole country, and they know the value of the property, so that they are in a good position to say whether a party should be put on or struck off the roll. Every man is given a vote who has a right to vote, and it must be shown very clearly that a man has no right to vote before he is struck off. Now, Mr. Chairman, under this Bill as it was first brought down, the revising officer was not only to revise the list, but he was to make the list in the first instance. The revision of the list would not be worth anything because he made the list in the first place. He was only required to go to the assessment roll for such information as he imagined he required, and then he was to hold his revision court and his decisions were, I may say, final. Now, everybody knows that it is a very rare thing, except in the city of Halifax, to make the appeal really worth anything. At first only appeals in law were to be allowed, but it has now been stated by some gentlemen on that side, and I believe it has been agreed, that the appeal shall be allowed in matters of fact as well as in matters of law. But that is not worth anything in consideration of the fact that it will always be attended with trouble and expense, and will conseqtently be of no advantage whatever to the people. I do not very often read from newspapers, but as the hon. member for Lincoln read from the Halifax *Chronicle* the other night, I think it would be pardonable for me to quote from the article to which he referred. He stated that, as this was an Opposition paper, it was a matter of great importance that that paper should have stated that there was very little difference between the Dominion Act and the Act lately introduced in Nova Scotia. If the hon. gentleman had read the whole article——

Mr. RYKERT. I read the whole.——

Mr. VAIL. I think he would have seen plainly what was the opinion of the *Chronicle* on the subject of this Bill. (The hon. gentleman here read an editorial article from the paper in question.) If the hon. member for Lincoln had read the whole of that article, he would have given us a correct idea of the editor's opinion on this subject; but as he only read a portion it was calculated to deceive the House——

Mr. RYKERT. Would the hon. gentleman allow me a minute? I simply read that portion of the article in order to show that the Bill would not disfranchise any of the people of Nova Scotia, in reply to an assertion by the hon. member for North Norfolk.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman emphasised strongly that this was the organ of the Opposition, and he put forward the article to show that the franchise under this Bill was more favorable than the provincial franchise. The hon. gentleman, if he thinks the opinion of newspaper editors so important, might have gone a little farther and read from the *Morning Herald*, of Halifax, which is a Government paper. That paper, before I suppose it got the hint that it was bound to sustain the Bill, said on April 18, 1885:

"We have always expressed disapproval of Sir John Macdonald's Franchise Bill. It may be true as alleged that the people of Quebec are not yet in a condition to justify the abolition of property qualification, but it is not true of the people of Nova Scotia. If the condition of the two Provinces is widely different, why a similate the franchise law. The suffrage will only be uniform in name and not at all in fact, if applied to such different conditions of society."

That is the opinion of the Government organ in Nova Scotia. The franchises are so widely different in the different Provinces that it is impossible, except in name, to have a uniform franchise, even if this measure is passed. Now, a word with regard to what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) said last night in reference to members of this House being representatives of the whole Dominion. My hon. friend was very patriotic—I am sorry he is not in his seat; he did not know why a member, though elected for a New Brunswick constituency, should be a representative of New Brunswick any more than a representative of British Columbia or Manitoba; because, he said, we were all sitting here as members for the Dominion. One would suppose that ours was a legislative union, and not divided up into Provinces. Why, the whole of this Confederation is made up of Provinces; each Province is allowed so many members, and we come here as the representatives of the several Provinces. Each Province is, by a well established rule, allowed so many members in the Government. I do not pretend to say that a member of the Government should confine his attention to one particular Province, with a desire to get any undue advantage for his own Province; he is to all intents and purposes a member of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and as such should transact all business in connection with the Government; but he is nevertheless a representative in the Cabinet of the particular Province he comes from, and I venture to say that not a question comes before the Government of the Dominion which my hon. friend opposite, the Minister of Public Works, does not consider in the light of its effect on his own Province. The hon. member for Kent said it was nonsense for people to talk about the

rights of the several Provinces being violated in this House, and that there was no disposition on the part of the representatives from any Province to ask for more than they were willing to concede to other Provinces. What have we seen in this House? Have we not seen the members for Quebec voting for something for their Province, and directly afterwards voting against extending the same right to Nova Scotia? Have we not seen during this very debate members from Prince Edward Island voting to compel every other Province of the Dominion to accept this law and then moving in favor of Prince Edward Island being exempted from it? Have we not seen them voting against allowing New Brunswick and Quebec the same privilege that they ask for their own Province? Do we not see that those people are considering this question entirely from a provincial standpoint? The people of the Province of Quebec are very tenacious of their rights; they are determined that their autonomy shall be preserved as far as possible; and when this Confederation was formed, the whole basis of representation for the several Provinces of the Dominion was that Quebec should have 65 members forever, and the other Provinces proportionate numbers. If this Dominion is to be a federal union, it must be based upon representation of the Provinces in this way; if it is to be a legislative union, I can understand that provincial lines may be broken down, that the autonomy of the Provinces may be destroyed, and that we may sit here as the representatives of different counties in the Dominion of Canada and not as representatives of different Provinces. Therefore, I take exception to the argument of the hon. member for Kent, because it is contrary to the system under which the government of this country is carried on. In regard to this Bill, you are actually forcing upon the different Provinces a franchise which is distasteful to a large portion of the people, merely because you have the power to do it. It is better to leave the Provincial Legislature to fix the franchise which they know to be most suitable to their particular Province. This can be done without expense, and it leaves the responsibility in the hands of the people. If we are to have responsible government carried out in a way that will be satisfactory to the people of this Dominion, we must allow the people to govern themselves. And I am satisfied if the Government will accept the amendment I have proposed and allow Nova Scotia to elect her members under the provincial franchise that was passed last year, it will be much more satisfactory to the whole Province than this Bill, which, I know, will disfranchise a good many people, notwithstanding it may enfranchise a few who are not so well entitled to the franchise as those who will be deprived of it. It is a very serious matter to disfranchise anybody. The right to vote is a privilege inherent in every citizen in a free country; every young man looks forward to the time when he shall be able to exercise the rights of a citizen. If the law be left as it is in the Province, it will be more satisfactory to the people at large. Considering the position the Government occupy, considering they went to the country before the expiration of their last term, considering the law that was passed making new lines in Ontario in regard to the electoral districts, it would only be a liberal act on their part to let this matter stand as it is at present, until after the next general election. Then, after the country has been informed upon this matter, it could be re-introduced and the Bill be made perfect, which it is far from being at present. It is unfair, it is unjust to undertake to force a Bill of this kind through the House in order to obtain a party advantage at the polls. Supposing my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when at the head of the Government, had undertaken to pass a measure of this description, what would have been said by hon. gentlemen opposite? A howl would have gone up from them which we would not have heard the last of for ten years. They would have carried on the debate for six months before allowing a Bill of this kind to pass. I believe in doing justice to all parties. The Liberal Government, which was led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) took a manly course. They went to the people without passing any Election Act to strengthen their position, and said: Our course has been such that we have a right to claim a renewal of your confidence for the next five years; we are not disposed to make changes in the tariff that we know will, in the end, be injurious to the country, for the sake of getting a temporary advantage and holding power a few years longer; we are determined to stand or fall on the principles we have enunciated. We were defeated; did we complain? No; we accepted the defeat. We said, we have done our duty; the country has condemned our policy, but the time will very soon come when the people will see and acknowledge their error. The time has come now, and the Government acknowledges that the time has come by putting that Bill on the Table and asking the House to endorse it. They ask the House to pass that Bill so that they may have an undue advantage at the polls, and for no other reason.

Mr. TUPPER. After the two speeches the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has made upon this question, two speeches grossly inconsistent with each other, and after the very able speech of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) in which he dealt with this question upon high ground, it will not be necessary for me to occupy much of the time of the House in order to show that this Bill will be received in Nova Scotia with the greatest satisfaction, from one end of the Province to the other. I say that advisedly. Not only is the principle of this Bill acceptable to the Liberal Conservative party of Nova Scotia and to my friends, to whom the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) specially alluded, but it is, from their own admission, acceptable to the Liberal press, the Grit press of Nova Scotia, and to the Grit party there, if I may claim the utterances of the paper from which the extract was read by the hon. member for Digby as the utterances of that party—and I take it the *Chronicle* occupies such a position in Nova Scotia in regard to the Liberal party so called, the Grit party, and that it really speaks with more authority than does the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman read sufficient to show this House that the Liberal party in Nova Scotia admitted, are forced to concede, that this Bill will broaden the franchise to a greater degree than the Bill passed last Session in the Local Legislature. That admission also came from the hon. gentleman's own mouth. He went further than the *Chronicle*; he stated that the miners, a large and important class in that Province, were to enjoy this high privilege of voting, of expressing their opinions on public questions, questions which affect their interest so closely. I wish to point out to the committee a curious change that has taken place during this very debate in the mind of the member for Digby. Before that article in the *Chronicle* was written the hon. member, on the 21st April, rose in this House and condemned this Bill because it restricted the franchise. He used this language:

"In the Province of Nova Scotia we have a simple franchise which is easily understood: $150 worth of real estate, or $300 of personal property, or $300 or real estate and personal property combined, entitles a man to vote; and that is the whole franchise of Nova Scotia as it stands at present. Now, this Bill, if it is carried through the House, will deprive a considerable number of voters in Nova Scotia of the right to vote for members of this House."

Now either the hon. gentleman did not entertain the view that it would restrict the franchise or he has been educated sufficiently by this article to know that it does not.

Mr. VAIL. Will my hon. friend read on what I did say. I pointed out that it restricted the franchise, inasmuch as it took away the right of voting on personal property.

Mr. TUPPER. I have not time to read the whole speech. It is in the *Hansard*, but I may mention that the whole of it has been repeated to-day with certain inconsistencies which I will point out. What I was about to say was, either the hon. gentleman has not sufficiently studied the Bill or has been whipped into line by this article, because I find at this stage he comes under the taunts that have been thrown across the floor of the House by hon. gentlemen opposite, that sufficient study of the Bill has not been made, since by studying this important question again he has actually confused two clauses of the Bill. He stated here in Parliament, at this late stage of the debate, that the occupancy clause and the income clause went together, and that the income availed no man anything unless he was an owner of real estate. That is a sad admission to come from the hon. member for Digby, but that admission, together with the others, makes it unnecessary for me to do more than point to the paper which he read as showing that there is an extension of the franchise, which that organ hails with pleasure, in an article of the 9th May, 1885. They go on to show in this article that we have dealt with a class not included in the Bill of the Local Legislature, the fishermen, so far as regards their nets and tackle, and the occupants. The hon. member for Digby added another class, the mining class, and he might have gone further and shown that a large proportion of the mechanics throughout that Province will enjoy the same privilege as the miners. The mining class in Nova Scotia is one of the most important portions of the artisan or working classes. They earned on the average, during the last year, over $2 a day. These men are intelligent. They are not such men as he insinuated to-day, who could be deluded by political agents or by any party to a greater extent than other men. He insinuated to-day that we had deluded those men in connection with the National Policy and had made them believe that it would benefit them and the Province, and I judge that his conclusion, in opposing their admission to the franchise, was that therefore they should not be permitted to vote, because they would still record their votes in favor of that policy and in favor of myself as a representative of the County of Pictou. That is a novel reason why any class in the community should be deprived of the franchise, and I am afraid that, under the broadest franchise in Canada to-day, there would be very few voters if all who approved of the National Policy were to be disfranchised. The hon. gentleman quoted a small extract from the Halifax *Herald* to show that that paper, being in the interests of the Conservative party of Nova Scotia, opposed the Franchise Bill, but he knows that the only ground on which that paper has disapproved of this Bill is that it does not go far enough. That paper, like the hon. gentleman, if I can take what he has said to-day as his real opinion, prefers universal suffrage to the legislation proposed by this Bill, and it would have been only candid for the hon. member, who read a lesson to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), for not reading the whole of an article which he quoted, to have read some of the articles in that paper in which they say explicitly that their opposition is grounded on the fact that this Bill does not grant universal suffrage. It is apparent to most hon. gentlemen that this Bill has extended the franchise to such an extent that the number of people excluded from its operations will be very few indeed. Some years ago, the present leader of the Opposition, when occupying a position in the Local Legislature of Ontario, made a speech in reference to a Bill which proposed to reduce the property qualification in townships and villages from $500 to $200. A motion was made to still further reduce it to $100, and my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island and all of us from Nova Scotia can take heart in reading certain language used by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. He said:

"No one could be more disposed than he was to say that, while we are adopting the property qualification as a necessary ingredient in the right to the franchise, we should see that the property qualification was not raised so high as to prevent those who had a substantial stake in the country in the property they held from exercising the franchise; but we should remember, with reference to this branch of legislation, that, while it was easy to go down, it was impossible to go up. A step in the direction of that which the hon. member for Middlesex proposed to take was a step practically irrevocable. When once they reduced the franchise, they would not find any man, or at least any number of men, bold enough to propose to raise it. It might be that, in a very few cases in townships and villages, there might be a man intelligent enough to exercise the franchise who was the owner of a lot and house in which he resided worth no more than $200, but this must be a God-forsaken part of the country, and the domicile must be of a peculiar description."

No one will say that there is any God-forsaken part of Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia.

"The hon. member for Middlesex said he would like to give the franchise to every man whose name was upon the roll. That was what we were coming to if, without cause shown, we were going to reduce the property qualification one-half. He thought, if hon. gentlemen opposite had acted wisely, they would have kept up the franchise in cities to $500. If they had done so, we would not have found the hon. gentleman now urging this downward course."

No doubt the hon. gentleman has changed his opinion upon that subject, and is not so averse to the broadening of the franchise as he then was, but that is language used by an hon. gentleman of as great weight then as now, and we cannot be charged with doing such outrageous things if our Bill has gone no further than the hon. gentleman said it should go at that time. I do not know that it has been mentioned in this debate, that, just as the *Chronicle*, the organ in Nova Scotia, a year or two ago, so the *Globe*, the organ in Ontario, a year or two after that speech of the hon. gentleman, stated that this Parliament should proceed to regulate its own franchise and to make one franchise for the Dominion of Canada. I therefore fail to understand this extraordinary excitement that has been worked up, not in the country, though an effort has been made in that direction, but in one corner of this House. I fail also to understand this indignation and excitement, because, it seems to me, that we are not making a jump from the provisions in the British North America Act, to which allusion has so often been made. We have come gradually down to the position we are taking to-day in fixing a uniform franchise for the Dominion, because I find that Parliament has already legislated and fixed upon a qualification for the members of this House. It has regulated the mode of those elections. We know that open voting prevails in one Province of this Dominion; why, then, do hon. gentlemen not say that in the Province of Manitoba, which says not only who shall vote, but how people shall vote—why do they not come forward and say that in Manitoba, Dominion elections shall be by open voting?—as that is the mode which prevails in the local elections in that Province. But in the Dominion elections the Dominion law lays down a different mode of procedure, and dictates to the proud people of Manitoba how they shall record their votes. We also find that by the Dominion law, parties are disfranchised in the different Provinces, judges for instance. We find also that this Parliament already has enfranchised a particular class in the Province of Nova Scotia, the Intercolonial Railway officials. Now, on the passage of these different provisions, I can find no record of a debate of this character. I think it singular that this storm should burst so suddenly upon us; but there may have been storms on the passage of these various Acts, which have passed away and are now forgotten, as I believe this storm will pass away and be forgotten in a few years hence. I take it, we are only now going, step by step, in the direction contemplated by the British North America Act. We have taken many steps, and have regulated the mode of our elections, and have said who shall be representatives in this Chamber, and we are further enlarging the

provision already in this Act, in regard to how the lists shall be made up. Now, in regard to the appointment of revisers' we know that as this Bill broadens the franchise in so many Provinces, and goes far beyond the assessors' list, once you admit the principle of the Bill to be correct, and once you admit the qualifications for voters to be correct, you must of necessity make a provision for revisers, or some other parties, to prepare the lists. It is impossible to take the assessment list, because that list will not contain the names of voters to be enfranchised by this Bill. Therefore you have your choice. Will you delegate to the municipalities the right to appoint special officers? I say the preparation of such a list, as is contemplated by this Act, is not within the duties of local municipalities. I take it that, if this Parliament chooses to leave these matters to the municipalities, it has power to do so; but I, for one, do not see any reason why we should not appoint our own officers in this connection, as well as in connection with any other legislation passed by this House. I also find another objection on the score of expense. Well, when the Ballot Act was introduced there was an additional expense caused by the change from open voting. Will any hon. gentleman deny that an additional expense was incurred by the introduction of the ballot system? Because more machinery was necessary, and when you have more machinery you have more expenses. Once having admitted the general principle to be right, that it was in the interests of the country to adopt a ballot system in place of open voting, no man will stoop to the argument that the fact that it would entail additional expense was sufficient reason for not adopting the change. I think that argument is puerile, and it exactly applies to the question of expense under this Bill.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend, in pointing out my inconsistencies, referred to a speech I made a few days ago. This is what I said, and I think it fully bears out what I said to-day:

"In the Province of Nova Scotia we have a simple franchise which is easily understood; $150 worth of real estate or $300 of personal property, or $300 of real estate and personal property combined, entitles a man to vote; and that is the whole franchise of Nova Scotia, as it stands at present. Now, this Bill, if it is carried through the House, will deprive a considerable number of voters in Nova Scotia of the right to vote for members of this House. The measure is largely based upon the principle of the ownership of real estate. It is not intended to give any man a vote who possesses personal property only, no matter how much it may amount to."

That is all I said with reference to the Bill, and it is just in accordance with what I said to-day.

Mr. KIRK. I desire to say a few words in favor of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail). The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) and several other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the opposite side of the House have taken up a great deal of time in discussing the constitutionality of this measure, in affirming the right of this Parliament to pass a Franchise Bill. I think it was altogether unnecessary for them to do so, because that right is admitted by both parties in this House. The fact that Parliament has this right is shown by the legislation in which this Parliament undertook to regulate the franchise of the different Provinces years ago, especially the franchise of Nova Scotia. In 1871 the Novia Scotia Legislature enacted a law by which all railway Customs, and many other officials of the Dominion were disfranchised, as well as officials of the Local Government. This Government undertook to say by Act of Parliament that those electors who were so disfranchised should have the right to vote for members of this Parliament. By that Act the Dominion Parliament showed its power to deal with the electoral franchise. The action of the Nova Scotia Government was similar to action previously taken by the Ontario and Quebec Legislatures. The pretension with respect to uniform franchise goes to the winds. While we admit the right of this Parliament to pass the proposed Bill, we deny the expediency of doing so. The local franchises which have existed so long without any complaints being made by any Province should still prevail. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), says this Bill will be hailed with great satisfaction by the Liberals of Nova Scotia; that the Grit press hail with pleasure this Bill because it enlarges the franchise. The hon. member said the *Morning Chronicle* admitted that this Bill gave a more liberal franchise than the Bill passed by the Nova Scotia Legislature. I admit that the *Chronicle* says it would like to see the Provincial Franchise Bill more liberal but it did not say that this Bill under discussion is a more liberal Bill than the one passed in the Nova Scotia Legislature. I desire to show that this Bill restricts the franchise as compared with the local law of Nova Scotia. The local law gives a vote to every owner of real estate to the value of $150, also to every man owning personal property to the value of $300, or to anyone owning personal and real estate amounting to $300. This Bill gives a vote to an owner of real estate to the value of $150, but it does not take personal property into account. Under this Bill fishermen will be disfranchised to a large extent. Take a fisherman who owns a small farm to the value of not more than $150 or $200. He is allowed to come in with his boat and tackle but he is not allowed to count in any other personal property. Therefore his sons will not have votes. A fisherman may own a small vessel worth $1,000. That cannot count for his sons or for himself under the present Bill. Under the Nova Scotia law if a fisherman owns such a vessel it will give a vote to himself and to his three sons, if he has that number. It has been said that the income from the vessel would give the fisherman the right to vote. I do not see that it is so. Suppose the fisherman sent the vessel to sea with captain and crew and there were no profits received, how would the case stand? He would have no vote on that account under this Bill. But under the Nova Scotia law he and his sons would have votes if the vessel did not earn a dollar. Take again the franchise in cities. Under the Nova Scotia law every man having $150 worth of property has a vote; but under this Bill he must own property to the value of $300. In towns, a merchant may own a small store and have sufficient real estate to give him a vote. He may have two sons, and a stock of goods worth $1,000. Under the Nova Scotia law he and his two sons would have votes. Under this Bill the trader only would have a vote. I say, in view of these facts, this Bill does not enlarge the franchise. It is said that this Bill gives a vote on income. In Nova Scotia we have no income tax; how then can the reviser ascertain the amount of income earned by the people? The revising officer must travel round in order to obtain that knowledge. If that is to be the case the expense will be very great. Hon. members have talked about $500,000 as the probable expense of making out the voters' lists annually; but if the revising barristers have to travel over every county to ascertain the amount of income received by the people, it will take double that amount to pay their expenses. It will require $1,000,000 per annum to pay the expenses of making out the lists. Then it was said that any man owning a vessel would be entitled to vote under this clause. I maintain that the clause does not read so. It reads:

"Derives an income from some trade, office, calling, or profession, or from some investment or charge on real property in Canada."

He cannot have a vote if his income is on personal property instead of real property.

Mr. KINNEY. Yes, he can.

Mr. KIRK. I think not; the investment must be a charge on real property.

Mr. KINNEY. An investment of any kind.

Mr. KIRK. Well, I am not a lawyer, nor is the gentleman who contradicts me.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that any investment will give a man a vote?

Mr. KINNEY. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Money invested in a savings bank?

Mr. KINNEY. I say that under this clause as it reads, a man who did not hold real estate at all might still have a vote.

Mr. DAVIES. Under what word in the clause would you bring in a man owning a ship?

Mr. KINNEY. I do not say anything about a ship, but I say that there can be a vote on personal as well as real property.

Mr. KIRK. I am arguing as to the men having ships, and I say that a man may have $400 income from investment in a vessel, and under the Bill he would not have a vote, because the money must be invested in the particular way described in the Bill. The hon. member for Pictou said that the franchise under this Bill would largely increase the votes of the miners of Nova Scotia. I deny that it does. I say that the law of Nova Scotia passed last year is more liberal to the miners of Nova Scotia than the present Bill, and for this reason. The Nova Scotia law gives a vote to any man who is in occupation of property worth $150. Now it is a very poor house indeed, in the coal regions of Nova Scotia which is not worth $150, and if he is in possession of such a house for one year, even if he does not pay one dollar rent, he is entitled to a vote. Under this Bill, however, he must pay $20 a year rent, and he must, I suppose, satisfy the revising officer that he has paid the rent, by producing the landlord's receipt. Now, I ask if a man who occupies a house worth $150 is not better entitled to a vote, and if he does not obtain it on easier terms than the man who actually pays $20 a year rent; and who must be prepared on election day at the polls to swear that the rent was actually paid? The franchise of the farmers is also restricted in this Bill, and I do not think there is a single class in Nova Scotia as to which the franchise is more liberal in this Bill than the local law, unless it is in the matter of income, and even as to that the difficulty of obtaining the amount of income would be so great that the law would be entirely a dead letter. One hon. gentleman said that this Bill would enfranchise a great many teachers in Nova Scotia. I dare say there are some teachers in towns and cities who receive larger salaries than $400, but the teachers in country places do not receive anything like that amount, and so they would not be enfranchised. Still in that particular case—the income voters—and in that case alone, is this Bill more liberal than the present Nova Scotia franchise. But if the Bill restricts the franchise in some respects, it is proposed to make it up in others—to make it up by the enfranchisement of the Indian. For the first time in the history of this or any other country the Indians are to be enfranchised. I need say nothing at all about the conditions of the Indians of Nova Scotia, for there is no man here who knows anything about them, who does not know that they are uneducated, illiterate and ignorant, and that they are not a desirable class to enfranchise. Besides, they are under the direct control of the Government, and will feel in duty bound to vote for the Government under any circumstances. I maintain that under this Bill all the Indians on a reservation will be entitled to vote, if the reservation as a whole is of sufficient value to give them votes. Then, Sir, we are to have the voters' lists made up by the nominee of the Government. At the present time, in our Province, they are made up by the municipal councils, who are elected by the people, free from political influence, because in our Province we have no political strife in running our municipal elections. If those hon. gentlemen on the other side wish to make a noise I will wait till they are through.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order.

Mr. KIRK. The voters' list is made up from the assessment roll. A board of four assessors are appointed by the municipal council, and one or more members of the board travel through the district, see the property, and take an inventory of the property, and then the four meet and value it.

Mr. DAVIES. I think we might take the sense of the House, Mr. Chairman, as to these noisy interruptions. The hon. gentleman speaks very seldom, and it is very unfair and ungenerous in those who do not wish to hear him to give him this treatment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order.

Mr. KIRK. These hon. gentlemen talk about obstructing the business of the House. I wonder who are the obstructionists. I was proceeding to say that the board of assessors value the property irrespective altogether of the right of the owners to vote. Before they proceed to their work they are sworn to value the property at its actual cash value. From the assessment roll made up in this way the reviser's list is made up by three appointed by the municipal council also, and that list is made up irrespective of political influences. I have scarcely ever heard of any trouble in regard to political influence being brought to bear on the revisers; they are allowed to act according to their best judgment without interference from any person; and these men are appointed, so far as I know, from both sides of politics, so that there is no liability of any difficulty arising from a political cause. The fact that when the Franchise Bill was amended in the Nova Scotia Legislature last Session, and fully discussed by members on both sides of the House, not one solitary word was said against the principle on which these lists were made up by any hon. gentleman in that House, ought to be pretty good evidence that the people of Nova Scotia are satisfied with the system of making up the electoral lists. But this system is to be changed. We are to have the making of the electoral lists placed in the hands of a nominee of the Government, who may base his valuations on the assessment roll or may value the property just as he pleases, and place whom he pleases on the list or leave off whom he pleases. The revising barrister sits in but one place in the electoral district. In my county he will probably sit in the town of Guysboro, the shire town of the county. There is more than one polling district in that county which is 80 miles from Guysboro', and I would like to know if any elector in that county will go to the trouble of travelling 80 miles in order to see that his name is on the list, even though he knows he is left off; and we do not know how many names will be left off, either accidentally or purposely. Why should the Government ask to have their own nominee do this work, unless they want to be in a position to control entirely the electoral lists and elect whom they please to this House? On that ground I object to this Bill. I believe the electoral lists should be kept away from the control of the Government as much as possible; I think the Government should not want to interfere or to assume any advantage over the Opposition. I oppose this measure also on the ground of expense. At present the electoral lists cost the Government nothing; they are made ready to hand, and made as fairly and as well as it is possible for a revising barrister to make them; and why not use those lists? Why want to change a system which has given such universal satisfaction to the people of this Dominion? I cannot see why, unless the Government want to control the

whole affair. I believe that is the main object the Government have in view in pressing this Bill through the House; they wish to get control of the electors of this country. This Bill, to my mind, has a wrong title. Instead of its being entitled "A Bill respecting the Electoral Franchise," it should be entitled "A Bill to elect Tory members to Parliament," because that is just what it is and what it will be, and for these reasons I oppose it, and shall vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail).

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I should apologise for trespassing upon the time of the House, only that I desire to make a few observations relative to the remarks made by my hon. friend from Nova Scotia. I do not regret that the electoral franchises of the different Provinces have been separately submitted to this House, because the contrast which the discussion has shown to the committee proves conclusively that the discussion relative to the smaller Provinces is much more moderately conducted than when the franchise of Ontario is under consideration. My hon. friend from Guysboro still maintains that the franchise of Nova Scotia is not extended by this Bill. The *Morning Chronicle*, the organ of the Liberal party in its issue of the 7th instant admits that it is an extension of the franchise in Nova Scotia even beyond the franchise provided in the Bill lately introduced into the Local Legislature. But what I desire to call particular attention to is the very strong feeling that exists in this House on the franchise. My hon friend from Kent, N.B., referred to the irritation that existed in language both forcible and suggestive. I have seen in the *London Advertiser* of the 5th of May:

"The Reformers of the House of Commons, in their gallant struggle will have the sympathy of all fair-minded men. Sir John, insolent and defiant, paraded his brute strength, and boasted of his power. Were he allowed, he would crush the Reform party out of existence as ruthlessly as he would take the life of a snake. But he has been made to whine. He has felt that there is force of brains that can be used against the force of numbers. The Reformers can compel the withdrawal of the diabolical measure, and they will do so."

Such language used by the organs of a great political party in this Dominion is calculated to create a great deal of mischief. Such appeals to the prejudices of the people have been the cause of the rebellion in the North-West Territories, and if these appeals continue to be made to the prejudices of the Province of Ontario, I fear we will have a rebellion nearer home. Not only has the *Advertiser* appealed to the prejudices of the people of Ontario, but I find in the Toronto *Globe* of 2nd May the following passage:—

"It is hard to say what the next few hours will bring forth. The indignation of the people is rising. The gallant band at Ottawa will not be left without support. They have the sympathy of every respectable man in the country, Conservative as well as Liberal. Public opinion would support the sending to Ottawa of a delegation of five thousand citizens entrusted with the duty of preventing, by any constitutional means, the injustice now sought to be perpetrated.

Such appeals if made to our people in the Maritime Provinces would, I fear, end in a rupture of the Dominion, but it appears to have been the practice of the past in the older Provinces of Canada to make similar appeals. They have been in the past the cause of dead locks resulting in the impossibility of governing Canada during the union of Upper and Lower Canada, and I fear that unless these appeals made to the prejudice of the people are thwarted by the representatives of the people in the Dominion Parliament, the existence of Confederation will not be any more lasting. The reason why I am glad that the franchises of the several Provinces should be submitted for the consideration of this House is simply because there is a variation which is rather refreshing. I find the Bill under consideration is discussed from the point of view of each one's constituency from which every member in this House should discuss it. Before the question of the franchise to the several Provinces, apart from the whole Dominion, was admitted, I fancied that there were only seven constituencies in this Dominion, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia. If there were no other reason, why we should have a franchise absolutely, within the control of the Dominion Parliament, the evidence is in the irritation that existed in this House during the discussion on this measure. Each representative holds his own peculiar views as to who should be and who should not be disenfranchised, who should and who should not have a vote in his own constituency. While we differ as to the qualification necessary, I think we should, as sensible men, agree that this Dominion should have the control of its own franchise. I would say that for the municipal council every intelligent British subject over 21 years of age, who is subjected to taxation by the municipal councils, should have a vote for members of the municipal councils; for the same reason, I should say every person who is directly or indirectly taxed by the Local Legislature ought to have a voice in returning representatives to the Local Legislature; and for the same reason I should consider it but proper and just that every person who is taxed by the Dominion Parliament, who is over 21 years of age, and is a British subject, ought to have a voice in returning representatives to this Parliament. But whether we differ on that subject or not, we ought all to agree that this House should have full control of the franchises for the Dominion Parliament. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) has compared the Franchise Bill lately passed by the Local Legislature, during the last Session of Parliament, with the Franchise Bill which is now under our consideration. I submit that is hardly a fair comparison. He should have compared with this Franchise Bill, the franchise under which members of Parliament from Nova Scotia were returned in 1882 to the House of Commons. If he compares the measure now before the House with the Franchise Bill of 1882, under which we were returned from the several counties of Nova Scotia to this Parliament, he will find that this Bill gives a very largely extended franchise to that Province. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that in my own county it will extend the franchise to at least 750 people, as compared with the election law of 1882. My hon. friend from Digby said that the members of this House should go back to the same electors as returned them. I would ask how is it possible for us, who were returned on the electoral franchise of 1882, one very different from that now existing in Nova Scotia, to go back to the same electors? The hon. gentleman must know that the franchise is now very materially extended from what it was in 1882, and even now we cannot be sure that we will have to go back to the electors that are at present entitled, under a very anomalous Bill, to return members from Nova Scotia. I have only a few words more to add in reference to some comments made on my former speech by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. on the 5th instant, the hon. member said I had stated that the object of the Bill was not to secure uniformity at all. (See *Debates*, page 1812.) I cannot conceive how he could have gathered that from my remarks. I will read the words which I used. (See *Debates*, page 1684.) I listened also with a great deal of attention and patience to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) who referred to my argument on the right of this Parliament to pass the Franchise Bill, but said we had also the power to say that no man over 21 years of age or with blue eyes or red hair should have the right to vote, but that we were not called upon to exercise that power. I think I can show, from his own philosophical reasoning, that we should adopt a franchise for the Dominion Parliament. The Local Legislatures have also power to say that no man over 21 years old or with blue eyes or red hair shall vote. It has been repeatedly stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a great political war between two great political generals, the

Premier of Ontario and the Premier of the Dominion. Let us suppose that the Premier of Ontario passed a law which would only give votes to philosophers. Does not my hon. friend from Bothwell know that such philosophers would only vote for Grit members for the House of Commons, and that would unquestionably annihilate the Conservative vote from Ontario? It would be a most dangerous thing to permit any legislature, without our knowledge or consent, to so frame a franchise as to keep out of this Parliament all representatives who were not in accord with them. The franchise should have a uniform basis if possible, with a voters' list on which the names of all those who are entitled to vote should be placed, and no others. The present Bill provides an excellent franchise. It is true that the agitation against a revising barrister reached the far distant county of Inverness, and I hold in my hand a petition in reference to it, and, as petitions have been presented against the Franchise Bill, I think this is an appropriate time for me to present this one.

"We, the undersigned warden and councillors of the municipality of Inverness, beg respectfully to recommend to our Dominion representative and to the Government of Canada the appointment to office of revising barrister for this municipality under the provisions of the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885, of John L. McDougall, of Mabou, Esq., barrister."

This petition is signed by sixteen municipal councillors, by every Grit municipal councillor in Inverness, except one, and I believe by nearly every municipal councillor who was present in council on the 5th instant. The reason for the recommendation is evident. The council would not be in session again until some time in January next, and no other opportunity would present itself to its members to send a recommendation to their representative in the Dominion Parliament. They therefore took this course to recommend a person for the revisal of the electoral lists in the same way as they recommend revisers for the local lists in Nova Scotia, and I think, if there is any evidence required, this furnishes ample proof that, in the county of Inverness, the principle of having a Dominion franchise under the control of this Government has been approved of. The person who is recommended was, at the last general election, a very strong opponent of mine. He is a person of considerable ability, and exercises a good deal of influence. He has been recommended by the municipal council, and although an opponent of mine, I do not see any reason why, if this Bill becomes law, I should not recommend him to the favorable consideration of the Government. I have a good deal of confidence in him; I have a similar amount of confidence in every lawyer in the shire town which I have the honor to represent, who has been in practice for five years; and I believe that when under oath, they would prepare an honest electoral list. I am astonished to hear hon. gentlemen from the Province of Ontario say that they have so little faith in the honesty of purpose of the legal profession of that great Province. From the way they talk one would almost believe that there is not an honest man in the legal profession of Ontario; but from my personal acquaintance with hon. gentlemen from Ontario, on both sides of the House, who are lawyers, I do not think they are as bad as they represent each other to be.

Mr. BLAKE. An hon. member has alluded to a speech I made years ago, in the Legislature of Ontario, which obliges me to say one word. The observations I addressed to the Legislature of Ontario on that occasion were specially directed to a proposed franchise based upon property, but not at all with regard to what the proper considerations for a franchise ought to be. As long ago as 1874, I publicly proposed, in reference to a franchise based upon property, the adoption, first of all, of a household suffrage, entirely irrespective of value; secondly, that of a farmers' son's franchise, in respect of which farmers' sons had themselves no interest in the property; and thirdly, I wish to say that upon the same occasion, now eleven years ago, I stated my own view that the true basis of a suffrage was not upon property at all, but that it was that which I stated in my speech on the second reading of this Bill—citizenship, residence, and intelligence.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Vail) negatived. Yeas, 67; nays, 39.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think it is possible to provide an uniform franchise for the Dominion unless by a different method from that proposed by the Bill. I do not see that it would be possible to have any sort of uniform suffrage for the Dominion, unless the suggestion embodied in the notice of motion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is adopted, namely, that of universal suffrage. I contend that nothing short of universal suffrage will provide an uniform franchise for the Dominion. It has been pointed out that the principle of uniformity is already broken, in that we have Indian suffrage in some Provinces, while in others, the same class of Indians, namely, residents on reserves, are not to be allowed to vote. It has been pointed out that we have, under this Bill, a special fancy franchise for the fishermen of the eastern Provinces, which does not apply at all to Ontario, and to only a small extent to some parts of the province of Quebec; which will not apply at all to Manitoba, and which will have very little application to British Columbia. We are, then, already far away from the principle of an uniform franchise I contend, therefore, that the question before us is not so much whether we should have an uniform franchise for the Dominion, which this Bill does not give, as whether we should have the particular franchise proposed in this Bill. It is worthy of discussion, however, whether we should even attempt to provide an uniform franchise for all the Provinces. It is admitted on all hands, it has been stated *ad nauseam*, that we have power to create a Dominion Franchise. As I recollect the wording of the constitution, it does not say that such Franchise should necessarily be an uniform one; but that this House should have the right to settle the franchise upon which members of the House of Commons should be elected. As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has pointed out, we have already done that. It is part of the statute law of Canada, that whatever franchise should be adopted from time to time by each Province should be the franchise on which the representatives to the House of Commons from that Province should be elected. Therefore, at the present time by a statutory provision, and under the constitutional provision to which I have referred, the Dominion Franchise is that of each Province individually, and every person who is enfranchised by the Act of the Provincial Legislature has become, ever since 1874, a voter at elections for members of this House. We have to consider therefore, not primarily whether such and such persons or classes should be enfranchised, but whether any of those who already possess the franchise should loose it. The proposal before us is one to disfranchise a number of people who already possess the right to vote, and to give that power to others who do not now possess it. The question is much graver than it would be if we were now in the early days of Confederation and a franchise Bill were proposed. It is a much graver act to take away the franchise from people who already enjoy it than to settle who shall possess it when the question of the basis of the franchise first comes before Parliament. It was never contemplated, when that provision was placed in our constitution, that a step of this sort should be taken. It was contemplated that the Dominion should take some steps to say who should be voters at Dominion elections; but it was never contemplated that this House should restrict the Provincial franchises already existing. No such precedent can be found in

either English or Canadian practice. We, on this side of the House, have urged that the people should be consulted before such an important change is made. We have been answered that Mr. Gladstone effected a sweeping change in the franchise in Great Britain without consulting the people, and that Mr. Mowat did the same thing in Ontario. But in each case no restriction of the franchise resulted from the measure adopted. I am aware that point has been disputed, but I will prove it later on. The Mowat Government went to the people with the extension of the franchise as a plank of their platform, in 1883, The people returned that Government to power, in spite of thousands of arguments sent out from this capital, which the pockets of contractors supplied; but, in spite of the golden arguments, and the precious documents supplied by those individuals, the people returned the Mowat Government to power, largely, no doubt, on the ground that they proposed to extend the franchise. They carried out that pledge. The franchise has been extended; and it involved an extension of the franchise for elections to this House. It is now proposed, without an appeal being made to the people, to take away from the people whom the Mowat Act has enfranchised the franchise they now legally possess, for Dominion elections. Such a proposal is a constitutional revolution, or rather an unconstitutional change in the constitution. It might more properly be called a *coup d'état*. It is a proposal to place the whole basis of the franchise and the machinery of registration in the hands of the Government. If that is not a revolution in the constitution, a *coup d'état* and a usurpation of power, by violent means, I do not know what proceedings could be described by such language. It is an attack, not only on the rights of the Provinces, but on the principles of representative and constitutional government on which our whole parliamentary system is based. I say, Sir, it is utterly inconsistent with any conception of representative institutions, it is utterly inconsistent with the idea of representing the people at all, that the right to say who shall be represented, who shall be the voters, shall be assumed by the Government—I do not say merely by this Government, but whatever Government is in power. It would just be as absurd, as unconstitutional and as unjust, to enact that a Reform Government who might be in power should say who were to be the electors for this House, as to say that the present Government should have that power. And, Sir, I must repeat the warning which has already been given to their *confrères* by some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, who have chosen to act independently in this matter, the warning, namely, that they must look to the future and see how they would like this Bill, if it were in the power of every Grit candidate in Ontario, or any other Province, to say who should make up the voters' list for that constituency—if it was in the power of that candidate to take the position of revising officer, make up the list himself for that constituency, and then resign that office and present himself to those electors he had created by his own fiat. Hon. members, when they look forward to that prospect, will be able to realise our position, and how we feel at the prospect of our opponents in each riding in the Dominion being able to make up the jury list which is to try our case —able to make up the list of electors to whom we have to present ourselves, and to decide in advance in every riding, except in those in which there is an overwhelming Reform majority, who shall be the member in that particular riding. We are charged with obstructing a Bill of this character, as if it were a discredit to us. We are told that the minority have no right to resist the majority. I do not know where they get those principles of constitutional government. They do not come from British practice, from Canadian practice or from the practice of the United States. I do not know in what other countries the science of representative government has been so fully developed as to afford a wholesome precedent, but in these three countries they can find no precedent for the assertion that the minority should never seek to hinder the will of the majority from becoming law. There is no precedent for that assertion in the text books or proceedings of any Legislative Assembly. There is no justification for that assertion, either in common sense, logic, or fair play. For what purpose are the rules of parliamentary debate arranged? For the express and declared purpose of protecting the minority from the tyranny of the majority. If the majority were able to say, at any time; "there is no use discussing this question any further; our minds are made up, and we may as well vote now and we will vote now"—representative government would becomes a farce. It would become merely what the independent member from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) would make it, according to his own statement, a machine for the registering of those acts which the Government have already decided upon, and which the Government, forsooth, say should become law. I say that the forms of parliamentary debate have been expressly arranged to allow the minority to protest, to hinder and delay the progress of measures through the House, until those measures have been fully discussed, until the country has had time to pronounce on those measures, until, in fact, it has been ascertained beyond doubt that the Government does represent the will of the country with regard to those particular measures. There are cases, undoubtedly, in which obstruction would be mere factiousness. We have seen instances of that sort here. We have seen them in the British House of Commons. But to say that if we had systematically obstructed this Bill from the first moment in which it was proposed, our obstruction would have been factious, is to say that for which there is no justification in constitutional precedent or plain common sense. It is a matter of fact, known to every hon. gentleman, that, with the exception of those occasions on which they insisted on keeping the House sitting at hours when discussion was impossible, this Bill has been discussed—not obstructed, but discussed—but I say that even if we had decided to systematically obstruct, by every means which the forms of parliamentary debate allowed to us, at each stage of this Bill, we would have had ample justification, in the nature of the Bill itself, and the public feeling existing with regard to it throughout the country. When the Government proposes to do that which will destroy representative institutions, which will disfranchise those who sent them and us here, when they propose to make free discussion in future Parliaments an impossibility, I say it would be justifiable for us to use every legal and parliamentary means to prevent that measure becoming law. I do not say we will do that; I do not say it will be necessary. We have great hopes yet that amendments such as have been made or may yet be made in the Bill may make it something tolerable, but I say if we were forced to adopt that course, we would be justified by British constitutional precedent and by public opinion in this Dominion at large. Let these hon. gentlemen go back to the people whom the Bill proposes to disfranchise. Let them say that the Grits are obstructing the will of the majority, are putting representative institutions on their trial, are making parliamentary institutions a farce—tell them that——

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Inverness says "hear, hear," and to do him justice he has occupied as much time as any Grit in the House. But I say, tell the people who are going to be disfranchised that we are obstructing this Bill, and they will say: We honor you for it. They will say: Those men are fighting for the rights and liberties of the people, for the existing law, and we do not care whether they are retarding the will of the majority—whether they are preventing a tyrannical majority

from carrying their measures or not; we honor and respect them, and if the franchise is left to us, we will vote for them at the next election. I hope hon. gentlemen will use that cry in every riding in the Dominion where the franchise is going to be restricted. I hope they will make every elector in those ridings believe that we have been using every effort to prevent the passage of an Act which will deprive them of the franchise which they now enjoy. I say we have not obstructed this Bill. We have only talked loosely and largely, at times when discussion was really impossible, but I am quite willing that they should make every elector in the Province of Ontario believe, if they choose, that we have obstructed the Bill, and I am willing to take the consequences. I should infinitely rather be published throughout the length and breadth of the Province as one who assisted in obstructing this tyrannical and corrupt measure, than have it known through my riding that I had sat, as the vast majority of those on the other side have sat, silent, dumb dogs, sent here to guard the interests of their constituents, and so far neglecting their duty as to sit still, without a word of explanation or defence, and see the franchise of their constituents taken from them by this Bill. We are willing to take the risk of being charged with obstruction. Are hon. gentlemen opposite all willing to take the risk of unpatriotic silence?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I except my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron). He has done more than most supporters of the Government towards the discussion of this Bill; he is a man who, evidently, wishes to enlighten us on the subject; but we have had no light from those gentlemen in front of me. If there is any defence for this Bill we have not had it from them. We have had to look to their organs for the line of defence which they wished to be taken. They say that we are in darkness—that we do not understand the provisions of the measure. Why do they not explain them to us? Why do they not show us the beauties of the Bill? Because they feel that there are no beauties in it, and that their safest policy is "least said soonest mended." We have not had two explanations from hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken that have agreed with each other. The hon. member for King's, N.B (Mr. Foster) said that he was in favor of the Bill because it largely extended the franchise, and that he was "in favor of going as far as he could towards enfranchising the citizens in the Dominion." Suppose that is his position on the franchise question; where would it lead him? It would lead him to oppose the application of this Bill to the Province of New Brunswick, to the Province of Ontario, to the Province of Prince Edward Island and to the Province of British Columbia—in all of which Provinces it greatly restricts the franchise. An hon. gentleman asks me if he will do it. I doubt it very much. I doubt if he will oppose a single item or clause in this Bill. I have no doubt he regards it as the pink of perfection—as going just as far and no farther than a Bill ought to go, in extending the franchise. I have already pointed out that another member from New Brunswick, the hon. member for Northumberland, has, through his newspaper, expressed ideas the very opposite of those of the hon. member for King's, and has declared that this Bill does not go nearly far enough; that he advocates manhood suffrage, and that he thinks it is bad policy on the part of the Premier to force such a Bill as this upon his unwilling supporters. There we have two supporters of the Government who have given their views; and have they enlightened us on the Bill? Not at all. They have taken opposite lines. Other gentlemen have spoken, and not two of them have taken the same line in regard to the Bill. Each has found a different reason for supporting it, drawn from some real or fancied necessity of his own particular Province. Now, it is very doubtful if we should accept the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland to extend the franchise to every citizen over twenty-one years of age. There is some room for doubt as to whether we should adopt even an extension of the franchise without consulting the existing electors. I am quite prepared to express my opinion upon it when the proper time comes. But when a proposal is brought forward to take the franchise from those who already have it, I can have no hesitation in saying that it is unconstitutional, un-British, un-French, unfair, to adopt it, without consulting those from whom we are proposing to take the franchise, as to whether they are willing to part with it or not. I repeat, then, what I said this afternoon, that the Government should take the advice of the *Mail* newspaper; let them go to the country and ask the advice of the people on this measure, as they profess to have the majority of the people with them. We are willing to submit to that arbitration. Whatever the people may think of their general policy we believe that we have a majority of the people with us against this Bill, and we believe it from the bottom of our hearts. One thing has become quite manifest from this discussion, that in the attempt to enforce a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion it is impossible to suit every Province. Some of the Conservatives from Quebec have complained that this Bill is too liberal; the Reformers of Ontario have complained that it is too restrictive; both parties from Prince Edward Island have complained that it is too restrictive; British Columbia we have not heard from yet. The Bill is opposed in Quebec because it seems likely to lead to manhood suffrage; it is opposed in Ontario because it does not go far enough in the direction of manhood suffrage—because the views of the Conservatives of Ontario, as expressed by their votes in the Local House in favor of manhood suffrage for that Province, have not been carried out in the Bill; it is opposed by both parties from Prince Edward Island, because manhood suffrage there is to be abolished by it. Does not all this show what we have contended from the beginning, that it is impossible to adopt an uniform franchise which will be satisfactory to all the Provinces of the Dominion? Each Province has its own peculiarities, which make variations in the franchise absolutely necessary in order to secure fair play between the different Provinces. The right hon. Premier has recognised this; he has recognised that it would not be proper to allow the tribal Indians in the North-West or in British Columbia to vote, but he says it is proper to allow the Indians in the older Provinces to vote, because he thinks they are sufficiently intelligent to do so. He says himself that we require a different franchise in the different Provinces with regard to the Indians. The same is true with regard to other classes. You cannot apply the same rule to all the Provinces.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, Sir, I was concluding my remarks on the general question of provincial franchises *versus* a franchise for the whole Dominion. I pointed out that there were great differences of sentiment and taste and prejudice among the different Provinces as to what the franchise should be. I pointed out that no amount of legislation, no length of experience of a so-called uniform franchise, would do away with those differences of taste and feeling with regard to the franchise, and that we would consequently, if we attempted to have a franchise of that sort at all, be compelled to tinker it continually at the demand of one Province or another. I wish to speak now more particularly of the Province of Ontario.

There is no doubt whatever that this clause, so far as it applies to that Province, is a disfranchising clause, and that the Bill, as a whole, is a disfranchising Bill, as regards Ontario. I made some statements on Friday night, to which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) replied. I entered into some details of comparison of the Ontario Act with this Bill, and gave figures to support my contention. The hon. member for Lincoln also gave figures in his speech, which appeared to damage my conclusions rather seriously, but I claim to be able to show that his figures and mine are not in reality inconsistent. I ask the indulgence of the committee if I go on to elaborate my own figures before disposing of the hon. gentleman's calculations, and I do so with the understanding that I shall, later on, show that, notwithstanding the calculations made by the hon. gentleman, the figures which I gave Friday evening are substantially correct, and that very little change need be made in them, in view of the calculations to which he has called attention. With regard to the first comparison, that between the qualification clauses of the two measures, it has been urged by the Ministerial press, particularly by the *Mail*, whose arguments have been copied by the local papers very extensively, that the Dominion Bill is really more liberal than the provincial Act. The *Mail* of Monday last stated that the Dominion Bill would enfranchise at least 10,000 or more workingmen who were refused the franchise by the Ontario Act. This has been repeated time and again, and I am sorry I have not a copy of one of the papers at hand, that I might show you how absurd the contrast is between the statement and the facts; but as I suppose most members of the House have seen the articles in question, I shall go on to give the answers to those assertions, without troubling myself to quote in detail the assertions themselves. In what respect is the proposed Dominion Act more liberal than the other? Is it in respect of owners of real estate? I think not. The Dominion Bill requires $300 worth of property in towns and $250 worth in townships, as a qualification of owners of real estate, while the Ontario Act only requires $200 worth in towns and $100 worth in townships. In regards to tenants, the Dominion Bill has adopted a peculiar and rather fanciful plan, by making the qualification depend upon the rental instead of upon the actual value of the property. The tenant who pays $2 per month $6 per quarter, $12 per half year, or $20 per year, has the right to vote, without regard to the value of the property upon which he pays that rent. It has been pointed out already that this peculiar provision seems likely to put great power in the hands of owners of a large number of tenement houses in cities. There are a great many capitalists who own a number of shabby tenement houses, so shabby that they are hardly fit for habitation, in many instances, and yet I do not know where you can get tenements in large towns, however poor the lodging, for less than $2 a month or $20 a year. This franchise appears to go to the length of extreme liberality with respect to tenants, as compared with its liberality to owners of real estate. It will certainly admit a class of voters much lower in the scale of intelligence and political education than those admitted under the franchise as owners of real estate. I do not know why there should be this inconsistency. Still, it does not go quite so far in admitting all classes of householders as the Ontario Act. Dealing still with the comparison with regard to real estate qualification, the qualification required for occupants and tenants in real estate in the Ontario Act is the same as that required for owners—$200 in cities and towns and $100 in townships I do not see that there is the least reason for arguing here that the Dominion Bill is more liberal than the Ontario franchise. My friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has urged that the reduction in qualification will make very little difference in the number of persons admitted to the franchise, in his county. He tells us that since Friday last he had all the assessment rolls of his constituency sent to him here, in order that he might see the effect of this Bill and that of Mr. Mowat's Act in his county. That is rather an extraordinary statement. I was not aware that the assessors or township clerks, or whoever should now be in possession of the assessment rolls, would furnish those rolls——

Mr. RYKERT. I have copies of the assessment roll in my county, of the last twenty years, which I get and pay for annually.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman has had copies sent down since Friday last?

Mr. RYKERT. I have copies which I paid for.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has taken a very wise precaution in having copies of these lists. He has been able to get them, no doubt, much more cheaply than he would be able to get copies of the voters' lists under the proposed Dominion Act, unless he were a sitting member or a defeated candidate. I am sure he has not had to pay 6 cents for every ten names on the copies of the assessment rolls which he has obtained. These rolls show, he says, that only forty-nine persons in the county of Lincoln, outside of the city of St. Catharines, were assessed for an amount under $200, and that, therefore, only forty-nine who would not have the franchise under this proposed measure, now hold it under the Mowat Act, as owners of real estate. Of course, I cannot dispute his figures, not having seen the rolls. If that be the case, either the assessors in Lincoln must be in the habit of valuing property much higher than the assessors in other counties, or else the county itself must be in a most extraordinarily prosperous condition, composed of none but comfortable farmers. I have always thought that my own county was fairly rich, but I find that in my riding there are ninety-five persons qualified as municipal voters by holding properties between $100 and $200 who were not qualified to vote at the Ontario elections under the former franchise, which was practically the same as the present Dominion Act, but who now have provincial and Dominion votes by Mr. Mowat's late Act, which they will lose if this Bill is passed. In the township of York, one of the richest townships in Ontario—if not in the whole Dominion—I find there were 105 males in the same position out of 3,000 voters. I admit that the percentage is not very heavy, but it shows that the abnormally low proportion found by the member for Lincoln, in his county, does not exist in other counties equally well settled. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that only those forty-nine, to whom he referred, would gain votes under Mr. Mowat's Act. He has forgotten that there are a large number of persons of the wage-earner class who do not appear on the assessment roll at all, but are entitled to votes by that Act. So his deductions from those figures lose all their force. As to the income franchise, the amount demanded by this Bill is $400 a year, which is to consist of income derived from a "trade, calling, office or profession," and gentlemen of considerable legal knowledge say it is very uncertain whether this would include the wage-earner even if he earned $400 or over. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems to feel certain that it would not, and other lawyers to whom I have spoken have varied in their opinion; but I have yet to find a single lawyer assert his opinion that it certainly would include the wage-earner. On a former occasion the Premier interpreted similar words in a former Bill in such a manner as not to include the wage-earner; and, in the absence of any explanation from him on this occasion, we are entitled to suppose that this is his intention still. Of course, his intention is not binding on courts of law, but it would be naturally supposed that a lawyer of such eminence would have drawn the clause so as to carry out his intention,

and probably the average judge or revising officer would interpret this clause as the hon. gentleman intends it to be interpreted, so as to exclude the wage-earner from qualification under the income franchise. Mr. Mowat, at all events, whose legal knowlege and acumen will not be disputed, was not satisfied that the ordinary wording of an income franchise clause would include the wage-earning classes, because he has put in a separate clause to bring them in beyond the shadow of a doubt. Even if it were held that wages and income were synonymous terms, and that $400 wages would qualify for a vote in the same way as that amount of income, the qualification, under the Ontario Act, is very much lower. That Act gives the franchise for $250 of income or wages, while this Bill requires $400 income, without saying anything about the wage-earner. Although the attempt has been made in the newspapers to represent this Bill as more liberal than the Ontario Act, probably in the hope that people would compare the new Dominion Bill with the old Ontario Act instead of with the present one, I do not believe any one in this House will risk his reputation by making such a contention. There is another class dealt with in the Bill, which is one of the most important in the country. I refer to the sons of farmers and other landholders. This Act makes provision for each of those classes separately, while the Ontario Act treats the sons of all landholders under one heading, defining landholders so as to include both farmers and other owners and occupiers of land or houses. Under the Dominion Bill only as many sons can be qualified as the property in question would qualify if the father and the sons were joint owners. Thus, in townships, property of the value of $300 would qualify the father and one son, $450 would qualify the father and two sons, and so on. Under the Ontario Act, all the sons of landholders are qualified, without regard to the value of the property. If a landholder has over twenty acres of land of the full value of $100 in townships, or land under twenty acres, or house property, worth $400 in cities or $200 in townships, he may qualify as large a family of sons on that property as Providence has blessed him with. Landowner, too, is so defined as to bring sons of occupants as well as owners within the provision. To make this quite clear I must read the two clauses of the Act:

"Fifthly—Every landholder's son, who is resident at the time of the election of the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided therein with and in the residence or dwelling of the landholder whose son he is for twelve months next prior to the return by the assessors of the assessment roll,"

and so on, is qualified. Now landholder is defined in the interpretation clause as meaning:

"Any person who, being the owner of and residing and domiciled upon real property of at least twenty acres in extent, or of at least an actual value in cities and towns of $400, and in townships and incorporated villages of $200, is, in the last revised assessment roll of the municipality where such property is situate—"

and so on. Now, it will be clearly seen that these two clauses taken together offer a more liberal franchise for the sons of landowners than is offered by this Bill. Not only does the property required for the qualification of the father himself qualify all his sons, but the sons of tenants are qualified as well. Now, we come to another clause, which carries this enfranchisement principle much farther. Under the Ontario Act all householders, without regard to the value of the dwelling, are qualified to vote; and it is especially provided in this clause that "dwelling house" may mean part of a dwelling house, occupied as a separate dwelling, so that if three or four families live in the same house and have their separate holdings, although each may occupy only one room, each one of these heads of families has the franchise; but there is no such provision in this Bill. In the Mowat Act there is a general clause, including all heads of families, no matter how poor they may be, but is this Bill there is instead a special bid made for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. The Ontario Act gives the franchise to all householders, while this Bill gives a fancy franchise to a certain class of householders only, whose support it is desired to obtain. Now, we come to the resident and non-resident voters. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), said:

"There are in my own county 269 people disfranchised by reason of their being non-resident."

I did not know the hon. gentleman was an Irishman before. He says here that there are 269 people living in his county who do not live there. His meaning, probably, was that 269 people living outside his county, but having votes in his county, are disfranchised, as he calls it, by the Ontario Act. Now, I maintain that these 269 parties, to whom the hon. member for Lincoln refers, and others in the same position throughout the country, are not disfranchised by Mr. Mowat's Act. Disfranchising means depriving a person of his vote. These persons are not deprived of their votes, for the hon. gentleman has not pretended that, although they cannot vote in his county, they are prevented from voting where they live. They are only deprived of a surplus vote; they are only deprived of exercising a double, or treble, or quadruple electoral power. Is a man to have two votes simply because his property happens to be differently situated, geographically, from that of his neighbors? I must repeat what I think will commend itself to every impartial mind, that the principle of representation is the representation of individuals; that we are not seeking to represent town lots, or farm lands, or dwelling houses, or tenements, or mills or factories; we are seeking to represent the persons who own these things. Property qualification is merely required as a test, showing the stake in the country, as the saying is, of the persons who own these properties or occupy them. Therefore, once a person is shown to be qualified by the possession of property, or by an income, he is entitled to vote. Then you are done with him as a voter. Once you have established the fact that he has a right to vote, give him his vote, and let him take that vote where he lives. If he cannot qualify where he lives, I would not object to his voting in any one riding in which he has a qualification. But let him have a vote in one specified place, preferably where he lives, and let him have no more votes. Why should a person who owns $1,000 worth of property, scattered through five ridings, have five votes, while a person who has $5,000 worth in one riding has only one vote? Why this law enables a man to buy the right of out voting his neighbor. I say that taking away the plurality vote from these persons is not disfranchising them but enfranchising their neighbors, for it restores to the neighbors of these people, and other citizens around them, the electoral power which had been taken away from them in the first place, by giving it, in undue proportion, to these holders of plural votes. Suppose that there were, as the member for Lincoln says, 269 persons living outside his county who voted in that county, it is reasonable to assume that these people have votes at home also. They vote in their own county, and their votes counterbalance 269 votes of their neighbors. Not content with that, they go over to the county of the hon. member for Lincoln and outvote 269 persons in his county, and it is possibly by such means as this that the hon. gentleman sits here to-day, by receiving the votes of non-residents, of people who are not his neighbors, who have no interest in his county, except that they hold a bit of land there, or are qualified in some such way. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) appears to be of the opinion that if the 400 odd voters living outside his riding, but having votes in his riding, were deprived of their votes in his riding, he would have a poor chance of returning here. But it speaks ill for a representative to be so anxious to have the votes

of outsiders to outvote those who live in his own riding, and who have an intimate knowledge of him. The hon. member for Lincoln compared this with the case of voting for municipal purposes. He said: "If it was fair to let a man vote in every municipality where he held property, it was fair to give him a parliamentary vote also wherever he had property." I do not see it. The chief object of municipal government is to raise taxes and to expend them for the benefit of the property in the municipality in the carrying out of certain improvements. It is quite rational that a man should have a vote for municipal purposes wherever he has property, because a municipality is, to a great extent, a joint-stock institution. The case is extremely different in regard to parliamentary elections, where we do not deal with the property of the voter, but only with the individual; and I am surprised that the member for Lincoln should have drawn such a comparison. The only clause in this Bill that is more liberal than the Ontario Act is that respecting Indians. The Ontario Bill is liberal enough, for it provides that all enfranchised Indians, that is to say, all Indians who have been made citizens in the manner prescribed by the Indian Act, and some Indians who are not enfranchised, but are living off reserves and carrying on business like white people, shall have votes. This Bill goes even further. It will admit the same classes and all Indians who are not citizens, tribal Indians who are not citizens in any sense of the term. By the admission of a new class to the franchise you impair the electoral power of those who formerly exercised it. It is worth while noticing to what extent this will occur, more especially in a case like this, where people who are not citizens are to be allowed to exercise the franchise, to the detriment of those who are citizens. According to the census of 1881 there were 15,325 Indians in Ontario. Taking that number to represent 3,000 families and reckoning two votes to a family, father and one son, there will be about 6,000 Indian votes which will offset the votes of 6,000 citizens who now possess the franchise. These Indians will be admitted to the franchise without having citizenship. To that we object. We have stated our willingness and desire for years past that every facility should be afforded Indians to become citizens. Let Indians acquire property, become citizens, and then give them the right to vote. Why should we treat the Indians worse than the negroes? Let us give them an equal chance and they will become as good, probably better, citizens than the negroes.

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you refuse the Indian a vote when he has property the same as a white man?

Mr. CASEY. I would not. The Ontario Act gives Indians votes when they have property, the same as white men. This Bill, however, proposes to give Indians votes when they live on the reserve, have no right to sell, and have no right to any property, except to live on it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Indian must have some property qualification. He owns the land.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen understands the Bill better than the First Minister, but that right hon. gentleman stated that the law was intended to extend to tribal Indians living on reserves. We know that tribal Indians are incapable of holding property under the law, are incapable of suing and being sued; yet it is proposed to give them the franchise.

Mr. SPROULE. The Indian pays taxes and owns the land.

Mr. CASEY. Indians on reserves are not taxed or assessed and can not individually own land. Indians like Oronyatekha, Mr. White, the member of the Ontario Assembly, and others, have distinguished themselves; in fact, most of them are quite as capable of distinguishing themselves as are most white men, if they are given the opportunity. It is worth noticing how the Indians are distributed in Ontario. By far the largest number are in the constituency of Algoma, the hon. member for which has shown such solicitude to have Indians given the vote. The number of Indians there is 4,678, which will represent over 1,800 votes. It is not at all probable that those Indians, living so completely under the control of the Government, will vote against a friend of the Government. It is quite probable that the hon. member for Algoma will be even more secure in his seat than at present.

Mr. SPROULE. How many have votes now?

Mr. CASEY. I do not think there are any.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CASEY. I understood from the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) there were not any.

Mr. SPROULE. The timber agent of the Mowat Government brought them up by dozens last summer, and they voted all right.

Mr. CASEY. A considerable number may, perhaps, be entitled to vote under the Ontario Act, but I do not know what proportion. In Essex there are 137 Indians—a small number, and I believe a good many of them do vote there. In Bothwell there are 785, and I do not think any of these, or very few, have votes. This would give an addition to the electorate of Bothwell of something over 300 votes, at the rate we have been calculating. It is a very peculiar coincidence that it is proposed to add those voters to a constituency in which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) only obtained a majority of 12, according to the return, at least, at the last election. It does seem almost as if it were a continuation of the attempt to get rid of that hon. gentleman, which failed so disastrously in the case of the gerrymander, and that finding it impossible to dislodge him by that means, it is their intention to enroll the Indians, and thus drive him out of the constituency. It is possible that this attempt may turn out to be a mistake, like the other, and that the Indians may divide themselves on political grounds as other voters do; but the intention is evidently a political one. In West Elgin there are 273 Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what kills you.

Mr. CASEY. I shall not go into the calculation in that riding, because it does not much matter there if the whole of them had votes. In North Bruce there are 760, nearly the same number as in Bothwell. But there is this difference, that whereas in Bothwell a prominent member of the Opposition got in by a bare majority, in North Bruce a supporter of the Government (Mr. McNeil) got in by the narrow majority of 88; and it is highly probable that the votes of the male Indians of those 760 may be the salvation of that amiable gentleman at the next general election. It is possible he may come back without them, but I think the Government are acting wisely by making it as sure as possible that he will come back, by giving him the help of the 300 sound Indian supporters, who will probably take the same view of the questions of the day as the Government does. In South Middlesex there are 1,429. They will not do much harm there either, except that they might reduce very nearly to a tie the handsome majority obtained by my hon. friend who represents that riding. Now, we come to South Brant, where there are 2,650 Indians, representing in all over 1,000 votes. Here, again, is the case of a prominent member of the Opposition, whose ruin was attempted by the Gerrymander Bill, who escaped that attack, and who is now being subjected to the attack of the Indian vote. His majority at the last election was 176, and it is quite clear that if these Indians vote as the Government hopes and expects, that majority is gone very far away.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you make 1,000 votes out of 2,756 Indians?

Mr. CASEY. I calculate that about two-fifths of the number will have votes. I explained the calculation when I began.

Mr. BOWELL. The ordinary calculation is about one-fifth.

Mr. CASEY. But, as I explained, it is different in the case of the Indians, because it is reasonable to expect that in every family of five there will be at least two votes, the father and one adult son, because they will be living all together on the reserve and will qualify on the reserve; whereas, in the case of the unfortunate white man, you can only qualify as many as can be qualified on the joint ownership principle. Every adult Indian will practically have a vote. In the county of Haldimand, where the present representative (Mr. Thompson) had 126 majority, there are 437 Indians. It is possible that this is a coincidence, that it is undesigned, but it is possible that the Indians may be the means of turning the scale in that county. In Muskoka the gallant gentleman who is now at the front (Mr. O'Brien) had the tremendous majority of three, but if this Bill passes he will have the additional assistance, at the next general election, of the adult males out of 390 Indian skirmishers. In West Northumberland, where the Conservative majority was 80 there are 190 Indians; in West Peterborough, where the Conservative majority was 160, there are 147 Indians; in East Hastings, where the sitting member (Mr. White) had a majority of 53, there are 855 Indians. In North Renfrew, where the Conservative majority was 23, there are 518 Indians, and in Cornwall there are 247. It will be noticed that in all these places it is a very strange coincidence—perhaps it is only a coincidence—but it is a strange fact that they are so located that they will either render unsafe the seats of opponents of the Government or make sure of the election of supporters of the Government. The probable effect will be to make five or six seats safe for the Government, and two or three seats very unsafe for the Opposition. If it is a coincidence, it is a strange one. It is strange that Providence has induced, or that former treaties have caused the Indians, with the greatest foresight——

Mr. BOWELL. It is well to have Providence on your side.

Mr. CASEY. Especially when you make a providence of your own and call him a revising barrister.

Mr. BOWELL. Don't be irreverent.

Mr. CASEY. But whether it is the result of Providence or not, the fact remains that the Indians are so distributed that their enfranchisement will have the effect I have mentioned, and that with the assistance of their providence—the revising barrister—and the Indians, the strength of the Government will be greatly increased.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I have just come in, and did not hear what the hon. gentleman said about East Hastings. How many Indians did he say there were in that riding?

Mr. CASEY. Eight hundred and fifty-five, according to the census. I do not know what changes have been made in the boundaries since 1881.

Mr. WHITE. You do not think they will all be voters?

Mr. CASEY. No; I have explained the basis, and it appears to be satisfactory to the House.

Mr. WHITE. There will be about 100 voters.

Mr. CASEY. No; on the basis I have explained, there will be over 300. A great deal will depend on the revising officer—on a Tory providence. I wish now to go into some details as to the number of persons who will be disfranchised by this Act in the Province of Ontario. I have gone through the census returns of the different classes of industries of 1881, but I regret that these returns are not as useful as they might have been, for the reason that they jumble up employers and employed in the same industry. I will have to submit to this defect and make such allowance as may be fair, in order to get at the correct result. I find that in all Ontario, in 1881, there were 78,132 laborers, none of whom, I believe I am justified in asserting, will be qualified under the $400 income clause, but all of whom are qualified under the $250 wage-earners' clause in the Ontario Act; because it will be seen, on reference to the returns of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, that the unskilled laborer throughout the Province is getting almost invariably over $250 and under $400. I think it is a very liberal allowance to suppose that one-third of these laborers may be qualified as landowners or tenants or occupants under the Dominion Bill, leaving two-thirds who are qualified under the Ontario Act but disqualified under this Act. I shall go on in the same way to notice some of the larger classes, because I do not wish to take up the time of the House by referring to them all. There are 17,126 carpenters and joiners, of whom about one-half would be qualified under the Ontario Act and not under the Dominion Act; and therefore 8,000 carpenters and joiners are, in all probability, qualified under the Ontario Act who will not be under the Dominion Act.

Mr. WHITE. Go on and prove that they will not be.

Mr. CASEY. I have already stated the reasons on which I based that supposition, and it is only a supposition——

Mr. WHITE. Oh, it is a supposition?

Mr. CASEY. And I think if gentlemen will not listen to what I say they should not call for explanations that have been already given. Then there are 12,474 commercial clerks, of whom I think it is highly probable that one-third, or about 4,000, are getting under $400 a year—I have taken that figure after consulting some business men. Then, of farmers' sons there were 71,642 in Ontario when the census was taken. Judging from the number in my own county, more than one-half of those who now possess the franchise under the Ontario Act will be disqualified under this. In West Elgin the total number of farmers' sons in 1881—in those townships which then composed West Elgin—was 755, and the total number on the last voters' list under the joint ownership franchise was 313, less than half. But to make it absolutely sure, we will say one-third, say 24,000 in all, in the Province, who are qualified under the Ontario Act and not under the Dominion Act. Of railway employees I calculate that 2,500 would be qualified under the Ontario and not under the Dominion Act. Another very large class are the blacksmiths, who number 10,030, of whom I estimate that probably 6,000 would be qualified as wage-earners under the Ontario Act, and not under the Dominion Act. These are the largest classes; I will not go into detail as to the smaller classes. Now, I have made a second calculation in regard to these, and have made up a list of the number in each of these classes who might be qualified in some other way than on income under both Acts. I find that the total number of these industrial classes I have mentioned, according to the census—I have not taken note of the smaller cases—is 167,850, of whom I estimate that 44,000 in all would be qualified otherwise than on income or as wage-earners or farmers' sons under this Act, leaving 123,000 odd who would, in all probability, be qualified as wage-earners or landholders' sons under the Ontario Act and not under the Dominion Act. As these 123,000 persons are now qualified under the Ontario Act, and will cease to be qualified if this Act passes, that will amount to the disfranchising of 123,000 persons in the industrial classes alone. But it is not only amongst the industrial classes that this disfranchisement will take place. The abolition of the household clause, which is in the Ontario Act, will disfranchise large numbers; and so

with several other classes, which I will not refer to in detail. As I said, there is only one enfranchised class to set against this, that is the Indians, whose enfranchisement will reduce the electoral power of the remaining white voters. I shall now call attention to the criticisms of the hon. member for Lincoln, which I laid before the House in the rough, and which I have now given more in detal. He said it is quite impossible there could be 125,000 people, or anything like it, disfranchised by this Bill, because there were only 472,411 male persons in Ontario, of twenty-one years and upwards, in 1881, and that the voters' lists for the whole Province in 1883 footed up 417,112, so that only 55,309 male persons in Ontario had not the right to vote. He is willing, however, to add 15,000 to this number for holders of plural votes. I must draw attention to the extreme weakness of this criticism. He takes the census of 1881 for the number of adult males in the country, but takes the voters' lists of two years later for the number of voters. I had not access to that list when I made up my figures.

Mr. RYKERT. You say one-half left the country.

Mr. CASEY. We have plenty time to discuss that yet, and the hon. gentleman should not be so ready to invite attention to it. It is sadly true that many have left but it is not the pleasantest subject for hon. gentlemen on that side, and they had better leave it alone. In 1882 there were 389,000 voters on the list at the time of the Dominion election.

Mr. RYKERT. There were 1,000 more than that.

Mr. CASEY. Well, I will call it 390,000, to suit the hon. gentleman. Taking the 472,000 adult males who were in the country in 1881, and adding to that the ordinary percentage of natural increase for the year, 1½ per cent., we find there were, in all probability, 479,000 adult males in the Province, in 1882, when this voters' list was made up. If you subtract the 390,000, you have already 89,000 a larger result than the hon. gentleman made up. But it is utterly unfair to subtract the number of names on the voters' lists from the number of adult males, because the total number of names on the voters' lists does not represent the number of persons enjoying the franchise. What we want to get at is the number of persons enjoying the franchise compared with the number of adults in the country. Then we come to the class to which the hon. gentleman referred—those who left the country and whose names still remain on the lists. No doubt a large number left after they were put on the voters' list. Taking these along with those who died since the voters' list was made up, and before it was used, we can assume an average of 100 in each riding. There is that number in the large ridings of East and West Elgin, and there must be more than 100 in other larger ridings; and, on the whole, the average would be a little more than 100. This will make about 10,000 in the whole Province. Then we come to the largest deduction of all. Everybody knows that in the voters' lists in every township in Ontario the names of some persons appear very frequently. The large farmers, or the farmers who rent land at some distance from their own homesteads, for grazing and other purposes, the names of such appear several times on the voters' lists, even in the same township. I took three or four townships in the county I represent, in which the repeaters were marked, and I found the average number was about 8 per cent. of the total vote in those townships. In towns, where persons own property in several wards, the proportion will be larger; in England it is put at 15 per cent. We may assume the deduction to be made from the total number of names on the voters' lists, on account of repeaters, would be from 8 to 10 per cent. Allowing 8 per cent., we have a deduction of 31,000 to make, or allowing 10 per cent., which is more likely the average, we have a deduction of 39,000 to make. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rykert) was willing to allow 15,000 for plural votes. Adding these deductions together, we have a total of 56,000 to take from the total number of names on the voters' lists, at 8 per cent., or a total deduction of 64,000 at 10 per cent. Subtracting these totals from 390,000, the number of names on the voters' lists in Ontario at the last general election, we have, in the one case, 334,000, and in the next, 326,000, as the actual number of persons represented by the 390,000 names in the list of 1882. Subtract this from the total number of males, as shown in the census, with the natural increase of 1½ per cent. added making 479,000, and you find a margin of 146,000 in the one case, and in the other, of 153,000, as the difference between the number of persons possessing a vote and the actual number of males twenty-one years of age and over.

Mr. RYKERT. Make it 200,000, in round numbers.

Mr. CASEY. No; I will not, because I am bound by some slight desire to keep near the facts. I am not quite so free in my estimates on this question as some hon. gentlemen may be, because I am bound down by the very careful calculations which I have made, and I do not want to stultify them. My former estimate, in which, to some extent, I was guessing, was that from 123,000 to 125,000 would be disqualified by this Bill who were now qualified in Ontario. The other system of calculation introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln and which I have just carried out and corrected, leads me to the conclusion that at least 145,000 persons who were adult males in 1882 were not then voters under the Ontario law, which was practically the same as the law which is now proposed here. On the other hand, Mr. Mowat's Act practically provides for universal suffrage. I do not know a single adult male in my riding, who is not a pauper, a lunatic or a criminal, who will not be enfranchised under that Bill.

Mr. RYKERT. You do not mean to say there are any lunatics there?

Mr. WHITE. No; they have left; they are not there now.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, the hon. genteman was there once, but he has not been there for some time. The poorest laborer in any county that I know of is earning, either in cash or in cash and board combined, at least $250 a year. The average wages of farm laborers last year were $264, without board, and $175 with board, whereas the lowest amount with board, which would qualify them to vote under Mr. Mowat's Bill, would be about $159. Farm laborers, therefore, throughout Ontario, are qualified. I do not know any class of laborers who receive lower pay than farm laborers, and no sort of mechanics are paid as low as laborers. I think every laborer in good health is earning $250 a year or its equivalent; or, if not, the chances are 99 in 100 that he has a habitation of his own which will qualify him, or that he owns a little lot to the value of $100, or that he will come in in some other way. So that we have practically universal suffrage under Mr. Mowat's Act. But I do not ask the House to go so far. I will knock off 200 persons in each riding as not being qualified under Mr. Mowat's Act, which will amount to less than 20,000 for the Province; but I am willing to call it 20,000. If you deduct 20,000 adult males—and that is a grossly exaggerated estimate—from the 145,000, you arrive at exactly the figure which I mentioned on Friday night, and which the hon. member for Lincoln attacked. At least 125,000 persons who now have the vote in Ontario will be disfranchised by this Bill. If you add to the number of voters who possessed the franchise formerly, viz.: 334,000, those who now have the franchise under Mr. Mowat's Bill, 125,000, you have a total of 359,000, as the total number of persons who would have had the franchise in 1882 under the Mowat Act. You find too that the second part of my estimate on that occasion is surpassed by the facts, which

show that it is not almost one in four, but almost one in three, of the present electorate of Ontario, that will be disfranchised by this Bill. It is a very serious thing to disfranchise people.

Mr. WHITE. You are mistaken.

Mr. CASEY. Order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. I have a right to say you are mistaken.

Mr. CASEY. We have put up with a great deal of interruption from that hon. gentleman, because we do not look upon him as subject to the ordinary rule of parliamentary behavior. I have put up with it for three-quarters of an hour, but now I insist that he be called to order.

Mr. WHITE. You have told us this eighteen times, and we cannot put up with it forever.

Mr. CASEY. Almost one in three will be disfranchised by this Bill in Ontario.

Mr. WHITE. That is nineteen times.

Mr. CASEY. It is a very serious thing to take the franchise from anybody. It is a revolutionary thing to take it away from one-third of the electorate, without giving them an opportunity of expressing their opinion in reference to it. If hon. gentlemen opposite were capable of appreciating the argument, if they were capable of appreciating even the figures of the member for Lincoln, who admitted that 55,000 persons were disfranchised, they would not dare to go back to their constituents after this Session and confess that they had voted for such a Bill as this. Perhaps they may shelter themselves under the conviction that it does not matter what the disfranchised ones think about it, as they will have lost their votes any way, but I remind them that these men have friends and relations and respecters among even the Conservative electorate of the country, and I do not think the case can be better put than in the words used to me by a Conservative gentleman in this House, that the people of the country have such a sense of British fair play that any Bill of this kind which appears likely to operate unfairly to one class of the community will do them infinitely more harm, among the independent voters of Ontario, than all the good the revising barrister can do them. They will not dare to defend this Bill in the House. Not one in ten of them will speak on it. They will not defend it in the country, except in a good Conservative neighborhood. If they have the audacity, or what might be called outside of these walls the cheek, to tell the people that this Bill, which disfranchises one in three of the electorate, is a liberal Bill, they will have more cheek than I give them credit for; but the people of the country are beginning to understand it, and those who think they are getting a great party advantage will discover that fair play is the best play, that honesty is the best policy, and that they will lose more than they can possibly gain by introducing an unjust and tyrannical policy of this kind. Let them take warning from the utterances of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in his paper. He has been a colleague of the members of the present Government, and is now their consistent supporter; but if they pay attention to what he has told them they will see that this is not only unjust and unfair, but a gross blunder in party policy. I beg to move:

That all the words after "that," in the motion, be left out, and the following words inserted before the word "every," in the first line of section 3:

None of the provisions in the following sections of this Act, in reference to the qualification of voters, shall apply to the Province of Ontario, but in that Province the persons entitled to be registered as voters under this Act, and, when so registered, to vote at any election, shall be such persons as are, at the time of such registration, entitled to vote at an election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly of that Province, and no others.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The clause the committee is considering is one of vast importance, and we have now the amendment of the hon. member of West Elgin (Mr. Casey), which proposes that the franchise be allowed to remain under the control of the Province of Ontario. I may just premise my observations with a few remarks addressed to the hon. gentlemen, who show a disposition to annoy me. During the time I have sat in this House I have never interrupted a gentleman while speaking, and I do not expect that hon. gentlemen opposite will give me anything but fair play. This is a question that the people are anxious about, because, by this clause, we propose to take away from them the rights they have enjoyed since Confederation; you propose to insult the people who have been allowed to prepare the voters' lists ever since Confederation, and I will not sit silent while the people of that Province are being insulted by this measure. I stand here in the interests of the people. To-day I had the honor of presenting a petition from the people in my riding, and I observed among the names many gentlemen who opposed me at the last election, which fact encourages me to persist in my opposition to this measure. Sir, if hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to be factious, and to obstruct this discussion in this House, is it not an evidence that they are bound to prevent a knowledge of the history of this outrageous measure from becoming known to the people of this country, by free, ample and full discussion? Now, Sir, if this Bill passes it strikes a death blow at representative institutions in this country. This measure was never before the country for discussion. I have run four elections during my short life, and I never heard a word said about this measure; I never heard a single murmur from the people that the basis on which the voters' lists have been prepared was unjust or unfair. This measure is a direct insult to the farmers of this country, who, generally, have the preparation of these lists. If the Government desire fair play in this matter let them appeal to the country to ascertain if the people want this measure. Let them adopt the course that was pursued by Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone enunciated his policy in his Midlothian speech, and Mr. Mowat did the same before his election; and if the Government desired fair play, like these two distinguished gentlemen, they would allow this Bill to pass over and allow the people to pronounce upon it, and say whether they prefer a Dominion franchise, or whether they prefer to make the franchise for themselves. Why, Sir, is there any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House who is satisfied with the condition of things in this country now? Look at the meetings held in New Brunswick; look at the Legislature of Nova Scotia; look at the North-West; look every where, and what do you find? Discontent.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am speaking of an historical fact. I say this is an inopportune time to press this measure. This is a revolutionary measure, and while we have a revolution going on, when blood is being spilt, when the young men of our country are being sacrificed to this evil spirit——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the motion before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Just what I will do, Sir, and nothing else. I am very much obliged to you for telling me that, and you must have known perfectly well I would have done nothing else. Now, this measure proposes to disfranchise, in my own Province, a very large number of people, and can I sit idly by while it is being passed through? Am I to allow a measure to go through that strikes at the liberty of the people who sent me here to

represent them, without lifting up my voice against it? I have been looking over this matter, and I will give you a little idea of the number of people who will be disfranchised if this measure becomes law. Why, Sir, the idea of a Government endeavoring, at this crisis in the history of our country, to place a revolutionary measure like this upon the Statute Book, is an assumption of power which shows a disregard of the wishes of the people of this country. The time is inopportune for this measure. It is not a fit time to introduce this measure. Sir, I say it is a cowardly thing to do; it is cowardly to press this measure through, which the people have not discussed and do not understand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must inform the hon. gentleman that he has no right to attribute unworthy motives to members of this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not spoken of motives; I am speaking of the actions of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill. I say the Act is a cowardly Act.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If there are any stronger terms by which I could designate this Act I would use them. I would, if I could, select any other words that would meet your wishes, Mr. Chairman, and parliamentary rules and practice. I say the Bill is an iniquitous Bill. The Bill is an outrage against the will of the people. The Government are endeavoring to obtain absolute power in the different constituencies of Canada, as was the case in Britain years ago, before the passage of the Reform Bill. Look at the condition of things in England at that time. And yet we are endeavoring, at this noonday of the nineteenth century, to bring about a despotism in Canada such as existed in Britain at the time I have mentioned. Boroughs were held by different people, who determined who should be elected. The Duke of Wellington, on one occasion, wrote to the electors: "Mr. Peel is the nominee to be elected for Clonmel." That was the power held by individuals before the passing of the Reform Bill. The First Minister and those who support him are trying to introduce similar despotic power into this country, and to say that the people must submit to their doctrine with passive obedience. It is a monstrous thing, in this age, to ask the people to go back to the doctrines that are now obsolete. We have no evidence that the people are dissatisfied with the existing state of things. We have the voters' lists under the control of the people. The people elect their councillors, who elect the township clerk. The Council appoint the assessors who prepare the rolls. The clerk records the roll. It is afterwards revised, and if a man's name is omitted it can be inserted. If the assessors do not discharge their duty they will be dismissed by the council. We have been told they do act unfairly. If that be so, the council is responsible for the unfairness, and the assessors will be dismissed. Then there is a court of revision, and no matter how poor the man may be, his name will be inserted if omitted. The list is afterwards published. If anything goes wrong an appeal is made to the judge and a remedy is applied. By this Bill it is proposed to disregard the people in every way. It is not proposed to take the assessment roll as a basis for the roll to be prepared by the revising officer. We are insulting, by this measure, the whole people of the country. The people are told to yield a passive obedience. A young sprig of a lawyer will prepare the roll; he will place on it whom he pleases. There is no appeal. No petitions have been sent in, asking for this measure. The people do not want it. Let the people manage their own affairs. If we want to promote harmony between the different Provinces let them manage these matters. This Bill is a vote of non-confidence in the people, and it shows the Government are afraid to face the people, unless they obtain control of the voter's lists and appoint a duck of a revising barrister, who will say: Mr. White is to represent Cardwell, and Mr. Bowell North Hastings, and so on. A comparison of the Ontario system and that proposed shows the advantages of the former, not only as regards cost, but as regards the merits of the system. In the one case the roll is prepared by a young sprig of a lawyer, one who has been five years in the profession. Under the other system the roll is prepared by tried and honored officials, who have the confidence of the people, and under that system there are safeguards for the rights of the people. Any man of common sense and fair play would resent the adoption of such a system as is proposed by the Bill. I cannot understand how it is, that in a free Parliament and free country, at this day, a measure so iniquitous, that strikes at the will of the people, should be seriously proposed and attempted to be passed through this House, with every obstruction thrown in the way of free discussion. Another important matter to the people, and one in which the people are greatly interested, is the expense. Under the proposed system you will have double the expense of the present system—yes, tenfold the expense. I made an estimate of what it would cost in my riding to carry out this Bill, and I find that it would be $3,500 or $40,00.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Give us the calculation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Capitalise that sum at 5 per cent., and it would represent $70,000, or enough to pay off one-third of all the railway debts of the riding I represent. In over three years the cost of this Bill would pay the whole of our railway bonuses. Would it not be better to pay off our railway debts with that money, instead of sending a dainty duck of a lawyer to make out the lists——

An hon. MEMBER. Yes; you are the old drake.

Mr. LANDERKIN—to make out the lists, which are now made out at a cost to this House of, perhaps, not more than $500 or $600. This is something at which the people will be astonished—that any Government who were honored with the confidence of the people would propose, by a measure of this kind, to so disregard the best interests of the people, and squander their money, and for what purpose? Not for the benefit of the people, not for building railways or other public works, but to give some hungry officials some of the money which has been wrung out of the pockets of the poor people of this country. It is for that purpose and for another purpose—for the purpose of trying to perpetuate the reign of a party in power, who are afraid to go to the polls on their record and to the same electorate who sent them here. I say a party who seek to perpetuate themselves in power——

Mr. RYKERT. Would not that be the best thing for the country?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say that the cost of this Bill for one year would pay off one-third of the railway debt for which we have been taxed so heavily in our riding. We had no Government to build us railways; the Government here gave us no aid; we have never received any public money from them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order. Stick to the subject.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am talking about the Franchise Bill and nothing else. I say it is but natural that the people of my county will think that that money will be better spent in paying off our railway debt than in sending up a dainty duck of a lawyer to prepare their lists, for the purpose of perpetuating any party in power, no matter what party. Now, I examined the rolls in South Grey, and I find, Sir, that in that riding 155 people will be disfranchised by this Bill.

Mr. RYKERT. One hundred and fifty-five thousand, did you say?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, sir; 155 who are now on the list.

Mr. RYKERT. You cannot tell all that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Cannot I? You do not want to tell. You want the Bill to pass. You want to get a revising officer and get somebody else on the Welland Canal.

Mr. RYKERT. I want to get a Grit, and I would drown him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe you would.

Mr. FERGUSON. You could not do that; it would be contrary to sanitary regulations.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We have two classes of voters on the list, those who vote for members of the Legislature and those who vote for members of the municipal council—the latter being assessed under $200. Now, in the Bill passed last year by the Legislature of Ontario, all those assessed for $100 will have a vote, but the present Bill requires them to be assessed for $150, and 155 people in South Grey will be disfranchised in that way. This is contracting the franchise of the people, and it is adding to their expenses. There may be some objection to the law as it was passed last Session in the Legislature of Ontario. There are a good many provisions in it which, when fully considered and discussed, will meet the wishes of all right-thinking men, no matter of what party. There are several wise and useful provisions in it. Under the Ontario Bill the non-resident vote is abolished. Does anybody say that is bad?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, we will attend to them presently. In that Bill the vote is not given to the property, but to the man. Property is only an evidence of qualification. Does anybody say that is bad?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You say that is bad?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; address the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is one vote for one man, and does any hon. gentleman say that is bad?

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some hon. gentlemen over there would say anything. Under that Bill the rule is not representation according to property, but according to population. Does not that meet the views of all the people of this country? Yes, of course. There was a consensus of opinion on this subject—that representation should not be based on property but on population. Suppose there were $1,000 of assessment in five counties to one person, that man could give five votes, but a gentleman owning $1,000 worth of property in one county would only have one vote. Is that right?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes; that is all right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then a non-resident cannot vote. Is that right?

An hon. MEMBER. No; that is all wrong.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not wonder at the hon member for Lincoln saying it was wrong. That was the system which created more bribery and corruption than anything else, and consequently the hon. member for Lincoln says it is not right to strike a blow at bribery and corruption.

An hon. MEMBER. It would hurt a good many of you Grits.

Mr. RYKERT. What about "Come along John; give us a big push now?"

Mr. LANDERKIN. Under this system there may be some hardships; probably there will be. For instance, a candidate who does not live in the riding he represents cannot vote for himself, some of them say, and a fearful whine is raised about this—what a tyrant is Mr. Mowat. It is a singular thing that in this great country they cannot find a local candidate in the different ridings; and if a candidate is elected for a riding that he does not reside in, he can well afford to labor under some disabilities.

Mr. WALLACE (York). What about the member for Wheeler and the member for West Durham?

Mr. LANDERKIN. My observations apply to one side of the House as well as to the other. I am not speaking for one side of the House more than for the other. If gentlemen become candidates in ridings where they do not live, it may be due to some great qualities they possess; but if they have those qualities they might be willing to labor under some disabilities, more particularly when that clause in the Bill strikes the greatest blow at bribery, corruption and personation that could be struck by any franchise Bill, and is one of the greatest boons, in the way of establishing purity in elections, that we have. Now, Sir, there are some gentlemen in this House who are elected to support the Government and who believe that it is their duty to support every measure the Government introduces.

Mr. FERGUSON. Some think it is their duty to oppose them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that is a dangerous doctrine to which this House should not lend its assent. The Premier says he draws his inspiration from Britain. The member for King's says we are here for the purpose of registering the decrees of the Government.

Mr. RYKERT. I have heard that six times to-day.

Mr. FERGUSON. And six times contradicted.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, you must have line upon line, and precept upon precept, and then it will do you very little good. The doctrine laid down by the hon member for King's is a singular doctrine, and if you knew the kind of gentlemen who are sitting behind the Government, you would not be surprised at their carrying that doctrine out. They dare not say anything about these measures; they would get into trouble; the Ministers would make it hot for them—would write to their constituents. And yet these gentlemen come here and bodly announce to this House that their object is to register the decrees of the Government, whatever those decrees may be. There may be a sense in which that is right. If these questions were discussed before the people and were laid down on a platform, and they subscribed to that platform, it would be right; but if they are honest men they will not subscribe to a platform of that kind on other grounds. Now, Sir, Mr. Gilbert, the author of "Iolanthe"——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Io—who?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is that the gentlemen who proposed to enfranchise the Chinese in Montreal? I will reply to you again; I will take up the Chinese question and discuss that; I will talk to you about that presently. Mr. Gilbert, in his "Iolanthe," made use of the following:—

> "When in this House, M.P.'s divide,
> If they've a brain and cerebellum, too,
> They've got to leave those brains outside,
> And vote just as their leaders tell 'em to;
> But then the prospect of a lot
> Of Tory members in proximity,
> All thinking for themselves, is what
> No man can face with equanimity."

That is just the way with those gentlemen over there. If the Government have any Bill to put through the House, they have not the equanimity to discuss that Bill, but they

must vote for it. I think that doctrine strikes a blow at representative institutions; it is destructive of the principles on which representative government is based. I think it is a doctrine that will be received by the people of the country with astonishment and alarm, that members on that side of the House come here to register the Bills the Government propose to the House, and are obliged to assent to them without discussion. Now, this Bill is very different from the Bill that was introduced last year; yet the Government say they are not taking the country by surprise. I have the Bill of last year in my drawer.

Mr. RYKERT. Leave it there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I want to show you that the Bill they introduced last year and the Bill they introduced this year, are very different Bills. In the Bill of 1884 we find that the interpretation clause says:

"'Person' means a male person, married or unmarried, or a female person unmarried, or a widow; and the pronoun 'he' and its inflexions, include either sex."

Do you find any reference to the Indian in that, as in the Bill of 1885? Is this not taking the country by surprise? Is this not changing the whole system of the franchise? Is this not proposing to give the franchise to persons who are not citizens in the strict sense of the term, who are wards, who are receiving annuities from the Government, and are under the control of the Superintendent General, the Premier of this country? Now, if the hon. gentleman from Montreal will give me his question, I will deal with it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Sit down and take a rest.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I like to see gentlemen, when they have got a question, have the courage to ask it. I do not see why it is that the Government are bound to obstruct the debate upon this question, to prevent us putting our views upon record. We condemn the Bill because we consider it to be a violation of the principle of fair play, because it is not British, because it is one that any gentleman imbued with the spirit of fair play cannot support. It is a revolutionary measure in every sense. It changes the basis upon which the voters' lists are made, and in that respect, it is a direct insult to the people. The Government say to the people: You are incompetent, although you have had large municipal experience in making out the voters' lists, and we will tax the people of the country to the tune of $500,000 a year for the purpose of having those lists prepared by nominees of our own, by men who, as the hon. member for Cumberland said, will fix the lists, and no doubt they will do their best to fix them in the way best calculated to keep the Government in power. How much more manly, how much more British, would it not be for the Government to appeal to the country on their record than to go to the people on the strength of their revising barristers, who, they expect, will cover a multitude of sins, by leaving off the lists objectionable voters and putting on voters who will support the Government? Do they suppose the Conservative party are made of putty? Do they suppose that the rank and file of the party are going to subscribe to anything of the kind? I have more faith in the Conservative party than to believe that they will. Any gentleman who has ever played cricket, that noble, British game, will be astonished at a player trying to take a dishonorable advantage of an opponent. I wonder at a proposition of this kind being made in this British Parliament. What do the Government propose to do? They propose to disfranchise, in my riding, according to their property qualification, 155 people; but of course I do not know how many the revising barrister will refuse. But no doubt the gentleman who will oppose me will be able to tell those who will have a vote and those who will be struck off the list. I would be untrue to Canada, that I love so well, were I to allow a measure of this kind to become law, without indignantly protesting against its passage. Under this clause the property qualification in towns and cities is to be $300, in townships $200. In Ontario it is $200 and $100, a difference of $100 in each case. How many will that disfranchise? It may, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Tassé), be the means of your losing your seat, unless, of course, you are provided with a revising barrister, who will see that the lists are properly fixed. This clause brings up the principle of manhood suffrage, in favor of which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has given notice of motion. The law in Ontario almost amounts to manhood suffrage, and I believe the principle of manhood suffrage is very much to be preferred to this principle. Under this system you disfranchise many people who now have votes, many who, perhaps, have voted for years, who felt they had an interest in the country, and you deprive them of their right. A revolutionary spirit is abroad in this country. Where is it going to end? You give a vote to tenants of real property who pay $2 monthly or $6 quarterly. The Mowat Bill gives a vote to all who are rated on the assessment roll at $200 in cities and towns or $100 in villages and townships. Then, in this Bill there is no reference to the wage-earners, the workingmen of this country, unless they get $400 a year. In Ontario it is $250. That virtually gives the franchise to every workingman in Ontario, but at $400 a great many will be deprived of their votes. You, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Curran), have a few workingmen in your constituency, and are you to sit idly by while they are disfranchised, when, under the provincial law of Ontario, they have a right to vote, feeling that they are free citizens, having an interest in the glory and renown of this country. Now, about the Indian. The Government propose to give the franchise to the Indian. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) asked the First Minister for some information as to the true meaning and intent of this Bill in that regard. I find from the *Hansard* what was there asked and answered:

"Mr. MILLS. What we are anxious to know is, whether the hon. gentleman proposes to give other than enfranchised Indians votes?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. Indians rsiding on a reservation?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; if they have the necessary property qualification.

"Mr. MILLS. An Indian who cannot make a contract for himself, who can neither buy nor sell anything without the consent of the Superintendent General—an Indian who is not enfranchised?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether he is enfranchised or not.

"Mr. MILLS. This will include the Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. Poundmaker and Big Bear?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes?

"Mr. MILLS. So that they can go from a scalping party to the polls?"

You see that the Premier proposed to give the franchise to the wild tribal Indians all through the country, and, if there is to be a change made in the Bill the country will be pleased to know that the effort which has been made by the Opposition has resulted in that change. If those who have scalping knives in their hands now were to have the ballot placed in their hands, and this has been prevented by the labors of the Opposition, our time here has not been misspent, our opposition has not been obstruction, but our labors have resulted in something which will prove a great boon, not only to the present but to the future welfare of this country. It appears that some hon. gentlemen did not think that such was the intention of the Act. The Premier has so explained it. He introduced the Bill and ought to know about it.

Mr. RYKERT. Will the hon. gentleman read what the Premier stated about giving the Indians votes?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have just read it.

Mr. RYKERT. Read it a little further. Act fairly to the Premier.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have read all I have to read.

Mr. RYKERT. Read from bottom of column 1, page 1487.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Not just now.

Mr. RYKERT. You will not act fairly. Try and be fair, if you can.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Lincoln should be the last man in the House to accuse anyone of being unfair. I have read the extract. I will show him what I have read from, if he will come over here. I have read all I had on the paper I had.

Mr. RYKERT. Read the whole of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not got it. How can I read it when I have not got it? He should not accuse me of being unfair without knowing what I have got. You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RYKERT. Read the other side of your paper.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is nothing on the other side of my paper. It would be just as well if you would consider what you say before you accuse me of being unfair.

Mr. RYKERT. Will you allow me to read what the *Hansard* says?

Mr. LANDERKIN. You can, when I have done. I have read all I have, and then he accuses me because I do not read what I have not. That is about in keeping with the whole thing.

Mr. RYKERT. What have you got?

Mr. LANDERKIN. They charge us with obstructing this Bill because we are desirous to discuss it. We would as much like to be at home as they would, but we are bound, in the interests of our country, to stay here and discuss this Bill until we have it fairly understood by the people of this country. We do not desire to prolong this discussion. We have no object to serve, except to have it well understood by the people, so that they may know the nature of the legislation proposed by the Government and supported by hon. gentlemen behind them. There are many more clauses of this Bill, and I may have occasion to speak on some of them when we reach them, especially when we come to that clause which proposes to strike a blow at the liberty of the people, in the person of a revising barrister. I have not discussed that to-night because it has been ruled that we should not discuss the revising barrister on this clause, although it seems to me that everything pertaining to the making up of the lists would come under the question of the provincial franchise, and I should think it was clearly within the competency of a member to discuss it at this stage. However, as I am a staunch believer in parliamentary procedure, as I believe in adhering strictly to the rules of Parliament, and to the rules of order enunciated by the Chair, I will not refer to that now, but may speak upon it at a subsequent period. I would just say, in conclusion, that I oppose this Bill because it is wrong; I oppose this Bill because I believe it strikes a blow at the liberties of the people of this country; I oppose this Bill because it is un-British; I oppose this Bill because I think it is an attempt to bolster up the party in power, who are afraid to go to the people on the record of their parliamentary legislation.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman would not allow me to read what the Premier stated when he was speaking on the Indian question to this House. Now, in order to give the antidote to the poison the hon. gentleman has placed before the country, I will read an extract from the speech of the Premier. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman read from some fly sheet emanating from the *Globe* office. This is what the Premier stated, as I find it on page 1487 of the *Hansard*:

"I am sorry that the proposal to put in one word in this clause should excite the blatant indignation of hon. gentlemen, and move them to make such an exhibition of themselves in discussing the question of whether or not an Indian is a person. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, and the hon. member for Algoma, in his admirable and well-informed speech, has told us that many of these Indians are respectable, educated and worthy persons in every respect, and he knows perfectly well that the Bill can in no way apply to the savage nomads of the North-West. It is only designed to give a vote to those Indians who have the ostensible evidences of property which the white man can show—have houses, furniture, and civilised appliances of a certain value."

Now, the hon. member knew right well that the Premier did not intend to apply it to the savages of the North-West, and could not possibly so apply it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Would the hon. member for Lincoln have the kindness to read what he said just before, and see if not more than twelve days elapsed between what he said then and what he said afterwards.

Mr. RYKERT. That shows how correct the hon. gentleman is. There were not over fifteen minutes between the two remarks.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it and see.

Mr. RYKERT. On page 1484 of the *Hansard*, on the same afternoon, I find the following:—

"Mr. MILLS. I rise to ask the hon. gentleman how we are to understand the word Indian?"

And there is a little of what I call by-play on the part of the Premier, for he answered this:

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it, read it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Give it to me and I will read it.

Mr. RYKERT. I wish the hon. member would take his medicine quietly. The hon. gentleman has read exactly as it appears in the *Hansard*, at page 1484. I do not deny the correctness of what he has read, as taken from the *Hansard*. Those words appear here, but I say that the Premier was not in earnest when he made these remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. RYKERT. I would like the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to keep quiet, if he possibly can.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who gave you authority to say that? Did the First Minister give you authority to say that?

Mr. RYKERT. I believe the hon. gentleman now interrupting me is the gentleman who speaks upon both sides of every question. After the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) spoke; and immediately after that the hon. member for Bothwell made some remarks, extending over about 2 inches of the *Hansard*, and then the Premier delivered the observations I have read to this House. The hon. member for Bothwell must have known that he could not apply it to the North-West Territories, because they have no representation, and he must have known that the Premier could not have intended his observations to convey the idea that persons living in the North-West Territories could have a vote. He knew that right well. And the same afternoon, four or five minutes afterwards, the Premier made the remarks I have read. So I say it would have been much fairer for the hon. gentleman to have quoted the whole than only a part.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit for a moment that any hon. gentleman on either side of the House, except the hon. member for Lincoln himself, believes that the Prime

Minister did not mean precisely what he said when he answered the various questions which I put to him. He has never resiled from that position, substantially, from that hour to this. Now, I used some words that are not in the *Hansard*, but they appear in some of the newspapers. What I said, when I put the question with regard to the North-West Territories, was this: "So that when the North-West Territories are represented on the floor of this House, Poundmaker and Big Bear will be included." These are the words I used, and those are the words that appear in many newspapers. They were made with special reference to a former discussion in this House, where we had before us the question with regard to the representation of those Territories. The First Minister answered, in reply to that question, "Yes;" and the same answer with regard to the further question that was put to him. Now, when he saw what might be the probable effect of his observations upon the country, when he saw the profound impression that his observations made upon his own followers in this House, then the First Minister was disposed to resile from the position he had taken, and said that he did not intend to include the nomads of the plain. Nobody said he included the nomads of the plain. All those Indians are located upon reservations, and do not belong to the nomadic class of which the First Minister spoke. Then, the question was, whether he intended to include the Indians of Manitoba, and he said: "Yes;" British Columbia? "Yes;" he intended to represent all these. We know that the Indians of Manitoba are not a whit more civilised, except those who may reside on St. Peter's reservation, than the Indians of the North-West Territories. And the First Minister has, in a period more recent than the time he made the observation which has just been read, declared that he had not in view British Columbia and Manitoba when he made his provisions in the Bill. He makes no exception of any Province; and when he saw the probable consequence of his course, and knew what the feeling of the British Columbia members was on the question of the representation of Indians, and when he knew what would be the probable effect of giving representation to the Indians in Manitoba, then the First Minister was disposed to eat his own words, to give up the doctrine of uniformity, and to confine Indian representation to an attempt to swamp certain constituencies in the Province of Ontario. That is the position of the First Minister. The hon. gentleman may undertake to question it, but I say now he would be acting quite as worthily the part of a leader in this House, or of a statesman, in giving to the Indians of British Columbia and Manitoba representation, as to give it to some of the Indian tribes that he proposes to have represented in this House. What is the difference between the Indians on St. Peter's reservation, in Manitoba, and the Indians upon any reservation in Ontario? The hon. gentleman knows that the representation of the Indians, by the provision of this Bill, is not to be confined to Indians who are enfranchised, and living like white men, but to Indians who reside on reservations; and if the reservation value is sufficient to give a vote to every Indian upon it, then such Indian will receive a vote. That is the position taken by the First Minister, and from that position he has refused to recede; and in reply to my hon. friend from South Brant, in contradiction of what was said by the hon. member for Algoma, the First Minister declared that, so far as the old Provinces are concerned, that was his intention and to that intention he has so far adhered.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Lincoln referred us to page 1487, and read a small portion of the remarks made by the Premier. He then challenged the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to continue reading, but he took good care not to read what was said on page 1484. I will supply the deficiency. (The hon. gentleman here read from page 1484 of the official reports.) The only attempt to modify the Premier's expressions in this respect is the flimsy excuse set up that the Indian of the North-West will not have a vote. Certainly he will not; neither will the white man, until there is representation granted the North-West; but the Indians in Manitoba, the reservation Indians in British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, will have votes. The Premier has distinctly affirmed that they will, and the only Indians excepted from that assertion are the nomadic tribes of the plains of the North-West Territories, where there are no representative institutions. The discussion on this Bill distinctly proves that the purpose of the Government is to give, in any place where any British subject in the Dominion has a vote, the right to vote to Indians who are not enfranchised, who are not citizens, who are not paying taxes, who retain their tribal relations, who are barbarians, if need be. And when the North-West Territories are granted representation in this House, then the nomadic Indians of the North-West Territories also will have votes, under this Bill. They are only excluded from voting so long as those Territories are not given representation in Parliament. The hon. member for Lincoln, and those who side with him in this House, have met with very little success in explaining away this damning feature of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to say that some remarks of the hon. member for South Grey are entirely unfair and misleading. First, I will refer to the allusion he has made to the nature of the revising barristers that may be appointed. I may say, in general, in reference to the remarks of the Opposition on this point, that they all appear to harp on the same string; they argue from the entirely illogical and unfair basis that every barrister of five years' standing, and every judge who may be appointed to discharge the duties of a barrister, is either a scoundrel or a rogue. The hon. member waxed eloquent over that part of it, when he said that it was a direct insult to the farmers, and to the people generally, of this country, to say that the power would be taken out of their hands. Is it not a greater insult to the county court judge of Grey, a part of which the hon. member represents, and the barristers of that county of five years' standing, to say that they are invariably either tools or rogues, who, when sworn to do their duty, are not fit to be trusted? Which is the greater insult? I think it is a disgrace to this House to throw out such an insinuation towards the judges of this country who have discharged their duties so faithfully and satisfactorily to the people of this country, and also to the revising barristers, because only men who have five years' professional standing are eligible to be appointed, under this Bill. I assume that human nature is not so depraved; that we have honest men in the country, men who respect their oath sufficiently to do their duty fairly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). They are not under oath in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that they have to take oath to do their duty faithfully.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member should read the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a remark which the members of the Opposition invariably hurl across the floor of the House—that the members who support the Government have not read the Bill. The hon. member for North Brant has said it, and the hon. members for South Brant and South Grey have said it, and they appeared to think that it was very smart to say: "I venture to say that the hon. gentlemen have not read the Bill."

Mr. PATERSON. It is in the schedule.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman, who has consumed hours after hours in this debate, will keep his temper for a moment and stop howling, I should like to proceed. The hon. gentleman from South Grey says it is an insult to the electors of his county to say that 155 of them, who have been voting in the past, shall be cut off by this Bill. He has overlooked, or is disingenuous enough not to say that there has never been one in his county who voted on an assessment of $150.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I stated that under the present Ontario Act, which comes in force, I presume, next winter, they will have the right to vote.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not say a word about when it comes in force.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I said that under the Ontario Act, where the assessment is $100, everyone of these 155 would have a vote.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's statement was that these people would be cut off, and that it is an insult to the electorate of South Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say it is.

Mr. SPROULE. He went on to say that they would be cut off by this Act, because they had been voting under the law of Ontario. When have they voted under a franchise of $150 or $100? There has never been such a vote cast in the county of Grey. And if it was cut down by the Mowat Act to $100, I say this is the first time we have heard of it. Now, with reference to the hon. gentleman's calculation about expense: He first calculated that it would cost $7,000 for revising barristers each year, and he says, if he capitalised that amount, it would represent $70,000 capital, or about one-third of the railway indebtedness of the county of Grey.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I said, of my own riding.

Mr. SPROULE. A short time ago I saw some of the speeches sent out to that county, showing that by his own calculations the additional amount which would be paid owing to the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway, would be no less than $150,000 in the south riding of Grey. He overlooks the fact that the county of Grey is indebted, besides that amount of $300,000, to one railway, with the exception of a little which has been paid—that it is indebted to another railway a large amount, and according to his own calculations that he made a short time ago in this House, the county of Grey, outside of what he said about the Canadian Pacific Railway's indebtedness, was indebted for railways no less than $750,000. He says the cost of the revising barrister represents one-third of the railway indebtedness of the county, which is about as near correct as the calculations of the hon. gentleman usually are. Now, I wish to make a remark with reference to a statement made by the hon. member for North Grey on this question. He spoke of 700 Indians in his own county, who were to be enfranchised. Now, where are those Indians?

Mr. ALLEN. I said my country—I did not say county.

Mr. SPROULE. I took it from *Hansard*, and it stands there to his record, but when the papers began to criticise it, it may be convenient——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman said he did not say county but country, so the hon. member is bound to take his statement. He must not persist in putting words in his mouth which he says he did not use.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is getting peevish. He wants to philosophise.

Mr. MILLS. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the hon. gentleman's point of order.

Mr. MILLS. Will the hon. gentleman take his seat.

Mr. CHARLTON. Sit down.

Mr. MILLS. My point of order is the one I have already taken. The hon. member for North Grey says he used the word country and not county, and the hon. gentleman persists in accusing him of falsehood, which he has no right to do.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLS. That is the point of order, Mr. Chairman; and I ask for your ruling.

Mr. HESSON. He is quoting from *Hansard*.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Curran). The hon. gentleman is obliged to accept the explanation.

Mr. SPROULE. If hon. gentlemen had not been so peevish, if they had given me time to finish the sentence, I was going on to say that I would accept his correction, but that the undeniable statement was standing to his record; that the papers had criticised it, and that now it might be convenient to change it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to order.

Mr. SPROULE. These hon. gentlemen are very peevish.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman reiterates the charge of falsehood in refusing to take back the words, and in saying that it is convenient now to change what he says is on record against him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman said it might be convenient; he did not make the assertion. I was careful to notice his words.

Mr. RYKERT. Always wrong.

Mr. SPROULE. These hon. gentlemen will not sit quietly, for this happens to touch them. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he said "700 Indians in my own country." What does that mean? The hon. member for West Elgin says there are something like 20,000 Indians in the country.

Mr. RYKERT. 90,000.

Mr. SPROULE. If he refers to the country, I say a great many people in the county of Grey understood that it referred to his constituency. I found out, as far as I could get the information, that there were about 100 Indians, and out of that number the probability is that there would not be twenty votes. This, however, is only on a par with the calculations, or, I might say, with the exaggerations, which are used with regard to this Bill. The hon. member for South Grey waxes very eloquent, very earnest, very angry. He talked loudly and boisterously; he used hard names and insinuations against the supporters of the Government, because he said they were there registering the decrees of the Government. He went on to say that parliamentary usage would not allow him to make use of stronger language. Judging from his looks at the time, he felt much like the old man who used to be a great swearer, and who was going up hill one day with a load of pumpkins. The boys pulled the end board out of his waggon, and the pumpkins all rolled down hill. He looked on in silent amazement, and some of his friends standing near, and knowing how he usually expressed himself, said: Why don't you swear? He replied that he could not do justice to the occasion. The hon. gentleman says that he was sorry to say parliamentary rules bound him, or else likely we would have had a tirade of another kind of language from what we have been treated to. It reminded me much of the last clause of a text which was given out once by a preacher of a certain nationality. There are a certain class

of people in this country who are in the habit of using the pronoun immediately after the noun, and this gentleman belonged to that nationality. He endeavored to preach a sermon, and the text was: "The devil goeth about lik a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour." This gentleman endeavored to divide his text into four heads. "First," he said, "We shall endeavor to ascertain who the devil he was. Secondly, we shall enquire into his geographical position—where the devil he was going; thirdly, who the devil he was seeking; and fourthly and lastly, we shall endeavor to solve the question, which has never yet been solved, what the devil he was roaring about." It appears to me that the wrath and indignation of the hon. gentleman was worked up out of nothing—that there was no justifiable reason for it. But he had to obey the mandate that was given out; he had to use so much time; he had only spoken seven times before, and he had to speak again, and he had to create an appearance of honesty and of a disposition to do something in the interests of his constituents and his country. So he must work himself into a state of wrath, he must compel the Chairman to call him to order time after time, in the course of his speech. Still, if you examine that speech and the arguments he was using, you could not see what he was roaring about—what he was using such harsh names about. Was it on account of the fact that the judge of the county of Grey, who is likely to be the revising barrister, is going to be a rogue, a dishonest man, that he would not do justice to the two parties. Was it because of the host of respectable men who have been barristers for five years, and who are likely to be appointed as revising barristers in this country. Did that entitle him to display the indignation which he displayed in his remarks to-night? Was it with reference to the number of electors that he says will be cut off in his constituency—155, as he says. I say, emphatically, and I have gone over the list, that I have no doubt that if the Bill passes, and it will pass, if a vote is taken in the south riding of Grey there will be found to be more voters in it than there are to-day. I will stake my reputation in this House upon that statement, and I have no doubt I will have the opportunity of drawing the hon. gentleman's attention to this statement at some future time in his own constituency. But it is used for the purpose of getting up indignation among the people, for the purpose of getting them to send petitions down here, so that we can see that there are petitions coming in from the country—something like those we have heard about in Toronto that are being signed at the rate of 15 cents a hundred names, and are sent down here to show the great indignation of the people against the Bill. The hon. gentleman says: Submit this measure to the people; but I would like to ask if Mr. Mowat submitted his measure to the people.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, it was never heard of in the county of Grey, that I know of; and I think that measure is as revolutionary in its nature as this. It was taken up in the Local Legislature, and the gentlemen opposing it carried on their opposition to it in a manly, straightforward way. Where they believed it was not right the protested against it, but they did not display that unseemly conduct which we have seen in this House for several weeks past, and which has been used for the only purpose of annoying the Government and causing delay by open obstruction. They protested against the measure and let it pass; they did not ask Mr. Mowat to submit it to the people. With reference to the Indian question, it seems to be necessary for these hon. gentlemen to endevor to explain themselves away on that question time and again. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) got up and read so much of the *Hansard* as suited his purpose. And although the Premier, in answer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), stated that the Bill would only enfranchise those Indians who had the proper qualification under the Bill, the hon. gentleman did not refer to that in his reference to the Indian question. The hon. member for Norfolk says we know very well the Indians cannot vote in the North-West; and yet, in the same breath, he says: Did not the Premier say that Poundmaker and Big Bear were to vote? How much knowledge of geography does the hon. gentleman display when he says: We know that the Indians in the North-West Territories cannot vote; and yet he says these men can vote. He knows that these men are in the North-West Territories, and it was never intended that they were to vote unless they settled down like white men and acquired the same qualifications. When an Indian is in that position he is entitled to a vote, and not till then. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) says these Indians do not pay taxes, and therefore ought not to vote. What taxes? Municipal taxes. Well, we are not talking about municipal government; it is Mr. Mowat who has to deal with that subject; and yet the hon. gentleman tells us, almost in the same breath that Mr. Mowat has enfranchised these Indians. We are not regulating the franchise according to those who pay municipal taxes; we are regulating the franchise for the Dominion of Canada, and the taxes these Indians pay to the Dominion of Canada are the taxes they pay on the dutiable goods they consume, the same as any other man in this country; and if they have the property qualification required by the Act, and are endeavoring to get along, why should they not have the same right as the white man to say who shall make the laws which affect them for their weal or woe? To my mind, if there is one thing more than another that will tend to elevate the Indian from the savage state he is in, and to raise him to the same level as the white man, it is to give him the same responsibilities and privileges; and this Bill will go a long way towards it. I think the Government has been doing wrong in making the enfranchisement of the Indian so strict and so difficult as they have done in the Indian Act; and I am glad this Bill goes further, and enfranchises the Indians under a new principle that is much fairer to them, and will be likely to do them a great deal of good. Now, I only got up to say that in the county of Grey every elector who voted during the last election, unless he has disposed of his property since or has gone out of his tenancy, or in some other way has become deprived of what he then possessed, will have a vote undis this law, when it comes in force. I think it is an insult to the judges of this country and to the men who are eligible as revising barristers to assume that every man who is appointed to one of those positions will be so dishonest that he will not do fairly between the parties. These gentlemen would be showing greater respect if they assumed that there was some honesty in human nature, and that these men are not rogues until they are proved to be rogues. It is time enough to hurl maledictions against these men when they have shown that they are unable to discharge their duties fairly between the parties, and not till then. I do not regard this provision in the same light as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), that it is an insult to the municipal officers of this country, because we say that the municipal assessment roll shall be taken as the basis of the franchise, and appoint other parties than the municipal officers to make up the lists. I do not think it is an insult to them, and they will not recognise it in that light. When the measure comes into force the people will be able to appreciate the great amount of nonsense which has been talked in this House, and the useless debate which has been carried on, night after night and week after week, by the Opposition, in reference to this measure. A few years of trial of this measure will convince the people of the insincerity of the Opposition or their great want of intelligence in this debate.

Mr. ALLEN. I rise to say a few words by way of explanation in reference to statements made by my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). If I understand parliamentary rules, when a gentleman denies a statement, unless the member who makes the accusation can prove the contrary, that denial is accepted. I am sorry that my hon. friend from East Grey has not accepted my statement as true.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to relieve the hon. gentleman's mind. I accepted his statement long ago.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). In a parliamentary sense.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. I find that the report of my speech on the Indian question in the *Hansard* states that I said: "My county." That report is incorrect; I said: "My country," and I then spoke in reference to the Saugeen Peninsula, in the county of Bruce. I think the hon. gentleman will remember that I spoke of the small majority a member would have in North Bruce, and said that the franchise provided by this Bill would certainly give those Indians the control of that riding, so that the representative here will be the representative of the Indians, and not of the white people of that county. That is the statement I made; I made no correction of my speech in the *Hansard*, and the mistake has gone. But in reference to the franchise, I believe that, as we understood the Act of Confederation, it was intended that each Province should send its representatives to this Parliament to transact the business of the different Provinces, independent of any control over the voters' lists by the Parliament of Canada. The way the country understands, the way the farmers understand the Confederation Act, is that they should send their members independently, that they are the parties who should make out the voters' lists, without any meddling on our part. I believe that the great majority of my county, on both sides of politics, will stand up and declare that the franchise should be left as it is, and the voters' lists be made up by the municipalities. They will protest against so enormous an expense being imposed upon the people as will be by the present Government, under the revising barrister clause; they will refuse to accept any such measure; and if we went to the country to-morrow on this measure I am sure those in favor of it would be elected to stay at home.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Lincoln stated that the conversation that took place between the hon. First Minister and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was only by-play. I do not think it was so intended by the First Minister. After that debate had gone on twenty-four hours, and after the First Minister had made that statement, I am credited in *Hansard* with putting the following question to the First Minister: "I understood that the First Minister stated that the word 'Indian' in this Bill, would include those living on reserves; while the hon. member for Algoma says it means half-breeds; and, as the First Minister is present, I would like to ask him for an explanation on that point." The First Minister replied: "An Indian is certainly not a half-breed, and a half-breed is not an Indian." I then asked: "Is it the intention to enfranchise the Indians living on the reserves, who do not pay taxes to the municipality, but are the wards of the Government?" And the right hon. gentleman said: "I answered that question last night." The answer to which he referred was given in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who asked: "This will include Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia?" And the First Minister answered: "Yes." So that I think the hon. member for Lincoln is not correct in trying to make the meaning of the words: enfranchised Indians living on reserves in Manitoba.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to address the House shortly on this question, but before proceeding to refer to it I wish to offer a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He charged the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) with having cast a slur on the county judges, in charging them, as revising barristers, with a possibility of doing anything improper. In the first place, the judges are not mentioned in the Bill at all. The Bill simply refers to revising officers.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. the First Minister, in answer to a question across the House, said that, wherever available, there would be revising officers. They are available in almost every county in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS. There are forty judges, while we have ninety constituencies.

Mr. SPROULE. Those forty judges would be used.

Mr. McMULLEN. We are dealing with the Bill before us, and it distinctly states revising officers. A few evenings ago an hon. gentleman on the opposite side remarked he would not trust any Grit assessor. The hon. member for Lincoln said: "Neither would I, from my experience, trust a Grit assessor." If that is his experience with regard to Grit assessors, I would like to know on what grounds he can reasonably expect us to accept Tory assessors, because, virtually, revising officers will be Tory assessors, and they will have full power to say who shall and who shall not vote. They will also be vested with the power of deciding whether a property is of sufficient value to enable the holder to vote on it. If the revising barrister chooses to say that a property which is assessed at $250 is not worth over $150, the owner of that property will not be put on the roll.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the judges were not mentioned in the Act. On page 9 he will find that judges may be appointed. It is only right I should draw the hon. gentleman's attention to that fact, before he goes on making use of the term "Tory assessors."

Mr. McMULLEN. The Act distinctly provides that revising officers shall be appointed. They are called revising officers, but the Government reserve to themselves the right of saying whether they shall appoint judges or not. They do not say judges shall be appointed, but they simply mention, by way of courtesy, perhaps, to the judges, that in cases where they are eligible the Government reserve the right of saying whether they shall appoint them or not. If they use the word "shall" instead of the word "may," it might be inconvenient, for there might be judges who would not make as acceptable officers as barristers would, and therefore the Government reserve the right of appointing or not appointing judges, according as political exigencies demand. The hon. member from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) took the opportunity to belittle the remarks, and the manner in which they were delivered, of my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). He related a story in regard to a sermon, and he tried to get a laugh about that. As far as loud talking is concerned, I think the member for East Grey can compete with any member of this House. He reminds me of the story I once heard myself of an Indian who was once going through a bush, and he came across, and it was the first time he had ever seen, a cow bell, and he lifted it up and gave it a rattle, and he looked at it, and he said: "You are a long tongued, empty-headed beggar." I do not apply the story any further, but I think the hon. gentleman showed very little courtesy to his professional neighbor who represents a different constituency in the same county. He also gave a story in regard to the pumpkin. I have often heard that story, and I dare say every member in this House has heard it. There was once a cute lawyer who put a question to a man to test his ability to give evidence in court: "Who made you?" The answer was: "Moses, I suppose." The witness asked that he might ask the lawyer a question, and he said yes. "Who made you?" "Aaron, I suppose." "Well," said

the man, "we understand that Aaron made a calf, but who would think the darned critter would have wandered in here?" We have heard the story of the pumpkin, but no one would imagine that one of the pumpkins would have rolled in here. I do not say it did, but it looks like it. Mr. Mowat is charged with not having brought this question of the franchise before the Province of Ontario before he introduced it into the Local House. That is not correct. I had an opportunity before of addressing this House on that question, and drawing the atttention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that Mr. Mowat discussed that question at a convention held in Toronto before the last general election. A number of resolutions were adopted at that convention, including a resolution in reference to the franchise, and when he went to the country that was one of the planks of his platform, and he has since carried out that extension of the franchise. I desire to draw the attention of the hon. member for Lincoln to the fact that, in a reference he made to some remarks of mine, he did not quote my utterances correctly. I was not present at the time, but I find that he said:

"'But,' says the hon. member for North Wellington, 'we are prepared to accept the franchise as it now exists in Ontario, no matter how it may be changed in the future.'"

That is an incorrect quotation. I am not prepared to say that the hon. gentleman intended to quote me incorrectly, but I did not utter those words, and the hon. gentleman must have had his *Hansard* before him, and had he read from *Hansard* he would have seen that these were not my words. The words I used were:

"For my part, I would be willing to accept an amendment which would provide that, if we do adopt the provincial franchise at the present time, the Provinces would not have the power to alter that franchise by any restrictive measure without concurrent action on the part of this House."

In quoting from any speech, hon. members should be careful not to misquote. I also desire to correct another statement of the hon. gentleman. He made a great many quotations from the *Globe* newspaper of many years ago, on the question of income franchise, and he attempted to prove that the *Globe* was opposed to income franchise. He said:

"So you will see that while to-day they profess to be favorable to granting the franchise to a large body of the electors, they have systematically opposed a reduction of the franchise. I think I can satisfy the House that every reduction of the franchise that has been granted by the Reform party was at the instance of the Conservative party, and only when the Reform party was driven into the last ditch. Now, Sir, we find that the organ of the party, at that time, had the same view upon this question. On the 27th November, 1868, we find this language:

"'If he (Mr. Sandfield Macdonald) would take the trouble to enquire as to the practical effect of his $400 real estate franchise in Toronto, where it will include nearly all but the very poorest tenements, he would be able to see that he is enfranchising, in this city alone, hundreds of persons who are, to say the least, no more worthy to be enfranchised than the class he resolutely excludes.'"

He does not quote the whole passage, but simply what suits himself. He garbles the quotation. I will give you the whole clause from the *Globe*:

"While announcing a reduction of the franchise in cities, so as to include tenants assessed for real property to the amount $400, Mr. Attorney-General Macdonald declared most distinctly that he would not assent to any franchise based upon income or salary."

This is the portion which he quotes:

"If he would take the trouble to enquire as to the practical effect of his $400 real estate franchise in Toronto, where it will include nearly all but the very poorest class of tenements, he would be able to see that he is enfranchising, in this city alone, hundreds of persons who are, to say the least, no more worthy to be enfranchised than the class he so resolutely excludes."

Then, allow me to give the balance:

"Than those who would be admitted by a franchise based upon a moderate income, say $400 or $500 a year. The clerks, salesmen, teachers, mechanics and others, who are in receipt of such income and yet are deprived of the franchise because they are not householders, are as independet and intelligent as any other class of voters in the city. What can be the secret of Mr. Macdonald's hostility to an income franchise?"

It is just the very reverse of what the hon. gentleman quoted. In order to make a point, he garbles one little sentence that suits him and quotes it to the House and says nothing about the rest. I sent over yesterday a messenger of the House to ask the hon. gentleman kindly to favor me with the *Hansard* report of 1868; and he sent back word by the messenger that he had taken it down to his house after he made his speech, so I could not get it. I suppose the hon. gentleman felt that, perhaps, if it feel into the hands of some persons it might be made to tell tales that would not be creditable to him, and so to protect himself against my correcting him, he kept the book, and it has not been seen by anybody but himself. But I happened to go into the Library to hunt up the *Globe*, and I have now quoted from the *Globe* to show that he garbled the passage and made it the very opposite.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman has said that I stated I had carried it home. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. The boy came back and told me you said it was at your house.

Mr. RYKERT. The page came and asked me if I had the scrap book of 1868, and I told him I had it in my library. He did not say a word about the *Hansard*.

Mr. McMULLEN. I told the page to ask the hon. gentleman what I have said, and I have no doubt he did ask him, because the hon. gentleman is too well posted to be ignorant of the fact that there was no *Hansard* in 1868. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln stated to the House that he was the first man who introduced the income franchise in the Ontario Legislature, which was in 1868, and I do not find that the hon. gentleman introduced any Bill that year with regard to the franchise, although, perhaps, I may have overlooked it. The first man who introduced the subject into the Legislature was a gentleman named Perry, who introduced a resolution with regard to the income franchise. The hon. gentleman has stated that it was only when the Grit party were driven into the last ditch that they ever accepted any extension of the franchise. What was the vote on that occasion? Every Conservative of the House voted against that extension, but two, and the Reformers voted for it. And if you go over all his speech, you will find that nine out of ten of the hon. gentleman's statements are garbled statements for a purpose. Now, Sir, I hold that when you take away from the people the rights they have in any constituency, of saying who shall vote, you are striking at the principles of British liberty. We have had a Franchise Act in force ever since Confederation, and there is not the slightest evidence of any necessity for a change. No fault has been found, no petition has been sent in and no remonstrances have been made. It appears that hon. gentlemen think that at the next general election they are going to accomplish a good deal by means of this measure, and that they are going to get the inside track of their political opponents, but I am inclined to think that the people of this country will give them a surprise in that respect. If I know anything of the feeling of the people they are not favorable to a system that will put under the control of any lawyer, no matter how respectable, the power of saying who shall vote and who shall not. I do not wish to disparage lawyers. They are a necessary—I was going to say, evil—they are a necessary class, and occupy a prominent position. At the same time, it is well known that the electors in rural districts have no particular love for lawyers; and you will find that, when you subject the people to the necessity of holding their right to vote at the will of a revising officer, a strong feeling of resentment will prevail throughout the country. I hold that this measure is unwise, from a financial point. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored

to show that the expense will not be so much as we have claimed it would be. The hon. member for Lincoln undertook to show that the expense incurred by the members of this House in discussing this measure was more than the expense of the revising officers would be for the first year. Now, I deny that any member of this House will get more than his ordinary sessional allowance if he remains here for the purpose of discussing this Bill. I do not think a single servant of this House, that the Clerk of the House, or the *Hansard* reporters, will get any more, by reason of the prolongation of this Session. Now, the people will be called upon to submit to a great expense under the operations of this Act. Once you fix the salary of a revising officer for the first year, and of his clerk and bailiff, and you will have great difficulty in keeping it down to that point. If you were fixing it at a very low sum you might possibly be able to prevent an increase, but where you fix a sum which will be necessary in order to discharge the duty the first year, you will find afterwards great difficulty in reducing it. Not only that, but every revising officer will exercise a very desireable influence to cultivate. He will, no doubt, be a desireable man to be on good terms with, and, no doubt, the candidates, particularly the Conservative candidate, will feel it his duty to see him recouped for the very valuable services he is likely to render. There will be a Conservative association in every constituency, aided by a Government allowance; the revising officer will be *ex officio* the president of that association, or will discharge that duty. His ear will be open to receive suggestions with regard to changes to take place; and, as has already been stated by the hon. member for South Grey, where an opportunity occurs for erasing the name of a Reform voter, without exciting particular alarm, the chances are that that name will not be found on the list when the day of voting comes; and where there is a Conservative that it is desireable to have on the list, you will often find, I have no doubt, the name, in some peculiar way that no one can explain, or nobody is aware of but those who are in the secrets, will be on the list on polling day. I contend that in this way the duties of the revising barrister can be made very valuable to a member who is running for the constituency. In some constituencies, possibly, the revising officer may discharge his duty in a spirt of fairness, where there can be nothing accomplished, where it will not be possible by any act of his to materially affect a large majority; but where the numbers are very close in a constituency, and a few votes added to or taken from the list would be of vital importance, I have no doubt there will be quite a number of Reform votes missing on polling day. Hon. gentlemen may feel a little reluctant, as they have expressed it, to remain here for the purpose of discussing this measure; but I believe they are doing more in the direction of securing their seats at the next general election by pressing and urging this Bill through than they possibly could do if they went home. I am quite sure they believe so, and that if they get this law through they will be benefited very materially. They feel that it will be the best organisation they have ever had in this Dominion, and I have no doubt they will find it of great value. It, at least, will place the Conservative party in this position, that they can rest on their oars, and there will be no necessity for hunting up the voters' list and seeing that their friends are on, of looking after the different polling sub-divisions, and seeing that the names of their friends are on the list. The revising officer will look after that. But the poor Reformer will have to do all the hunting up and coaxing, and if they make an appeal the probability will be that they will have their trouble for their pains and accomplish nothing. You may say that we are making an unnecessary fuss about this; but our experience in the past has been that when hon. gentlemen opposite make up their minds to do anything which will benefit themselves they generally do it well. When they made up their minds, in 1882, to arrange the constituencies of this Dominion, particularly in Ontario, they did it well. It gave them some members in this House who probably would not otherwise have had the honor of sitting here. But some of the constituencies did not do what was expected of them, and as they would like to persuade them on a future occasion that they ought to do. Under this Franchise Bill, when it passes, there may be found some constituencies, after all, which will not come up to hon. members' expectations, notwithstanding the voters' lists have been carefully prepared, and numbers added to them who would not otherwise have been entitled to vote, and others omitted who should vote. After all, the people will feel an inherent sense of honor, and will not permit themselves to be led round to accomplish the ends which hon. gentlemen have in view in placing this law on the Statute Book. While we may differ in this House on political issues, and as to the course which we think ought to be pursued in the government of this country, if there is one thing above another with which we ought to deal fairly, honestly and openly, it is in going to the country for the purpose of obtaining the verdict of the people. I say a jury, free from any restriction, is the one before which we should desire to appear. As to-morrow is a holiday, and it is now midnight, I suppose it is the desire of the committee that the Speaker take the Chair.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 15th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. TROW. This Bill, which has been under discussion for several days, the Franchise Bill, has created, apparently, great excitement throughout the country. I do not know how many copies have been issued, but I know numbers of letters are received daily by members, from people on the other side of politics, stating they are most anxious to ascertain the contents of the Bill, and that not a single copy could be got for love or money during the past two weeks. I move that authority be given to the Government Printer to furnish 5,000 additional copies of the Franchise Bill for the use of members.

Mr. SPEAKER. That motion will go to the Printing Committee without being put.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. I desire to read to the House a full report, at least, a more lengthened report, of the battle at Batoche which I have received from the General, and which, I think, will be of interest to the House:

"14th MAY, 1885.

"To Hon A. P. CARON,
"From BATOCHE, N. W. T., 12th.

"Since my last evening despatch to you I have ascertained some particulars of our victory, which was most complete. I have myself counted twelve half-breeds on the field, and we have four wounded breeds in hospital and two Sioux. Among the wounded breeds is one Ambroise Joubin, a councillor, and Joseph Delorme. As far as I can ascertain, Riel and Gabriel Dumont left as soon as they saw us getting well in, but cannot ascertain for certain on which side of the river he is but think must

be this side. The extraordinary skill displayed making rifle pits at the exact proper points, and the number of them, is very remarkable, and had we advanced rashly or heedlessly I believe we might have been destroyed. As I told you, I reconnoitred to my right front with all my mounted men yesterday morning, with a view to withdrawing as many of their men from my left attack, which was the key of position, and on my return to camp forced on my left. and then advanced the whole line with a cheer and a dash worthy of the soldiers of any army. The effect was remarkable. The enemy in front of our left was forced back from pit to pit, and those in the strongest pit, facing east, found them turned and our men behind them; then commenced a *sauve qui peut* and they fled, leaving blankets, coats, hats, boots, trousers, and even guns, in their pits. The conduct of troops was beyond praise, the Midland and 10th Regiments vieing with each other, well supported by the 90th and flanked by the mounted portion of troops. The artillery and gatling also assisted in the attack with good effect.

"When all behaved so well, it might appear invidious to mention particular names; still, there are always some who, by good luck, are brought prominently before the eye of the commanding officer, and these names I shall submit to you later on. My staff gave me every assistance, and were most energetic and zealous. The medical arrangements under Brigade Surgeon Orton, were, as usual, most excellent and efficiently carried out. I have to regret the death of three officers, as well as two soldiers, but they died nobly and well. I found no want of ammunition among the enemy or food, in spite of what has been said to the contrary, and we found large quantities of powder and shot. Nearly the whole of the rebels' families were left, and are encamped close to the river bank. They were terribly frightened, but I have reassured them and protected them. There is a report that Gabriel Dumont is killed, but I do not believe it, though I think it likely he is wounded. One of the killed has been recognized as Donald Ross. one of the council. Yesterday evening, just as the action was finished, the *Northcote* and *Marquis* steamers arrived up, the latter having twenty-five police on board It appears that the *Northcote* had a hard time of it, as the rebels fired at it very heavily, and though it was well fortified, the rebels managed to wound two men slightly. The *Northcote* got on a shoal for a short time, but managed to keep the enemy off and to get off themselves. Finding that, owing to the barges alongside, they could not go up stream again, they decided to run down to the Hudson Bay crossing, get rid of them, and return. At the crossing they found the other steamer, and came up together. This morning I sent out a letter addressed to Riel, as follows:—

"'BATOCHE, 11th May.

"'Mr. RIEL,—I am ready to receive you and your council and to protect you until your case has been decided upon by the Dominion Government.

'FRED. MIDDLETON.'

"*Major Genl. Commanding North-West Field Forces.*"

"I cannot, of course, be certain, but I am inclined to think the complete smash of the rebels will have pretty well broken the back of the rebellion; at any rate it will, I trust, have dispelled the idea that half-breeds and Indians can withstand the attack of resolute whites, properly led, and will tend to remove the unaccountable scare that seems to have entered into the minds of so many in the North-West, as regards the prowess and powers of fighting of the Indians and breeds. There is not a sign of the enemy on either side of the river for miles.

"FRED. MIDDLETON,

FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

Mr. CHARLTON. It has always been known that parliamentary bodies have treated petitions with respect and decency. The only exception that I remember, as to any English-speaking body, was when the United States House of Representatives refused to receive petitions asking for the abolition of slavery. Some petitions which were presented here to-day were greeted with derisive shouts and cries of "fifteen cents a hundred," and one gentleman to my left, when, in a petition presented by the hon. member for Wentworth, the highly respectable name of Dr. Laing was mentioned as one of the signers, made an insulting remark about Christian politicians and other fanatics. Whatever may be our opinion in reference to the Franchise Bill, there is certainly a great deal of excitement in regard to it, and the excitement is increasing, and if the citizens of Canada choose to petition Parliament on the subject, their petitions should be received with politeness and deference.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McMULLEN. A Bill of this importance cannot receive, at the hands of any member of this House, too much consideration. It is highly desirable, in the interests of the freedom and the rights of the citizens of this Dominion, that we should carefully consider its several provisions. Hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed surprise at the course that we have considered it our duty to pursue in the discussion of this measure. While we have been criticising it and pointing out the several features we consider objectionable, they have sat still, and turned a deaf ear, and have not endeavored, except in a few instances, to justify the peculiar provisions of the Bill. We claim that, before a Bill of this kind is passed, it is highly desirable that there should be shown to exist some necessity for it, either by petitions on the part of the people or by some evidence that the people are dissatisfied with the law that has now been in force in this Dominion for so many years. The fact that no such evidence has been presented shows that the Government has some sinister motive in view in insisting upon the passage of this Bill. We claim that the Government has a personal and party object to gain by pressing this measure at this time. Some hon. members opposite have characterised the reasonable criticism that we have made on this side as obstruction, and as an attempt to waste the time of the House. Now, we claim that there are, outside this House, certain individuals who have voluntarily, and in an independent way, expressed their opinion of this Bill; we claim that men who have been associated with the Conservative party for many years, men of an independent mind, men who appreciate British liberty and British rights, have plainly expressed themselves as opposed to this measure. I would take the liberty of reading a letter that has been written by Mr. D. B. Read, of Toronto, a lawyer of good standing, a man who has been recognised for years as a prominent Conservative, who, I believe, is a Queen's counsellor, high up in his profession, and is respected, I have no doubt, by every Conservative in this House, and by the First Minister himself. (The hon. member here read the letter condemnatory of the Franchise Bill). That of itself is very strong evidence that the feeling is not altogether confined to Reformers. That is evidence of a fair-minded, honest man, who has given this subject long and impartial consideration, who has clearly expressed his views with respect to the evil results of the office of revising barrister. It is a just cause of complaint on our part that a law of this one-sided kind, which will give one party absolute power to control the entire votes of the Dominion, is a dangerous and pernicious law. It is wrong, unwise and unjust, and reflects upon the party now in power, that they, having such a large majority in this House, are afraid to appeal to the people on fair and equal terms, and have their conduct judged by the grand jury of the country, without endeavoring first to pack the jury. They appear determined to have the advantage in every case. It is to be regretted that hon. gentlemen opposite have no more idea of political honesty and fair play than to attempt to place the Reformers in a disadvantageous position by this Act. It is our right and our duty to oppose the passage of such a law. There has not been a moment lost in criticising this Bill. It is our duty to offer criticism. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), said that if we were prepared to offer suggestions no doubt they would be received. During three weeks we have been offering suggestions and pointing out serious objections to the measure; but our objections and suggestions have not been acted upon. We are quite willing to assume the responsibility of criticising this Bill from day to day, and when compelled to go to the country, with all the odds against us that this Bill will give, we can honestly claim that we endeavored to prevent the evils of this Bill. The revising barrister is one of the most objectionable features of this measure. It is contrary to all legislation that has taken place in this country for twenty years, all our legislation having been in the direction of giving the

people a fuller right to govern themselves. Instead of retrograde legislation such as this, we should have granted the people more privileges and rights than they already possess. It is absolutely necessary in a new country like ours, that members representing constituencies should come here untrammelled by legislation, should come here by the free will of the people. In close constituencies this Bill will have the effect of enabling revising barristers to act as partisans. Under our present election law the value of property is fixed for assessment purposes. Under this Bill it will be fixed simply for the purpose of Dominion elections. The revising barrister will be able to sit down quietly and consider whether a certain man's property is worth $150, he can claim the right to say that it is not worth that amount, if such a decision should suit his convenience as a party politician. I do not say in all cases this will be done and that all the appointments are going to be of such ultra-partisans as would experience that power. But it is dangerous to place that power in anyone's hands. The present system of preparing voters' lists has worked admirably. No evidence has been produced to show the necessity of the change; and it is imprudent to appoint one man in 20,000 in every district clothed with the power to say who shall vote. I say that is an injustice that I believe our people will not willingly submit to. I say that to place the honest and industrious yeomanry of this country, who, from day to day are fighting the battles of life, and struggling with the difficulties they have to encounter in this country, those men who are in an impoverished condition—to place them in a position in which they may be dictated to by some aristocrat, some kid-gloved gentleman, who will tell them that he will not allow them the privilege of voting, that their little homestead is not worth $150, that their position in life or the value of their property is not such that he could place them on the voters' list—I say no man has a right to be placed in that position.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings.) Do you think any revising barrister would do that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, plenty of them.

Mr. WHITE. Not a bit of it; they would not be guilty of such a thing.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman says they would not be guilty of such a thing, but past experience has told us that extreme politicians will do strange things betimes, and I say that there is no necessity for empowering them to do it. I say it is in direct opposition to British liberty and rights, and that the laboring classes should not be placed in a position to be dictated to, or their rights taken away from them.

Mr. WHITE. You know that nothing of the kind could ever happen.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. WHITE. I am perfectly in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Get up on your feet then.

Mr. McMULLEN. This thing is going to lead, if it leads to anything at all, to manhood suffrage. I am not prepared to say that I would oppose any such measure. I would prefer a thousand times a well regulated manhood suffrage, with registration and residence as a condition, rather than the Act we are now asked to accept, and I believe this Act will lead in that direction. I believe the members who are now in this House, and who are opposed to any extension of the franchise in that direction, should take warning in time, for, in my humble opinion, if the people wake up to the fact that their rights and privileges are going to be seriously interfered with under this law, you will find an agitation for manhood suffrage before many years. The question of expense has been pointedly brought before the notice of hon. gentlemen by members on this side. We have endeavored to show that the Bill is extremely objectionable in the present financial condition of the country, that the amount necessary to defray the cost of the inauguration of this system should not be expended under present circumstances. With the very extended territory we have got to develop, the people of this country feel very seriously the burthen of taxation at this moment. It is bearing very heavily on the laboring classes of this Dominion, and year by year we are adding to our responsibilities. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, during the last six years, added something like $80,000,000 to the responsibilities of the Dominion, and I say that, in the face of this increase, it is highly imprudent to countenance the increase which will result from the introduction of this Act. Of course, the question of expense has been pooh-poohed by some hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Lincoln rather belittled the remarks of hon. gentlemen on this side, on this question. He tried to show that the increase cost of the protracted session of Parliament, which is now being held, would more than over-balance the expense incurred by putting this statute into operation. Now I venture to predict that not much less than about $400,000 will be sufficient to put this system into operation. I hold that when you approach revising barristers, if they are to be appointed, and even if you approach county judges, and ask them to perform the necessary duties which will devolve on them, under the operation of this Act, when you consider the fact that they have got to hold two distinct investigations of the rolls, that they have got to hold revising meetings in each township of the riding, you will find that when you ask them to perform those duties for a sum less than $500 or $1,000 a piece, you will have little hope of getting men who are disposed to discharge those duties efficiently. You may possibly secure the service of some political partisan for less money. I believe there are some men so imbued with extreme political ideas that they would willingly devote themselves to that work almost for nothing, for the sake of getting an opportunity of victimising their political opponents, by striking them off the lists, and thereby showing once in their lives how far their political feelings would go, if they had an opportunity.

Mr. WHITE. You could not find a revising barrister in the Province who would do it—not one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then if no revising barristers would do it, I would say that no gentleman so absolutely devoted to his party as my hon. friend from Hastings is, will be appointed.

Mr. WHITE. No revising barrister would do it, anyway.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is singular that we should find a unanimous adoption of this Act by hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding that some years ago they took a very different view. When the hon. member for East York introduced his Act in 1874, some hon. gentlemen opposite took occasion to compliment him on the fairness of that statute—some who are not now in this House. The First Minister himself complimented him so far as to say that he would support the second reading of that measure, and would do what he could for the purpose of perfecting it in committee. Well, he went on and made several suggestions in order to perfect that measure. His suggestions in some cases were accepted, as were also the suggestions made by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). Several other hon. gentlemen made suggestions as to features which were supposed to be objectionable, and the promoter of the Bill accepted them in a spirit of fairness

and fair play. I admit that the present Leader of the Government made some suggestions which were not accepted, and because the Government of that day were not prepared to adopt every suggestion while offered, he flew into a passion and quite lost himself in making some remarks with regard to the Bill. He said this: (The hon. gentleman quoted the remarks of Sir Jonn A. Macdonald on the Bill in question). Now, Sir, what have we had since this Bill was introduced. Have we not made suggestions night after night, and has one been accepted? Have we not endeavored to show hon. gentlemen on the other side and the leader of the Government some very objectionable features. I myself pointed out one case, in which persons could become tenants of property only for the purpose of giving them votes, and I pointed out cases which had actually transpired under my own observation, during my last election; and notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding that I pointed out that this Bill leaves room for these very things to occur again, the hon. gentleman has not paid the slightest heed to those suggestions and under the Bill, if it passes in the present shape—and we have got that particular clause—we will have a repitition of those unfortunate occurrences in the future. Now, I say if he was disposed to accept suggestions, to perfect this Bill, as he ought to be where there are objections of that kind and where there are proofs brought forward to show that there is just ground for those apprehensions, I think in all fairness he should accept them or suggest something to get over the difficulty. The question of expense is a very important one, and I ask is it wise, in the face of the increased expenses of this Dominion from year to year, that we should incur this additional burden of $400,000 for this measure, if there is absolutely no necessity for it. I say this measure is brought forward in the interest of a party, and it is unfair that the Conservative party should organise a Dominion Conservative Association to be paid out of the resources of the Dominion. Every man in this Dominion, whether he is a Reformer or a Conservative, will have to contribute his mite to maintain that association. In every constituency the revising officer will, no doubt, have his ear open to suggestions from all sides; no doubt there will be an association in each sub-division, to make suggestions to him, and he will reserve the right to put on the list and to put off whom he pleases. I maintain that this law will give him the power after the lists have been completed, after all the examinations have been made, after all the evidence has been taken, to strike any name he chooses off the list before he returns it. It is unfair, unjust and unwise that our people should be placed in this position. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), made some remarks with regard to an Act passed by the hon. Attorney-General of Ontario; and he said there was some feeling between the leader of this House and that hon. gentleman. The electors of this country have nothing to do with that. It is to be deplored, if a personal feud between men occupying those conspicuous positions, is to be the cause of the people's rights and privileges being interfered with; and if the people are to be subjected to the payment of $400,000 a year for a new election law, because the leader of this House is not disposed to accept the law of Ontario, because it has been passed by political opponents of his own. If Mr. Mowat has placed on the Statute Book an election law which is satisfactory to the people, it is unwise to take away from the Local Legislature the regulation of the franchise. The exercise of the franchise is dear to the people of this country. This Bill is going to deprive a certain percentage of the people of Ontario of the right to the franchise which they enjoy under the Mowat Act; and it is an acknowledged principle in all free institutions, that once you grant a man the right of the franchise it is improper and unwise to deprive him of that right afterwards. The hon. member for Lincoln endeavored to prove that a number of the residents of his constituency—some 267—would be deprived of the franchise by the Mowat Act. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, but I challenge the correctness of that statement. I venture to say that there is not one single individual in his constituency who had the franchise under the previous Act, who will not have it under the present Ontario Act. Because Mr. Mowat has deemed it his duty to prevent a man duplicating his vote from poll to poll, that is no reason for saying that that man will be deprived of the franchise. Take, for instance, a man in the city of St. Catharines, who owns a property worth $5,000; if it were scattered over ten different ridings, he would be entitled to vote ten times; but under the present Ontario Act he is only entitled to vote once, and I say that is right. No man has a right to go from constituency to constituency to record his vote, simply because, for the time being, he happens to be the owner of property in the different constituencies. If you follow out the principle, there are men who might be enfranchised in twenty different constituencies. I hold that is not fair; it is an injustice to the poorer classes. The poor man who lives in his cot, if it is all he owns, holds his right to the franchise as dear as the man who lives in his castle and spends his thousands every year. Mr. Mowat is protecting the rights of the poor man.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a man had his property in one riding and lived with his brother in another, how would he be qualified?

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall take the opportunity afterwads of answering my friend. I do not consider the question of such vital importance as to cause me to drop the thread of my address to answer it. Now, Sir, the desire for a uniform franchise, which will place all men on an equal footing, appears to be the potent argument in favor of the Bill now before the House. The hon. First Minister presented the measure to the House backed up with the declaration that he is anxious that a uniform franchise should be established under which members should be elected to this House. Now, I believe it is impossible to establish throughout this Dominion a uniform franchise, and on the very face of the Bill it appears that it is not uniform, because in one Province it permits a man to vote upon chattels, while in another Province a man can only vote on real estate. In the Maritime Provinces, fishermen are to be entitled to vote, provided they possess real estate and fishing tackle of the value, in all, of $150. I do not think the hon. gentleman has been so cautious to guard against the rights of the fishermen as to clothe the revising officers with all the powers they are to possess, or he would not have drawn the clause relative to the fishermen so loosely as he has done. He says the fishermen are to be allowed to vote if they have real estate and fishing tackle combined worth $150; he does not say if they have real estate without the fishing material, or the fishing material without the real estate of that value; but they have to be the possessors of both, and they have to be fishermen. Perhaps when he comes to that clause, he may insert the word "or" instead of the word "and," and in that way amend that peculiar provision. However, it is very singular that he should have required fishermen to have both real estate and fishing tackle, to the value of $150, or more, before he would be allowed the privilege of exercising the franchise. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), referred to the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and tried to show that, notwithstanding the criticisms of the latter, the voters' lists would be fair and just. Hon. gentlemen opposite seek to entrench themselves behind the feeling that the lists, whether fair or not, will, at any rate, be in their interest; they feel they are doing more good to themselves, while

sitting here day after day, in the way of securing their returns at the next elections, than they could if at home; they feel they will be able to sit in their easy chairs and trust implicitly in the revising officers, while the Reform candidates will have to make determined efforts to have their rights respected and use all their powers of persuasion to coax the revising officers to do what is fair. In all the time a Reform Government was in power, I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point to an act of this kind; I defy them to show that, under any Reform Administration, an attempt was ever made to legislate opponents out of existence. I would consider myself humiliated to be compelled to follow a party or leader disposed to do an act of that kind, and I am glad to say that the Reformers, to their credit and honor, have never been party to so truckling a business. How different has been the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1882, by the redistribution of seats in Ontario, they sought to politically behead my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Charlton) and others, but they failed in their purpose. To-day they hope, by enfranchising the Indians, to accomplish something more in that direction. The measure they are now trying to force through Parliament is one of the most disgraceful entactments that has ever blackened the pages of the history of our Dominion. It is a disgrace to the party attempting to pass it. The country will rise in indignation against it. Hon. gentlemen opposite say, then why not let it become law? Because we intend that the people shall fully realise its hollowness and iniquity. The party in power have a political record that would justify our coming to the conclusion that they would pass this or any other law which would have the effect of keeping them in power. Beginning with the double shuffle and coming down to the Franchise Bill, we can point to enactments and transactions, year after year, which stand out like milestones along their political course, marking their political disgrace, this last measure indicating their lowest descent, and in point of corrupting, capping the climax of all their previous acts. We, on this side are only doing our duty in showing up plainly and pointedly the evils of this measure; we intend to keep it up; we intend to educate the people; we intend to open their eyes with regard to the iniquity of this Act; and we hope to be able to show that the people are not blinded to all sense of honor, but will be aroused to a proper sense of justice, which they will show at the polls when the opportunity is given them to record their verdict on this attempt to shackle the free expression of public opinion. It is an impossibility to give an equalised Dominion franchise such as this Bill demands. While you cannot place all property on an equal footing, while you cannot give an equal value to all property, you cannot equalise the franchise. Until you can say that a house of certain dimensions in Ottawa is worth the same as a similar house in Winnipeg or Victoria, you cannot make an equal franchise. To show the injustice that can be practised by the revising officer we will begin with him from the time he is appointed supposing this Act to be passed. His first duty, on being appointed, is to assess the entire riding. He is not supposed to take the assessment roll, as an indispensable necessity, but simply as an aid, to arrive at what he believes to be the value of property in the riding. He makes the assessment of the entire riding. Then he constitutes himself municipal clerk. Instead of, as the assessor now has to do, making the return of the assessment roll to the municipal clerk and making a solemn declaration as to his faithful and exact performance of the duties of assessor, he makes a return to himself. He himself is the municipal clerk, and as such makes out the roll and puts several numbers of that roll in the different places. He does this without further obligation than that the statute binds him to do it. Under the present law, the clerk of the municipality has to make a declaration before the Revision Court that the necessary duties have been performed by him, before the court can sit. There is nothing of that kind to be done by the revising officer. He is to put up the list from place to place, and therefore he discharges the duty of municipal clerk. The next duty he discharges is that of the municipal council. The men who have the confidence of the people, who are elected to perform municipal duties, who are well posted in regard to the value of property in each ward, who have had experience as residents of the municipality, are not to be consulted in reference to the matter, and any assessment of the value of property made by them is not to be taken into account by the revising officer, who therefore constitutes himself the municipal council. Next, he constitutes himself the judge. At present, after the voters' list is made out, if there are any objections to it, there is an appeal to the judge, who is called upon to listen to the appeals. A day is appointed, parties are summoned, and they present their objections or arguments in favor of the alterations that they claim should be made in the voters' list; he hears the arguments and considers whether it is wise to make the changes or not. The revising officer discharges that duty also. He sits as judge, he listens to argument or not as it suits him, he is not compelled to listen to evidence as to irregularities, and he can decide whether parties shall be heard or not. He has all power, and can accept or refuse evidence as he thinks proper. I am not going to say that in all cases this will be done. I believe that there are respectable, decent, honest Conservative barristers that perhaps would discharge the duty. I can vouch for it that in my own town, and in my own riding, there are men who, I believe, are honest enough to discharge the duties faithfully, and who would not lend themselves to anything wrong, but, while I admit that, I know that we have men who would do the very opposite if they had the chance; and that is where the evil is. Is it the right-minded men who will be chosen? I think, in a constituency that is very nearly balanced, if they can possibly get a man ready to lend himself to a criticism of the voters' list with a view to strike down the number of Reformers and increase the number of Conservatives, he will be found a pliant tool and he will be appointed to perform that duty. If the county judges were appointed, a great deal of the evil would be got over. We have two county judges in my constituency and, although they are Conservatives, I am not prepared to say they would do anything improper. Still, it is an injustice to the electorate to clothe any judge with the power of doing an improper act if he chooses. We cannot reiterate the fact too often that this is taking out of the hands of the people a power which has been vested in them through their council, and placing it in the pocket of one man to exercise as he pleases. The people ought not to submit to it, and I hope, when they have the opportunity, they will back us up in the course we are taking.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Are not the assessors clothed with power? Do not they do wrong?

Mr. McMULLEN. We have had assessors that have done wrong.

Mr. WHITE. They are clothed with power.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will answer him. They have to appear before the municipal council, and those upon whom an attempt is made to perpetrate a wrong have two chances to get the wrong righted; first, before the municipal council, which is seeking for the suffrages of the people, and, in the next place, if he does not get it done before the council, he can get it done before the county judge.

Mr. WHITE. That is just the way this will be.

Mr. McMULLEN. But here we have no such recourse. I defy the hon. gentleman to show there is any such

recourse. The revising officer embodies in himself the powers of the municipal council and the judge, and he has the power to refuse to take evidence and can do right or wrong as he chooses. If an appeal is made to the judge under the present law, he must hear and determine it This Bill does not declare that the revising officer has to do anything of the kind. He may receive the evidence or not as he pleases, and afterwards he can strike a name off or put a name on just as he pleases, and there is no appeal from his decision. That is unfair; it is retrograde legislation, striking at the rights and privileges of the people and depriving them of a privilege they have possessed for years. If you take the whole course that has to be pursued in revising the voters' list and in the election of a member, I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to point out a single feature of the entire procedure that gives the slightest evidence of justice or shows the slightest mark of consideration to the Reform party of this Dominion. From the appointment of the revising officer when this law comes into force, to the time when the return is made to the clerk here, everything has a one-sidedness about it that is unfair and unjust. Of course the revising officer will appoint his own returning officer and his own clerk, and in everything we shall have to submit to the injustice of meeting our opponents on unequal terms. If the judges of the land had the power to appoint these men, we would not object to it so much; but they have not that power; the Government retain that power themselves, and no doubt they will avail themselves of it to the advantage of their own candidates. Now, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) has stated that no Bill had ever been discussed so fully in this House as the Franchise Bill, and he could not understand why in the world hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were kicking up such a fuss about it. Well, it is very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to shield themselves with such a pretence. But I think if that hon. gentleman sat on this side of the House, and a Liberal Government were to bring in a Bill of this kind, we would hear his voice very loud and very long in condemnation of it, and I am sure the whole Conservative party would oppose it with as much tenacity as we are doing. I am glad to think that we cannot be charged with ever having made an effort to put upon the Statute Book an Act of this kind, that we cannot be charged with ever having attempted to behead our opponents in the unscrupulous way in which hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to behead us by this Bill. I would commend to the attention of the First Minister the cartoon of *Grip* last week; and I think that who ever will look at the position there occupied by the First Minister, with his revising officer on one side, and the Indian on the other, and fair Canada, with her hands tied behind her back, will say that is a fair picture of the position the First Minister will occupy when this measure becomes law. I have only to say that if we have got eventually to go to the people under the operations of this Act, I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will find that it is going to help them as much as they expect. But if they are right in their anticipations, and if, by means of this measure, they succeed in returning to power, and in diminishing the numbers of the Opposition in this House, we will at least have the satisfaction of having done our duty in attempting to prevent, by fair criticism and discussion, the passage of such an iniquitous measure.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has paraded, with a great flourish of trumpets, the fame of Mr. D. B. Read, of Toronto, as a Conservative. I do not wish to be uncharitable towards the writer of that letter, but I must say that he is not so strong a party man as is the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless I greatly mistake, that gentleman was president of the Conservative

Association of Toronto, or a gentleman of that name, not many years ago.

Mr. SMALL. A good many years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think he was also a candidate for the representation of one of the Torontos in the Local House. If I am in error on that point I should be glad to be corrected.

Mr. McCALLUM. You used to be a Conservative, and now we find you over on that side.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If my hon. friend were aware of the facts he would know that when I was first elected to Parliament, I was elected by a very large Liberal, as well as a very large Conservative, vote. I took my seat here, and held my seat here, as independent a man as any man well could be. From the first time of my connection with Lennox, to the present time of my connection with South Huron, I have never failed to have the support of a large proportion of the best men of both parties.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman was turned out of his first constituency because he left his party.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend may recollect that a gentleman who ought to be in his place here to-day, the First Minister, had to leave his constituency of Kingston at the same time.

Mr. LISTER. This is a subject so deeply interesting to the electors of the Province of Ontario, that it is not necessary for me to offer an apology for addressing the House. We have been charged over and again by hon. gentlemen opposite, with having adopted a policy of obstruction for the purpose of preventing the passage of this Bill. I deny the charge, but I say that even it were true, it would be perfectly justifiable under the circumstances. If we have accomplished nothing else in the discussion of this Bill, we have, at least, shown up its defects and deformities, and succeeded in arousing public sentiment throughout the country to the dangers which threaten our free institutions. I feel that this Bill is so objectionable that it is necessary on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to iterate and reiterate our objections to the iniquities of this Bill. obstruction pure and simple would be justifiable under the circumstances, for a more scandalous measure has never been presented to any legislative body acknowledging free institutions and responsible government. I need only quote from the independent press, which usually cordially supports hon. gentlemen opposite, to justify my statements. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to an article in the Montreal *Post*, an influential and independent journal. (Quotation from article read.) If we have succeeded in doing nothing more we have awakened public interest in this measure. Within the last two weeks meetings have been held from one extremity of Ontario to the other, denouncing the provisions of this Bill, and petitions have been forwarded from almost every constituency in Ontario——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LISTER.—presented not only by members on this side of the House, but by hon. gentlemen opposite, protesting in the most emphatic manner against the passage of this Bill. I have asked frequently, who have demanded the passage of this Bill? When was it ever submitted to the people, considered by them and by the press? The first intimation was the production of this Bill, although as late as two years ago general elections took place. At that time it was never referred to by the First Minister or by the Conservative party. I hold that such a radical change as this involves, so important and far-reaching in its consequences, amounts to an usurpation of power, without the

Government having asked the approval of the people on it. In view of these facts, it is the duty of the Opposition to oppose the Bill as strenuously as possible, and hon. gentlemen on this side would be false to their duty if they failed to stand up and protest solemnly and repeatedly against the passage of a Bill which, I am sorry to say, I can only characterise by the word, infamous. The measure proposes to disfranchise thousands and thousands of persons in my Province. I say that advisedly, and it is a statement that cannot be successfully contradicted.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I contradict it.

Mr. LISTER. I say tens of thousands of persons who possess votes under the Ontario Act will be disfranchised by this Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not given the subject that consideration it deserves. They have been too apt in this case as in others, to accept the statement of the First Minister as to the provisions of the Bill, believing that a Bill introduced by him would be a fair and just Bill. Let me consider its provisions and compare them with the provisions of the Mowat Act. While the Ontario Act provides that every person owning real property to the value of $200 in cities and towns and $100 in townships and incorporated villages shall be entitled to the franchise, this Bill places the qualification at $300 for cities and $150 for townships and villages.

Mr. WHITE. One is the assessed value and the other is the real value.

Mr. LISTER. I suppose the assessors, who are required to take an oath, assess property fairly. As regards tenants, this Bill provides that a tenant at a rental of $2.00 monthly, $6.00 quarterly, $12.00 half-yearly or $20.00 yearly, in any municipality, and has been in possession at least one year before the first day of November, and has paid one year's rent at the rate aforesaid, shall have the franchise. The Ontario Act provides that a male person rated on the assessment roll as tenant of property of the actual value in cities and towns of not less than $200, and in townships and incorporated villages at $100, shall have the franchise. That section of the Bill is a most objectionable one. It is a fancy franchise; it opens the door to all sorts of fraud on the part of the voter, and it is in every sense of the word an objectionable franchise. (The hon. gentleman here quoted the provisions of the Bill and the Ontario Act respectively, as to voters as owners, tenants, occupants, and income voters.) When my hon. friend speaks about his being rated about the actual value of the assessment he shows that he does not understand the matter, because the assessment roll is not final and conclusive at all, as a man cannot only appeal against his assessment to the Court of Revision, but directly to the judge of the County Court, if he chooses.

Mr. WHITE. Is the hon. gentleman quoting from the Mowat Act as it passed, or as it was introduced. Mr. Mowat's Act was much improved, and so will this be.

Mr. LISTER. I am quoting from Mr. Mowat's Act as it became law.

Mr. WHITE. This Bill has not become law.

Mr. LISTER. I understand that.

Mr. WHITE. You may find it different.

Mr. LISTER. With regard to income voters we know that there are a very large number of people consisting of school teachers and clerks in offices of various kinds, and wage-earners, whose incomes do not amount to $400 a year, while under the provisions of this Act these people will be debarred from voting. I think it is safe to say that in the Province of Ontario two-thirds of the school teachers do not receive incomes amounting to $400 a year, and I suppose there is not a laborer in the whole Province who earns wages to that amount. There are a large number of clerks in stores and offices, intelligent and well educated young men, eminently fit to exercise the franchise discreetly, all of whose interests are in this country, and when it is necessary to call on men to defend the country they are the first to spring to arms. Under this Bill you disfranchise every one of these men, unless they have property entitling them to vote, while at the same time you propose to enfranchise the Indian who has no property whatever, who is the ward of the Government, who can make no contract, who is uneducated, and who is under the control of the Government and its agents. I say that under such a provision you are doing the gravest injustice to a large portion of the community who are entitled to the highest consideration at the hands of Parliament. (The hon. gentleman then read the provisions of the Bill and of the Ontario Act respectively, as to the franchise for owners' sons.) Now, Sir, while you propose under the Dominion Act to enfranchise the sons of farmers, under the Provincial Act the son of every landowner is enfranchised whether he be a farmer or not, or whether he lives in a town, city, village or in the country. In that way you cut off from the electorate a very large number of intelligent young men fitted in an eminent degree for the franchise.

Mr. SPROULE. Read the first part of section seven, and you will see that you are entirely mistaken.

Mr. LISTER. That relates to the Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. No, to the sons of owners of real property.

Mr. LISTER. Under the Dominion Bill he must be:

"The son of a farmer or any owner of real property and not otherwise qualified to vote, and resident with his father (or mother) for one year before the first of November, as well as at the time of the election, if the value of the property on which the father is qualified to vote is sufficient if equally divided amongst them as co-owners to qualify as voters under the Act; otherwise the right to be registered as a voter and to vote in respect of such property shall belong only to the father. Occasional absence of not more than four months in the year shall not disqualify a son as such voter."

Under the Ontario Act he must be:

"Duly entered and named in the assessment roll as a landholder's son, resident at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided in the dwelling of his father for twelve months prior to the return by the assessors of the roll on which the voters' list used at the election is based. Temporary absence, not exceeding in the whole six months in the year, shall not operate to disentitle a landholder's son to vote under this section."

Under the Dominion Act the property must be of sufficient value, if divided up amongst the owner and his sons, to entitle each to a vote; in the Ontario Act there is no such provision.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, yes there is.

Mr. LISTER. No, there is not. If a man is assessed for property worth $300 and his sons are living with him, those sons are entitled to be placed on the assessment roll and to vote.

Mr. WHITE. Only one son.

Mr. LISTER. Under the Dominion Act, the First Minister has intimated, he intends to exclude the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West, but every tribal Indian residing in every other portion of the Dominion will be entitled to exercise the franchise; while under the Act of Mr. Mowat if the Indian possesses the qualifications the white man possesses, does not reside on the reserve, and is not under the control of the Dominion Government or its agents, that man is entitled to vote. The two Acts will not bear comparison. The Ontario Act is wider in its scope, is infinitely more generous, and enfranchises a much larger class of people who are thoroughly fitted to exercise the franchise, than the Bill of the First Minister. But why has the First Minister thought proper

to introduce this measure? I ask if there has been any public opinion expressed in its favor; I ask if the Province of Ontario or any other portion of the Dominion has requested or petitioned that a Bill of this kind should be introduced into Parliament.

Mr. FARROW. How many times have you asked that? About 50 times.

Mr. LISTER. I do not know what constituency you represent, but you are very insolent. A little good breeding would be a good thing for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LISTER. I say there is no public opinion in favor of this Bill, and I quote from *The Week*, a newspaper published in the city of Toronto, which is thoroughly independent, and whenever it can consistently support the hon. First Minister, it does so. (The hon. gentleman read the article referred to.) That article is taken from the paper of a great admirer of the First Minister, a man who never hesitates to applaud and approve of the acts of the First Minister, when those acts can, by any possibility, be entitled to approval. It is the language of a man who has no political end to serve and no object in misstating the facts of the case, and it is a powerful arraignment of the First Minister and the Bill before the House.

Mr. FARROW. I ask the hon. gentleman what paper he is quoting from?

Mr. LISTER. I am quoting from a paper that, I have no doubt, you never saw, *The Week* newspaper.

Mr. FARROW. I think I saw that article in the *Globe*.

Mr. LISTER. It is a very good article whether it is Grit or Tory. It is from the pen of Mr. Goldwin Smith, and Mr. Goldwin Smith is a personal and political friend of your chief.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman deny that he is a political friend of his?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I do deny it with all my heart.

Mr. LISTER. All I can say about it is that Mr. Goldwin Smith took the stump for the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald.

Mr. DAVIES. He has changed his politics.

Mr. LISTER. It is a strange man who will not change his politics under these circumstances. Public opinion from one end of this Dominion to the other is opposed to this Bill. Public meetings have been and are being held protesting against this measure; petitions have been and are being sent from the country protesting against it; the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) himself, 10 years ago, protested against such a measure; no portion of the people have petitioned for the Bill; every portion of the press, except the out-and-out Conservative press, are opposed to it, and the out-and-out Conservative press give it a most feeble support. The Act is an usurpation of the people's rights; it is an Act unparalleled in the history of constitutional government in England; it inflicts a serious wound on the representative institutions of this country, and hon. gentlemen who become a party to the passing of this Act merely for the purpose of gaining a party victory, are doing an act which will ultimately inflict serious injury on the commonwealth of Canada. The people of our country are a source of all power; it is from them we get the right to sit in this House, to legislate for them, and it is our bounden duty to acknowledge their mastership; yet, it is proposed by this Bill to take away from the people that power which every free people and free country ought to have, the right to prepare their own voters' lists. It is contemplated by this Bill to deprive them of this right, and to place it in the hands of individuals against whose decision there is to be no appeal; it is proposed to put in the power of one man to say who shall be on the list and who shall not. The question whether such men, men in that position, will act honestly or dishonestly is not the issue. If you could get a man who was perfection itself, you might convey to him the powers with which you propose to invest the revising barrister; but as there was only one man who was ever perfect, and it is not likely there will be another, it is a dangerous thing to place in the hands of frail mortals this power. It is a revolutionary measure which would be well worthy of some South American or Central American Republic, at the hands of the usurper, but in a free Parliament like this, it is hardly conceivable that the leader of the Government would introduce such a measure, one which cannot fail to meet with the condemnation of the people, one which even the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite throughout the country do not approve of, and the more they know its provisions the more they will see in it to condemn. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to be returned to their seats, but they must not forget that throughout the country the people generally, even their own friends, will not look on this measure with the same self interest, but will look upon it as dispassionate men having no end in view but the good of their country, and that Bill cannot be fairly submitted to them and its provisions explained without its meeting their disapproval. It is proposed to place in the hands of these irresponsible men, the revising barristers, the power to say who shall be voters and who shall not. My hon. and very esteemed friend from the county of Monck (Mr. McCallum) says these men will do what is right. I would take my hon. friend's word for almost anything in the world, but in this matter he is deceived when he makes a statement of that kind. Without saying anything to reflect on the profession to which I have the honor to belong, I must admit that in it there are men who are so eaten up by partyism that they would not hesitate to do injustice to an opponent. Men of standing in the profession will not take the position of revising barrister; it will not be in the best but in the worst and most unscrupulous portions of the bar that men will be found to accept positions under this Act. Is it fair that the right of deciding who shall exercise the franchise should be given to such men? Is it fair that they should have the power of excluding from the lists men who may be fairly and justly entitled to vote? Yet this is the proposition which the Government submit to us. We are told it is the intention of the Government to modify the Bill very radically. We hear that outside, we hear it whispered in the lobby and and in the corridors, but we have had no such intimation from men authorised to make such a statement, and I say that the Bill in its present form is a monster of iniquity, an encroachment on the rights of the people, and that the Canadian people do not possess the spirit I believe them to possess, if they will quietly submit to it. I to-day received a letter from a gentleman who takes no great interest in politics, and who says that in the county from which he writes, he never saw such excitement as exists there now since the rebellion of 1837. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but this Bill has stirred up a feeling of indignation throughout the country, and they are blind if they cannot see it. Why is it sought to press this measure at present? Hon. gentlemen opposite have never given any reason. The leader of the Government said a Bill of this kind would take the time of a whole Session for proper discussion, yet without any cause, without any demand having been made for the measure, he brings it down at the last hour of the Session. Will some hon. gentleman opposite attempt to explain what the particular reason is for passing

this Bill now? Although they have attempted to discuss its provisions, they have evaded its real issue; they have neglected from the time it was introduced, some three or four weeks ago, to give some valid reason why it should be introduced now, or why should it become law without consulting the people and obtaining their sanction. No reason has been made public for this course. Goldwin Smith says the object is to give the party in power a party advantage. That may be so, and there may be several reasons in addition. It is certainly not for the good of the country. The effect of the Bill will be to add seriously to the difficulty and expense of the people. Some say it is to divert the attention of the people from what is going on in the North-West. Perhaps that may be the reason, or it may not be. Others say that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is about to ask Parliament to advance it a further large sum of money, and that, in the discussion which this Bill causes, the demands of that corporation may be granted without the attention of the public being called to them. I think the real cause is an intention on the part of the First Minister, so far as it is in his power, to perpetuate the rule of the Conservative party in Canada. I think it indicates on the part of the Government the intention to bring on an election in a short time. In 1882, an election was brought on after the Gerrymander Act, and in 1872 an election was brought on after the transaction between the Government and Sir Hugh Allan, and we have reason to expect now, in 1885, that it is the intention of the party to further control, if they possibly can, the electorate of the country, so as to secure the return of their friends. If it is considered imperative that a Dominion franchise should be fixed by this Parliament, is it necessary to appoint revising barristers under the form proposed in this Bill? Hon. gentlemen have said that the local officers are not under the control of the Dominion Government, but, under this Bill, the municipal officers of Ontario are compelled to furnish to the revising officer the assessment rolls and voters' lists of the several municipalities throughout the Province. If they can enforce obedience to that provision, have they not the same power to enforce obedience to any other demands they may make as to the preparation of these lists? In England, the revising barrister only sits for the purpose of revising the lists made by the local authorities, and those revising barristers are appointed by the judges. You could find no party in England who would be base enough to take into their own hands the preparation of those lists as this Bill proposes to do. I suppose the dominant party there has the same power as the dominant party here, and no doubt it would be a great advantage to them to have these officers under their power, but the party in power in England shrank from taking this into their own hands. If it is necessary to have revising officers, it would be safer and better to follow the English pattern and have them appointed by the judiciary. In that case should we not have a guarantee that the men appointed would not be partisans. The appointments there are made each year and not for life, and therefore we should also have a guarantee that, if these officers did not perform their duties properly, honestly and impartially, they would be removed. Is not the present proposal a menace to the people of this country, is it not a dangerous power which you are giving to these men, which it will be hard to remove when once it is introduced? I hope, for the sake of the people, that no such power will be taken by the Government, but that, when we come to the revising barrister clause, the Government will yield and will consent that, if they are bound to have revising barristers, they shall be appointed by the judges. That would wipe out one of the most objectionable features of this Bill. I can only repeat that, so far as the revising barrister clause is concerned, it is a dangerous power to put in the hands of any man, and no Government would for a moment think of putting such a power into the hands of any man, except with some sinister motive in view. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), the other evening, gave the House to understand that the Indians were to vote, provided they had the same qualification as a white man. His statement is entirely misleading. That is neither the wording nor the intention of the Act. The Act, in language as broad as can be used, includes all Indians living upon reservations. Why, Sir, is it possible that the First Minister would think of giving the Indians a vote in view of the position they occupy towards the Government? Only three years ago he distinctly stated that the Indians were not sufficiently advanced, even for municipal institutions, on their own reserves, and yet within so short a time the Indian has become so civilised that the Government proposes to give him a vote! Any one who has lived near these Indian reservations, who is at all familiar with the habits and customs of the Indians, will agree with me in saying that, while there are a few who are intelligent, the vast majority of the Indians are not fitted to exercise the franchise. But if the right hon. gentleman thinks that the franchise ought to be extended to them, he is bound to enfranchise them entirely, he is bound to sever the last link that binds them to the Government, and to destroy all the influence that the Government may have over them. Personally, if it is thought right that the Indian should be enfranchised, I would not raise my voice against it, provided you placed upon him all the responsibilities that rest upon other citizens of this country. If he is sufficiently intelligent to exercise the franchise, the highest privilege of a citizen, he is intelligent enough to have control of his property, and to assume the duties and responsibilities of other citizens; but I say it is a monstrous thing to give him the right to vote until he does assume the responsibilities of other citizens, and while he still remains in a position of tutelage and dependence upon the Government. Sir, the only inference tha can be drawn from such a proposal is that the Goverment hope, by the power they can exercise over the Indians, so to twist them and bend them that they will vote for the Government candidate. Does it redound to the credit of any party, or of any man, who would seek to keep himself in power by such means? It has been said that this proposition, without elevating the Indians, will debase the electorate of the country, and in that view I fully concur. I can scarcely believe that the Government are serious in their intention of forcing a Bill through Parliament with a provision so infamous and so repugnant to the feelings of every man, Conservative or Reformer, who looks at it from a non-partisan standpoint.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in the Ontario Act.

Mr. LISTER. Only when they are living off their reserves and hold property; but this Act includes Indians living on their reserves. The 6,000 acres of land will be so assessed that the 600 Indians, who are occupants of that land, will be given a vote by the revising barrister. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), in his remarks the other evening, took occasion to say: (The hon. gentleman read an extract from Mr. Tupper's speech, page 1883 of the *Hansard*, in reference to uniform franchise.) Now, the hon. gentleman is—I will not say deliberately—misleading the House. The question of saying how an election shall take place is a different question altogether from that of fixing the franchise. There is no doubt at all as to the right of this Parliament to fix the franchise and to say how elections shall take place. But because this Parliament has the right to say in what manner a man shall vote, surely that does not include the right to say what man shall vote and what man shall not vote. It is a matter of no consequence how a man votes, whether openly or by ballot, but it is of vast consequence to say who shall vote.

I have attempted to point out how voters' lists will be prepared. This Parliament has the power to appoint an officer to obtain information and prepare these lists. They have undoubtedly the power to appoint revising barristers. But it is unwise and inexpedient that they should exercise that power. If it is necessary to appoint an officer for the purpose of preparing those lists he should be appointed by a power which is free from this Parliament, not by this Parliament. The result of appointing by this Parliament will be that a man may be appointed who is a partisan and willing to act so as to prevent Reformers exercising the franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to have the country believe that by the discussion of this important question large sums of money are being daily lost to the country. So far as monetary loss is concerned, it comes out of the pockets of hon. members of this House. They may not go home with so much in their pockets as they would under other circumstances; but the country loses nothing whatever in dollars and cents by the discussion now taking place. Hon. members receive $1,000 whether the Session is a month or six months; the officers of the House are paid by the year, and there is no additional expense entailed on the House by the discussion of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. What about printing the *Hansard?*

Mr. LISTER. As to printing the *Hansard*, I will inform the hon. gentleman that the cost for the first year under this Bill he is supporting so vigorously would print *Hansard* for 15 or 20 years.

Mr. SPROULE. But you said there was no extra expense.

Mr. LISTER. The First Minister took occasion the other day to make a speech on this Bill and wound up by stating that Parliament was becoming a farce and might end in a tragedy. What kind of tragedy is it going to be? Is it going to be the hon. gentleman's physical or political extinction, or are we going to be forcibly ejected from this House? I do not understand very well what he means by tragedy. At all events, we are prepared to take upon ourselves the full responsibility of what we are doing, and we are thoroughly convinced that, when the proper time comes, the country will thoroughly and completely approve of the stand we have taken in this House. Canadians must view the future of the country with great misgiving and concern. Insatiate lust of power has induced the leader of the Government to utilise the most dangerous weapons of parliamentary corruption and intrigue in order to keep himself in power. Lavish corruption and the indiscriminate distribution of gifts are doing fearful work; the distribution of patronage and place, timber limits, coal limits, and colonisation companies lands has dealt a blow at the political morality of the people. Undoubtedly this state of things is the proximate cause of the revolution in the North-West. Our public debt is increasing by fearful leaps and bounds. Our annual expenditure is to be increased by this iniquitous measure. Can infamy go farther? I believe when the time comes the people will say it cannot, and that other and better men shall take the place of these hon. gentlemen who now form the Government of the country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some time since I placed before the committee certain reasons which in my estimation were sufficient to convince us that the present franchises should be retained. I wish now to address myself to the consideration of the question as to whether Ontario itself should not have the privilege of retaining its present franchise. There is an evident desire on the part of all the Provinces, and that desire has been manifested in this committee, to retain the franchise they now possess. A motion for the retention of the franchise in the case of one of the Provinces was made by a supporter of the Government, I allude to Prince Edward Island. We may assume that this desire to retain those franchises is a universal one, or we would not have seen a supporter of the Government from Prince Edward Island moving the retention of the present franchise in that Province. British Columbia, it is true, has not made a request to retain its franchise. I presume it is not because the representatives love Rome less but that they love Cæsar more; their allegiance to the Government is so great that they lose sight of the interest of their Province in the servility with which they serve the party in power here. But the evidence is unmistakable, that were this question submitted to the people of the various Provinces as to whether they would retain the franchise they now possess or not, the decision of the vast majority in every Province would be in favor of the retention of the provincial franchises; that no change should be made, that the Government of the Dominion should not assume the power assumed by this Bill, which for 18 years has remained in the hands of the Provinces.

I proceed in the case of Ontario to urge certain reasons why no change should be made in this matter, why the motion now before the committee should prevail, why Ontario should be premitted to retain its own provincial franchise. We have exercised that right for 18 years, almost long enough to give us an indisputable title. We have exercised that right through five different general elections, and I venture to say that there is not an elector in Ontario who is not satisfied with the present state of things, and there has been no expression of public opinion in that Province or indeed in any other Province that would warrant the Government in taking the steps proposed. On the contrary, Sir, the great majority of the people of the Province of Ontario are thoroughly satisfied with the present condition of affairs, and are thoroughly averse to the change which is proposed to be made. This is evidenced by the petitions which have been pouring into the House, by the condition of public sentiment throughout the Province, by the marked hostility evinced towards this measure by the Liberal press and the Independent press without exception in the Province of Ontario, and is also evidenced very markedly in supineness and half-heartedness that characterise the advocacy of this measure on the part of the Government press of Ontario.

These are general reasons of course—reasons which apply as well to the other Provinces of the Dominion as to Ontario, and I shall proceed to urge the special reasons which apply to the Province of Ontario. In the first place, I state broadly that this Government is hostile to the Government of the Province of Ontario, which is the choice of the people of Ontario, and so much so that they would not stop short of the adoption of any measure or means which would lead to the downfall of that Government. That hostility has been evinced in various ways and in the most unmistakable manner. The British North America Act clearly defines the powers which are reserved to the Provinces, and this hostility has been clearly evinced in the attempts which have been made to infringe on the constitutional rights and safeguards of the Province of Ontario. Sub section 9, of section 92, of that Act defines the powers of the Provinces with regard to the different kinds of licenses, and yet, Sir, the Dominion Government in its hostility to Ontario superseded that right, exceeded its powers, and after an abortive attempt lasting two years, was at last compelled by a decision of the Supreme Court to cease its attacks upon the integrity of Ontario in that matter. The provisions of the British North America Act with regard to property and civil rights seemed to be explicit and unmistakable, and yet in the case of an escheat to the Crown the Dominion Government again attempted to invade the jurisdiction of the Provinces in a matter of civil rights, and again in the Mercer escheat case the decision was against them, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council having decided that the

right belonged to Ontario. I have no doubt that the law officers of the Crown here, understood as well before that attempt upon the rights of the Province were made as they did after, what was the purport and meaning of the section of the constitutional Act referring to these matters. Another clause defines the power of the Provinces over timber and streams.

Mr. SPROULE. What has that to do with the Franchise Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am giving reasons showing that this Government is hostile in its purports and intents to the Province of Ontario, and showing, therefore, that Ontario should retain all her safeguards for the preservation of her rights. But in this particular, as in the others, Ontario was only able to get her rights when they were attempted to be invaded by the Dominion Government, by a decision of the Privy Council. We have a special illustration of the hostility of the Dominion Government to the Province of Ontario in its conduct in the matter of the boundary award. After a long and manful struggle on the part of Mr. Mowat, the rights of Ontario were finally secured to her in this as in the other instances, through an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We had evidence of the unscrupulous character of the machinations of some parties connected with the Government in the attempt to expel the Government of Ontario from power, a year ago last Session, and this case points clearly and unmistakeably to the fact that Ontario as a great Province, having an autonomy of her own, having rights guaranteed by the British North America Act, should act with circumspection in respect to the powers which pertain to her, and for these reasons it behooves Ontario, her iterests impel her in a manner altogether greater than the other Provinces, to retain the control of the franchise with reference to the election of her representatives to this Parliament. The Bill recently passed in the Legislature of Ontario largely extended the franchise in that Province, and that franchise is now much more liberal in its provisions than the one before the House. It cannot be said that it is too liberal to meet with the approval of any portion of the population of Ontario, because the Opposition in the Ontario House of Assembly, the supporters of this Government, went so far as to move in favor of universal suffrage, in place of the franchise adopted by that House, which is itself practically universal suffrage. As the Ontario Bill will be in operation a year before this one, the effect of the passage of this measure would be to debar thousands from voting for members of this House who have the privilege of voting for members of the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. Such has been proved to be the case from the Bill. If you make a comparison between the two measures it is estimated that 100,000 people will be disfranchised, possessing the qualification under the Ontario Act. Now, what will be the reflection of disfranchised provincial voters, who are permitted to exercise the right of freemen with regard to the election of representatives to their Provincial Assembly and are denied the exercise of that very right with regard to the men who are to represent them in the same manner in the Dominion Parliament? It will not tend to increase the feeling of loyalty to this Government—that feeling of loyalty that we require to build up if we are to create a nationality in Canada. It will have a contrary tendency. It will have a tendency to sow the seeds of bitterness and party strife; it will have a direct tendency to create a feeling of deep-seated hostility towards the institutions of this Dominion. If there were no other reasons that could be urged against the Bill, that reason itself should have potency enough to deter us from passing this measure. Why, Sir, we have in this Dominion at the present time the evidences on all hands of discontent, we have the evidences on all hands that we are not a thoroughly homogeneous people, that these Provinces are not thoroughly assimilated, and the policy of a wise Government would be not to widen those breaches, not to increase that feeling of discontent, but to adopt conciliatory measures, to endeavor to attach all classes in the Dominion to the institutions of the country, and to give them a sense that they were being dealt with in a spirit of justice and fair play. Now, Sir, this Bill will cause a discrimination that will give rise to dissatisfaction with this federal union—first, in disfranchising those who have a provincial franchise, and, in the second place, in taking away from the people's officers the preparation of the lists, a privilege which they have enjoyed for eighteen years. How is it done? The municipal council elected by the people has its own machinery for making the voters' lists. The assessor makes up the assessment roll, and from that the municipal clerk prepares the voters' list, which contains the name of every man who has the proper qualification to vote; that list is published, and if any person deems himself unjustly treated, he may put in his claim before the Court of Revision, and if he fails to receive justice there, he may appeal to the county judge. That machinery was worked smoothly and well, and has done substantial justice in every case; it is under the control of the people themselves, and they can change it any time if it does not work to their satisfaction, For that we propose to substitute a machinery that is entirely independent of the people; we propose to take from the township council elected by the people the functions they now enjoy, and hand them over to an appointee of the Government, who is in no way amenable to the people. Now, I ask if any civilised state in Christendom can be pointed out where the registration of voters is provided for in a manner so subversive of all the rights of the people, and so much at variance with all the principles of justice. In England, the voters' lists are prepared by overseers of the poor, who are elected at municipal elections. [The hon. gentleman read the provisions of the English law bearing on this point] These revising officers are appointed annually in England, not by the Government, but by the courts of the land, and you must see there is a vast difference between the system in force in England and the system proposed by this Bill. In England, as in Ontario at present, officers elected by the people prepare the voters' lists, and in England, as in Ontario at present, the lists, after being prepared are subject to revision, which revision is made in Ontario by the courts and in England by officers appointed by the judges. The machinery for the revision and preparation of the voters' lists is substantially the same in England as in Ontario. From England, I will pass to some of England's colonies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is the hon. gentleman going to discuss the details?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am merely pointing out the most cogent of all reasons why the people of Ontario should desire to retain the power of fixing the franchise, and I am pointing out that the mode provided by this Bill is an infraction of all the rules provided in the election laws of other states. There is not another commonwealth under the face of heaven that has such a provision.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That provision is not under discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps you will save time by permitting me to allude to it here, and then I will not have to allude to what that provision comes upon. This is a motion asking that the provincial franchise be retained in Ontario, and although, technically speaking, I may be out of order on the ground of discussing the motion, my argument is in order. Having referred to England, I will refer to one or two of England's colonies. In New South Wales, the Court

of Petty Sessions appoints collectors for each police district who makes the rolls. These lists are posted on the court house and other public places one month and fourteen days; appeals for removal or for the insertion of names may be made, not to an appointee of the Government, but to a judicial officer, the clerk of the Court of Petty Sessions. In Victoria, the electoral registrars are appointed by the Governor in Council; and they are to make out the lists of electors, have them printed, and provisions are made for inspection and publication. Although the electoral registrars are the appointees of the Governor in Council, the Court of Revision is the Court of Petty Sessions, so that the revision, both in the case of New South Wales and Victoria, is made by the judicial officers of the Province. If we turn to the republic to the south of us and examine the laws of the different States of the Union, we will not find an instance where the officers having control of the registration of voters, are not officials elected by the people themselves and amenable to the people. I may be permitted to allude briefly to the provisions in several of the States. In the State of New York, a board of inspectors is elected as inspectors of elections and which is also to be a registration board. They meet to make the lists and to correct the lists, and their proceedings are open to all the electors; the lists are filed with the town clerk for inspection, and in case any elector appears before the court and makes oath that another is not entitled to vote, the word "challenge" is written opposite the name protested against, and when this person appears at the poll he is challenged and obliged to prove his right to exercise the franchise. In the State of Michigan, the aldermen, in cities, form boards of registration; in the rural districts, the supervisor, the township clerk and the treasurer of the township compose the registration board; they form the lists, and after the lists are made out, sessions are held, the lists are posted, and appeals are heard. The whole proceedings, as in the State of New York, are open. In the State of Wisconsin, there are inspectors of elections, elected by the people, three for each polling place. They are authorised to act as a board of registration. Open courts are held, voters are heard before them, the utmost publicity is given to all their proceedings, and the utmost facility given to a voter to get his name put on the list. In the State of Iowa, the township trustees and the clerk, with the registrars elected by the people, hold open courts, revise the lists, and hear evidence as to putting on or striking off names. In Oregon judges are appointed by the County Court, three in number for each district, to revise the lists. In Illinois the County Board appoints electors, as judges of elections, in each election district, the supervisor, assessor and collector, to be appointed judges for the district in which they reside. These judges see to the registration of voters, and hold open courts where the lists are publicly revised and corrections made. These are all the cases I shall allude to with regard to the law of registration. In the case of England, the Australian colonies and the American States I have quoted, the lists are made and revised either by the officers of the people or the judiciary, and, in no commonwealth under the face of heaven, whether under British rule or not, is so flagrant an infringement to the rights of the people perpetrated or tolerated as that proposed in the Bill under consideration. Another reason why this Bill will be sure to create dissatisfaction in Ontario is that it largely increases the public expense, that it creates a full regiment of officials. Under the provisions of this Bill, 844 persons can be appointed, and $500,000 a year will in all probability be added to the public expense. In return for that, is the country to have any increased safeguard for its security, any better law, any law more in consonance with the wishes and the genius of the people? No; this great expense is to be incurred and this regiment of officials is to be appointed in order that the liberties of the people may be infringed upon, in order that the condition of things now existing, which is satisfactory to all the people of Ontario, may be changed; not for the purpose of securing the existing liberties of the people of Ontario or the Dominion, but in order to make it more probable that the party now in power, which fears to go back to the constituents which sent it here, may retain power. Another reason why this measure will create dissatisfaction with the federal union is that it will create confusion and difficulty, and will baffle and annoy the ordinary elector. A large proportion of the electors in Ontario have sufficient difficulty now to comprehend the machinery for registration, revision and appeal. If, in addition to the present machinery, you compel the elector to appear before the revising barrister, the confusion and annoyance will be such as to create an intense feeling of dissatisfaction with this Bill and with the Government which placed it on the Statute Book. Another reason why these provincial franchises should not be interfered with is one which I must reaffirm, that the Provinces are component parts of this Dominion, that they have a distinct autonomy, which is proved by the fact that the Dominion Government has come into collision with at least one Province on matters of constitutional law and jurisdiction, that we have had litigations between the Dominion Government and Ontario to settle the respective jurisdictions, that these questions have been carried on appeal to the highest court in the British realm, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and that the autonomy and constitutional rights of the Province has been affirmed on six different appeals. These Provinces, through their delegates, formed this Union, and they are represented in this Union only by the members of this House of Commons. They have no representation in the Senate, no power over the Administration or the executive of this country, and the House of Commons is consequently the only bond of union between these Provinces and the Union. Is it not reasonable to say that they shall select these representatives? No man will deny it. The members of this House should be selected, and are selected, by the different Provinces, and, if they select their representatives, is it unreasonable for them to demand the power of designating by whom they should be selected? When we are the representatives of the Provinces, is it not a violation of the abstract principles of justice and right for us to interfere with the right of those Provinces to decide who shall select their representatives in this House? In the constitutional convention which formed this Dominion, the Provinces, through their delegates, arranged the basis of representation. It was not arranged by this House, but it is a part of the organic law of this Dominion. The British North America Act provides that the basis of representation shall be population, that the Province of Quebec shall have an unalterable number of 65 representatives, and that, at every decennial census, the representation of the other Provinces shall be adjusted upon that basis. This House has no power to change this basis of representation. This is a provincial right guaranteed by the organic law of this land. We cannot nominate the members of this House of Commons. Great as is the power of the Governor in Council, they cannot nominate the members of this House of Commons. Those members can be elected only in one way, by the expression of the wishes of the inhabitants of the Provinces.

Mr. MILLS. We elected Tupper here.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Bothwell that we elected the hon. member for Cumberland here, but it was not in the ordinary course.

Mr. DAVIES. We elected the member for King's the previous year.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Provinces have the right to choose their representatives, I hold that it follows as a matter of course, as a natural corollary that they shall have the right to designate who shall make the choice. A good deal has been said about obstruction.

Mr. McCALLUM. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Monck says "Hear, hear." He requested me to sit down almost before I had got up, and I promised my hon. friend that I would sit down some time, and I intend to do so. With regard to this question of obstruction. Not very long ago the British House of Commons adopted a system of cloture, but we had the declaration of the First Minister the other day that he did not propose so great an infraction of the rules of discussion. Mr. Forster, a member of the British House of Commons, in reference to this matter said: (The hon. gentleman read from "Forster—Political Presentments," pp. 5, 6, 7, 14 and 15.)

Now, Sir, with regard to the measure under the consideration of this House, I hold that, although a considerable degree of discussion has been indulged in upon this Bill, there has not been enough discussion to apprise, even members on the Government side of the House of the real character of this Bill. I hold that, long as this measure has been under discussion, at least one-half the members of this House are not yet thoroughly conversant with it. This measure is only now arousing the attention of the country. Demands are coming upon us by the thousand, that the passage of this Bill should be delayed in order that the people, who are ignorant of the character of the provisions of this measure, may examine them for themselves. This measure requires ample discussion; it requires a greater amount of discussion than it has as yet received, and weeks would be insufficient to arouse the country to the character of this measure, or even to impress the majority of this House with the real meaning and scope of its provisions. I have shown, in a former discussion upon another clause of this Bill, that, in the country to the south of us, the individual States control the franchise and although that franchise is now uniform, it was not uniform when those States had the control of the franchise given to them. There can be no doubt that we shall ultimately have a uniform franchise here in the same sense as they have a uniform franchise in the United States. We shall have universal suffrage in all the Provinces. But I hold that we should leave the Provinces themselves to decide how soon they will reach universal suffrage, how rapidly they will change the conditions of the franchise as now existing. I pointed out the other day that in the United States the people voted for a President and members of the House of Representatives; that each State elected its own representatives as members of the United States Senate, each State having two members of that body; that the privileges and powers of the States of the American union far exceed those of the Provinces in our Federal union, and that the States had civil and criminal jurisdiction, that the judiciary of the United States consisted of the Supreme Court and the circuit courts and their jurisdiction was a limited one; and I will point out what that jurisdiction is, in order to show how much greater in that country is the power of the component parts of the confederation than is the power of the Provinces under our own system. Article three, section 2, of the constitution United States says:

Mr. McCALLUM. I think the hon. member is out of order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid hon. gentlemen are opposed to listening to arguments.

Mr. McCALLUM. What has the constitution of the United States to do with the Franchise Bill?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am pointing out that while it is proposed to take away from the Provinces some part of the small power they possess, there is great disparity between the powers possessed by the Provinces of the Dominion and the States of the Union.

Mr. McCALLUM. I submit the hon. gentleman is out of order. He is giving us a lecture on the constitution of the United States. He invariably does so and he draws his inspiration from the great country over the line. But what has that to do with the Franchise Bill?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for North Norfolk is perfectly in order. He is pointing out the difference between the powers of the Provinces and those of the States of the Union. Hon. gentlemen opposite themselves always allude to the United States when advocating the National Policy.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman always draws his inspiration from the United States.

Mr. MILLS. You do.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is you who do—you, and the hon. member for North Norfolk. He never rises in the House without giving us a lecture on the United States. It is a very nice document, but we do not want to hear lectures upon it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member goes to the United States for his coal and for his National Policy.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I submit that the hon. member for North Norfolk is perfectly in order. He has laid down a proposition, and he is seeking to fortify it by authorities which he may find in the United States, Great Britain, or any other portion of the world.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member is perfectly in order in drawing an illustration; but he must do it in such a way and at such length as not to weary the patience of the House. If it is done openly and avowedly to take up time, which I think I may assume is the case, it is not allowable, and the patience of the House is to be considered in these matters. I think the hon. gentleman is in order in making the illustration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have always pleasure, so far as I am concerned, in being able to thank you for your impartiality, Mr. Chairman. I was about to read the clause, as follows:

"The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under this constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made under their authority; in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizen of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State, claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State or the citizens thereof and foreign States, citizens or subjects."

In all matters of civil and criminal jurisdiction the courts of the different States are supreme, except so far as they are limited by the clause I have read. What I desire to point out is, that the powers pertaining to our Provinces are limited and trivial compared with those enjoyed by the States of the American Union. It is a very convenient thing for hon. gentlemen opposite to talk about Yankeeism. It is the part of wisdom in a public man to learn from the lessons of experience, from whatever source they may come, from any nation or people, in any age or epoch, and to say that we would not profit by the experience of the great nation at our doors with the very system which we are now about to abrogate, or to benefit from the salutary results derived from its institutions in fostering the prosperity and growth of that country—I say it would be fatuity on our part not to gather lessons from the history of that country, or of England, or France, or of any other christian, or any other barbarian country for that matter, on the face of the globe.

Now, I pass to the Australian colonies. I have here a summary from the London *Times* of a plan for the federation of the Australasian colonies, and I think we may draw from the features of that plan some useful lessons, showing how carefully the doctrine of provincial autonomy and provincial rights is looked after, and how much more prominent they are than in our own country. The mode of constituting the federal council is described as follows:

"On the federal council each Crown colony is to be represented by one member and each other colony by two. But at the request of the colonial Legislatures Her Majesty may, by Order in Council, increase the number of representatives for each colony. As to the mode of appointing a representative, and as to the tenure of his office, the Legislature of each colony is empowered to make what ever provision it thinks fit."

It will thus be seen how entirely the tenure of office and the mode of election and other matters of that kind are left in the hands of the provinces, or colonies.

Mr. PAINT. They are not confederated yet.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are talking about the proposed plan of confederation as I said. Some of the proposed powers pertaining to the federal council are as follows:—

"With regard to the matters that are to be subject to the legislative authority of the council, they include (1) the relations of Australasia with the islands of the Pacific; (2) the prevention of the influx of criminals; (3) the fisheries in Australasian waters beyond territorial limits; (4) the service of civil process of the courts of any colony within Her Majesty's possessions in Australasia out of the jurisdiction of the colony in which it is issued; (5) the enforcement of judgments of courts of law of any colony beyond the limits of the colony; (6) the enforcement of criminal process beyond the limits of the colony in which it is issued, and the extradition of offenders (including deserters of wives and children and deserters from the Imperial or colonial naval or military forces; (7) the custody of offenders on board ships belonging to Her Majesty's colonial governments beyond territorial limits; (8) any matter which at the request of the Legislatures of the colonies Her Majesty by Order in Council shall think fit to refer to the council."

I do not know that it is necessary to give the full list of the powers pertaining to this council, as the clauses I have read will indicate their scope and drift. There are other powers and provisions which are thus explicitly granted:

"Moreover, the Governor of any two or more colonies may, on the address of the Legislatures, refer for the determination of the council any questions relating to them or their relations with one another. A special obligation attaches to the first three matters, namely, the relations with Australasia with the Pacific islands, the influx of criminals, and the fisheries. Every Bill in respect of these is to be reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure, unless it has been previously approved by the Queen through one of her principal Secretaries of State."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think it is hardly in order for the hon. gentleman to read these provisions in all their details.

Mr. CHARLTON. These colonies are about to form a union, and it is necessary for us to know, in the light of our own experience and the experience of other countries, what course these colonies are about to take in regard to matters which have a bearing on the Bill we are now discussing.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think that it is in order, or that it is relevant, to read these particulars as to a scheme which has not been adopted.

Mr. PAINT. No; that is it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The scheme has substantially been adopted, it has gone through——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. The scheme is going through the House of Lords and its passage is a mere matter of form. I was about to point out what the provisions of the scheme are with regard to——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to drop the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did you rule?

Mr. CHARLTON. Do I understand that you rule that I cannot read the provisions of that scheme, which I consider a matter of the utmost importance in elucidating clearly the principles which underlie this Bill. If so, I shall be sorry, as it is essential to what I intended saying that I should be permitted to make this statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. My ruling is that an incidental reference to a matter of that kind is permissible, but to refer to the whole matter in detail I think would not be in order.

Mr. CHARLTON. I purpose passing over nine-tenths of it, as I felt in approaching the subject that it would be trespassing on the patience of the House to read it all. But if, as you say, you will permit an incidental reference to its provisions that will be sufficient.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall not read the provisions, but I shall only make some comments upon them. The acts of the council are to prevail over the colonies, and the council has to make representations to Her Majesty——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What has that to do with the franchise of Ontario?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Under my ruling the hon. gentleman cannot go into the details of the scheme, but he may refer to its chief features as an illustration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was referring to the chief features of the scheme, and I was nearly through, but of course it is impossible to tell what they are without hearing a statement of them. The scheme makes an arrangement with regard to expenditure; the provincial council has not power to levy taxes; the expenditure is to be apportioned among the provinces, and it is to be a voluntary charge. In this scheme there is an unlimited reservation of State rights; the council has no power to impose taxes, to enforce treaties, or to enforce its own laws. The colonies may, at any time, withdraw from the Confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentlemen would rather have an appeal to the House than to allow me three minutes to conclude, we shall take it. I do not think I am treated with any fairness by the majority in this House.

Mr. BOWELL. What does it matter? He has to waste so much time, and he might as well do it in this way.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not wasting time. I purposely abridged my remarks. I am standing here in my right as a representative of a riding in this Dominion, and I am discussing a measure that I believe to be a detestable measure. I feel warmly on this matter. I have taken a scheme prepared by other of Her Majesty's colonies to illustrate my argument. I shall conclude by saying that we are taking from the Provinces a right that the Australian scheme leaves with the Provinces. That scheme preserves State rights, and any Province can retire from that Confederation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is what I wanted to state; and now I am through with regard to the Australian matter, and it simply illustrates that in no other British commonwealth would the amount of restriction of provincial rights and provincial autonomy be tolerated that this Bill proposes to impose on the Provinces of this Dominion.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. gentleman has discussed this five or six times.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, if I choose, I will discuss it seven or eight times more. I do not think the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me would understand it if it was discussed fifty or sixty times.

Mr. PAINT. I do not understand any Yankeeisms.

Mr. CHARLTON. Well, with regard to the charge of Yankeeism, it is frequently hurled across the floor of this House. I have a word to say about that. I happen to be a British subject by birth. I have lived thirty-five years in this Dominion. I have served in this House since the year 1872. I have always, in my capacity as a member of this House, and a citizen of this Dominion, sought to promote its interests. I spurn and repudiate and spit upon that exhibition of paltry malignant prejudice that is made by hon. gentlemen who get up the cry of Yankee. Sir, is it impossible for a person born in the United States to live in Canada and be a loyal citizen? Is he to be denied the rights and privileges that belong to a citizen of this country? Is he to be taunted time after time by this miserable, petty spitefulness on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? The leader of the Government himself has not been above that appeal to popular prejudice. In the United States to-day there are 1,000,000 Canadians, among them are men who are filling positions of every rank, and I venture to say that not one of them has been reminded of his nationality in an offensive manner, no matter how narrow his prejudices may be as a Canadian. In that country, where the population is made homogeneous, all men are welcomed, and when a man casts in his lot with the people of the United States, it matters not what his place of birth may have been. After he becomes a citizen of that country he is received with open arms, and is given all the privileges and enjoyments, all the rights and immunities that belong to an American citizen. Here, Sir, it is different. A man may come here from the United States, and he is a Yankee if he should live here for half a century; he cannot be a Canadian. If a man comes from Ireland he is a Paddy; he cannot be a Canadian; it cannot be forgotten what his nationality is; he must be reminded that in this blue-blooded country he cannot be considered a citizen of the Dominion of Canada, desiring to participate in the rights and duties of a citizen. Sir, the child that is adopted in the family is considered and treated as a member of the family; the citizen who is adopted in the State is considered and treated as a member of the State. In the United States three years' residence is all that is required for naturalisation; in Canada, after having lived here 35 years, after having all my interests in this country, after having labored in the interest of the country, to-day, if I say anything that does not happen to meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, if I alluded to anything in the history or the laws of the United States, by way of illustration, how I am answered? Not by a refutation of the argument; no, but by allusion to the fact that I may have been born in the United States. Sir, I did not choose the place of my birth; I was not responsible for it; I was not consulted; I do not even remember the circumstance; and I disclaim all responsibility for the circumstance of having been born in that country. I came here in boyhood; I cast my lot in this country, and while God spares my life I intend to fight for the salvation of the country. I am fighting for its salvation to-day, against a measure calculated to rob the people of their rights. Now, I shall be pleased to have the taunt about Yankee thrown across the floor again; I will reply to it, and occupy the time a little longer.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You have a right to talk about Americans, but you must let Irishmen alone.

Mr. McCALLUM. Whom does the hon. gentleman allude to when he talks about gentlemen on this side calling Yankee? It is a term I never use; but I say that he and two or three others on the opposite side of the House draw their inspiration from the United States, and when he speaks of his loyalty, and all that, I question that very much. I have reason to question the hon. gentleman's loyalty, when he talks of the volunteers of this country—he knows what I refer to—when he comes here to flaunt his loyalty; and when we are bored here, hour after hour, by hon. gentlemen opposite wasting the time and money of the country by obstruction, I, for one, won't stand it. I am bound to tell hon. gentlemen what I know when they come and flaunt their loyalty in our faces.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman says he is bound to tell us what he knows, and he did not tell us what he knows. Now, this little episode with regard to nationality has developed this fact, that no American can have fair play from hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of this Chamber. It has developed the fact that in the case of any man of American birth, if they can injure him, by appeals to popular prejudice, they are not above doing it, from the First Minister down to the lowest man in the ranks. I resent these insinuations. I affirm that I am loyal to this country and its institutions; I am a citizen of this country, and a subject of the British Empire by birth. I derive my descent from an old English family; whose family lineage can be traced back for 800 years, and I take pride in the fact that I am of English descent. I take pride in the fact that my blood is pure Northumbrian blood; and I resent, repudiate and deny any insinuation made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of this House, that I am not loyal to the institutions of this country or that I do not wish this country well.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. When you left the Chair, Sir, after six o'clock, I was in the midst of a defense against the charge of having been born in the United States, a charge that I do not deny. I, of course, was a passive agent in the matter; I could not very well help myself. But I find, on looking at our parliamentary companion, that some other hon. gentlemen are in the same difficulty. I was under the impression that the Minister of Railways was born in that country; the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), I believe, is an American by birth; one of the members of the Senate, formerly a member of this House (Mr. Plumb), is an American by birth. I think that the party of hon gentleman opposite, some years ago, introduced an American by the name of Anson Green Phelps Dodge, naturalised him after a residence of 12 months, and elected him to a seat in this House, and when the Pacific scandal was under discussion, sent to New York for him to vote. I believe the Minister of Railways has recently been spending large sums of money to build a road in the United States, and has just returned from a trip there.

Mr. POPE. Not a dollar of public money.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe that an American named Howard, in charge of our Gatling guns, who went out to our North-West Territories to teach our men how to use them, is doing good service there, but it is likely that were he to remain in Canada thirty-six years he would be reproached by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) and the hon. member from Nova Scotia, with having been born in the United States.

Mr. McCALLUM. I found no fault with the hon. gentleman for having been born in the United States.

Mr. MILLS. Why did you allude to it.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not allude to the fact that he was born in the United States, but I said he drew all his inspirations from that country. I am glad to hear the expres-

sions of the hon. gentleman to-night, because I am always glad to have my opinion corrected, if wrong.

Mr. CHARLTON. Last Session, Sir, it will be in your recollection that when a substantial amount was being voted to the Canadian Pacific Railway my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) moved an amendment, debarring that company from spending any of our public money in the construction of railways in the United States; but that amendment was voted down, hon. gentlemen opposite in a body voting against it, and that company has spent millions of our money in the United States. I think this whole cry of Yankeeism is one that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be ashamed of. I have referred to the constitution of the United States as illustrating the principle of federal compact. There is not a man of prominence in England to-day who dees not speak in the highest terms of the American constitution and American public men. The present Premier of England pronounced it one of the most remarkable of all human productions in the shape of organic laws. If we take that broad, comprehensive view of public affairs, which every man with breadth of mind should take, we are bound to give the constitution of that great nation its due weight in a discussion of this kind. There are existing in the world to-day about 90,000,000 English-speaking people. In all their leading interests they have common interests; they belong to a common stock; they have common institutions; they all have institutions derived from that great hive of nations, England. It is unworthy of reasonable, intelligent men, in this Legislative Assembly, this House of Commons, to appeal to these narrow, contracted, bitter prejudices, that exist amongst the most ignorant of men, by raising this cry of Yankeeism, levelled at me or any other man who may attempt to illustrate an argument by pertinent illustrations, drawn from history and the polity of that country. Of all federal compacts in existence, this federal compact in Canada takes the lead in a centralising tendency, a tendency to centralise in the Dominion Government the powers and privileges that are in the possession of the component parts of Confederation. The Provinces in this Dominion have less of State right, less of all that pertains to provincial autonomy, even without this Franchise Bill, than the Provinces of any federation in existence. This Bill, with its clause with reference to revising the voters lists, is one which, should it pass, will be unique in legislation; it is a measure of a character that would not be introduced into any civilised Legislature, whether it be Anglo-Saxon, or French, or Italian, or Teutonic. There is no Legislature in christendom that would accept this Bill or seriously consider such provisions as it contains. I have pointed out to you, in the case of England and in the case of the Australian colonies, and in the case of the numerous States of the American Union, that there is not one case where any provisions analogous to those contained in this Bill, with reference to the making and revision of the voters' lists, obtain. I have pointed out that in England the officers are elected by the people who form the lists; I have pointed out that in New South Wales the officers who form the lists are appointed by the court; I have pointed out that in every State of the American Union officers elected by the people form the registration board, and that the whole machinery of registration and revision in all these countries is directly under the control of the people and of the courts. There is not an instance, except Canada, should this Bill become law, where the Government appoint officers to form the lists, and revise the lists, and to fix the lists. I have two very brief quotations to make, from a work on political ethics, by the celebrated writer, Lieber. This quotation refers to what constitutes the duty of a party in power with reference to the principles of justice. He says, on page 442;

"The moment that justice is sacrificed to party interest, the party or respective individual becomes factious: for justice being the grand object of the law, of the constitution, of the State itself, the party sets itself above these, and makes itself its own object, while a party can have any sensible meaning only in that it is formed for the public good. In denying justice the party becomes factious."

Now, if the party in power to-day has introduced a Bill which denies justice to the people of this country, that party, great as it is, and not the party represented by hon. gentlemen on this side, becomes factious. With reference to public opinion and the necessity for consulting public opinion, and the necessity for being governed and guided by public opinion, the same author says:

"Nevertheless, real public opinion is carefully and respectfully to be consulted, for the two reasons, first, that there is a very great chance that, if it be settled, and, of course, touching a subject on which there can exist any public opinion, it is upon the main correct, and if not, that there is, at any rate, much to be learned from it; secondly, that it is the greatest, mightiest of all powers, and therefore not to be slighted."

Has there been any pressure of public opinion demanding this measure, asking that this power should be wrested from the Provinces and exercised by the Dominion Government? I deny that there has been any such pressure or manifestation of public opinion, or that the Government is consulting public opinion in the course it is taking. The same author, in another work on civil liberty, lays down the principles which should govern an election, which are diametrically opposed to those which the Government are adopting:

"All elections must be superintended by election judges, or officers independent of the executive, or any organised or unorganised power in connection with the Government."

Is this the condition the Government are to observe under this Bill? No; the elections are to be superintended by officers appointed by this Government, for the purpose of saying who shall vote, and of so arranging the voters' list as to give the Government the power, if these gentlemen will obey their wishes, of influencing the elections in a greater or less extent by a manipulation of the voters' list. We, alone, of all commonwealths that exist under English law and English institutions, are capable of such violence to representative institutions as is contemplated by this Bill. Hasty legislation is always to be deprecated, and measures of this great public importance should be weighed carefully and passed with deliberation after full discussion. A constitutional change of this kind should not even be thought of by a Government without good and sufficient reasons. No such reason exists to-day or has existed since Confederation for the change proposed by this Bill. There is no necessity for it, and the Government, in making it, lay themselves open to the suspicion that they are actuated by motives other than those which should actuate a Government which desired to act for the good of the people. Such action should be deliberate and cautious. You can scarcely point to a State inhabited by people speaking the English language where constitutional changes are not made with caution and submitted to the people, as our constitution should have been submitted to the people. There is no reason why we should act precipitately in the matter, except one. There is no present necessity for this change. We have lived under the existing institutions for eighteen years, and we could live for eighteen years more under them without sacrificing any public interest. The only reason, for the present action is that, if the Bill is not put through this Session, then the manipulation of the voters' list cannot be made in time for another election. But for that reason, the change could be made as well next year, or the year following, or ten years hence, as to-day. It is one of those changes that can be made at our leisure, that can be made with caution and deliberation, and ought not be made hastily, and there is no reason for adopting any other course, except that the Government intend to take possession of the electoral machinery of this country and reap an unfair advantage from this Bill at the next general election. This is a constitutional

change, reaching far beyond mere party interest, one that will affect this Dominion, not only for the next general election, but for all the elections to come, that will affect the interests of the country just so long as this change continues to exist. It is a change reaching through this generation and to future generations, and any Government that, for the sake of a momentary advantage at the coming election, will be governed by that consideration alone, is a Government recreant to its trust to the people. We have shown in Canada, in the arrangement of our organic laws, a singular and reprehensible disregard of public opinion. Our present constitution ought to have been submitted to the people, and, if it had been, there might not have existed in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the dissatisfaction that now exists. There is a feeling in all the Provinces that the mode in which this constitution was adopted, without the judgment of the people being passed upon it, was a grave mistake. This very clause 41, under which power is taken by the Government to-day to pass this Bill, is one that ought to have been submitted to the people of Canada. We have not yet acted under that section, so that there is yet time to take the sense of the people upon it, as it ought to have been taken in regard to all the provisions of our constitution. What is the course pursued in other countries? The measure now under consideration in the House of Lords from the Australian colonies is not to be of force until it is approved by the different colonies, and no Province will come into that Confederation until it has adopted the provisions of that Act, in the same manner as the people of the Canadian Provinces ought to have adopted the British North America Act. The constitution of the United States was adopted in 1787 but was not acted upon by the States until 1789. It was referred to the different States and ratified by each State, and the time taken for ratification extended over two years. So, with regard to the constitution of the various States, wherever a constitution is framed it is submitted to the people of the State, and unless a majority of the people ratify it the constitution dies. It must have the approval of the people, the source of power. Our constitution ought to have had their approval, and this provision should have the approval of the people before it becomes the law of the land. There is abundance of time to ascertain the wishes of the people of Canada in regard to this measure. No advantage will be sacrificed by delay, except that which the Government expect to obtain by undue manipulation of the electoral machinery in the year 1887. This Bill is supported by many members on the other side of the House who will never see these halls again; not that their ridings will not return Government supporters, but that many of these men—and my hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) is probably one of them—will go back to their constituencies in bad odor, from the fact that they have supported a bad measure; and, though their constituencies may be faithful to the Government, they will return other men than those who have supported a bad and an unfair measure. The gain that many members of this House expect to reap from this measure they will not reap from it, personally; their party may reap an advantage, but many of themselves will be left at home, where they deserve to be left, as a punishment for their betrayal of the interest of their Province and of the interests of the people. Sir, I repeat that this Bill is likely to engender hostile feelings towards this Government. We have enough dissatisfaction, we have enough disloyalty to the Dominion Government in Canada already. The foundations of this Government have not been laid as broadly and as deeply as we might wish, and a measure which is calculated to foment and increase the feeling of dissatisfaction and hostility that exist in some quarters to-day is a measure that ought not to receive the sanction of this House. I claim that this is a measure which will largely increase the public expenses, at a time when we are burdened with taxes to the utmost limit of endurance, a measure that, in the case of the Province of Quebec, is likely to provoke the bitterest hostility, when the people come to realise the character of the measure in so far as it concerns that Province, and when they come to realise that the barriers that have been raised around them to protect them from the interference of the other Provinces in their domestic affairs are broken down. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite are risking the future of the Dominion in this Bill; they are risking it by doing violence to the principles on which it reposes; they are risking the future of this Dominion by passing a measure that places in their hands unjust powers, that they intend to use unjustly, for the purpose of keeping themselves in power; they are risking the future of this Dominion by involving this country in half a million dollars additional expense at a time when we are sure to have a deficit. They are endangering the future of this Dominion for selfish party purposes, for the purpose of maintaining themselves in power, because they dare not appeal to the constituency that sent them here, they dare not appeal to the constituency that has twice given them a majority, once in 1878 and once in 1882. Not daring to appeal to that constituency again, not daring to trust the electors who have twice given them a verdict of confidence, they have introduced a measure for the purpose of packing the public jury, when they appear before it to answer, as defendants, to the charges made against them by the Opposition of to-day.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would not trouble the House only for the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Charlton). He said, before six o'clock, that I had kept something back. I stated then that if I did keep something back I must always be allowed to state my convictions. I have known the hon. gentleman for a long time. He gave us a great lecture on his loyalty and on his ancestry. I have nothing to do with that. He spoke of his loyalty, but I will say to you here that if there is a disloyal man in Canada he is found in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. I ask that hon. gentleman now, when he boasts of his loyalty, if he did not write some letters to the American papers, at a certain time when there was a great crisis going on in this country, in 1866? I hold in my hand here some complimentary remarks that the hon. gentleman made on the volunteers of this country at that time, and I hope the House will bear with me while I read them, and then the hon. gentleman can deny it, if he says it is not true. It was written by Mr. John Charlton, who is now, I believe, the member for North Norfolk:

"Your correspondent happened to be in Paris, C.W., on the 19th inst. (June, 1866); heard music, saw flags, civilians, military, &c.; enquired what was going on; found that volunteer pic-nic was in progress, and concluded to stay and see the show.

"Six companies of volunteers, numbering about 300 men, in the Canadian uniform of black coats, with ridiculously short tails, and dark grey pants, excessively large in the rear, just below the waist band, were the guests in whose honor the spread was made.

"The grounds where the tables were spread, and the stand for the speakers and music erected, were in the beautiful valley of Grand River, just below the Buffalo and Lake Huron bridge. The day was all that could be desired, sunshine and a fresh, bracing breeze, contributing to the enjoyment of the crowd of hilarious and self-satisfied Cannucks.

"The proceedings were inaugurated by a battalion drill of the warriors. Your correspondent knows very little of military tactics, but is decidedly of the opinion that the six companies of volunteers aforesaid got slightly tangled several times, and had not a very clear conception of what they were trying to do. They formed hollow squares, for the purpose of repelling cavalry (one of Colonel Booker's strong points, I believe, when resisting an enemy without horses), but got their squares so solid that moving arms was next to an impossibility. After going through various evolutions, arms were stacked and the volunteers invited to the stand to hear the order, granting them permission to return to their homes, read. The reading was performed by a tall, amateur military man, rejoicing in the title of major, whose legs were long enough to enable him to keep up with the fastest member of the Queen's Own, if it ever became necessary to try, and whose coat tails were not long enough to impede his progress in the least.

"After reading the order, and what I took to be an address from the officers, complimenting Canada on her loyalty, progress and self-sacrificing devotion to British connection, and the volunteers on their soldierly qualities, patriotism, courage, virtue, fighting, height, weight, &c, the chairman introduced the Rev. Wm. Ryerson, ex-M.P.P., who made a speech by way of grace before dinner. The speech of the Rev. gentleman was a very fine specimen of buncombe and bombast, and contained not a solitary acknowledgment to the United States for faithfully performing treaty obligations, and all the duties on international comity, in suppressing the contemplated Fenian invasion. The crowd who stood open-mouthed, imbibing the sentiments of the venerable oracle, was informed that Canada had the finest volunteer force in the world, who had just gained a great victory, by repulsing and driving back the Fenian hordes, which a professedly friendly nation had permitted to attack them; that their institutions were immeasurably superior to the ultra-democracy of the United States, and that Canada was to become, through the agency of Confederation, one of the greatest powers of the earth; had demonstrated to the world and all mankind her ability to take care of all Fenian hordes, and with the assistance of Britannia,—that Goliath among the nations—to repulse and drive back, in ignominy and disgrace, if need be, that greatest nation in all creation which they had for a neighbor.

"After the speech of the Rev gentleman, the volunteers partook of the repast provided for them by the ladies of Paris, which I presume was a bountiful one, though I did not inspect the tables.

"Dinner over, speaking became the order of the day, and the clergymen of Paris, in rotation, ventilated their sentiments. The Rev. gentlemen are good on buncombe; one, however, the Rev. Mr. Robertson, did get off a few sensible ideas, which refreshingly varied the monotony of clap-trap and self-laudation. He had the hardihood to assert that it would not be improper to enquire whether Ireland did not labor under grievance and to doubt whether the tenure by which land was held and the fact that a State church was forced upon an unwilling people was just the thing.

"In all the speeches made, I did not notice a word of acknowledgement for the course taken by the United States. All the changes were wrung on the repulsion of the Fenians; the fact that they gained one victory, and left without being repulsed, was not mentioned.

"The self-glorification and elation over the glorious demonstration of power and patriotism made by Canada, certainly appeared, to an on-looker, like wasting a good deal of powder on a small amount of game; and the studious avoidance of any allusion to the United States, except in tones of insult and disparagement, by the small fry who figured as orators on the occasion, is, I presume, an indication of the tone of public men and of the press in Canada, who will now attempt to counteract annexationist tendencies by misrepresenting the United States and sowing the seeds of bitterness and hostility in the minds of the people. Perhaps they may succeed, for the masses in Canada are not remarkable for intelligence."

Mr. TROW. What connection has that with the Franchise Bill?

Mr. McCALLUM. I was very glad to hear from the hon. member to-night that he was loyal to the core. I never charged him with disloyalty, and never with Yankeeism. This charge was brought against him in his own county. He snatched the paper away and tore it into atoms, but the pieces were taken care of afterwards; and I have read it from print. If hon. gentlemen do not believe it, I have photographs here. They were sent to me. I never listened to greater nonsense than I have heard on this question before the House. We have been here three weeks and have done nothing. Obstruction has been practised by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. McCALLUM. I say yes, and I know what I am talking about. Hon. gentlemen opposite say the measure is revolutionary, yet we are not proposing to do anything more than we have power to do. All that talk is made because we will not allow Oliver Mowat and the local Grits of Ontario to say who shall elect members to this House. Although I do not perhaps approve of all that is in the Bill, yet it is an improvement on the franchise we have had in each of the Provinces. When this Bill is passed we shall have a franchise of our own. Hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the Franchise Bill passed by the Local Legislature of Ontario last Session. How did that come about? Having seen the proposed Dominion Franchise Bill the Ontario Government determined, to use a sporting phrase, to adopt that and go one better. They put the franchise a little lower, and they thought by that to catch the votes of the workingmen. But from an examination of the Bill before this House I honestly believe it will prove as liberal a measure as the Ontario Act, and even more so. But that is not what hon. gentlemen opposite want. They want to talk against time, and they have done so for three weeks. Is there any member of the Government who can tell me the cost of the time so spent to the country, and for which cost the Opposition are responsible. Can the Minister of Militia tell me that? I venture to say it will be quite an item, and I want to hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for it, because they are responsible and cannot get out of the responsibility. What is their duty? It is to criticise reasonably, to enter their protest and to vote against the Bill. That is their course, if they are sensible men; I always thought them sensible hitherto, but I question it, since their actions of the last three weeks. They have been acting, if the expression is a parliamentary one, like madmen. They think they know more than the whole people of the Dominion. They tell us that petitions are coming in. I know the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) presented a petition from Monck to-day. I sent for it. I think the much-defeated member for West Ontario should have been satisfied with his experience of the people of Monck, for they would not accept him.

Mr. MILLS. They did accept him, and he sat here.

Mr. McCALLUM. Only for a short time, and they put him out soon afterwards and sent him about his business. I looked at that petition. It has evidently been hawked about five municipalities, and it has 60 signatures, among them my opponent at the last election, a namesake, because the Reformers thought if they could not defeat me in Monck by my hon. friend from West Ontario they perhaps might do so by getting a namesake and confusing the names. I say there are 60 names on the petition; I know every name on it, and I think there is one Conservative among them, and I question very much whether that signature is not a forgery. His name is down in pencil, and it does not look like his signature. I know him very well. If he did sign, it was under a misapprehension, and I am sure he will not vote for any Grit. If this is the kind of petitions to be presented, let them go ahead. We have had such petitions presented before. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to raise the wind before this; they are trying to raise the wind now. They do not seem to understand what a ridiculous figure they are making. They are wasting the people's money and they will be held responsible for every dollar expended on the discussion of this measure. The people of the country will hold them responsible. It is, of course, a difficult matter for members on this side to keep quiet, but we did keep quiet for three weeks, and listened to the most nonsensical arguments ever addressed to any assembly in the world. I would not have risen at this time if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had not boasted so much of his loyalty, and said as much as that I wanted to accuse him of disloyalty. I did nothing of the kind; but when he flaunted in my face that I was keeping something back, I could not help replying that I had kept nothing back but what I am willing to give to the House.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has done me the honor to refer to me in rather a pointed way. The hon. member, as we all know, sits for a constituency which has been twice gerrymandered to enable him to carry it. When I first had the pleasure of meeting that hon. gentleman in that constituency he had been elected by a majority of about 300 four years before, and he beat me, a stranger, by only 5 votes. Before the next election came on he had the constituency gerrydered again to suit him, a constituency which he had carried by 300 majority, a constituency in which he lived himself. He had it gerrymandered when I ran against him the second time——

Mr. McCALLUM. The people would not have you.

Mr. EDGAR. And in spite of that gerrymander, I beat the hon. member by forty-two votes. So the hon. gentleman has beaten me in a gerrymandered constituency. But, before the last general election the hon. gentleman, in order to save himself, had to get not only his constitutency gerrymandered but had to get paid a very extravagant price for an old tug-boat on the canal. Everyone must have seen that since I presented the petition to-day the hon. gentleman has been in a state of the wildest excitement. He has been interrupting hon. gentlemen on this side every five minutes. He has never been quiet since that petition was presented, since I told him that there were Conservative names upon it. If I am correctly informed by the hon. gentleman who was a candidate against him at the last election, and who sent me those petitions—and I never knew they were being signed—he gave me the names, and the number of Conservatives on those petitions is far more than enough to turn the election against my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman says that all the disloyal men in this country are to be found on this side of the House.

Mr. McCALLUM. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. Let me mention one test to the hon. gentleman. I tell him that one of the finest of the regiments that have gone to the front is the Queen's Own, of Toronto, and I can tell him, from my own knowledge of the rank and file of that splendid regiment, that the majority of them are Reformers. I tell him also that of the nineteen officers who are at the front twelve are strong Reformers. There is a test which the hon. gentleman can take, and he can take any test he likes, as to the loyalty of the Reform party to the Dominion of Canada. But he is mistaken if he thinks because we are to be loyal to the Dominion we are to be loyal both to the sovereign, his ox and his ass; because we are loyal to the sovereign we are not to be loyal to the dictates of anybody of men who happen to advise the sovereign for the time being, and if they introduce measures destructive to the constitution, or destructive of the rights and liberties of the people, we would be recreant to our duty if we did not point that out, and if we did not point out, as we do, to the leader of this Government, that this Bill, if it passed, would be the greatest strain on the Constitution to which it has ever been subjected. Individually, I will not be prevented from saying that from my place in the House, by any $10 a night, peripatetic, professonal trramp in this House. I was lectured the other day by the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster) as to my loyalty to Confederation, and I would like to say this: that eighteen years ago, at least, I was working in the ranks of my party in Ontario, to bring about Confederation, and that I have heartily and earnestly tried to support it ever since. I would like to know where the hon. member for King's was then?

Mr. FOSTER. How long ago?

Mr. EDGAR. Until 1882 the hon. gentleman never appeared on the political horizon—he was not known; and since that time how has he become known? How has his loyalty to his party and his country been displayed? Why, Sir, we all know that he crawled into Parliament over the prostrate form of an honest, staunch Conservative, that he was elected on the Independent cry by Reform votes, and that he came here to support no party and to advocate the great cause of temperance. Well, Sir, we all know what a beautiful mess he has made of the cause of temperance in the McCarthy Act, and how magnificently he has shown his independence since he came into this House, for the leader of the Government has not a more servile—no, I shall not say servile, Mr. Chairman, since you shake your head—I will say more devoted or loud-mouthed supporter than the hon. member for King's; and I am sure the country will feel that he has earned his reward, if he calmly sinks into the position of inspector of insurance.

Mr. BEATY. There is no doubt of the importance of the measure which is before the committee, and if there is any objection of an outside character to be made to it it is that the Government have not introduced and pressed it to a conclusion long before this, in former Sessions of this Parliament.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to make a personal explanation, and perhaps it will come in more appropriately now than after the hon. gentleman has made his remarks. I wish to refer, Sir, to the election dodger which has come out at the call of the last trump—which has been resurrected and brought forth with great pomp and circumstance by the hon. member for Monck. In 1872 I had connection with politics for the first time. In 1872 I contested North Norfolk and defeated the then member, Mr. Aquila Walsh. The article which the hon. gentleman has read to-night was read on that occasion at the hustings. It was brought out by a gentleman living in Norfolk county, and it was expected that it would produce a great sensation and result in my defeat. It is true, I tore up the article. When the gentleman who read it came down from the hustings and passed me, I asked him if that was my letter. He said it was. I said as the thing came out I would tear it, and I tore it in two places. The fragments were appropriated, and I believe the hon. gentleman has them, and perhaps he had better exhibit them to you.

Mr. McCALLUM. Do you deny it?

Mr. CHARLTON. It consisted of an article written in pencil and without date or signature. I requested the man who read it to prove it was my letter, and he failed. That gentleman was shown a letter by one of my friends with the signature turned in, and he was asked if he knew the writing, if he could identify it as Mr. Charlton's handwriting, and he said: "No, he could not." He turned up the signature and asked what he thought of his ability to identify my handwriting. The article the hon. gentleman has read is written in pencil, without date or signature, if it is the one I saw. He is welcome to all the capital he can make by producing that old election canard, which produced no effect then, which flew back like a boomerang on those who attempted to use the slander against me, and it will produce no effect to-day. If the hon. gentleman will put it in your hands, Mr. Chairman, I will leave it to your judgment to say whether it is in any sense a letter, and any expert in handwriting can identify it, if he chooses, as my handwriting. I think it is beneath the character of the hon. gentleman, with whom I have had many intimate business relations for many years, to introduce this old slander, which has been lying buried for thirteen years, for the purpose of trying to injure me in this House.

Mr. McCALLUM. I rise to a personal explanation. I ask the hon. gentleman to deny it, but he did not say that he did not write it. I do not say it is any gentleman's letter, but it is for him to say that it is not his. I hold in my hand a certificate which I will read:

"We, the undersigned, do hereby certify, that having attended a meeting attended by Mr. Charlton, last evening, at the school house, in the German settlement, in the township of Middleton, we heard him make the acknowledgment of having written the astonishing manuscript which was read by Col. Tisdale on the hustings, on Saturday last, ridiculing the volunteers assembled in Paris in 1866, on their way home from resisting the Fenian raid, and imputing ignorance to the masses of the people generally, in Canada.

"(Signed) H. H. MARTER,
" R. STODDART.

" JAMES WHITESIDE,
" ROGER CRYSLER, } *Magistrates.*"

That is my authority. Of course, if the hon. gentleman will deny that, it is all right.

Mr. CHARLTON. On the day following the publication of that statement it was followed by an affidavit of forty-

five men, who attended the meeting, certifying that it was a lie.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has not denied it. He cannot deny it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask hon. gentlemen to return to the subject of discussion.

Mr. BEATY I was about to say that if the Government should be charged with anything in connection with this matter, it should be that they have neglected so long to bring in this measure and press it into law. Seventeen years have elapsed since Confederation was established, and this, the last measure necessary to complete Confederation, so to speak, has not yet been enacted. There is no doubt whatever that it is a primary idea of constitutional liberty in free countries that Parliament should regulate the qualifications of those who elect their representatives; and in this country, under our system, the superior power should regulate that matter, and not the inferior power. The Confederation Act we have received from the Imperial Parliament, with the consent, of course, of the Provinces and of the Dominion; and that Act distinctly provides—it is not denied, but it has been admitted through this debate by both sides—that this Parliament has the constitutional right to regulate the franchise and to fix the qualifications of voters. Now, for the last two or three weeks we have heard all kinds of subjects discussed in connection with this matter. Not since I have been in Parliament have I heard so many subjects discussed in reference to one. This Bill has been described as a Bill to strangle the Liberal party, as a Bill to choke them off, as a Bill to keep the Tory party in power, as a Bill to deprive the Provinces of the rights they possess, as a Bill to deprive the electors of their rights. We have had indictment after indictment and count after count made against this Bill, in the strongest language that it was possible to use without exceeding parliamentary propriety, and in some instances, I think, exceeding it very largely. I have noted down, occasionally as I heard them, a few of the epithets used by hon. gentlemen opposite to characterise this Bill, which I will read. It has been described as an outrageous Bill, an infamous Bill, a fraud, rascally, iniquitous, cowardly, monstrous, unfair, unjust, dishonest, disgraceful. There were a great many more, but these are all I recollect. Now, I think this is not the way to discuss questions of so much importance as hon. gentlemen, in their inflamed speeches, would have us believe. A question of this importance to the country should be discussed in a calmer, more reasonable manner, and with a view to enlighten both the House and the country in reference to it, and during the few moments I purpose speaking on this resolution concerning Ontario I wish to bring back the discussion to the real question, so far as I can. For the purpose of doing that, I will, with the permission of the committee, read just two sections from the Confederation Act, and from the Act of 1874, relating to elections, which is now in force. The 41st section of the Confederation Act says:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several Provinces. The voters, at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating seats of members, and the execution of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces."

Then, a large part of that was repealed by the Act of 1873, which was again repealed by the Act of 1874, the 133rd section of which makes this provision:

"The Act passed by the Parliament of Canada in the thirty-sixth year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled: 'An Act to make temporary provision for the election of Members to serve in the House of Commons,' is hereby repealed, except only as to the elections held, rights acquired or liabilities incurred before the coming into force of this Act; and no enactment or provision contained in any Act of the Legislature of the late Province of Canada, or any of the Provinces now composing the Dominion of Canada, respecting the elections of members of the elective House of the Legislature of any such Province, shall apply to any election of a member or members of the House of Commons, held after the passing of this Act, except only such enactment and provisions as may be in force in such Province at the time of such last mentioned election, relating to the qualification of electors and the formation of voters' lists, and which will apply, for like purposes, to the election of members of the House of Commons, as provided in this Act."

Now, the point to which I wish to call attention is this: The Confederation Act gives authority to this Parliament to be elected, until this Parliament should otherwise order, on the basis of the qualifications existing in the different Provinces. That provision was largely repealed in 1873, but the Act of 1873 having been itself repealed, I will not now do more than allude to it; but the Act of 1874, which was passed during the administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), took charge of all the items which belonged to the Provinces under the Act of Confederation—all those items constituting the parliamentary system—except the two items, the qualification of voters and the formation of the voters' lists. Now, we have heard the claim made here, repeated and reiterated during the last two or three weeks, that the rights of the Provinces were infringed upon by our legislating on this question. If the rights of the Provinces are infringed upon by this Franchise Bill, what was the kind of legislation enacted in the Act of 1874? Did not that interfere with the rights of the Provinces in the same manner and to the same degree as this proposed legislation will? Out of the fourteen items contained in that Confederation Act, in reference to the parliamentary system and elections, every one was taken away by the Act of 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite held the reins of power, except two, the qualifications of voters and the making of voters' lists. Hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, did not recognise the rights of the Provinces in reference to this matter. They said this Parliament has the power, this Parliament exercises the power, and if it exercised it in reference to twelve items out of fourteen, why should it not exercise it in reference to the other two? The contention, therefore, that any of the rights of the Provinces are taken away by this Bill is simply a contention that has no base to rest on, and that has been ignored by the action of the Opposition themselves. It ought to be emphasised, for the benefit of those who may think that, because of the constant assertion of the fact that the Provinces have rights in reference to this question, that the Provinces have no rights whatever in respect to it. If this Parliament, and if the English Parliament, with the consent of this Parliament, have tolerated provincial legislation in this matter for convenience sake, for the sake of expediting the operation of Confederation, for the sake of temporary advantages, that is no evidence for deducing the conclusion that the Provinces have rights over which this Parliament has no power. If this question of legislative or provincial rights has any force whatever, it is simply from the view of expediency. Shall that expediency prevail for a longer period than it has already prevailed? That is the only question. I submit it should not; I submit that it has prevailed too long already, and I submit that this Parliament should have taken possession of this, as they did of the dozen other items of machinery, and dispose of it, as they did those, long since. Why should there be any cry for provincial rights in this connection? If I were to make any demand in this connection in Parliament it would be on behalf of the municipalities. I should go down to the bottom; if any inferior power whatever to Parliament has the right to fix the qualifica-

tions of voters for members of this House I should go to the municipalities and ask them to settle for themselves the qualifications of those who should elect members to this House. The argument that it should be given to them is just as forcible, just as expedient and just as valid as the argument that the Provinces should have it. There is one great fact which has been already mentioned, and which ought to be urged strongly, that the variety of qualifications which exist in the different Provinces is a strong reason why the present system should not be continued. We have in Prince Edward Island, and practically in British Columbia, what is called manhood suffrage; we have in the other Provinces largely a property qualification, in some greater, in some less, but all based on the property idea. If this House is to adopt a provincial franchise the question would naturally arise which of these provincial franchises should be adopted. One hon. gentleman would urge the adoption of manhood suffrage, another manhood taxation suffrage, another residence, age, and intelligence, as the basis of the suffrage, and so on; others insisting that there should be a large property qualification, others that it should not be so large, but that it should simply recognise the principle of property, making that the basis of qualification, simply giving the guarantee to the country that the man who votes has at least some interest in the country. A variety of franchises is therefore a reason why this legislation should be uniform, but nobody pretends it should be made uniform in a mathematical sense. It is simply a practical uniformity, a uniformity of classes; that is to say, the one class in Ontario and the same class in Prince Edward Island shall have the vote on the same qualification. These classes should be made uniform all over the Dominion. For the purpose of this question, we should not talk about the Provinces as such. We have nothing to do with the Provinces here in this connection, and they have nothing to do with us. In the past we have simply adopted the provincial franchises existing in the several Provinces for temporary purposes, until this Parliament, as the Confederation Act expresses it, "directed otherwise." This direction otherwise should have come sooner, but it is better late than never. We had better now bring into operation all the measures that the Confederation Act declared this Parliament should legislate upon for the purpose of harmonising the divided Provinces and bringing them all into one working whole. It has been urged very strongly, from the view of the Province of Ontario, that the Conservative party in the Local House, under the leadership of Mr. Meredith, voted for manhood suffrage in Ontario, and that therefore the Conservative party in this House have no right to adopt another line of qualification. There is no argument whatever in that. If I were in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario I might say that for the purpose of that House manhood suffrage was the proper franchise to adopt, though I am not disposed to say so. I believe that a property qualification, as regards our Parliament, or the Legislatures of the Provinces, or the municipalities, is of the first importance; it has the effect of ballasting men, of giving firmness and decision to their judgment, of making them consider what they propose to do, as what they decide will affect their property as well as the property of others. It does not matter how much a man owns. One man may own only $1,000 worth and another $100,000 worth, and yet to the one of $1,000 worth may be of greater importance than is the $100,000 worth to the other. The other might lose $50,000 of his $100,000 and yet be a comparatively wealthy man, but the one man losing his $1,000 would lose all he has. Therefore, the basis being a property qualification, that has an influence upon the mind of the voter, and gives him the motive to vote for his own best interests as a property man, and consequently for the best interests of the country at large. The opposition to this measure should not be based, as it appears to be, on the provincial idea. It is somewhat inexplicable to me that gentlemen elected to this House should have the provincial idea so much on the brain. I have as strong a conviction as any gentleman in the Opposition that we should maintain, not only the rights of this Parliament, but the rights of the Provincial Legislatures, of the municipalities, and of the individual electors; but as a member of this House, representing a constituency for the Dominion and not for a Province, I am not a provincial, I am not a man devoted to parish politics or municipal affairs, or one looking solely to individual rights, except as they affect the Dominion at large; and, when you look at these things in the general interest, you must take in the individual, the municipality and the Province. It is difficult to reason with hon. gentlemen who seem to be possessed of the provincial idea so largely. I do not think we have heard one hon. gentleman speak on the other side during the whole of this three weeks' debate, who has not constantly iterated and reiterated the idea that we are infringing upon provincial rights. We should not look upon it in that light. We have nothing to do with the Provinces as such, except to leave them alone. We simply have to maintain the rights of this Parliament, of this Dominion, which are given to us by the constitution of the country, and to let the provincial and municipal rights alone. The Opposition idea is in direct contravention of the spirit which is shown in the enthusiasm of our volunteers in the North-West. Do they go to fight for a Province or for a municipality? No; they go to fight for the one flag of the whole country, as nationals and not as provincials, and that is the idea which we ought to cultivate, and this little contest and conflict in the North-West, the occurrence of which and the bloodshed which has followed it, I regret, will impress upon the young men of this country, more than all the arguments that can be used in this House, that this country is one, that it is truly confederated, that it has an authority and a nationality and a power here in this centre which must be respected and maintained. The Opposition idea presented to us in the war of words of the last few weeks is not the spirit which prompted the fathers of Confederation, which made the leaders of the Government of that day and the leaders of the Opposition bury the tomahawk and come together to build up a nationality under this Confederation. If they had brought to the consideration of those matters simply the provincial idea or the municipal or parish idea, would there have been a Confederation on this continent such as that of which we are so proud? It was because they rose above this provincialism, because they were men of national patriotism, that they so united. They possessed a large idea and a broader view, and went for building up a nationality from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which to-day has been cemented in the blood of brave men from almost all the Provinces. This is the idea which we should entertain in this House. We should not let it go forth that we are a combination of provincials. On the other hand, we should be a combination of national men, desiring to promote a national patriotism, not confined to one Province or parish, but extending the whole country over. This national idea which we ought to express in this Franchise Bill has been expressed in our great railway, which was prompted by the wisest patriotism and the broadest views in relation to the prosperity and magnificence of Canada. I do not think there is any opening country, with the history we have, which has the same advantages to present to the world. Who would have thought, eighteen years ago, that to-day we should be almost at the completion of a national highway, leading our people from the eastern to the western ends of the Dominion, for the purpose of protecting the one flag which covers this country. That national highway was prompted by the idea that this people should not be only confederated in the statute or consolidated by legislation, but should be consolidated and

confederated in community of feeling and interest and in harmony of spirit, the same design which prompted those who first developed the idea of our Confederation. I suppose there is not a gentleman in this House who, five years ago, would have prophesied that, in four or five months from the present time, we could go from the Atlantic to the Pacific on a railway, without changing cars, eating, drinking and sleeping the whole way, if we choose.

Mr. FOSTER. Not drinking.

Mr. BEATY. Water. The hon. gentleman can put a stick in it if he likes. This national idea as against the provincial has been manifested in the National Policy, which was designed to accomplish the same end. All these views which have manifested themselves in the legislation of this Parliament have negatived the provincial idea, have shown that we are getting out of that. It was one of the aims of Confederation to lift us above provincialism and place us on the vantage ground of nationality, and I think it has accomplished that result. One other argument which has been pressed upon us has been that we should get down to the people. What does that mean? According to the Opposition argument, it means simply that we should let the people do what they have hitherto done by courts of revision, appeals to the county judge, and other processes, to settle the voters' lists. But that does not go down to the people in reality, so long as you have Provincial Legislatures to fix the qualifications of the voters; we say that the qualification, as it is fixed by the different Provinces, does not go down to the people in the true sense. If we are to go out of this Parliament at all to fix the qualification of the voters, we should go down to the people and get them, in their municipal councils, to establish the qualification. If I were opposed to this House exercising the legitimate power which the Confederation Act has given to it, the authority with which it has been clothed to fix the qualification of voters to elect members of this House, I should go to the municipalities. What right have the Provinces to touch the matter at all? They have no right; they are not recognised in the matter, except as a temporary expedient; and if we go to the people to regulate the matter, we should go to the municipalities and allow the municipal councils to fix the qualification of voters. And yet we do not find hon. gentlemen opposite asking that this should be done. They simply say: Let the Provinces settle the matter. Now, suppose the Province of Ontario should adopt this Bill next Session; suppose it should change its mind, as it has done so often, and say: We will adopt this Bill, which was submitted to the Parliament of Canada in 1885; would hon. gentlemen opposite say then that we should not adopt it? Would they say it was infamous, outrageous, scandalous, and all those other hard words, if adopted by Mr. Mowat, the Little Premier—always vigilant, always watchful for the interests of his Province, in the sense of provincial rights; fighting for it, belligerent for it, at every opportunity that present itself—more so than, I think, he ought to be; yet he is vigilant and active for the purpose of maintaining what he claims to be provincial rights. Now, if he should adopt this Bill, would hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not adopt it? No, not one of them, I should judge, from the manner in which they act in this House, would, for a moment, say that the Little Premier should not adopt that Bill. It would then be a good Bill; it would then be a righteous Bill; it would be going down to the people; it would be the people's Bill; and therefore it should be adopted by this House. And yet we have no guarantee, observe, in this House, the country has no guarantee, that it shall not be adopted by the Ontario Legislature, or by the Quebec Legislature, or by the Legislature of any other Province. Members will be elected to this House upon this very basis. Now, this Bill is designed, as I understand, to give a people's voters' list, and not a party voters' list. Hon. gentlemen opposite make a strong point of this. They say the Bill is going to strangle the Liberal party, that it is going to destroy the Liberal party. Well, if the Liberal party can be strangled and destroyed by such a Bill it must be a very weak party; it is not as strong as I am accustomed to regard it. I think the Liberal party has a strength, as any party may have, if it adopts a rational and reasonable policy; but if the Liberal party continues the tardy tactics that we have seen in this House for the last week, the country will become disgusted, as I know it has become disgusted already. Let me illustrate. When I went out of this House to-day, and was going down the street, a laboring man, apparently, came up to me. I had no notion who he was, and I suppose he had no notion who I was. He said to me: "How ridiculous that Opposition is making itself." "Why," I said, "that is a very mild word to use in reference to the matter. You have not been attending upon Parliament or you would use stronger language." Now, that illustrates the feeling that exists all over the country, wherever you go. Of course, there are exceptions among these little coteries of the Opposition, where these printed petitions are signed. Hon. members opposite talk about the excitement. Where is the excitement? Is there any excitement in this country? All the excitement there is is in this House, where we have heard these inflammatory speeches, this strong language that has been uttered with all the vehemence possible by hon. gentlemen opposite. But where is the excitement outside? Is there excitement in the streets of this city? This is a city of some intelligence; the people here know something of their rights, and are able to judge of these matters. But I have not seen any excitement. Even the galleries have not been excited very much.

Mr. MULOCK. They are not excited now.

Mr. BEATY. I propose to reason with the people, not to declaim, not to raise disloyal cries. The galleries have been cleared from night to night by the dull eloquence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and so it goes on. We have no excitement on the streets of this city, there are no bayonets fixed, no one proposes to shed blood in reference to this matter; and so it is all over the country. Hon. gentlemen have worked themselves into a sort of frenzy in reference to this matter, and they believe that because their imaginations are heated the people of this country are also excited. On the contrary, they are taking the matter very coolly. Now, I submit that this Franchise Bill is designed to secure a people's voters' list, as against the idea of a party voters' list; and all possible precautions will be taken to accomplish that end. There is no reason in the world why it should be otherwise. Now, what is the great point of this Bill as a people's Bill. It enlarges the Franchise. "O no," say hon. gentlemen, "it does not." Now let us consider the matter. If we take the 120,000 people in Prince Edward Island, and the 30,000 white people in British Columbia—in all 150,000 people—where manhood suffrage prevails, out of the 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 in the Dominion, does this Bill not enlarge the franchise on the whole? Does it not enlarge the franchise in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba? Have we not heard hon. members from each of these Provinces distinctly affirming, one after another, that this Bill would widen the basis of the franchise in their respective Provinces? Now, if that is so, is this not a people's Bill? It does not enlarge the franchise merely for the Conservative electors, but it enlarges it as well for the Liberal electors. There can be no distinction in this respect. It cannot be made a party machine, cannot be made a party instrument, for the purpose of giving votes to Tories and taking away votes from Liberals. That is impossible, in the nature of things, and will be impossible under the operation of this Bill. Hon. gentlemen say that we get the true work in courts

of revision—sometimes it may be absolutely controlled by Liberal members, and sometimes by Tory members—Grit members on the one hand, and Tory members on the other. The municipalities are controlled sometimes by Tories and sometimes by Grits. There is no use in saying they do not do their best. I know they do. In all the counties in which I have been interested, and in the city where I have a substantial interest, I know how the machinery works, and that both sides try to do their best to make their votes the more numerous. Let them do so. So they can and will do under this Bill. But the machinery provided by this Bill will be adapted to give the votes to as large a number of persons as the Bill itself will authorise and qualify. The point to determine, then, is as to the qualification, and that brings us back to clause 3. We do not need to go and rake up the constitutions of all the nations of the world and bring them here; but we require to look at the qualification mentioned in the clause of the Bill. This Bill will place classes in each Province on the same footing as those in other Provinces. That is equality, uniformity, unification. I have been told that I was a legislative unionist. So I was; but I am now a confederationist. I propose to carry out the constitution. I do not propose to fight for the Provinces against the Dominion, or for the Dominion against the Provinces; but to give the Confederation, as a whole, its rights and the Provinces their rights. At the present time, if a man leaves Prince Edward Island and removes to Ontario he may feel wronged by the fact that while he was a resident of the island he could vote for a member of Parliament, whereas in Ontario he would have no vote. Under this Bill a man who has a vote in one Province may, on removing to another Province, have a vote in that Province. That secures uniformity and tends to nationalise the people everywhere; and it promotes the sentiment of equal rights to all. This Bill may produce discontent if it should turn out that it disfranchised people in Prince Edward Island who now have votes. I do not believe that a single man who has a vote to-day will be deprived of his vote by this Bill, if it should pass in its present form, when the elections of 1887 come round. The action of Parliament should be in the direction of teaching —and all legislation has power to teach the masses—that they are represented individually in this Parliament, not provincially. What Province has sent us here? Not one.

Mr. MILLS. The constitution says so.

Mr. BEATY. It says that each Province shall send a certain number of representatives. That is all; but they come here representing constituencies, representing the people of constituencies, and the idea should be encouraged that the people are represented in this Parliament as individual voters, not because they belong to a Province. The idea should be emphasised and impressed that the people are represented in this Parliament. That is the view I take in regard to my own position. I do not represent Ontario. What right have I to say I represent Ontario? Ontario has not sent me here, or sent any hon. members.

Mr. MILLS. It has sent ninety-two members.

Mr. BEATY. It has not sent the member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. BEATY. Not as a Province. The individual constituencies, the individual voters, have sent members. I represent the constituency of West Toronto, and I think I can say, and I do say it sometimes to my constituents, that I represent one of the most, if not the most intelligent, constituency in Canada.

Mr. LANDRY. We all say that.

Mr. BEATY. If the hon. gentleman is to be taken as a sample of the intelligence of his constituency, I admit it. We have heard of petitions coming up from different parts of the country in regard to this Bill. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite this question: Have complaints come up from any of the Provinces? If provincial rights have been threatened and endangered by reason of this Bill, which was introduced three years ago, where are the protests from the Legislatures of the Provinces, which have met three times since the Bill was introduced, protesting against the invasion of the rights of the Provinces? It is for the Provinces to say something in regard to this matter. Where is the Government or the Executive Council of a Province that has said anything in regard to this matter? Not even, since hon. gentlemen opposite have aroused this excitement, and inflamed the country by vehement addresses, has one Executive Council, which could have met in an hour or two, protested against this Bill as an infringement of provincial rights. How can it, then, be claimed that the Provinces are complaining that provincial rights have been destroyed. Where is the claim from any of the seven Provinces comprising the Confederation that their rights have been invaded and taken away? Hon. gentlemen must answer this question. They must be obliged to say that no Executive Council, no Legislative Assembly of any Province, during the three years which this Bill has been before the House, have protested that their rights were going to be infringed upon and endangered by the action of this Government and a majority of this Parliament. Dominion representation should be based on Dominion legislation. It cannot be denied legally or constitutionally. This Bill proposes to carry out that idea. It takes power to the Dominion Parliament to establish a central authority and give to this Parliament a Dominion representation. That is the true idea. We are sometimes charged on this side as Conservatives or Tories—as they are pleased to call us—although I do not think I am a Tory, in the old sense of the idea.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh yes, you are.

Mr. BEATY. I think I am a conservative Liberal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BEATY. I think I am just as conservative a Liberal as the hon. member for Bothwell, though I do not think I am as revolutionary a Liberal as he is.

Mr. MILLS. You are supporting a revolutionary measure.

Mr. BEATY. I go back to the Confederation Act, and I hold that anything which Parliament orders strictly within the line of that constitution is not revolutionary. The Conservatives do not fear the people; they were always willing to go to the people—always willing to let the people be heard. If there is any idea strong in the minds of our party it is that we do not fear the people, because our motto is to do justice to all and to maintain all the rights of the people. That has been demonstrated since Confederation by the length of time the Conservative party have been in power. The people have not been blind. We have no idea of talking to the people as if they were dull and stupid, as if they did not understand their own interests, as if they had to be looked after at every stage of our legislation, in a paternal fashion. That is not my idea; I am one of the people myself, and I believe the people are as independent as I am, that they have as strong rights as I possess, that they understand those rights, that they will exercise them, and that if the people's rights are endangered or destroyed the people will turn on those who endangered or destroyed them.

Mr. MULOCK. No doubt about that.

Mr. BEATY. But they don't do it. It was said in 1878 that the people's interests and rights were being destroyed and endangered, but the people returned by a large majority the party who did not fear them. In 1882 they returned

them again, notwithstanding the loud cries about the tariff, the national railway, and the Administration——

An hon. MEMBER. And the gerrymander.

Mr. BEATY. And the gerrymander, and all the rest of it. We believe in this great national work. We believe in building up a nation on this continent, on this territory, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as fertile a territory as is open to the world to-day; we believe that we should give those constitutional rights and liberties in the highest degree, which no people enjoy equally with us to-day. That is the idea. The people see that the Conservative party and Government are with the instincts of the people, that they are in sympathy with them, that they want to carry out the ideas of the people, that they want to lay the foundations of this nation broad and wide, and the people know that the men who will do that are those who belong to the Conservative party. Now, I refer to the idea that this resolution does not affect the Provinces as such. In 1874 the Bill of the hon. gentleman for East York took away, out of the fourteen items of the machinery which constituted electoral representation to this Parliament—they took away twelve, leaving only two. Yet the Opposition of that time did not raise a howl, such as we hear now, as to the infamy that was perpretated, or as to taking away or destroying the liberties of the people, or that the Provinces would ultimately secede from the Confederation. They took all but two items out of those which were given to the Provinces for the time being as a temporary expedient—taking them away in the effort to build up a national edifice, which the Opposition began, and which, I believe, was the only work of a national character which they ever attempted. Now there is one thing in connection with this question which is very strong and conclusive against this idea of provincialism, and that is that the right and power to legislate in this matter is in the Dominion Parliament. That has not been denied—it is admitted; and that being the case, it is the duty, the obligation imposed on the Dominion Parliament, to legislate on the subject. While it may be said that this party has neglected its duty, inasmuch as it did not so legislate when it was in power so long, it is better to do it now than neglect it altogether—better late than never; so that the charge of neglect of duty is the only one which can be hurled against them in this connection. The obligation rests with this Parliament, and not with the Provincial Legislatures any more than with the municipalities, or any power inferior to this Parliament. That is an idea which, I think, will commend itself to the intelligent masses of this country: that while this Parliament has neglected its duty on both sides, and when both parties were in power, it now remains for them to do what should have been done long ago, instead of standing up in a strong, concerted phalanx against this measure, and saying: So far as we can, we will present physical resistance to it from beginning to end, and prevent it being carried into law and administered in any shape or form. Now, the bugbear or hobgoblin of this whole measure is the revising barrister, as presented by hon. gentlemen opposite; and when I have heard this feature of the Bill presented in the style in which it has been presented, even by gentlemen of the profession, from the Opposition benches, I have been simply astonished at their conception of their own profession. When I hear the member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) whom I have always believed and am willing to regard as a very respectable, able and eloquent representative of the profession, talking in the manner he has done, with other gentlemen on that side, with reference to members of his own profession—stating that they are not to be tolerated in connection with this simple matter, that they are liable to sell themselves, liable to become corrupted, liable to commit dishonest acts, liable to perjure themselves—that they are not only liable, but will do it, and that they cannot help doing it—that because they receive the appointment, it may be from this side of the House, they will destroy their reputation, and repudiate the principles of honor that characterise every respectable practitioner, I am astonished; for I think the people will admit that there is not a profession to be so trusted in money matters as the legal profession. If the people at large trust them with their money and their property, do you suppose they will not trust them with their rights in this matter? I think they will; I think there are more outside of the profession who will trust them, if there are any within the profession who, I was going to say from their own feelings and instincts, are not able to trust the members of that profession which is so noble and just, and which does so much for the country at large, not only in the courts but in the Legislatures and in this Parliament. I did feel, I must say, some indignation that hon. gentlemen opposite should characterise the profession as utterly incapable, dishonest and corrupt, in a matter of this kind, and that members of the professon themselves were casting this stigma upon it. Now, if an hon. gentleman from the Opposition, or any one outside of this House, should suspect any person who should be appointed to this office next year or the year after, and should say that such a man has betrayed his trust and become corrupt, that is a case for inquiry; but to recklessly slander a whole profession in connection with this matter is certainly not the way to commend the common sense arguments which they wish us to believe they have used, to people who are accustomed to take common sense views of things. Now, the idea is presented, in a sort of argumentative way, that the courts of revision are honest. I do not deny it; I think they are practically honest, though there are occasionally those whose zeal disarms their honesty, and who are notable to carry out those principles which they themselves think right. But to say that the members of the legal profession, who are to be appointed to this position to exercise judicial functions, are any more to be charged with corruption and dishonesty because they are the appointees of the Government than are the judges of the land, the Superior Court judges, who to-day have the trial of controverted elections, is simply to distinguish things that do not differ, and to try to find an argument when no argument is to be found. Gentlemen of the Opposition are prone in the press sometimes, and sometimes out of it, to charge judges who carry on election trials, some of them, with partiality and even with dishonesty; and if they charge those hon. gentlemen who occupy those elevated positions in the country, from their capacity and their legal education, and not at the whim or caprice of any Government or party, and who are there for life, during good behavior, having a fixed salary—if they charge them with dishonesty, will they not charge the lesser lights of the profession, who may be appointed to do this work throughout the country? And yet the one might be done just as well as the other. There is no reason for charging any gentleman who might be appointed to this position with dishonesty; if he does a dishonest act he will be found out, and receive punishment from this side of the House as well as from that side, as such a man would deserve. Now, if the judges are appointed from the legal profession to try controverted elections, to decide who should be members of this House, why cannot members of the legal profession decide who shall be voters?

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman oppose the trial of controverted elections by the judges?

Mr. BEATY. No.

Mr. MILLS. Well, will he tell us where the difference is, between this Legislature authorising the provincial courts

to try controverted elections and this Legislature authorising the adoption of the provincial lists as the basis of our electoral franchise?

Mr. BEATY. I will tell the hon. gentleman the difference. The judges are not provincial judges; they are appointed by the Dominion Government and paid by it——

Mr. MILLS. They are provincial judges.

Mr. BEATY—and that is all that is proposed by this Bill—to appoint judges where they exist in the different counties, and where they do not exist to appoint members of the legal profession, or *quasi* judges, if you please, to perform judicial functions. Now, I say this system is the system of all systems which can be adopted in this country to procure safety to the people, to maintain their rights and to guarantee that they shall not be infringed upon by any local coterie whatever; but that a man in open court, with counsel on both sides, with the public before him, with public opinion behind him, will do his duty, animated by that principle of equity, justice and conscience, which has ever animated the judiciary of this country, whether high or low, in whatever position they may occupy. I say that this system of appointing judges and leading members of the profession, revising barristers, for the purpose of making voters' lists, is the very thing that will make these lists the people's voters' lists and that will protect the people in their rights. I am quite willing to trust this duty in the hand of any hon. gentleman opposite who has been a member of the legal profession for five years, confident that he will do justice, confident that he will act impartially and righteously in the matter.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman, if possible, state any other constitutionally governed country where this system that he approves of is in force?

Mr. BEATY. I think it is practised in England. Who are the revising officers selected from in England? Are they not selected from the legal profession?

Mr. MILLS. They are selected by the judges. But who appoints ours?

Mr. BEATY. No matter who appoints them, who appoints the judges? Are they not appointed from the party, because of their party proclivities, because of their party services and party distinction? Certainly they are. Does any man mean to say that because a gentleman, as Solicitor General or Attorney General, has rendered great services, he cannot be entrusted with the administration of matters pertaining to property and civil rights. I simply say that this is the purest, the safest, the most competent tribunal, that could possibly be selected by any country for the purpose of accomplishing this duty. We have heard a great deal said about the terrible expense that this is going to inflict upon the country. It is characteristic of men who can see nothing in favor of one party but everything in favor of another. Hon. gentlemen opposite remind me of that description, that a greater man than I used, in reference to a greater man than any of them, who, he said, was a "sophistical rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity." Hon. gentlemen opposite are inebriated by hearing one another talk; their imaginations become heated; they do not take things coolly, and see them as they are, and hence they go to work and say: Oh, this expense will ruin the country, this will cost half a million dollars a year. I do not know that any of them went below half a million, but one went to $784,000. What are the facts? Has any Government or Administration ever been carried on without expense? Should a Government, on the ground of expense, not do its duty? Would the ground of expense be any reason for not sending volunteers from the east to suppress the rebellion in the west? Is any consideration to be given to expense when the rights and liberties of the people are in question? Yet hon. gentlemen opposite, with their petty parish politics, see everything through the light of expense. With their partisan patriotism, they talk of this country as if a few dollars would settle the question one way or the other. That is not the view to take of the matter; we view it in a broader light. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) asked how much this franchise debate was going to cost the country. From the manner in which the Opposition are carrying on this debate, I would say that it is costing the country more than the revising barristers will cost the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the items.

Mr. BEATY. I probably will. I will say the hon. gentleman has probably cost the country more than he is worth, anyhow. I do not object to discuss——

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the items—what the increased expense will be.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will get them when the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we will get them before this Bill passes.

Mr. McMULLEN. When hon. gentlemen make statements of that kind, they should give us the items.

Mr. BEATY. Hon. gentlemen opposite remind me of an elector in Ontario, at the last elections, who, when he had gone home very late, was asked by his wife to explain. "Oh!" said he, "I have been singing Ontario, Ontario." "I know," she replied "where you have been; you have been on a tear-io." Hon. gentlemen opposite have been singing the tune, only to a more monotonous refrain. I do not object to it. It is the price of liberty, and if we are to have liberty we must pay for it. I say if this Bill is to be discussed until midsummer hon. gentlemen discussing it, if it cost the country a $1,000,000, I do not object; I pay my share of taxation and am willing to pay my share of this; if it be necessary for the purpose of maintaining the rights of the people and the rights of Parliament, let it go on until Christmas. The party tactics of the Opposition have, it seems to me, cost the country as much as this Bill can possibly cost it. If this Bill is necessary to maintain liberty, a national representation in this Dominion Parliament, why talk of the little expense in connection with it. Everything necessary to legislation and the administration of the law must be attended to and must entail expense. Now, these extravagant estimates of hon. gentlemen opposite cannot be let go unchallenged. There is no doubt whatever that the revising officer can do all the work he has to do in ten days, in any county in Canada. How much would that cost all through? I hold that the revising officer in Toronto does his work in two or three days.

Mr. MULOCK. Do you mean riding or county?

Mr. BEATY. Each election riding, certainly. Say it will cost $20 a day; and he has more, I am sorry to say, than our judges get in Ontario or in Quebec or the other Provinces; and I charge the Government with neglect in not giving the judges of the land a greater salary than they do—that they only possess the salary to-day which they had twenty or thirty years ago, when living, as everyone knows, in cities in this country did not cost more than one-half what it does to-day. The Government should bring down a Bill, and no one in this House should object to an expenditure which would place the judiciary on a proper footing as to salaries, any more than he should object to this, because these functionaries have interests so directly, closely and strongly affecting the people, that they should be kept in a position to do their duty freely, impartially and without any difficulty whatever. I esti-

mate that the total cost will not exceed, for the 211 ridings, from $75,000 to $100,000 a year. Ten days, at $20 a day, in the 211 ridings—and I say this for the hon. member for Wellington—would make $42,200. Ten days of a clerk, at $5, would make $10,550. Ten days of a bailiff, at $2, would make $4,220. Two copyists for lists, ten days at $2 each, would make $8,440. This would amount to $65,410. Add $10,000 for printing, and contingencies of that character, and you have $75,000. I have no objection, if you like, to add $25,000, more and make it $100,000, for I think the result will well pay the cost, and the expense will be nothing in proportion to the advantages to be reaped by the country and by this Parliament from this national Bill giving a Dominion representation by Dominion legislation. I do not propose to enter upon the items of the Bill, because they will come up in their order. I have only followed the tactics of hon. gentlemen opposite in the discussion of this matter. They have been ruled to be in order over and over again, and as I take it that ruling must be correct, I have availed myself of the privilege in committee of dealing with these points, which hon. gentlemen have dealt with so largely, so elaborately and so imaginatively during the last two or three weeks. It has been urged by a peculiar line of argument that hon. gentlemen, or at least one hon. gentleman on this side of the House, said we were here to register the decrees of the Government. He said that was so in a sense, and so I say. I endorse that idea. This Parliament was elected distinctly on a national basis, in reference to national questions, in reference, even, to Imperial questions. The maintenance of the Empire was a question, the unity of the Empire was a question, the consolidation of the Empire, in a sense, was a question, not its disintegration, not the secession of the colonies. That is not the idea which we on this side entertain as a party in relation to the Empire. We look upon it as a broad question, covering the destinies of the Anglo-Saxon race and of the people at large who are under the sway of the sceptre of Queen Victoria, the destinies of all people in all the colonies as well as those who cluster around the Throne in London or in England. It is therefore a national question. The party was elected to present to this country a nationality on this northern part of the continent, with its five millions of people now, and in ten years perhaps with its ten millions, and in a few years more with its twenty millions; and, as the United States have progressed in 100 years, until now they have their fifty millions, so we will increase in the same way. It is in that view, as a great part of the Empire, that we have been elected here to maintain the unity of the Empire; and, when I hear gentlemen talking now in regard to the federation of the Empire, I wonder what they mean. Have we not now the unity of the Empire? What did we see in the Soudan, when volunteers went from Australia, from England, Ireland and Scotland, from Canada and from the different parts of the Empire, for the defence of the flag? Is that not sufficient to show the unity of the Empire? This idea of the federation of the Empire must, therefore, have relation to something else than its unity. We are elected as a party to produce national results and national legislation. That is the idea. We have done it in reference to our National Policy, in reference to our national highway, and in relation to national matters generally, and we are doing it now with reference to the same ideas and objects, in order to make a national representation, by giving a qualification to such voters as this Parliament deems proper to possess the highest right of a free man, in the exercise of which this country has shown such wisdom, by sending a majority to this Parliament to promote national measures and national prosperity.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. After the thunder we had in the early part of the evening, it is hardly to be expected that the committee will listen with patience to quiet, common-sense gentlemen like the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) and myself. I have listened with a great deal of interest to his address to-night. We have got what we always get from him, a plain, common-sense, gentlemanly, quiet view of the question. You never get it presented in any other light by the member for West Toronto. However, like all the other gentlemen who have preceded him on that side of the House, he deals most delightfully in generalities, and keeps away from the specific point so strenuously objected to by gentlemen on this side of the House, and which I say fully justify the long list of adjectives he read to the House to-night. At the outset, he charges gentlemen on this side of the House with questioning the power of the Dominion Parliament to enact a Dominion franchise. I think he overstated the case there. If he had listened to the statements of hon. gentlemen on this side, as I have listened to them, I do not think he would have come to that conclusion As far as I am concerned, I have never once denied the power of this Parliament to enact a Dominion franchise. In fact, this Parliament has already legislated in that direction and passed a Dominion Franchise Act. But, while such is the case, gentlemen on this side, while not denying the power of this Parliament to pass a Dominion Franchise Bill, have declared that the use of that power under present circumstances, is inexpedient; and, in confirmation of their view, I need only point to the fact that gentlemen opposite, after Confederation, held office for six years without once attempting to enact a Dominion franchise, except by introducing measures into this House and throwing them out again. More than that; the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government declared that the enactment of such a statute would require a whole Session to itself. They did what was wisest under the circumstances; they took the franchise which they found had worked so well up to that time, and adopted it as the franchise for the Dominion, and an experience of eighteen years has proved the wisdom of their course. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) advances, as one of his arguments for a Dominion franchise, the variety that obtains in the franchises of the different Provinces. Now, that is just the ground that we take why the provincial franchise should be retained—the variety of the franchises in the different Provinces, the difficulty of reconciling the different franchises, of saying that one franchise instead of another shall be adopted. In Prince Edward Island, for example, they have manhood suffrage; in other Provinces there are provincial qualifications, and there would be great difficulty in reconciling the views of the people of the different Provinces. If you take the Province of Quebec, for example, we learn from statements made by hon. members from that Province that the people are very much opposed to female suffrage. But that question has taken a strong hold in Ontario, as well as in other Provinces, and it is a question that, sooner or later, this House will have to face; and it may be that the pressure of public opinion in the other Provinces may compel Quebec, against her will, if we are to have a Dominion franchise, to accept female suffrage as a part of that franchise. Again, we learn from the representatives of the Province of Quebec that the people of that Province are opposed to manhood suffrage. That is another question that is gaining rapidly in the other Provinces. In the Province of Ontario the leader of the Opposition made a motion in its favor, at the last Session of the Legislature, and it was supported by his party; and I have no doubt that in the Province of Ontario universal suffrage will be the law of the land before many years have passed over. Now, we can easily understand how the Provinces that possess manhood suffrage as a provincial franchise will demand that the same rights should be extended to their voters in Dominion elections, and thus Quebec may find herself, against her will, compelled

to accept manhood suffrage. So, taking the views of the people of the different Provinces into consideration, as I believe we are bound to do in all legislation, it would be wiser for us to retain the provincial franchises. The hon. member for West Toronto made a statement that surprised me. He said we had nothing to do with the Provinces but to let them alone, and therefore we ought to ignore the provincial franchises. Well, if those are his honest sentiments, this is the side of the House he ought to be on. Have we not struggled for years and years in defence of that principle? For years the Province of Ontario has been engaged in a struggle against the Dominion Government to retain its provincial rights, and it has only been able to wrench them from the grasp of the Dominion Government as the shepherd wrenches the lamb from the wolf. The money of the Province has been frittered away, and has been expended to pay the legal expenses of defending her and even her soil against the Dominion Government. Then, again, the hon. gentleman says: Suppose Mr. Mowat had introduced and carried a Bill like this, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would have to be satisfied with it. Well, Sir, it is needless to answer any such supposition, because it is supposing the impossible. From all we know of Mr. Mowat, such a Bill as this could never have emanated from him. In connection with the revising barristers, the hon. gentleman accuses us of throwing a slur on the legal profession. I have never heard that done. We are proud to believe that amongst the legal profession you will find, in proportion to their numbers, as many honest and upright gentlemen as you will find in any other profession in the country. But unfortunately they are not all of that description. We believe that it is not from these honest lawyers that the revising barristers will be chosen, but they will be chosen for their fitness, for the work which it is intended they shall perform, and that is the reason why we object to this clause. If we can have the list prepared in some such way as it is prepared now, so that we can have an appeal to the county judge, as is now allowed in some of the Provinces, and if we can get the pernicious Indian clause struck out of this Bill, I, for one, will cease to oppose the Bill. While regretting that this enormous expense should be incurred, I should content myself with protesting and voting against it, and let the matter go. But we have no evidence that the Government intend to accede to any such modifications. The Bill is before us, and we have to discuss it as we find it. The hon. gentleman tells us that the revising barristers will most likely be honest and upright men. Well, suppose they are. Is it right, even on that supposition, that such an unlimited power should be entrusted to any class of men, no matter how honest? Now, I do not mean to cast any slur upon the judges of the land. We know we are blessed with upright judges; but from all of them there is a right of appeal. As the Bill is drawn, there is no appeal from the revising barrister, unless he pleases to allow one on questions of law. One of the objections to the present Bill is that in almost every Province it will disfranchise large numbers of persons, and those among the most intelligent classes. In comparing the Bill with the Ontario Act, one of the large classes that will be disfranchised are the sons of landowners. Under this Bill it is provided that persons holding property shall enjoy the franchise. If the owner's son is interested in the business he may not exercise the franchise, because there is no provision to give it to him. Under the Ontario Act it is provided that property-holders' sons, and even grandsons, sons-in-law and step-sons shall be enfranchised, if the property is of sufficient value. All these people will, therefore, be disfranchised by the present Bill. It has been objected that the people of Ontario do not at present enjoy those rights because the provincial Act will not come into operation till the end of this year. That objection, however, is a frivolous one, as the new voters' lists will not be available till then. Another class that will be disfranchised are the school teachers. From the report of the Minister of education of last year, I find there are 2,553 teachers in Ontario. Under this Bill their qualification is $400 a year. The average salary of male teachers, in rural sections, I find to be $394; so a very large number of them will be disfranchised. Another class that will be disfranchised are wage-earners, of whom we have a large class in Ontario. Some, no doubt, are immigrants, intending to make this country their home; they are men hired out as laborers among farmers and in other callings, who earn $250 a year. That embraces 99 out of every 100 of the farm laborers in Ontario. There is provision made that board, lodging and other advantages shall be counted in; so that under the Ontario Act almost every such individual is entitled to the franchise Now, Sir, I want to draw particular attention to this matter. These wage-earners in Ontario are composed very largely of farmers' sons, who are not too proud to hire out and work for their neighbors, as many of their fathers did before them. They begin their life in that way, in order to gather something together to give themselves a start, and they take a manly and honorable way of making a start in life. I have had many such working for me. They are not ignorant young men; they are men who, in their father's house, have had the advantage of a good public school education, the advantage of reading the public papers, because there is scarcely a house in Ontario where these are not taken, and where politics are not discussed. They have had all the advantages which the institutions of Ontario present—and she is well supplied with public institutions for that purpose—for gathering information and knowledge, and I am happy to say that they generally avail themselves of them. I have found it nothing unusual to have these young men, whom I have had in my employ, hurrying through their work on an evening, in order to take part in those literary institutions they have in the country—it may be in reading either their own compositions or the essays of others, or debating the public questions which come up in these institutions for discussion. Still, if this Bill becomes law, these men would be disfranchised under it. About twelve months ago I was travelling on the railway, and I met the reeve of one of the wealthy municipalities of the west, a gentleman who is largely engaged in manufacturing brick. He owns three brick yards, and runs an extensive business. As labor was scarce a year ago last summer, I asked him if he did not find it difficult to procure laborers for his brick yards, as he required many of them. He said: "No, I do not; I make it a point, wherever I can get them—and I generally succeed in getting as many as I want—to employ farmers' sons." He told me, as many others have told me, that these were the best possible men he could get for any employment He put it this way: "I find that one of them is just worth two imported laborers. They are the men who give the most satisfaction; they take an interest in their work; and they are men who can go to their father's houses on a holiday, dress themselves in a good suit of clothes, and take their father's horse and carriage, enjoy their holiday, and then go back to the brick yard the next day." These are the men this Bill aims at; and if it becomes law they must be disfranchised. These are some of the reasons why we prefer the franchise which obtains in Ontario, and why we oppose the passing of a Dominion franchise. Now, Sir, I wish just to ask who it is that this Bill proposes shall take the place of these voters. This is a most astonishing feature in the Bill—that these intelligent classes shall be disfranchised, and that their places shall be taken by the Indians, those who are the wards of the Government, who cannot either speak or write the languages in which politics are discussed, who know nothing about our institutions or politics, who are dependent on the Government, from their cradle to their grave, who cannot perform any of the acts of citizenship, except under

the control of the Government, who are unacquainted with the usages of citizenship, who pay no taxes, who contribute nothing to the revenue—this Bill proposes that these people shall take the place of the intelligent gentlemen who will be disfranchised by it. Yet, we are accused of obstruction because we protest against anything so unjust and absurd. I ask if we are not justified in using every legitimate means in preventing the passage, or securing the amendment of a Bill so monstrous as this. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) makes light of the question of expense. He differs most materially from the estimate which hon. gentlemen on this side have made of the probable expense of carrying out this Act. He sets it down at $100,000. Well, Sir, all I have to say is this, that he is very moderate in his estimate. But he only takes the sum which this Government will have to pay out, and even then, I believe, he has not estimated one-fourth of it. There are other expenses which have to be considered as well as the money this Government pays. There is all the trouble and expense to the people, and if you look at the Act you will find that the lower assessed people, those who are the poorest, are those upon whom these expenses are likely to come. The men who have to travel a long distance in order to secure their right to the franchise, the men who are least able to pay for it, are those who will be encumbered with these expenses. But, Sir, I hold, and I think it is capable of proof, that the hon. gentleman was far below the mark in his estimate of what the actual cost will be. But, suppose he was right, unless some great good was going to be secured, some great advantage which has never yet been shown, will be secured, unless more than a mere fanciful uniformity is going to be secured, is this House justified in incurring such an expense at the present time? There is not a man in the House who, if he looks at the position in which we are placed, with regard to our financial affairs, at the present time, at the character of the people who pay this expense, but must come to the conclusion that this House is not justified in incurring any such expenditure. But, Sir, there are other features which are far worse than the expenditure. That is a matter which might be got over. Heavy as it is, heavy as it is likely to be, that matter might be got over. It may be that the Act may sometime or other be repealed, or that the country may become more wealthy and more able to bear the expense, but there are other features of it which connot be estimated by any money expenditure. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite have noticed it as much as I have, but I have noticed that for years past you can scarcely take up a public periodical without finding instances recorded of men forfeiting the confidence that has been reposed in them and taking the funds belonging to institutions that have been entrusted to them, and using them for their own special purposes. Some of them leave the country and others land where all such men ought to land. We are surprised at it; but is there anything surprising in it when men occupying the highest positions in the country are guilty of such acts as this, such acts as the infamous gerrymander, such acts as the Pacific scandal, where a great public trust was sold by the men to whom it was committed, in order to get funds to corrupt the electors? Is that different from men lower down in the scale appropriating that which does not belong to them? This question is one that cannot be estimated by dollars and cents; it is a great moral question. So long as a man, who debauches public opinion, who teaches that there is nothing higher in public life than party, who teaches that any measure, no matter how unjust or howmean it is in its provisions—that anything a party may do to get funds to secure the elections, that everything is right which tends to continue the party in power—so long as such a man or a party act on such principles, is it anything surprising that men in a lower scale should take the lesson from them? The moral aspect of this measure is worse for the country than any money losses that is going to be entailed by it. I do not intend to take up the time of the House any longer at this time. I merely wished to enter my protest against the passage of this Bill, with these features in it, and to give the reasons why the provincial franchise in Ontario should be continued, and I think it would be wise to apply the same principle to every other Province in the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) favored the House at some length with his views as to the duties of this Parliament. He ventured to give his opinion as to the relative powers and duties of the Local Legislatures and of the Dominion Parliament. He began his address by announcing that he was not a parish or municipal politician, but that he was in favor of protecting the rights of every part of our constitutional system, and that we had nothing to do with the Provinces, except to leave their rights alone; and having very fully amplified that position, he concluded his argument by saying that that was the true position. I agree with the words he uttered, that it is the duty of this Parliament to leave the rights of the Provinces alone; but I am sorry to say that I cannot judge him altogether by his words. I think it is right to see how far the hon. gentleman believes in those utterances by referring to some of his own acts. He says we should leave the Provinces in the full enjoyment of their rights. Has he ever done so? He publicly announced himself, years ago, as opposed to the federal system; he was in favor of one central Government for the whole of Canada; a legislative union at one time was the only system of government for Canada that met with his approval. He appears to have got new light in the abstract; but what has been his record? What was his action in regard to some conflicts that have taken place between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario, a large and important portion of which he represents in this House? It is not long since he appeared on a public platform and endorsed the action of this Government in seeking to abstract from the Province of Ontario a large portion of its territory, which has since been declared its property by the highest tribunal known to us; neither was he above taking his place on a public platform and endorsing the action of this Government in disallowing what is generally known as the Streams Bill; and it is within the knowledge of every member of this House that there was no more faithful supporter of the McCarthy Act in this Chamber than the hon. member for West Toronto. What did these measures mean; were they not directly aimed at interfering with the rights of the Provinces? The hon. gentleman, by his voice and vote, endeavored to strip the Provinces of their constitutional rights—rights that, both before and since, have been determined as theirs, and yet to-day he tells us that he is the true exponent of the functions of this Parliament—that he alone gives the true explanation of the relative duties and obligations and powers of the various Provinces, when he says they must be left in the enjoyment of their rights. Who cares for a defender who, with his lips, asserts one thing, and with his vote and influence acts otherwise? The hon. gentleman announced a curious proposition. He says that he measures the duty of this Parliament by its power—that it is in the power of this Parliament to declare its franchise, and that being in its power, this Parliament is bound to exercise that power—that because it has the power it has the corresponding obligation; and he defends this legislation on the ground that it is not a matter of discretion whether this Parliament shall exercise the power that is now being invoked or not—that it cannot shrink from this duty, because it has the constitutional power to do what is asked for. Now, we need not press that argument, for it carries its answer in the statement of it. Look at the Con-

federation Act and see the powers that are vested in this Parliament. Ever since Confederation Parliament has been legislating, according as the conditions of the people demanded; but, if we adopt the reasoning of the hon. member for West Toronto and apply it as he desires it should be applied, we are bound every day to do what we have the power to do. We have the power by one Act to repeal every Act of Parliament that was passed by this Dominion. The inference to be drawn from the principle laid down by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) is that therefore we should do this absurd and ridiculous act. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has left the House, for there are other matters to which I would like to refer, but which I will abstain from referring to during his absence. Public opinion, he said, was against the action of the Opposition, and the evidence he gives of that is that a laboring man, whom he did not know and who did not know him, told him that the way the Opposition were going on was ridiculous. Probably that laborer was a man of the dandelion brigade. The hon. gentleman asked where is the excitement in country against the measure? There is none, he says, in this city. Well, while I think there is a great deal in Ottawa to be proud of, Ottawa is not Canada. Canada possesses many millions of people, and of all the places that are apt to be under governmental influence Ottawa is the principle one. The hon. gentleman said he knew something of municipal machinery. I have no doubt he does; he has had a good deal to do with municipal machinery, and municipal machinery has had a good deal to do with him. Probably his intimate acquaintance with the machine has had something to do with his being able to stand up here to-day. The hon. gentleman spoke highly of his constituency, but I think he shows very little gratitude towards it when he asks to have the power taken from it which it now possesses. He said he represents one of the most intelligent constituencies in Canada. I do not think, however, we can draw from that the inference he wishes us to draw. I remember the story of the man who said he had married the daughter of a celebrated philosopher. "I am sorry," replied the other, "you have not married the philosophy." The spirit of conservatism, according to the hon. gentleman, is to conserve all rights; and imbued with this spirit, he launched out into a panegyric of the revising officer, who is to be the great preserver of rights. How has the hon. gentleman shown his desire to preserve rights while in this House? Where was his vote when the Gerrymandering Bill was forced through Parliament? What stand did he take in the attempt to rob Ontario of a certain portion of her territory? Can he justify his connection with the McCarthy Act? Until the hon. gentleman can clear his reputation of these stains he can hardly expect to have much weight attached to his words when he says it is the great party of conservatism who preserve the rights of the people. The hon. gentleman says the Opposition have characterised the legal profession as unscrupulous and corrupt. I challenge him or any of his friends to name any hon. gentleman on this side who has made any such a charge. It speaks very little for the intelligence of the hon. gentleman if he cannot discriminate between criticism of a measure and criticism of the imperfect machinery for carrying it out. If we do not choose willingly to place unlimited power in the hands of any set of men, why should he complain? If this power is to be given to the revising officers, from whom is is to be taken away? Why is he so anxious to take the power from the municipal officers? Whatever criticism he can direct against us as objecting to the new tribunal we can direct against him as objecting to the existing tribunal. He occupies some vantage ground in reference to this matter. He says he is intimately acquainted with the machinery of the municipal system, and argues from that standpoint that the machinery should be taken from the municipal bodies. If he is proceeding upon good evidence, it is rather a reflection upon that municipal system of which, until recently, he formed a considerable part. When I asked him if he could name any constitutionally governed country in which such a system prevailed as was sought to be imposed upon Canada, he cited England, and stated that there revising officers were appointed to do the duties that are to be done by the revising officers here; but when he was asked who appointed the revising officers in England, he declined to answer that question. Was that candid? He knew he was misrepresenting the position in England, and he branched out into generalities, and asked whether we did not appoint lawyers to be judges. The position of a judge is entirely different from that of a revising barrister. A judge is chosen, not to do the will of a particular party, but to administer the law between individuals. In the appointment of a judge the Government has no temptation to make an unwise appointment, as it knows that the best appointment it can make will best serve its interests, and we therefore have always, in the choice of judges, a guarantee, from interest alone, that the Government will make the best possible choice; but when it comes to the revising officers, the case is entirely different. The revising officer is chosen by the Government to do a certain work, in which the Government is directly interested, and the revising officer does not cease on his appointment to be an ordinary citizen, taking his share in all the political affairs of the country. How different is the case of a judge. Do we know of any judge who, during the period of his occupying the bench, has degraded it by embarking in trade, commerce or politics? All these things are left aside, and in this country up to the present time every judge has attempted to wear his ermine unsullied. But the revising officer will still be free to take his share in the political struggles of the country, he will still be one of the competitors in the race of life with his fellowmen. The two positions are absolutely incomparable, and it is to be regretted that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) has not yet been able to see the distinction between the two classes of men. I am glad to see that the hon. member has returned to the Chamber. He has made a discovery that no other man in Canada has made, unless it may be the person who conceived this measure. There is no member on his own side of the House who, in private conversation, defends the scheme for the appointment of the revising officer, there is not one but tells us that that scheme must be amended. One may say that the time may come when the Grits will be in power and he would be extremely loath to leave such power in their hands. Others say the scheme is not right, and it is wrong to leave so much power in the hands of one man. There is not a newspaper that has defended the scheme fairly and candidly. The whole independent press of Canada has denounced it. The leading press in the city of Toronto has denounced it. Members of the Conservative party have openly denounced it on the floor of this House. The Opposition have denounced it. No individual member has defended it in its entirety, until it came to the lot of the hon. member for West Toronto to speak, and he made the grand discovery that the scheme was the best, the most competent and the purest tribunal that could be found.

Mr. BEATY. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. He still endorses it. He goes on to speak of the matter of costs. He tells us that this scheme, at best, will not cost more than $75,0000, but in order to make it even money he says $100,000. Well, I know he is a gentleman who deals in large figures, and a few thousands, more or less, is of little consequence to him; but they may be of some consequence to the people who have to pay this money. The hon. gentleman, however, did not attempt to show that the country would derive any benefit from this expenditure; he did not direct a single argument to show what good was

to flow from this measure. He indulged in some wide generalities about Great Britain and the glorious constitution, etc. He is certainly a giant with a most vivid imagination. I suppose, from his willingness to throw away this $100,000, that he knows of some hidden mine in this country where the people can obtain all the money they wish. The hon. gentleman made a trip to England last year, and visited the town of Plymouth. As a native Canadian he addressed the people there, who he considered to be unsophisticated people, who work honestly for a living, who give a day's work for a day's pay. Well, the hon. gentleman told them about Canada, and I have no doubt he spread discontent amongst many of the hardy toilers in Plymouth.

Mr. BEATY. After I told them what Canada was, a gentleman at the dinner table said: "Let us all go to Canada."

Mr. MULOCK. It appears, then, that this hon. gentleman's speech was made after dinner, and I suppose that accounts for the character of his remarks. Now, let us see what the hon. gentleman said to the people of Plymouth at this banquet. Speaking of the North-West, he said:

"There are mines of gold, of silver, of copper and precious stones. All you have to do is to go and pick them up. The gold lies there in the beds of the rivers, shining in the gladness of the noon-day sun, and all you have to do is to pick it up and put it in your pocket."

What a beautiful view! How literally correct!

Mr. BEATY. It is literally correct.

Mr. MULOCK. This Sinbad reminds us now of a beautiful picture. Why is it that these Plymouth people are not all in Canada to-day? How reliable this gentleman's evidence must be! How founded upon fact! How sound his judgment! How well he may boast that he represents one of the most intelligent constituencies in Canada! Now, Mr. Chairman, I object to this Bill, because it interferes with the rights we have heretofore enjoyed. I have heard hon. gentlemen say that this Bill would not disfranchise any people, to any extent, in the older Provinces. Now, let us compare the franchise of this Bill with the franchise of the Province of Ontario. As a result of that comparison, I find that this Bill will disfranchise a large number of people in the Province of Ontario. The Dominion Bill requires that a person must possess real estate to the value of $300 in cities and towns to have a vote, while the provincial Act declares that $200 worth of real estate in cities and towns shall entitle a person to vote. There are not as many people owning property worth $300 as $200, and therefore you disfranchise all those who own less than $300. Under the local Act it is provided that any person who is a householder shall be entitled to vote; and by householder is meant any person who is resident in a city or town, and who *bonâ fide* occupies a dwelling for his use. That is a very wide provision. There is no such provision in the present Bill, and therefore all persons who do not pay the amount of rental mentioned in clause 3 will be disfranchised. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that by this Bill the Dominion controls its own franchise. The Bill declares that persons in a town shall vote on a certain qualification and persons in villages and townships under a different qualification. But who is to declare what is a town and what is a village? Certainly not this Parliament. So, after this House has established the rates of qualification for the various communities there still remains in the Local Legislatures the power of entirely upsetting your calculations by saying that this town hereafter shall be a village, this village a town, and so on. Who has control of the franchise, then? This shows clearly that this Parliament, if it adopted this Bill would establish a franchise of an arbitrary character, and one that would not prove to bear equally on the people of the different Provinces. The Dominion census of 1881 gives a list of cities, towns and villages, with their populations, and the figures show how absolutely impossible it is for Parliament, on the lines indicated by this Bill, to establish a just franchise. It appears there are thirty-seven cities and towns in Canada having a population each of 5,000 and upwards. In the various Provinces no regular system has been adhered to; in some of the Provinces we have towns with similar populations to villages in other Provinces. I will show this by the following list taken from the census: Nova Scotia —Shelburne, town, population 2,055; Marshall, town, 1,077; Windsor, town, 3,019; Truro, town, 3,461; Pictou, town, 3,403; New Glasgow, town, 2,595; Mill Village, village, 3,340. New Brunswick—St. George, town, 3,412; St. Andrews, town, 2,128; St. Stephens, town, 2,338; Milltown, town, 1,664; Upper Mills, town, 318. Quebec—Schoolbred, village, 369; Escuminac, village, 229; Gaspé, village, 324; Rimouski, town, 1,417; Fraserville, town, 2,291; Cacouna, village, 648; Kamouraska, village, 771; Bien Village, village, 1,020; Lauzon, village, 3,560; Lotbinière, village, 2,000; Plessisville, village, 774; Larochelle, village, 370; Nicolet, town, 3,710; St. Ours, village, 808; Iberville, town, 1,847; Varennes, town, 1,788; Longueuil, town, 2,355; Beauharnois, town, 1,499; Lavaltrie, village, 1,385; Berthier, town, 2,150; St. John Baptiste, village, now I believe a town, 5,732; Terrebonne, town, 1,398; L'Orignal, village, 853; Morrisburg, village, 1,719; Prescott, town, 2,995; Merrickville, village, 1,819; Richmond, village, 1,639; Arnprior, village, 2,147; Garden Island, village, 495; Bath, village, 546; Fergus, village, 1733. Now, if any man analyses these figures he will find some very curious results. I will not turn over all the combinations, but I would just invite the attention of the hon. member for East Hastings, who asks if he could not get it all from the census himself—I ask him if he thinks it right that a town having a smaller population than a village should require a larger qualification for its inhabitants than is required for the inhabitants of a village. For example, take the town of Marshall, in Nova Scotia, which has a population of 1,077, according to the census of 1881. The owner of real estate in that town, in order to have a vote, must have his real estate valued at the sum of $300. If, on the the other hand, you take the village of Arnprior, in Ontario, which has a population of 2,147, a resident of Arnprior holding property worth $200 will, under this Bill, have a vote, and yet the owner of the property in Marshall will not have a vote, unless his property is worth $100 more. On what principle is that done? You are endeavoring to apply, an arbitrary system to a very complex system of affairs. So we may take Milltown, which has a population of 1,664. Each of the inhabitants of Milltown must be the owner of property worth $300 in order to have a vote, whilst, if the Legislature were to choose to cancel the Act of incorporation, and make that place a village, a far greater number would have a vote. These facts simply convince me that the scheme adopted is not a just one, under all the circumstances existing in the Dominion. Take some other towns in the Province of Quebec. Take the town of Rimouski, with a population of 1,417, and St. Ours, with a population of 808, and so on. There are many villages in the Province having populations in excess of the population of those towns, and yet because they are called villages the franchise is lower than if they were towns. Yet hon. gentlemen are declaring that this Bill is worthy of support, because it gives the Dominion Parliament control over its own franchise. We find it full of absurdities at this stage. Take the converse case. Take, for instance, a town of which I know something—Newmarket, which had a population, according to the census of 1881, of 2,006. If we take Milltown village, N.B., it had a population at that time of 2,240. Lotbinière, in the Province of Quebec, had a population of 2,010, and at St. Jean Baptiste, a population of 5,574; these three last being villages, and all of them having a popula-

tion in excess of the population of Newmarket at that time. Now, any one owning property in any one of these villages, to the value of $200, under this Bill, would be entitled to a vote; but the unfortunate resident of Newmarket cannot have a vote if he owns property worth less than $300. You are endeavoring to provide a scheme applicable to various Provinces; and you forget, when you use the words cities, towns, and incorporated villages, that you refer to institutions existing simply by the will of the Local Legislatures. I object to this scheme, then, not for that reason alone, but I do object to it for the reason, which must have impressed itself on the minds of hon. gentlemen, that the scheme is an incomplete one. Not only is it incomplete, but, in my opinion, it cannot, on the present lines, be made more complete. I fail to see how you can provide an equitable and just scheme for all the electors of Canada, from ocean to ocean, basing that scheme simply on property. It may be considered a general scheme in the abstract. The hon. member for West Toronto boasted of it as a general scheme. Well, it is a general scheme, but there is too much of the scheme about it; and taking it as it is offered to us, I submit that the Bill does not offer a scheme that can be general and fair in its application to all the people. The conditions of our people between the two oceans are so varied and different that it is almost impossible, by any such arbitrary system as this, to establish what can be considered a just scheme. Now, there is an attempt to deal with a certain set—as, for instance, the fishermen. I have no objection to the fishermen having credit for their boats and fishing appliances, in order to enfranchise them; on the contrary, I entirely approve of that portion of the measure. But it is idle to call this a general scheme, when that feature must necessarily be local in its application. The trouble has been that there is an attempt in this particular instance to legislate for a class only, and the framer of this Bill seemed to forget that there were other classes whose whole wealth, or the principal portion of it, were invested in the implements with which they earn their daily bread. Take the Province of Ontario, and when you go back from the shores of Lake Ontario and the other waters of that Province, there are no fishermen. It is idle to tell the inlanders of Ontario that they can get votes on their fishing nets or boats, for they have neither one nor the other. If the equipments used for the purpose of earning a living are to be valued, why is there nothing of that kind with regard to landsmen—the people of my Province, the people of the great towns, or the young men in the back districts, many of whom invest a considerable portion of their capital in chattel property? One man owns a horse and cart; he may be merely a lodger in a house; why is he not entitled to have his horse and cart valued as well as the fisherman to have his boat? Why is not the mechanics' kit of tools, taken into consideration? You talk of a general scheme, which is not within the reach of the majority of the people; it is boasted of because it is general on paper. But it is limited in its application. In the neighborhood of the Lake of the Woods and in the Rocky Mountains there are considerable mining interests, the owners of which have been entirely overlooked by this Bill. Apart from the evidence furnished by the hon. member for West Toronto, where is the evidence of public opinion in support of this Bill? Outside of the interested evidence of those who advocate it, the only evidence is the evidence of one unknown man. What evidence have we that the public are against this measure? Day after day, we find the time of this House largely taken up with the presentation of petitions against it.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Oh, dear, dear.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for East Hastings seems to attach very little importance to that mode of expressing public opinion; but it is probable, when he examines the petitions that come from East Hastings——

Mr. WHITE. Let them come; East Hastings is all right.

Mr. MULOCK—he will have reason to feel that he has under valued that expression of opinion. He will find on the petitions the names of a good many gentlemen who helped to place him where he is to-day, and it will be time enough for him to belittle them after that. Have there been any public meetings in favor of this measure?

Mr. COCHRANE. There were two at Brockville, and they had to adjourn.

Mr. MULOCK. In favor of this measure?

Mr. COCHRANE. In opposition to it.

Mr. MULOCK. That was not the fate of any meetings called against the measure. I have seen accounts in the public press of rousing meetings, at which strong resolutions have been carried, denouncing the measure; and in one of the papers I saw a letter from a prominent Conservative who had attended one of these meetings, and who afterwards, being asked by a number of his Conservative friends why he had done so, answered them all collectively by writing a letter to the newspaper, setting forth why he condemned this measure; and when he came to the question of the revising officer he stated that language failed to enable him to express his disapproval of that provision of the Bill. I would also call your attention to some of the utterances of the press, and in doing so I will not refer to any newspaper which is, so far as I know, a supporter of the Liberal party. I have only two or three cuttings that I have picked up during the last few days. The Montreal *Herald* is controlled and, I presume, owned by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), an able supporter of this Government, and one who, unlike the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), does not undertake to endorse everything that the Government may choose to submit. That paper deals with this measure and with the queston of the day in its issue of the 2nd of May, 1885. (The hon. gentleman read the extract.) I will read an extract from the Newmarket *Era*, of the 8th of May, 1885; it is a thoroughly independent journal, and in its preceding issue it spoke approvingly of the Franchise Bill. (The hon. gentleman read the extract.) In that article you have temperate language and with it a condemnation of this measure. Then, if we take some of the Toronto papers that are independent in character, we find they are of the same tenor. Take the Toronto *Telegram*, an independent journal; perhaps the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) will admit it is an independent journal, with strong leanings towards the Conservative party. The *Telegram*, on the 7th, said; (The hon. gentleman read an extract from an editorial of the *Telegram* published on the 7th). That is the opinion of an absolutely independent journal, with the exception that if it has any leanings at all they are Conservative. Then I can give you the evidence of the Toronto *World;* perhaps the hon. gentleman for West Toronto will not discredit that paper. It is a newspaper that, at the general elections of 1882, supported the Conservative party in the city of Toronto and throughout the country, and continues to give it much liberal support. Its article is as follows: (The hon. gentleman then read an article from the *World*). The rest of the article deals with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and approves of the policy of the Government in dealing with that railway. You will observe that the last article I read purports to give the opinion of the independent press of Canada. The last quotation with which I will trouble the committee is from the *Week*, of 14th May, 1885, a journal which is independent in its politics:

"A statesman must be at a loss for practical subjects of legislation when he goes out of his way to abolish an anomaly which is not also an evil. It cannot be said that the anomalies of the franchise in the

different Provinces were evils; not a word of complaint respecting them had been heard. It is probable that, if their history were examined, they would be found to be not merely accidental but adjustments in some measure to social or economical peculiarities. When the question is put, each Province seems to wish to remain as it is, and Tory delegations give a party assent to equalisation only on condition that their own Province shall be left out. To bring on a political crisis with a military crisis already in existence, merely for the sake of forcing on everybody a uniformity which nobody desires, was surely not the part of a statesman. Unfortunately the measure cannot be called purposeless; the longer the discussion lasts the more clearly it appears that there was an object, and that the object was, under color of regulating the franchise, to perpetuate the ascendency of the party now in power. The proposal to enfranchise the Indians speaks for itself: these poor pensioners of the commonwealth must needs vote with the meal bag, which is in the hands of the agents of the Government, and more than one constituency might probably be strangled by their vote. The aim of the female suffrage clause was revealed by Sir John A. Macdonald himself when he told a deputation that the Conservative party in England was a unit in favor of the measure. The Conservative party in England is not yet by any means a unit in favor of the measure, but the managers have recently taken it up in the hope of party gain, believing that the women would vote Tory under clerical influence, and Lord Beaconsfield, from the same motive, used to support it by his silent vote and his clandestine influence, though he never ventured to support it in a speech. That, however, which bears most distinctly the mark of a sinister policy is the provision for the appointment of revising barristers to draw up the list of voters and decide upon the title to vote, which has called forth widespread and most reasonable indignation. The revising barristers are to be appointed all at once by Sir John Macdonald, under the conventional alias of the Governor General in Council; there is to be no appeal from their decision except with their own consent, nor any means practically of getting rid of them so long as they continue to serve the interests of the party by the head of which they are appointed. In England the revising barristers are appointed by the judges, and hold their offices only for one year. The patronage of course will be exercised on the strict party principle, and ill-omened names are already heard. We have seen enough to be convinced that such nominees would shrink at a pinch from no disregard of electoral rights, and that the more unscrupulous the service they rendered the surer would be their reward. If the Canadian people submit to such treatment they will show themselves bad guardians of their freedom; but their minds have been so perverted by party influence that there is no saying what they may do with their birthright if party calls for the sacrifice. In the United States there would be always a hope of reversal in the Senate, and at present there would be the certainty of a presidential veto on iniquity; but our Senate is a registration office and our president is a figure-head."

Hon. gentlemen defend this measure on various grounds. They have not vouchsafed to elaborate their arguments to any extent, but one of those advanced feebly in support of the measure is, that Parliament ought to control the franchise on which it is brought together. What is the object of our representative system? Not merely to elect a Parliament. The highest object of the system is not that so many hon. gentlemen shall meet together and, as one hon. gentleman has just been doing, amuse themselves by playing ball. The object is that the will of the people may find its way to the Statute Books of the country. Parliament is but an instrument for executing the will of the people, and if hon. gentlemen contend that the Parliament of Canada should control every bit of the machinery whereby it is brought together, much more should they say that Parliament should afterwards control every measure that is placed upon the Statute Book; and yet it does not do so.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This Parliament has a right to disallow every local Bill passed. This Government has, at all events.

Mr. MULOCK. I was not referring to the local legislation.

Mr. McLELAN. He does not know what he is referring to.

Mr. WHITE. He is pretty well muddled, anyway.

Mr. MULOCK. If Parliament should control the machinery by which it is brought together, much more should it control the legislation which it enacts, but most of the laws are carried out by persons not amenable to this Parliament at all, except indirectly. Take the criminal law of the country. This Parliament declares what is a crime, but who carries out the law? It is true the judges are appointed by this Government, but the rest of the machinery is in the hands of the Provinces. The Provinces appoint the Crown prosecutors; they provide, by their legislation, for the empanelling of jurors, they appoint the magistrates, they can declare whether or not juries shall be used in criminal cases, and when the law is finally declared, when a man's rights are finally ascertained, the Local Legislatures, through their agents, put the law into execution. You may declare it a crime for a man to commit murder, but it is the Local Legislature that provides for hanging him. If it is so important that you should control the machinery that brings you together, why not carry the reasoning to its logical conclusion, and control every bit of legislation this Parliament enacts? There is no disguising the fact that there is an object in the Bill, and that object has been plainly stated in the articles from which I have quoted. One Province alone is specially aimed at—there is no disguising that fact,—and that Province is Ontario. Why is Ontario singled out for attack? Is it that she has defended herself successfully, in the courts and at the polls, against the Dominion Government for some years? Is it that she does not possess sufficient intelligence to enable her to control the franchise? Is it that her people have not the stake in the country that would justify their being entrusted with the franchise? What is the reason that this legislation is brought on at this time? There is but one object, and it would be well at this stage if hon. gentlemen would throw off the mask and tell us plainly, what we all know by inference, that there is but one object in this measure, and that is to control the elections, and especially to control those in the Province of Ontario. If intelligence, if education, if wealth, ought be factors in determining who should control the franchise, where does Ontario stand in that respect? If the Government pass this Bill we shall have a double system of franchises.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Since Ontario has been a Province she has had two franchises, one for the municipal council and one for the two Legislatures.

Mr. MULOCK. True, but both arranged by the same man in the same way and at the same time. At present we have a simple machinery in the Province of Ontario, whereby any person possessed of property qualification can have himself enrolled. The public have been educated in that direction, and they understand it. Our people understand what to do if their names are left off the roll, and they know where to go to put in an appeal. But here it is proposed to introduce another system, an embarrassing system, which it would take more than a Philadelphia lawyer to understand. Now, Mr. Chairman, who are to benefit by this Bill? The Dominion Government are to benefit by it, of course, but there is another class that are to benefit by it, namely, the revising barristers. The revising officers appointed will, no doubt, be persons who have claims on the Government for political services. I admit that proper political services should be properly remunerated; but a good many political services are unfortunately of a character that tend to demoralise the country. Such services are rendered by people who fasten themselves upon the country like parasites and eat out its vitals. Is it in the public interest that we should have 633 of such officers? The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) said that in addition to revising officers, clerks and constables, there would be copyists; so I suppose there will be an army of 1,000 men appointed after the passage of this Bill. No one has attempted to justify this expenditure. In the course of the debate the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) informed this House that in Quebec there had been only forty appeals from the voters' list within a period of four years. The Secretary of State said that the reason why, in the Province of Quebec, up to the present time, so few appeals from the voters' list had taken place, was because of the expense involved. (The hon. member read a quotation

from the Secretary of State's speech page 1173, *Hansard*). Under the present system an appeal can be made almost without expense; but under this Bill the appeal must be to the Superior Court, and a barrister must be engaged. If, under the present law, errors are not corrected on account of the cost involved, how are the errors, and more than errors, which will arise under the propsosed system, to be corrected? Why is the present Bill forced upon the House? The Government say: This is not a want of confidence in the municipal system, for we have the utmost confidence in the officers who carry out the muuicipal laws. The Government cannot escape from the position in which they have placed themselves. If they take the power from the municipal officers, who have enjoyed it for so many years, a power incapable of being abused, they do it, either because they declare that the municipal authorities have, up to the present time, shown themselves unworthy custodians of that power, or because they have not been sufficiently pliant to the powers that be. They may choose between two alternatives, but they cannot escape the inference which must be drawn from their action. They are not drawing that power from the municipalities because they have been unfaithful, but because the municipal officers have been faithful and trustworthy, another tribunal is to be provided. The hon. member for East Grey made a request to this House. I refer to *Hansard*, page 1852, where, speaking of the revising officers, he said:

"It is time enough to hurl malediction against these men when they have shown that they are unable to discharge their duties fairly between the parties, and not till then. I do not regard this provision in the same light as the hon. member for South Grey, that it is an insult to the municipal officers of this country."

That, Sir, was a very cool request, that we shall allow this measure to go through with all its defects, and after the power has been transferred from the people to these officers we shall then, when they have shown themselves unworthy of that power, find fault with them. It will be rather late then. We cannot recall the power. They may abuse it, but is that the time to object? Would it not be a case of locking the stable after the horse is stolen? That is not the time to be careful of your property and your rights. Surely we are doing what is best and wisest, by seeing that the system is a safe one, rather than suffer under the mistakes or the unjust acts of such officers. Hon. gentlemen complain that part of the debate conducted by this side of the House at a certain stage was of an obstructive character. I do not take that view of it at all. Have any of us heard any complaint from the people of Canada against the defenders of Battleford, on the ground of obstruction? The only men who could so charge them would be Poundmaker and his gang. Has anybody charged Captain Dickens and his gallant band at Fort Pitt with obstruction? The only persons who could do so would be Big Bear and his band. We are entitled to defend the liberties of the people on the floor of this House, and we are but doing our duty in taking this course. I trust that now the debate has taken a calm and temperate form, and all bitterness appears to have passed away, that if any such measure is adopted it will be only such a one as will meet with the general approval of those who desire to see the representative system of government on a thorough, safe, and stable basis.

Mr. HICKEY. The hon. member who has just taken his seat labored very hard to set aside the effects of the speech of the hon. member for West Toronto—a speech which will be like a beacon light to the country as compared with the Opposition speeches on this subject. The arguments which he set forth are unanswerable, and I think they have been so regarded by the country before they were announced, because I believe he only voiced the views of the country in his remarks. The member for North York let his own heart out of the difficulty when he said there must be some special object in this Bill, and then said that it must be specially aimed at Ontario. He did not tell the House how it was aimed at the Province of Ontario, or that the Province of Ontario is singled out in the way that this amendment asks to have it singled out The whole of the provisions of this Bill extend to the Province of Ontario as to the other Provinces, and not otherwise. Why it should be singled out is not clear. The only foundation for such a suggestion is the fact that so many of these hon. gentlemen coming from that Province have made this Bill a bugbear, and so regarded it, without entering on the question, as they would have upon another Bill, and giving it that fair and candid consideration which otherwise they would have done. He mentions the subject of education in this matter—that it would embarrass some of the Provinces, hinting specially at Ontario, by being kept back by other Provinces which were not so advanced. He went on to say that some of the difficulties of this measure would be that it would be establishing two franchises, and the people would not understand them. That is rather a severe criticism on the advancement of education which he was speaking about just before. I think the people are apt to conceive what their rights are, that they are determined to have them, that they will pursue them, and that we need not fear the people in that respect, because they will quite readily understand this question, just as well as hon. gentlemen in this House. The country is highly intelligent throughout, and the newspapers circulate in every direction. Then, of course, the skeleton they put in the trunk of this Bill is the revising officer. Now, what are the facts in relation to this matter? The revising officer is to take the assessment roll and the voters' list last prepared. That assessment roll comes from the hands of the court of revision. It has been advertised, and it goes to the hands of the county judge, if necessary, if anybody wishes to appeal. It is almost a perfect document in itself. The revising officer has to take that assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence to support the list. He prepares the list and advertises it; again it goes to the people, and they can appeal to put on names or take them off. Every one can see it when it is published. He holds a court and perfecting the list it is then published in the *Canada Gazette*, and here is another appeal to a superior court. Why, Sir, if there is anything about the Bill which makes it more needful to the people, it is the fact of the revising officer and the position he is required to take in it, because there are three different stages of the voters' list in this Bill, in which the people may protect themselves—looking at the list, and seeing if there are any imperfections in it, and having them corrected at different stages. A man can appear there, as at any other court, and see that his rights are properly protected; and there is no man, no matter how basely he may be depicted in this House, who would lend himself to do a wrong, especially under such circumstances. What would be the effect of it? There is no man who could do wrong in that position and prosper. The Opposition speak as if it would be an advantage to the Government to appoint the worst possible men in the profession to do their dirty work for them; but honesty is the best policy—and that is why the Conservative party are in power to-day; they have done what they could to build up the country, and the country has trusted them. That is the whole of the question regarding the revising officer. He cannot possibly do a wrong; if he does, the person against whom he does wrong has three opportunities to obtain justice, so that there is no possibility of any person being injured under the Act unless he wilfully neglects his own duty. The hon. member for North York quoted from several newspapers, among them the Montreal *Herald*. I happened to read the article myself, and knew that it applied to the condition of this debate—to what may be understood as the dead-

lock; and the writer being strongly in favor of manhood suffrage, suggests that as a means of solving the whole difficulty. After what the hon. member for North York read, the article goes on to accuse the Opposition of obstruction, and of having forgotten their duty to the public in that respect. The subject of petitions has been brought up. What do they amount to? Nothing whatever. Hon. gentlemen here have protested very strongly against this measure; they have pressed their people in the country and through the press to petition against this Bill, to get up meetings, etc., and the whole thing has been a perfect fizzle, so far. To-day two petitions were presented from my county, and out of a polling division of 200 electors comes a petition with thirty names, all of them of Grits. There is only one man in the whole number whom I would be doubtful of at all, but he is an innocent man, and may have been induced to sign the petition. I do not despise petitions; I think they are right in principle; but when gentlemen get up here and insult the intelligence of this House by telling us of indignation meetings and petitions against this Bill, it paralyses the respect one might have for those gentlemen. Does not the country well know that no Government measure can be introduced into this Parliament that hon. gentlemen opposite would support? During the two Sessions that I have been in this House everything the Government has brought forward has been contested by the Opposition. So what does all this agitation amount to? It amounts to this, that hon. gentlemen are attempting to back up the position—the regretted position, I believe—that they took against this Bill, and are asking the country to sympathise with them, so that they may let themselves down easy. Hon. gentlemen objected to the Bill because it provided for a class of fishermen. The Bill attempts to meet the fishermen in a very fair way. We have not many fishermen in the Province of Ontario, but down by the sea there are large numbers of those people, who spend their lives in one of the great interests of this country, and there is every reason why they should be given an opportunity to vote for their representatives. He asks: Why not take in mechanics' tools, and make them part of the assessment? This Bill does not propose to establish manhood suffrage in this country; it does not intend to give votes to men who may be here to-day doing a job and in the United States to-morrow, but to settled classes in the community. If hon. gentlemen had pointed out any special class who have not been provided for in this Bill I am sure the Government would be glad to extend the franchise to that class. The hon. gentleman gave us some figures from the census returns with regard to towns and cities, and showed that it would be impossible to apply this Bill to those conditions. Well, if that difficulty exists in this Bill the same difficulty will be found in the provincial Act. If we have a franchise for towns and cities, everybody agrees that it should be different from that in the country. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite contend very strongly that the local Government should control our franchise. Well, if they should, why not carry the principle further, as the hon. member for West Toronto said, and give the right to the municipal council; and if you give them the power to make the franchise for this Parliament, why not let them have the right to fix the boundaries of our electoral districts? Why not give them the control of the courts that try our election cases as well? The thing becomes ridiculous, if you follow it up. If this Parliament has the right to fix the boundaries of the electoral districts it certainly should have the right to fix the qualifications of those who vote in them, as well as to supply the machinery for the elections. Then, the hon. member for North York said that he was satisfied that in the cities and towns, especially in his own city, a great many people would be disfranchised. That will not appear to be the fact when this Bill comes to be put in force, because there will be no house and lot in the city of Toronto, for instance, that will not be worth $300; besides, any person paying a rent of $2 a month will be entitled to the franchise, so that every individual who is worthy of the franchise, even in the city of Toronto, will have it, and I do not believe any appreciable number of persons will be deprived of votes. This same gentleman had the audacity to assert that no supporter of the Government had attempted to defend the revising officer. Why, there has not been a member who spoke upon the Bill on this side who did not defend the position of the revising officer. Yet, hon. gentlemen opposite will coolly tell the House that no supporter of the Government in this House or in conversation with them has attempted to defend the revising officer. Such a statement is unfair to those with whom the conversations were had, and is unfair, as far as this House is concerned. That hon. gentleman speaks of the county court judges and the revising officers being two very different classes of men. The Government, he says, would appoint a very respectable lawyer to be judge, because he was going to be outside their jurisdiction, but they would naturally appoint unscrupulous men to be revising barristers for their own purposes. Well, as I said, honesty is the best policy, and the policy of the Conservative Government fully answers that way of putting the case. He said the hon. member for West Toronto lost his character, so far as his being a defender of the people's rights are concerned, when, in 1882, he supported the wonderful gerrymandering Act, and consequently could no longer be regarded as a supporter of the people's rights. It is evident hon. gentlemen denounce here as wrong and infamous what, in the Province of Ontario, they look upon as most virtuous and highly intelligent. Not a member of the Reform party found fault with the gerrymandering Act of Mr. Mowat in 1874, nor with his gerrymandering Act of last Session. What is the case in the city of Toronto? Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that no man should have more than one vote, and they disfranchise non-residents on that ground, yet their own politicians in the Province gave to every voter in the city of Toronto two votes. They have done this for the purpose of stealing a member from the Conservative party in that city. Consistency is a jewel, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will say less on that point hereafter. If they have any regard for themselves they will. The hon. member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Platt), the other evening, said that half the population was opposed to this Bill. There is no doubt, in my mind, that every Grit in Ontario may be opposed to it, because hon. gentlemen on the front benches opposite are opposed to it, and they are opposed to it because it comes from the Government. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) found some little fault, in criticising the $2 a month tenancy voter; he thought it would be better to make the value of the house the basis, because a man might live in a hovel and pay $2 a month. That is what he calls looking after the interests of the poor man; the poor man should not have a vote because he cannot pay more than $2 a month. We have heard a great deal lately of having the franchise extended to every individual, and hon. gentlemen opposite have been posing as great defenders of this, declaring what a wrong it would be to take away the right of the franchise. Have not the Conservatives in Ontario been fighting, ever since the farmers' sons franchise has been established, to have the merchants and mechanics' sons entrusted with the franchise. Mr. Mowat, after having been driven to the wall by the people last year, yielded and gave the franchise to the sons of merchants and mechanics, but he did not yield until forced to do so by the pressure of the Opposition, and the appearance of the Bill we are now discussing. The mechanics' sons and the owners' sons will not thank the Ontario Government for this tardy justice done them. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the man is the

voter and not the property. I ask: Why have the property qualification? They would disfranchise the non-resident voter, yet, still they have property as the standard of qualification. If property is the standard of qualification, there is no reason why a non-resident should not have his vote where he has property, or otherwise a great many men would not have a vote, because they happen to live away from their property a part of the year. The Indian question has been made a great deal of. Well, the Indian has his franchise, under the Local Government Bill, while he lives off the reserve. He may be just as intelligent, have all the fine sentiments pictured in the *Globe* of the Indian, and live on the reserve, but shall not have a vote. Why he should not is not clear. He is living in his own municipality, it is true, and holds territory of his own, not the Government's. If he were worth $10,000 personal property and still lived on the reserve he could not have a vote, according to the Ontario Act. This is manifestly unjust. But how are we to lift the Indian from the position he occupies unless we take him by the hand and treat him as a white man, when he deserves the treatment. Hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with the franchise being given to Indians, because they say he will vote for the Government or its friends. Well, he may. Does the hon. member for Bothwell, or the hon. member for South Brant, or any other member, do otherwise than vote for his friends? There are several Indians in the constituency of the hon. member for Bothwell who may possibly give him their votes. A great deal has been said about the expense which will result from this measure. The estimate of the hon. member for West Toronto of $75,000 to $100,000 will, I believe, be much more than sufficient. It is well known that the Provinces have no more money than they can make good use of. Why, then, should they not have adopted manhood suffrage and so saved expense? They can take advantage of this Bill, if it proves useful, as no doubt it will, and so save expense to that extent. It is not correct to say that any rights will be taken away from the people by this Bill. They will perform their duties as they did before. There is no pleasure to a municipal council, or to a judge, or to the people, in having to make the voters' list, and if a revising barrister should not be trusted, surely men who are less responsible, and who know they go out of office this year or the next, may be tempted to do more for the sake of party than a man who has a position, and will do right for honor's sake, especially when his action is before the whole world. If men are bound to do wrong they will do it in any case. We have been challenged to go back to the country on this Bill. I object to that, for this reason, that if we went back we would not have so many of the Opposition to contend with in another Parliament. The same sort of threat was given in 1882. Before the last general election these hon. gentlemen said the National Policy was a failure, that the Government had bamboozled the people, and that if they appealed to the country that policy would be set aside; but no sooner did the leader of the Government propose to appeal to the country than they began to whine because they would be put to the expense of another election. If the Premier to-day accepted the challenge to go to the country, the next day there would be a whine in the newspapers that more expense was to be caused, and if the Government did appeal to the country on this Bill, they would be sustained by as large a majority as they have now. Hon. gentlemen have referred to letters which they received from Conservatives in opposition to this Bill. It is very strange that we on this side, who are Conservatives, have received no such letters. They say that the question has not been talked about in the country. I know that, in my county, it was talked about from the time it was introduced; and the people only wondered why the Premier did not proceed with it before. It is idle and dishonest of the hon. gentleman to say that this measure was not understood and looked forward to by the people. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said this was an inopportune time to bring this Bill forward, because we have trouble in the North-West. It is true that we have trouble in the North-West, but how, in such a case, can the Opposition spring like a wild cat at the throat of the Government, and threaten us with a small rebellion here? It is unfair, unpatriotic, unmanly. Some of them have been almost in arms. They have said that this Bill shall not pass. Even to-day we have had a repetition of that, and it ill-becomes them to indulge in this sort of disloyal talk in this House, when we have these troubles in the North-West. No doubt, they would like to saddle the responsibiliy for all that trouble upon the Government; but I have no doubt that, when the time comes, the Government will be able to show that they have done their duty there.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that you have summarily stopped discussion when the subject of the North-West has been mentioned. I do not object to the hon. gentleman's mentioning it, but I call your attention to it now, so that he may be fully answered from this side of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is the hon. gentleman rising to a point of order?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; he is speaking in reference to the North-West troubles.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order.

Mr. HICKEY. I am only replying to a statement made by an hon. gentleman made on that side. I have no doubt that he objects to have it put squarely before the country. The hon. member for South Grey also quoted the remark of the Duke of Wellington in reference to the election for Clonmel. If that was despotism, we have the same sort of despotism in this country. When Mr. Blake named Mr. Edgar as the nominee to be elected in West Ontario there was as much despotism as could possibly be used under any possible Bill arranging the franchise so liberally as this Bill proposes. But that is the kind of criticism which they give to this Bill, a criticism unfair in every respect. They say that the people should have their way. The people have had their way, they have elected us to support the Government on the principles they have enunciated to the country, and until the majority of this House turns against the Government, they will be entitled to carry such measures as the majority back them up in. It comes with a bad grace from hon. gentlemen opposite to threaten the Government with rebellion because a small minority in this House cannot rule. They say the provision in regard to the revising barrister, and, in fact, the whole Bill, is designed to keep the Government in power. The people will judge of that, and when the people understand the Bill, they will be quite satisfied with it, and, I have no doubt that it will keep the Government in power, with or without the Bill they will be kept in power. Sometimes hon. gentlemen have objected to the criticism that they have obstructed the business of the House, and when the member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), put them in the position they occupy before the country, the member for East Elgin said he was willing to accept the responsibility.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. HICKEY. I said the member for East Elgin.

Mr. WILSON. I represent East Elgin.

Mr. HICKEY. I meant Mr. Casey. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I should have said West Elgin. He tried to hedge himself, and said he would take his share of the responsibility. We have had tirades and vituperation against the record of the Premier and the

Conservative Party for the last twenty years. All we ask is that the record of the past shall be the record of the future, and the country will have nothing to regret, but will go on in its grand and glorious march to perfection, and will be the envy of the rest of the world. The true reason why hon. gentlemen make such a dead set upon this Bill is that they know that, in 1887, this Parliament must appeal again to the electors, that they have no policy of their own, and no principles but obstruction and opposition, and that they would like the people to understand that this "infamous," "nefarious" and "rascally" Bill will be the reason for their defeat at the next election. That is the sole object of the Opposition. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that we were afraid to appeal to the same constituency that elected us. Well, that is what we have been afraid of, and that is the great necessity for this Bill. We fear that we shall not be able to appeal, in the future, to the same constituency that elected us. If the Provinces have a right to limit the franchise—although we have had a very liberal extension of the franchise, it is true, in Ontario, and I do not complain of that—but if the Provinces are allowed to limit the franchise they might restrict it so as to defeat the intentions and objects of the Government and its legislation here. But when we have a franchise of our own we will then know to whom we are to appeal, and I think that is the great necessity for this Bill. The objection has been made that the Bill has been brought down too late. Well, it is late, and so far as our interests are concerned, we are sorry it was not brought in years ago. But it is not so late that it should not be passed through, and if hon. gentlemen had shown any fairness in criticising it, the Bill would have been through before this; but they are making it late, and intend to make it still later. I believe the Bill, on the whole, is a step in the right direction. It is another link that is needed to bind the Provinces together, another platform on which the different Provinces will stand together. The men of every Province will stand on the same footing, with reference to the franchise; and after what we have heard in this House, we know that we need a link such as this to bind these Provinces more closely together in the interests of the great Dominion.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I congratulate the House, the committee and the country on the determination, sudden though it is, that has seized our hon. friends opposite, at last, to take part in this debate. I think it is evident that, much as they may disparage the petitions that have been presented here, much as they disguise the feeling that has been aroused in the country since the full measure of the iniquity of this Bill has become known, the very fact of their rising now and attempting its defence is the best evidence that an impression is being made on the country. I welcome with satisfaction this evidence that the time we have spent here in discussing this Bill has been well spent, and that hon. gentlemen opposite begin to feel the necessity of saying something on its behalf. They have stood like dumb-driven cattle long enough.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON. I am proud to know that at last we have compelled them to speak. They expected heretofore that, with their majority, they were going to shove this Bill through by brute force, but they now realise that the country is awakened to the full measure of the iniquity of this Bill, that they can no longer afford to sit silent and allow the Bill to remain undefended. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Hickey) was kind enough to say that the extension of the franchise in the Province of Ontario by the Local Legislature at its last Session was a very liberal one. Now, if that was a liberal one, what can they say of the franchise proposed in this Bill? The Ontario Act gives a vote to every one earning $250 a year, while this Bill only gives it to those earning $400 a year. Where, then, is the liberality of this Bill, as compared with the Ontario Act? If it is a liberal measure to give the franchise to the son of every land-holder in the Province of Ontario, as the recently adopted provincial Act allows, I want to know where the liberality of this Bill comes in, when it restricts the franchise to the sons of land-owners only, and that in proportion as each one's share is valued at $400 or over? The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that the Ontario franchise only gave a vote to every land-owner when the land was valued over $400. But we have only to refer to the provisions of the Ontario Act, in order to show the decided difference in this respect between the two franchises. (The hon. gentleman read the defining clause of the Ontario Act, showing that the Ontario franchise is to all the sons of "land-holders" of $400 in value, and followed by reading the same clauses in the Bill under discussion which confines the franchise to the sons of "land-owners" in proportion as the holding exceeds by $400 a minimum of that amount.) Continuing he remarked: It appears evident, from what has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they have ventured to take part in this discussion, that they feel they cannot relieve themselves of the responsibility that attaches to them for the recent occurrences in the North-West. If the hon. member for Dundas, or any other hon. gentleman opposite, chooses to introduce these questions into the discussion they must take the consequences. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hickey) adverted to the fact that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was here by the grace of the leader of the Opposition. If it is becoming to make a reference of that kind to an hon. member who occupies a seat in this House by the same right that any other hon. member occupies his seat, I want to know by the grace of whose power it was Sir George E. Cartier occupied his seat here at one time—whether it is not a fact that the present leader of the rebellion in the North-West did not withdraw from Provencher in order that Sir George Cartier might take his seat here? I do not want these references by hon. gentlemen opposite to go unchallenged. Is it not true that the right hon. gentleman who now leads this House sought and obtained a seat in British Columbia when an Ontario constituency refused him a seat? What right, then, have hon. gentlemen opposite to make references to hon. members on this side, who have secured their right to sit in this House by the free will of the people.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I wish to correct a statement just made. The Premier did not seek a seat in British Columbia. It was spontaneously offered to him.

An hon. MEMBER. I would also state there was no necessity for a member of Parliament resigning his seat and taking office under the Local Government in order to leave the seat vacant, as was the case in West Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. Consequently there was no purchase.

Mr. CAMERON. Hon. gentlemen opposite are drawing fine distinctions.

Mr. HICKEY. I only gave an illustration as to what the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) calls despotism. If in one case it was despotism, it was in the other. If it was not despotism in the latter case it was not in the former.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman will see how vulnerable his side of the House is on this point. It does not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to say anything as to the position of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), as he has as clear a right as any hon. member who sits in this House. We have heard to-night, for the first time in some weeks, the strength of the argument in favor of the Bill. The hon. gentleman, I think, defended the measure in the strongest degree of which

it is capable. He differs, however, from some hon. gentlemen supporting the Government, as to the Indian clause. He says: Why not a vote to the Indian, who lives on a reservation and may be worth $10,000, and still who has not a vote. No gentleman on this side has taken the position that an Indian should not have a vote when he becomes enfranchised, but we do object that the Indian who is placed in a position entirely different from the white man, who must have a property qualification, should have a vote. In my locality there is a large number of Indians, and as, thanks to the gerrymander, they do not affect my riding, I can speak free from any personal consideration, and I say, from my knowledge of the locality, that if this Bill was accompanied by the enfranchisement of the Indian, by his acquisition of property in his own right, the whole locality would welcome the Bill, because they wish to see that property sub-divided, and the fact that it is not sub-divided and is now largely unproductive is a drawback to the whole neighborhood. It is a serious source of irritation that there should be so many thousands of acres, in one of the best counties of the west, where there is no municipal organisation, where taxes cannot be collected for the purpose of making roads, where any municipal powers whatever cannot be exercised, simply because it still lies in the hands of the Crown. As the ordinary hour for adjournment has arrived, I am quite willing to discontinue speaking.

Mr. JENKINS. Before the House rises, I wish to ask if it is parliamentary for an hon. member to stigmatise members on this side as dumb, driven cattle. If it is parliamentary, all I can say is that it is the language of a low, untruthful person.

Mr. EDGAR. It is a quotation from the poet Longfellow:

"Be not like dumb, driven cattle,
Be a hero in the strife."

Mr. BOWELL. It is a great pleasure that it is not a quotation from the poet Edgar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think I may be allowed to say that my hon. friend did not say that hon. members were dumb, driven cattle, but simply used that quotation from the poet as an illustration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON I think the best proof of it is the fact that the Chairman would have called him to order, if he had applied that term to them.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at two o'clock a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 16th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

PRESENTATION OF A PETITION.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg leave to present a petition, setting forth that hitherto the Provinces have——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. It is irregular for an hon. member to read a petition when he is presenting it. If he wishes to have it read, the Clerk will read it.

Mr. MULOCK. He has a right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. He has a right to read the prayer of the petition, and, if he wishes to have the petition read, the Clerk will read it at the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. He has a right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; Chair, chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I am in order. I am under the impression that the rules of the House entitle an hon. member who presents a petition to state briefly the material allegations contained in it.

An hon. MEMBER. What rule?

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know what rule.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the petition if it is asked for.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps, Sir, you will record your ruling, and quote the authority afterwards, according to custom.

Mr. SPROULE. The rule is that:

"Every member offering to present a petition to the House shall endorse his name thereupon, and confine himself to a statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it, and the material allegations it contains."

Mr. BLAKE. It is rule 85.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 86 says:

"Every petition not containing matter in breach of the privileges of this House, and which, according to the rules or practice of this House can be received, is brought to the Table by direction of the Speaker, who cannot allow any debate, or any member to speak upon or in relation to such petition; but it may be read by the Clerk at the Table, if required; or if it complain of some present personal grievance, requiring an immediate remedy, the matter contained therein may be brought into immediate discussion."

Mr. BLAKE. I would also call your attention to rule 85, which says:

"Every member offering to present a petition to the House shall endorse his name thereupon, and confine himself to a statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it, and the material allegations it contains."

It is consequently in order for my hon. friend to state the material allegations of the petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true, but the hon. member for North Norfolk was reading the petition from the beginning.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yesterday a petition was read on its presentation. The statement of the material allegations is the prayer of the petition, and, if a further statement is required, it is the practice to have it read by the Clerk. That has always been the practice.

Mr. BLAKE. The rule says the member shall state the material allegations.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the material allegations are the prayer.

Mr. CHARLTON. The petition contains five material allegations, the prayer is that the Bill entitled the Franchise Bill be not passed. I present the petition with the request that the Clerk be permitted to read it.

The Clerk Assistant read the petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 85th rule says:

"Every member offering to present a petition to the House shall endorse his name thereupon and confine himself to a statement of the parties from whom it comes."

Then the 86th rule says:

"Every petition not containing matter in breach of the privileges of this House and which according to the rules or practice of this House can be received, is brought to the Table by direction of the Speaker, who

cannot allow any debate or any member to speak upon it or in relation to said petition; but it may be read by the Clerk at the Table if required."

Our practice is that the petition is presented on the responsibility of the member, and then the next day it is brought up, and if there is nothing in it which should prevent its being received, it is received, but the member is not allowed to speak upon it, nor is any other member allowed to speak upon it, but he may then at the time of the receipt, ask that it may be read. That, I think, is the meaning of these two rules taken together.

Mr. BLAKE. It is of little consequence whether the view of the First Minister be correct or not, if the view which I expressed a few moments ago be correct. I have never yet heard, in any court of law or equity, or in the high court of Parliament, that the allegations of a petition were the prayer. I understand the allegations of a petition to be the statements of facts or opinion which are contained in the body of the petition, and that the prayer of the petition is entirely different. The prayer is the consequence of the allegations of the petition, and is the view of the petitioners of what the House should do or abstain from doing. I have always understood, up till to-day, that it was within the competence of a member, under the 85th rule, to state, upon his responsibility, the material allegations that are contained in the petition; but I think that a member presenting a petition is, under the 85th rule, entitled to state to the House in the act of presentation, what the material allegations of that petition are, as distinguished from its prayer. If so, then the House is possessed at the time of presentation of the allegations, and it becomes of less consequence at what period the House shall become possessed of those allegations from the other source, namely, the reading at the Table. But your views upon the subject differ from that of the hon. gentleman opposite and from my own, and you may rule in favor of his view or in favor of mine, or, perhaps, against both of us, but, if it be decided that a petition can only be read by the Clerk on the day following its presentation, it becomes still more material that we should consider what the true meaning and effect of this 85th rule is, and whether a member is to be entirely precluded from communicating to the House what the material allegations of the petition are, as distinguished from its prayer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the reading of the material allegations of the petition means that everything that is alleged in the petition is material, and may be read by the member presenting it, it would evidently bring before the House difficulties that cannot be surmounted. A petition may contain allegations that should not be received at all by the House. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) may not agree with me; he nods to me that I am altogether wrong, but his opinion is not equivalent to an authority. According to the general rules of the House a petition cannot be presented, if it contains objectionable matter. According to precedents, the material allegations, that is, the main object of the petition, can be mentioned when it is presented, but our rule requires that the petition cannot be received and read to the House the same day it is presented, so that time may be allowed for its examination to see if there are material objections to its being read. There might be slanderous allegations in the petition, and if the Clerk is obliged *de plano* to read the petition when it is presented, the House might be obliged to listen to libellous and slanderous petitions. I say that a member, in presenting a petition, is allowed to state its material allegation and to state the prayer of the petition. It is then laid on the Table and examined, and if afterwards the member desires it to be read, it can be read, if examination has shown that it contains nothing objectionable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. BLAKE. My experience in this House is a little longer than that of the hon. gentleman and I will say that, although, as a general rule, members have confined themselves to reading the prayer of the petition, I have not infrequently heard members state, without objection at all, the material allegations of a petition.

Mr. CASEY. The Secretary of State objects to my word on this point. I think on this point I might reasonably be considered a better authority than the hon. gentleman. He is now in his second Session in this House, and I am now in my fourteenth Session. I think I should know as much, if not more, of the practice in this House than the hon. gentleman. My recollection is that members have mentioned the material allegations of the petition, and their right has never been questioned.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman said he has been here fourteen years. He might be here thirty years, and I would not take his dictum, either as to precedent or as to reason.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The difficulty probably arises in this way: The practice of the House has been for a member to say: I beg to present a petition for so and so —praying for some object. But very frequently the member has stated some of the leading points of the petition, though it is not the habit of members. I have frequently seen that done. On the other hand, I have no recollection of a petition being read at the moment it was presented, except on a special motion being made that this petition be now read and received; otherwise, the reading was always left until two days afterward, when the Speaker has taken cognisance of the petition, and is able to say to the House whether the petition should be read or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I concur with every word the hon. Minister of Public Works has said. Not infrequently a member has stated the material allegations of a petition, which he has done on his own responsibility. The act of reading the petition is done subsequently, and is the formal act of the House. But we must deal with the statements made by myself and by another very active hon. member of this House for many years as to whether our practice has been to allow a member to state the material allegations of a petition. I say that is in accordance with the rule and with our practice.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The meaning of the rule cannot be as stated, and I have not yet heard any answer to what I have said. Although some of the material allegations of a petition were allegations which could not be read, which was against the dignity of the House, yet, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, a member would have a right to read or have read those allegations, although they were in direct conflict with the privileges and dignity and honor of members of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said that if my view is correct a member would have a right to read the material allegations of a petition. I say he would. The rule says he has a right to read the material allegations. That does not compromise the dignity of this House. On the day when the House comes to act on the petition and to decide whether it should be read and received, the House acts; but as an hon. member may make statements on his own responsibility, so he may state those allegations on his responsibility, and the House will not be in the slightest degree compromised, for it is not the act of the House but the act of an hon member.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. According to my view of the rules, the reading of the allegations of a petition might lead to the inconvenience and abuse I have mentioned. A member must confine himself to state what the material allegations

of the petition are, and that does not mean that he shall read every allegation of the petition, but simply confine himself to the statement as to what the main object of the petition is.

Mr. MILLS. The whole question is what are the material allegations of a petition. They are the facts set out in the petition. The prayer is not an allegation, but is something asked for, based on the material allegations. When the Secretary of State says it is not right for a member to read all the material allegations, or to state them all, he is laying down a proposition which is contradicted by the rule. The rule is that he has that right. The whole question is what are the material allegations? They are, in general terms, the facts set out in the petition; and if there is anything immaterial which does not fall within the rule, a member shall be restricted from stating it. But the material allegations, whatever they may be, and however numerous, may be stated by the member presenting the petition in order that the House may be placed in possession of the facts and know something of the character of the petition. Otherwise, the House would be kept in the dark until the petition was read at the Table.

Mr. MULOCK. It is clear that the rule is not a mere formal rule but contemplates that a member presenting the petition shall state something as to its nature for the information of the House. If the member presenting the petition were to be confined to reading the prayer alone, it would afford no possible information to the House. That being the case, it seems right for the proper construing of this rule that a member shall state for the information of the House the material allegations contained in the petition, which must necessarily be statements of fact, the prayer being simply a conclusion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Whenever there is any doubt about the construing of a rule, it must be construed according to the practice of Parliament. I find the rule lays down that a member shall state the material allegations of the petition. But in Bourinot's book I find it stated:

"Then the members who have any such documents to present will rise, and after briefly stating the purport of the document in accordance with the rule, they will send it to the Table, where it is taken charge of by one of the clerks."

I find in May:

"While a member may state the purport and material allegations of a petition, he is not at liberty to read the whole or greater part of the petition himself; but if he desires that the petition shall be read, the proper course is to request it to be formally read by the Clerk at the Table."

Yesterday the hon. member for Middlesex read almost the whole of a petitition he presented, and I thought the hon. member for North Norfolk was about to do the same thing, when I called his attention to the fact, that if he wanted the petition read, it must be sent to the Table, and that he should state the prayer. I might change that to "purport," and he should state the purport briefly; and as the hon. member for West Durham has said, he should state it without reading, and should make himself acquainted with the allegations so as to be able to state the purport briefly to the House, and if the hon. member wants the petition to be read it should be read by the Clerk at the Table. Two days afterwards the petition will come up for the formal reading and receiving, and that perhaps is the correct time to read it. But the practice and usage of Parliament has been that if a member wants to have the House put in possession of the facts of the petition, he asks to have it read at the time it is presented. In accordance with that practice, if an hon. member wishes the petition read he must send it to the Clerk, asking to have it read, so that the House will be put in possession of the facts and allegations before the two days subsequently when it will be formally read and received.

Mr. EDGAR. I have presented a petition which I want read.

The petition was read accordingly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must be excused for calling your attention to the fact that one portion of the question submitted to you has not yet been decided. You have stated that a member may, after giving the material allegation of the petition, ask that the petition be read. That is one matter by itself. But is it the privilege of a member to have it read without the consent of the House, for, if so, I must say that after 28 years' experience in Parliament, this is the first time it has been done within my experience. What is the result? The result is that the petition will first be read on the mere will of the member, and then it will be read the second time in the usual way, if a member asks it. I must ask you, Mr. Speaker, to be kind enough to state the rule by which a member can have a petition read in this way by his own free will, and then have it read the second time at the Table.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We may have even something worse than the case which has been pointed out by the hon. Minister who has just sat down. If a member has a right to ask the Clerk to read a petition, it might contain allegations which were slanderous, libellous, or dishonorable to the dignity of this House—not merely untruthful, which might be a frequent occurrence in certain petitions presented to the House—and still the petition would be read. Then it would be read the second time, which should not be done without reason. But the result would be still worse, if the petition was objectionable; then we would have the petition read by an officer of the House, and two days afterwards you might say the petition should not be read, and still the petition would have been read by the chief officer of the House.

Mr. EDGAR. You held, Mr. Speaker, when this question was raised by me that it would not be allowable that a member should read anything but the prayer of the petition, and that being the case, it seemed to me that that was the only way in which the substance, the material allegations, of the petition could reach the House. But since you have decided that the petition may be read, I am sure that the good sense and taste of hon. members will prevent them from asking that petitions should be read at this stage, except under extraordinary circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is the right of an hon. member to ask to have the petition read, though, of course, if the House refuses its consent, it cannot be read. Our rule is exactly the same as the English rule. The English rule is:

"That every such petition, not containing matter in breach of the privileges of the House, and which, according to the rules or usual practice of this House, can be received, be brought to the Table, by the direction of the Speaker, who shall not allow any debate, or any member to speak upon or in relation to such petition; but it may be read by the Clerk at the Table if required."

Now, the same words are used in our own rules—"it may be read by the Clerk at the Table if required"—and the practice in the English House of Commons is, if a member wishes it read, to move that it should be read. That is what the practice has been—that the member who brings in the petition may ask that it may be read, but, of course, when there is any opposition to it, he must make a formal motion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would like to ask a question as to the usual practice in England. Supposing the petition contained matters which are slanderous, or other matters constituting a breach of the privileges of the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not to be read in any case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But how can you know it?

Mr. SPEAKER. The member who presents it presents it on his own responsibility.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The rule says:

"Every petition not containing matter in breach of the privileges of this House, and which according to the rules or practice of this House can be received"——

and so on. But if it ruled that a petition can, as a matter right, be read if required, and if it contains matter which is a breach of our rules, it would be read by the officer of the House without anybody having time to call attention to it, nobody having seen it.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). It is within the recollection of the great majority of hon. members of this House that during this Session a petition was presented to the House, and the member presenting it asked that it might be read and the Clerk read it, and after having read it the Chief Clerk of the House ascertained that it was informal and reported that fact to yourself, and then you decided that the petition could not be received. This illustrates what my hon. friend the Secretary of State has said. I quite agree with what he says that it appears to me that a petition should not be read except by the consent of the House first, and the hon. member who presents it and endorses it is made responsible for what is contained. But there is this difficulty, that supposing an hon. member endorses the petition and it is found that it could not be received by the House—that would certainly be a great inconvenience.

Mr. BLAKE. The question becomes complicated by the view you have taken as to the different readings of petitions. I am not prepared to differ from your conclusion upon the English practice, but it seems to me to involve some sources of inconvenience. I do not apprehend the inconvenience which the Secretary of State mentions. I understand that this reading may take place at the request of a member; but, as you have lately stated, if the House objects on a formal motion that it be not read, this involves no reception of the petition by the House, but a reading in order that the House may learn what the allegations of the petition are—not the reading which takes place when a petition is received.

Mr. SPEAKER. With a view to receive.

Mr. BLAKE. A reading in order that yourself and the House may be informed of the substance of the petition, and if it turns out to be one which cannot be received, according to the rules of the House, you would at once say the petition cannot be received and the matter would be ended. Therefore I do not understand that the difficulty is created. But if we consider the question of convenience, it would perhaps be served by a somewhat more liberal interpretation of the rule than even now you appear disposed to fix. I do not know what you mean by the expression purport; but if a member is allowed to state briefly from memory what the material allegations of the petition are, I presume—unless there was some very special case, in which he desired the House to hear the petition—there would be no proposal that the petition should be read by the Clerk. I do not understand that there would be an absolute right that the petition should be read; but if it were objected to, a motion might be made to that effect; but it would be a very inconvenient thing, to have a motion and perhaps a division upon it. The practice, which the hon. Minister of Public Works and myself agree has been pursued so long, is a good practice. According to that practice a member may state briefly the material allegations of the petition; if he wants it read at the Table, he should say, I want this petition read; and I think the House would allow that to be done, unless in the case of a number of petitions of the same character, when I think the House might decline, as in this case, to allow several petitions of the same character to be read. If there was an abuse of the practice, the House would have it in its power to stop that abuse by declining to receive the petitions, and I presume the reading of those petitions approved of by you might take place at length when the short title is read at the Table. It seems to me our practice is a convenient practice; there has never been any difficulty about it until to-day, and I think we had better adhere to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps on the whole this discussion has been a useful one, because it will enable us to settle what the practice has been. The ordinary practice has been what my hon. friend opposite and the hon. Minister of Public Works have said, and it has not caused any inconvenience. The practice has been uniform. I can speak after forty years' parliamentary experience, and the general practice has been for a member merely to state the prayer. Sometimes he states shortly the material allegations; but he cannot read the petition, or get it by heart; but he can state shortly the material allegations leading up of necessity to the prayer. He does that on his own responsibility. If he reads anything that is improper, or slanderous, or libellous, or contrary to the privileges of Parliament, the voice of Parliament and your voice, Mr. Speaker, would at once check him. Then, sometimes, as the hon. member for West Durham truly says, a member states the material allegations, and having stated them, I think that statement will convince the House whether or not it is proper under the special circumstances of the case to have the petition read at once. If the House assents it is read; if the House dissents, or any one member, I take it, dissents, it must be postponed. I have known many instances in my experience in which an hon. member has pursued that course. He states that the petition is very important to the interests involved, and requests that it should be received at once to save time; and if the material allegations he makes are of sufficient importance to allow it to be read, it can be received at once without waiting for the two days. That has been the practice, and it might be well to continue it. However, it is well that this question should have been brought up and settled.

Mr. BLAKE. There is only one point on which I differ from the hon. gentleman. I quite agree with him that there have been cases in which petitions have been read and received at once, but that has always been on a motion, and always by the unanimous consent of the House. For example, motions of that kind have been made with respect to important private Bills, and I have never known any hon. member to be prevented by the voice of any member from having such petitions read at once. Of course that reading will not take place if you decide that the petition is one contrary to the privileges of the House. The reading which you have been speaking of is the *quasi* general right of the member, and is not the act of the House; it is simply the machinery by which the House thinks fit, on the suggestion of a member, to become possessed more fully of the facts of the petition in the special case, and the House is no more committed to the reception of the petition by that act than when the member states the material allegations of the petition in his place.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is the question. Can a petition be read by the member presenting it, or can it be read, as a matter of right, by the Clerk of the House, at the request of a member? I say no. Not only can it not be received, but it cannot be read. In certain cases, the House may have allowed petitions concerning unopposed questions to be read at once by the Clerk, but it was an exception to the rule. It cannot be the case with the petitions now in question. These petitions are presented on subjects which are under discussion, and on which one side of the House differs from the other side. This is the point I raised, and I think it has been well raised. I do not think a

member has a right, at his mere request, to exact that the petition should be read by the Clerk of the House at any moment when he presents it. I would be very sorry if it was made the rule of the House that a member might call for the reading of a petition when he presented it, and that, as a matter of right, it should be read by the Clerk.

CAPTURE OF RIEL.

Mr. CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read a telegram received from General Middleton, confirming the capture of Riel:

"CLARK'S CROSSING, 15th.

"Riel my prisoner.

"FREDERICK MIDDLETON."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex.) Before the committee rose, at two o'clock this morning, I was addressing myself to the remarks of the hon. member for Dundas on some points with which he had dealt. In doing so, I referred to the fact that the petitions presented to the House against the Bill had had the effect of opening the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite and inducing a discussion of the question by hon. gentlemen opposite to a greater degree than had previously taken place. In this connection I made use of the quotation, "like dumb, driven cattle." Although your ruling, Sir, supported me as to the quotation, I wish to say I had no desire whatever to make it in any sense personal to any hon. gentleman opposite. Its applicability was to the particular circumstance, and I should be very sorry that any hon. gentleman opposite should take it in any other sense than that in which it was intended. There are many things that can be said in debate, under the rules of the House, but which it is not always advisable to say, as there are Bills that can be introduced in this House, the present among that number, which it is not expedient to pass. I make this explanation in justice to myself, personally; I like to see courtesy observed between the two sides of the House, and if I have been the cause in the slightest degree of disturbing that good feeling which I desire should prevail, it is but right that I should make whatever explanation is becoming and necessary to remove any doubt as to my intention. I referred this morning to the Indian franchise, as affecting the Province of Ontario, and practically as affecting the whole country. If, as hon. gentlemen opposite admit, the Ontario Indian franchise recently adopted is one acceptable to this House, we should embody that franchise, as far as it affects the Indians, in the present Bill; if we cannot arrive here at a definite determination as to what the provisions of this clause affecting the Indians should be, let us take up the Ontario franchise and settle the question definitely. I was charged with not admitting that the unenfranchised Indians were allowed a vote under the Mowat Act. At that particular juncture, I was dealing with a particular class of the Indians, with particular tribes of Indians, with those Indians who are located in my own immediate neighborhood, and with whose circumstances I am best acquainted with; I said, with reference to these living on their reserves, the unenfranchised Indians, that they certainly should not have the right to vote; but at the same time I emphasised the proposition that the enfranchised Indian, no matter what his other relations to the State might be, should undoubtedly have the same rights as white men, but the Indian who still lives on his reserve should not have the same right as a white settler. The Indian on the reserve occupies the land in common; it is his only in a remote degree; he cannot dispose of it; he cannot acquire any direct title to it whatever, unless with the sanction of the Indian Department, and on the breaking up of his tribal relations. Still he is an occupant, and as such can claim the right to be placed on the voters' list. That is exceedingly distasteful to those who live in the immediate vicinity of an Indian reserve. The Indians on those reservations pay no taxes to the municipality and assume none of the obligations of citizenship. Is it fair, then, that they should have the right to vote? The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) stated last night that one good reason why the Indian should vote was that he knew who his friends were. I presume that is the case, and that it is the moving impulse with hon. gentlemen in their determination that the Indian, whether enfranchised or unenfranchised, shall have the vote. Originally it was proposed that the Indians of the entire Dominion should have this right, but it is now limited to the older Provinces, because, I suppose, the relations between the Government and Poundmaker and similar chiefs in the North-West have since become strained, and the Superintendent General imagines they have some doubt as to who their friends really are. The hon. member for Dundas candidly admitted that the recent Ontario Franchise Act very largely increased the electorate. In the discussion of the New Brunswick franchise, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), urged the adoption of the present Bill for the reason that it would materially broaden their franchise, and when the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) made some remarks leading to the same conclusion in regard to his Province, they were received with enthusiasm by hon. gentlemen opposite as an admission that the franchise in Nova Scotia would be extended by this measure. The admission of the hon. member for Dundas that the Ontario Franchise Act is a material extension is for the same cause a reason why that franchise should be adopted and engrafted on this Bill. It has been urged that we have developed obstructive tendencies in this debate. A similar Bill to the present was introduced in the English House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone on the 5th February, 1884; on the 28th February the Prime Minister made his explanations, and the Bill was discussed, according to the custom in the British Parliament, at the first reading; a number of amendments were moved and a long debate took place; that Bill passed through committee only on the 26th June in the same year. Consequently, that measure which did not make such sweeping changes in the electorate as this Bill does, took four months to pass through the House of Commons alone. Does not that offer the strongest justification for the ample discussion that hon. gentlemen on this side are determined to secure for this measure? Now the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) also dealt last night with the question of the revising barrister, and I suppose on that point, he spoke with some knowledge of the intentions of the Government. We were told that the assessment rolls were to be *prima facie* evidence. Very well, that is one of the few concessions which have been wrested from the other side of the House since this discussion began.

Mr. BOWELL. You never let us get far enough to make any concession.

Mr. CAMERON. We were assured by the hon. gentleman that the assessment roll, as it comes from the hands of the county judge, is an almost perfect document, and we were assured, also, that there is to be another appeal after publication in the *Gazette*. Now let us see what value there is in this appeal. (The hon. gentleman read sections 46 and 47 of the Bill.) The appeal is simply on a point of law, and it must be to a superior court, and we all know that the cost of submitting a case to the Superior Court will

be so great that only a rich man will be able to prosecute an appeal. Now we were told by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) that the revising barrister was to be of a man of very high character, one whose word would be as good as his bond. But what authority has he for saying that the revising barrister, in all cases, will be a gentleman of the high character that the hon. gentleman so poetically described? Clause 11 states that the revising officer may be a judge or a barrister of five years' standing. But it does not positively provide that he shall be either. It is not absolutely necessary that he should be either. The truth is that the clause is so worded as to leave a loophole so that any man could be appointed revising officer. In section 40 of the Franchise Bill introduced in 1870 it was provided that the Governor in Council shall from time to time appoint a revising barrister or judge, and so on. The adoption of the amendment now before the committee would have the effect of materially broadening the franchise in Ontario. It has been shown that a large number of the wage-earning class will be disfranchised if this Bill passes in its present form. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) in the course of his remarks proceeded on the assumption that this Bill was to prove the coping stone of our confederation system. We have proceeded a good many years without it, and that successfully, and I warn hon. gentlemen of the seriousness and gravity of the situation they are precipitating. I repeat what has been urged before, that unnecessary interference with the franchises of the Provinces, at a time when so many other difficulties lie in the way of the success of the Confederation, is very unjustifiable, especially when such a measure, so far from being called for, is protested against by public meetings and petitions. It is particularly unjustifiable to press such a measure when, under ordinary circumstances, we should be leaving for our homes, and when, even without this measure, other business which imperatively demands our attention would occupy our time a month, or possibly six weeks or two months, from the present day. Now, did the hon. gentleman assume this to be the last measure of Confederation, because he felt that our federal system was likely, as a result of this legislation, to travel back to the condition of things which existed in the old family compact days? Whether that was his intention or not, the details which have already developed with reference to the purpose of this measure clearly show what the intention is, and what powers are intended to be given by it to the Ministry of the day and their officers. The fact that the franchise will be considerably contracted, so far as Ontario and some other Provinces are concerned, and that many who possess votes for the Local Legislature will not have the franchise to this House, must produce a great deal of irritation, especially when the franchises in Ontario and others of the Provinces have been gradually travelling in the direction of manhood suffrage. The argument as to the rights of this Parliament to pass such a Bill was referred to again last night, but I do not think there has been any contention against that argument on this side of the House, because that principle has been conceded by the legislation of 1874. The fact that hon. gentlemen still bring up this argument would seem to show either that they consider it the best reply that they can make to the position taken on this side, or that they have realised that it is not the question under consideration at all. But if we have only reached that point, after three weeks discussion, how can we expect the full discussion which the First Minister considered necessary when he said that an entire Session ought to be devoted to a Bill of the kind. It was urged that the variety of franchises in the different Provinces was a reason why the present state of affairs should not continue, on the ground that it would create confusion in the minds of the electors. I would like to know what confusion would be created in the mind of an elector of Ontario, by his knowledge that the franchise in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia was different from his own? What difference does it make to the elector in the Province of New Brunswick to know that there is a wage-earner's franchise in the Province of Ontario? So far from this producing confusion the great danger of confusion will be from the existence of two different franchises in the same Province, which is going to be a source of great trouble, annoyance, and irritation, and result in a great many mistakes. How can a man who works from seven o'clock in the morning till six at night, or later, understand the complications of this franchise, when after all the discussion we have had in this House we have not reached unanimity as to the full effect of its provisions. From the point of view of the voter there is a decided objection to the adoption of a uniform franchise for the Dominion, because it will lead to a great deal of confusion in the minds of the electors. Another reason given for the adoption of this franchise was that it recognised the principle of property. In the Province of Ontario the principle of property is still adhered to, and that argument does not apply there. But whether it applies or not, I hold that we departed from the principle of real property when we gave an income franchise. I think the principle on which we ought to proceed is that which will give every intelligent man who contributes to the revenue of the Dominion, the right to a voice in its affairs. It must be recognised by this time that a very large fraction of the electors in the Province of Ontario who have the franchise under the Provincial Act, will be disfranchised by this Act. It was shown the other night that there are over 2,000 teachers in that Province whose average salary does not reach the minimum of $400, which under this Act secures the right to vote. I stood up in defence of the rights of that class of the community when another clause of this Bill was under discussion. The Ontario Act, in giving that class the right to vote, has recognised the claims of one of the most intelligent classes in the community; and, if only on account of that particular class, I would enter my strong protest against this Bill and support the amendment now before the Chair. Among wage-earners there are many farmers' sons, who are often employed away from home for four or five months in the winter, and return home when the farm work begins in the spring. They are disfranchised under the farmers' sons clause for two reasons —because they are away from home over four months in the year, and because the holding of the parent may not be a freehold, and may not be of the value to entitle them to vote. These very men who are thus disfranchised are the men who will have the destiny of this country in their hands in a few years, and we should not fail to educate them in their political duties as early in their career as possible, by bringing within the influences that the exercise of the franchise exerts. Now, we must not lose sight of the fact that we have already a Dominion franchise; we have passed an Act and existed under it for ten years or more, which says that the provincial franchises for the time being shall be the Dominion franchise. Now is the first time we have heard any objection taken to that system, or that there is a single individual in the community who takes exception to it. Under that system ample provision is made for the protection of the minority in every constituency in the preparation of the voters' lists. I ask if the protection at present enjoyed by the voter is not greater than what is provided in this Bill. In the Province of Ontario, as has already been pointed out, the assessment roll, prepared under the direction of the municipal council, is made the basis of the voters' list. In this clause under discussion, property of various kinds is made the basis of the franchise. The assessment roll affords facilities by which the actual value of that property can be

more readily ascertained than it can possibly be by the machinery provided in this Bill. The municipal council which is elected by the ratepayers of the municipality, is bound to do justice by them, and the council appoints an assessor who is sworn to assess the property within a particular fraction of its value, with the view to the collection of rates upon it. Every individual in the municipality, whose name appears on the assessment roll, has a direct interest in seeing, not only that he is properly assessed, but that his neighbor is properly assessed as well. If a ratepayer finds that he has been assessed too low or too high, he has the right to appeal to the county judge, who hears the evidence in a summary way and determines on the evidence the value of the property. All these precautions are a direct incentive to the officers who are charged with the duty of preparing the assessment roll and the voters' lists, to do their duty properly. There is no such restraining influence provided in this Bill in the case of the revising officer, for the whole arrangement of the voters' lists is under his control, and he may give the vote to or take it from whom he likes independent of any control. There is another feature of the Ontario law worth mentioning, and that is if a man is unjustly left off the list the municipality has to pay the cost of the appeal, since the fault was theirs; but under this Bill the appeal on a question of law is to be taken by an individual, and no matter whether successful or not, he has to pay the costs. Under clause 55, the revising officer has the right to strike off the names, of his own motion, of persons who have died or become disqualified. You can understand how wide a latitude this will give him.

Mr. SPROULE. You think he will not respect his oath?

Mr. CAMERON. The best security is not the promise of the individual, but his bond. Do you throw doubt on a man's word when you take his note? Or when you go to a notary and get the obligations between him and you set in writing? Human nature is frail, and a man is apt to consider his duties in the direction of his interest.

Mr. SPROULE. The judges are in the same position.

Mr. CAMERON They have nothing to do with the Government. True they are appointed by the Government, but not for a special purpose in which the Government is directly interested, as in the control of the electoral lists. If the oath implies as much as hon. gentlemen opposite say, why is it that the revising barrister in England is appointed by the judges instead of by the Government, and from year to year instead of during good behaviour. The purpose is distinctly stated in a work which I have beside me, which says that the Legislature and the Goernment recognise the imperative necessity for keeping the electoral lists out of the hands of the Government of the day. It has been urged that, although the revising barristers in England were appointed by the judges, the judges themselves were politicians before their appointment. That applies less in England than it does here, for many of the judges there have not been politicians, and have not occupied seats in either Houses of Parliament before their appointment. The Bill of 1870, introduced into this House, provided for the appointment of a board of registration which was to make the preliminary voters' lists, and those were to be practically the lists for all time, subject to revision by the county judge, or, in the case of Nova Scotia, by a revising barrister. At that time there were no county judges in Nova Scotia, and there was therefore some reason for that provision, but now there are county judges there, and the same ground does not exist. Under that Bill the judge or the revising barrister was to go on circuit, and hold open court for the decision of appeals in regard to the voters' list. Why has it been found necessery to make such a material change in the provisions of this Act? It will be practically impossible for the county court judges to discharge the duties that are imposed upon them under this Bill. Their other duties will practically preclude their performing this duty. It has been generally claimed in this discussion that it will cost at least $400,000 a year to run the machinery of this Bill, and the statement has not been successfully refuted. Now, the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett), very recently, in discussing the questions of registration and the appointment of revising barristers, stated that the Province of Prince Edward Island adopted that system some years ago, but had abandoned it on account of the expense. He stated that it cost $12,000 a year, in the six constituencies of his Province. Now, I understood from the hon. gentleman that the machinery was much like the machinery that is provided by this Bill, and if it cost $12,000 a year in the six constituencies of his Province, we may fairly assume that for the 211 constituencies of the Dominion, this Bill will cost $422,000 a year to pay the expenses of its operation. In addition to that there are a number of incidental expenses that will crop up, such as the preparation of the voters' lists, the transmitting of the voters' lists, travelling expenses, and such like, which will run the expense up to within a very small fraction of the largest sum which has been mentioned on this side of the House as the probable expense to the country of the adoption of this system. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the arguments of the hon. member for West Toronto, in the direction of a legislative union, as opposed to the federal principle in our constitution, are arguments that cannot be accepted by this House. When he defended the real property qualification clause, he defended a proposition that was entirely abandoned by a colleague of his own in the Ontario Legislature. It will be recollected that in the Ontario Legislature, when the present provincial franchise was under discussion, the Conservative minority voted in favor of manhood suffrage pure and simple; and in the discussion that took place, Mr. Clarke, who is a colleague of the hon. gentleman as representing West Toronto in the Local Legislature, stated that he was not afraid to build on the rock of manhood suffrage. That hon. members in the Local House said he was not afraid of passing a measure in favor of manhood suffrage; that at one time he believed a property qualification, meant something, but now it meant nothing. Undoubtedly this franchise measure should have been submitted to the people. If that principle is not maintained it is quite possible that the most radical changes may be introduced and carried by Parliament. It is true we have two Chambers and the Crown, which possesses a veto power over all Acts, but that veto has not been exercised for many years. In the mother country it has not been exercised since 1707, when Queen Anne vetoed the Scotland Militia Bill. The principle for which I am contending is recognised in the mother country, and all proposed constitutional changes are submitted to the electors before an attempt is made to pass them into law. The whole tendency of constitutional changes has been in the direction of contracting the power of the Crown and more fully recognising the rights of the people to control the actions of Parliament.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman must keep to the question

Mr. CAMERON. I was following in the line of the hon. member for Bothwell; but I will attempt to confine myself more closely to the question. I shall deal for a moment with the protest which has been made from the other side against what has been termed the protracted discussion on this question. Now, Sir, the English House of Commons occupied four months in discussing a similar Bill. The hon. member for Lincoln the other night

protested against the expense to the country of this protracted Session, but he was quite willing to incur the additional expense—not yearly but for all time—which would be involved in the passage of this Bill. He protested in the strongest language, and with a vehemence that almost indicated a personal interest in the matter, against the expense which the country was being put to by this discussion. Now, Sir, what is that expense? The indemnity of members, or the expense of the officers of this House, or the running of any of the Departments of the House, do not depend on the length of the Session. It is true the gas bill and the paper bill for the printing of *Hansard* may be larger, but these items will appear very small against the expense which will be assumed by the passage of this Bill. If there is a reason to appeal to the community as against the course of the Opposition, in increasing the gas bill and the printing bill of *Hansard*, how much stronger reason have we for appealing to the country against a permanent charge on the country of $400,000 a year?

Mr. SPROULE. You forget the expense to members by the loss of time.

Mr. CAMERON. I quite recognise that every hon. member, without exception, sacrifices a good deal by remaining here, but I can only hope that that sacrifice will be recognised in our personal relations with our constituents. At the same time we come here to discharge our duties fairly and justly, and I recognise that the matter of time is not to be an element in the discharge of those duties.

Mr. BOWELL. Time is not the essence of this contract.

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman appeals to us on the question of the time devoted to this discussion, I say to him that if he will appeal to his own leaders, and insist on their submitting measures in good time—measures which members on this side will insist on discussing, whether they are submitted on the first, or the sixtieth, or the ninetieth day of the Session—I say if those measures are brought in in good time, and the early part of the Session is not wasted, as it was this year and last, we will be quite prepared to facilitate the business of the House, as we are always disposed to do. A thorough understanding of that principle will make it unnecessary for the hon. member for Grey in future to make the remark to which I have alluded.

Mr. SPROULE. If it takes one month to discuss the first clause of this Bill, how long will it take Parliament to discuss forty Bills?

Mr. BOWELL. That is too hard a problem; give him something easier.

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman shows the same lack of acquaintance with the other clauses of the Bill that he displayed with reference to the clauses we have just discussed, I say we are justified in remiaing here a much longer time than there is any probability of remaining. The hon. gentleman disputed my proposition that anybody but a judge or a barrister of five years standing could be appointed revising officer under this clause, but I think I have proved that any man is eligible under the clause which I quoted.

Mr. SPROULE. You stated it, but you did not prove it.

Mr. CAMERON. I think I proved it to the satisfaction of other members in the House, but I despair of proving it to the hon. gentleman. I do not believe there is another hon. gentleman on either sides who has any doubt on the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. We have no doubt abont it, because we believe that what you say cannot be done.

Mr. CAMERON. I trust the hon. gentleman only speaks for himself, and not for those who are in accord with him in political matters. It has been urged that we should make efforts to become a homogeneous people, and it is claimed that this Bill will tend to promote that desirable aim, and that as different Provinces we are to move forward in the march of progress as one consolidated whole. I like to see these fancy pictures drawn, but we must come down to every day practical affairs; we must discuss the question whether the clause under discussion is preferable to that proposed in the amendment. The remarks of many hon. gentlemen who usually ally themselves with hon. gentlemen opposite clearly indicate that our homogeneous existence is not going to be furthered by the passing of this clause. When this Bill comes to be put into operation, I believe the result will be the very reverse; I believe that such an amount of dissatisfaction will exist in the different Provinces, as will very materially affect our homogeneous existence in the future. I should like to see the country progress in the direction hon. gentlemen indicate when they use that word. As one of those who welcomed the Confederation of the Provinces as an assurance that we were to grow up as a nationality with British instincts and with a love for monarchical institutions on the American continent, I should like to see that homogeneous existence brought about; but when I see the disposition of hon. gentlemen opposite to trample on the rights of the different Provinces, I am led to despair of the success of that homogeneous existence which I had fondly hoped to see attained. In more than one of the Provinces, this Bill, when put into practical operation, will be assumed as another attempt to deprive those Provinces of their rights. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if those disputes which have taken place between the Provincial and the Dominion Government were not invariably the result of legislation at the instigation of the dominant party in the Dominion against the interests of the Provinces. There was no justification for challenging the right of the Provinces to pass a License Act. It was a gratuitous interference with the rights of the different Provinces, like many other acts of the hon. First Minister; and instead of a feeling of confidence in this Legislature growing in the different Provinces, it is lessening as the result of the policy that has been pursued for many years past.

Mr. HICKEY. That is your opinion only.

Mr. CAMERON. How is it that not in Ontario only, but in the Province of Quebec, the question of provincial rights is a burning question. Now, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) the other day exhibited a petition from the municipal council of the constituency he represents, favoring the appointment of a particular individual as revising barrister under this Act. He was kind enough to inform us that it was signed by a great many of his political opponents, and that it was in favor of a gentleman who was also an active worker against him. Now, I ask if in these facts there does not lie a very serious reason against adopting the principle proposed to be embodied in this Bill. That hon. gentleman without perceiving it, gave away his case when he said the gentleman in whose interest he presented the petition is politically opposed to him. What is the result? Let us assume that the gentleman in whose interest the petition was signed, is appointed. Will the hon. gentleman say he has strength and courage enough to favor the appointment of a man politically opposed to him unless he feels that he will derive some personal advantage from it? If there is to be any advantage resulting from the appointment of a political opponent, is not that which we contend as being a vicious and vexatious principle of this Bill admitted by that very fact? I hold that it is. The petition which the hon. gentleman has read indicates clearly that the purpose of this Bill decidedly is to put the electoral franchise practically into the hands of the Government. That being the case, I hold that the provincial franchises should be adhered to, and if

I must confine myself more particulary to the clause under discussion I will say that so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned her franchise should be adhered to. The majority of the people of Ontario have determined that it is the one they prefer. It was submitted to them at the elections of 1883, and the Government will be doing a grievous wrong to the people of Ontario, if they do not embody this amendment in the Bill. I desire for a moment to refer to the election law of 1874, by which the franchises of the different Provinces were adopted by the Dominion as the Dominion franchise. When that law was under discussion, hon. gentlemen on both sides gave their general adhesion to the principle then being recognised. Hon. gentlemen opposite will recollect that, owing to the want of any registration facilities in the Province of Prince Edward Island, the Government then proposed to make a change with regard to that Province which involved the acceptance of the franchise which there existed for the election of legislative councillors instead of manhood suffrage. Gentlemen opposite, who were then in Opposition, stood up manfully in favor of the larger franchise as against the more restricted one, although gentlemen on this side urged that it was but a temporary expedient that would be abandoned when Prince Edward Island provided machinery by which every vote, under manhood suffrage, would be registered. That being the case, hon. gentlemen opposite are bound by their record to support the position taken by the Opposition in favor of the provincial franchise. I find on reference to the debates of 1874, that the Hon. J. H. Cameron, then member for Cardwell supported the Bill, that the hon. member for North Huron, who was then a member of this House as he is to-day, is reported to have approved of the Bill generally. We ought to adopt the franchise of the Province of Ontario as the Dominion franchise for that Province. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) claimed that the franchise now proposed was more liberal than that adopted in the Provincial Legislature. The hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) made an admission to the contrary. They can be left to settle that between themselves, but I believe the hon. member for Dundas has made the more correct statement of the two. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) took exception to the provision in the Ontario Act which deprives an elector of more than one vote, but I hold that that is the correct system. It is known that not more than 50 per cent. of the names on the list are usually recorded now, and that is largely caused by the repetition of names on the electoral roll. If persons are entitled to more than one vote because they have property in different municipalities, they should have votes proportioned to the amount of property they own. The Ontario Act in that respect has made the franchise more symmetrical than this Bill proposes to do. In England it has been estimated that the repeating franchise was equal to 10½ per cent. of the entire electorate, and I do not think it is less in Ontario, taking the cities and the rural districts together. The Ontario Act has given votes to the wage-earner, the land-holder's son, and the man with an income of $250 a year, who previously had not votes as such. I therefore say that the Ontario Act makes the foundation of our country broader and deeper, and appeals to justice and right in the same manner and from the same motive as the Prime Minister in England appealed to the Parliament of that country, in relation to his recent Franchise Bill. Reverting again to the Indian clause, I wish to remark that the operation of the ballot system among the Indians will be little better than a farce. If secrecy is an essential to the principle of the ballot, what secrecy is secured in the case of the Indian vote? If it is impossible to operate the ballot successfully in any country where intelligence does not prevail, I ask you what prospect is there of secrecy being maintained, and the principle of the ballot successfully recognised, when the Indian will not be capable even of marking his own ballot? I say we are departing from one of the principles which underlies the ballot system. I repeat what has been said in this House more than once, that we, on this side, are quite willing to give the Indian the franchise if the Government will impose upon him the same responsibilities which are exacted of the white voter. I desire to read an article from the Toronto *News*. Its position has been defined so recently that it is not necessary for me to indicate what its relations are to either of the political parties in this country. But that journal, with others, has discussed the Franchise Bill, and its article on Monday last I will read. (The hon. gentleman read the article in question.) Such is the opinion of one independent journalist in this country, a journalist who I think has proved his independence by the fact that both parties in this House—and perfectly justly—disowned any connection with him, or any responsibility for his views. Now, Sir, if all these expressions of opinion, if all the correspondence which members on this side are receiving indicate the unpopularity and offensiveness, and the general discredit with which this Bill is received, we ought to refrain from going further than the adoption of the amendment now before you. I say that the Bill is objectionable for every reason which has been urged against it. It is objectionable from every point of fair play, and I say that hon. gentlemen who are so fond of referring to British institutions as the moving impulse in everything they do, cannot, in the whole history of British institutions, within the last century, find any measure which has so many scandalous provisions involved in it, as the one now under discussion. I say that their reverence for British institutions must be of a much less marked character than their pretentions, if they will persist in defending this Bill with so many offensive, one-sided and objectionable features. The general character of this Bill is foreign to that principle of fair play which is a characteristic of the Canadian people, as well as of those from whose loins we have sprung, and I can say of this as could with equal for ce be said of another Bill which was a matter of comparative recent legislation in this House, the Gerrymander Act:

> "You may alter and change this Bill as you will,
> The taint of the Tory will hang 'round it still."

It is far better that hon. gentleman should withdraw a Bill which has met with so determined opposition in the country, and if they are bound to have a Franchise Bill for the Dominion, let them make one which will have some elements of fairness about it. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, on the ground of patriotism, to refrain from placing a measure on the Statute Book which will be referred to with odium by the generations which will succeed us. Our position here, as custodians of the popular will, as those who have been trusted by our constituents with the most sacred political rights which can be entrusted to men, should consider the position very carefully before we make such a marked alteration as is proposed here. We should hesitate, if we wish to secure that endorsement of our conduct that was secured by an American statesman who died not long ago, in these lines:

> "His statecraft was the golden rule,
> His right of vote a sacred trust,
> Clear over threat and ridicule,
> All heard his challenge, 'is it just?'"

That is our position to-day. We ask in the name of the people of Ontario and of the Dominion whom we represent here. Is this just? We do not ask it as between party and party. We say let party sink, let it be evanescent as an hour, but let our country still exist. A Bill such as this, that practically places in the hands of one man the representation of each constituency of this Dominion, is the most severe stab at popular institutions that has

been attempted in this country, or in any country, within the last one hundred years. I say, Sir, that the only hope of a community under such circumstances is the uprising of the popular will. The only hope under these circumstances is the rising wave of indignation which is gathering strength, and I pray hon. gentlemen opposite, for the consideration that ought to be shown to popular institutions, not to ignore that wave of popular opinion as persistently as they have hitherto done. We have, Sir, in the history of our mother country in the past, examples of the dangers which are produced by misgovernment and misleglislation; we have in its history the evidences of the evil results which follow, because it invariably happens that when the populace has to resent unjust legislation, whether it came as in the past from the Crown, or as at present from the Crown representatives, they have invariably gone further than was just, right or judicious. I say that the danger which threatens us from that very circumstance is the reason why I appeal, with all the warmth of which I am capable, against passing a Bill which has not only the objection that public opinion does not demand it, but the objection that, wherever public opinion has been expressed, it has been expressed most determinedly in opposition to it. These are the reasons why I prefer in the first place that this Bill should not, in its entirety, be passed; these are the reasons why, in the event of that course not being adopted, I favor the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to leave the Provincial franchises as they are; these are the reasons which, if that amendment should not prevail, induce me to support the proposition which leaves to the Province of Ontario the franchise it now possesses. But if the amendment should not prevail, I hope that the promised amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will receive recognition. I will be glad if better counsels should prevail among hon. gentlemen opposite. I should be prepared to see their existence as the dominant political party for a great many years under any circumstances rather than see this Bill passed, even if it should ring their death knell. We should be capable of placing the country before party. Feeling strongly as I do, I have the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will stay their hands before they insist on the passage of this measure in its present objectionable shape.

Mr. WILSON. Judging by the treatment which has been given to the amendments which have been already introduced in favor of the exemption of some of the Provinces from the operation of this Act, I am inclined to think that very likely the Province of Ontario will share the same fate. However, I feel that it is my duty, as it is my pleasure, to use this opportunity of expressing my strong opinion that the provincial franchise, which has worked so well and given such general satisfaction in the Province of Ontario for a number of years, should be allowed to remain, and that the amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) ought to prevail. I have had an opportunity of watching the working of that franchise for a number of years, and I tell the Government that if they would consult the electors, the municipalities, and those whose duty it is to look after the preparation of the lists, they would agree with me that it would be in the interest of the Province of Ontario to be allowed to continue to use the lists that we have been using for the last sixteen or eighteen years. During the last few days we have had some expression of the wishes of the people, by means of the numerous petitions which have been presented to this House, and the Government who are here for the purpose of carrying out the will of those who elected them ought to consider their wishes as expressed in those petitions. If they treat them with indifference the electorate will, of course, have an opportunity of saying to them whether they should longer remain in the position they now occupy. On a previous occasion I asked hon. gentlemen opposite to show wherein any necessity existed for pressing upon the country this measure at the present time. I called on them to point out a single reason why, after a four months' session, we should be compelled to stay here, day in and day out, discussing a measure of this description, when no necessity has been shown for it. I received on that occasion no reply. True, we have been told—and we have not pretended to deny it—that the Dominion has the power to pass a Franchise Act. The Dominion may possess that right and power; it possesses many rights and powers which it has not heretofore exercised. Why is it necessary that it should exercise this right when heretofore it has not exercised any such right or authority? There must be some reason why the Government is pressing this right at present. Where is the necessity for pressing it? We cannot find it from the arguments of those who have spoken on the other side. I have not heard a single hon. gentleman opposite, who spoke in this debate, point out clearly any wrong, hardship or injustice existing through the use of the provincial franchises. What necessity, therefore, is there to introduce this measure, for which no demand has been made? There must be some hidden reason; there must be something behind all this. Will the Government explain what that something is? Hon. gentlemen opposite may be in the secret, but we are not. Probably the Government feel that on account of the course they have taken, and of the acts they have done, it would not be safe for them to appeal to the country on the same franchise as before. They appealed to the country before and their course was endorsed. Are they afraid now? If their measures are, as they say, all good, if they are administering our affairs for the benefit of the commonwealth, why should they be afraid to appeal to the same jury as before? True, they did not appeal before to the same jury as on the previous occasion; true, they arranged it a little, and now it may be that they deem it necessary to so arrange the franchise that they may be able to come back to this House, not with the free expression of the people, but with the dwarfed expression of the people, an expression carefully prepared by themselves. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite say that the Reform party has never been in favor of the extension of the franchise. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) said it was only when driven by the Conservative party that the Reform party extended the franchise. I propose to show how unfair is that statement. The hon. gentleman is always ready to make an assertion, but he is not always competent to prove its correctness. I believe I can prove that the Reform party have always been in favor of all the advancement and all the reform this country now happily is enjoying. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) was very liberal with quotations, and he always contrived to read them so as to make them appear to the best advantage on his side; some would say they were more or less garbled and did not convey fully the whole truth. In referring to the income franchise, he contended that he was the first to introduce a measure of that description in the Local Legislature, and that the Government of the day took his measure up. I wish to examine into the truthfulness or untruthfulness of that assertion. That measure was introduced in the Local Legislature by the Hon. Mr. McKellar, and more than a month after that time the hon. member for Lincoln introduced his Bill, which never received a second reading. The hon. member claimed that he was the first to introduce a measure in relation to the income franchise. That was not correct, for early in the year 1862 Mr. Boyd introduced a Franchise Bill, and the hon. member for Lincoln was among those who voted against it. He has stated that the Conservative party are always the advanced party in favor of the extension of the franchise, yet, among those who voted against that Bill was

Mr. M. C. Cameron—I mean the member, who was then in the Local Legislature and is now Judge Cameron, not my hon. friend from Huron, because, if he had been there, he would have voted on the other side. I find also, that the present Postmaster General voted for the six months' hoist of that measure, and he had a brother in the Legislature who, true to the instincts of Toryism, true to the desire of opposing the rights of those who had to earn a living by their daily work, also voted against that Franchise Bill. On the other hand, all of the Reformers are recorded on the other side.

Committee rose, and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in addressing this House the other day, claimed that the Reform party had never advocated an extension of the franchise, unless they were driven into the last ditch by the Conservative party. I will read what the hon. gentleman said on that occasion, as I find it in *Hansard*, of the 11th May. (The hon. gentleman read an extract from Mr. Rykert's speech). Well, I have gone through the record of the Conservative party, and I cannot find a single instance where they were the advocates of that principle; but, on the contrary, that they withheld it, as far as they could. The hon. gentleman says that in 1868 he introduced a Franchise Bill into the Local Legislature; and, that again, in 1874, he introduced a Bill, giving the franchise to men enjoying an income, which Bill was taken up and passed by the Government. Well, Sir, I find by the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1868-69, that an Act respecting the election of members of the Legislative Assembly, by the Attorney General, Sandfield Macdonald, on the 9th of November, 1868. It went on, and on the 8th of December the Bill was brought up for its third reading, and a division took place. You will remember that he stated that when Mr. Coyne, the member for Peel, introduced a measure granting the franchise to females, the leader of the Opposition had not the courage to remain in his seat and record his vote, pro or con. We will see what this courageous hon. member did on the occasion of the third reading of the Bill. (The hon. member read from the Journals of the Ontario Assembly). We find a vote took place, and every member of the Reform party voted in favor of that income franchise, and we find that all the Conservative members who voted at all voted against the income franchise on that occasion. True, I do not see the name of my hon. friend from Lincoln. He found it convenient not to record his vote, yet he stated that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, had not the courage of his convictions in reference to female franchise; while the hon. member for Lincoln, on that occasion, either had not the courage of his convictions or else left, so as not to be compelled to record his vote. The hon. gentleman stated the other night that in 1874 he introduced a measure in the Provincial Legislature in the direction of granting franchise on income. Well, we find in the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1874, that on the 4th February Bill (No. 17), an Act to extend the Electoral Franchise, was introduced by the hon. Mr. McKellar, and on the 6th of March we find that Bill (No. 136), entitled An Act to amend the Franchise, was introduced. On the third reading of Mr. McKellar's Bill Mr. Rykert moved an amendment that the Bill be recommitted, with instructions to the committee to amend the first section by adding a provision that no person assessed for income should be entitled to vote at a parliamentary election unless he had paid all taxes imposed on him on account of such income. Yet the hon. member for Lincoln has posed here as the champion of the income franchise, and as having been in favor of relieving those who were assessed for income from being disqualified to vote if their income tax had not been paid. I will read to the House what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question.

Mr. WILSON. I bow to your decision, Mr. Chairman, and I will not quote the full language of the hon. member; but I will simply state that the hon. member was opposed to an extension of the franchise. I find that that hon. gentleman and some other members of this House have stated that there is danger in leaving the franchise in the hands of the Local Legislatures, lest they might abuse the trust. In the same number of *Hansard* this hon. gentleman went so far as to say: (The hon. member here quoted from the official *Debates*). I would ask that hon. gentleman if he can put his finger upon a single instance in which the Province of Ontario has usurped any of the rights, privileges or prerogatives of this House. I say that the Province of Ontario has never attempted to encroach upon the rights and prerogatives of this Parliament, and while I would hold sacred the rights and privileges of the Local Legislature, I would be equally willing to defend the rights of this Parliament. The hon. member for West York took objection to that provision of the local Act which prevents a non-resident from voting. My opinion is, that as we are extending the franchise as far as we can in the direction of manhood suffrage, the measure brought in by the Local Legislature is a just one. I do not think that a man who has $10,000 worth of property in a number of different ridings should have a greater amount of influence in the legislation of the country than the man who has $50,000 worth of property in one county. I believe the true principle is one vote for one man, under all circumstances, and that the small property which is owned by a poor man is just as valuable to him and just as sacred as the large amount of property owned by the rich man, and I say that the principle adopted by the Local Legislature is the true and correct principle. Some hon. gentlemen have said that if the Bill is so unpopular as we on this side assert, why not let the Bill pass, and go to the country, if our desire is to defeat hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, that is a sordid motive upon which to act. It is not the principle which ought to influence the wishes and feelings of any hon. gentleman in this House. We are not here merely to try and oust hon. gentlemen opposite, or to get ourselves in power. We have a higher duty to perform. We are here to try to purge our legislation of evil and wrong-doing, and it is our bounden duty to do so, whether it facilitates our coming into office or our remaining where we are. It is our bounden duty to oppose wrong wherever we find it, and we have no difficulty in finding much of it in this House. If we compare the relative merits of the Ontario franchise and the one which is proposed in this Bill, we find that the Ontario franchise is much more liberal and deals out far greater justice to the people than this measure does. Take, for instance, the franchise granted to wage earners. This Bill, by not making a provision of that kind, will deprive 100,000 or more people of that class of a voice in the government of the country, and I ask, as we have been advocating an extension of the franchise, as we have all felt that property, as the basis of representation, should no longer exist to as great an extent as heretofore, as we have recognised the principle of the income franchise, is it not unreasonable to favor a Bill which will disfranchise all those honest and industrious laborers. Can the First Minister any longer appeal to the country and say that he is the friend of the workingman. If the hon. gentleman is a friend of the workingman, why should he hesitate to incorporate such a provision in his Bill? Does he feel that he has no confidence in them, as he has

heretofore felt he had no confidence in others? If he has confidence in them he should show his liberality and carry out his intention by amending the Bill so as to extend the franchise to the honest and industrious laborer, who is just as much entitled to it as a man who occupies a house rented at a very small sum? Many of these laborers, receiving perhaps only $200 or $250 and their board, can give a more intelligent vote at the polls than householders who pay $2 a month rent. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the assessors are prone to undervalue property. My experience has been quite the contrary. Any man who is appointed to that position and who takes an oath to faithfully fulfil the duties imposed on him is not very likely to assess property far below its real value. But hon. gentlemen opposite have given that as one reason why we should have the revising barrister, because, as the hon. member for Lincoln said, if the property were assessed too low, the revising barrister, as its valuation would not be used for assessment purposes or for the collection of taxes, would place it at a higher figure. That is giving us some of the motives of this Bill. The revising barrister is going to be a very convenient person. In cities, where the qualification is $300, one man, whose property is assessed up to $300, will have the right to vote, but another man, who may perhaps be obnoxious to the revising barrister, or be opposed to the Government of the day, may find his property undervalued, and he will be turned away. Whatever the faults of the assessors may be, it is a dangerous and vicious principle to place a man in a position to enfranchise one and disfranchise another, merely for the purpose of pleasing the Government of the day. I believe that part of the Bill should not for a moment receive the consideration of this House. I can hardly understand some hon. gentlemen opposite speaking about Ontario having set itself against the Dominion. I do not know what that had to do with the question, but I find it recorded here in *Hansard*. Now, it comes with ill-grace, I must say, from hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, to speak in that way, unless they have a desire to humiliate the First Minister. He has no doubt too vivid a recollection of his struggles with the Province of Ontario, and the result of those struggles; and I imagine that it is not very cheering consolation to him to have any of his followers in this House probe those old sores. I think an order ought to be issued in caucus that no reference ought to be made to the Province of Ontario setting itself against the Dominion Government. All that the Province of Ontario has done has been to contend for its just rights, and I think that not only the Province of Ontario, but every Province in the Dominion, ought to contend, inch by inch, for its just rights, and not allow this Government to encroach upon the rights and prerogatives of its Legislature; because, if this encroachment continues in the future as it has been in the past, we shall find some of these Provinces clamoring for separation from this Confederation, and that, I think, we all ought seriously to deplore. Therefore, I hope that in the future we shall hear nothing more in reference to the Province of Ontario taking any course hostle to the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, if this measure be all that the Government declares it to be, if it is a just measure, and one desired by the people at the present time, if it is intended to remove abuses which have existed for a number of years, as hon. gentlemen opposite assert abuses have existed, I will ask you to point out any of the newspaper organs of hon. gentlemen opposite in which you can find a true and full account of the various provisions of this Bill and the meaning of them. If it was such a good Bill, and one likely to meet with the approval of the people, would the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite hesitate for a moment to print the Bill, so that every elector taking any of these papers might have an opportunity of seeing the Bill just as it is, and knowing its full effect?

Mr. WILSON.

But what do we find? When they refer to the Indian enfranchisement do they tell the whole truth? I hold that any newspaper which deliberately, by any means, misleads the public, is equally guilty as if it had told a deliberate falsehood; and therefore I say that if the measure be what hon. gentlemen opposite say it is and what their press pretends it is, they should have no hesitation in giving it publication, so that every one may have an opportunity of ascertaing what the clauses of the Bill are. Can you point out to me, Sir, any newspaper that supports hon. gentlemen opposite which has printed in full the clause relating to the revising barristers? Hon. gentlemen opposite say it is similar to the English Act, but they know very well that the clause providing for revising barristers in this Bill is a very different thing from the revising barrister provision in the English Act. What object can hon. members have in making such comparisons, unless it be for the purpose of trying to mislead the public? What are those revising barristers to do, under this Bill? They are to prepare the rolls, and they are clothed for this purpose with almost unlimited power. What can be thought of any Government that will take to themselves, through their officials, as these revising barristers will be, the power of selecting the men who will have the right to vote and of striking off those who, they think, should not have that right, and thus control the elections to suit themselves. I say this is an unheard of Act. The Premier, the other day, said that constitutional government was on its trial. I think he is going to give it a severe trial; if he persists in forcing this Bill through in its present condition he will strike a blow at the constitution, the result of which no one can foresee. We know full well the object of this measure. Its object is plainly evident on the face of it, and that is that the Government may be enabled so to prepare the rolls as to ensure, as closely as it can be ensured by such means, their return to power. They evidently fear that unless they do something of this kind their return to office is extremely problematical. To pretend that a measure which wrests the control of the elections from the people and places it in the hands of irresponsible revising barristers is a just measure is an absurdity. No one can fully appreciate what is just, right and fair, who can advocate carrying such a principle into effect, and then claim that in so doing they are acting as responsible advisors of the Crown. I could hardly believe that such a thing would be advocated by anybody had I not seen the Bill. As the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, poises as the friend of the poor man, I would like to draw his attention to one section of this third clause, the 4th sub-section, that in reference to tenancy:

"4. Is the tenant of real property within any such city or town or part of a city or town, at a monthly rental of at least two dollars, or at a quarterly rental of at least six dollars, or at a half-yearly rental of at least twelve dollars, or at an annual rental of at least twenty dollars, and has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year next before the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, or in any subsequent year, and has really and *bonâ fide* paid one year's rent for such property at not less than the rate aforesaid; Provided that the year's rent so required to be paid to entitle such tenant to vote shall be the year's rent up to the last yearly, half-yearly, quarterly or monthly day of payment, as the case may be, which shall have occurred next before the first day of November in each of the said years respectively; and provided also, that a change of tenancy during the year next before the said first day of November in any such year shall not deprive the tenant of the right to vote in respect of such real property if such change is without any inter nission of time, and the several tenancies are such as would entitle the tenant to vote had such tenant been in possession under either of them, as such tenant, for the year next before the said first day of November in any such year."

What do we find here? A convenient clause, a clause, no doubt, it is intended the revising barrister may make good use of. It would hardly have struck me that the First Minister was going to act in the future as an agent for collecting rents. It does strike me that, through his barristers, he is going to take to himself the right to say that every man must pay his rent or else must be debarred from giv-

ing his vote. What will this lead to? Suppose I should be a landlord, having a number of tenants, some of whom I know would vote for me and others would not, would I not be in a position to say to a tenant: I want your vote; you have not paid your taxes, but if you vote all right your taxes will be paid, your rent will be paid; but if you do not vote all right I will have you sworn when you come up to record your vote. Here you have a provision to compel the poor, unfortunate, industrious laboring man, who may have met with difficulty and is unable to meet his rent, to vote in the way his landlord desires him to vote. An industrious, hard working man may, from circumstances over which he has no control, such as sickness, be unable to pay his rent when it is due. Is it right that, because a man is sick or unable to get work in consequence of the hard times, he should be told that, therefore, he must not vote for a member of the Dominion Parliament, though he might cast his vote for the member for the Local Legislature? This shows the true intent of this Bill. However it may be concealed, the real intention is not to extend the franchise as hon. gentlemen claim, but to deprive the poor, industrious, honest sons of toil of the opportunity of recording their vote. Although I have not a very great deal of confidence in the spontaneous action of hon. gentlemen opposite in a matter of this kind, I believe many of them will agree with me that it is unfair, because a man happens to be born to toil and has to contend with difficulties from the day of his birth to his death, that he should be deprived of having as much voice in the administration of affairs as the man who has been born in easy circumstances and who has floated through life with any amount of means at his disposal. It would be very easy for us to show many other inconsistencies in a Bill of this description, but I think that all who have heard this Bill discussed will agree with me that, before it can possibly become law, many very serious and important changes ought to be made in it. This Bill, from beginning to end, is one of injustice to the electorate of the Dominion of Canada. Take whatever Province you like. Go to British Columbia, and I will ask you if many of the electors there will not, by this Bill, be deprived of a right which they have hitherto enjoyed? But, on the other hand, the Indians of British Columbia will be enfranchised, and perhaps the Chinamen also.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I hope the Indians will be enfranchised.

Mr. WILSON. We know that in Prince Edward Island this Bill will disfranchise a very considerable number of the electors, and I cannot, for the life of me, understand how the hon. members from that island can sit quietly in their seats when they know that a large number of the intelligent, upright and honest electors of that Province are going to be deprived of a right which they have hitherto exercised. For my part, as one of the members for Ontario, I believe that we would be recreant to our duty if we do not oppose a measure of this kind, that will inflict an injustice upon many and extend justice to none. For these reasons, I shall vote in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey).

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) As the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Wilson) has spoken of Prince Edward Island, I would ask permission briefly to reply to his remarks. There is no doubt that the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition are carrying on this debate to its present unprecedented length for the purpose of arousing a feeling in the country against this measure. I am compelled to believe it has not affected the country to the extent hon. gentlemen would have this House believe. If there is any Province of this Dominion that should be affected by the lengthened debate that has taken place on the question of the franchise it is Prince Edward Island. An election took place there yesterday, to fill a vacancy in the Legislative Council of the Province, and I hold in my hand a telegram I have just received, announcing the result of that election. It reads as follows:—

"CHARLOTTETOWN, 16th May, 1885.

"Bowers defeated by 154 majority in constituency, where thirty months ago, a Grit was elected by 200 majority, and notwithstanding the probable loss of manhood suffrage and the rebellion, both of which were charged against the Conservative candidate."

I think this goes very far to show that this protracted debate has not had the effect of converting the people of that Province to the views of the Opposition. Notwithstanding the position of the question as regards the island at this stage of the Bill, I yet trust that before the Bill is passed the House will see fit to grant concessions to that Province.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I happened to be absent when the House dealt with the amendment which was moved the other day by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and whose object was to substitute for the provision of the Bill which we are now considering the local franchise of the Province of Quebec, as far as that Province is concerned. It is hardly necessary for me to say that if I had been here I should have voted for the amendment, but I hope I shall have an opportunity to vote for it before the Bill is adopted. It may be thought that, being a member from the Province of Quebec, I do not feel interested in the amendment which is now under discussion, and whose object is to regulate the franchise as regards the Province of Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I consider that this amendment is just as interesting to Quebec as it is to Ontario, because it is contending for a principle which is just as important for the Province of Quebec, for British Columbia, for Prince Edward Island, for New Brunswick and for Manitoba, as it is for the Province of Ontario—that is, the principle of local franchises. I have already had occasion to address the House on the Bill which is now before us. Since then I have followed the debates with great attention while I was here, and when I was away I took the trouble to read the *Hansard*, to see what would be said by hon. gentlemen opposite. It does not take much time to read what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this Bill. We have attended a discussion, the like of which has never been heard, either in this Parliament or in any other, I think, on such an important question. There has certainly not been any discussion on that question by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Government and their friends do not think, or do not seem to think, that this measure is important enough to be worth the trouble of discussing it. Long discussions have taken place since the beginning of the Session on questions which were almost insignificant, when compared to that which is now before us, and in which the gentlemen opposite have taken part. But how is it that they do not say anything on this Bill? The reason is very simple: They have nothing to say. Not long ago I was in Quebec, and I had occasion to speak to a great many persons on the subject of this Bill. The long debate which is taking place on this Bill begins to draw the attention of the people, which has heretofore been concentrated on the affairs of the North-West. Well, Mr. Chairman, when the provisions of this Bill are made known to those who enquire, there is only one voice to condemn it; there is but one voice to condemn, especially, the abominable system of official revisers. I have not heard one discordant voice on that point. I spoke to Liberals and I spoke to Conservatives, who have been Conservatives all their lifetime, and all agree to condemn this Bill. The Conservatives are even more afraid of it than the Liberals. There are things in that Bill which appal them. The Conservatives to whom I spoke of it said to me: If we once admit

the principle that the Dominion Parliament has a right to regulate the franchises for the different Provinces, the Province of Quebec may prepare to submit to whatever franchise the majority from the Province of Ontario and other Provinces may see fit to force upon it. Now, it is not necessary to be a great prophet to predict that before long we will have universal suffrage in the country. We know that manhood suffrage exists in Prince Edward Island; it also exists in British Columbia; it almost exists in Manitoba, and we know that during the last Session of the Ontario Parliament the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Meredith, proposed universal suffrage, and that all the Tories in Ontario voted for that motion. On the Liberal side the motion was rejected, but it was made a question of expediency, a question of time, and it was given to understand that it would come to that. Therefore, we may expect to see the majority of the Provinces of the Dominion pronouncing in favor of universal suffrage; consequently, those of the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who vote for the principle that the Dominion Parliament should establish a uniform franchise for all the Provinces are voting beforehand for universal suffrage. For my part, that would not frighten me, but I believe it ought to frighten those who denounced me when, in the Quebec Legislature, I proposed amendments which were far from involving universal suffrage. I was denounced, not only in the House, but also in the Conservative press of that Province. Well, Mr. Chairman, the same gentlemen who have denounced me at that time are preparing to vote a measure which will throw open the door, not only to manhood suffrage, but also to womanhood suffrage. Now, what are the reasons which were given in favor of this Bill since I had occasion to address this House? I must declare that there was hardly anything said, but the only reason which was given was that which had already been given, and that is, that the Act of British North America gives to the Dominion Parliament the right of regulating its own franchise. I have already said that on this side of the House nobody had ever questioned that fact. Besides, has not this point been settled? In 1874 this Parliament was called upon to settle that question. A Bill was introduced by Mr. Mackenzie's Government, and it was supported by the then Minister of Justice, who is now Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, Hon. Mr. Dorion. It will not be without interest to remind hon. gentlemen opposite of what they said at that time, or what was said by those who had a right to speak for them. On this side of the House there has been no change of opinion; what is upheld by the discussion which is now going on is just what was upheld by the Liberals in 1874; but I notice an extraordinary change among the hon. gentlemen opposite, a change, not in the language, because they do not speak, but a change in the vote. In 1874 the Bill of the Mackenzie Government proposed to adopt, for the Dominion elections, the franchise of each of the Provinces. Well, was there any opposition to that provision of the law? I have taken the trouble to read the debates which took place at that time, and I have them in a newspaper whose orthodoxy will not be questioned by hon. gentlemen opposite. I take them from the *Mail's* report. I find in it that two of the hon. gentlemen opposite, one who is still here and another who is not, have pronounced on that question. The hon. First Minister has never varied in his opinions; we know he is a supporter of legislative union, and he has been consistent with himself. When Confederation was established he would have desired to have legislative union of the Provinces, and when this Bill was introduced, in 1874, he at once explained his views on the question; he regretted that a uniform franchise had not been adopted for the whole Dominion. Here are the words which he used:

"He was strongly in favor of a property qualification, and was of opinion that people who contributed to the public revenue should possess the franchise."

It will be noticed that the First Minister has altered his opinion. Thus, in 1874, the right of suffage was to be given only to those who had property, and to-day he admits that those who have no property should have the right of suffrage:

"The principle upon which the franchise should be based should be as wide, as liberal, and as generous as was consistent with maintenance of the principle. He claimed that the franchise should be in all Provinces as equal as possible, so that all classes in the various Provinces would be placed upon the same footing. He held that a constitutional principle in this respect should be adopted, which could be tampered with as little as possible. The House by this Bill would be forcing upon the Local Legislatures the onus of saying what should be the franchise for this House, and by doing this they were abnegating their own functions. For these reasons he was opposed to this portion of the Bill, and was of opinion that they should decide upon their own franchise. He believed the franchise he included in his Bill was liberal enough, and would have included all that should have the right to vote."

So we find that the hon. First Minister held the same views in 1874 that he holds to-day, namely, that it was expedient to establish a uniform franchise for all the Provinces. But did his party agree with him in 1874? It will be remembered that, at that time, his party was left perfectly free, and there was not even a vote taken. The present First Minister, then leader of the Opposition, felt so well that the majority of the House was favorable to the principle under which each Province was to keep its own right of franchise, such as it existed, that he did not venture to challenge a vote. No doubt he had good reasons not to do so, for the leading Conservatives pronounced against him. I may mention, among others, Mr. Hillyard Cameron, a distinguished man, who held a prominent position in his party. He was a man who had a right to speak on behalf of the Conservative party, and when I quote his opinion I am quoting the opinion of the Tory party, for Mr. Cameron was a Tory of the old stamp; he was representing the county of Cardwell. Here is what he said:

"Mr. J. H. Cameron (Cardwell) said he agreed with a great deal that had fallen from the hon. member for South Bruce with regard to the uniformity of the franchise."

The then member for South Bruce is to-day the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and he made a very able speech in favor of the maintenance of the special franchises of the Provinces, and his opinion has not changed; it has remained the same on this point:

"He believed and agreed that the adoption of the course proposed would assist greatly in securing the affections of the electors of the Provinces for the confederate election in a much greater degree than would be the case if they were to deal with them in a separate and harsh manner."

Now, he opposed ballot voting. But, as we see, he was quite in favor of the Government Bill, and gave for it a reason which was never given before to my knowledge. According to him, it was a means of securing the affections of the Provinces by giving them the franchise which they had among themselves. He said it would be a means to secure their affections to the state of things which existed, and to make them interested in the federal elections. Now, I find another member who then occupied, and who now occupies, a high position in the Conservative party, and who pronounced in the same way; it is the Speaker who so worthily and so fairly presides over the proceedings of this House:

"Mr. Kirkpatrick thought the matter should receive the greatest attention at the hands of the House. He was of opinion that, on the whole, the proposal of the Minister of Justice, with regard to the franchise, was the best that could be adopted. He thought, if minors and felons were allowed to vote, that women should not be prohibited from voting."

As we see, the present Speaker of this House pronounced in favor of the principle which we are upholding to-day, and consequently against the principle which is sought to be brought to prevail in the Bill which we are now discussing. I still find another member, the member for West Huron (Mr. Farrow), who pronounced in favor of the fran-

chises of the Provinces. I do not know whether he will vote in the same way or not to-day:

"Mr. Farrow was in favor of the Bill as a whole, although with some of its details he did not exactly coincide."

Therefore, he approved of the Bill as a whole, and in particular that part of the Bill which proposed to maintain the various provincial franchises. I find a still stronger authority among those who pronounced themselves in 1874, and it is that of the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence. He expressed himself in the following terms, and he seems to have completely forgotten it since that time:

"Mr. Caron, who spoke in French, agreed with the Minister of Justice, who had expounded his views with such clearness. The Bill involved questions of the greatest moment to the future of the people of this Dominion."

It will be remarked that the Minister of Justice was the Hon. Sir A. A. Dorion, who proposed a distinct franchise for each Province; that is, to maintain the local franchises:

"The ballot had been adopted by the most civilised nations and the farthest advanced in political science, and had been found to work well."

Mr. CARON. The ballot?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Let the hon. Minister keep his temper. I am just coming to the most ticklish point for him:

"As to the franchise, he was in favor of the system they had enjoyed hitherto. He did not approve of abolishing the nomination day. He thought it enabled the people to discuss the political questions of the day with advantage to themselves."

As will be seen, there is not a word of dissent on the principle of the Bill. The most important point of the Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice was, above all, the local franchise. The hon. Minister of Militia did not think it proper to differ; on the contrary, he gave it his general approval.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) I do not think that there is a general approval. Where are the words of approbation?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) But there are no words of disapprobation.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) That is quite different.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) There are words of disapprobation on all that the Minister of Militia did not approve; he condemned two or three principles in the Bill and he points them out. He approved the rest and he points it out in a general way. Thus, if I approved the Bill in a general manner it would not be necessary for me to say that I approve such or such a clause of it; I would merely state that there are three or four points of which I do not approve.

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) The hon. member does not consider this question from the same point of view as the Minister of Militia. The hon. member thinks that all that which he disapproves is approved by those who do not hold the same opinion as he does. I simply said what I thought on this question, and I did not at all approve of the measure, such as it was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Dorion.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Then the words of the hon. Minister are not reported right; because the report says that he gave a general approbation to the Bill. If that report had been made by the *Globe* it might, perhaps, be questioned, but it is that of the *Mail*, and it cannot be questioned. That report says:

"Mr. Caron, who spoke in French, agreed with the Minister of Justice, who had expounded his views with such clearness."

We find that he approved of it in a general way. He took exception to the two or three points on which he did not agree with the Minister of Justice; but, when in a Bill, one takes the trouble of condemning one clause or two and of approving the remainder in a general way, I do not see how it can be said that the object was to condemn the Bill, which contained very important things, because it will be admitted that the nomination was an insignificant thing, so to speak, when compared to the franchise. Well, the hon. Minister of Militia, who took the trouble to take exception, who has even pronounced a condemnation on the question of public nomination, said nothing at all about the franchise. Therefore, I have a right to say that that part of the Bill was covered by the general approbation which he gave at the beginning of his speech. Now, on the Bill, such as it was introduced in the House in 1874, there was an exception made with regard to Prince Edward Island, an exception which at that time was rejected by the Senate. It was an unfortunate exception, and for my part I would not be ready to defend it. There was given a reason which may have been good or bad, for all I know; but the Bill merely introduced for Prince Edward Island the franchise which had existed for the elections to the Legislative Council. On that point many supporters of the Government criticised that provision, and it was finally put aside. Thus we see that the universal sentiment, in 1874, save a few exceptions, which were so few that they are only an evidence that the unanimity of opinion which existed at that time was to the effect that it was better to leave to each Province the local franchise which had existed until then; that is to say, to have the same voters for both local and federal elections. It was also the opinion of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). He expressed that opinion in a newspaper, which was quoted the other day in this House. But hon. gentlemen opposite change their opinions with wonderful facility; they have certain opinions during a certain time, but they change the moment they have no more need of them. When I was denounced in 1874, I was less advanced than they were, only my ideas have not changed, but theirs are quite different from what they were then. I am now wondering if this is not a reason for me to pay a great deal less attention to their denunciations than I did at that time, for in the future I might say that the opinions of these gentlemen will change the moment they have no more need of them. On our side of the House we uphold whatever opinions we believe to be just, fair and equitable, but hon. gentlemen opposite uphold the opinions which they believe to be useful to them for the time being. I said a moment ago that in 1874 the unanimous sentiment, not only of the House, but also of the country, was in favor of having for Dominion elections the same franchise as for the provincial elections. What has happened since that time, that this system should be changed? Was there any of these expressions of opinion which were imposed by circumstances, and to which Parliament ought not to resist? I find nothing of the kind; on the contrary, I think I may affirm, without fear of being contradicted, that every time the hon First Minister—and that has happened often—has tried to introduce a Franchise Bill, proposing a uniform franchise for all the Provinces, he has been universally blamed by the Conservative press of the Province of Quebec. I think I may say that not an article has been published in a Conservative paper, either this year or during preceding years, in favor of a uniform franchise, but dozens of articles might be quoted from Conservative and Liberal papers of this year and of the preceding years which have pronounced against this uniform franchise. So much for the Province of Quebec. But in the other Provinces were there any of these expressions of public opinion which are irresistible, and before which a Parliament must give way. I have never heard of any. I do not believe that the press, even the Conservative press, has ever pronounced in favor of a uniform franchise before this Bill was introduced, and even before the Government had manifested their intention of forcing it through. Well, if

there was nothing in the public which has compelled the Government to introduce this Bill, what is the reason why it was introduced? Mr. Chairman, things must be stated as they are. This Bill is forced upon the majority of the Government by the Ontario Tories; the Tories from the other Provinces, or the Conservatives from the other Provinces, if it sounds better, do not want it. We have just heard one of the most devoted—not to use a stronger expression—servants of the Government declaring that he had not changed his mind; he tried the other day to press the adoption, in favor of Prince Edward Island, of the local franchise of that Province; he has not succeeded, but he has just declared that he had not lost all hopes; this thing seems to him of such great importance that he hopes that the Government will change their decision and will finally consent to leave to Prince Edward Island that to which it attaches so much of importance, the local franchise which it has enjoyed until now. The hon. member understands very well the use which will be made against him of the present Bill; he has not forgotten the use which was made against the Liberal party of that unfortunate clause of the Bill of 1874, which was to give a special franchise to Prince Edward Island. Dr. Tupper tried to stir up religious prejudices with respect to that clause; he contended that that clause was destined to prevent the Catholics of Prince Edward Island from voting. I would like to see him in the ranks of the Opposition to-day. Would he say that the present Bill is for the purpose of preventing the Catholics of Prince Edward Island from voting? For the present Bill will establish just the same franchise which was proposed in 1874, and which was rejected. Therefore, if we except the Tories from Ontario, nobody wants this Bill to pass. To be convinced of that, all that is necessary is to speak about it outside of this House. There is not one Conservative, if we except those from Ontario, who is in favor of this Bill; every body would prefer to leave things as they were in 1867. All this is in view, not of a uniform franchise, but in view of having these famous revisers, who will revise nothing but who will do everything in the first instance. It is very well understood that if it was intended to maintain the local franchises which exist in each Province there would be no necessity of ascertaining who are the electors for the Dominion Parliament. Now, what is wanted by the Tories from Ontario is that no electors should be made except those who will send to Parliament only Tories, and Tories of the old stamp, Tories who will be absolutely hostile to the Province of Quebec. Besides, Mr. Chairman, I am not the only one to say so, and the thing is perfectly known by the friends of the Government outside of this House; the friends of the Government who are not all obliged to go through the same door do not hesitate to say that they deeply regret the introduction of the Bill. All those who have a little sagacity, those who can see a little further than their nose, as is commonly said, understand perfectly well what is the object of this Bill. It is to cause a Tory majority to be elected in the Province of Ontario, such a compact majority as to make it possible to dispense with the majority from the Province of Quebec. That is the object, and in order to do that the revising barrister is needed. It is intended to adopt the following system: It is intended to have in every county a man who will say who will be the person who must be sent to the House; it is intended to arrive at a system whose result will be to have only one elector in each county, and this elector will probably be a man who will be able to do all the work, all the unclean work of the Government.

Mr. CARON. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) It is well known that there are men who are not to be stopped by an oath, and good care will be taken to appoint that class of men, so as to have on the voters' lists only puppets, and all the Government will have to do in election time will be to pull the strings. That is to say, that through hypocrisy it is intended to come to this: That nobody but Tory members will have a chance to be sent to Parliament. Such is the object in view. And to come to that it is proposed to have a uniform franchise; because, otherwise there would be no chance of appointing revising barristers, such as are intended to be appointed. Now, there has been an attempt to justify the appointment of these revising barristers, and, Mr. Chairman, although the clause we are now discussing only relates to the city franchises, the appointment of revising barristers is essentially connected with it; because, in reality, it is perfectly useless to say who are those who will be qualified. As to those who can read between the lines, all they have to do is to examine clauses 3 and 4. What do these clauses say? Those who are posted on political events and who know how the Conservative party deals with patronage will understand that these revising barristers will only give a vote to those whom they will know beforehand as being ready to vote for the Tory candidates. This is what clause 4 says. Apparently, the trouble is taken to state what will be the qualifications of the electors; but in reality these qualifications will depend on the judgment of the revising barrister; they will depend on the question whether the revising barrister will be willing or not to find these qualifications. As I said a moment ago, the appointment of the revising barristers is of the highest importance. An attempt was made to justify the appointment of the revising barristers for the preparation of the voters' lists, by contending that this institution exists in England. Well, such a statement as that is an insult to the good sense of the public. There is no analogy between the two. They did not quite dare to call them revising barristers, but they call them revising officers. In England it is perfectly well known that the revising barrister does not participate in any way in the preparation of the lists; the electoral list is not prepared by them. The valuation of the property and the preparation of the lists are made by the overseers in the counties, and in the towns by the clerk of the town. It is about the same thing as that which takes place here. What do the revising barristers do? They simply revise the electoral lists which have been prepared by the local or municipal authorities. We have no objection to that. Moreover, in England it was found so important to secure the independence of these revising barristers that they are not appointed by the Government; they are appointed by judges, and they are not even always appointed by the same judge. So great was the precaution taken on this point that it has been enacted that these officers would be appointed by the senior judge of the Assizes, and it is well known that it is not always the same judge who holds the Assizes. And yet these revising barristers do not exercise half of the duties which will be exercised by our revising officers here; because, as I said, the revising barristers in England are only charged with the duty of revising the work done by the local authorities. What will be the duties of the revising barrister here? As I said, it will be the manufacturing of electors, and nothing else. He will be charged with the duty of making the valuation of properties. Here is a lawyer, who is going to take a trip in the country, and unless he is ready to go through his oath as a gymnast goes through a paper disk in a circus, he must go from one house to another, valuating the properties, as the municipal assessors do. But even if he is a man to whom his oath may give a few scruples, he will have means of putting himself above scruples; all he will have to do will be to take information from unsworn Tories, and by that means he may value at $200 a house which is worth $400. It will be said to him: Why, how could you, without perjuring yourself, make such a valuation? He will have a ready answer. He will say:

I have enquired of so-and-so—an individual who will not be sworn, but who will be a good Tory, a good canvasser of the Conservative party—who valued that house at $200. He will not even take the trouble of taking his information from a man who will be sworn. Mr. Chairman, these revising barristers are the absolute upturning of all our electoral system. There is no use in concealing the object of their appointment. It is to allow only those who are willing to vote for the Government to give their votes, and perhaps the attempt may succeed; but appearances must be saved, and whenever the thing is tried, people will be sure of the result beforehand. It is the upturning of our constitutional system. What is the system of our constitution? It is a very wise system, which has given good results. It consists in this: The members must reflect the opinions and the interests of their constituencies. How can that be so? It is so when they are elected in a regular manner. It is when those who vote for them act in a regular manner, under a general law, according to which no fraud can be committed, and who then vote according to their conscience. Why have we such severe laws on electoral corruption, laws which prohibit treating, undue influence, etc.? What is the object of these laws? It is to maintain the constitutional principle which I have just mentioned. If it was allowed to buy all the electors of a county, this electorate would not send to the House a member who would represent their opinions, but they would send a man representing the opinions of whoever bought them. Our laws prohibit treating, because it is intended that there should be no appeal made to the greediness of the electors. If treating was allowed, the man who would be elected would not represent the true opinion of the free electors, but he would represent the electors whom he had furnished with drink and food. What is the object of our laws against undue influence? All the judges who have dealt with this question have been unanimous on that point, because it is considered as very important to respect the conscience of the electors. Indeed, if those who are in a position to control the votes of the electors were allowed to make them vote by threatening them, the elected candidates would not at all represent the opinions and the interests of their electoral division; they would represent whoever was in a position to influence them, and we see what precaution was taken, and wisely taken, to ensure the respect of this great constitutional principle, that the member who is sent to the House must be sent there to represent the true opinion and the true interest of the electoral division which he is supposed to represent. With the system which is sought to be established to-day, all this will be put aside. If this Bill comes into force, and if it is carried out as intended by those who have inspired it, the members who will be sent to the House will, in fact, represent only the opinion of the revising barrister, because there will only be on the voters' lists those whom the revising barristers shall have deemed proper to put on, and it will be a very awkward revising barrister, who will not find the means to put only Tory majorities on the lists in a great number of counties. I admit that in counties where there are Liberal majorities of 400 or 500 votes, it would be rather hard to convert them into Tory majorities; but take a county where the majority is 50, and the revising barrister must be very awkward if he does not succeed in converting that majority of 50 into a minority of 50. There are only 100 votes to change, and if there are 60 polling places in a county, this will make a change of two votes in each polling place. A revising barrister whose conscience will be somewhat elastic will very easily find a reason for saying that the property of an individual has been assessed too high by the municipal assessors, and he will deprive him of the right to vote. It will be still easier as regards the valuation of income. Thus, when he has to deal with a good Tory he will take his gross income; if it is a Liberal, he will say that it is the net income which must be taken, and in that manner he will manage to put on the electoral list only those people whom he will wish to put there. Such is the object in view. Now, before concluding, I deem it my duty to say a word about a charge which was brought against the members of the Opposition. I see by the Conservative papers, not only the English papers but also the French papers, that they do not say a word to defend the present Bill; but they carry out the principle, that when people have a bad cause, the best plan is to abuse the lawyer of the opposite party. At the present time the Conservative papers seem to have a cause which is not defensible; and how do they proceed? They abuse the lawyer of the opposite party. We are charged with obstruction. But, Mr. Chairman, have they a right to charge us with obstruction because we are discussing a measure like this? The hon. First Minister has stated, on a previous occasion—and I believe that his authority will be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, as it cannot be pretended that he spoke without knowing what he was saying—he has already stated, when he introduced a measure of this kind, that it was a measure which would take a whole Session, and I believe he was right. Perhaps it was expected that this measure would be passed hurriedly, without any discussion, because it was known that it could not stand discussion; but, is it to be supposed that this lengthy, and perhaps very tedious and very tiresome discussion for hon. gentlemen opposite, is a pleasure to us? I believe that if there are people for whom it is burdensome to stay here, they are found rather in the Opposition than on the Government side. Why do we undertake an exhaustive discussion of this Bill? It is because it is a Bill of the highest importance; we consider that we would be recreant to our duty, as representatives of the people, if we allowed this measure to be passed without discussing it. The discussion which has taken place has not been useless. Suppose we had discussed this Bill during ten hours, as the Secretary of State wished to allow us to discuss it, could we, during a ten hours' discussion, have found in that Bill what was in it, and what hon. gentlemen were compelled to admit was to be found in it, the right of voting given to Poundmaker, to Pie-a-pot and to all the other Indians? These people claim the right of scalping their enemies, but it was intended to give them the right of voting besides. Without the discussion which took place, that clause would have been adopted, and all those Indians, who are to-day killing our volunteers in the North-West, would have been allowed to vote. It will be admitted that it was well worth a fortnight's discussion to make hon. gentlemen opposite understand that the Bill such as it was proposed and such as it was sought to be passed, gave the right of voting to the North-West Indians. Well, if that was struck out of the Bill, is it due to hon. gentlemen opposite? Not at all; these gentlemen were there to swallow that, the same as the rest; the trouble of gilding the pill was not even taken to make them swallow it. Again, I say that we have made no obstruction, and when long quotations were made it was because we were compelled to sit for two or three days in succession, and during hours at which it is impossible to have serious discussion. It must be admitted that until the hour when a serious discussion should end we have always discussed seriously; we have not spoken against time; but when it was intended to keep us until six o'clock in the morning, and even during fifty-seven consecutive hours, it could not be expected that we should discuss seriously. It would have been taking this side of the House for a pack of fools, to expect a serious discussion under the circumstances. Since we are sitting until a reasonable hour, and the sittings are still long enough, there has not been a single speech against time; the object of every speech delivered was to show the defects of the Bill,

The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has pointed out in the Bill a defect which had not yet been discovered, and a very serious defect. It is that the Bill, such as it is now framed, will have the result of depriving of their votes people who have not paid their rent. It is a thing which was never seen until now in any Province of the Dominion where the franchise is based on property. The moment an individual has a property which is assessed high enough to allow him to vote he ought to exercise that right, no matter whether he has paid his rent or not. And who will generally suffer from this provision of the law? It will not be the rich men, but it will be the poor men. Well, there was not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite who had yet discovered that. I say it is only through a lengthy and exhaustive discussion that we may come to discover all the disastrous consequences of that Bill. I admit that the discussion would not be so long if hon. gentlemen opposite took part in it, but as we are alone to discuss we are obliged to find both the objections and answers on this side of the House. We intend to discuss this Bill just as if it had been introduced at a proper stage of the Session; but it was introduced at a time when the Session should have been virtually ended; it was delayed till the last moment, in order to avoid discussion. If the Bill had been introduced during the early days of the Session, and if we could have discussed it during the first month or during the first two months of the Session, the idea would never have occurred to any one to make obstruction. Well, has that discussion, which would then have been a regular and legitimate discussion, become irregular and illegitimate because the Government was pleased to press the adoption of that important measure when the Session is about to end? Surely such an absurd statement will not be made. We are discussing this measure as, I believe, the Opposition ought to discuss all the other measures of the Government, if they were introduced at the beginning of the Session. This will be a lesson for the future. This is my first Session in this House, but I have noticed one thing before to-day, and it is, that all the most important measures, which naturally ought to be Government measures, are never introduced during the first two months of the Session. The first reading takes place before that time, but none of them are discussed. It is only the moment the members are preparing to leave for home that these Bills are introduced, in order to stop the discussion. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Liberal members, far from acting contrary to their duty, by discussing this Bill as they do, are doing their duty, and they would be remiss in their most sacred duty if they did not do it. We are sacrificing all at this moment to our public duties by staying here, but it is a duty which we will fulfil to the last. I am not speaking on behalf of the Opposition, but as a single member, who may be allowed to have opinions which are not compromising to anybody. I say that when at this stage of the Session a Bill is introduced, the object of which was a cowardly attempt to decimate the Liberal party, I say that if the members of the Opposition allowed this Bill to pass without discussing it, such a cowardly course on their part would make them worthy of the contempt of the country at large, and I, for my part, would despise them if they did not defend themselves against such a Bill. What is the intention of the Government? They intend to use the strength of their majority to pass the Bill. And we, who are in the Opposition, could we have the foolishness, the stupidity, to let this Bill pass without using the means which are afforded to us by the constitution to oppose it? I say that it would be absurd if it was not cowardly. Even if we were not able to discuss it seriously—and I maintain that we have always discussed seriously—even if we had discussed for the sole purpose of endeavoring to defeat this Bill, whose object is to decimate the Liberal party in the Province of Ontario, we would have been justified. I do not fear the consequences for the Province of Quebec, and if I only looked to the interests of my party I would vote with both hands in favor of this Bill, because there is no measure which is more unpopular in the Province of Quebec, and the hon. members opposite who belong to the Province of Quebec will have to defend it on the hustings. They will have to defend the right of suffrage in favor of those who have an income and who have no property, a principle which they formerly condemned. I repeat it, if I only looked to the interests of my party in the Province of Quebec I would say that I would ask for no better chance. But we must look to the general interests of the Dominion, and as we have in Ontario friends whom it is proposed to annihilate, I say that it would be cowardice on the part of the Liberal members from the other Provinces, did they not do all in their power to come to their aid. Therefore, we will discuss this Bill; we will not perhaps prevent its being passed, but we will discuss it long enough to leave it no excuse before the public. We will put it so clearly before the public that if it produces disastrous consequences we will not be blamed for them, but, on the contrary, the electors will bear us testimony that, for our part, we have done our duty, and our conscience is clear on that point.

Mr. TROW. I may say that the Bill before the House has created a great deal of excitement throughout the Dominion, judging by the numerously attended meetings which have been held in cities and towns in the Dominion, the strong resolutions which have been passed, as well as the petitions which have been sent to this House, signed by thousands of people, condemning the measure now under discussion. To my mind, at least, the matter is one which has taken hold of the community, and they are of the opinion that the measure is one that is out of place, undesirable, and besides that there is not sufficient time to have a proper discussion of the measure. The First Minister stated that it would take three months at least, or a whole Session, to analyse and ventilate a Bill of such importance. We were here for many weeks at the outset of the Session, and very little public business was brought before us, the result was that a great deal of valuable time has been lost, and now, when we should be near the close of an ordinary Session, we are called upon to discuss a measure which affects the whole Dominion. I know that in Ontario, at least—and I presume in the other Provinces—there are a great many people who now enjoy the franchise who will be deprived of it if this Bill becomes law. I do not think that any Administration is justified in taking from any voter a right which he formerly enjoyed, and I know that in my own county there must be hundreds who will be deprived of the franchise by this Bill who, under the local franchise, had that privilege. We have not heard of any petitions being presented in favor of this Bill, nor of any meetings asking that the Government should make such a change. Any ordinary measure would unquestionably pass the House without much opposition. It is necessary for an Opposition in the House to ventilate measures, and, if possible, amend them, and an Opposition discharging those duties is just as essential as a Government. The Government of the day are certainly under a debt of gratitude to the members of the Opposition, and more particularly to the leader of the Opposition, for the way in which their crude measures have been analysed and perfected by him. Hon. gentlemen can call to mind many measures in previous Sessions which were introduced by the Government, and which the courts pronounced unconstitutional, and there are certainly many measures which would have been unconstitutional but for the supervision of the leader of the Opposition. The present system in the Province of Ontario works admirably. The assessors, as a rule, are men of standing in the community, thoroughly

conversant with the business they undertake to perform, residents of the municipality, many of them, for a quarter of a century, and they are men who are selected on account of their qualifications for their position. They do their work in such a way as to do full justice to all parties concerned, to give satisfaction to the council which employs them and to the whole community. The hon. member for North Perth—who I am sorry to say is not in his place—made the astounding statement that the assessors were not reliable in his county, but were placed in their offices for political purposes. That hon. gentleman is certainly in error. He stated that the municipal councils were, as a rule, political partisans, and that these assessors were appointed on account of their political proclivities. I may mention one instance to show that that is not the case in the county of Perth. In the township of Downie I have had five or six different contests, during the last twelve years, and I have received from 140 to 150 majority in that municipality. The council of that municipality have always had a majority of Conservatives in their membership. They have always had a Tory assessor and a Tory clerk, and notwithstanding that fact my majority at the last election was 149, showing conclusively that they are not partisans or elected for their political proclivities.

Mr. BOWELL. That they are honest men.

Mr. TROW. I do not pretend to say that, but I say that politics does not rule in that municipality; because, as a matter of course, if the Reformers in that township give me a majority of 150 they could get positions in the council if they felt inclined to do so, but I know that Reformers are not anxious to get the position for that purpose. There are several municipalities in Perth which give me majorities, who, by their possession of the books and papers, would be able to do wrong, if they felt inclined to do so; but I believe that the assessors of that county, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for North Perth, do their duty honestly and uprightly. I am astonished at the statement of the hon. gentleman, that all the officials are dishonest and are political partisans. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) tried to make it appear that the expense of the revising barristers would not be a very large sum. I am not prepared to make an estimate, but I have no doubt it will amount to from $300,000 to $400,000 per annum. We will place it at $300,000, and it is so much money wasted. The work will not be done in such a business-like manner. The present system works so well and is carried out without expense to the Dominion Government, that I am astonished the Government should entertain the idea of employing other officials when officials are already employed by the local municipalities without any expense to the Dominion Government. The present system, I repeat, works well; it has been working well for eighteen years, and has given great satisfaction to the community. There are no complaints, no petitions, presented against it. With respect to the revising barristers, I am not aware of any barristers in any section of the country who would be competent to value indiscriminately lands through municipalities. To do so in one riding, comprising fourteen or fifteen municipalities, would occupy his attention more than twelve months. Such men, I think, as a rule, are most incompetent to examine and report upon the value of real estate, or even personal property. The question arises as to how the expenses will be paid. Suppose the dispute arises at a remote end of a township. Generally speaking, a revising barrister will live in the county town, and the property requiring his consideration may be situated 50, 80 or 100 miles distant. The result of an investigation would be that large expenses would be involved, and I should like to know who would be responsible for them—the Dominion Government, the municipality or individuals complained of? One great evil of this Bill is the want of appeal from the revising barrister. The principal objection I have to the revising barrister is that there is no appeal from his decision. If he thinks proper, he can allow an appeal; but it is not to be expected that a man will allow an appeal against his own judgment, and the result will be that there will be no appeal. Under the present system there is an appeal to the county judge, and the county judges, as a rule, are men of standing in the community; they are considered to be unpurchasable; the people have every confidence in them, and I do not see why revising barristers should be appointed to take their places. I have listened with a great deal of attention to various speeches which have been delievered on this Franchise Bill. It is true, the discussion has, in a great measure, been confined to the Opposition. A few gentlemen on the opposite side have taken little part in it, but none of them apparently understood the purport of the measure, because the hon. First Minister had to state that the interpretation they placed on it was entirely wrong. The First Minister himself, on introducting the Bill, was rather limited to time in his explanations of it, occupying 84 minutes; consequently his supporters were at a loss as to what the true interpretation of the Bill was. After some days of discussion the hon. First Minister apparently lost his temper; he came into the House somewhat confused, and made great complaint against the members of the Opposition. He said they had combined together, not merely to occupy valuable time, but purposely to make a dead set upon him—they wished to kill him; that he was 71 years of age. He made great lamentation—pity the sorrows of a poor old man. Now, I would like to know what object the Opposition had. I know there is not a member of the Opposition who does not respect the hon. First Minister, and I do not know how they could injure his health in the course they were taking, because he was in his room three-fourths of each night asleep; he did not remain in the House more than three or four hours out of fifty-seven hours consecutively; one hon. gentleman says he was only here five hours out of fifty-seven. He should have been here to give explanations, because there was no other member of the Government, apparently, who was able to explain the measure as thoroughly as himself. The Hon. Minister of Public Works has certainly stuck to the ship, and I believe he will stick to it if it sinks, as I have no doubt it will before long. I give him credit for tenacity of purpose and a desire to do his duty.

Mr. MILLS. He is a Grit.

Mr. CHARLTON. He ought to be a Clear Grit.

Mr. TROW. I object to the passing of this Bill, because it deprives hundreds of young men who are conversant with the history of the country of the franchise, while it gives the franchise to the untutored, uncultivated Indian. I have travelled a good deal and seen a great number of Indian tribes, but in no treaty ever submitted to this House have I seen the signature of a single chief. It has always been their mark instead of their signature, whether in Ontario or in any other Province, or in the North-West or Manitoba.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I will show the hon. gentleman some signatures in the handwriting of the chiefs themselves.

Mr. MILLS. Are they going to have the franchise?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I hope they will; I would be very glad for them to have it.

Mr. TROW. It is proposed to give the right of the franchise, the dearest right we possess, to men who traffic in their wives' and daughters' virtue. They are described in the report of the agent of the First Minister as lazy, worthless, untrustworthy.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. There are lazy people in all classes.

Mr. TROW. These people are not taxed; they are fed and clothed in a great measure by the Government; they are wards of the Government. The result is, that every Indian who gets a right to the franchise will cast his vote in support of the Government of the day. You could not expect anything else. They will vote just as a son would be naturally inclined to vote in the same way as his father, because he is under his care and protection. This Bill has, no doubt, been in incubation for fifteen or twenty years, and it is now submitted because another election is approaching within two years. It is designed for the purpose of striking at certain members of the Opposition, among others my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) and my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). They are members who take an interest in the discussion in the House, who have done their duty in committees and in debate, and in this respect are useful to the Government, even if they are in Opposition. This Bill is also intended to strengthen the Government supporters, for in many ridings represented by Conservatives, who were elected by trifling majorities, this Indian vote, it is expected, will make their position more secure; and hon. gentlemen opposite who are in this position are somewhat callous, and are opposed to the Bill being withdrawn simply because they are interested. I have every confidence that the First Minister, when he sees, as he cannot help but seeing, the extraordinary excitement which this objectionable measure has aroused throughout the country, will see fit to withdraw it. Petitions have been presented here from all parts of the country, signed, many of them, by large numbers of Conservatives in the different ridings. I, myself, presented one from the village of Milverton, in my riding, which was signed by many of the most ultra-Conservatives of the place. This Bill cannot fail to result in a great injury to the Government, if carried, because the people are aroused to its unfairness and iniquity. It is much more objectionable than the Gerrymandering Bill, and that was bad enough in all conscience, but hon. gentlemen opposite never appeal to the country without first taking the precaution to secure some undue advantage to themselves. In 1872 the Conservative party obtained $360,000 from Sir Hugh Allan to carry on the elections; in 1878, when the country was suffering under commercial depression, they managed to secure an undue advantage by raising the cry of the National Policy; in 1882, before going to the people, notwithstanding they had nearly 70 of a majority, passed the Gerrymander Act. By that Act I was handicapped at the start by 38 of a minority, when, if the county had not been interfered with, I would have had 200 of a majority at the outset. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) was also handicapped by a minority of 100 by the same means, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had to start 100 votes behind his usual calculation. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) is uneasy, but we can excuse his uneasiness, in view of the petition sent from his riding, signed by 35 of his supporters, which would considerably reduce his majority of 15. I hope the Government will reconsider this measure, which is so objectionable to the whole community, and decide to withdraw it, and allow legislative business to be proceeded with at once; and, according to the hon. member for Brant, it will take thirty or forty days to get through with the necessary and legitimate business of the Session.

Mr. MILLS. I have no intention to punish hon. gentlemen on that side; I only regret they should have insisted on endeavoring to punish us. They kept the House in session fifty-seven hours in one continuous sitting, and voted down any proposition to adjourn.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not true.

Mr. MILLS. I say it is true, and I say further that in a matter of this kind the hon. gentleman's word is not to be taken.

Mr. TROW.

Mr. BOWELL. The only difference is this: You moved the resolution for the amendment, but refused to let it be put.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that before I undertook to speak I asked the First Minister whether he would consent to the motion being put, and if so, I was prepared to forego my observations. He replied: Certainly not. Hon. gentlemen opposite sought to destroy the health of hon. gentlemen on this side by keeping the committee in sitting for that period, and then endeavored to make it appear that we were seeking to injure the health of the leader of the House, although that hon. gentleman did not feel called upon to attend the sittings of the committee at all. You have in your hands, Sir, two very important amendments, the one moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk and the other by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I purpose making a few observations upon both. We know this Bill has been prepared for a political purpose. This Bill, it is rumored, is to be passed because the hon. Minister who leads the House is anxious to emancipate himself from the hon. gentlemen who follow the Minister of Public Works. It is said that the orange colors and Quebec blue do not blend well together, and that it is highly desirable that the Tory party in the Province of Ontario should be strengthened, in order that it may emancipate itself from the influence of those who follow the hon. Minister of Public Works. Sir, we know that there is a great deal of foundation for that observation. We know, for instance, the zeal, the devotion of the Minister of Public Works, to a superloyal Protestant party, and we know that the hon. gentleman may tolerate, but he does that with a great deal of difficulty, those who entertain the opinions of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Now, Sir, the Bill before us has a provision specially intended to put the Orange party on that side of the House, and to transfer the Bleu party to this side of the House, and to exclude those who entertain what are known as Reform political opinions from the representative body altogether. It is felt that as long as we occupy a position in this House the hon. gentleman cannot secure for himself that personal independence that he feels it most desirable that he should possess. He chafes under the yoke that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has so long put upon his neck. He wears it with ill-grace. He feels that it is one in which he cannot get on satisfactorily; and, by a species of constitutional assassination, applied to members on this side of the House, and by a little independence shown towards hon. gentlemen who follow the Minister of Public Works on that side of the House, he hopes to change the political complexion of Parliament, and then there will be far less embarrassment in catching Riel, if that condition of things prevailed, than there are under the existing circumstances. Now, I wish to call your attention to some provisions of this section of the Bill. In the Province of Ontario we see that this Bill proposes to increase the electoral franchise and to disfranchise a larger number of people who possess the electoral franchise in that Province under the provincial Act. By this section the owner of property in a town or city must be assessed for at least $300 before he can vote; by the law now in force in the Province of Ontario he need be assessed but for $200, and in rural districts and incorporated villages for about $100. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has made a calculation—and having followed him in his observations I am inclined to think his calculation is not beside the mark—that the number of persons who would be disfranchised was about 125,000; and I think there would be at least that many. Now, Sir, if this House may disfranchise 125,000 this Session, it may, with equal constitutional propriety; disfranchise 125,000 more next Session, and the succeeding Session it may disfranchise 125,000 more. And so you may go on with the same constitutional propriety and disfranchise, each year, a like num-

ber, until you would leave the electoral privileges in the hands of a mere handful of the population, and, if you can, do away with the electoral system altogether. It is perfectly competent for us to pass an Act to declare that the electoral franchise shall be confined to a few inhabitants in every town and village in the country. We might do that without violating any law, although we would certainly violate the principles of our constitution. We might declare that a number of persons named in the Bill should be the only persons who should have a right to vote for the election of members of Parliament, and we have just as much power, and your Bill would be, in point of law, just as binding, if we did that, as for us to carry this Bill through Parliament. They have discussed the constitutionality of this, using the word constitutional in the sense of *ultra vires*. There are two senses in which we may use the word unconstitutional. An Act of Parliament may be unconstitutional as being *ultra vires;* but it may be unconstitutional as being a departure from the practice and principles which are recognised as constitutional principles. It is in this sense that this is an unconstitutional proceeding. In every instance, the English Parliament, when asked to deal with a question of this kind, has first submitted the question to the country at elections, and obtained the sanction of the country to proceed with the measure before Parliament was asked to pass it. I might mention cases in which that has been done. Some hon. members have said that the measure recently carried through the Imperial Parliament was not sanctioned by the country during the elections of 1880. That is a mistake. Every one who has read the interesting discussion that took place on the extension of the franchise to householders in counties, between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe, in 1879, in the *Contemporary* or *Fortnightly Review*, will remember that Mr. Gladstone committed himself strongly in favor of legislation on this subject. But he did not rest content with that discussion. He expressed his views in Parliament and upon the hustings, and during the Midlothian campaign he addressed the country on the subject:

"He said he ought to have mentioned the extension of county representation. It was most unreasonable that the very class of men who, if they resided within the limits of the parliamentary boroughs, were deemed competent, and had shown themselves competent, to exercise the franchise, if they happened to live within the district of a county, were denied the suffrage, and were excluded from all direct influence upon the policy of the Government of the country. This, if not the very first question, was one that should occupy the early attention of the Parliament about to be elected."

Mr. Gladstone clearly expressed the opinion that it was the duty of the Government to deal with the question of the extension of the franchise and confer the privilege of voting upon householders in counties as it was at that time enjoyed by householders in boroughs. The same principle, observed in 1831, 1857, 1868 and 1874, was again followed in 1880, and the proposed changes received the sanction of the country before they were approved by Parliament. It is true this Parliament may legislate on any subject within its limits; at all events, with regard to the ordinary legislation that does not affect our constitutional system. If Parliament makes a mistake, it may correct it through popular representation after the next election. But if you alter the basis of representation and change the electorate body you put the remedy out of the power of the people, without a revolution. I hold that so long as the majority of the people support hon. gentlemen opposite, the Government ought to remain in their hands; but when public opinion changes, when it accepts the views held on this side of the House, it is our business to see that the representation of the country remains in such a condition that it is highly probable the majority of the people will be able to secure a majority of the representatives in Parliament. I cannot fancy a more unfortunate condition of things than the one contemplated by the Gerrymander Act and by the Bill now before the committee, that the condition of the electorate shall be so changed that a majority of the electorate will not be able to secure a majority of the representatives on the floor of this House. It is impossible to suppose that the people, under that state of things, would respect laws made under such circumstances. The moment you produce such a condition of things you strike at the root of the constitutional system; you prepare the way for revolution, and instead of having an orderly condition of things and respect for the laws, you cannot have any respect for the laws. That is what is proposed by this Bill. Look at the provision in respect to tenancy. If a man comes forward and proves that he pays $20 a year rent, or produces a receipt to that effect, he shall be placed on the voters list. The Ontario law provides that if he is the tenant of property of the value of $200 he shall have a vote. Under the Ontario law the amount of property for which a man is assessed determines his right to vote. The provision in this Bill is the amount of rent he proposes to pay; but he may not pay any rent. A landlord may place on the voter's list for an ordinary dwelling house twenty tenants. This Bill contains a proposal to have a fraudulent voters' list. When you depart from the present system there is no standing ground except, manhood suffrage. I believe in that principle, and I will support that proposition, if the present amendment should fail. I am willing to leave this matter in the present hands, because it is then in the hands of the people, not because they are represented in the Local Legislatures, but because we can appeal to the same people who sent us here. The Local Legislature has nothing to do with the preparation of the voters' list, that being entrusted to the hands of the people. The people elect the council; the council appoints the assessor; the assessor is sworn to fix the value of property fairly, and in the great majority of instances does so. The people have an appeal from him to the municipal council, and, if they think that they do not act fairly, to the county judge. The whole thing is in the hands of the people themselves, and from the ministerial act of the original preparation of the list there is an appeal to the representative of a judicial body, the judge of the county court. Let us take a practical view of the matter. We say, in the first place, that the preparation of the voters' list is a matter of fact proceeding, and you take the local authorities because they live on the ground and they know the people. The assessor has seen everybody, he comes in contact with everybody, and if, by accident, he leaves off a name, the chances are ten to one that some member of the council will put it on, without interference on that part of anyone; and if there is afterwards any ground of complaint there is an appeal to the county judge. Supposing you were to name a sheriff, or a warden, or some other party, how is he going to prepare the voters' lists in a county of 50,000 people, in which he probably does not know more than 2,000? The chances are that the list will be exceedingly defective. I say this law is essentially defective, no matter whether you put the appointment of the revising officers out of the hands of the Government or not, and as a first condition of justice it should be out of the hands of the Government. Apart from that, unless you have some local authority in every municipality to prepare the list, in every instance you will have a defective list, or else an enormous expense in preparing that list. It is my strong feeling and conviction, and I believe it is the feeling and conviction of every hon. member in this House, except it be some man who expects to have a friend or a partisan appointed to the position of revising officer, to prepare the lists in his behalf, that there is not a member of this House but would rather incur the expense of an ordinary election than undertake to look after these lists, with but a single revising officer for the purpose of preparing it. Under the present system a dishonest or unscrupulous assessor will be put

out, or punished, because the council who appoint him are responsible to the people; and if you look at the number of appeals you will see how small the number is, compared with the total number of persons who are emyloyed in the preparation of those lists throughout the Dominion. I say, in the next place, that the preparation of the lists should be in the hands of a ministerial, and not of a judicial officer. You do not deal with a judge as with an ordinary ministerial officer, for you cannot make him responsible if he goes wrong; you cannot punish him if he gives a wrong judgment, as you could a ministerial officer, who is responsible for his conduct. The preparation of voters' lists should, I say, be made by men who are responsible for what they do, who can be punished if they do wrong, and then an appeal should be had from this responsible ministerial officer, who prepares the lists, to a judicial officer, whose business it is to revise them, and see that names are not improperly put on or left off. It has been said by the Minister of Customs, and other hon. gentlemen on that side, that the Ontario Act has done a great wrong, in depriving non-residents of their votes. The principle of that Act is that one man should have one vote, and that is according to the principles of our constitution, that representation should be based on population. The basis of representation is ascertained by dividing the population of Quebec by 65, the number of members allowed for that Province, the number for each being about 20,000. Under such a system, why should you give 20 or 30 votes to one man, who may have his property divided into so many village lots, in different counties, while you only give one vote to another man, who has ten times as much property in one county. It is contrary to the theory of our constitution—contrary to the principle of represen tation by population. When an election was held, some twelve months ago, in West Middlesex, I had an opportunity of examining the voters' lists, and I found there were 128 voters who had been residents there before, but who were then residing in the State of Michigan. Now, it was possible to bring every one of those who had been placed on the roll when the assessment was made back to the riding to give their votes. There was the possibility of buying those votes; they might be bought while residing outside of the constituency. These men could vote and return, and if you should contest the election you had no means of bringing them back to give evidence, to ascertain whether there was bribery in the election or not. This non-resident voting is one of the most fruitful sources of bribery and corruption in elections. It is highly undesirable that at every election a large number of people should be brought in from the United States for the purpose of voting for members in the Parliament of Canada; and yet that has been done again and again. Now, the law of Ontario proposes to remove that, and it does so, not by disfranchising any man, but by saying no man shall have more than one vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What do you do for the electors of Toronto? You give them two. That is an exception to your rule.

Mr. MILLS. It is in this sense: that two or three members are given to one constituency, and an elector votes for the members who represent that constituency.

Mr. SPROULE. You give each elector two votes.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the hon. gentleman can make a speech when he is ready.

Mr. SPROULE. I am helping you.

Mr. MILLS. I call the attention of the committee to this fact, that there is no vote outside of a single contituency. If there are three members in a constituency, the elector will vote for the three, but that is a wholly different thing from allowing him to go from constituency to constituency in order to poll his vote. Whether constituencies should be separated or grouped is another and different question.

Mr. BOWELL. Why do you not carry it out in the municipal elections?

Mr. MILLS. That is a representation of property.

Mr. BOWELL. What is the difference?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman ought to know that representation in municipal bodies is a representation of property, not of persons. Representation in this House is representation of persons, and not specially of property. In municipal bodies the principle is nearly the same as in the case of banking institutions; you deal with taxation of property, and you say that if a debt is to be incurred, unless a man has a lease running as long as the debt, he will not have a right to vote on the question of the debt.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that in a city having seven wards, if a man is assessed for $200 in each ward, and there are three aldermen for each, he votes for twenty-one aldermen, but if he is assessed for $100,000 in one ward he only votes for three.

Mr. MILLS. That is a reason for changing the municipal law in that particular.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, why did you not change it?

Mr. MILLS. I am not sitting in the Local Legislature. The hon. gentleman may address this observation to me when I am defending that defect in the municipal law.

Mr. BOWELL. You just defended it on the principle that, in municipalities, there was direct taxation and the votes were given on property.

Mr. MILLS. So they are, and because it is not carried out with mathematical exactness the hon. gentleman assumes that the rule is different from what I have stated; but it is exactly what I have stated. Now, the principle of represention in England itself has undergone very great changes. When Mr. Burke was discussing the question of parliamentary reform it was pointed out to him that the county of Devonshire returned as many members as the whole kingdom of Scotland, and he defended that condition of things, because, he said, each member was returned, not for the particular locality in Devonshire, but for the whole United Kingdom; and if he was returned for his own locality the danger was that he would, in time, regard himself as simply the representative of that locality instead of the entire kingdom. Mr. Burke was combating—and a great many of the statesmen of his day held the same view—the doctrine of representation by population. Sir James Mackintosh, in his Essays on Government, points out that there ought to be representation, not of population, but of classes, and that each class should be so represented that no one class, whatever might be its numbers, could command a majority in Parliament, and therefore its representatives could not devote themselves exclusively to their own particular interest. Now, the hon. gentleman who proposed this Bill—in an imperfect way it is true, and to a very limited extent—spoke in defence of this Bill on the lines indicated by Sir James Mackintosh. It was the views of the world fifty years ago and not the views of to-day—it was the constitutional system of fifty years ago and not the constitutional system we have now—that the hon. gentleman put forward as his defence of this Bill. He spoke in favor of uniformity in the franchise, and the representation of different classes. Now, all that is at variance with the declaration of our constitution. Our constitution recognises the principle of representation by population, not representation by classes. If the population is represented, all classes are represented. It is by giving to all people who

are not paupers the elective franchise and representation on the floor of Parliament that you give all classes representation. But when you propose to divide the community into classes, and to give representation to those different classes, then you seek to revive a condition of things that the force of the industrial changes that society is undergoing has swept away. It has gone in England. Everybody knows that the old views of parliamentary government, with regard to representation, have all been swept away, and that no one at the present day is disposed to question the propriety of the principle of representation of the people. The representation of the aristocratic class, of the mercantile class, of the manufacturing class, and of the agricultural class, is all gone. There is no defender or advocate of that view in the British Parliament. The prevailing view is the representation of the people as a unit—not a representation of the people divided into classes or orders; and in a democratic country like this, it is preposterous to seek to establish such a system; yet that is what is proposed in the section now before us. I have pointed out why that section ought not to be adopted. There will be a great cost in the preparation of the voters' lists; count the cost of 210 revising officers, of 210 clerks, of 210 constables, and all the other officers who are required, together with the cost of printing everything connected with the voters' lists, and I think $500,000 is a very moderate estimate of that expenditure. Are we in a position to incur that expenditure at the present time? Is the condition of the country, financial and otherwise, such that we ought to engage in experimental legislation of this sort, altogether apart from the pernicious features of the Bill? I say we ought not to do so. We have voters' lists now prepared for us without any additional cost to the Local Governments, and we do not require any other lists. Not a word has been said in defence of the Bill. The plea of uniformity has been abandoned.

Mr. McCALLUM. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that it has.

Mr. McCALLUM. No, I do not.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows less than I supposed he did. Does he not know that in this Bill it is proposed to give the sailors and fishermen the right to vote on personal property, and it is denied to the cabmen and the owners of bank stock and the men who have money deposited in the savings banks.

Mr. McCALLUM. You can be a fisherman if you like; you are fishing for information now.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman not know there is no class entitled to vote on personal property except fishermen. Why should they be so entitled to vote, any more than cabmen, or than the men who have money deposited in the savings banks? There is no uniformity in the Bill. It is merely intended to promote the interests of party for the purposes of party, after public confidence has been withdrawn from that party.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman any further information from the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 18th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to enquire whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session the Franchise Bill, of which notice was given in the Speech from the Throne.

ENQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to bring before notice of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the fact that a return asked for some time ago has not yet been brought down, although I have asked four times respecting it. It is a return respecting the accountant of the Ministers' Department, who is now Deputy Minister of Fisheries. It involves a charge of a very serious character.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is speaking of any serious charge his remarks will call for a reply. He must therefore confine himself to enquiries respecting the return.

Mr. McLELAN. I was not aware that the return was in connection with a serious charge against any individual. When the hon. member called attention to it last week, I told him that the document had been sent over to the Secretary of State's Department. I have forgotten to make enquiries since; but I will do so, and have it brought down immediately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Customs, who, I presume, is acting for the Minister of Finance, to the fact that a return, several times promised, as to savings banks, has not been brought down. It has been ordered a couple of months, and the first half, which relates to Government savings banks and to the post office savings banks also, I think might have been procured by this time.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry, and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was there any correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, subsequent to the 18th March, 1885, on the subject of the proposal for a change in the arrangements between the company and the Government? Was there any report from the chief engineer in connection with the matter? Was there any report from any Minister on the matter? Was there any Order in Council on the matter? Was any report from any officer of the company laid before the Government? Has the Government the balance sheets prepared by Mr. Miall, but not appended to his letter?

Mr. POPE. I thought the hon. gentlemen's question was respecting correspondence "previous" to the 18th March, 1885, and not "subsequent" to that date. I will give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. I call attention to the fact that this question was put on the Paper on 8th May. I have already postponed it once, and now that I am asked to postpone it a second time, I hope full information will be given.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What were the receipts and expenses of the Intercolonial Railway from the 1st day of July to the 1st day of May, in the years 1884 and 1885, respectively ?

Mr. POPE. When the question was asked a few days ago, I informed the hon. gentleman that we had not received returns up to 1st May this year. The hon. gentleman then asked me to get the return for 1884.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Both were asked for.

Mr. POPE. I could not see that would be of any service to the hon. gentleman if he wants to make a comparison. Consequently, I obtained the latest information I could for the two years, namely, up to 1st April. The figures are as follows: 1884, working expenses, $1,858,760; earnings, $1,739,357; 1885, working expenses, $1,966,147; earnings, $1,727,357. The working expenses have increased this year on account of the very severe winter we experienced—the worst ever known in the experience of the Intercolonial.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What additional sum or sums (if any) have been borrowed by the Government since the 1st day of April to the date of this enquiry, and from whom and for what length of time have they been borrowed ?

Mr. BOWELL. In reply to this question, I have to inform the House that it has been deemed advisable to request the Finance Minister to proceed to England to arrange for the redemption of the 5 per cent. loan, and to provide for the short time loans, and that between the 1st of April and the date of his departure he arranged for advances to the extent of about $2,000,000, to meet the expenses of the Militia Department in connection with the North-West difficulties and the subsidy and loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, falling due under the contract in the Act of the last Session of Parliament. With regard to the latter part of the question, as to the parties with whom the arrangements were made, I have simply to repeat the answer I gave to almost a similar question a short time since—that the banks and others object to their names and the terms upon which these arrangements are made being made public, and it is not deemed advisable in the public interest that they should be given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose that answers my question up to the 8th May.

Mr. BOWELL. Practically so, although the answer I have before me says to the 1st April, in accordance with the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Since the 1st of April

FRENCH CANADIAN OFFICIALS IN THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES asked, How many officials are there now employed in the inside branch of the Customs Department at Ottawa ? How many of these are French Canadians ?

Mr. BOWELL. There are twenty-seven employés in the inside Customs Department, two of whom are French Canadians, precisely the same number that were in the Department when I took charge of it.

SERVICES OF SURGEON-GENERAL BERGIN.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether Dr. Bergin, Surgeon General to the volunteer forces in the North-West, is in receipt of pay for services connected therewith, while in Ottawa drawing indemnity for parliamentary duties ? If not, has pay been promised him, or is it the intention of the Government to give him pay ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame, shame.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may state that Dr. Bergin, Surgeon General of the volunteer forces in the North-West, has rendered invaluable service to the Department of Militia, in organising the ambulance corps and the medical staff. He was required to look after our volunteers who were fighting the battles of our country. He is on active service, like any other gentleman who has joined his regiment and is now at the front, and as such he receives pay, as the other gentlemen who are now on active service receive pay.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many half-breeds have been already enumerated and are declared entitled to receive scrip—(1) for 160 acres, and (2) for 240 acres, under the Order in Council of 20th April, 1885 ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Order in Council of the 20th April, 1885, applicable to those who left Manitoba, provides for money-scrip redeemable in land, and twenty-six half-breed heads of families have proved themselves entitled to $160, and 422 minors, $240. There are some cases in which additional evidence is required before they are finally disposed of.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RAILS FOR THE GOVERNMENT SECTION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government supplied the rails for the Government section of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia ? Whether the contractor for the construction of the railway has the right to use these rails for the transport of traffic over the unballasted line, without the consent of the Government, and on his own terms as to freight charges ?

Mr. POPE. The Government did supply the rails for that portion of the road. With respect to the right of the contractor to use them, there is nothing stated in the contract with regard to it, although I have since heard considerable complaints about it. I thought of asking the opinion of my hon. friend as to the legal points, as the Minister of Justice being away I have not had an opportunity of consulting him.

Mr. BLAKE. I can tell the hon. gentleman now, that if there is nothing stated in the contract the contractor has no such right, so that there is no necessity for him sending for an opinion.

AUTOMATIC BUOY—LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N. S.

Mr. FORBES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to replace the automatic buoy which went adrift in November last from the entrance of Liverpool Harbor, Queen's County, N.S., this season, with another automatic buoy or a bell buoy ?

Mr. McLELAN. It is intended to replace it by a bell buoy, for which tenders are now being asked.

PURCHASE OF MARINE STORES IN HALIFAX.

Mr. FORBES asked, When may I expect the return asked for on 6th March last, from the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in relation to stores, galvanised and tinware, etc., purchased in Halifax ?

Mr. McLELAN. When the return was moved for, the official at Halifax was instructed to send the information immediately, but as it has not been received it has been telegraphed for.

PURCHASE OF RAILWAY SUPPLIES IN HALIFAX

Mr. FORBES asked, When may I expect the return moved for 6th March last, in reference to hardware and railway supplies purchased in Halifax by the Railway Department, etc., for the Intercolonial or any other Government works?

Mr. POPE. If the return has not come down I will enquire into the matter.

PROTECTION OF LIGHTHOUSE, COFFIN'S ISLAND.

Mr. FORBES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to build a timber protection along the seaward face of the lighthouse on Coffin's Island, Liverpool Bay, during the coming season; if so, what is the estimated cost of such work?

Mr. McLELAN. The inspectors have reported in the matter, plans are being prepared, and I think they are about ready. I have not yet got an estimate of the cost.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Have the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company agreed to the terms of the resolutions of which notice has been given by the Government? When was such agreement signified to the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Protracted negotiations were going on with the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and principally with the president and vice-president, as to the relief of that company. The company desired better terms—a greater amount of relief than was finally agreed upon. The agreement was verbal, and was of course arranged finally immediately before notice was given by myself.

USE OF THE NORTH SHORE BY THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any arrangement has been made at the instance of the Government, between the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the North Shore Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the use of the North Shore Railway for purposes of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Negotiations have been going on between the Grand Trunk, the North Shore Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or by persons appointed by them, discussing the possibility of an arrangement. Several papers were signed, I believe, between the two companies; but they are not satisfactory to this Government, and I fancy are considered as confidential arrangements, which have not as yet resulted in any conclusion.

EMPLOYMENT OF LOUIS SCHMIDT AND OTHERS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any, and if so, which of the following persons have been in the employment of the Government in the North-West: Louis Schmidt, James Isbister, Gabriel Dumont, Moise Ouellette, Michael Dumas, all of the Prince Albert district? If so, when did such employment begin what was its nature and when did it end?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Louis Schmidt was appointed clerk in the office of Dominion Lands, Prince Albert, on the 1st of May, 1884, and has been so employed ever since. None of the others mentioned have ever been employed in the Department of the Interior—nor, so far as I know, in any other Department.

NORTH-WEST PAPERS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When will the North-West papers be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are to be very soon ready, and will be brought down at once.

DOMINION LANDS—ALLEGED IRREGULARITIES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Have frauds and irregularities been discovered in connection with the preparation and issue of patents for Dominion lands in the Department of the Interior? Has any and which of the clerks in the Department supposed to be implicated in these matters left his situation within a short time? At what time and under what circumstances did he leave? Are his whereabouts known? Where is he supposed to be?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certain irregularities have been discovered on the part of a clerk in the Department of the Interior. These irregularities are the subject of strict investigation by the Department at the present time. It would not be in the public interest to make any further statement in connection with this matter until the investigation proceeds still further.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has it been charged that individuals have received patents for Dominion lands, to which they were not entitled, and without authority; and that bribes have been taken by a clerk in the Department in connection with the transaction of business in the land granting branch? Have such charges been investigated?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has not been charged, nor is there, so far, any reason to believe that patents for Dominion lands have been issued to persons who have no right to them. The subject matter of the rest of the question is now under investigation.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one aspect of this Bill which has certainly been alluded to not infrequently during the discussion, but which cannot be said to have been discussed in any proper sense; and to which I desire on the present occasion to call the attention of the committee, inasmuch as it is one which, in my opinion, affords an extremely powerful argument why the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should be adopted in place of the propositions contained in the Bill. It is one of the most remarkable circumstances attendant on the presentation of this measure, that, long as it has been discussed, most meagre explanations were given in the first instance, and exceedingly meagre explanations have been given up to date, not merely by the First Minister, but by his colleagues. With respect to various important questions connected with and arising out of the measure, I do not think that anything can show more clearly the disregard—I might almost say the insolent disregard—of the liberties of the people, than the course which has been pursued in reference to this matter. If ever a measure was presented to Parliament with regard to which the represen-

tatives of the people had the right to ask for the fullest possible information on every point connected therewith, it was surely this measure. Now, Sir, we have had no sort of information, more particularly from the Minister in charge, as to a great many very important points. That hon. gentleman did not give us the slightest idea when he presented this measure, how it was going to affect the various constituencies in the various Provinces. Neither did he condescend to give us any calculation whatever as to the added burthen likely to be inflicted on the people of this country, if this measure became law; and as to introducing the Bill at the period of the Session at which the hon. gentleman chose to introduce it, and in the conditions of public business which then prevailed, and as to the determination to force it through at all hazards, I need hardly remind the House that neither he nor his colleagues have condescended to give any rational or reasonable explanation; while, as to the grave constitutional questions which are involved, and which, even the youngest and least reflective members of this House must see are of far-reaching character, likely to affect the future of this country for many years, it is equally unnecessary for me to remind the House that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, from first to last, have been equally reticent. No provocation, no challenge, no offers, no proposals or suggestions, which were made from this side of the House—and he cannot deny that he has had offers and proposals and challenges enough—have had the least effect in inducing, not only the hon. gentleman himself, but his colleagues and the more prominent members of the party, to break the silence which, for reasons best known to themselves, they have seen fit to preserve on all these questions. They have not attempted, any of them, to give the slightest forecast as to how all these alterations are likely to affect the future of the electorate of this country. Probably they did not wish to do so; probably they had no desire that the attention of the House should be drawn to the enormous importance, even from a merely numerical or financial point of view, of the alterations they propose to effect. Sir, it would appear that their sole object was simply to obtain, in any shape or form, a measure which would place the electoral lists at the disposal of a number of unscrupulous political hacks. Were this measure, in place of being, as I and many other members of this House believe, an exceedingly bad measure—were it as good a measure as we conceive it to be bad—still at this moment it becomes a material question for us to decide how far this country is in a position to bear, without serious inconvenience, the additional cost which it is clear this measure is about to impose upon us. Now, I want to call your particular attention to this. There have been times in our history, no doubt, when the question of cost was of much less importance than it is to-day. There have been periods when we could have calmly contemplated the addition of several hundred thousand dollars to the annual expenditure of Canada, and have been able to show that we were in a situation to afford it without grave inconvenience. But my position is this, that there are circumstances connected with our financial position to-day which render it to the last degree inexpedient and improper that we should incur any unnecessary additional expenditure; and I propose to show you, Sir, and the committee, at some length, that the existing financial circumstances of the country are such as to afford an exceedingly strong argument in favor of the adoption of the proposition of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and against the adoption of the proposal made by the Government. Now, I somewhat regret that the extraordinary and unprecedented conduct of the Government has compelled me to bring up this matter in this shape and at the present moment. Had the Government, as I conceive they ought to have done, when they found that this measure could not be put through without an exceedingly protracted discussion, had they then proceeded to consider the general position of the finances of the country, had they gone on, as I think was their duty, with the discussion of the Estimates, we might have then, to more advantage than I can now, discussed those circumstances to which I have alluded, and which, in my opinion, make this an exceedingly improper moment for further increasing the burdens of the people. It is possible, at least, that the conduct of the Government in this respect may have been of set purpose and design. I can very well understand how they may have thought, and in particular why the First Minister may have thought, that it was better, at any cost, at any hazard, to occupy the attention of the country with this measure, which he knew full well could never be expected to pass this House without a most determined opposition, rather than allow public attention to be called to various other matters for which the Government were plainly responsible, and a discussion of which he thought, perhaps rightly, would be exceedingly inconvenient to himself and colleagues. You are aware, Sir, that although the Government, as I contend, in entire dereliction of their plain and manifest duty, have not, up to the present moment, vouchsafed any explanation whatever to the House as to the cost of this measure; although, as I have said, they have neglected to do what they should have done at the very moment this Bill took its second reading, and have not placed in possession of the House a fairly digested estimate of what the cost of this measure would be, we have had from a considerable number of gentlemen on this side, although, as far as I recollect, the matter has not been discussed from the other benches, various estimates of the probable cost of the measure, varying from $200,000 or $250,000 to $300,000 and $400,000 and $500,000. Now, I am not, at this moment, going to say which of these estimates I think, on the whole, is most likely to be verified in fact. The point to which, in the first instance, I desire to call your attention is this: that the Government, whose plain duty it was to do so, have entirely neglected to give us any information or data on which we could compute with reasonable accuracy what this measure is likely to cost us. As regards the First Minister, I dare say he neither knows nor cares what the cost of the measure may be. He has always been, within my recollection, exceedingly reckless, how any act or proposal of his may affect the financial position of the people; his motto has always been: "After me the deluge;" and I do not believe I do him any injustice at all when I say that, provided the thing lasts his time, it will give him no concern or compunction whatever to what extent the burdens of the people may be aggravated by any act of his. I took occasion, a couple of months ago or more, when the Budget of this country was under discussion, to point out to this House that I regarded the situation as one of very great gravity; I pointed out then, and no answer has been made to it from that day to this, that of one thing there could be no sort of doubt, that the debt of this country and the expenditure of this country were increasing in an exceedingly rapid ratio, out of all proportion either to the population or to the resources of the country. I further took occasion to point out that, not only had there been an exceedingly rapid increase in the expenditure of the country, but that there had been a very great and rapid diminution in the receipts from various portions of revenue; and I pointed out that, under those circumstances, we were running a very great risk, more particularly as it was well known that we were about to go into the English market, for the purpose of affecting large loans; that even a trifling accident might very seriously interfere with the calculations of the Finance Minister; and that consequently we were bound in all things we were then proposing to do to pay a much closer regard to the cost and expenditure, than might have been necessary a short time before. On that occasion, I

purposely forebore to comment at length on many things which might justly have attracted attention, because I thought it was perhaps as well that the House should see how the proposals contained, and the statements made on that occasion, would strike impartial observers at a distance; and because I was perfectly aware myself that the situation was of such gravity that, in all probability, but a very few months would elapse before even the least observant and intelligent among the supporters of the right hon. gentleman would wake up to the conviction that the whole future of this country had been very seriously put in peril by the unparallelled extravagance with which the Administration had been conducted for the past few years. If that was the case on the 3rd of March of this year—two and a half months ago—I need hardly say that the situation since that period has altered immensely for the worse; I need hardly point out to any man who sits in this House that all the calculations on which our receipts of revenue were then based have been most seriously deranged; and that enormous and probably permanent additions to the expenditure of this country have been made which it will take the best energies of the Government to provide for in any shape or manner whatever. Many of the resources on which we relied have vanished, many new demands have arisen. I am not going, at present, to base my argument at all upon the contentions made by my hon. friends behind me, or on any assumptions of my own; I am going to base my argument wholly and entirely on the statements formally made to this House and the country by the Minister of Finance himself. I do not pretend to be responsible for these statements, I do not guarantee them. That is for the hon. gentleman's own friends, colleagues and supporters to do; but I say that their lips, at any rate, are shut in this matter, that it does not lie in their mouths to contradict the statements to which they then gave their assent; and I think that nobody who choses to pay careful attention to the statements that were then made by the Finance Minister, and who will consider how seriously our resources have been impaired and how enormously our expenditure is likely to be increased, will be disposed to gainsay my proposition that since that time circumstances have so seriously altered that we are doubly and trebly bound to see to-day that no single dollar of unnecessary expenditure be inflicted on the people of the country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is going outside the question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am quoting, in proof of my statement that it is not fit or proper that any additional, unnecessary expense should be incurred, from what is equivalent to a State paper, the official statement made to us by the Finance Minister of the probable expenditure and receipts for the current year. I am going to show that these statements have been, by force of circumstances, greatly modified, and that unfortunately we are less able to incur the expenditure about to be inflicted upon us than we were then. If anything is relevant to an argument of this kind, this is relevant. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report of the Finance Minister's speech, they will find that he estimated that our revenue from Customs would be $19,500,000; from excise, $5,400,000; from postal service, $1,900,000; railways and canals, $3,000,000; and here is an item to which I desire to call your attention especially:

"The interest which last year was put down at $750,000, will amount to $1,900,000, with however more than an equivalent increase on the other side, because, under the authority of this House, the Government floated a loan by which money was raised to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This increased, of course, the amount of interest payable by us, to a very considerable extent, but it increased on the credit side the receipts from the estimate of $750,000 to $1,900,000."

In other words, the Minister of Finance at that date expected to obtain nearly $1,200,000 from the interest due from the Canadian Pacific Railway within the current year.

"From the miscellaneous items we expect to obtain $800,000, as estimated last Session; and the lands in the North-West, from which I estimated we would obtain nearly $1,000,000, I now have to estimate at $500,000, making altogether $33,000,000 revenue with an estimated expenditure of $32,850,000. The estimated expenditure is $32,850,000, leaving $150,000 surplus for the present year."

It can hardly be expected that I, in any respect, will agree with a policy of charging $300,000 expenditure for Dominion lands to capital on one side, and crediting $500,000 in regard to receipts from Dominion lands on the other side to income; and, consequently, according to my contention, instead of a surplns, as shown by this statement, of $150,000, there would be a deficit of $350,000, even if all the other items named by the Finance Minister realised the sum which he anticipated at the close of the year. But I call your attention to this fact—I have pointed out the various items from which he expected to obtain his revenue—I now call your attention to the fact that there can be no sort of doubt, on the one hand, that the expenditure for this year, wholly apart from the expense of the expedition to the North-West, will fully equal and indeed will probably considerably exceed the $32,850,000 estimated by the Finance Minister on the 3rd March; and, in order that the House may fully understand the situation, I call your attention to the returns of the three months ending respectively on the 30th March, 30th April and 30th May, in 1884 and 1885. On the 31st March, 1884, our total revenue amounted to $23,445,000 and our expenditure to $20,691,000. In other words, on the 31st March of last year we had a nominal surplus of $3,000,000. On the 30th April, the revenue amounted to $25,602,000, and the expenditure to $22,698,000, giving as before a nominal surplus of nearly $3,000,000. On the 31st May, our revenue amounted to $28,527,000 and our expenditure to $25,792,000, being again an apparent surplus of nearly $3,000,000. When, however, we came to balance accounts on the 30th June, we found that the expenditure amounted to $31,861,000 and the revenue to $31,107,000. So the apparent surplus of $3,000,000 had shrunk to one of $754,000. I am not going to detain the committee by pointing out that a great deal of that surplus was really fictitious, and that a more accurate statement would have reduced it enormously, if not disposed of it altogether, but I do desire to call attention to this: that, whereas on the 31st March and 30th April, 1884, we had an apparent surplus of nearly $3,000,000 in this present year, though the receipts were about precisely the same, our surplus of $3,000,000 has shrunk to barely $1,000,000, and that our expenditure is quite $2,000,000 in excess of our expenditure of last year, and that there is the strongest probability, apart altogether from the cost of the North-West expedition, that our ordinary expenditure for the year 1885 will exceed that of 1884 by $2,000,000. The figures show that our revenue on the 31st March, 1885, was $23,249,000, and our expenses $22,525,000, being very nearly $2,000,000 more than on the corresponding day of 1884. On the 30th April, the revenue amounted to $25,717,000 and the expenditure to $24,687,000, showing as nearly as possible there also a difference of $2,000,000 between the expenditure of 1884 and in 1885. You will also observe that our revenue remains constant, although that is largely due, as the Finance Minister explained, to the increased amount of interest we receive on certain investments. Still, taking it altogether, it remains constant. At the same time, there is an increase of $2,000,000 in our expenditure, and, when you recollect that our nominal surplus was barely $750,000 and that no provision has been made to bring in any increased revenue, and that the Minister does not himself estimate any increased revenne, you will see that I am perfectly correct in my statement that the probabilities are that, wholly apart from the expenditure on the North-West expedition, there will be a deficit on the 1st July of not less than $1,250,000. In 1884, our expenditure amounted to $31,107,706. If you add the

$2,000,000 additional which we are known to have expended up to the 1st May and the vote which we passed of $700,000, according to the Government's own statements and according to the votes passed at their instance, we are likely to expend not less than $33,807,000 for the service of this present year. And, if the receipts for 1875 remain as at present, precisely similar to those of 1884, and amount to $31,861,000, we would have a total deficit, on the Finance Minister's own showing, of not less than $1,945,000, a circumstance which, I contend, adds enormous force to the strong arguments laid already before the House by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) against substituting a most expensive mode of registration and of compiling voters' lists, for the cheap and expeditious mode which we, at present, possess. I repeat that in all probability, further expenses will be incurred, but I prefer throughout to base my argument entirely on the facts which the Government, speaking through their authorised Minister, have laid before the House. If they know of any reason why these facts should not be held good, if they have any ground to present to this Parliament showing that the expenditure will be less, or that the receipts will be more, I call upon those gentlemen to rise and to give us their reasons for entertaining such opinion. Until they do so, I must persist in pointing out that, even on the Finance Minister's own showing, we are threatened, in the year 1885, with a deficit amounting in round numbers to $2,000,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You might add another $500,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I will not add any more than what is in sight; I desire to understate rather than overstate the case; and for that reason, I confine myself to those statements, which can be clearly deduced from the statement of the Finance Minister himself, and from the other official information which the Government have laid before us. Well, Sir, I pointed out, even at that time, that we have really a deficit of $350,000, and I may observe that, if the estimate made by the Finance Minister of $500,000, which he expected to receive from Dominion lands, be not realised, then it is quite clear the receipts will be considerably less, and the deficit will be larger than I have stated. I have chosen, on this occasion, to take the receipts of last year for the reason that, up to the present time, our receipts exactly correspond with those of last year. I have pointed out that there is every reason, judging from the Finance Minister's own statement, to anticipate a deficit of $2,000,000, or thereabouts, in the present year. But when we come to the much more serious consideration of how recent events are going to affect our position next year, then the case becomes very much stronger—I may truly say, almost overwhelmingly strong, in favor of the contention of my hon. friend for North Norfolk. Sir, it must be remembered that the Finance Minister himself, in the calculation which he submitted to this House, as showing his probable receipts and expenditures for the year 1886, did not venture to estimate that he would have one farthing of a surplus except from the sum that he expected to receive from North-West lands. His statement is as follows:—

"The estimate for the current year and next year of the proceeds from lands in the North-West amounts to $700,000. Our expenditure is estimated at $31,757,000, leaving an estimated surplus——

On the supposition that he would receive this $700,000.

"of $1,247,000."

He says afterwards:

"The Supplementary Estimates may reduce this surplus to $700,000."

Now, you will observe, the Finance Minister, unless he receives $700,000 from capital account for the year 1886, barely expected that he would be able to make both ends meet. You will further observe that in expecting to make both ends meet, he relied on receiving, at least, one million and a quarter, or one million and a-half, as interest, from his statement here, from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the members of this House, I want to ask any independent-minded man from one end of this country to the other, is there a rational human being to be found in Canada to-day, who believes that the Finance Minister, as matters now exist, looking at the circumstances which have since transpired, can with any degree of safety reckon on a receipt of a million and a half dollars from the Canadian Pacific Railway during the year 1886, unless, indeed, the Government advances the money to pay that interest. If the Government choose to go through that feat of legerdemain, if the Government choose to hand to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company one, two, three, five or ten millions of dollars, for the purpose of enabling them to pay the interest due to us, then, Sir, that thing may be done; but otherwise, as every man in the country knows, the whole of that million and a half must be struck out of the expected receipts of the Finance Minister, as must also, I believe, the whole sum of $700,000, or, at any rate, very much larger part of the $700,000 which he expected to receive from Dominion lands, and which he proposed, improperly, in my judgment, to charge to the credit of ordinary receipts, while, at the same time, he was charging the expenditure to capital account on the other side. Now, there is another thing to be taken into account. We have propositions laid on the Table but not yet discussed by which it becomes——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am afraid you are going a little too far.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir, I am pointing out to you the strong reasons which exist for refusing to lay upon the people of Canada the additional burdens which this Act will inevitably impose; and in order to do that, I must show you, Mr. Chairman—I am doing it with extreme brevity; I could extend this to almost any extent, if so disposed—I must show you what are the burthens which the Government themselves have stated that they propose to impose upon this country. Now, we know perfectly well that we are going to be asked to add about a quarter of a million of dollars to our permanent debt for the purpose of providing for a loan of $5,000,000, or more, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. You must, therefore, add to the expenditure which I have mentioned, a quarter of a million more for the expected grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and I am sorry to say you must make up your minds for several years to come, to incur a very large unforeseen expenditure in maintaining law and order in the North-West. We have, Sir, also, a proposition from the Government, which will add, probably, half a million to our annual expenditure for an additional force of mounted police. It is perfectly well known that a very considerable additional expenditure will also have to be incurred for the maintenance of other garrisons in that territory for a considerable time. Those I estimate, and I place the sum within the mark, at $500,000 more; and no hon. member who has paid the smallest attention to the question of the Indians or to the position in which we stand with respect to the Indians of the North West to-day, will, I think, rise to dispute my proposition: that the expected reduction of half a million which was to be made in the Indian grant is entirely illusory; that in place of spending $700,000 or thereabouts as we expected to expend for 1886, we shall have to spend $1,200,000 or so, which was the amount heretofore for that service. The result of all that is this: that the Finance Minister's calculation has been disturbed in two different directions; that while he is barely able to make both ends meet under the circumstances——

Mr. McCALLUM. I submit that the hon. gentleman is out of order. He is giving a financial statement which has nothing to do with the question before the committee. If the hon. gentleman's object is, and I hardly think it is, obstruction, then well and good. No doubt he belongs to the obstructionist party.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand the hon. member takes the point of order that a financial statement, which the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was making, is not pertinent to the subject before the Chair, and is therefore out of order. As I understand it, the hon. gentleman's line of argument is this: By the propositions in this Bill, the Government are proposing to add to the annual burdens of the people about half a million of money a year. The hon. gentleman says we cannot afford to do that; the country is not in a position to do it, because the burdens of the country have been so enormously increased within the last few years, and are now so great that our financial position will not stand it. Surely that is a fit subject for discussion. It appears to me to be a pertinent subject, an essential subject before we pass this legislation; and that, before we pass such legislation, we should thoroughly understand whether or not the financial aspect of the country would fairly warrant the additional expenditure asked. How can you decide that question unless you ascertain by facts and figures the exact financial position of the country now. I find the point laid down in Cushing, who I suppose is an authority, as he is quoted in the valuable work by Mr. Bourinot. At page 634 I find the doctrine laid down. And here let me say that I think the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) is about the last man who should raise the point of order as to taking up the time of the House.

Mr. McCALLUM. I want nothing but what is fair and right.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman is out of order himself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That has nothing to do with the question before the committee.

Mr. CAMERON. This authority shows how far a member of the English House of Commons was allowed to go in discussing a substantive proposition before the House. He says:

"The question was whether that Parliament was to be dissolved and the members sent back to their constituents because they had pronounced an opinion that the English representation should not be reduced."

The petition was a petition in favor of the Reform Bill.—

"Being called to order, on the ground that there was no question before the House on which they could be addressed in that manner, the Speaker, Mr. Manners Sutton, said: 'The question arising out of the petition was parliamentary reform. The question for him to decide was whether or not the observations of the members speaking had a proper application to that question; not whether he had strictly adhered to what was contained within the four corners of the petition, but whether the general tenor and scope of his speech did not come within the subject matter introduced to the House by a petition on the subject of reform; and he must say that, according to his opinion of the rules and orders of that House, he could not see that the observations of the member were not applicable to it.'"

I submit that any question that affects the financial position of this country as bearing upon the proposition contained in the Bill, is pertinent to the Bill itself. The authority I am quoting goes on further to say:

"So where a member addressing the House on the subject of a petition complaining of distress was called to order on the ground of the irrelevancy of his remarks, the Speaker, Mr. Manners Sutton, said that 'when a petition was on the Table, complaining of distress, it was very difficult to say what members should not speak of as occasioning that distress. He could not, therefore, support the member in rising to order.'"—

Further, by this proposition, the expenditure of the country, must necessarily be increased. The Bill provides new machinery for making out voters' lists; it provides for a new class of electorate, and must necessarily entail additional expenditure. In fact, I believe the First Minister has a resolution before the House in connection with the increased expenditure. Surely it is a proper question as to whether the country is able to stand the expenditure, and whether the Government have, by their extravagance, reckless and unnecessary expenditure so added to the public burdens that we cannot afford it. That is clearly a pertinent argument which can be used against the Bill. The authority whom I am quoting goes on to say:

"In another case when a petition has been presented for the better observance of the Lord's day, and a member, in speaking upon it, took occasion to make some remarks upon two petitions of a similar description presented the day before, and upon the motives of the petitioners, the member was called to order on the ground that it was disorderly to impute motives to the petitioners, whose petition was presented on a former night and was not then before the House. The Speaker, Mr. Manners Sutton, said, that, with respect to the reference of a petition presented on a former day, if it were on the same subject as the present petition he could not say, that, applying motives to those petitioners was disorderly. In all these matters, a good deal must be left to the good sense, the good feeling, the taste and the propriety of hon. members themselves. If then a member is called to order on the ground of the irrelevancy of his remarks, all that can be said is that it does not appear in what manner his remarks are applicable to the question, the member will be allowed to proceed; the Speaker sometimes reminding him of the terms of the question, or informing him under what circumstances his remarks would or would not be in order. Thus, a member being called to order on the ground that the member interrupting him could not see in what manner the circumstances he was mentioning could apply to the question before the House, the Speaker, Mr. Manners Sutton, said, that he took it for granted that the member would bring his observations to bear upon the motion before the House, and that he meant to make some proposition for the consideration of the House."

That is the position here. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is discussing the financial position of the country. And he says that with the enormous burthens on the people you cannot afford this additional burthen of $500,000 a year, or whatever it may be. Surely that is pertinent.

"So, again, a member being called to order and enquiry made of the Speaker, whether the argument of the member, with respect to the monarchy and the House of Lords, had anything to do with the question before the House, the Speaker said, that 'if the member made the supposition alluded to for the purpose of reviving a discussion which had already been terminated, he was out of order; but if he considered his supposition pertinent to the question before the House, he was quite in order.'"

When the remarks of a member are strictly relevant to the subject of the question, but are extended into a wider range than seems necessary, the member will nevertheless be allowed to proceed, unless restrained by the House. Thus, where, on the motion for the production of a paper relating to the volunteer force a debate on the general subject ensued, and a member rose to order, and objected that if the motion was merely for the production of papers, it was wrong to go into the subject of it (the volunteer force) at such length, the Speaker, Mr. Abbott, ruled that:

"The motion had certainly branched out into a more general range than such a motion seemed to require; but, it was in the discretion of the House to permit or restrain such extraneous proceedings; he did not feel warranted in interfering to check it before, and he did not now."

Now, I say that those authorities make it clear that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has a perfect right, in view of the fact that you are proposing by this Bill, admittedly, to incur an enormous additional expense—he has a right to point out that you are not in a position to do so, that the country cannot stand it, because by the course you have been pursuing for the last ten years the burden of the country and its annual expenditures have very largely increased. I say that is an argument which comes properly under the 3rd clause, when the Government proposes to introduce a new franchise and thereby to increase the burdens of the people. I submit that the hon. gentleman is quite in order.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has taken the opportunity of making a long speech upon the point of order. I contend that this question of expense was all discussed on the second reading, and I hope, if the hon. member for South Huron wishes to go over the entire expenditure of the country for the last forty years, that he will take another time to deliver his financial statement. Until to-day the obstruction which has been going on in the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. On Saturday, the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) discussed for the information of the committee the probable cost of putting this measure into operation, which he estimated altogether at $100,000. The financial view of this measure has been discussed on both sides of the House, and almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken has been permitted to treat the question from a financial standpoint. It has been admitted throughout the debate that this Bill would involve an expenditure of public money, and if at this stage of the debate we are not allowed to proceed on that line, we will have a most incomplete debate. It has been conceded that this Bill will cost a large sum annually to put it in force, a sum which will add permanently to the capital debt of the country, and if that is the case, surely it is perfectly germane to this motion for us to stop and look at our resources and see if we are able to put this Bill in force. Surely, we are entitled to take the same view of the measure which a prudent man would take, if he contemplated embarking in any enterprise, such as building a house. Such a man sits down and counts the cost, he sees what resources he has, what other claims he has upon him, what debts he owes, and the necessary expenditure he is liable for. If he is a prudent man, does he not consider all these matters before he embarks in a new enterprise, especially if it is one which is not necessary, or, at all events, is of doubtful utility. Under these circumstances I can scarcely conceive of anything more germane to this measure than the consideration of the resources of the country. It has not been conceded that the Bill was necessary, and the question is: Can we afford to adopt such a measure? Instead of this point being discussed, in this third or fourth week of the debate, it might better have been discussed at an early stage, but it is never too late to mend, and in view of the turn which the debate has taken, it is better that we should discuss this important feature late than never. Supposing we put this view of it—that there is no money in the exchequer, what becomes of your Bill? It could not be put in force, because it is admitted by all that it involves the expenditure of money to put in force.

Mr. MILLS. You have in your hands a proposition to adopt a new franchise with new machinery, and another proposition to retain the provincial franchise. One of the arguments pressed on the committee by the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the propriety of adhering to the provincial machinery, which costs the Dominion nothing, and, for the purpose of showing the desirability of adhering to the provincial franchise, my hon. friend has undertaken to point out what was the present financial condition of the country. That was a perfectly legitimate proceeding on his part, for if he can show that the finances of the country are in an unfavorable condition, and that the country is financially in straitened circumstances, that would be an additional reason for our rejecting this third clause and adopting the amendment. It is perfectly obvious that there is nothing in the point of order raised by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum), and that my hon. friend from Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) is adhering strictly to the rules of debate in bringing this matter to the attention of the committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that the remark of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) had a bearing on the question, when he said that, if a man was commencing to build a house, he would count the cost; for we took into consideration that question when we adopted the principle of the Bill, by passing the second reading, and we are now perfecting the details. I cannot, therefore, understand how the minute financial statement which the hon. gentleman was making had any reference to the qualification of voters. If his argument is applicable to this question at all, it would be on the second reading of the Bill. I think there has been great latitude shown with reference to this debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Longitude you mean.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman spoke of its never being too late to mend, but I certainly think it is time they were commencing to mend. The principle of the Bill was fully discussed on the second reading, several amendments were offered and voted down, the principle was carried, and in committee we are now perfecting details.

Mr. BOWELL. It strikes me that the precedents read by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) are not relevant to the present subject. If I understand him, the points to which he directed his attention and the decisions which were given upon them, were with reference exclusively to debates which took place in the House with the Speaker in the Chair, and not in committee where the debates are more restricted in their character, though members addressing themselves to the subject can speak as often as they please. Those who have paid any attention to parliamentary practice, know that when the Speaker is in the Chair, and any new principle is brought before the House, you can discuss it at any length. And you can bring in almost any subject or point which has reference to the subject before the House. But I think, on consultation of parliamentary authorities, it is very clearly laid down that, after the principle of a measure has been affirmed by the House, as this has been, then the House goes into committee, and as each clause is taken up for consideration, you must confine yourself to the subjects involved in that clause. The proposition now before us is that contained in the third clause, to adopt certain qualifications for voting, with the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk to retain the provincial franchises, and the amendment thereto by the hon. member for West Elgin to exempt Ontario from the operation of the Bill. These I think are the questions now before the House, and the only question it appears to me for the Chair to decide is whether the elaborate statement now being made by the member for South Huron upon the finances of this country is at all relevant to those questions. I know it was argued by the hon. member for Bothwell just now that as the proposition is to exempt Ontario from the operation of the Bill, therefore the country would save whatever expense is to be incurred by the new system. Whether that argument is legitimate or not, it is for the Chair to decide, and whether the course pursued by the ex-Finance Minister is strictly within his right. If I were uncharitable, and if it were not unparliamentary, I might say that I thought he had some other object in view; but that would not be arguing the point now before the House. I rose expressly for the purpose of pointing out that the precedents read from the authorities by the hon. member for West Huron were not at all pertinent to the question before the House. Apart from that, I do not believe any good can result, particularly at the present time, from the statement which the member for South Huron is attempting to get before the country, and I believe he has other objects in view than the Franchise Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The motion I had the honor to place in your hands was to the effect that it would be in the

public interest to retain the provincial franchises instead of substituting for them a Dominion franchise. That resolution was based upon certain reasons, and one of these reasons is that it would be a saving of public expense to retain the provincial franchises. Sir, that is one of the most powerful arguments that can be offered in favor of that motion. Nothing more pertinent could be brought before the Chair than the question as to whether the financial position of the Dominion warrants us in incurring the expense that my amendment proposes we should not incur; and in order to make up our minds on that question, it is reasonable and proper that an examination of the financial position of the Dominion should be made. I think nothing could be more pertinent to the question than the very statement of the hon. member for South Huron.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It seems to me that the test to apply as to whether this discussion is in order or not, is the discussion which it is likely to lead to. Everybody will admit that it is quite pertinent to the discussion of this question to say that this country is heavily burdened, and that we cannot incur additional expenditure; but it is an entirely different thing when an hon. gentleman undertakes to deal with the Pacific Railway policy and the burdens which it is going to bring upon us, with the North-West policy and the expenditures connected with that, with the general proposition of the Budget Speech delivered by the Finance Minister, and the disappointments which current events are likely to bring to the country through the expectations held forth in that speech not being realised—all these questions are involved, unless they are prevented from going to the country, and, what is worse, going across the Atlantic to head off the Finance Minister, whose success depends more thoroughly and completely upon misstatements not being uttered upon the floor of Parliament without an answer than almost anything else; so that you will see that by permitting that kind of discussion you are going to have a discussion, not on the Franchise Bill at all, not on the qualification of voters in towns and villages, but upon the Pacific Railway policy and the whole financial position of this country; and if, under these circumstances, you can possibly permit an elaboration of argument upon questions of that kind, such as the ex-Finance Minister has ventured to indulge in to-day, without being interrupted up to this time, then all I can say is that upon going into committee upon any Bill, a member can discuss anything he pleases. The House of Commons has determined, by assenting to the principle of this Bill, that it will have a Dominion franchise upon the general lines of this Bill; it has submitted that Bill to this committee to arrange the details; we are bound by the reference which has been made to us; and while I think a great deal of the discussion upon this question has been utterly out of order, the question of order has not come so prominently forward as it comes to-day, when we are at the third week of this discussion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. The fourth.

Mr. WHITE—and when we are presented with a new class of argument altogether, which hon. gentlemen now tell us is the chief ground of opposition to this Bill. I think there can be no doubt whatever, if the rule is to be allowed to permit that kind of discussion, that there is no means of progressing with measures before Parliament. The rules of Parliament are based upon the assumption that we are all gentlemen, influenced by the courtesies that characterise gentlemen, and that we will not attempt, by means of a strained interpretation of the rules, to impose inconvenience on members, or permit a violation of the manifest intent of the rules of Parliament; but up to this time that has hardly been the result of this discussion. Certainly, if this is to be permitted to go on, we shall have to go into the discussion of an entirely different line of subjects, greatly to the detriment of the progress of public business, and greatly to the detriment, I believe, of the interests of the country as well.

Mr. DAVIES. I failed to follow the argument of the hon. gentleman fully. If I understand it, it amounts to this: That because the House has acceded to the second reading of the Bill, there will be no opportunity of discussing thoroughly the questions involved in the clause before the Chair, and the two amendments are out of order. He says: You have acceded to the principle of the Bill; therefore it is not reasonable to argue whether or not you should adopt the provincial franchises or the new franchise proposed in the Bill—that is what it amounts to. We are now considering whether the machinery proposed in the Bill should be adopted by the House; it is admitted that the carrying out of that machinery will involve a very large expenditure of money; the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk says that money can be saved by the adoption of the provincial franchises, and that the expenditure of that amount of money in the present condition of the country is unjustifiable. Therefore it is not only proper that we should discuss it, but it is necessary. Supposing that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) proves to the satisfaction of the committee that the financial condition of the country is such that it will not justify the expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000 additional a year—what then? Are we not to discuss that? It is not only pertinent, but it is also necessary. No person who listened to the hon. Minister of Customs can doubt the kindliness of the motives which prompted him to state that the hon. member for South Huron had some ulterior object in view; everybody who knows the hon. gentleman knows he had the kindest motive in suggesting that. Suppose it were necessary to thoroughly discuss the financial condition of the country, would not such discussion be in the interest of the country, if it were proved that this proposed additional expenditure of $200,000 or $300,000 was both unnecessary and improvident? That is the point. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) put it, the right to reply. Doubtless it will be necessary, but what the committee has to discuss is not whether certain time will have to be taken up or not in making a reply, but whether the discussion is pertinent and necessary; and inasmuch as the discussion involves the decision of the question whether we can afford this extra expenditure or not, it is not only pertinent and proper but it is the only means by which we can arrive at a fair and honest conclusion, and is therefore absolutely necessary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question is not only whether the remarks of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) are relevant. I think the case is very much stronger than that; there cannot be two opinions as to their being relevant. They certainly could not be ruled out of order on that point; but they are more than relevant, they are positively necessary. The Bill contemplates a great annual increase in the expenditure of the country, and various figures have been given. We cannot arrive at a definite conclusion as to the cost until we have the figures placed before us by the Government, but hon. gentlemen on the Government side who have at all entered into detail of the cost have estimated it from $75,000 to $100,000. We believe this to be far below the mark but are not arguing it now. It is conceded on both sides that the rejection of the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) will entail inevitably a very large additional annual expenditure on the country, and to say it is not relevant to discuss our ability to bear this increased expense seems to me absurd. In fact, if any one were to attempt to deny it was necessary that we should have such discussion, he would be taking an indefensible position,

It would be necessary, not only to discuss our financial condition, but to discuss it minutely for this reason: Not only the present condition, but the prospective condition of the country will be affected by this measure, because the expenditure it will create will be an additional annual expenditure, and not an expenditure simply for one year; it will be an expenditure that will go on until the law is repealed. As to the statements which my hon. friend from South Huron will make will call for a reply or not is a matter which must be left to hon. gentlemen opposite. If they cannot deny the position taken by the hon. member for South Hurnn, and contend that under that condition they are justified in creating this additional expense, of course they will have to defend it; if, on the other hand, they consider the statements of the hon. gentleman and his conclusions incorrect, it will be their bounden duty to point that out and if they fail the responsibility will be upon them. The point of order is this: Is it proper for the hon. member for South Huron to point out that he is in favor of the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk, on the grounds that the Bill will add a large amount to our burdens which, in our present financial condition, it is both unnecessary and inexpedient to add, and which, by the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, will be saved to us.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I cannot follow the argument of the hon. member who has just sat down. I submit that the discussion into which the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) proposes to enter strikes at the very root of the Bill, and this is not the time for such discussion. When the Bill was before the House on the second reading was the time for the hon. gentleman to discuss that question. It is a part of the principle of the Bill that it is going to cost a certain amount of money; and when that Bill was discussed on the second reading, it was affirmed that we should have the Bill and that the cost was not to interfere with our having it. Now the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss on the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk the whole question of the finances of the country. I submit with great deference to hon. gentlemen opposite that such discussion is not in order, because it strikes at the very foundation of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, and I dare say they have got it into their heads, because they have been allowed to go beyond the proper limits in discussing this measure——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I submit nevertheless that if this discussion is allowed to continue and this point is carried, as suggested by an hon. member from one of the ridings of Prince Edward, then as a matter of course, the Bill must be thrown out; whereas it has been read the second time and its principle affirmed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is no question about the amendment before the committee being in order and regular. There is an amendment which virtually embraces the proposition of substituting the provincial systems and qualifications for the Dominion system as proposed in this clause 3 of the Bill. The question of expense naturally arises under that, and a reference to it can certainly be made; a reference to it has been permitted, and a large amount of latitude has been taken and given during the debate. At the same time I think the question of expense is but a subsidiary one, and I do not think it would be regular for an hon. member to make it a pretext, or a reason and ground, for entering into a full elaboration of the financial condition of the country. I raised the question as to the relevancy, or rather as to whether the hon. gentleman was not referring to a previous debate, and I permitted a short reference to former debates as it bears very largely on the question of expense, and I think the hon. member for South Huron cannot now be called strictly to order; but, at the same time, my ruling is this: That an elaboration of the financial condition of the country would be out of order, and that only in so far as it affects the main question before the House can a discussion of our financial condition be permitted. I would ask the hon. gentleman to bear that in mind in further discussing this point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If permitted to say so, I will recall to your recollection, Sir, the fact that I stated in the fullest and most emphatic manner what my intentions were before I proceeded and called your attention to the point. I do not propose to discuss the financial condition of the country in what is called minute detail, but I do propose to point out the expenditure and the probable burdens that will be laid on the people and also to point out how much those burdens have been increased by certain unforeseen circumstances which were not in the mind of the Finance Minister and which may not have been in the mind of the First Minister when he introduced this measure, and I do so on the ground that I called your attention to it. I do so because my contention is that even if this measure were a good one, in the present condition of the country the question of expense has assumed a vast importance. Within those limits I will make my remarks as short as I can, but you will see that they cover a considerable amount of ground; if it be your decision I may go on those lines, on those lines I will go on, and you will judge how far I exceed them or not. If it be your decision that I am not to go on upon these lines, I will have to make some other arrangements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. When the hon. gentleman travels beyond the clause under discussion I will take leave to call him to order. When he goes beyond the discussion of the condition of the country as affected by the expenses of this Bill, or the expenses which it is supposed will be caused by this Bill, I shall ask him to stop, because I do not think that an elaborate statement of the financial condition of the country, which would then become the main question of the discussion instead of the provisions of this Bill, could be permitted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I must go on and see where your views and mine coincide. I had pointed out, when my hon. friend from Monck called your attention to the question of order, that, according to the Government's own official statements, a very serious deficit for the year 1885 was impending. I had pointed out that that was a circumstance that must be taken into account in deciding on the advisability of adopting the suggestion of my hon. friend from Norfolk. I am going to point out that the case for 1886 is much worse than that for 1885, and that therefore a much stronger case can be presented in regard to that year against the proposition of the Government and in favor of the proposition of my hon. friend from Norfolk than could heretofore have been supposed. I call the attention of the Government especially to it because I suppose they have not been able to pay sufficient attention to it. I am aware that there is a great and growing disposition in members of Government to pay attention to their own Departments alone, and, knowing that some of them, and the Prime Minister in particular, are rather reckless in regard to any questions of finance, I desire to draw especial attention to it. In 1886, the calculations of the Finance Minister were sure to have been disturbed by two very important circumstances, one that the large amount of revenue he had calculated on receiving from Dominion lands in the North-West cannot be expected, and the other that the interest due by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman appreciated the result of my ruling, because to go fully into

the details of the receipts and expenditure for the coming year would not be in accordance with it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). But, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; Chair, chair.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not know for what purpose the hon. gentleman has risen, but he cannot question the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CAMERON. I can appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, appeal.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; sit down; Chair, chair.

Mr. CAMERON. Surely I have a right to ask the Chair——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order as I understand, you rule. After you rule, the hon. gentleman cannot speak to your ruling. He can appeal to the House, but he cannot argue in reference to your decision after it is given. With your permission, he can discuss the point before the decision is given, but not afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But cannot he ask a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. Simply ask a question?

Mr. CAMERON. Well, Sir——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled, and therefore the hon. gentleman will be out of order in referring to the ruling.

Mr. CAMERON. I only want to know how far your ruling goes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has heard my ruling, as other hon. gentlemen have heard it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it has been——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; Chair, chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot speak on the question of order; I cannot hear anything on that question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the floor.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; Chair, Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot speak to the question of order, which has been ruled upon.

Mr. CHARLTON. Can he not raise another point of order?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose I am still permitted to appeal to the House. I regret to say that my view is different from yours, and the question is one of so much practical importance that I think it is sufficient to justify me in appealing to the House.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. I am in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member for South Huron has asked for an appeal to the House. I can allow no further discussion.

Mr. PATERSON. But, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is necessary——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. I want to know whether it is necessary——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order; Chair, chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has heard my ruling. He has also heard that an appeal has been asked.

Mr. PATERSON. It is not that, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot be heard until that appeal is decided.

Mr. PATERSON. When the House was appealed to before——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. Listen to me. When the House was appealed to before, when the Speaker was in the Chair, the Speaker said that, before the appeal was decided upon, there should be a discussion as to the point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Committee rose, and House resumed.

Mr. DALY (Chairman of committee). I have to report from Committee of the Whole, that the member for South Huron having, in the course of his remarks on clause 3 and the amendments thereto proposed by Mr. Charlton and Mr. Casey, discussed at length the financial position of the country as pertinent to the subject under consideration, a question of order arose, whereupon I ruled that reference to the expenditure of the country, except as a subsidiary question, could not be allowed, and that a full and elaborate statement of the financial condition of the country was out of order, which decision the committee has desired me to report to the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Am I permitted to——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. PATERSON. Am I permitted to make one remark?

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the question is simply an appeal to the House. I must take the report of the Chairman as to what the point of order is.

Mr. PATERSON. I just wish to remark that I understood from you, the last time this course was pursued, that you ruled that the Chairman of the Committee should have the point to be submitted to you, argued, and that has not been done.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Chairman of the committee has ruled, that, in discussing the 3rd clause of the Bill, now in committee, a reference to the financial position of the country is allowable as a subsidiary question, but that a full and exhaustive discussion of the finances of the country, is out of order; from which an appeal has been made to the House. The question is, shall the ruling of the Chairman be sustained.

House divided on the ruling of the Chairman of Committee.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Allison,	Fortin,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Moffat,
Bell,	Girouard,	Paint,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hickey,	Ross,

Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Royal,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Kranz,	Smyth,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Sproule,
Cimon,	Landry (Montmagny),	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Langevin,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's),	Temple,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	McCallum,	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth,
Dodd,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wright.—67.
Farrow,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Auger,	Edgar,	McCraney,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fairbank,	McIntyre,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	McMullen,
Burpee,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Cameron (Huron),	Guay,	Mulock,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Ray,
Cartwright,	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Irvine,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Thompson,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Watson,
Davies,	Laurier,	Wilson.—41.
De St. Georges,	Lister,	

Mr. CHAIRMAN'S ruling sustained.

Mr. TROW. I wish to ask if my name is recorded there?

Mr. SPEAKER. No; the Clerk did not call it.

Mr. TROW. For the simple reason that I was in a hurry, and could not get a pair for Colonel Williams.

Mr. SPEAKER. I declare the question carried in the affirmative, and the ruling of the Chairman is sustained.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, in obedince to your decision, sustained by the House, I shall not proceed with this discussion; but I take this opportunity of stating to hon. gentlemen opposite, that I think this matter is so important that I shall, on the earliest possible opportunity when the rules of the House will permit, complete the discussion which, according to your ruling, I cannot now proceed with.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There are two aspects in which I wish to discuss this clause and the amendments thereto, namely, the practice of Parliament, and the duty of the Government. I propose to point out the duty of this Government, or the duty of any Government, in submitting to Parliament a measure of the revolutionary character which is involved in this Bill. I propose to discuss this aspect of the Bill in the light of English history, and the practise of the English Parliament, and I wish to show that the Government in introducing this measure, have not followed the practice of English statesmen. I propose to show by the clearest authority on constitutional practice, that the course of the Government with respect to this Bill is not sanctioned by the history of similar legislation in the English Parliament, nor, so far as I am aware, by any previous legislation in this Parliament. I propose showing, in the second place, that the franchise proposed by this Bill is not the best franchise. Now, the first step suggested is to enquire, what is the duty of the Government, if they are to follow the example of the English Parliament? It is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a large majority of the representatives of the people in Parliament having approved of the principle of this Bill by assenting to its second reading, that therefore it is the duty of the minority quietly to submit, no odds what their own views may be, as to the injudiciousness or the injustice of this Bill. Now, Sir, as a general rule, one may admit that, in matters of ordinary legislation, the proposition is correct that the voice of the majority in Parliament ought to be submitted to cheerfully and gracefully. But I say there are questions, and there are times in the history of the country, of such gravity with respect to legislation changing the constitution, or making changes in the fundamental principles upon which the constitution is founded, that it becomes the imperative duty of the representatives of the people in Parliament to consider with the greatest possible care the necessity of such legislation; and if the minority think that such legislation is not in the public interest, it becomes the imperative duty of the minority to protest in the strongest possible way known to the constitution and to parliamentary practice and usages, against such a proposition. We, the Opposition, although we are charged with having obstructed this legislation, say we have not done so. We have discussed this important question in the sense I have just indicated. We propose to discuss it in the same way to the end. We thoroughly believe its principles are bad, that its details are vicious, and so believing, although a majority of the representatives in Parliament have pronounced in favor of the principle of the Bill, we think we are within our rights and doing what is only proper for us to do, representing as we believe we do the voice of the majority of the people, in protesting against this Bill. We know as a matter of fact and as a matter of history that majorities are not always right. We know on the contrary that as a general rule that majorities are wrong, that they are seldom right. We know further that majorities are not only not always right, but majorities are occasionally tyrannical. The committee will recollect what Mr. Gladstone, in one of his great orations, said upon this point: The tyranny of the majority was detestable and odious. We see that the tyranny of the majority of the representatives in Parliament is detestable and odious. They have no ground for pursuing the course they have been pursuing during the last five weeks; no warrant from the people for taking the course they are taking with respect to this Bill; and to deal with it in Parliament without the voice of the people having been pronounced in favor of it, is absolute tyranny on the Opposition. Thoroughly approving the doctrine laid down by Mr. Gladstone, we oppose this Bill. We have opposed it in the past and we propose to oppose it until it becomes the law of the land. An hon. member on the other side of the House, laid down a very simple rule as to the duties and responsibilities of the representatives of the people in Parliament. According to that hon. gentleman's primitive views as to the responsibility of the representatives of the people, we are here simply as recording scribes of the decrees of any administration that may occupy the Treasury Benches for the time being. We do not so believe and understand our duties in Parliament. As representing the people, and in this respect we believe we represent the majority of them, we think we have higher and nobler duties to discharge, and we propose to oppose this Bill and to discuss it upon its principles and details according to the light we possess. We heard some evenings ago from the First Minister warnings. We were appealed to by the right hon. gentleman to cease discussing this Bill. We were threatened, or half threatened at all events, by the First Minister that our discussion upon this Bill was verging upon the dangerous. We were reminded it is true in very delicate language, but all the same, we were reminded of the fact that in England there was such a thing as a clôture, that the United States Congress had adopted the gag law, which was more effectual in preventing a thorough and exhaustive discussion upon a given proposition than even the English clôture. Parliament is reminded by the First Minister that many of his followers, many of his followers in Parliament and out of Parliament, had urged that he, in order to cut off discussion upon this

Bill, should adopt either the English clôture or the American gag law. We have been reminded over and over again of it, not only by the First Minister, but by the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite. The Montreal *Gazette*, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite in the Province of Quebec, delicately told us there was such a thing as the clôture in England, and it might not be improper to have a clôture in Canada. We were told by the Toronto *Mail* that there was another and more summary and more effective way of ending this discussion in Parliament. We were threatened with an army of 5,000 men to dispose of the people's representatives on this side of the House, and when they were disposed of, the First Minister could pass his Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Why not?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. These remarks are irrelevant to the question before the committee.

Mr. CAMERON. We are discussing the details of the Bill. The First Minister reminded us the other day that there was such a thing as clôture. The Montreal *Gazette* reminded us of the same thing; and the *Mail*, the organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite, threatened us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That matter is not under consideration.

Mr. CAMERON. What I am pointing out is, that not only are hon. gentlemen opposite trying to force this legislation through Parliament——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is entirely out of order.

Mr. CAMERON. If you rule, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot state that the *Mail* newspaper said that if we do not cease our opposition we will hear the tramp of marching feet, then I submit. We have been protesting against this Bill on principle. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) took occasion the other evening to refer briefly to the very important constitutional question that I propose to discuss and cite authorities to sustain my position, that no Government is justified in introducing and carrying through Parliament a measure of this kind without having first submitted it to the people at the polls. It is laid down in most standard works on constitutional law in England, that no Bill of the character of this Bill, making such radical changes as this Bill makes, ever was passed through Parliament, at all events within 100 years, without having been submitted to the people at the polls, or without there being a strong public opinion pronounced in favor of the proposition before the Bill became law. We protest against this Bill, because we say that public opinion has not been pronounced in favor of it. We protest against it, in the second place, because we say public opinion, so far as it has been pronounced, is adverse to the principle of this Bill. We protest against it in the third place, because we say that the measure has not been submitted to the great tribunal of the people, and that the people have expressed no opinion in favor of the principle of the Bill--in favor of a Dominion franchise. We protest against it also, because we say that the period selected by the First Minister for introducing this Bill is a period exceedingly inopportune, in view of the difficulties, the trials, and the troubles which now exist in the Dominion of Canada. We say that it is an inopportune period for the First Minister to present such a proposition to Parliament, and cause throughout the country an amount of excitement which the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to allay. Now, the First Minister knows—hon. gentlemen opposite know, or at all events those of them that ever trouble themselves about questions of this kind, that in England, Parliament has over and over again refused to pass measures that the mass of the people have not pronounced in favor of, which the constituent body had approved of, because the principles of the measure had not been sanctioned by public opinion. I say that the Parliament of England has rejected over and over again public measures of the first consequence to the country, because the people at the polls had not been consulted with respect to them, and no strong public sentiment had been expressed in their favor. We say further, that the Parliament of England has passed public measures which the representatives of the people were not strongly in favor of, simply because there was a strong, emphatic, pronounced, public opinion in favor of them outside of Parliament. Now, Sir, no hon. gentleman in this House will pretend to say, no hon. gentleman does say, that any public opinion in any portion of Canada has been evoked in favor of this Bill. On the contrary, as far as a public has found expression in Parliament, it is all against the principle and the details of the Bill; and with that certainty staring us in the face, it is not fair or just or right that the First Minister should seek to force this Bill through Parliament. I say that in dealing with a question of such magnitude, one affecting the large interests which this Bill proposes to affect, a Bill which may have the effect of disfranchising thousands and tens of thousands of electors who have votes under former laws in the Province of Ontario, as well as in the Provinces of Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and British Columbia——

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON. An hon. gentleman says no, which shows that the statement we have made over and over again is correct—that one-half the hon. members of this House do not understand the provisions of this Bill, and it we discussed it six months they would not understand it, simply because they do not take the trouble to read the Bill, to digest and understand its provisions. I was pointing out to you that no English Government has ever done what the First Minister proposes to do in this case—submitted to Parliament, and forced through Parliament, contrary to the will of the people, without the voice of the people being pronounced in favor of it, any great proposition which affects the representation of the people in Parliament. Now, Sir, you will find that in 1852, Lord John Russell introduced his first Reform Bill, after the Bill of 1832. That Bill was objected to by the Opposition in Parliament on two grounds. It was pointed out that the Bill was a Bill which ought not to become law, because it had not been submitted to the people at the polls, no strong public opinion was expressed in favor of it outside of Parliament. Syme, in his valuable work on representative government, at page 100, lays down the rules which English statesmen have invariably followed with reference to any proposition affecting the representation of the people in Parliament, or any proposition which affects the great mass of the people in the country:

"The House of Commons has repeatedly rejected measures which have been approved of by the constituent body, because public opinion had not endorsed them. The history of Lord John Russell's three Reform Bills will serve to illustrate what I mean under this head. His first Reform Bill, introduced into the House of Commons in 1852, was a great advance upon the Reform Act of twenty years before. It proposed the enfranchisement of several large towns, the disfranchisement of certain small boroughs, and the lowering of the borough and county qualification for electors. It is not disputed that the constituents were in favor of reform on the line here laid down, at the time that this measure was introduced; and it admits of no doubt that this measure owed its introduction to positive pledges given by ministers to their constituents at the previous general election. The Premier, Lord Palmerston, had on that occasion distinctly pledged himself to parliamentary reform, and the Queen's speech at the opening of the Session showed that he had not forgotten the circumstance, as it intimated that the Government intended to propose 'such amendments in the Act of the late reign relating to the representation of the Commons in Parliament as may be deemed calculated to carry into more complete effect the principles upon which the law is founded.' This was distinct enough. Here then, was

a Bill which one might suppose would be certain to be carried; the country had pronounced in favor of it at a general election, and a majority of members had expressly, or tacitly, given their adherence to it on the hustings; and the Ministry had pledged themselves through their chief to carry it into law. It was not carried into law, however, and no serious attempts were ever made to discuss its provisions. Its rejection was a foregone conclusion; it was laid aside by general consent of all parties, and for no other reason than because there was an absence of enthusiasm in favor of it out of doors. The House would not bother itself about a measure when there was no violent agitation out of doors in favor of it.

Lord John Russell's second Reform Bill, introduced in 1854, was, in many respects, an improvement on the first. It provided for the extension of the franchise in counties and boroughs, for the disfranchisement of boroughs having fewer than 300 electors; boroughs not having more than 500 were to return only one member, and cities and counties having a population of 1,000, and returning only two members, were to have three under the Bill. The measure appears to have been carefully prepared, and its provisions were fully and ably discussed by its author; but like the previous Bill on the same subject, the House would not entertain it."

Now, here is a proposition for the first time seriously introduced by the First Minister, with a view of crystallising it into an Act of Parliament, a Bill on which the people of this country have never been called on to express, and have never expressed, a favorable opinion, a Bill that never was submitted to the people at the polls, and a Bill which, in its most material parts, involves grave and serious changes from the former Bills introduced by the First Minister. And yet, Sir, the First Minister introduces the Bill two months after the House is in Session; he attempts to force it through Parliament without having a single tittle of evidence to show that the voice of the majority of the people of this country is in favor of either its principle or it details. Now, Sir, in 1854, two years after the first Reform Bill was withdrawn from Parliament because public opinion was not sufficiently pronounced in its favor, Lord John Russell introduced the second Reform Bill. It was a great improvement upon the previous Reform Bill. It enormously extended the electoral franchise; it disfranchised several rotten boroughs; it made vast strides in advance of the Bill of 1832 or the Bill of 1852. The Bill was discussed in Parliament; it was discussed in the constituencies before it was introduced; many of the members returned to Parliament had pledged themselves to support a Reform Bill, and the Government to a large extent were pledged to bring it in. The Bill was introduced, read the second time, and exhaustively discussed in Parliament; and yet it did not become law; it was abandoned for two reasons—first, because England was then engaged in a deadly conflict with Russia, and both the people and their representatives deemed it an inopportune time for a question of this importance to be discussed in Parliament when every power and energy of the British empire was strained to repel a foreign foe, and in the second place, because the representatives of the people in Parliament were not convinced that the voice of the people at the polls was sufficiently expressed in favor of the Bill. Mr. Syme discusses the action of the representatives of the people at the time as follows:

"The Bill was objected to as inopportune (owing to the impending war with Russia) and uncalled for, there being, it was alleged, no agitation for it out of doors. To these objections Lord John Russell very forcibly replied: 'I cannot think,' he said, 'there is any danger in discussing the question of reform during the excitement of a foreign war. The time that is really dangerous for such a discussion is the time of great popular excitement and dissension at home.'"

Now, if it is true that the time to discuss a Reform Bill is not when the country is disturbed by an armed outbreak at home or by any other cause, surely that argument would apply to the present Bill with added force. The hon. First Minister knows perfectly well that every power he and the Government possess has been strained the last three or four weeks to its utmost tension to quell the outbreak in the North-West; and yet that is the very moment he selects for introducing this Bill into Parliament The Bill I have referred to was not the only Bill affecting the representation of the people that was introduced into the English Parliament and abandoned. In 1860 Lord John Russell introduced his third Reform Bill. It was objected that public opinion had not been strongly pronounced in its favor.

Mr. SMALL. I rise to a question of order. What has that to do with the matter before the House?

Mr. CAMERON. I dare say the hon. gentleman cannot see.

Mr. SMALL. Yes, I can see. I can see that there is a good deal of obstruction on the other side.

Mr. MILLS. It is perfectly relevant. There is nothing in the point of order the hon. gentleman has stated. My hon. friend is pointing out why the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk is preferable to this Bill. That amendment has had popular sanction; the present Bill has not been supported by the constitutional practice.

Mr. BOWELL. What the hon. gentleman is pointing out is the desirability of withdrawing the whole Bill from the House for certain reasons which existed in England at the time the Franchise Bills were withdrawn there. The question before the House is whether the provincial franchises shall be retained in preference to this Bill, or whether Ontario shall be exempt from the operation of the Bill in case it becomes law, and not as to the whole principle of the Bill, or whether it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CAMERON. That is not what I am pointing out at all. It is proposed by the third clause of this Bill to adopt a Dominion franchise—an expensive franchise. That is a new experiment—a change in the constitution that we have had for the last eighteen years. I say an important change of that kind should not be made unless it is submitted to the people at the polls and a majority of the people are in favor of it. I say further that this Bill should not be passed because the practice of English statesmen and the English Government has been not to force changes of this kind through Parliament without submitting them to the polls and obtaining the sanction of the people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman has not exceeded the limits of order so far.

Mr. CAMERON. I am going into a history of this question in England, but it is perfectly pertinent to the question before the Chair. I was pointing out that the Conservative party objected to Lord John Russell's third Reform Bill on the ground that there had been no clearly pronounced indication that public opinion was in favor of it. Now, I say that this is a much stronger case than the three cases I have cited, because in all of those cases the principles of the Bills had been discussed, and some of the Ministers had pledged themselves to Parliamentary Reform; but in this case, it cannot be said that the First Minister or the Government have in the slightest sense pledged themselves at the polls that this Bill should become law. They have not even submitted it to the people: I venture to say that the First Minister, in the manifesto he issued at the last election never referred to this measure. Lord Derby's Government succeeded the Liberal Government, and in pursuance of the pledges which had been given by himself and some members of his Government, introduced what is called the fourth Reform Bill. That Bill met with practically the same fate as the previous Reform Bills. Mr. Syme points out with respect to this Bill:

"Lord John Russell's third Reform Bill was introduced on the 1st of March, 1860, and experienced the same fate as the two previous ones. Some time before this, the Derby Ministry being in office, Lord John Russell moved an amendment on Earl Derby's Reform Bill, as follows:—'That it is neither just nor politic in the manner proposed in the Government Bill with the freehold franchise as hitherto exercised in the

countries of England and Wales, and that no re-adjustment of the franchise will satisfy the House or the country which does not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage in cities and boroughs than is contemplated in the present measure.' This amendment was carried, in a full House of 621, by a majority of 39. The Derby Ministry thereupon dissolved Parliament, and the result of the appeal to the country was 302 Conservative and 350 Liberals, or a majority of 48 against the Ministers On the assembling of Parliament the Ministry was defeated on the address by a majority of 13. Lord Derby thereupon resigned, and the Palmerston Ministry took office. Soon afterwards Lord John Russell, who was a member of the new Administration, introduced a new Reform Bill in accordance with the terms of his amendment. Having by that amendment defeated the late Ministry, and the country having subsequently marked its approval of the policy of the Opposition by returning a majority in their favor, the new Ministry were in honor, as well as by constitutional usage, bound to stand or fall by their measure."

It was not until after the people at the polls had an opportunity of pronouncing upon the question, until a Reform Bill had been four times before Parliament and four times withdrawn, and until the question had been fully discussed in Parliament, both in principle and detail, that the fifth Reform Bill met with any measure of success. Now, Sir, that is not the course that hon. gentlemen opposite propose to pursue here. Without any reference to the people at the polls, we are asked to give our sanction to the provisions of the Bill; in fact we are told that having sanctioned the principle of the Bill, we are to be debarred entirely from discussing at length its numerous details. Speaking of the Reform Bill of 1860, Mr. Symes, in his work on Representative Government, says:

"The measure was introduced by Lord John Russell in a speech which occupied an hour in delivery, and which was said to have been listened to with a decorous calmness that almost amounted to indifference. The debate was adjourned six times before the 3rd May, when it was read a second time without a division."

Is that the way the Opposition are treated? Why, the very moment the First Minister moved the second reading of the Bill, he warned us that he proposed to proceed *de die in diem*, and he not only proceeded day in and day out, but night in and night out with the Bill. When, in England, the Reform Bill was before Parliament, the discussion was adjourned different times in order that the representatives of the people might have an opportunity of making known their views to their constituents in order that the people might judge whether or not the Bill in principle and detail was such as commended itself to the country.

"The Bill," says Sir Erskine May, "was received with coldness in the House and with indifference out of it. It had not been hailed by popular acclamation. The cause of reform, which once had aroused enthusiasm, now languished from general neglect. The press was silent or discouraging; petitions were not forthcoming; public meetings were not assembled; the people were unmoved."

What is the condition of affairs with respect to this Bill? One would naturally suppose that nobody wanted it but the First Minister and his colleagues. No response outside has been given to their speeches in favor of the Bill, nor has any petition reached this House asking for it. Where are the public meetings throughout the length and breadth of Canada protesting against the stand taken by the Opposition? Where are the countless petitions that should encumber the Clerk's Table if the people wanted the measure? There are none. It is evident that this Bill has not only not evoked enthusiasm in its behalf, but, on the contrary, has aroused public indignation against it, and this ought to be sufficient to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite that it should not be allowed to become law. Sir William Molesworth, dealing with a similar question, says:

"'The people, though by no means indifferent, did not feel strongly on the subject, and did not give the Government any warm support;' and, referring to the absence of excitement out of doors on questions of this nature, he adds 'unfortunately it is only when a very strong feeling on the subject prevails that Parliament can be induced to deal with them.' The very strong feeling was not forthcoming in this instance, and the Bill was accordingly lost. Yet there had been appeals to the country on this very question, and the result of these appeals proved beyond a doubt that the country was in favor of the policy embodied in the Ministerial measure. Nevertheless, as we have seen, the Bill was withdrawn, and solely because there was an absence of outside pressure in favor of it; and notwithstanding the terms upon which they obtained office, the Ministry made no further attempt to carry out the wishes of the country in this direction."

There the question had been before the country for years, and because there was no enthusiasm in the country the proposition was dropped. In 1866 Mr. Gladstone introduced another Reform Bill; it was submitted to Parliament and discussed in Parliament, but did not become law for precisely the same reasons, because it excited no interest and was considered inopportune; thus this Bill which had been submitted several times to the people and upon which public opinion had, to a considerable extent, been pronounced, was dropped for the fifth time, simply because the voice of the people was not sufficiently pronounced in its favor. What voice has the First Minister heard in favor of the Bill before us? What public representation has been made to him to warrant him in assuming that the voice of the people is in its favor? The First Minister has not given us any evidence to show that the people are at all interested in this matter, to show he is legislating in the interests of the people and not for some particular purpose of his own. All these Bills were discussed exhaustively in the British House of Commons and were all abandoned. In 1866 the Conservative Government was defeated and Mr. Gladstone, who succeeded to office, introduced the seventh Reform Bill. The same objections were made to it in the House, but public opinion was then pronounced in its favor. The immense gatherings held from one end of England to the other, the enormous gatherings at Hyde Park, Marble Arch, Manchester, Rochdale, Liverpool, and other places, convinced the Government that at length public opinion was sufficiently far advanced, and that it became absolutely necessary the Bill should pass. Still that Bill did not become law. When the Reform Bill of the Conservative Government was introduced, which was, perhaps, not as liberal as the Bills which were introduced by the preceding Liberal Governments, Mr. Gladstone moved ten amendments, nine of which had to be accepted by the Conservative Government. This Bill became law in consequence of the enormous pressure brought to bear from outside, and this author says that four solid months were consumed in the discussion of the Bill in Committee, that is of the details of the Bill, and the discussion of the principles of the Bill occupied several days on the second reading. That Bill was eight times before the people of the country, was favorably pronounced upon by the people, and yet that same Reform Bill was discussed four months in committee, but when we had been discussing this Bill one week, we were called obstructionists, and were told that we were not discussing it upon the merits. In 1832 Lord Althorp introduced a resolution into the British House of Commons to abolish church rates, and that was carried by 256 to 180, but the resolution was abandoned because Parliament was convinced that the public sentiment of the country was not sufficiently pronounced in favor of the proposition. Nine years afterwards Sir John Trelawney introduced a Bill sweeping away the church rates altogether, which received its second reading but went no further, because the mover of the Bill was satisfied that public opinion was not sufficiently pronounced in favor of it. For the third time, a Bill for this purpose was introduced into the Imperial Parliament, but was not pressed, for the same reason. Here we have no expression of opinion in favor of this Bill. There has not been a petition in favor of it, not a constituency or an individual or a Province has pronounced in favor of it, and yet the First Minister seeks to force it through Parliament. The same thing took place in England with reference to the disestablishment of the Irish Church. It was passed in the House of Commons and rejected in the House of Lords once or twice, and then they yielded because of the pressure of outside opinion, and it became the law of the land. The First Minister's conduct

is in striking contrast with the conduct of any statesman in England in passing an important Bill through Parliament. He selects the moment when the people of Canada have their energy and their attention strained to the utmost, in regard to other matters, as the appropriate one to introduce this Bill and force it upon the people. Instead of a feeling existing in favor of this Bill, a feeling has been aroused, in one Province, at any rate, and I believe in others, against it, and I believe that, if it is forced through the House, it will raise a whirlwind of indignation in this country that may prove of very serious consequence to the people, and will tend to weaken the bond that binds the several Provinces together. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that not only has there been no public opinion pronounced in favor of this Bill but that in so far as it has been expressed, public opinion has been decidedly against this Bill. Now, under these circumstances, what course ought the First Minister to take? I say that if he desires that peace, prosperity and harmony shall prevail throughout this Dominion, if he desires that the bonds which bind the Provinces to the Dominion shall be strengthened and confirmed, instead of loosened and weakened, there is only one course for him to pursue, and that is to submit this Bill to the people at the polls. Sir, if the electors of this Dominion, after this question has been submitted to them at the polls, and they have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon it, if they pronounce in favor of it I say that we, the Liberals in Parliament assembled, will submit cheerfully to the will of the people in that respect. Let the First Minister follow the example of English statesmen in regard to similar great questions. I have shown that almost invariably these great propositions affecting the representation of the people in Parliament have never received the sanction of Parliament unless the people at the polls have pronounced in their favor. We have heard the First Minister boast, over and over again, that he draws his inspiration from English sources; then, I say, let him follow the example of English statesmen and let him not force upon the people of this country, without consulting them, such propositions as are contained in this Bill. The hon. gentleman knows that the voice of the people of this country, so far as it has found expression on the floor of Parliament, is opposed to the principle of this Bill. He knows that the unanimous voice of the Conservatives in the Province of Ontario, as represented in the Local Legislature, has pronounced in favor of a different franchise from the one submitted in this Bill, and in favor of manhood suffrage. He knows that the unanimous voice of the representatives of the Conservative party in Parliament assembled has declared in favor of a more liberal and broader franchise than the one proposed in this Bill. We know, also, that in the Province of Quebec public opinion does not justify the course of the First Minister; we know that one organ of the Government after another has declared that the First Minister ought to throw this Bill into the waste basket. We know that another organ of the Government declared that legislation of this character and of a kindred character was straining the constitution and weakening the bonds that bind the Provinces to the Dominion, and that it was high time a danger signal was erected We know that the Montreal *Gazette*, in its wiser days, took the same ground; we know that the hon. gentleman who has controlled that organ, and who is still reputed to influence its course, was in favor of a provincial franchise. We know that other papers, usually supporting the Government, have taken the same ground. We know perfectly well that the supporters of hon. gentlemen in this House are not a unit on this question, and that two hon. members who usually support the Government have refused to support them in carrying this measure through Parliament. We know that there is dissatisfaction and discontent, and that among nearly all of them there are grumblings loud and deep against the proposition of the First Minister. Therefore, I say, in view of all these facts, the First Minister ought not to force this Bill through Parliament. The First Minister has had, in his long life, many opportunities of doing what a great statesman ought to do in dealing with questions of this kind, that is, to take the people of the country into his confidence; but he has invariably failed to do so whenever he had any political object to gain. I say the First Minister has now the opportunity of following the illustrious example of English statesmen, by submitting this measure to the decision of the people. He has now a chance of earning for himself a reputation and a character which he has not earned for himself in his long political career, by taking the people into his confidence and acting in accordance with their decision. And when the First Minister is satisfied that the will of the people justifies him in submitting this proposition to Parliament, and carrying it through, I, Sir, shall record my vote in favor of that proposition. Sir, I repeat that in view of the position in which the country is placed to-day, in view of the difficulties that surround us on every side, it is inopportune to force this Bill upon Parliament, and to force it through, as the First Minister is endeavoring to do. If the First Minister will not listen to the voice of the people at the polls, or even to the voice of his friends, or be guided by the expressions of public opinion received thus far, but will shut his eyes to the lessons taught by English history and the course pursued by English statesmen, then it is the desire of the Liberal party in this House and the country that this Bill, when it goes through Parliament, shall be shorn of all its objectionable features and made as little objectionable as possible to the people. The First Minister has now an opportunity to give the people such a Dominion franchise, if he is bound to give them a Dominion franchise, as the majority of the people can approve. By accepting the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) he can adopt as the franchise for Ontario the franchise recently adopted there, a franchise broad enough and liberal enough to cover almost every class in the community. If the First Minister will not accept that proposition, other propositions will be submitted, to which the hon. gentleman should assent. What I am mainly concerned with at this moment is, that the franchise as laid down in this Bill is not such as should be adopted in a free country like this. The proposed franchise is in startling contrast with the franchise recently adopted in Ontario. The Ontario Bill enfranchises the laboring classes, the wage-earners of the country, this Bill disfranchises them. Too little attention is paid in Parliament and elsewhere to that important element. We know it is an intelligent element, a progessive element, and therefore it ought to be considered with great care and deliberation; in fact, it is an absolute necessity to give some recognition by legislation to the interests and rights of the wage-earning class. They live in our midst, they contribute more or less to the revenue of the country, they earn their incomes by manual toil, but they are not to be disregarded on that account. Any franchise adopted by Parliament should be extended as far as to cover the wage-earners. What justification has the First Minister in not extending the franchise to this class of the community? Upon what principle did he base this measure? There must be some ground on which you can justify an electoral franchise. You cannot justify a property qualification on any reasonable or sensible ground; the only franchise you can justify is a franchise which will include every one of the age of 21 years who is a citizen of the country, and who is freed from mental or legal disabilities. The true principle appears to be laid down by Mr. Gladstone, in one of his able speeches, when he says that

every man is entitled to exercise the franchise, unless it is proved that his exercise of the franchise is dangerous to the State. That is the principle we should adopt in extending the franchise, and the present Bill does not go far enough to cover that principle. It is a self-evident proposition, that if a man lives in the country the interest of the country is the interest of the individual. Mr. Kinnear, in his work on principles of reform, says:

"The poorest man is concerned just as much as, perhaps more than, the rich man in the law that affects his domestic relations, such as the laws of marriage and divorce, of guardianship of children; or the social relations, such as those of master and servant; or the civic relations, such as those of pauperism, of education, of the church, of the punishment of crime, of taxation; or the national relations, such as those of peace or war, alliance or treaties. Where expenditure at all enters into these questions (and it does into only very few of them) the poor man's interest is, in proportion to his livelihood, almost the same as the rich man's; nor, while he is relieved of only a small proportion of taxation, such as income and assessed taxes, he pays beyond his proportion of the customs and excise duties, which form the bulk of our revenue. And any error in our fiscal system, or extravagance of expenditure, while it only diminishes the rich man's profits, is liable, by injuring trade, to deprive the poor man of his livelihood altogether. His stake therefore being that of life, is undeniably at least equal to that of the rich man's, and therefore neither on the ground of legislation being only or chiefly concerned with property, can we find any just reason for excluding household suffrage. How then can we exclude universal suffrage, by any other than an arbitrary, irrational and unconstitutional test, such as that of penalties."

You can find no authority for giving the franchise upon the basis of a property qualification; nevertheless, by this Bill such is made the test. It is an arbitrary and illogical test, it is a test not justified by any constitutional authority within the last fifty years. The only franchise possessing the principles of equity and justice is a franchise of a broader nature than is proposed by this Bill; and the only franchise you can justify is the one laid down by Mr. Gladstone. (The hon. gentleman again quoted from Mr. Kinnear's work; and continued): Now, I say that is the position—that there is no principle upon which you can justify giving the vote, except on the principle that every man is entitled to the franchise when the giving of it does not endanger the safety of the State itself. The giving of the franchise is not an abstract or a prescriptive right. It is a right given for the safety of the State, and no man can rightly exercise the franchise otherwise than for the interest and benefit of the State. The benefit of the State is the ground upon which you can justify the extension of the franchise to those who are citizens of the State, enjoying the protection of the law, and who are bound to serve the State in times of war as well as in times of peace. That proposition is very fully and very ably laid down in the following statement from this text-book. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the same volume.) Now, if you pass the Bill, what will be the effect of it? It will be to deprive almost every laborer in the country of his vote.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, yes. The fact that the hon. gentleman says no, no, is only another indication that he has not read the Bill. Everybody knows perfectly well that at least 70 out of 100 of the ordinary laborers of this country do not get $400 a year for their labor. I refer to the wage-earning class, the unskilled laborers, the men who work on ditches and roads, but who nevertheless consume dutiable goods and thereby contribute to the revenue, and are just as much entitled to votes as the hon. gentleman, with his millions. You treat that man who pays taxes, who is a citizen of the country, who has taken the oath of allegiance, or perhaps was born in the country—because every man who is born in the country is not born with a silver spoon in his mouth—you treat him as an infant, a minor; nay, Sir, you treat him as a slave. You do not give him the rights of a free man, living in the country; he is outside the pale of citizenship, and you propose to treat him so to the end. Still, hon. gentlemen in this House and their organs outside have posed as the friends of the workingmen. We were told by the *Mail* newspaper that we were fighting a battle against the wage-earners when it is well known to the country that we have been fighting their battles, and the battles of the great majority of the people. Instead of treating these men as children you should adopt the more liberal franchise, treat them as free men living in a free country, enjoying the blessings of free government—for we are supposed, at all events, to have free government; treat them in this way and you make them self-reliant and independent. They become part and parcel of the country, they have an interest in the country and its legislation, and a voice in moulding the laws under which they are governed. You give them an interest in the preservation and support of the State, and in the peace, prosperity and progress of the country. Let me read again what this writer says on this subject. (The hon. gentleman quoted again from the same volume.) Sir, there never was sounder or more constitutional words penned than those of this text-writer. It is not when the feelings of the people are aroused, when they are excited, but when we may discuss calmly the principles of such a measure, as free representatives of a free people, that we should deal with a matter of this kind, and lay down rules which we can justify to our own consciences, to our constituents and to the people at large. I commend the views of this writer to the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially those sitting on the Treasury benches, as the true grounds upon which the representation of the people in Parliament should be based—the true ground upon which you can justify a franchise that should be broad and liberal enough to cover the great mass of the people, and which shall not exclude any man on account of his occupation or his position in life, a franchise which will be open to the day laborer, with his spade in his hand, or the navvy on the railway earning $1 a day, living in our country, enjoying the protection of our laws, contributing to the revenues of the country—give him the franchise just as freely and fully as to the millionaire who possesses his carriage, and has his coachman, his footman and his liveried servants. In this country there should be no distinction, and no distinctions are known to the law, except what are purely arbitrary distinctions. We boast that the law is open to all, to the poor as well as to the rich; and if the law is open to all, why should not the right to vote for the representatives in Parliament who make the law be open to all. Let me make another reference on this subject, because it is an important subject. We are starting out on a new line, and the more fully we discuss this proposition the better for this country. If we adopt a new franchise now without consideration, without care, and without caution, what may be the result? The result may be that year in and year out we shall be tinkering with the franchise, whereas if we adopt a sound franchise now, and one which will meet with the approval of the great mass of the people of this country, with its foundations laid broad and deep in the respect and the affections of the people, we shall have a franchise that will not require to be changed at every meeting of Parliament. Grey, in his "Parliamentary Government," deals with the question as to whether there should be manhood suffrage or a suffrage based on property qualification.

"Arguments entitled to serious consideration have not been wanting on either side of this question. In favor of an extension of the franchise, it has been been urged that our existing system of representation affords to the working classes no means of making their wishes and opinions heard with effect in the House of Commons; that there can be no doubt that a large number of persons, perfectly qualified for the exercise of political power, are not admitted to the right of voting, and that this exclusion is unjust; that advantage would arise from allowing a large proportion of the community to take a part in public affairs by voting in the election of members of Parliament, because the exercise of this power would tend to make those to whom it was granted, feel a more lively interest in the concerns of the nation, and thus exercise a useful influence on their character."

Mr. Grey points out that the importance of a franchise that will leave no man discontented, that will leave no substantial grievance in the breasts of any considerable portion of the community, cannot be over-estimated. Another authority, whose utterances are received with great respect, discussed this question, a man who thoroughly knew and appreciated the working classes—the day laborers and the wage-earners—that great mass that the franchise of England does not even yet reach, and the mass that this Bill does not propose to reach. Richard Cobden, who was a statesman of wonderful power, who understood and appreciated the working classes better than any statesman of his day, has given expression to his views on this question over and over again. In one of his speeches, delivered in 1849, he referred to the subject, and advocated a wide extension of the franchise. (The hon. gentleman quoted from the speech). The ground on which Mr. Cobden justified a liberal extension of the franchise is very clearly understood. It is better for the State, because it gives every citizen an interest in the laws passed by Parliament, and leaves no element of the population any ground for dissatisfaction or discontent. At a public gathering held at Leeds, in 1862, shortly before the death of Mr. Cobden, he also discussed the question of extending the franchise to the laboring classes. (The hon. gentleman quoted from the speech). Now, I do not propose at this moment to discuss in minute detail the various sections of the different classes in the community who are disfranchised under this Bill, nor do I propose to discuss the various sections of classes who have not had the franchise extended to them by this Bill. All I say on that subject is, that if you adopt the franchise provided by the present law of Ontario you will have a broader and more liberal franchise than that proposed in this Bill; you will have a franchise that will embrace nearly all the classes I have named. The income franchise is reduced to $250 in the Province of Ontario, and there is the wage-earners franchise of $250; and although it is probable that there is a large number of the wage-earners class whose wages do not extend to $400, there are very few whose wages do not reach $250 a year. Take, then, the Ontario proposition, and you will extend the franchise to a large number of classes that ought to be enfranchised now; or if you do not propose to adopt the franchise of Ontario, adopt a more liberal, a more extended franchise, one that will embrace the class I have just spoken of. It is plainly the duty of the Government, unless they see insurmountable reasons against it, which they can make plain to Parliament, to leave no class entitled to the franchise deprived of it. There is another class in the community which the First Minister by this Bill will deprive of the right to vote. The principle of property is the foundation of this Bill; it contains no test of intellect, so that no matter how wise a man may be, no matter whether he be possessed of all the knowledge of the ancients and the moderns, though he may be the man in the community, above all others, best capable of judging between the respective merits of the two candidates, from his intelligence, position and circumstances, yet unless he possesses $150 worth of land or has $400 a year income he is not entitled to vote. The Bill ought to go further, if the hon. gentleman is bound to have some test of capacity besides the test of manhood, responsibility, citizenship, and being a British subject, and of his living under the law, and submitting to the law, and serving his country in time of peace or war; the hon. gentleman ought not to limit it to a property qualification. There are other tests of qualification, apart from the test of capacity, which the hon. gentleman has signally ignored in the provisions of his Bill. The professional man, the man who has gone through college and obtained his degree, who may be a professor, may not be entitled to vote under this Bill, while a man utterly illiterate, if he has the necessary property qualification, will be entitled to vote. If the hon. gentleman purposes to adopt any test of capacity, besides the test of capacity provided in the Bill, it ought to be a test that would embrace the laborers, the wage-earners and the learned professions in the community. There ought to be educational qualifications—I do not mean an educational test of capacity—as well as qualifications upon property pure and simple. I say that this educational test of qualification is one that has been discussed for years by the first minds in England and elsewhere. It has been adopted in some of the United States of America and has worked satisfactorily there. In the colony of Victoria, Australia, there is, besides the property test, an educational qualification, and so far as I have been able to learn, the principle has worked satisfactorily. In this Dominion the First Minister ought at least to adopt, if he is bound to persevere in the proposition he has submitted to Parliament, an educational and professional test of qualification.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) When you left the Chair, Sir, I was pointing out the propriety of extending the franchise to classes not provided for by this Bill. I was pointing out, that according to the laws of several of the other Provinces, Ontario, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, the franchise was much broader and more liberal than the one proposed in this Bill; I was pointing out that in the colony of Victoria, Australia, the franchise was, in some respects, much more liberal than the one under discussion; that although in that colony the possession of property is made the test of capacity, still there are other tests provided. There is the educational qualification, so that men without the property qualifications are entitled to vote if they have the educational test of capacity. It appears to me it is well worth the serious consideration of Parliament that men of education should not be deprived of the right to vote, which is conferred on men without education who possess the property qualification. I wish here to draw your attention to the observations of Mr. Cobden on this subject, taken from a speech of his made at Leeds, in 1859. (The hon. gentleman read an extract from Mr. Cobden's speech). When people have arrived at that stage when they are fairly entitled to exercise the right of the franchise, when we have some guarantee, some reasonable security, that they are intelligent enough to understand the great political questions that are constantly agitating the country, they should be given the right to vote. In the colony of Victoria the law provides a property qualification as a test of capacity, but it also gives a vote to those who are educated, so that there is not only a property qualification but an educational test of qualification as well. In the colony of Victoria every graduate of the university in any part of the British Dominions, every barrister, solicitor, attorney, proctor, medical practitioner, minister of any church, and every schoolmaster possessing the necessary testimonials, and every officer or retired officer of Her Majesty's land and sea forces, has the power to exercise the franchise. In some of the States in the neighboring Republic I believe the same right is given, and I believe that, if this clause had provided for that class, the hon. gentleman would have made a step in the right direction. I trust that he will even yet adopt the franchise which exists in some of the States and in the colony of Victoria, and in that way will add to the electoral list a very large, important and intelligent class of electors, who willl be cut off by the Bill now before the House. In the Province of Ontario there are nearly 5,000 teachers who receive less than $400 a year. Of course, a number of these are females,

but there are a large number of males, and if the income franchise were put at a lower figure they would be entitled to vote. The Ontario wage-earners' clause at $250 a year instead of $400 admits them, and the hon. gentleman might adopt that, or the franchise which, I think, can be justified on every ground—manhood suffrage. In that way he would be acting on the maxim laid down by Mr. Gladstone, that everyone is entitled to exercise the franchise whose exercise of it would not be injurious to the State in which he lives. We should not be afraid of the great mass of the people in this country. We ought to trust them. They defend our persons and property, and yet we do not allow them to exercise the franchise, which would encourage and elevate them. The true principle to adopt is that described by Lord Ashley in an address which he delivered to the working classes in 1845, and one delivered in the House of Lords by Lord Shaftesbury in 1867. Lord Ashley said:

"The growing demands, and, indeed, the exigencies of the realm, require an occasional adaptation to the necessities of the times; and I rejoice, and we may be thankful, that our system of polity is capable of a safe and most beneficial expansion. You may lengthen your cords, and strengthen your stakes, and in the very elongation of the supporting power, make the edifice you would sustain more erect and symmetrical."

This Bill would deprive a number of these people of their natural and inherent rights as citizens of Canada. If you give them the franchise you make them free men indeed. Give them the electoral franchise, give them all the rights of a British subject, and you make them men in every sense of the term; you give them an interest in the representation of the people in Parliament, and rest assured, when you give them that interest, they will take an abiding interest in public affairs. What does the workingman care now for what we are doing here? What do the laboring classes care? They say: We have no right to vote; we have no voice in making the laws of the land. But give them an interest in the representation and you give them an interest in the progress and prosperity of the country. Now, Sir, "Lorimer on Constitutionalism," in discussing the rights of men to the franchise, lays down a doctrine well worthy of consideration. (The hon. gentleman read from pages 165, 166 and 167.) Sir, we see here the doctrine laid down that the true basis of the electoral franchise is citizenship, free from the disqualifying accompaniments of pauperism, crime or minority. By adopting that foundation we elevate the popular element. We give them a sense of their importance, we give them a sense of their responsibility, and we remove from them the standing grievance of which, to some extent, they now complain. In the language of Lord Ashley again, "You may lengthen your cords and strengthen your stakes, and in the very elongation of the supporting power make the edifice you would sustain more erect and symmetrical." More than that; in adopting manhood suffrage you lessen the cost to the candidate and to all others concerned in the matter. It is admitted that the cost of the proposed Bill will be very considerable. You have, first, the preparation of the list itself; you have the preliminary revision, and you have the final revision, all of which will cost considerable. Then you have to pay the revising officer, the clerk and the bailiff, and all these things will make a very considerable charge. By adopting a more liberal franchise you can lessen expense and minimise, to a large extent, the chance of committing frauds. It is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Opposition in Parliament, for the last four weeks, have been struggling against the enfranchisement of the people, the laboring classes and the wage-earners. Now, Sir, you know perfectly well that, on the contrary, we have, to the utmost of our ability, been fighting the battles of the great wage-earning classes of the country, and asking that the franchise be made liberal enough to include them. We have been fighting the battle of provincial rights against this attempt to centralise the whole power of the electorate in the Dominion Government at Ottawa. Sir, we may fail in this. The champions of popular rights have failed before now. The political exigencies of hon. gentlemen opposite may make it necessary, from their standpoint, that we should fail. We know that, before now, popular rights and the people's interest have had to yield to political exigencies; but in the end they triumph. Now, I am sure that whatever disposition may be made of this Bill, whether it carries or not—and carry, I suppose, it will, if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in forcing it through—hon. gentlemen may rest satisfied that the masses who are excluded from the right to exercise the franchise under this Bill will ultimately obtain the franchise. There will be discontent, dissatisfaction and grievances in the meantime, but ultimately popular rights will prevail, and so sure as daylight succeeds darkness, so sure will the rights of the people have to be ultimately accorded to them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Before the vote is taken on the sub-amendment in your hands, I wish briefly to give my reasons why I support that sub-amendment, which asks that the Province of Ontario be exempted from the operations of this Act. If this amendment is carried we will preserve the franchise to a large number of our fellow citizens in the Province of Ontario, who, by this Bill, will be deprived of it. In the city from which I come, steps have been taken to ascertain what the effect of this Bill will be as compared with the operation of the Ontario Act. The information I have is, that in one industrial establishment alone in that city 78 men, who will be entitled to vote under the Mowat Act, will be deprived of the franchise under the Bill we have now before us; and in another industrial establishment in that city 74 men, who will have the right to vote under the Mowat Act, will be deprived of it under this Bill. In taking these two industrial establishments, that employ two or three hundred hands each, I have given you the effect this Bill will have, and it is estimated that the total number will be some hundreds in that city—not a very populous city—who will be deprived of a vote under this Bill, but would have it under the provincial law. That is one of the reasons why I support the sub-amendment—in order that these men who, I consider, are entitled to the franchise, should be allowed to retain it. Another reason is, that the machinery under the Mowat Administration to secure the preparation of the voters' list is simple and inexpensive, those entitled to get on the roll being able to do so without expense to themselves, and without there being much danger of their names being omitted; while under the present Bill the machinery leads to very great danger that names may be left off, even where this Bill, with its more restricted suffrage, designs that they shall be on the roll. The present system of registration in the Province of Ontario is so complete that it is by a mere accident that a name can be left off. Even with a careful officer, and one desirous to do what is right, there is danger, under the machinery of this Bill, that names will be left off. It is answered that those men can easily have their names put on the roll. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) told us that all such a man would have to do would be to take his counsel with him and have his name put on. The men whose names are most likely to be dropped are those engaged in manual toil, and it is absurd to say that such men can take counsel with them and have defects so remedied.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman state how the franchise will be of a restrictive nature in Toronto? Under Mr. Mowat's Act a man can only vote for two members, and the city of Toronto sends three representatives to this House.

Mr. PATERSON. I have explained the result in the city from which I have figures. My third reason is, that under the operations of the Bill it will tend to increase the feeling of partisanship that exists, and intensify the strong party feeling in the different communities. It is not to be wondered at that the independent press of the country, without a single exception, all denounce this Bill as one that should not pass, because one of its effects must be to destroy, as far as possible, anything like independence of party. If those journals are true to the principles they enunciate, if they will view questions from an independent standpoint and not bind themselves to either party, but create an independent sentiment, to hold the scale between the parties, they must feel that this Bill is an attempt to destroy that feeling of independence. A laboring man or a mechanic, on finding his name off the roll, cannot take counsel to have it inserted, and thus be driven to go to the managers of one of the two great parties to ask aid to have his name placed there. He should not be compelled to ask such a favor. Having, however, secured their services, he might, in a measure, feel under an obligation to that party and vote for its candidate. I give these three, among other reasons, as forming one strong reason why I prefer the amendment before the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman had always addressed the committee with the same brevity and the same point as he has done just now, we would have made considerable progress with this Bill. He has stated very shortly two or three points of objection to the Bill. Had we proceeded regularly and discussed the clauses, each according to its intent and purpose, we would have arrived at those special clauses to which the hon. gentleman took particular objection; and then the Government, and I, as representing them, would have had an opportunity of exchanging, without political acrimony of any kind, our views across the floor as to the various points in this Bill. Although the remarks of the hon. gentleman do not all apply to this clause, the first reason given certainly does. He says this Bill establishes a restricted representation in comparison with the late Bill of the Province of Ontario. We must remember that this Dominion Bill has been before the country—we will not look back to when it was first introduced—for the last three years, and this Bill, the hon. gentleman must admit, is much more liberal than the Bill under which he and I were sent here as representatives of the people. After our Bill was introduced and was before the country, the Government of Ontario introduced their Bill and carried it; after seeing our Bill and that we were greatly advancing on the present legislation, the Government went one more, to use the phrase of the gamester, and enlarged the franchise in some particulars, restricting it in others. But at this moment the Ontario law recently passed is not in force; and if there were elections to-morrow, either for the Provincial Legislature or for this Legislature, they must be held under the restricted franchise, not under the enlarged franchise of this Bill or the new Bill passed in Ontario. That Bill does not come into force until 1st January next, and is not the law, therefore; and we are to be called upon to wait quietly and patiently until that Bill comes into force. Supposing that hon. gentlemen should defeat the present Government, supposing that hon. gentlemen should succeed in robbing us of the confidence of the majority in this House, and that we should say: That may be, but we still retain the confidence of the people, and should go to the country. We must go to the country on the present franchise, which is a much more restricted franchise than the one under this Bill. Then the hon. gentleman says that the process is going to be expensive and difficult. I do not see the difficulty at all. I think, if the hon. gentleman will fairly scan the Bill, he will find that there is no such difficulty in parties desiring to have a vote getting their names put on the roll. The Bill provides simply this: that the first duty of the revising officer, the county judge, or a superior court judge, or a barrister of five years' standing, is to send to the officers of the different municipalities and get the finally revised assessment list from each of those officers. He takes all the names that he finds on those lists who have a right to vote, according to the franchise of this Bill—he takes that as *primâ facie* evidence. Then, under the Bill, all parties have a right to send in by mail, if they do not go by themselves or by counsel. After making out the lists, taking all the names he finds on the assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence, he posts them up in certain public places, where every person can see what names are there, and the committees of the different political parties can see in what respect it is deficient. The different parties, and everybody else who takes an interest in the matter, will send in a list of objections, as to names put on the list or as to the names of parties omitted. The course of the revising officer is plain. He adds all those names to the list, and he marks opposite to the names those that are objected to, and he publishes that as the preliminary list. After that preliminary list has been published, and the people are fully notified, he goes to the different municipalities and he finally settles the list. That is the process for settling the first list. If the hon. gentleman looks at the Bill he will find that in all subsequent years the double process will not be required; because, when a list is once settled, especially in the older parts of the country, which are well settled, the judge will only be obliged to strike off the names of the dead, of those who are gone away, or who have ceased to hold the franchise from year to year—a matter, as in England, of only a few days. As to the expense: hon. gentlemen of course have spoken very strongly on that point. I believe that their statements are altogether mistaken, altogether exaggerated. I believe that the county judge, with one clerk, can do the whole work, and do it easily, and speaking for those Provinces which have county judges, such as Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, the county judges will only be too glad to do the work for a small additional amount. In fact, it will not increase the expenses materially, if at all, in those Provinces, because, as perhaps hon. gentlemen coming from those Provinces know, there is a universal cry among the county judges that their salaries are insufficient. They are asking and pressing that their salaries be increased, and at an early day the Government will be obliged to grant an addition to their salaries. Some of the judges have already stated that a small addition to their salaries would be very acceptable, and they would be glad to do the work for such small addition, so that the expense has been altogether exaggerated. Now, I cannot avoid breaking a rule which I have been rather speaking against, but I will speak further on that point. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have opposed this Bill—and it is rather remarkable on that point that the opposition comes altogether, or nearly altogether, from the Province of Ontario—are very much afraid that the revising barristers will be mere partisans. Well, I think, Sir, that the present Government — and I may say the same of the Government which preceded us— both Governments have naturally been anxious, for their own credit and the good of the country, to appoint good judges, and the same principle which would actuate both Governments in that respect would call upon us—they would feel themselves called upon—to appoint equally good revising officers. But, Sir, I took early occasion in this discussion to state that, wherever it could be done, the judges would be utilised, and from the advices which I get I find that county judges, are many of them—of course, I have not heard from all, or nearly all—but many of them would be

glad to do the work, and they think they could easily perform all the duties, without materially or at all affecting their usefulness as judges. I learn further that several of the judges, who know their own counties, have stated that they could do more than one constituency, and certainly in those counties where there are several ridings—I believe almost all, with one or two exceptions—as a general rule there are junior judges, and the county judges and the junior judges could do the work. Then, Sir, I have consulted, as it was my duty to do, my friends who do the present Government the honor of supporting them, and after full discussion of the matter we have come to this conclusion: that in all those cases where the revising officer is not a judge of the Superior Court, or a county court judge, there will be an appeal to that judge, and it shall not be discretionary on the part of the revising officer to refuse an appeal. I think it well to state that to the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I call the Premier's attention to the 15th section of the Bill. The right hon. gentleman stated that, in the case of a preliminary list, it would be the duty of the revising officer to go on circuit in every municipality in the riding.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no—not the preliminary list.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought the hon. gentleman spoke of the preliminary list in his remarks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not the preliminary list, but the final list. The process is simply this: he will take one municipality in, say, the hon. gentleman's own riding. He will get the list from the township clerk, or whoever is the officer who has the list. He takes every name that is on that list, that appears on the assessment list—which is *primâ facie* the list—every name that appears to enjoy the franchise according to the Bill. He hangs that up in certain places; everybody sees that; and then they send to him. They need not go—not one of them; they send by letter the list of names they object to and the list they wish to be put on. He then adds all those names requested to be put on the list and marks those objected to at his preliminary sitting. Of course, people can go to him if they like, at this preliminary sitting, held in his office at the county town; but all others send in their lists. He publishes the list again with the additions, and then he goes and visits the municipality, hears objections and applications, and settles them. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is no appeal from the county judge in Ontario. It is true, he only sits on appeals made to him in individual cases. In this case he gets the assessment list, and there is an appeal on the whole list. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it would be only adding expense—the hon. gentleman might think that an objection—and it would enable rich candidates to bother poor ones, if there was an appeal from the county judge to the Superior Court.

Mr. MULOCK. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that there is to be an appeal on questions of fact. In the Province of Ontario to-day, when there is an appeal on the voters' list, the county judge goes on circuit to convenient points throughout the riding, where appeals are made to him, and he sits and hears cases, having original jurisdiction. It is a cheap and inexpensive system; those claiming the right to a vote appear before him, and he hears evidence and decides; and if there is an equally cheap and convenient machinery in this case, the appeal would be of value. I presume it will be as simple as it is to-day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite so.

Mr. MULOCK. Then these details will be modified?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think they require modification; but when we come to them I will be glad to consider them.

Mr. MULOCK. But the system will be as simple as the present system?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope so.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived.

Mr WATSON. I beg leave to move in amendment to the amendment:

That none of the provisions in the following sections of this Act, in reference to the qualifications of voters, shall apply to the Province of Manitoba; but in that Province the persons entitled to be registered as voters under this Act, and, when so registered, to vote at an election, shall be those persons who are entitled to vote at any election for the Legislative Assembly of that Province, and no others.

I move this because I believe that, if this Bill passes, it will disfranchise a large number of electors in the Province of Manitoba. The qualification of an elector to-day in that Province is as follows:—

"No person shall be admitted to vote at the election of a member of the Legislative Assembly of this Province unless his name appears at the time of the voting on the list of electors then in force; and no person shall be entered upon the list of electors for any electoral division unless he fulfills the following conditions, that is to say:

"1. He must be of the male sex, twenty-one years of age, and a subject of Her Majesty by birth or naturalisation;

"2. He must not otherwise be legally incapacitated;

"3. He must have been, in such electoral division, for a period of at least three months, actually and in good faith owner of real estate of the value of $100 or upwards, or tenant for the year or by the year of real property of the value of $200 and upwards, under an annual rent of at least $20, or the occupant and *bonâ fide* householder, by the residence of himself, or himself and family, if he have any, on land in the electoral division, of the annual value of at least $20."

The persons who are not entitled to vote in the Province of Manitoba are:

"Indians, or persons of Indian blood receiving an annuity from the Crown, so long as said Indians or persons of Indian blood receive such annuity; and if any of the persons set forth in this section vote, he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $500, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding twelve months, in default of the penalty imposed, and his vote shall be null and void."

I do not propose this amendment in opposition to the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), for I am in favor of the provincial franchises in all the Provinces being used for the election of members of this House. The hon. the First Minister has just stated that in all the older Provinces, after the first list is made up, it is changed very little in following years; but this is not the case in Manitoba. There the population changes very rapidly. You may see a voters' list one year, and again two or three years afterwards you would hardly recognise it as the same list. Therefore, I have some hope that the hon. the First Minister will exempt Manitoba from the operation of this measure. The present franchise in that Province is broader than the franchise proposed in this Bill, and it works very well. This Bill, if passed, will create great confusion, owing to the existence of two lists of voters. A man who has a vote for a local member may not be allowed to vote for a member of the House of Commons, and *vice versâ* in some cases. The only Dominion franchise I am in favor of, if the provincial franchises are not to be used, is manhood suffrage, and I will support the amendment to that effect, which I believe is about to be moved by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). As we have a very high protective tariff in Canada, and as every man living in the country, who is a wage-earner, is a consumer, and necessarily contributes

to the revenues of the country, every man ought to be qualified to vote for a member of this House. I believe that my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) was correct the other night when he said he thought that a man who owned $1,000 worth of property was as equally entitled to vote as a man who owned $50,000, because the one who owned the smaller property felt probably as great, if not a greater interest, in it than did the one who owned the larger amount in his. I believe that principle to be correct; I believe that a man who owns but $100 worth of property has as good a right to vote as the one who owns $300 worth, and therefore I am opposed to this Bill applying to Manitoba. In that Province there is a large number of young men, some of them school teachers, who are not householders, who do not pay rent, and who do not earn $400 a year, but who still own real estate to the value of $100 or $200, and therefore would not come under the $300 qualification. It is well known that two or three years ago nearly every young man who went to that country invested his all in town lots, but unfortunately for them these speculations did not turn out the best, and to-day town lots which cost $400 or $500 would probably not be assessed at $300, so that these men would be deprived of the right to vote at the Dominion election. I do not think that is right. These properties are all these young men own; they look foward to reaping something in a future day from their investments, and therefore have as keen an interest in the country as anybody whom this Bill would include. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the Government had the power to pass this Bill, but it is not always advisable for the Government to pass Bills because they have the authority to do so. It has often occurred that Bills which the Government introduced and which the Government had the power to pass have, after some discussion, been withdrawn, and I hope the Government will see fit to place this measure in the same category, by withdrawing it. In the Province of Manitoba, as in Ontario, for the laws of the two Provinces are a good deal the same, we have a capital system of getting out voters' lists and arriving at the qualifications of men who should be entitled to vote. The municipal councillors are elected, as a rule, irrespective of their political prejudices, and it is they who appoint the assessors. The assessor is selected as being a man who is intelligent and competent and who will do his duty and, as a rule, there are very few objections to the voters' lists as prepared from the assessment rolls. The assessor is sworn in, as I believe he is in all the different Provinces, and I have yet to learn that he has wilfully neglected to do his duty. I was surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), a few nights ago, state that the elections of councillors in his county were run as political elections, on political basis, so that an assessor might be appointed who would not act impartially, but would favor one side or the other. That is not the case in Manitoba, that I am aware of; as a rule, we have very fair assessors, whose work gives general satisfaction. The voters' lists are based on the assessment roll, and any person owning $100 worth of property, or paying a rental of $2 per month on $200 worth of property, is entitled to vote. The chances are that those assessors will perform the duty much more fairly than would any revising barrister appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite; for, as a rule, these barristers will be partisan. The First Minister has told us that judges, as a rule, will be appointed. That is welcome information to hon. gentlemen on this side, for we have always been under the impression that, not the judges, but barristers of five years' standing, would be appointed. In this connection I may say that some hon. gentlemen opposite have a higher opinion of the revising barristers than we on this side have. In my opinion, no revising barrister of five years' standing, with more brain than cheek, would take the position of revising barrister, unless he had reason to believe he would receive indirectly some further remuneration than what he would receive directly from the position. I do not think that the revising barrister is likely to be a person qualified to value property in the different municipalities. As a rule, when barristers want valuations to be made of property, for the purpose of insurance or other purpose, they employ the assessors of the municipalities, whose judgment is looked upon as pretty accurate. A revising barrister would not be acceptable to the people at all. I do not think the people would wish to see a young lawyer value their property and decide, on his own fiat who shall and who shall not vote. I do not know how it is in other Provinces, but in Manitoba lawyers are looked upon in pretty much the same light as General Sheridan is said to have looked on an Indian. "I know of only one good kind of an Indian," said he, "and that is a dead Indian." So in Manitoba the people have about the same opinion of a lawyer. I do not think it is necessary that I should occupy the attention of the House at great length, and I hope, after this short explanation of matters in Manitoba, relating to voters and voters' lists, the First Minister may see fit to exempt our Province from the action of this Bill. I know that its application there would create a great deal of dissatisfaction. Its provisions are not in the best interests of the Dominion, but apparently have been framed solely for the purpose of maintaining hon. gentlemen opposite in power. Unless they have some such object in view I cannot understand why they should persist in forcing this Bill through at this late period, after the House has been in session over three months, and when it will require at least six weeks longer to get through with the other business before us, independent of the Franchise Bill altogether. It looks as if we were to have two months extra session, solely for the purpose of passing this Bill, which has not been put before the people, which the people have not had an opportunity of pronouncing on, and against which, at this late hour, when the people are becoming awake to its provisions, petitions are pouring in by the hundred. The people of the Province of which I have the honor of being one of the representatives have hitherto known little or nothing of the Bill, but those who do know anything of it write me very strong letters, saying the Opposition are perfectly justified in the course they have taken to protect the interests of the people. I hope the First Minister and this House will see fit to exempt Manitoba from the operation of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure that those gentlemen in this House, on that side or on this side—and I do not think there were many on this side—who were under the impression that the Prime Minister was disposed to make some concessions to the views of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, must have been very much disappointed after hearing the observations which he addressed to the committee. I did not expect that he would recede from the position he had taken, upon the subject of the appointment of revising barristers, or any portion of the Bill, which is obnoxious to hon. gentlemen in this House, as publicly expressed on this side and privately on that side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

An hon. MEMBER. Speak for yourself.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman need not be uneasy. I am not speaking for him.

An hon. MEMBER. Whom are you speaking for?

Another hon. MEMBER. He is speaking for no one.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has made some observations on the subject of revising barristers, to which, I

think, I may be allowed to make some reference, before I pass to the other portions of the question more immediately concerned in the motions which are before you. The hon. gentleman spoke of those whom he intended to appoint as revising barristers. Hitherto, the appointment of revising barristers has been an act of the Parliament of Canada and not an act of the Government of Canada. They have been designated in the Bill passed by Parliament and not by an Order in Council or a commission from the Government. In the first place, we would make very strong objection to that. In the next place, the hon. gentleman has stated that he proposes to provide for revising officers who are not revising officers. The duties of revising forms a very small portion of the duties that will devolve on the officers appointed under this Bill. The hon. gentleman knows that neither in England nor in any of the Australian colonies nor in any of the States of the American Republic nor in this Dominion, heretofore, has the work of revision been performed by the parties who prepare the lists. If the the hon. gentleman were to withdraw his proposition altogether with regard to the appointment of revising officers, if he were to say that these officers shall be designated in the statute that they shall be the judges of the country, so far as they are personally concerned I would not make any objection to their fitness, so far as their good intentions are concerned, but I still say that they would not be competent officers to prepare the lists. It is necessary that the parties who prepare those lists should be personally acquainted with each separate community. I say that no judge possesses that qualification, and that work can only be done, as it is now done in Ontario, by legal officers in each municipality. When they have prepared a list, knowing, as they do, the individuals in their community, knowing their qualifications, knowing whether they are entitled to go on the list or not, in general terms, then there is very little difficulty in the revision. We know that in the Province of Ontario a great majority of those lists are never revised. There is no appeal to the county judge, or to any party, to put additional names on the list, because they are fairly well prepared by those local officers upon whom this duty devolves. I know that, generally, the year before an election takes place there is a little more attention paid than in other years. If the hon. gentleman's plan were carried out, I do not know whether, when he speaks of county judges being the revising officers, he means that the district of each judge in his ordinary capacity shall be that over which he is to have jurisdiction as revising officer. He has not stated that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had not had time.

Mr. MILLS. He informed the House the other day that there were ninety-two constituencies and only forty judges. What are we to infer from that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not necessary to infer; that is the fact.

Mr. MILLS. Everyone of these ninety-two constituencies is embraced in the jurisdiction of those forty judges. Why did the hon. gentleman make the distinction? The county of Bothwell, for instance, is made up of a part of the county of Lambton, and of a part of the county of Kent. When a revision takes place of the voters' list, part is revised by the judge of the county of Lambton and part by the judge of the county of Kent. Does the hon. gentleman intend that that shall continue, or that the county of Bothwell shall not be one of those included under the jurisdiction of the county judge, but shall be given to a revising officer appointed by the Government? Does he propose to give us a revising officer, as he gave us a returning officer? Does he propose to do the same thing in the different divisions of the county of Kent? What did he mean by his statement that there were ninety-two constituencies and only forty judges? Did he mean that the forty judges were to operate in forty electoral districts, and that fifty-two districts would be left in which he would appoint revising officers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see, if he looks at the Bill, that a revising officer can hold a commission for more than one district.

Mr. MILLS. I know he can, but the hon. gentleman can appoint them as he pleases. Under this Bill he retains a power which he ought not to possess. He does not say that he will abandon a power which no Government can decently exercise, no Government has a right to claim, as it is an interested party. The revising officer should be as independent of the Government as of the Opposition. The statement made by the hon. gentleman will not impose upon any member of this House who does not desire to be imposed upon. Barnum has said that it is wonderful how many people are fond of being humbugged, and if anyone accepts the statements of the First Minister it will be only some gentleman who is anxious to be imposed upon, in view of the fact that the First Minister retains this unjust, this atrocious provision, which he has proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. Carried.

Mr. MILLS. No; it is not carried. This is a practical question, and I am addressing myself to the merits of the question.

Mr. ABBOTT. For the first time.

Mr. MILLS. I am calling the hon. gentleman's attention to something which he has not generally stopped in the House to hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Lost.

Mr. MILLS. Although this Bill has been a long time before the committee, the hon. gentleman himself has not been very often present in the committee. I have no doubt he has recuperated and is refreshed, and has returned here on the first day of the week, invigorated by his long rest. The hon. gentleman has said this evening: Suppose we were to adopt the Ontario law. Why, it does not come into operation until January next, and see the extraordinary position we would be in. We would be obliged to go to the country under a new law. Mr. Chairman, let me observe that if we had legislation here it will not come into operation until 1887, while the Ontario law will come into operation next January; and so the hon. gentleman says it is absolutely necessary that we should go on in midsummer and legislate upon this question, although our law cannot come into operation until twelve months after the Ontario law is in operation. That is a most extraordinary argument to address to this committee as a reason for proceeding with this Bill. The hon. gentleman says: It is true that this Bill is not as liberal as the Ontario law, but then you must remember that the law of Ontario is made more liberal since I proposed this Bill two years ago. What does the hon. gentleman intend we shall infer? Does he intend we shall infer that the people of Ontario are in favor of an extension of the franchise, and that the Provincial Legislature has gone still further in the way of meeting the popular wishes than he has gone in this Bill? If I understand the law of Parliament, this Bill is before us for the first time. The hon. gentleman never took the opinion of the country upon his Bill on previous occasions. The very fact that he has withdrawn it on several occasions was the best reason in the world for the opinion that it would not be proceeded with at all. There was no other inference to be drawn. The hon. gentlemen forgets that in 1882, before his Bill of 1883

was before Parliament at all, there was a large convention of the Reform party held in Toronto, attended by upwards of six thousand electors, where it was agreed that a more liberal extension of the franchise should take place. The Government went to the country upon that question, and the hon. gentleman's friends, his lieutenant in the Local Legislature, also went to the country in favor of an extension of the franchise. Both parties did that, and the legislation of the Provincial Legislature at its last Session is the outcome of that appeal to the electors. The Tory party in the Local Legislature voted for manhood suffrage. Then, what are we to infer from this appeal to the country and the action of both parties in the Local Legislature? We are to infer that the country was prepared to go, at least, as far as the Government did, and possibly farther. Now, Sir, I say that upon this Bill the hon. gentleman has never appealed to the country. I gave several instances on Saturday where, in England, the Government had appealed to the country on proposed constitutional changes. I showed that in not a single instance, within a century, was any considerable alteration made in the constitution without an appeal to the country. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has referred to a great number of instances to-day in detail. The obvious reason is, that under the English system an alteration of the constitution is made by the same machinery as that which carries on ordinary legislation. But in order to protect the people against alterations in the constitution, against revolutionary measures, there is no instance of any such change having taken place without an appeal first having been made to the country. Now, the hon. gentleman has not asked the opinion of the people of this country upon this question. In 1874 we did appeal to the country. We proposed that the Parliament of Canada should, from time to time, adopt the law of the various Local Legislatures for the election of local members as the law for the election of members to the House of Commons. The people did sanction that appeal; they returned a majority to Parliament in favor of it, and the legislation that is now on the Statute Book was in consequence of that appeal. But the hon. gentleman now proposes to change the constitution radically, without giving the people an opportunity of saying whether they approve of this change or not. Then the hon. gentleman seems to have lost sight altogether of the fact that our whole system is based upon the principle involved in the law now on the Statute Book. Take the question of the trial of controverted elections. You refer these to the provincial courts, and you do not object to their trial by these courts, because the courts are provincial. You admit that that was tried, and the Privy Council decided that this matter lies wholly within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, that it is right and proper for the Parliament of Canada to declare that the provincial courts shall try these cases. The Parliament has as much right to name a provincial court for the purpose of carrying out their law as they have to create a separate and independent tribunal. We do the same with regard to summary convictions. I have here the statute which the hon. gentleman himself put upon the Statute Book. Who does it authorise summarily to try and convict for petty offences? Why, the magistrates. Who appoints them? They are appointed by the Local Governments; they are not officers of the Parliament of Canada; and yet you administer your laws through them. Now, is there any impropriety in saying that the clerk of a municipality, or assessor, or other local officer, shall prepare the voters' lists? What objection is there? We are here elected under laws of the several Provincial Legislatures. We have, by our law, declared that that shall be our plan, and we have elections under it; and we can, in the same way, declare that a certain municipal officer, designating him by his office, shall prepare the voters' lists. There is no more difficulty than in saying a provincial judge shall try controverted Dominion elections. The one is as clear as the other. The hon. gentleman knows it. He knows we have the same jurisdiction in one case as in the other, and he knows that if we were to act on the principle he has laid down in this Bill we would radically change our whole machinery for the administration of our laws. If the hon. gentlemen says he does not like the provincial franchise and wishes to have a separate and independent franchise for the Dominion, and that the Ontario franchise is too wide, he can still use the provincial machinery for preparing the voters' lists. What advantage is the hon. gentleman going to gain in taking the duty of preparing the list from parties who know all about it and placing it with persons who do not? Take the county of Kent, with a population of 55,000. No doubt the county judge will know a great many people, but, of course, only a small number in proportion to the population. There is only one common sense way for making up the voters' lists, and that is the way that experience has pointed out in every country. In England such lists are prepared by the overseers of parishes and the clerks, and the appeal is to the revising barrister appointed by the judge during the summer assize. The hon. gentleman seeks, however, to do away with all the local machinery by which the lists are prepared, and place the whole matter in the hands of a revising officer. Where are the lists to come from that the officer is to revise? It appears, however, that he has to prepare the list. How is he to know the names to put on? The hon. First Minister says he may take the assessment roll. But that does not contain all the names. They can only be known by people residing in the locality. The hon. gentleman has complained of this being a protracted Session and of the length of this discussion. Let him consider the length of the discussions on the Irish Church Bill, on the Reform Representation Bill and on the Irish Land Bill. I am happy to say that a new era is dawning upon the legislation of Canada. I look for better things hereafter. The hon. gentleman has been himself the legislator, instead of having legislation carried on by the Parliament of Canada. In England every Bill is thoroughly discussed on the second reading, and if there is no popular demand for it, although a majority in Parliament may be in favor of the measure, it is usually dropped. The hon. gentleman brought in this Bill at the end of ten or eleven weeks of the Session, after the period when the close of the Session has usually arrived. The hon gentleman proposed to push the measure through the House without discussion, and he gave us no opportunity of discussing it. No one but the leader himself had an opportunity of discussing the Bill on the second reading. The hon. gentleman refused to allow the House to adjourn, and insisted on our continuing the discussion, although we had had no opportunity of consulting the country upon it. Have there been petitions presented in favor of the Bill, or public meetings held? Has the hon. gentleman had any evidence, since this discussion began, that the people demanded the Bill? We have had nearly 4,000 names attached to petitions presented to-day; there were 3,000 names on Saturday's petitions, and I dare say as many more were received to-day by the last mail. So, the hon. gentleman is evidently determined to push this Bill through against public opinion.

Mr. McCALLUM. Against the opinion of the Grits.

Mr. MILLS. I presented a petition to-day with 70 Reform names and 28 Conservative names, and it is so marked on the petition. I strongly suspect the hon. member's own constituency does not support this Bill. It has already been gerrymandered twice, and no doubt the hon. gentleman will ask to have it gerrymandered again.

Mr. McCALLUM. I never asked for it.

Mr. MILLS. I am simply stating that in 1882 a township from Haldimand was attached to Monck, and it was gerrymandered a second time.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the facts. The hon. member for Haldimand went to the First Minister and requested that to be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear; that is true. Mr. Thompson asked for it.

Mr. MILLS. It was done, all the same.

Mr. McCALLUM. You said I asked for it. It was done at the request of the hon. member for Haldimand, not at my request.

Mr. MILLS. We all know from experience how very anxious the First Minister is to make constituencies safe for hon. gentlemen on this side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have made a good many.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; more than the hon. gentleman will ever have opportunity of doing again. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) stated that this would not be a party voters' list that would be prepared under this Bill, but it would be a people's list. Yet the people prepare the lists now. Neither the Local Government nor the Dominion Government interfere. One hon. gentleman said the councillors are respectable men, but the assessors are rascally, unscrupulous men, who are ready to commit perjury for the purpose of making a bad voters' list. But who appointed these rascally assessors? They are appointed by the respectable councillors, whether Conservative or Reform. The council appointing the assessors have both parties represented in its members. If one party happens to be in a minority they are there, at all events, to know. They are the watchmen; they are able to tell whether there is any improper conduct on the part of the majority; they are put on guard, and it is possible for them to make an appeal to the proper officers. But in this case how is this list prepared? By a man who is a stranger to the great majority of the people; by a man who is a partisan of the Government, when he is not a judge; by a man who, if he wishes to do right, is not able to do so, from the want of the necessary knowledge, and who, if he is disposed to do wrong, can do so without the attention of the community being called to his conduct in time. The chances are that in order to prevent an improper list from being prepared it will be necessary for every candidate and every member of Parliament to spend as much time and incur as much expense as he would in the conduct of an ordinary election.

Mr. McCALLUM. You have to do that now.

Mr. MILLS. No, we have not. I say the great majority of this House do not look after the voters' lists. The great majority of this House rest upon their general confidence in the fair play of the men by whom the lists are prepared, and it is a rare exception, and not the general rule, that the list should be revised by the judge at all. But that condition of things will continue no longer. The moment you adopt this law you make it necessary to spend more time and incur more expense each year, in revising that list, than in the conduct of an ordinary election. I say that the expense is a very serious matter, and that it will be far greater, taking the country collectively, than the expense incurred by the Government in the payment of the officers called upon to prepare these lists. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have addressed to the committee the remarks which I wished to make upon this portion of the Bill. I called the attention of the committee to the fact that in passing the law we now have on the Statute Book, and in adhering to that law, we are adhering to a law which is perfectly consistent with the general policy of our jurisprudence; that just what we have done every year in the trial of contreverted elections, in the administration of criminal justice, is precisely what we are doing in this case, in avoiding expense by using men who are acquainted with the people and who are infinitely better qualified to prepare the voters' lists, in the first instance, than the revising officers the hon. gentleman proposes to name, whether they are named in an unobjectionable way, by Parliament, in the Bill, or in an objectionable way, by the hon. gentleman himself. In that respect there is a very great distinction. I would say this that if the hon. gentleman persists in his adherence to this clause I shall favor an amendment, when we come to the proper part of the Bill, providing for the appointment of the reeve, the assessor and the township clerk, for the purpose of preparing the original lists. I say we can name them in the Bill, and we can impose on them the duty which is now imposed on the municipal officers, of preparing the list in the first instance. I say it is of the utmost consequence that the preparation of the lists should not be in the hands of the revising officer, but in the hands of parties who are acquainted with the ground.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find, Sir, that I made a great mistake. Seduced by the dulcet tones of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), I broke the rule which I had set for myself, which I found it necessary, as the leader of the House, to set for myself, and that was to obey the rules of Parliament. When we went into committee I stated from the beginning that we should adhere to the rules of Parliament, and that when in Committee of the Whole we should discuss, clause by clause, on its own merits, and not anticipate arguments on the very first clause, which might be brought against the very last. I laid down that rule; it was my bounden duty to do so. If the leader of the House desires to perform his duty he should see that he, at all events, should not consciously break any of the rules of Parliament. Now, during the whole debate we have broken the rule by which each clause should be considered on its own merits, without entering on a discussion of the whole measure. However, early that rule was broken. I could not help it, and on both sides we have had very instructive, though premature, speeches on various clauses of the Bill. It is my duty, however, to adhere to the rule which I laid down for myself, that when in Committee of the Whole we should discuss the single question before us at the time, and not diverge into a discussion—very proper when the Speaker is in the Chair, on the first, second or third reading, or on concurrence, but certainly a breach of the principles and practices of Parliament when in committee. I adhered to that, but I was seduced by the reasonable speech of the hon. gentleman to go further than the resolution which was before the committee. I did so with the best intention; but it only shows that I was wrong, and that I should have adhered to the rule, because, instead of being received, as I thought my remarks ought to have been received, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), he takes up the whole discussion again, opens it up *ab initio*, and shows that the present system—I will will not call it obstruction, but the system of lengthened and continued discussion—should be still continued. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman has not adopted the moderate and, in my opinion, the wise tone of the hon. member for Brant, in limiting himself to a short and succinct statement of his objections to the Bill. I apologise to the committee for making that mistake. I find that the hon gentleman has not reciprocated. The hon. gentleman is resolved —I do not know whether those around him will follow his track, but certainly his leader shows that he will not follow in that track; I say I do not know whether the remainder of the committee will pursue

this course or not; but if it is so, we must submit with all Christian resignation. I stated my reasons why I would oppose the adoption of the same rigid rules which exist in England, and which were forced on Mr. Gladstone, and I am strongly of opinion that I was right then, and I shall not—so far as I can help it—be induced, by any continued discussion, to attempt to introduce new rules in this House, until we find that legislation is put an end to by the acts of a minority. I hope that is not going to be the normal state of the Parliament of Canada—I hope so in the interests of Canada and the prosperity of Canada. I suppose it will last my time, but if this kind of obstruction goes on, why, those who follow me will not have such a happy 40 years as I have had during my parliamentary experience. It seems that the hon. gentleman wishes to make it a trial of physical endurance. Well, if that is the case, we must put up with it the best we can. I told the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) a story the other day, when we were taking luncheon, illustrative of what physical endurance means, and I will repeat it for the benefit of the hon. gentleman. There was an Indian in the county of Prince Edward, now represented by Dr. Platt, who had murdered a farmer and his wife. He was caught in the act; there was no hope for him; he was certain to be convicted and to suffer the extreme penalty of the law; and as he was an Indian—perhaps not enfranchised, and not able to vote against the hon. member for Bothwell—of course all the clergy, both Catholic and Protestant, were anxious to bring him to a sense of his state, and they went to see him. One day he said to the gaoler—the gaoler was my informant—said he, "Mr. McGuire, what kind of a place is hell?" "Well, John," said he, "it is a place of torment where bad people go to." "Has it been long there?" asked the Indian. "Oh, yes; before the world was created." "Many people there?" "Oh, yes; all the bad people go there." "Who was the first man there?" "Why," said the gaoler, "the devil." "Is he there yet?" "Yes, he is there yet." "Well," said the Indian, "if he can stand it, I can."

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to ask a question relating to the working of the Bill. The revising officer is to get the assessment roll and the list of voters, and from them is to prepare his first voters' list. At present the assessment roll makes no reference to the amount of rent that is paid; and how is the revising officer to get such information as to enable him to decide whether a tenant shall have a vote or not? This somewhat extensive class could only be put on the list upon personal application afterwards. I have a list in my hand relating to one constituency, on which there are over 700 names of persons of that class. Are those 700 to be left off the first list and only to be put on upon personal application to the revising officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I must adhere to the rule just laid down. I shall be very glad to answer the hon. gentleman when we get two or three clauses on, when this question will be appropriate. I shall then be glad to enter fully into the discussion, to give such explanations and to receive such suggestions as may be made on both sides.

Mr. MILLS. With reference to the observations the hon. gentleman addresses to me, I have to say that whatever he may have been, I deny that I was out of order. I discussed the clause before the committee; I incidentally alluded to the observations the hon. gentleman made; but what I said was strictly pertinent. I have nothing to say about the hon. gentleman's Indian story. That was quite as pertinent as his speeches usually are in this House. But if any of the Indians commit acts of that sort to-day he would not regard them as murder, and I suppose he will not send any of them to Hades on account of them.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend has asked for the bread of information, and the hon. gentleman has only given him a very good story—a story I have heard before with some amusement; and it has two morals to it. The one is, that which I suppose he wished to draw from it, that that side of the House could stand the discussion of this Bill as long as we could; and the other, which I think also follows from it, is, that we have been making it particularly hot for the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is your future, not your present.

Mr. CASEY. Well, they may be, perhaps, expiating now something of what they might otherwise have to endure in the future. At all events, it has been extremely hot for them, and if there were any proof of that needed, it might be found in the statement the hon. gentleman has made this evening, in regard to the changes he proposes to make in the Bill. Under these circumstances, the moral is very clear, and it is not very discouraging to this side of the House either.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Watson) negatived. Yeas, 40; nays, 65.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) negatived. Yeas, 40; nays, 70.

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that in the first paragraph the word "November" be struck out and the word "January" be inserted instead, and that the word "five" be struck out and the word "six" be inserted instead. The rolls in the cities, I believe are made up in December, and it is most convenient, therefore, that the starting point should be on the 1st of January instead of on the 1st of November.

On sub-section 2, section 3,

"Is a British subject by birth and naturalisation."

Mr. MITCHELL moved:

That all that part of section 3, after the word "and," of sub-section 2 of section 3, be struck out, and the following substituted: Has been a resident of the electoral district for twelve months, and has been assessed for and paid his taxes for the current year.

He said: I have followed with much attention and a good deal of regret the course this debate has taken, and I hope I will not be violating the rules which have been laid down, and particularly laid down to-night, by the right hon. the Premier, in suggesting that hon. gentlemen should confine themselves to the particular paragraph or section that is under discussion. I will endeavor to follow that rule as closely as circumstances will allow, but I may be permitted to make this observation in relation to the course this debate has taken, that I look upon the debate with extreme regret, as a constitutional man. I could make great allowance for the opposition of hon. gentlemen on the other side to this Bill, believing, as they do, that the independence of the country is assailed by its provisions, if they had only confined their course to lawful and parliamentary opposition. But I must say that in the earlier part of the debate the opposition, in my opinion, went beyond that, and took the character of obstruction, a character which I regretted much to see it take. During the last three or four days of the discussion, however, I am pleased to see hon. gentlemen have returned to what they believe to be their constitutional right, to discuss the Bill without obstruction, but to discuss it fully and effectually and completely. I hope that during the rest of the discussion on this Bill that course will be pursued by hon. gentlemen on both sides, and that we will endeavor, as closely as we can, to confine ourselves to the particular paragraph or section which may be under the consideration of the committee for the time being; and, following out that course, I will limit my remarks, as far as possible—indeed, I hope to do so entirely—to the particular amendment which I have the

honor to propose. There is no measure that could come before this House which could be more fatal to the independence and to the prosperity of this country than a Franchise Bill which would declare who should and who should not be elected to sit in this Parliament. It is well known that at a very early stage of the debate, when the question arose as to whether a Bill at all should emanate from this Parliament, whether we ourselves should regulate the franchise and the conditions upon which persons should be elected to sit and vote in this House, I then declared my opinion to be most decidedly in favor of a Franchise Bill which should emanate from us; I then declared that we ourselves should exercise the right of saying who should elect us, and that the right should not be given to any minor Assembly in this country to make restrictions which would affect or control the election of people to sit here. On the other hand, while taking that view of the case, I stated frankly that although I supported that main principle of the Bill I should oppose the details of the Bill, because I looked upon them as very cumbersome, as very expensive, and as entirely unsymmetrical. I have not changed my opinion from any discussion that has taken place since. I believe this Bill could be simplified very materially by the adoption of the resolution I have proposed. The advantages of the system I propose over the system provided in the Bill are, in my opinion, numerous. In the first place, the system I propose will be much more economical than the Bill before us. The right hon. First Minister has stated that the cost of the revising officers and the clerks is much exaggerated; possibly it may be. No person can tell what the cost of that staff of officers will be; but one thing we do know, and that is, that there are upwards of 200 constituencies in this country, that we have a revising officer for each constituency and a clerk and a bailiff, as provided by the Bill; these people must in each constituency have an office; there will be rents to be paid, stationery to be provided and printing to be done, and I am of opinion that the whole of this will reach certainly between $150,000 and $200,000 a year. If that be the case, it will be adding to the cost of legislation in this country a very considerable item which, I think, ought to be avoided if possible. Let us see how it can be avoided. Under the Bill, the extension of the franchise in individual instances is quite as comprehensive and goes quite as far as the amendment which I have the honor to propose. For instance, this Bill allows people who pay $2 a month rental to vote, and we all know the class of people who pay $2 a month rental; we know it is the very lowest and most impoverished class of people in this community who would live in houses for which they only have to pay $2 a month rent, and if that is the case, if that class of people are as low down in the scale of society as the class that I propose to enfranchise here, surely we cannot, on the ground that they are beneath those to whom we are going to give representation, refuse them the right to vote. The objection to this amendment, as I understand, is that it is too comprehensive. Well, the same applies to a certain class enfranchised under this Bill, and we have this difference between the two cases, that in one case you adopt an extensive machinery, with a large amount of cost, and a complicated measure for the consideration and discussion and judgment of these revising officers, and of the people themselves who may vote; you have a number of sections in this Bill which it is very difficult to understand, and all this would be removed if the amendment which I propose were substituted, and you would have the advantage of a measure simple in its character, uniform in its constitution and inexpensive in its operation. There is a principle underlying this amendment which I think is worth the consideration of this House. It is that we are gradually drifting towards universal suffrage, not here alone, but in Europe. It has existed in America for a long time, and has prevailed in several of the Provinces of this Dominion, and we have never found any very serious objection to its working. If, therefore, it were extended to the whole Dominion, and the right were given to every one who contributes to the taxation of the country to say how the taxes should be applied, it would have the advantage of giving satisfaction to the people, and would forever put an end to the agitation which must arise when this Bill is passed, and which is necessarily created by the passage of this Bill. It would create a finality in regard to any attempt to broaden the franchise, because the franchise could not be broadened; it would put an end to agitation on that subject, and would give, I am persuaded, very general satisfaction to the people of the country. Where is the great difference between the sons of farmers and the sons of mechanics? It is true that, under this Bill, some sons of mechanics may vote if their fathers possess freeholds, but there are many mechanics who do not own freeholds, whose sons are as capable of discriminating as to the proper person to be elected as the sons of farmers. If the franchise is given to one class of young men, no more intelligent than others, is it likely that a Bill of that character will give satisfaction and conduce to the harmonious working of our elective system? I do not think it will, and therefore I propose this amendment. I know some objections are raised to it in reference to its detail. I am not tied to the particular form. Some say that it should not be limited to the tax-paying element. I believe that is a sound principle. I do not believe in giving to paupers and others who do not contribute anything to the revenue of the country the right to say who shall distribute those revenues; but, on the other hand, I believe that the principle is just as correct, that everyone who does contribute to the revenues of the country should have a right to say how they should be distributed and who should be the people to distribute them. I am not going to take up the time of the committee. There has been too much time taken up already in the discussions which have taken place. I have simply stated the reasons which have induced me to submit this amendment, and I would say to the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government that, if he would accept the amendment, I believe it would give satisfaction to the country, I believe, though I am not authorised to speak for them, that hon. gentlemen on the other side would accept it, that it would stop this long discussion; and I say further that, if the right hon. gentleman would declare that this is not a party vote, that it is a question raised above party, and would leave the gentlemen who sit behind him to exercise their judgment upon it, I believe he would find that a large majority of them would sustain the principle of manhood suffrage based on taxation.

Mr. DAVIES. When the hon. gentleman first introduced his amendment I understood it was one in favor of manhood suffrage, pure and simple. I did not particularly examine the resolution which he placed in your hands, and so understanding his object, I told him I would be most happy to second it. It seems to me, however, on a critical examination of that amendment, that it does not go as far as I would wish it to go. That may be a fault of mine, but it does not cover the whole question of manhood suffrage. It necessitates the possession of property on the part of the British subject of twenty-one years of age; it pre-supposes the possession by him of property in order that he may get on the assessment roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; a man paying a poll tax of a shilling or a dollar would have a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are very few poll taxes in the Dominion or in the Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. They can adopt them, then.

Mr. DAVIES. If poll taxes were universal, and the hon. gentleman had said that those paying a poll tax should be included, I would have been glad to adopt it; but this amendment requires that the voter should have been assessed and paid taxes for the current year. That necessitates his having property, and places the right to exercise the franchise upon the same basis as the right hon. gentleman proposes, though in a different way. The Bill now before us necessitates the possession by the voter of a certain amount of real estate or the receipt of so much income.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The Bill pre-supposes that. He must be the owner of land worth $150 in cities and $350 in counties, or a tenant paying monthly rental of $2 or a yearly rental of $20. He must be an occupant, in the actual possession of land worth $150 or in receipt of a yearly income of $400. The classes reached, therefore, by this Bill, are nearly as extensive as those who would be reached by the amendment of the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I think he has worded his resolution unfortunately, and that it would not embrace those classes that he seeks to embrace. Therefore, I shall be obliged, in order to put my views on record, to move a small amendment to that—although I may say that when listening to his remarks I found that he and I were perfectly in accord. There is no doubt, as he says, that we are now arrived at a very important stage of this Bill. The House, by agreeing to the second reading, has affirmed a principle that this Legislature alone shall settle the franchise of those electors who are to vote for members here. And we are now face to face with the still more important question, in my view, of what that franchise shall consist of. I think the basis the right hon. gentleman has laid down is an unfortunate basis, and that it cannot be logically defended. I think, in a new country like Canada, we ought to have a more liberal and a more radical basis, and I propose that this Bill shall affirm that every free citizen of this Dominion, not disqualified by law, being 21 years of age, and having resided in the district for twelve months, shall have the right to vote. Sir, it is a new principle as regards some of the Provinces of this Dominion. It is not a new principle to myself and my colleagues from Prince Edward Island, nor is it new, I believe, to the members from British Columbia. We have had that principle in force for twenty-five or thirty years, and I will venture the assertion that after the experience of a quarter of a century no public man can be found who will express his opinion that it has failed. I think there has been a concensus of opinion from all parties, politicians and thinking men, statesmen of all kinds, who have any knowledge of Prince Edward Island politics, that the system of manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island has been a great success. Now, when we lay down the basis of a new franchise for the whole Dominion I think we commit a cruel wrong if we make it higher than the one which has been in operation in those two Provinces. It is a good principle, that once men have votes they should always have votes. You have no right to take from these men the rights which they have heretofore possessed, unless you can establish the fact that they have abused the trust which the Legislature reposed in them. No man dare say, no man has said, that the electors of Prince Edward Island have ever abused that trust. No man has said—or, at any rate, successfully said—that it is right or just to disfranchise that class. Sir, I ask that the principle we have had in operation in that Province be extended all over this Dominion. I say it is the only true basis upon which you can rest. You are now enacting, for the first time in this new country, the basis for a franchise. Is there any hon. gentleman within the reach of my voice who thinks you are going to rest there? You are going to exclude from the exercise of that dearest right of a Briton a large portion of the population. Do you think those whom you are going to exclude will be satisfied? Do you not know that the experience of past countries will be repeated? That from year to year there will be an incessant agitation carried on by these people to obtain the same rights as are enjoyed by their fellow citizens, the right to say who shall represent them and who shall tax them? Now, we have had the experience of other countries as to the effect of this system of manhood suffrage. The argument against it has been that there are, in cities, large floating populations who are not intelligent enough to exercise the franchise. But we have only to look across the line, to the great country south of us, and what do we see there? We see one of the greatest countries in the civilised world, where the principle of manhood suffrage has been in operation for nearly 100 years. After that experience of a century, is there a public man in the United States who would dare to stand up to-day and advocate a return to a more liberal franchise?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, thousands.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, of course my assertion, and the denial of my hon. friend, do not amount to a great deal; but I have read American history wrongly, and I have read the utterances of their leading men wrongly——

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Have you read an article written by Francis Parkman?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. You surely do not infer that he is in favor of manhood suffrage?

Mr. DAVIES. I did not know that Francis Parkman was a political man at all.

Mr. WOOD. His opinion has all the greater weight.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think so. I say no politician of any standing, no public man—using the word in the sense of a man who takes part in the politics of the country—will be found who will advocate a recurrence to a more limited franchise. Take the public men of the Republican party, or of the Democratic party: Did you ever see a plank proposed to be inserted in the platform of either of those two great parties that asked for a limited franchise, that would exclude any class of their fellow citizens from that franchise? Why, Sir, it would be the death knell of the party who proposed it. Looking at the broad results of one hundred years' experience, has the faith which the founders of the American constitution placed in the people at large been justified by the facts? I say it has. I say that, although that country has been the recipient of the floating population of almost every part of the globe; although I think I am not exaggerating when I say that millions have poured into that country for the past fifty years from the old world; although what is called the scum of the population of some of those countries has gone into the United States, still, Sir, when they once land upon that soil and reside there twelve months, they become citizens and find that they have the same rights as the millionaire, or the man who is born there, and the result has been that they become amalgamated with the people, and become lovers of the country which they have adopted; and I suppose that to-day you will not find any people more loyal to the flag they have chosen as their own than the immigrants from Ireland, England, Germany, Italy and other European countries. Sir, I say that their experience furnishes one of the most magnificent spectacles that the world has ever presented—the whole of that immense mass of people marching to the polls once in four years and electing its chief magistrate; and yet one would suppose, from the predictions who were uttered with reference to universal suffrage, that the exercise of that right would be accompanied by violence and by tyranny. Such has not been the case;

such was not the case. That country was brought face to face with one of the greatest revolutions the world has ever seen. The North and South were pitted against each other. The wiseacres of the old countries of the world shook their heads and said: The end has come; the Republic is a failure; disintegration has already set in, and this is owing in part to the system of giving every man a vote. What has been the result? No other country could have grappled with a rebellion of the same magnitude so successfully as the United States did in 1860. I invite attention to the opinion expressed by the greatest living statesman at the time he introduced the celebrated Franchise Bill in 1864. Mr. Gladstone referred to the rebellion in the United States, and pointed out that the result obtained was the result of every capable citizen being enfranchised and having a direct and energetic interest in the welfare of the State:

"Never was a great truth so vividly illustrated as in the war of the American Republic. The convulsion of that country between 1861 and 1865 was, perhaps, the most frightful that ever assailed a national existence. The efforts which were made on both sides were marked. The exertions by which alone the movement was put down were not only extraordinary, but they were what would antecedently have been called impossible; and they were only rendered possible by the fact that they proceeded from a nation where every capable citizen was enfranchised and had a direct and energetic interest in the welfare of the State."

Such was the result of the experience and reflection of the greatest living statesman of this age, and perhaps I am not far wrong in saying of any age. When we look at the facts of history as he has looked at them and accept the conclusion he has drawn, that that country was enabled to conquer from the fact that it gave every capable citizen a right to vote and take part in the Government, we have the nucleus and basis of a thought which should guide us in deciding what basis we should put the franchise upon in this Dominion. In the magnificent institutions of the United States and in the manner in which they amalgamate immigration coming to their shores, in the wonderful appreciation of their institutions, we see the solution of the problem how to govern a country by the people and for the people. (The hon. gentleman read from Mr. Mathew Arnold's work, being the result of his American tour, to show the homogeneous character of the American nation. Continuing, he said): The experience of the country lying alongside of the Dominion, with which we are most directly connected, about which we individually know the most outside of Canada, is one which affords to us a solution of the problem now under consideration. We have there a century of the most trying experience, and yet to-day it is a homogeneous people marching on in the race of progress at an unprecedented rate, and bidding for the supremacy of the world. We find the United States attracting immigration more than any other country attracts it, and I believe one reason for that is that every man who goes there knows that he becomes a full-fledged citizen, with all the political rights and privileges accorded to Vanderbilt or any other millionaire. We are competing with the United States for a portion of this immigration, and if we want to compete and succeed we should let immigrants from the old world know that when they arrive in Canada they are enfranchised and possess the same political privileges as they would in the United States. We are taking a retrograde step, one we shall regret, and one which, in a very few years, we shall have to recall, which, until it is recalled, will be followed by agitation, year after year, until we lay down the basis that every capable citizen has a right to take part in the government of the country. If we turn our eyes from the United States to England we find that an agitation has been going on in the same direction. That agitation has not reached its final point but is coming near to it. A political revolution has taken place during the last fifty years, not accompanied by bloodshed, but none the less a revolution. The people were fifty years ago excluded from the Government; those who had the right to vote were a very small class, and the result was this, that those elected by them legislated for the class and not for the benefit of the people at large. We know the result of the class legislation in England fifty, sixty, or seventy years ago was, that the people were brought almost to the verge of rebellion, and those who are conversant with the history of that country, about the year 1832, know that the concessions of popular rights which were then given were given almost at the point of bayonet. We know, Sir, that since that time, and in fact in that year, England went through the throes of a new birth. We know that since that time the harsh, cruel, and unnatural laws which were then in force have been nearly all repealed. We know that year by year the legislation of that country, instead of being behind the genius of the age, has been in advance of it, and has been an example to other countries; and when we look at the manner in which that legislation has been brought about, we see that it has been almost coincident with the extension of the franchise. I took the trouble to look up the number who had the right to the franchise in that year. I find, Sir, in that Bill, which has been characterised as the new *magna charta* of British liberty, 500,000 were added to the electorate, and 500,000 only. Why, Sir, the statesman of that day, Lord John Russell, who carried the Bill through, thought he had done something marvellous; he thought he was taking a dangerous step in admitting these 500,000 of the middle classes, educated people, to the exercise of political rights, which to us, seem almost as proper for them to enjoy as the right to breathe the air or enjoy the sunshine. But, Sir, he did admit them, and he advised his party to rest and be thankful. He thought he had done all that was necessary. According to his political light, that was all right, but what do we find? Do we find, Sir, that any of the evils which were predicted by the Conservatives of those days followed? On the contrary, we find those very gentlemen, or their successors, to-day, proclaiming that the step was in the right direction. We find their leader, many years afterwards, adopting the role of a Reformer himself, and opening the political portals still wider. We find that between 1866 and 1869 a very much larger number were added to the electorate. In 1866 the electorate of the United Kingdom reached 1,364,000 people, and that was a very small proportion of the population of the country. The Reformers of the country were not satisfied. They felt that a wrong was being done, that the mass of the people were not being represented in Parliament, and that not being represented, their interests were not attended to, because, disguise it as we may, if a small class have the right to elect a Parliament, Parliament will reflect the views of that class to a very large extent. The Reformers went on with the agitation until, as I say, between 1866 and 1869 a very large number were added to that electorate. Well, Sir, they adopted the principle of household suffrage. But they did not adopt it out of pure reasoning. They did not concede those rights to the people because it was proved to them in Parliament that the people should exercise those rights, but they conceded them to a large extent out of fear. I remember when I was in London in 1866, when thousands of people were parading the streets, when Hyde Park railings were pulled down, when it was thought the mob were going to take possession of London, I wondered what the row was about. I went to their meetings, I listened to their orators, and I came to the conclusion, as I think every man here would have come to the conclusion, that they were only asking what was fair, right and proper. There were hundreds and thousands of well dressed artisans, clever, intelligent men, who were excluded from the franchise. But between 1866 and 1869 the portals were thrown open, and they adopted the principle of household suffrage. But they have gone on since that time, and we find in 1884 there were 3,000,000 of electors. The agitation has been

going on since, and unrest and disquiet have been the condition in the manufacturing towns of that country and those portions of the country where the people were massed together, because millions of people were excluded from this right. They had adopted the principle of household suffrage, the same principle which the hon. gentleman is introducing in this Bill, but that was not going far enough. Thousands and millions of capable citizens were still excluded; the agitation rolled on year after year, until in 1884 we find Mr. Gladstone introducing his new Franchise Bill, and upon what does he base it? Does he base it on household suffrage? No; but he has come to the conclusion that the only fair basis on which to place a right of this kind is capability, and he declares that every capable citizen of the United Kingdom, by this Bill, shall have a right to exercise that great boon of every British subject, the franchise, and he admits by the Bill of 1884 over 2,000,000 of electors to the franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Household suffrage.

Mr. DAVIES. The principle is not household suffrage simply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must know that his Bill is simply extending to the agricultural laborers, the householders of the country, what the householders of the town had.

Mr. DAVIES. I am speaking of the principle which the right hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, and who knows as much about it, certainly, as the right hon. gentleman opposite, claims to base it on. Technically, the right hon. gentleman is right, but household suffrage has been construed to mean in England the smallest room.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. That has been affirmed by half a dozen judicial decisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A house may be one room.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). That is the lodger's suffrage

Mr. DAVIES. The meaning of the word house has been construed to cover a small room.

An hon. MEMBER. A single room in a house?

Mr. McNEILL. Do you mean that each of a number of rooms in a house has been construed to mean a house?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; there may be more than one house under one roof. It has been so decided by the unanimous decision in Common Pleas, that the owner of one room in a house comes within the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One room may be a house, and one room may not be a house.

Mr. DAVIES. One room in a house is a house within the meaning of the Franchise Bill. We find that in the English Parliament men like Mr. Lowe, who had formerly been Liberals, shrank in terror from the idea that household suffrage should be conceded. Mr. Lowe said it is time we educated our masters. Well, it was time, but the moment we admitted the people to the franchise they sent men to the House of Commons who introduced an education Bill, which is now educating the whole people of England. After the household suffrage was introduced the greatest reforms of modern days have been introduced and carried—in what is called the golden era of liberalism. Since that time the most liberal measures have been carried—the measure for the abolition of the Irish State Church, the measure for the reform of the Irish land laws—all those laws which have marked and distinguished Mr. Gladstone's Administration as the golden age of liberalism have been carried since the franchise was widened. Now, I want to come to the point I was at when I was interrupted a moment ago, that the underlying principle of Mr. Gladstone's Bill is the conferring upon every capable citizen of the state the right to exercise the franchise. I will quote the right hon. gentleman's own words, in the speech in which he introduced that measure:

"I take my stand on the broad principle that the enfranchisement of capable citizens, be they few or be they many, and, if they be many, so much the better, gives an addition of strength to the State."

There is the principle stated broadly and clearly; every capable citizen, he says, not every man who occupies a house——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not every citizen.

Mr. DAVIES. Every capable citizen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the evidence of capability? A house?

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Gladstone did not leave things in the dark, for he defined what he meant by a capable citizen. He referred to the condition of matters in the United States, and went on to say:

"The strength of the modern State lies in the representative system. I rejoice to think that in this happy country and under this happy constitution we have other sources of strength in the respect paid to various orders of the State, and in the authority they enjoy and in the unbroken course which has been allowed to most of our national traditions, but still in the main it is the representative system which is the strength of the modern state in general and of this State in particular."

The true principle has been recognised and applied by Mr. Gladstone in his Franchise Bill, that every capable citizen in the State should have a voice in the affairs of that State. Every man who is taxed should have the right to a voice——

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask one question? If capability is the foundation of Mr. Gladstone's suffrage, what is the test of that capability which he applies in his Bill?

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know what the test is; I am speaking of the principle. As he applies it at present in England, it is the extension of what is called household suffrage to every part of the United Kingdom. But he lays down, as the right principle, that every capable citizen has a right to a vote. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) will not contend, nor, I think, will the right hon. the First Minister himself, that it is any test of capability that a man occupies a house and pays a rental of $2 a month. Is that any gauge of his intelligence?

Mr. FOSTER. What is Mr. Gladstone's gauge?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, that Mr. Gladstone is a practical statesman, and that while he may himself believe in a further extension of the franchise than has been accorded in his Bill, he only introduced a Bill which he was able to carry. He finds that in England the majority of Parliament are only ready at present to concede an extension of the suffrage to those who are known as householders—that is, those who occupy the whole or part of a house.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I am a practical statesman, and I take that gauge.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says he is a practical statesman, and that he has a gauge. I want to know if there is a member behind him who will accept his gauge as a fair one of a man's capability to vote?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman say that because a man pays $2 a month for a room that that shows he is capable of exercising the franchise?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That man would not have a vote under Mr. Gladstone's Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a man who has passed his examination and is receiving $300 a year as a schoolteacher is not qualified, while an ignorant man, who pays $2 a month for a room, is? Why, there is no gauge or test at all in his Bill. It is because he has introduced a lot of fancy franchises, and has refused to adopt a fair test that I am attacking his Bill. Although Mr. Gladstone was not able to carry out his principle as far as he wished, he has carried it further than any English statesman ever did before, and at one stroke of his pen has admitted 2,000,000 electors to the exercise of the franchise who were previously excluded. I say, then, let us adopt the principle Mr. Gladstone lays down, and make a test of its application. The tests you have laid down in this Bill are unfair, unjust and tyrannical. They ignore intelligence; they exclude thousands upon thousands of the most intelligent young men of the country, and they admit thousands upon thousands of those who are less educated. Mr. Gladstone goes on:

"We are ready to take in the peasant as he is, and joyfully bring him within the reach of this last and highest privilege of the constitution. The whole population, I rejoice to think, have liberty of speech, they have liberty of writing, they have liberty of meeting in public, they have liberty of private association, they have liberty of petitioning Parliament. All these privileges are not privileges taking away from us, diminishing our power and security; they are all of them privileges on the existence of which our security depends. Without them we could not be secured. I ask you to confer on these very same classes the crowning privilege of voting for a representative in Parliament, and then I say we, who are strong now as a nation and a State, shall, by virtue of that change, be stronger still."

In that language the hon. gentleman can recognise who and what people Mr. Gladstone regarded as capable citizens—those who had the liberty of speech, those who had the liberty of writing, those who had the liberty of meeting in public, those who had the liberty of private association, and those who had the liberty of petitioning Parliament; in other words, he recognised manhood, citizenship, as the test of capability to exercise the franchise. Now, having before us the example of the United States, which has had universal suffrage for 100 years, and the example of the United Kingdom, which is yearly marching in that direction, and will march on until it reaches that consummation, we should not hesitate for a moment as to the principle we should adopt. We are a new country; we have not got the large residuum which is sometimes spoken of as existing among the English classes. We have not got that gross ignorance which seems to be almost inseparable from the aggregation of millions of people in towns and cities, such as we see in the great city of London; and the introduction of a new franchise into this Parliament, for the first time, should be marked by faith in the people we represent. Why should we be afraid of the people? Why, in this new country, should we be afraid of any class?

An hon. MEMBER. We are not.

Mr. DAVIES. Then why exclude them from this privilege of a free man? Why say they shall not have a voice in the affairs of the country? I say we should lay the foundations broad and deep, on a basis we can justify now, and where they will remain for many years to come. You may put up your fancy franchises to-day, you may exclude your thousands of young, capable citizens, from the exercise of their right, but how long will it last? Do you think they will be satisfied to remain outside the pale while their fellow citizens are marching up and electing members of Parliament? Do you think, while the great country to the south of us recognises the rights of every citizen, you can adopt a narrower principle here and have it remain? No; you are not only adopting a principle which is unsound in itself; you are showing a want of faith in the people which before long they will resent, and you will be forced, in a few years, to adopt that principle, which is the only true and just principle. If you want to have a test, take the test of intelligence. But the right hon. the Premier ignores that. He had the courage and the manliness to propose it to this House when he asked the adoption of female suffrage. I, myself, voted in favor of it, and would like to see it carried into effect; but hon. gentlemen opposite chose to ignore that principle, and refused to give women the right to vote.

An hon. MEMBER. Did Gladstone take that test?

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Gladstone's test was that every capable citizen should have a vote, and he wanted to apply that principle, but all he could induce his Parliament to do was to come down to household suffrage. Have we any class in this country such as that of which Mr. Gladstone and his friends were afraid? Have we this great mass of people who were never educated and never had the chance of being educated? No; we have not. In this new country, where education is almost universal, where there is no large, ignorant, floating population, we are bound by the test, which experience has shown in the United States to be a true test, to confer upon every capable citizen, every young man of age, every man who bears a share in the burdens of the State, the privilege of taking part in the government of the State. *Primâ facie* every free citizen has a right to vote. If you want to exclude him you are bound to justify his exclusion. On what principle do you justify it here? None has been offered. Are you afraid of the people? Has the result in those Provinces where manhood suffrage has prevailed been such as to justify your saying: We will not apply it over the rest of the Dominion. I say it has not. As a country, it is remarkable to what extent education is diffused among the mass of our people. In Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, the means of obtaining a fair education are within the reach of every man, and our young men have taken advantage of those means. There is no part of the world, in my opinion, where the people have the means of education freer at hand than the people of this country, and I doubt if there is any country where they are taken more advantage of. We have an educated people, not only educated at the public schools, but educated by the public press, which in this country circulates in almost every house. We have also the education which comes from our many-sided colonial life, and which is very different from the education accorded to those who grow up in the countries of the old world. We glory in our free institutions; we are proud of talking of them. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about this great Canada with its iron band from end to end, and its free institutions all over the land. Why then do they not give effect to their panegyrics? Are they afraid of the people who have developed these institutions? Ought we not, instead of fearing them, be proud of them, and grant to them the rights of full citizenship, and have as much confidence in them as the American Republic has in her sons? Until we do that we will not have reached the proper basis, we will not be laying down the proper line, we will not be doing what we will be bound to do in a few years. We drink in freedom at our every breath, and if hon. gentlemen think they are going to exclude free enfranchised Canadians from the exercise of the franchise they are mistaken. They may keep them out a year or two, but the people will press on with irresistible force, the portals of Parliament will be opened, and those men will have to be accorded rights which hon. gentlemen opposite only intend to grant to a favored few. These young men have taxes to pay, they respect the laws, and when the country is in danger it is to them we look for support and succor. When the rebellion raised its head in the North-West, who did you ask to shoulder the rifle? Whom did you call out to

maintain the integrity of our country and the honor of our flag? You appealed to the young men, and they responded, from one end of the country to the other; and they sprang to the front, at the first call, to discharge their duty, and yet you tell me you can put the onus of citizenship on the young men and refuse them the right; you can give them the burdens and not give them the privilege. I tell you you cannot do it. There are thousands of young men who went away at the call of duty to the North-West, leaving their families behind, leaving their loving wives or old mothers, those who depend upon them for support. You are not ashamed to call upon them to shoulder the rifle, to discharge the duties of citizenship. Why are you ashamed to give them the rights? Those who bear the burden, those that discharge the duty, should have the right to vote. I say there are hundreds in the North-West who, when they return to their homes, whether in Ontario or Prince Edward Island, will find, should this Bill pass, that while they are obliged to fight for their country they will not be allowed to vote for those who make the laws. Of the batallion that the Minister of Militia has ordered out from Prince Edward Island, one half of the men, when they come back from the North-West, will be disfranchised. You are inflicting cruel wrong on those poor men, which it may take years to right, but which will be righted, either in this House or by the people who send you here.

Mr. PAINT. That speech will help you at the next election.

Mr. DAVIES. Who are these men you are going to exclude? You are excluding all the workingmen in this country who are not householders.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. DAVIES. You are excluding all the farm laborers.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. DAVIES. You are excluding all the household servants.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member from British Columbia does not appear to know what he is talking about.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I do know what I am talking about.

Mr. DAVIES. He will please not contradict me.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. That statement is not true.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman has any convictions, if he has the courage of his convictions, let him rise up and express them, and not sit there shouting "no, no," and interrupting the speakers. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. So do I.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman does not even appear to understand the Bill before the committee.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The statement the hon. gentleman makes is not true.

Mr. DAVIES. I make the statement, which you must admit, that those who own real property in cities of $300 and in counties of $150 are given the franchise by this Bill, and that does not include the farm laborer.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Yes; it does.

Mr. DAVIES. If you know anything about the condition of farm laborers in this country you will know that there are thousands who do not own property at all. I know hundreds of them in my own Province.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. You do not know yourself what you are talking about. They get a vote by their earnings; that is how they get a vote.

Mr. DAVIES. That proves the crass ignorance of the hon. gentleman still more, because he should know that the farm laborers do not earn enough money to entitle them to a vote.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES. It is time that you should, and that you should know several other things. I say the farm laborers, as a class, will be disfranchised by this Bill.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope the hon. gentleman will have the courtesy not to interrupt.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Do not make false statements.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Chairman, I submit that I have no right to be charged with making false statements.

Mr. PAINT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a statement? The laborers in British Columbia receive day wages of $1.50 to $2.50, my hon. friend informs me.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman from Richmond, N.S., who is interrupting me, informs us what the laborers receive in British Columbia. I should like him to tell us what the rate of wages is in the county from which he comes, and in any of the Maritime Provinces. I should like him to tell us what the men get who are laborers on the wharves in the cities of the Maritime Provinces, and whether they will not be disfranchised under this Bill.

Mr. PAINT. In the city of St. John, N.B., they get $2 a day.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman appears to have a great aversion to his own Province. He wants to get away from home. He will not refer to his own Province at all. I assert that the farm laborers in those parts of Canada that I am acquainted with are disfranchised by this Bill, and if there are any in this House who will venture to say that farm laborers in this country get more than $400 a year, I want to see them, and I want to know the parts of Canada they come from. I want to see one individual who will get up and say so. There is not one. Then I repeat what I was saying, when I was so discourteously interrupted, that domestic servants will be disfranchised, and that all laborers in the cities of the Dominion will be disfranchised, unless they happen to own real estate, and that the workers in the manufactories of this Dominion will be disfranchised, and that the workers on the wharves of this Dominion and in the mines of this Dominion will be disfranchised, unless they receive $400 a year. I venture the assertion that none, unless they are skilled workmen, will have the vote, and a very large number of those do not receive $400. Fishermen's sons will be disfranchised. The schoolteachers of Prince Edward Island, an educated class, licensed to teach, receive—a great many of them—less than $400 a year, and they will be disfranchised. Clerks, employees in the cities of the Dominion—large numbers of them—receive less than $400 a year, and they will be disfranchised. Journeymen, mechanics of all classes, receive less than $400 a year, and they will be disfranchised. In a word, all unskilled labor will be disfranchised. It is true you may say that, if a man has $300 worth of land, he can come in, but I am not arguing on that basis. I say that is no test of the right to vote or of the ability to exercise the vote properly. You are excluding thousands and hundreds of thousands of the bone and sinew of the country in whom you ought to have confidence. Why should you be ashamed of the people? Go forward; take them by the hand; show your confidence in the young men and in the intelligent men; treat them as they should be treated, and you will win their confidence in return. But this attempt to exclude them from the dearest right of a Briton will recoil

on the head of the Tories who are attempting it. No statesman ever trusted the people in vain. No Government ever enfranchised the people and repented of it. I ask you to throw off the shackles which now seem, at any rate, to tie up the hands and the mental faculties of the right hon. gentleman opposite. He is so full of old time beliefs, he so clings to his ideas of a past age, that he refuses to recognise the progress of modern times, he refuses to recognise the logic of facts as they exist in the country south of the line, as they are showing themselves day by day and year by year, in the mother land; he refuses to go forward in the march of progress, he refuses to place his trust and confidence in the people of the Dominion. He is not ashamed to call upon them in his hour of trouble, and he will acknowledge that they have responded manfully and nobly, that they have shown a love of country and a patriotism which is beyond all praise, and these young men, who have been willing to give up their homes, and their labor, and their families, and to sacrifice their lives on behalf of their country—this is the class of men you are disfranchising, and this is the time you take to do it, and to proclaim that you have no confidence in them, and that you will not give them the right to exercise the franchise. I have faith in the people. I have seen manhood suffrage worked out. I believe in it, from what I have seen and from what I have read. I believe that all thoughtful men of modern days, who are in accord with liberal ideas and who live under popular institutions, have the trend of their ideas in that direction. We ought not to be behind in the race. We ought not to lay down a wrong basis and to exclude thousands of people from the franchise that we know are as capable of exercising it as those whom you are admitting. I object to the words in the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell): "and has been assessed for and paid his taxes for the then current year." Those words would disfranchise as many as the present Bill does; therefore, I hope he will see his way clear to amend it, by adopting these words I suggest.

Mr. MITCHELL. My object in introducing this amendment was to meet the moderate views of the gentlemen who might object to universal suffrage, because universal suffrage would include paupers and every person. My desire was to make such a restriction as, without impairing the effect of it—perhaps not even, to any extent, the extent of it—would meet the views of gentlemen opposite also. I am quite prepared to change it in such a way as will meet the wishes of the House.

Mr. DAVIES. Then I would suggest that this would meet the hon. gentleman's views as an amendment to the amendment: strike out the words "and has been assessed for and paid his taxes for the then current year," and insert in lieu thereof the words: "and has not received aid as a pauper, or been convicted of a felony, and is free from any legal incapacity."

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that if an election were to take place early in the year everyone in the constituency might be disfranchised, because it says "paid his taxes for the current year," and the taxes for the current year might not have been collected in any instance.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is just one of the difficulties that may be presented against the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Put "taxes due at the time of voting."

Mr. MITCHELL. Very well. As the right hon. gentleman is disposed to help me, and has made a suggestion, and a very capital one, if he will accept the amendment thus improved I will agree to it.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made a broad assertion about the volunteers in the city of Toronto who would be disfranchised under this Bill. He seems to know a good deal about Toronto and the volunteers, more than his remarks appear to justify. I am satisfied that not fifty volunteers who have gone to the front now will be disfranchised under the present Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. Why will it disfranchise fifty? Will the hon. gentleman, now standing here as a representative of Toronto, justify the disfranchisement of these fifty young men?

Mr. SMALL. The hon. gentleman said they were all disfranchised. He said they would not have votes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would not have the slightest alarm if universal suffrage were adopted, but I cannot help reflecting, after hearing the speeches that have just been made, upon the discussion we have had here during the last three weeks. I have been convinced, from the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is absolutely necessary that we should have regard, as far as we possibly can, consistently with a uniform Dominion franchise, to the expressions of public opinion from the several Provinces. Now, if this question of universal suffrage excites so much popular interest in the country, how is it these hon. gentlemen, with the influence they possess in their several Provinces, have not succeeded in getting their friends in those Provinces to adopt universal suffrage? When this Bill finally passes this House I believe it will approach very much nearer to universal suffrage than does the law under which we were elected at the last election. There is no doubt whatever that in the Province of Quebec, for instance, the number of young men, those volunteers over whose exploits the hon. gentleman grows most justly enthusiastic—I venture to say that at least four to one of them will have votes under this Bill who had not votes at the last election. In that Province there is no such thing as an income franchise; there is practically a property qualification, and nothing else—not a personal property qualification, but simply a property qualification. But there is no income franchise, and therefore all the young men, no matter what their salaries may be—and all the old men either, for that matter—who happen to be living in boarding houses, who are not domiciled in the house for which they are assessed, are prevented from voting under the present provincial franchise. Now, under this Bill, we have a very great extension of the franchise for the Province of Quebec. And we have had the statement made in the leading organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Nova Scotia, that the franchise, as fixed by this Bill—and I think I may say that when the Bill finally passes that will be undoubtedly true—will practically rather extend than diminish the franchise in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. KIRK. It will not extend the franchise.

Mr. WHITE. I take the statement of the Halifax *Chronicle*, which has been quoted on two or three occasions during this debate, that the franchise will not be materially changed, either in the way of extension or restriction, by this Bill, from what has been fixed by the Local Legislature. In the Province of Ontario we find that during the last Session, less than two months ago, in fact, the Legislature, led by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, rejected a motion for universal suffrage and adopted a franchise which, whether it be more or less liberal than the franchise proposed by this Bill, is, at any rate, based upon a property qualification, either a direct property qualification or one which indicates in the voter the possession of such intelligence as enables him to be a wage-earner or the earner of an income. That is the position of the Province of Ontario, as determined by its Local Legislature. Now, at a time when, I think, I may fairly say, so far as the subject of universal suffrage has been discussed at all, the expression of public opinion has been against it, why we should, in the passage of this Bill, adopt a system of franchise which

the largest Province in the Dominion has just rejected, and which none of the other Provinces have recently adopted, is something I cannot understand, especially when the argument in favor of it comes from those who, for the last three weeks, have been doing all they possibly could to prove to us that we ought to adopt the provincial franchises. Then, we have had an argument drawn from the United States. But there is one very important fact which has been overlooked, namely, that universal suffrage does not prevail in all the States. In some States there is a property qualification, and manhood suffrage does not prevail. Now, it is a singular fact that some of these States have maintained their property qualification in spite of the fact that the States surrounding them had manhood suffrage, and yet there seems to have been no serious agitation in favor of manhood suffrage in those States where the property qualification existed.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would the hon. gentleman tell us what States he referred to as having a property qualification?

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman himself has given us the statement during the elaborate speeches which he has made. He has pointed out, as one of the strong arguments in favor of adopting the provincial franchises, that in the United States they have different franchises in different States, and that the federal power has never attempted to interfere with them. That seems to me to be an argument which should lead us to hesitate, at all events, in adopting, at this time, the principles of universal suffrage. I have no hesitation in saying that we will come to universal suffrage; that in this country, as in England, every change made in the suffrage is in the direction of extending and widening it, and that ultimately the principle of manhood suffrage may possibly be adopted. But no one can look at this Bill and at the condition of the suffrage in the various Provinces, or in the Provinces in the aggregate, without feeling that we are making quite as important a step in the direction of widening the suffrage by the adoption of this Bill as ever was made by the adoption of the great Reform Bills passed from time to time in England. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) got rather into a difficulty when he referred to the position taken by Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone did not take the ground, although he is undoubtedly a very advanced Liberal, in favor of manhood suffrage, in favor of every citizen having a vote. He took care to qualify the term "citizen" by using the word "capable citizen;" and it seems to me that where we have the suffrage given to every man living in a house for which he pays $2 a month as rent, we may fairly say we have universal suffrage for every married man. There is no question about that. Moreover, when we declare that a man earning $300 or $400 a year is to have a vote, we declare universal suffrage for every man, wage-earner or income-earner, who has intelligence enough to exercise the vote intelligently, and we practically have adopted in this Bill that franchise which the leader of the Opposition referred to when he indicated that one of the tests of qualification in a voter, which he would adopt if he were framing a Franchise Bill, namely, the qualification of intelligence. Under these circumstances, it seems to me we have a Bill so far in advance, taking the Provinces in the aggregate, of the suffrage under which this Parliament was elected, that we may fairly leave the question of manhood suffrage to be considered hereafter, when it comes to be more generally discussed in the country. And while I believe, as I have said, that we will ultimately come to that, after discussion has taken place, and while I have the most unbounded confidence in the masses, in their intelligence and instincts to do right, I believe the true policy to-day is to adopt the Bill before the committee, fixing the franchise as therein stated, and leave the question of the discussion of a broader franchise to a subsequent period.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. McNEILL. One word about what Mr. Gladstone said as to capable citizens. After using the language quoted by the hon. member for Queen's, Mr. Gladstone said:

"Sir, the only question that remains in the general argument is, who are capable citizens? And fortunately that is a question which, on the present occasion, need not be argued at length, for it has been already settled—in the first place by a solemn legislative judgment aquiesced in by both parties in the States; and, in the second place, by the experience of the last more than 15 years. Who, Sir, are the capable citizens of the State whom it is proposed to enfranchise? It is proposed, in the main, to enfranchise the county population, on the footing and according to the measure that has already been administered to the population of the towns. What are the main constituents of the county population? First of all, they are the minor tradesmen of the country, and the skilled laborers and artisans in all the common arts of life, and especially in connection with our great mining industry. Is there any doubt that these are capable citizens. You, hon. gentlemen opposite have yourselves asserted it by enfranchising them in the towns; and we can only say that we heartily subscribe to the assertion. But besides the artisans and the minor tradesmen scattered throughout our rural towns, we have also to deal with the peasantry of the country. Is there any doubt that the peasantry of the country are capable citizens, qualified to make good use of their power as voters."

That is what Mr. Gladstone meant by capable citizens.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt the hon. gentleman is quite right in his quotation from Mr. Gladstone's speech; but Mr. Gladstone, in a controversy with Mr. Lowe, which appeared in the *Fortnightly* or *Contemporary Review*, goes much further than that, and declares that every citizen must be assumed to be capable, and that the burden of proof falls on those who deny his capability.

Mr. McNEILL. I was simply dealing with the question before the House. If the controversy with Mr. Lowe was submitted to the House it might not bear out the observations of the hon. gentleman, any more than the present statement of the hon. gentleman has done so.

Mr. MILLS. I will read that statement at the proper time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember very well the speech and the controversy about the franchise from a theoretical standpoint; but when, on his responsibility and as the head of the Government, Mr. Gladstone proposed that all capable men should have a vote, he lays it down with that qualification so clearly that I am surprised the hon. gentleman who first quoted his speech did not read the whole portion. That hon. member tried to make the committee believe that when Mr. Gladstone said capable citizen he meant every citizen; whereas, it distinctly appears that he meant those who gave evidence of capability by coming within the franchise of the Act. The hon. gentleman tried to mislead the committee—I make that as a charge—by omitting that portion which showed that Mr. Gladstone meant those men whose capability was shown by their qualifications for the franchise under the Act.

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to enter into a controversy as to what the hon. gentleman has said in reply to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). That hon. member is thoroughly competent to defend himself. But I wish to refer also to a speech Mr. Gladstone made at Liverpool, shortly after the close of the American war, in which he went on to say, that if the United States had not had manhood suffrage he did not believe they would have had strength to suppress that great rebellion; and he declared in that speech that the success of the United States in putting an end to that rebellion, and the patriotism exhibited by the people, made him a convert to the principle of manhood suffrage. No doubt the hon. gentleman remembers the speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. McNEILL. I recollect very well the speech in which Mr. Gladstone spoke of a man and a brother as being the reason why the franchise should be extended. That was before 1866, and before Mr. Disraeli's Reform Bill of that

year; but I have no recollection of a speech to which the hon. member refers, but I will endeavor to look it up. I do not impugn the veracity of the hon. member in any way, but I shall be pleased to obtain information as to where the speech can be found.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), a few months ago, in referring to the motion now in your hands, Mr. Chairman, informed us that in the United States, where the principle of universal suffrage prevailed, this principle had not become universal. The hon. gentleman did not designate the States that had failed to adopt universal suffrage; but he did state, when I asked him to name some States, that some of the States did not have universal suffrage, giving my words in a speech made in an earlier stage of this debate as his authority. When I was discussing the question some days ago I said that at the time when the constitution of the United States was adopted there were differences of suffrage, but since then the suffrage in the States had become nearly, if not quite, universal, with one or two exceptions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There are at least seven States where there is a property or assessment qualification.

Mr. CHARLTON. The suffrage is practically universa in all the States. There is no property qualifications in any of the States. The hon. gentleman also informed us that he had no doubt that the country would come to the adoption of this principle of universal suffrage, and that it was a matter that might very well stand until it had been considered by the country, until the country had time to pronounce an opinion upon it and bring pressure to bear upon this House. That is the argument which has been urged by the Opposition with regard to the whole Bill—that the whole Bill might properly stand, that there has been no pressure felt with regard to this Bill from the country, no manifestations of the popular will, either with regard to universal suffrage or a Dominion franchise, and that the whole Bill might stand, as the hon. gentleman says the principle of universal sufferage might stand. He tells us that the First Minister had expressed himself in favor of an intelligence qualification. Well, Sir, if he has, his conduct is singularly at variance with such an expression of opinion. Why, he proposes to confer the franchise on the most ignorant and debased portion of our population—the Indians. The hon. member for Cardwell takes the ground that the Liberal members from Ontario stultified themselves in their advocacy of universal suffrage in this House, because——

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I made no reference to the Liberal members of the House. I was speaking of the Legislature as a whole, and not of its party character.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the members from the Province of Ontario, in advocating universal suffrage in the House, were advocating a measure which the most Liberal party in Ontario had not advocated, Now, I say, it is not necessary to take the ground *per se*, as an abstract proposition, that universal suffrage is desirable. Many hon. members who may doubt its propriety as an abstract proposition may, with perfect propriety, advocate its adoption in a Dominion franchise, on this ground, that even admitting that it was an evil, it would in that case be the lesser of two evils, and that it would be better for the Dominion to adopt universal suffrage than the suffrage contained in the present Bill, for the reason that it would deprive the Bill of its objectionable features. We know that if we adopt universal suffrage the objection with regard to the revising barristers, the objection with regard to the different wants of the various Provinces, the objection with regard to the variation of the franchise throughout the Dominion, the objection that the franchise of the Dominion would be less liberal than the franchise of the various Provinces, would fall to the ground. The adoption of universal suffrage, although we might not wish it as an abstract proposition, would put an end to the objections urged against the Bill. It would, in the event of our adopting a Dominion franchise at all, reconcile the differences of opinion which exist, by removing from the Bill those features which are held to be objectionable by those who are opposing it. In taking a position in favor of universal suffrage I do so because I believe that if we are not to have universal suffrage in this Dominion then the matter of the regulation of the suffrage had better be left to the Provinces; because, I believe if this Dominion assumes to regulate the suffrage, it is inevitable, as my hon. friend from Cardwell admits, that we shall speedily reach universal suffrage. The pressure of public opinion, the difficulties which will exist with regard to the working of this Bill, the expenses which will attend its working, these, and other reasons, will irresistibly impel public opinion in this country to demand from the House that the suffrage should rest on the basis of manhood. I say, if we are going to have any other suffrage than that we had better leave the matter with the Provinces to regulate as they choose. There is a divergence among the Provinces at present. Two Provinces have universal suffrage—British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. The greatest Province of this Dominion has practically universal suffrage, for under the Franchise Bill of the Legislature of Ontario a very small fraction of the population of that Province will be without the franchise. Now, Sir, I repeat that if we are to arrange the suffrage for the Dominion that suffrage should be as liberal as the most liberal suffrage in any Province in the Dominion. If we do not adopt a suffrage which is as liberal as the suffrage in Prince Edward Island, British Columbia or Ontario, we are inevitably adopting a measure which will create dissatisfaction and discontent in the mind of every individual who is disfranchised under that Bill. If there are any classes, any elements of society, possessing a provincial franchise in any of the Provinces, which will be denied it by this measure, we have right there the elements of discontent which it would be unwise and unjust to create.

The belief in universal suffrage is one which is widely prevalent, and it may not be unreasonable to spend a few moments in looking at some of the States, in the past and present, which have adopted this principle, because this is a question of the very highest importance; we never have approached the consideration of a more important question in this House. It is a question concerning which all social, all political progress, in all ages, may give us lessons. Now, in the Jewish commonwealth they practically had universal suffrage, because there was no distinctions of citizenship in the eye of the law, and although it was a theocracy, at the end of a certain number of years a man who had temporarily been deprived of the enjoyment of his rights, as to property, might return to his enjoyment of civil and property rights. Take the case of Greece, and take, as an instance of the most liberal of the States of Greece, the city of Athens. You will find that up to 776 B.C., that State was governed by kings, and that a certain class of officers, called Archons, were elected by the nobles. Solon, who lived 638 B.C., divided the population into four classes, which were graded according to income. The first class were eligible to the highest offices, the second and third classes to the inferior officers, and the fourth class were not eligible to any office, but were exempt from taxation; but the members of all classes had votes for the election of Archons and magistrates. Another of his provisions was the establishment of a Senate, to consist of 400 members, so we see that Athens, in the course of time, arrived at the condition of a democracy. Now what was the status of Athens among the States of antiquity? Why,

Sir, that State was noted for the wisdom of its philosophers and lawgivers, and statesmen, for the talent of its bards, the eloquence of its orators, the extent and opulence of its commerce, for the great development of its arts, for its literature, for its magnificent architecture, and it stands in history to-day as the most eminent instance of a State celebrated for the monuments of its civilisation. Take Rome, the only other State of antiquity I shall allude to, the great mistress of the world. She commenced with a government of kings, with a population divided into two classes, the patricians and the plebeians, the former exercising such a despotic rule over the plebeians that it led to a rebellion, leading to the appointment of ten tribunes by the plebeians who had the power to set aside any law of the Roman Senate. This was followed by the opening up of the Senate, in 421 B.C., to the admission of plebeians; and this was followed by the Ogulman Law or Constitution of 300 B.C., by which plebeians were placed on an absolute level with the patricians. If we remember the privileges of the Roman citizen, defended as he was by the whole power of the Roman Empire; if we remember that the Roman populace, in consequence of their position as citizens, were maintained and fed by conquered Provinces, we will come to the conclusion that the States of antiquity attaining the greatest development, and famed for their later progress, and their understanding of the principles that underlie human progress, were the States that had the greatest degree of human liberty—the States that had universal suffrage. The Roman code, although Rome was a heathen State, is the foundation of all the laws of European States to-day. When we turn from the history of those ancient States to the condition of things which followed, when Rome was subjugated by the horde of barbarians that swarmed down upon her in 410; when we consider the darkness that settled down upon Europe in feudal times, when lords held their estate from kings and those estates were hereditary; when every yeoman held his estate from his lord, and had to yield a certain number of days' service in the year in return; when the daughter of a serf could not be given in marriage without the consent of the lord; when none but nobles held fiefs, and the great mass of the population were thoroughly enslaved; and, when we remember that some of the principles of these feudal States have come down to our present day; when we look to the time of the Saxon heptarchy, with the Witenagemote, consisting of knights and lords, who came together in the capacity of a great Parliament to levy taxes on the people, who were not represented at all; when we look at the conquest of England under William the Conquerer in 1066, and the introduction of feudalism and the system of slavery in England; when we remember that in 1215 there was scarcely a free man in England, outside of the nobles; and when we come down to this century, and find that in the year 1800 there was less liberty in England and her colonies then existed in Athens and Rome, the only improvement in the condition of society being in the fact that christianity is ameliorating the condition of mankind; when we look at all these things, and consider the improvement which has taken place since 410, they all point to the fact that there is such a thing as political progress, that man has been making progress to a better condition, and that we, standing here as the representatives of 5,000,000 of people, and settling what shall be the franchise for the millions of people who are to settle Canada, it behooves us to look over this vast field of progress and ask ourselves the question: Have we gone as far as human weal requires us to go, or can we go farther, with benefit to the mass of mankind, and in the proper discharge of our own duty?

The progress in this century, both material and political, has been very rapid. This century has seen the inauguration of many great discoveries—the railroad, the telegraph, the steamship, appertain to this century. The poorer classes enjoy many luxuries that were not even attainable by the wealthy some years ago. All this progress has been made since 1800. An event which occurred just at the commencement of this century gave a great impetus to human progress—that was the American revolution. When the declaration of independence was made at Philadelphia, which declared that all men are created free and equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these were life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, the old world listened with wrapt attention to that declaration, and its promulgation had a most marked effect on the progress of the world in succeeding years; and owing very largely to that declaration, which struck a chord in the breasts of humanity, the progress of mankind has been and will be very rapid. Let us look for a moment at the progress made in England during the last 60 years. Sixty years ago two-thirds of the House of Commons were the appointees and tools of the aristocracy of that country. At that time there were three peers in England who appointed 26 members to the House of Commons. Sixty years ago 300 members were returned by an average of 160 electors each; the great mass of the people were totally unrepresented; the members went there to represent, not the mass of the people, but a very small fraction of the people; 60 years ago the county vote of the whole kingdom of Scotland was only 2,000; 60 years ago the 100,000 inhabitants of the city of Edinburgh were controlled by 50 electors; since 1828 the Dissenters of England have been relieved from their disabilities; since 1829 Catholics have been relieved from all disabilities; in 1836 the newspaper tax of 8 cents a newspaper was removed; and it is only since 1844 that England became enlightened enough to escape from the condition of semi-barbarism under the corn laws into which we relapsed a few years ago.

If we look at the history of Canada, we shall find even here a tolerably satisfactory record of progress; we shall find that the family compact has been broken; that seignorial tenure has been abolished; that the clergy reserve question has been settled; that the confederation of these Provinces has been consummated; that representation by population, which was long struggled for, has been secured; within a few years the franchise has been materially extended in all parts of the Dominion; a law has been passed designed to secure the independence of Parliament, which has secured it to a large extent; we have a law providing for simultaneous elections, and taking out of the hands of the Government that dangerous power they possessed of bringing on the elections first in the ridings which they were sure to carry, thus becoming enabled to exercise influences in the remaining doubtful ridings that no Government ought to make use of—a very important reform, for which we may thank the Government of Mr. Mackenzie; we have also had introduced vote by ballot. In addition to these measures, which stand as milestones in the course of progress, we have had some events that stand against the stream of progress. We have had that principle of representation by population violated almost immediately after its adoption by the Government, in the case of British Columbia, giving British Columbia six members when they were only entitled to one; and, in the case of Manitoba, giving Manitoba four members when they were only entitled to two. We have had a long career of financial recklessness, that has brought us now to a condition in which we have $100,000,000 of pressing immediate liabilities to provide for, including the savings bank deposits and legal tender currency. We have had that blot upon the reputation of Canada, the Pacific Scandal; we have had the Syndicate Contract; we have had the various attacks upon Provincial Rights; we have had that great case of political rascality, the Gerrymander Bill; and we have what promises, unless it

should be very much modified in its provisions, to be a still greater piece of iniquity, the present Bill. Nevertheless, we have made in Canada, even under these unfavorable circumstances, substantial progress; we have been drifting along abreast of other nations, and are approaching the realisation of a greater degree of liberty and prosperity in this country, which we shall certainly reach sometime, when we get a change of Government.

The tendency of the whole civilised world is to be found in the words "universal suffrage." It is the result that has been reached by many nations. It has been reached by two Provinces of this Dominion; it has been substantially reached by the greatest Province—Ontario! It has been reached by thirty-eight American States and eight American Territories; it has been attained in the great Kingdom of France, in the Empire of Germany, in the Empire of Austria, and the existence of universal suffrage in Germany and Austria shows clearly that the principle is not in any degree incompatible with monarchical institutions. If we consider universal suffrage on its abstract merits, we find, as I have pointed out, that in ancient times it has produced beneficent results; if we examine the field more fully we will find many States besides those to which I have alluded that have had free institutions and have benefited by universal suffrage. The only reason they were submerged in the flood of barbarism is probably they had not, in addition to human liberty, the great advantage we possess, the possession of the Christian religion. Had the Empire of Rome, had the States of Greece, possessed the religion we possess to-day, with the liberal institutions they possess, we can reasonably suppose that their fate would have been different from that which befel them. We have glanced for a moment at the sad history of the ten centuries which followed the submersion of liberty in Rome; the dark ages were alluded to and the gradual advance from slavery and servitude to liberty and equality, and where are we now? We are in the last quarter of the 19th century, with all the wisdom of the past ages at our command, with all the developments the christian religion gives to us, with all the advantages and the achievements of science, literature and art, with all the gathered treasures of the past centuries concentrated among us—we are here, in the last quarter of this century, with all these accumulated blessings at our disposal. That is the position we occupy, possessing all the advantages of material progress and social progress, of intellectual progress and of the christian progress of this century and of all the centuries that have passed. Have we any remnants of the old condition of things? Have we anything to remind us that we once possessed less freedom and less advantages of every kind than we have to-day? Yes; we have many things to remind us of that, and there is nothing that is calculated to remind us of that truth more forcibly than the fact that we do not possess to-day a full measure, a full degree, of human liberty. There is nothing more calculated to impress that fact upon the mind than that there are differences in the condition of free-born British subjects in this land to-day.

There is a principle the violation of which led to a great war, about 100 years ago, which led to the erection of a nation and the dismemberment of an empire, and it is a principle that meets with the approbation of every British citizen on the face of the globe—that is the principle that there should not be taxation without representation. Upon that distinct and particular principle the American colonies revolted, because an attempt was made to tax them without the giving them representation in the British Parliament. Under this Franchise Bill this principle will have no consideration to-day. Is there any class in this Dominion that will pay taxes and will not have representation under this Bill? Will my right hon. friend the Premier venture to say that the Bill he is forcing through this House will not place any portion of the population of the Dominion in the position of men who are taxed without representation in this House? He will not. This Bill violates that fundamental principle of human liberty; that there should not be taxation without representation; because there is not a man in the Dominion who does not pay taxes, who does not contribute to the revenue that my friend the Minister of Customs collects. Who are tax-payers with us? Every man who uses a pound of tobacco or a pound of coffee, who makes use of any article that is imported, who makes use of any article that is rendered dearer by its importation, is a tax-payer, and there is not a man in the Dominion who is not a tax-payer to-day. There is not a young may 21 years of age, whether he has a vote or not, that does not contribute some dollars to the revenue of the Dominion every year. Last year the taxation from Custom duties was $4.75 per head, or $22.50 per head of a family of five. There is not a young man in this Dominion who does not pay taxes, direct and indirect, for we must add to the amount that is paid per *capita* 50 per cent., being the increased cost of the article before it reaches the consumer. You have the wholesale dealer's profits assessed upon the duty, and the retailer's profit assessed upon the wholesale dealer's profits and the duty, and the two amount to 50 per cent. of the original cost; so that there is not an individual in Canada who does not pay taxes every year to a considerable amount, and that individual is entitled to a vote on that account. The Bill imposes a great injustice upon any free-born British subject 21 years of age who has not a vote and who pays taxes into the Customs. Will we be told that an individual who has to pay taxes in the shape of Customs duties upon the goods he consumes, has no direct interest in the policy of the Government, and should have no voice in its policy? I hold that his interest is almost as great as the interest of any other man, so far as the value of taxes is concerned, because this Dominion levies no direct taxes; the tax is paid in the shape of Customs duties, and all who pay taxes are entitled to representation. All men should have a vote, all free-born citizens should have a vote, for a higher reason. Is there such a thing as an inferior race? If there is, the Anglo Saxon does not belong to it, and there should be no castes, no grades among Anglo-Saxons. All are free-born, all belong to a noble race, all have the advantages of citizenship and of our common school system, all possess the degree of intelligence which fits them for the duties of citizenship, all stand invested with the rights and privileges and dignity of manhood, and that is the best reason for giving them a vote. No other reason can be assigned so great as this, that all men were created free and equal. The bible says that God made of one blood all nations of men, and in another place it says that God made man a little lower than the angels, not one a little higher than the other. We have no classes, no grades, no castes, and it is an injustice for the Government to act as if there were castes, as if some were pariahs, and others were fitted for the rights of citizenship. Are men or is money to have the right to vote? If one hon. gentleman opposite should be qualified to vote now, and a reverse should overtake him next year, and he could not qualify, who would have the vote? It must be the money; it is not the man, because he, though invested with his manhood, would not be qualified, unless he had the money as well. Does money represent character? I do not think it does, necessarily. Does money represent honesty? I do not think it does. Does money represent independence of action? Does it represent political intelligence? Can there be neither character, nor honesty, nor independence of action, nor thought, nor political intelligence, without the possession of money? It is an insult to manhood, it is an insult to man, to make such an assertion, and the man who is destitute of the property qualification may be richer in those qualities of character, and honesty and thought, and political

intelligence, than the man rolling in wealth—much better fitted than the man who has property enough to qualify a hundred men.

What is the poor man's relations to the State? Has he any interest in the State if he has not a little money? Is he likely to be destitute of love of country unless he has $400 a year? Is he likely to be destitute of pride n his native land unless he has the money which this Bill says shall qualify him for the exercise of the franchise? He has in his heart, as strong as you or I, the love of home, be it ever so humble, the love of family the love of country. It is the land of his birth or adoption, it is his own home, it is his children's home, it is that around which all his affections cling, and the man who is not a villain, the man who possesses intelligence and average honesty, is the man who will take an interest in the good of his country and will seek to promote it. And it does not require that he should have a few dollars, more or less. He has that love of country, and that pride of country, and that pride in the history of his country, that every British citizen has, a pride that will lead him to labor and to hope for, and to have a sincere desire for the good of that country in every respect. A couple of stanzas, written by Mrs. Hemans, just occur to me. In "The Graves of England," she imagines a stranger visiting England, and asking where the great men of England are buried, where those who are worthy of remembrance have their graves, and the individual who is supposed to be interrogated, thus replies:

"The warlike of the isles,
The men of sea and wave,
Are not the rocks their funeral piles,
The seas and shores their grave?

"Go, stranger! track the deep,
Free, free, the white sail spread,
Wave may not foam, nor wild wind sweep,
Where rest not England's dead."

Yes, they sleep on every shore, they slumber beneath the waves of every sea, they have laid down their lives in every clime under heaven to promote England's glory and to ensure her triumph; and these men, who have given their lives to uphold the glory of England, and to push forward the glorious career of their native land, are to be held under our system incapable of voting unless they possess an income of $400 a year. I scout the idea that money is required to make any free-born British subject worthy to exercise the franchise. The poor man's labors, are they in any degree essential to the prosperity of the State, even if he does not possess money? What function does the poor man possess in building up the State? If he labors in the field, in this Dominion of Canada, does he not labor for and add to the greatness of the State. Take the broad expanse of field and meadow, take the improvements and the farm buildings and the beautiful homesteads, and how are these created? They are created by labor, and by labor alone. And the men who labor in our forests and in our fields, no matter how humble may be the capacity in which they labor, are intimately associated with the prosperity and growth of the State; they are the pillars of the State, they are the foundation upon which the prosperity of the State rests, and to refuse to give to these men a part in the management of the affairs of the country is a grievous wrong. And in the workshop, too, they perform their functions as the most important of the creators of wealth and prosperity. What has labor created, or, you might say, what has labor not created? It has created all things. There is nothing to-day that marks the difference between our condition and the condition of primitive man that is not the result of labor, whether it is city or cultivated field, or railroad, or steamship, or workshop, or work of art, or the fabrics of commerce; there is nothing that pertains to civilisation and characterises civilisation that has not been created by labor. It is labor that marks the difference between the cultivated man of the nineteenth century and the savage of primitive ages. Do we propose to invest labor with the dignity that belongs to it? No; we propose that the man shall not be judged by his manhood, not by the principle that, being a free-born British subject, he shall be entitled to a voice in the affairs of the nation, but he must have a certain amount of money, and the money must vote for him, and if he lose the money the vote is lost. Has not the poor man a great interest in the State? Suppose the State imposes unjust tariff laws, as we have done, does it not affect the interest of the poor man? It affects his interest as much as the interest of the rich man. It affects it to a greater degree, because the unjust tax may be a far greater burden on the poor than on the rich man, who may not feel it as much. In unjust tariff laws the poor man has a direct and intimate interest in the State, as well as a great interest in the State, and he is entitled to a voice in the affairs of the State. We cherish the liberty of the press in this country. We cherish it wisely. It is one of the bulwarks of British liberty. Is the poor man interested in the liberty of the press? Sir, there is not a citizen of the broad empire, there is not a citizen of Canada, who is not just as much interested in the liberty of the press as you or I are. But the Government, in which they have no voice, may attack that liberty, and the man who is, above all others, the most interested in preserving that liberty of the press, may be powerless to defend that great right, because he is not in possession of the franchise. We have liberty of conscience. Every man thinks as he pleases. Every man can express his opinions. We have freedom of worship. We are not compelled to worship according to any particular creed. We may worship in the Catholic church, we may worship in the Protestant churches, or we need not worship at all. We may be agnostics or christians. We have freedom of conscience and freedom of worship, and the poor man has as much interest in these great blessings as the rich man. It is something that it is in the interests of the poor man, as well as of every other citizen of the State, to preserve, if we deny him the franchise, we take from the poor man the power he ought to possess to enable him to conserve this great right as well as others.

It is very important that the country should be properly governed. A reckless or an incompetent Administration may plunge a country into war, may pile upon that country much debt, and may visit it with great and grievous ills, and the poor man, above all others, is liable to suffer from the ills that war would produce. He is liable, above all others, to be, perhaps, conscripted and dragged to the battle field, and forced to fight in a war brought on by the action of the Administration with which he had nothing to do, and could not exercise his rights as a free man, in any degree or sense, to control or modify it. In this respect the poor man's interest in the State is an intimate one, and one which ought to be respected. We have in this country popular education. Liberal grants are made to our educational system, and the great mass of the people of this country are the most intimately interested in that system of popular education. It is to their interest that it should be kept up, that the grants for the purpose should not be diminished. It is to their interest that the efficiency of the school system shall not be in any degree diminished, and we deny to the class that are most interested in that popular and free education the power to exercise any influence by their votes, or by political influence to conserve and preserve the educational institutions of the country. The State may enact unjust and oppressive laws—I do not know that there is any danger of its doing so, but it may do so. It may enact laws in the highest degree oppressive; it may even enact laws that will take from a subjest his liberty, that will take from a subject his property. And yet the subjects that these laws may affect are to have no

voice in the affairs of the country, no vote for the representatives of the people in Parliament, no influence, direct or remote, upon the legislation of the country, although they are equally affected by this legislation. Their interests in the legislation are as great as any class of people in the country. I will take the liberty of reading to you from Mill one or two extracts with regard to this matter of the exercise of the suffrage by the people. (The hon. gentlemen read several extracts from Mill). So the writer takes the ground that neither the ordinary test of intelligence, nor a property qualification, should be required, but that all who are under the obligations of the law should have a voice in making the law. Now, Sir, another interest, every man has in the State is his interest in that great heritage of all, the public domain. There is not a man in this country who has not an interest in our public domain; it is the heritage of all the people of Canada. There is not a man in this Dominion who is not affected by the management of the public domain. He has a direct property interest, as a member of the State, in that property which belongs to the State. Now, in the management of that great heritage I believe that in the past mistakes have been made; I believe that in the future mistakes are liable to be made, and where the mistakes are made they are sure to be made against the interests of the poor man. If a colonisation company is organised, it is not organised for the benefit of the poor man. If lands are withheld from settlement it is not for the benefit of the poor man. Whatever land regulations we may have had in the past, whatever land regulations we are likely to have in the future, in so far as they are divergent from the policy that ought to have been pursued, they have been made in favor of the rich and against the poor. And for that reason every man in this Dominion should have a voice in the Government that controls that great heritage of millions of acres of land in the North-West, that is to be the home of the poor of this country, and of their children. He has an interest in the great heritage of the people, the public lands.

He has another interest. The Government may subsidise corporations and invest them with power to plunder the Treasury and trample on the rights of the people. If a Government so far forgets its duty as to be guilty of this, does not that act affect the interests of the poor, and of every man in Canada? It certainly does. And we have an instance of that. We have an instance in the Government subsidising a corporation and investing it with power to plunder the Treasury and trample on the rights of the people of the country. In the North-West to day, the people have not the privilege of using their own money and deciding where to build a railway. If they attempt a rival line against the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly, the Government here would disallow the Bill. It has established a great corporation, has taken upon its back an old man of the sea, and given it power to endanger the liberties of the people of the North-West. The Government have invested the company with power to enable it to squander millions of the money of Canada, and there is not a man in the Dominion, twenty-one years of age, who has not a direct interest in that matter, if he has any regard for the interests of the country or of his posterity. All these are reasons why we should invest every man of twenty-one years of age, and a British subject, who is not an idiot, a pauper or a criminal, with the right of the suffrage, because those men stand on a common platform with the rich, and their interest in the State is almost in every respect, equal to that of rich men. The most sacred interests are those which we possess in common with all other men, and it is clearly an act of injustice to deny them the right to vote for representatives to the House of Commons.

The Government may do other things not in the interest of the public. It may squander the public money, not in the public interest, but to support candidates in various counties. The Government have done that to some extent. It may do that on the eve of an election, by organising 300 or 400 colonisation companies and making those investing in them the political friends of the Government. It may do that by a system of issuing timber licenses, by issuing coal and pasture lands. On many occasions useless grants for public works have been made in ridings, which were not in the public interest, but which were made for the purpose of strengthening the hands of Government nominees. If so, the Government are doing something as much opposed to the interest of the poor man as of the rich man, and every citizen has as much right to express his condemnation of colonisation land grants, or any other policy calculated to sap the independence of Parliament. In all the highest functions of government, in the preservation of liberty, in the making of laws which have to go down to posterity, and in regard to all other functions, the poor man has as much interest as the rich man. The poor man is equally proud of his country with the rich man, and desires to see it prosper and be blessed with good laws; and I repeat that in all the high functions of government the poor man is interested with the rich man in having those functions properly discharged. It may be true that property qualification should be applied in municipal elections, where a direct vote is taken for taxation purposes. I do not go so far, as an advocate of universal suffrage, as to say that in municipalities the man who pays no taxes should have the right to vote for a measure to impose taxes on the people; but in broad, national matters, all have nearly equal interest, and they should have an equal voice in the affairs of State. It will not be asserted that the poor man is not as patriotic as the rich man; it would be insulting to the poor man to make that assertion. Is the poor man not as ready to give his life in the national defence? The great majority of those who come forward in times of danger are poor men; and those who are patriotic and desirous of promoting the interest of the country should be invested with the evidence and safeguard of liberty—the franchise. When the United States Government liberated millions of slaves, although it was not claimed that the negroes were thoroughly well qualified for the exercise of the franchise, yet it was given to them, because it was thought they could not hold their liberty unless they had the full responsibility of freemen, and had the right to exercise the franchise. If that franchise was the indispensible accompaniment of the liberty of the black, if that was a sound principle in the United States, surely it should be a sound principle here. If the evidence and accompaniment of liberty there was the vote to the negro, surely it should be given to the free-born British subjects of twenty-one years.

Another argument in favor of universal suffrage is this: That the broader the basis upon which the institution of any Government rests the more security those institutions possess. The broad basis is the better basis than the narrow one; and the whole population invested with the franchise gives the broad basis, which means security. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), in the course of his remarks, referred to the case of the United States during the civil war. He gave an extract from Mr. Gladstone's speech, with respect to the great influence exercised in that struggle by the fact that all the inhabitants in the United States possessed the franchise. I believe that Mr. Gladstone's opinion is right, when he declares that the United States would not have preserved the Union if there had been restricted franchises in that country. But when the institutions of the country

were imperilled, when Fort Sumpter was attacked, every man in the North felt he was individually interested in the struggle; that it affected a country in which he was a citizen; that he was one of the citizens who formed the State, and his interest was as great as that of any other man in the State; and in consequence of that feeling pervading the entire mass of the American population, that great struggle was inaugurated, sustained and carried through in those years of trial to a triumphant consummation; and standing in my place here, I do not believe that there is any other free country in the world that would have gone through that struggle in the same manner as the United States, simply for the reason that there is no free State in the world that has laid the basis of its constitution on so broad a ground as the whole people, all possessing the franchise, all possessing equal rights, no man possessing privileges in the country superior to those possessed by the meanest citizen in the country.

Now, there can be no doubt that the possession of the franchise educates and elevates. There can be no doubt that a man invested with the franchise will take a greater interest in public affairs than if he were not; that he will become a more intelligent man, better fitted to exercise the rights of citizenship, and will acquire a degree of education and familiarity with public affairs which will enable him properly and judiciously to exercise the right with which he is invested. I shall ask the privilege of reading an extract on this subject from that greatest of political thinkers of this age, John Stuart Mill. (The hon. gentleman here read from an article on the Extension of the Suffrage, pages 66 and 74.) I hold that, if we are to take on ourselves the regulation of the franchise for this Dominion, we will not act the part of wisdom if we do not move forward with the spirit of the age. We have a great nation near us, that must exert a greater or less influence on our affairs, and the fact that that nation, with its 55,000,000 of inhabitants, has universal suffrage, will have a most potent influence upon us. Any attempt we may make to fix a franchise that comes short of universal suffrage will be an arrangement of a temporary character. If we adopt the franchise based upon this Bill it will not be a permanent franchise; it will only be a short time until popular pressure and popular demand will insist on the extension of that franchise to the degree of universal suffrage. If we insist on a Dominion franchise we may as well accept the inevitable now; if we wish to delay the adoption of universal suffrage we should leave the matter with the Provinces. Even admitting that evils attend universal suffrage, which I deny, I hold that the evils of the system we are about to introduce will prove to be much greater than any evil that could attend the adoption of universal suffrage. The measure before us is going to introduce a franchise different from the franchises that now exist in the various Provinces. It is a measure that is going to place in the hands of the Government a power which may be exercised, not in the public interest, but the interest of a party; it is a measure that will place upon this country the necessity of incurring a heavy outlay in working it; it is a measure that will create confusion in the minds of the electors, and men will be years in becoming accustomed to the change; it is a measure that will admit to the privilege of voting a class of people, the Indians, who ought not to be admitted, while it will exclude thousand upon thousands who now possess the franchise in the Provinces. It is a measure entirely uncalled for; none of the Provinces have asked for it, and the great majority of the people of this Dominion do not desire it, and would vote against it if it were submitted to them. For all these reasons, if we are to take the step of making this constitutional change, to remove the control of the franchise from the Provinces, we should certainly make the franchise as liberal as the provisions in the most liberal Province in this Dominion. We should adopt a franchise that would not disfranchise one voter in this Dominion, that would not create discontent in any part of the Dominion, that would recognise in the broadest sense the principle of human liberty, and the right of every citizen who contributes to the State, in the form of taxes, to have a voice in public affairs; and if we recognise these broad principles, which are recognised to-day in the United States, in Germany, in Austria, and substantially in Great Britain, as well as in the Province of Ontario, and some other Provinces of this Dominion, and if we act the part of wisdom, we shall accept the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). In discussing this question for a short time, I shall glance for a few moments at the surrounding circumstances, more particularly as they affect the Province I have the honor to represent. If I had my individual choice I should still prefer the ground taken from the first, that we should maintain in the separate Provinces the franchises to which those Provinces are accustomed. When we remember that three of the Provinces have felt it to be their interest to extend the suffrage to the widest possible degree, and that those Provinces have found that suffrage to work satisfactorily, after a lengthened experience, it occurs to me that any system that we adopt which will have the effect of restricting the privilege of voting in any of those Provinces will be inacceptable, from the simple fact that you always find the difficulty in taking from any portion of the community a privilege they have heretofore enjoyed. I should have been pleased to have seen any principle adopted that would have left those Provinces that have aleady adopted manhood suffrage in possession of that boon, and I think that if the supporters of the Government were free to express their sentiments, without those trammels which are imposed on them by party allegiance, I think those gentlemen would say that the franchise they at present enjoy is best suited to their particular wants, and therefore I feel that it is in some ways a questionable expedient to endeavor to apply the principle of manhood suffrage to some of the Provinces who have strong feelings of repugnance against it. From the expressions which have fallen from the supporters of the Government from the Province of Quebec—it is true they have not been very numerous, I regret to say—I gather that the representatives of that Province are disinclined to see the basis of representation broadened to the extent that this resolution proposes; and while we are bound to respect the feelings and perhaps the prejudices of that particular Province, it is for that reason that I hesitate to become an advocate for thrusting upon those people a franchise which they perhaps feel that their people are not ripe for. This is another strong argument why it will be found impracticable to have anything like an effective administration of one franchise for the whole Dominion. Speaking for the Province with which I am more intimately connected, I confess, without hesitation, that after the discussion which has taken place in our Local Legislature I would have preferred to have applied to my own Province the result of the labors of the Local Legislature, as developed in the last franchise Act of Ontario, than the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). Not that I am apprehensive of the working out of manhood suffrage in my own Province; far from it, but because I think any individual who calmly considers the effect of the provincial franchise, shortly coming into force in Ontario, will agree with me in saying that in its broad and general principle it is virtually almost manhood suffrage. Let me take a passing glance at the provisions of the Ontario Act and see what they really are, because I believe that hon. members have not really considered the divergencies between that Act and the Bill proposed to-night. Practi-

cally, the application of the Ontario franchise is manhood suffrage, with the proviso that, in one form or another, all these parties will be entered on the assessment rolls of the various municipalities. I need not refer specially to the property qualification, but will speak more particularly of the land-owners' sons and the wage-earners and the income class. In these respects the Ontario Act is very broad in its application; "householder" covers every individual who is an occupant of a dwelling house, without regard to valuation and qualification; "land-owner" covers not only owners, but tenants of property, and all their sons at home. Those and the personal and income qualification of $250 are wide enough to include, practically, those who are disfranchised under the Dominion Act, and to whom reference has so often been made, the volunteers who are to-day fighting the battles of their country. The result of these varied qualifications in the Ontario Act is this, that practically the Act takes in almost every citizen of that Province, with this advantage, that we have the guarantee he has a certain local standing by his being placed on those assessment rolls, either as a wage-earner or property owner's son, or for income tax. In this respect, this is a much broader basis than the basis provided by the Blil under consideration by this House. The provisions of that section of the Act——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is going beyond the question. The amendment before the House and the clause of the Bill to which it refers is what the hon. gentleman must confine himself to.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is merely contrasting the proposal to substitute manhood suffrage for the arrangement proposed in this clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has heard what I said, and will govern himself accordingly.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth.) I presume I will be in order in referring to the provisions of the Dominion law, as covered by this section. I do not think that they are quite as wide as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe. If we would accept the statements interjected by the hon. gentlemen opposite, by way of interruption to speakers on this side, we would be led to believe that the proposed Dominion Act is a very wide extension on the franchise as at present enjoyed in Ontario. I confess in some respects it is an enlargement. It is an enlargement in this respect, that it will reduce the property qualification in cities and towns from $400 to $300, and in rural districts from $200 to $150. I has applied the old principle of farmers' sons' franchise to property owners both in cities and rural districts; but in that respect it is limited compared with the Ontario Act, because it provides the old restrictions that exist in the Ontario law, namely, that these sons shall be only qualified provided the property divided would give each individual a property valuation of $300 or $150. That is quite a limitation of what is apparently an extension of the suffrage in that direction. Again, the income qualification is limited to $400 per annum. I do not know what it may be in the Province of British Columbia, because in those western Provinces $400 does represent as earnings more than the same value in the older Provinces, and it is just possible that an income of $400 might cover a very large wage-earning class in British Columbia and in some parts of Manitoba. But in the older Provinces this income franchise of $400 will exclude a great number of very desirable citizens, many of our mechanics and wage-earners, not to speak of our school teachers, intelligent people earning from $300 to $350 per annum. I admit that there is a wide extension in giving a vote to very tenant at $2 a month in a city, but I do not think this will bring within the range of the Act as desirable a class as would have been brought within it if the income franchise had been reduced from $400 to $250. I can see no object in extending the franchise to a class paying only $2 a month, and occupying only miserable hovels or tenements in cities and towns, and refusing it to a large number of persons earning less than $400 otherwise well qualified to vote. Another extension under this Act, to those who have not exercised the franchise before, is that which gives the vote to Custom house and Excise officers, and I do not think that an extension in that direction is likely to prove beneficial. I do not care how independent a man's thought or feeling, the fact that he is an employé of the Government and is dependent upon his superior officers for his position, though he may hold it during good behavior, does not put him in a position to vote freely and independently, as he otherwise would. I have already referred to the objectionable extension of the franchise to Indians, and I cannot understand the reason for the introduction of this clause, unless on the supposition which has been mentioned that they are entirely under the Government. The amount of $400 of income may take in a large section in British Columbia, but will exclude a large section in the older Provinces. Though you may have nominal uniformity, you cannot have practical uniformity. I think it would be far better to adopt manhood suffrage at once, and for that as applied to the Dominion you have had a great deal of encouragement. We deal less with property and civil rights than the respective Provincial Legislatures. I believe that every class in this Dominion, without regard to the social position they occupy, will, if combined in a general system of manhood suffrage, bring to bear upon the community at large, through the expression of their sentiments upon the representatives they elect, and do a great deal of benefit in building up this community. There are some social questions of vast importance that only men outside the present parties can take up and comprehend. I refer to those various questions that are pressing more and more every season upon this and other Legislatures, relative to the position of labor and capital. We have seen, in the Legislature of Ontario, that the interest of the mechanic has been recognised by the extended principle that the laws were made to protect him in his earnings against the property holder, who might have been, for the time being, his employer. And will any gentleman tell me that this class, because they do not happen to be represented in the way of occupation of property or holders of real estate, should not have a voice in saying who shall make the laws and who shall administer them as applied to the Dominion? In that respect we may profitably glance at the attitude of the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario. That party has a wide and strong influence in the Province. Although for the time being they do not control the Local Legislature, no man can deny that the Conservative party is a power in the Province of Ontario. Last Session this question of manhood suffrage came up in the Local Legislature, and how do we find the leader of the Conservative Opposition, Mr. Meredith, expressing himself on that occasion? I find a report of his speech in the *Mail* newspaper, from which I will read. (The hon. gentleman read the report of Mr. Meredith's speech on the subject of manhood suffrage, in which he unreservedly advocated and offered an amendment in favor of it in the Ontario Legislature.) Now, bear in mind that these words were spoken by Mr. Meredith in the face of a Franchise Bill that will become law in the Province of Ontario on the 1st of next January. Gentlemen here tell us that the Dominion Act does not exclude our volunteers, that are fighting our battles in the North-West. But, Sir, Mr. Meredith, in the face of the fact that he knew what the provisions of that Ontario Act were, distinctly declared that even with the broad provisions of that Act, a young man was still excluded from having a control or say in the affairs of his country. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that an Act which is far more restrictive than the

Ontario Act gives to these men that representation which Mr. Meredith says was denied in the provincial Act. I say there could be no more convincing proof than Mr. Meredith's own statement, that hon. gentlemen opposite have not considered the Bill before the House; they have not considered the limitations and restrictions that are imposed upon the young men of this country by that Act. If this Bill is as broad as they claim it is, where would have been the necessity, when Mr. Meredith was speaking of an Act still broader, to use the language I have just quoted? If Mr. Meredith had been discussing an Act such as we are discussing to-night, he would have said that it was an utter fraud on the rising men of the community to say that it gave them rights and privileges to say who shall make and administer the laws of the country. In the course of his remarks Mr. Meredith further declared that this was a democratic country, socially and politically, and that the franchise should be based on the broadest possible lines, so that every man who was a good citizen should have a voice in public affairs; and that hon. gentleman placed himself on record by moving an amendment in favor of manhood suffrage. It is sometimes said that such a broad franchise would involve an interference with the rights of property. But our laws, even as they exist, interfere very largely with the rights of property. We recognise that while an individual has a right in his property, that right is held subject to the good of the community at large; and we have seen in England, recently, legislation which, if applied to landed property in this country, would be deemed little short of revolutionary. I refer to the recent laws affecting real estate in Ireland. In regard to property qualification, we are liable sometimes to run to an absurdity, especially as regards the rural districts. A man may own real estate worth $200 and may let it to a tenant who may be worth nothing. Both the owner and the tenant vote on that real estate, and yet a man, probably a school teacher, who earns $350 a year, has not a vote. That is not an equitable distribution, and in common *parlance* it is running the property qualification into the ground. Property is a suitable qualification as regards local taxes, both municipal and provincial, as real property is peculiarly under provincial control, but when you come to the principle of taxation as regards the Dominion, we find that it cannot be fairly applied. There is no direct tax on property levied by the Dominion; they are all indirect taxes, which are levied on goods consumed by all citizens whether property holders or not. Is it not just and reasonable that those persons who are compelled to pay taxes directly to the Dominion Government, on the articles they consume, should be given an opportunity of voting for representatives in the Dominion Parliament. It must be remembered that no one class is fit to make laws for another class These men stand too close to their personal interests to see the interests of a class below and beyond them; and I say that a Government such as this, that claims to have originated the National Policy, ought to be a Government which should extend to the wage-earners and mechanics the broadest and freest opportunity of saying who should make and administer the laws of this Dominion. Sir, this Government has seen fit to extend the franchise to the tribal Indians, a class which is not amenable to our social laws, and takes no interest in the social well-being of the community, beyond their own tribe or reserve, who are wards of the Government, who have no independent existence; and yet the Government proposes to refuse the vote to our fellow citizens, whose income is less than $400, and amenable to our laws and to all the responsibilities of citizenship. I say, Sir, that is inequitable, unjust, a blot upon the commonwealth, and a discredit to the laws of our community. In the mother country the relations between capital and labor, and their relative positions, are very different from what they are here, and yet how has the extension of the franchise operated in that country, even under the conditions that exist there. Mr. Hughessen, in a recent debate on the extension of the franchise, spoke thus:

"He believed that every man who paid taxes and discharged his duty as a citizen had *primâ facie* a right to a share in the appointment of those who were to control the Government of the country."

Mr. Gladstone, in that noted article in the *Nineteenth Century*, in his discussion with Mr. Lowe respecting the extension of the franchise, used these words:

"Two Parliaments of very different complexions and merits have been returned under the influence of the constituency furnished by the household suffrage. Both of them have shown, in their respective ways, an attention to the interests of labor, which was greatly needed and more than amply justified, but neither of them has so much as supplied a shadow of a shade of warrant for the charge that the workingmen would combine together in the interests of their own class to wage war upon other classes. The marvel is that they have been unable or unwilling to combine so as to place half a dozen of themselves in the popular chamber, and thereby usefully to enlarge its means of acquaintance with the ideas, wants and tendencies of the people."

That, Mr. Chairman, is the matured expression of a statesman who has ideas broad enough to look beyond party, and take into account the influence which the extension of the franchise in England has had, and we find him to-day extending that franchise so much that, at the next election in England, 2,000,000 of electors, who never before had the opportunity of giving their votes, will have an opportunity of saying who shall administer the public affairs of that country. I say that if leading statesmen in England, after the experience they have had—because it is a question which was fought there inch by inch against the claims of the privileged classes—if they extend the franchise to those beyond and below them, why should we hesitate, in this Dominion, where the property qualification is so widely distributed and so easily acquired, to confer on every good citizen the right to say who shall administer and make the laws for the well-being of society. I say that we should not hesitate to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, and step out on the broad principle that every man who bears the burthens and responsibilities of citizenship should have a voice in the making and the administration of the laws; and I, for one, have no fear for the result. I have no fear that the extension of the franchise will produce a war against the class who have hitherto administered the affairs of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of their National Policy and of the number of wage-earners it brings to our country and employs in our midst, while they refuse to give those men the right to vote, and at the same time extend that right to the tribal Indian who assumes no responsibilities as a citizen, and call that justice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There was one statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with which I entirely agree, and that is, that the question before the House is of a serious and important character, and that it ought not to be disposed of at this late hour, and I think there is ample room for further discussion upon it. I do not know that I agree with any other statement my hon. friend made, but that I agree with, and I therefore support the proposition that the committee now rise.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.05 a.m. Tuesday

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 19th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

ENQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that I have not yet received some returns ordered at the early part of the Session. One was for correspondence in regard to the northerly boundary of Ontario, and another was in relation to the cost incurred by the Government in regard to the boundary case.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think they have been presented. At all events, I brought them here.

Mr. CHARLTON. An order was passed for certain returns in regard to timber limits. The non-essential portion was brought down some time ago, but the essential information as to the timber limits actually granted has not been given.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—INTEREST PAYMENTS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What payments and at what dates have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in respect of interest on the 5 per cent. loan—(1) prior to 1st November, 1884; (2) on or since 1st November, 1884? And to what date do such payments settle the interest on such loan?

Mr. BOWELL. On September 13, 1884, there was paid $273,750.78; on February 20th, 1885, $92,357.31. These two amounts meet the interest up to 1st November, 1884.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I desire to call the attention of the House to a certain matter. In the Ottawa *Citizen* of this morning there is an editorial article to this effect:

"Mr. Mills presented a petition in the House of Commons yesterday afternoon on which he said were the names of a number of Conservatives who protested againt the Franchise Bill. We should be glad to hear of that petition being closely scrutinised by some one familiar with the so-called Conservative signers thereof. We do not hesitate to say that such an examination would prove either that the names were forgeries or that if any Conservative was foolish enough to be caught in a trap by the hired Grit canvassers for signatures, he was the victim of false representations. Judging from past experience, however, we are inclined to the opinion that the names were forged. Grit agents are quite equal to that sort of work at a time when the interests of the party demand the performance of that or any other kind of rascality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as this matter is concerned, I assume the entire responsibility, because I handed the petition to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to present as I had some others to present, and he had none. As to the charge that the signatures were obtained by false representation, of course, nobody will mind that, because charges of that kind are made by one party and denied by the other, and we cannot tell as to that charge except by looking at the signatures and assuming that they mean something. But when it comes to a journal charging the hon. members of this House with presenting petitions which are filled with forged names, I think the matter requires to be laid before this House. Now, that petition was sent to me by a gentleman with whom I had no communication, and whom I know only by reputation—a gentleman living in Wiarton, in the constituency of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place. This gentleman, Mr. Campbell, accompanied the petition when it came to me with a letter, with part of which I will trouble the House, as it is in connection with this matter:

"I have stiff Conservatives on that petition, and they will not elect a member again that is supporting such measures as they are proposing at this Session. Furthermore, will you kindly show this petition to Mr. McNeill, and ask him if he knows all the parties that signed. He knows them all, and are *bonâ fide* signatures. I can swear that the names are correct, and that they are the parties' own signatures. I can affirm that with an oath before a justice of the peace if required. I have marked on that petition a cross with red ink, which indicates all the Conservatives."

Now on that petition, which is in possession of the House, any hon. gentleman can see that there are twenty-eight red ink crosses opposite the names, and under the authority of this letter and the examination of the petition, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), at my suggestion, mentioned that there were twenty-eight Conservatives who signed that petition. The hon. member for North Bruce was not in the House when the petition was presented, but as soon as he was in his place, I sent a note across the House to him, stating that I had been asked to call his attention to the fact that Conservatives had signed the petition, which I asked him to look at, and if he has done so he will be able to say, I hope, whether there are Conservatives' signatures on that petition or not. When the hon. gentleman does so, I hope he will have the goodness to state to the House what the result of his examination is.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman read Mr. McNeill's note to himself.

Mr. EDGAR. I have not got it here—in fact I have not got it at all, but I remember it perfectly well. Later on in the evening I got a note from Mr. McNeill, thanking me for my note to him, but stating that he had heard of the signatures before, and of the means used to obtain them. That is another matter, as everybody knows. He did not dispute the names, but thought perhaps they were signed in mistake. That is a matter we cannot discuss now, but we must assume that these names are genuine, as the parties signing are not idiots.

Mr. DODD. I may say that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) showed me the letter from Mr. Edgar. He told me, furthermore, that he had received a communication from one of the so-called Conservative signatories, in which it was stated and alleged that those names were procured entirely through misapprehension and misrepresentation to the parties signing them.

Mr. BLAKE. That of course is a matter to be decided on evidence, but the question which is brought forward by my hon. friend is the statement in this journal, twice repeated—not that the names were improperly procured, but that they were forged names—not that Conservatives were persuaded by mistake, or misrepresentation, but that they did not sign, and that the petition presented to the House is a false petition by forged names. Now, the statement of the hon. member for North Bruce, as stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, the statement which my hon. friend says he communicated to him, has nothing to do with that statement in the newspaper that the signatures are false, because it is acknowledged that the signatures were obtained from the gentlemen whose names appear on the petition, but it is contended that they were improperly obtained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the case stands, then, it is either forged or fraud—one or the other.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it is alleged to be a fraud, but it is not. If the hon. gentleman takes the responsibility of saying it is a fraud, let him do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has no right to address me in that tone. It is unparliamentary, improper, and ungentlemanlike.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated across the House that the case stands thus—that either those signatures were forgeries or frauds. I answered him that it was not so, that it was alleged that they were forgeries or frauds. That is what I answered him, and if it is to be a charge in this House that they were forgeries or frauds, the hon. gentleman must take the responsibility of making that charge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And the hon. gentleman is on the same footing. He must take the responsibility of stating that there is neither forgery nor fraud.

Mr. BLAKE. No, Sir, I made no such statement.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad that the amendments now before the committee have opened up a really broad question; a question which deserves and will no doubt obtain the careful attention of the House; a question which requires the fullest and most searching discussion. I have hopes, from the remarks made by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), at the adjournment of the last sitting, that it is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to debate this question. That hon. gentleman said that this was a question of such importance that it should not be disposed of at that hour of the morning, and that it required full discussion and explanation before it was settled. I hope, then, he is going to give us his views on the question, and that his example will be followed by other hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all the more reasonable that this question should be discussed on both sides, because it is not in itself a party question. The proposal to introduce what is practically universal suffrage comes from a gentleman on the Government side of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me. I imagine the hon. gentleman would not place me in that position exactly. I happen to be independent in this House.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Northumberland puts in his claim to be considered independent. Well, he has certainly shown a great deal of independence in connection with this Bill, but I only speak of him as generally supporting the Government, and as one who has been a colleague of hon. gentlemen opposite, and who is looked upon by the country as a possible future colleague of theirs.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you.

Mr. CASEY. This may be said without detriment to his claim to be considered an independent supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, because we find that it is generally the most independent supporters who have the highest claims upon them, and who are generally given seats in the Cabinet. I do not think the hon. gentleman's independence will damage his claims to a seat in the Cabinet, or diminish his influence in the country. Indeed, I am bound to pay him the compliment that I believe his action on this occasion will improve his position in the country. A proposition coming from such a gentleman can hardly be looked upon as a party proposition. On the other hand, the amendment to the amendment, coming from this side of the House, as I understand, has been accepted by the hon. proposer of the amendment as expressing more fully the views he wishes to put before the House. If any further proof were needed that this is not a party question, it is found in the circumstance that the Conservative Opposition in the Province of Ontario have put themselves formally on record by a party vote in the Assembly in favor of manhood suffrage for that Province, while the Conservative members from the same constituencies in this House have put themselves on record, by a formal vote, as not only opposed to manhood suffrage in Ontario, but opposed to even as low a franchise as Mr. Mowat's recent Act introduced. If we were to look for a question that should be discussed with an utter absence of party bias, we could not find one better adapted to such discussion than the present. The opinions of members on both sides are individually as divided upon it as possible. I am glad to have such a question before the House, and I hope to discuss it with as near an approach to freedom from party bias as can be expected from one who declares himself to be thoroughly a party man. The discussion opens two questions: First, as to the absolute advantages of manhood suffrage—its absolute claims to acceptance; secondly, as to its comparative claims to acceptance under our present circumstances. It is quite possible that a thing may be theoretically proper and desirable without being practically applicable at any given moment to the affairs of the country. It is possible, on the other hand, that a thing not in itself theoretically desirable may be expedient for the time being. We have, therefore, to discuss this question from both points of view. First, then, as to the absolute merits of manhood suffrage. I think a great deal can be said in its favor; I think indeed, with Mr. Gladstone, that the burden of proof lies upon those who wish to restrict the franchise within narrower limits than those of the whole adult male population—that the burden of proof rests upon those who say that such and such classes of the community are unfit to have the franchise, rather than upon those who say that the people, as a whole, should possess it. This claim is particularly strong in this Dominion. When we consider that every adult who is not a pauper, who is living upon his own resources, must contribute to the extent of the duty on every dutiable article he purchases to the revenue of this Dominion, we have one claim to his right to the franchise established. There is a well known maxim of constitutional government that representation and taxation should go together. When we find that every citizen of the Dominion is taxed for Dominion purposes, we must admit that there is strong reason for giving every citizen the franchise. Again every citizen is subject to military duty, and a responsibility of that kind should be accompanied with the right of the franchise. The burden of proof is thrown upon those who say that certain citizens who are subject to military duty or to taxation are not fit to have a voice in directing the affairs of the country. I shall not enlarge on other reasons for giving the franchise to every citizen. I shall not go into the question of abstract right, because I am not a very strong believer in the doctrine of abstract right in regard to political franchises. I believe in abstract right in policy, but I do not think we have much to say as to the absolute right of this or that class to this or that privilege. I think Government is to a large extent a question of expediency. In some cases certain classes of people who might be theoretically considered to have a right to the franchise, are not practically fit to exercise that right. We may find illustrations of this in certain foreign countries; but I do not think that can be said about Canada. I do not know of any class of citizens in Canada of whom it can truthfully be said that, as a class, they are unfit to exercise the franchise. Such a thing can certainly not be said by either party in this House of those who now exercise that privilege; we should stultify ourselves by saying so; they are those who sent us here. Such is the correlation of classes, such is the absence of hard and fast dividing lines between the different classes, that what may be said of those who now possess the franchise can be said in general terms, with equal truth, of all classes not yet enfranchised. If we say that a man who has an income of $400 a year, or who owns real estate to the value

of $150 in the country or $300 in the city, or who is a tenant at a monthly rental of $2, or a yearly rental of $20, is fit to exercise the franchise, I do not think we can stop there. I do not think we can take those figures as a distinguishing test of capacity for exercising intelligently the franchise. If we admit that which is admitted by the promoters of the Bill, I do not think we can go further and say that a man who has only $100 worth of property, or $200 of income, or who pays a monthly rental of only $1, is not fit to vote. Indeed, I do not think we can help saying that every adult citizen of the country who is not a pauper or a criminal or a lunatic, may be assumed, with every probability, to be as capable of exercising the franchise as the men belonging to the classes so near to him who are enfranchised by this Bill. In the Province with which I am best acquainted, there is practically no difference of intelligence between those who are now enfranchised and those who would be enfranchised by universal suffrage. In Ontario under the existing law, every farmer's son, every landholder's son, every householder, and every person deriving $250 income either from investment or as the wages of his own work, is entitled to vote. That includes practically everybody in the Province; but even if it did not include practically every adult male in the Province, I think nobody from Ontario will venture to assert that the few who are left out are inferior in intelligence to those who are included by the Act. I cannot speak with so much personal knowledge in regard to the other Provinces, but my opinion of them is formed largely from the representatives whom I have met here; and if we may judge from the representatives sent here by those Provinces in which the suffrage is the lowest, in which the suffrage is universal, I do not think we can claim that our Ontario electors or Quebec electors who have hitherto been qualified on a higher basis, have shown better judgment in the selection of representatives than the electors of those Provinces where universal suffrage has prevailed. I consider that on the abstract ground that taxation and liability to the duties of citizens should confer a right to have a voice in the government of the country, a very strong case is established in favor of universal suffrage. I do not consider that the case is absolutely convincing; I do not consider that we are absolutely forced by that argument to accept the principle of manhood suffrage. In fact, I am prepared to say if the question before us was simply a Bill creating *de novo* a universal suffrage for the whole Dominion as an alternative to the present state of things under which each Province regulates its own franchise, I should not support that Bill. I have strongly supported the propositions that each Province should manage its own franchise; that each Province knows what will best suit the genius of its people in the way of qualification; that each Province has, under the spirit of the constitution, the right to say on what basis its people should be represented. I conclude, then, that if the question before us were simply one of manhood suffrage versus the existing franchises, I should not feel bound to support that Bill. I should, indeed, feel bound to oppose it. I should oppose it, first, for the reason I have given, that the provincial franchises should be retained; and, secondly, for the reason I have given in opposing this Bill as a whole, that I do not think we should effect any extensive change in the basis of the franchise without consulting the electors as to whether they want that change or not. That objection, of course, applies with special force to the proposal to restrict the franchise; but I think it also applies to the proposal to enlarge the franchise; for such extension would undoubtedly diminish the electoral power of those who are now electors; but when the proposition comes before us in its present form, as an alternative to something else, I do feel that my duty compels me to support it. The proposal now before us is not to abrogate provincial franchises in favor of universal suffrage, but to substitute an uniform system of universal suffrage for another proposed uniform system of franchise which we, on this side, do not consider fair and equitable. Under those circumstances, I shall support this amendment. I have done my best by voice and vote, as other members of this side have done, to secure the retention of the existing franchises; but the House has decided otherwise in committee, and it is probable they will also decide otherwise when they come to vote on the third reading of the Bill. They have decided to adopt what is called an uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. I have tried to demonstrate that it is not uniform, but an attempt to secure an uniform franchise. That principle being established, I am prepared to argue that, if we are to have something which is meant to be a uniform franchise, it should be really so, and I hold that the only franchise which can be uniform is manhood suffrage. We have discussed in detail already the qualifications proposed in the Bill for electors. We have found that in no case do they agree with existing provincial franchises. We have found that those qualifications which have been thought best by the people of the different Provinces, are in some cases very much more liberal than in others. In the Province of Quebec, they are considerably less liberal than those in the Bill; but in nearly all the other Provinces they are more liberal. We have found also a general admission that no property qualification can be considered truly uniform throughout the Dominion; that if you take property as a test of qualification to vote, the ownership, say of $300 worth or $150 worth of real estate may mean one degree of intelligence in British Columbia, a different degree in Manitoba, a different degree in Ontario, a different degree in Quebec, and a very different degree in the Lower Provinces. We have found it admitted that an income qualification does not mean the same thing everywhere; in fact it is with regard to income especially, that the proposed franchise varies in uniformity. The earnings of the laboring classes, the receipts of professional men, the returns from investments, are so extremely varied in the different Provinces that the mere fact that different persons in different Provinces receive $400 income is no proof that they stand on the same social plane, or possess an equal amount of intelligence. No property franchise, no income franchise, no tenants' franchise, can secure real uniformity throughout the Dominion. If we are to secure that, we are thrown back to the basis of representation of the individual man. There we find, as the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Mitchell) said, that we reach a finality. This is one of the strongest arguments in support of his supposition. He said his amendment tends to secure finality for the franchise, and I think it does, since it asserts the proposition that a citizen of British Columbia is equal in intelligence to a citizen of Prince Edward Island and has an equal right to a share in the government of this country. You cannot tinker with that franchise; you cannot go into the question of a man's complexion or height or weight. When once you have manhood suffrage, you have reached finality, and you have also arrived at fair play and justice. The deprivation of the right to exercise the franchise in the case of any class which has heretofore exercised it, is without precedent in constitutional government in England, in the United States or in Canada. If we are compelled to move away at all from the provincial franchises, we should take a step not backward but forward. I do not know that the people of Canada are prepared for universal suffrage, I do not know that it would be popular with even the Liberal electors, but we know that some Provinces already possess universal suffrage, and there is therefore no escape from the position that, if we give up the provincial franchises we must go the whole length of manhood suffrage or else disfranchise large numbers of voters. I wish to impress upon our friends from Quebec, without discussing the wisdom of the Conservatism which I know characterises them in regard to the franchise more than those from other Provin-

oes, that, if they adopt this system of uniform franchise, there is no stopping short of universal suffrage, whenever a majority of the other Provinces may demand it. If they prefer a high qualification for the suffrage, they have a right to adhere to it, but, if they give up that right by voting for this Bill, they must be prepared to go further when the newer parts of Canada, which will outnumber Quebec as well as Ontario and the other older Provinces, insist upon the basis of the vote in the whole Dominion being universal suffrage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentlemen from Quebec cheer me. I suppose they have decided to vote for this Bill whether it leads to universal suffrage or not. I conclude that they are more liberal in their views than we have given them credit for, and I am glad to find that the Conservatives of Quebec are standing side by side with the Conservatives of Ontario in favor of universal suffrage, that, in fact, they are more radical than the moderate Liberals of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, it would appear that the Bleu of Quebec and the Tory of Ontario are in favor of even more radical changes than the moderate Liberals. I say this, not with respect to the provisions of this present Bill, which I maintain are less liberal in most of the Provinces than the existing franchises, but because it will lead ultimately to the adoption of radical changes in the constitution. If we are to have an uniform franchise for the Dominion, it should be, and must be, if the rights of the people are not to be outraged, one which will take away the vote from no one who now possesses it. I have shown in a former debate what a tremendous number of people in Ontario would be disfranchised by this Bill. I have shown by two modes of calculation, one rather loose and depending upon guess work, the other more accurate, and depending upon clearly ascertained figures, both of which methods led almost to the same conclusion, namely: that 125,000 people in the Province of Ontario, are likely to be disfranchised by this Bill; that almost one in three of the present electorate will be disfranchised, the most wholesale disfranchisement that ever took place amongst any civilised people. I will not say amongst any self governed people, because we have no historical records that any such disfranchisement ever took place among self-governed people at all. It is the most wholesale wiping out of voters of which we have any record; and when the true effect of this measure comes to be known among the people; when they see the difference between the voters' lists under the Mowat Act, and the voters' lists under this Bill, the indignation among them will be boiling over, and gentlemen opposite will have ocular demonstration of its existence, and will find it so hot—I am referring now to the right hon. Premier's humorous story last night—that the temperature will become quite unbearable. We will then be able to afford them absolute demonstration of that which we have now proven theoretically, and they will have most indubitable evidence that my figures are correct. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) endeavored to show the other day that they were not correct, but when I spoke next, I was able to prove that his calculation did not affect their correctness. More than that, the line of calculation which he adopted, when carried to its logical conclusion, established the correctness of my figures. I take it, therefore, that it is the admitted opinion of the House, since my figures have not been disproved, that the consequences which I pointed out will follow in the Province of Ontario. Therefore, I feel that, as one of the representatives of that Province, I should be grossly failing in my duty, I should be committing high treason to the Province, if I did not vote and speak, and do all in my power, to prevent the passage of a measure which will disfranchise nearly one in three of the electors of that Province. When I have the alternative before me of the disfranchising Bill proposed by this Government and a system of universal suffrage—which may not be, in itself, desirable, which may not be theoretically the most perfect system of representation for the people of Canada—I should be committing high treason to my Province if I did not accept that alternative which was the most liberal. Practically, Mr. Mowat's Act does give what is very near universal suffrage; it is only one step from that Bill to universal suffrage. But even supposing this proposal would admit a class of voters inferior to those now admitted by the provincial Act, I would sooner take the step to extend the franchise than to restrict the franchise; and I believe that every single voter, Reformer or Conservative, in my constituency would endorse me in that action. I believe that every single voter in the constituencies of hon. gentlemen opposite will feel, that in supporting this disfranchising proposal, their representatives have taken a step backwards, that they have taken a step entirely contrary to the genius of people of Ontario. I may be told that Mr. Mowat refused to give universal franchise at the last Session of the Local Legislature. Well, Sir, in the first place, I have never claimed that the people of Ontario preferred universal suffrage to the one they now possess; I think they have shown through their representatives that they prefer the system they now enjoy. But I say we have refused to allow them to continue that system, and we have now the choice of giving them either a vastly more restricted franchise, or a slightly more extended one. I have not the slightest doubt in the world, that the people of Ontario would infinitely prefer to have universal suffrage rather than the enormously restricted franchise which it is intended to impose upon them by the usurped power of this House. Now, Sir, there are reasons why universal suffrage might be more objectionable for the Local House than for the Dominion House, why it might be advisable to have universal suffrage here, while it would not be advisable to have it for our provincial Assembly. We all know that the Provincial Assemblies deal with property and civil rights, and there is some reason in contending that no man who is not an owner of property should be represented in an Assembly which deals with the tenure or transfer of property, and which can in the last extremity tax property. The Local Legislatures have power to levy a tax upon every man's farm or other property. They are, to that extent, in the position of a municipal council, and nobody imagines it would be fair to give universal suffrage at municipal elections, or that it would be fair and just to allow a man having no property to impose taxes upon the belongings of his neighbor who has property. It has been felt by many that in a Legislature which controls the tenure of property, and which might, in the last resort, impose a tax upon property, it would not be fair to allow a man with no property to be represented; and, therefore, Mr. Mowat's Bill, although going to the very furthest extent of admitting everybody who owns property, or had any income or any direct interest in property that might be assessable for municipal or provincial purposes, stopped short of giving the franchise to people who had no property or no interest in property. We have nothing to do here with the tenure or transfer of property, except in those territories directly under our control, and which, in a short time, will be organised as Provinces, and have a chance of establishing their own franchise. What we have to deal with is indirect taxation, and the responsibilities of a citizen to the State. While there is danger in the application of universal suffrage to provincial or municipal elections, such does not apply in the case of Dominion elections. The feeling against universal suffrage

among Conservatives has largely arisen from its abuse in American municipalities, and that argument has some force. Municipal government in New York city is considered to be a hotbed of corruption, and this is justly held to be largely due to the system of universal suffrage. Penniless voters maintain certain officials in power in order that they may obtain employment from them. No such results could follow the application of universal suffrage to Dominion elections. We need have no fear that the penniless class, if there be any such—say rather the more dependent working class—will ever control Dominion affairs. This is a question we can fairly consider without party bias. As a party I do not believe we would be better off for the enfranchisement of every individual voter than we would be under a high property qualification, as Liberals are equally well-to-do with Conservatives. Apart from considerations of party interests, or of how it will affect my own election, I support the amendment in favor of universal suffrage.

An hon. MEMBER. Do not be too venturesome.

Mr. CASEY. Such a remark should not come from any member on the opposite side of the House, when the Government is afraid to consult the people. If there is any conduct that could more properly be termed out of this House by the name cowardly, I do not know such conduct. Let the Government at least have the courage of their convictions; let them go to the people at the polls, or declare that this Bill shall not come into force until after the next general election. The truth is that hon. gentlemen opposite know that the majority of the people are against them on this Bill, and they simply dare not go to the polls before it becomes law.

Mr. BURPEE. I am a little embarrassed with the amendment. I scarcely understand the position we occupy, or the position of the mover of the amendment. The amendment proposes universal suffrage, and it proposes a Dominion franchise of universal suffrage. I am opposed to a Dominion franchise in any shape. I do not believe it was intended when we inaugurated this Confederation. I believe, Sir, in a federal union, and that each Province should fix the franchise for the election of its own members. For that reason I can scarcely go as far as the hon. member for Northumberland, who proposes a Dominion franchise, and, besides, he is somewhat mixed himself with reference to this franchise. It is true that in the paper for which he is responsible, he denounced this Bill in the strongest language, and called upon the leader of the Government in almost peremptory language to withdraw it, and yet he voted for the second reading and swallowed it by wholesale. Now, this appears to me to be inconsistent, and I hardly feel like submitting myself to his lead, as I hardly know where he will land me. The fact is that if I were to accept his amendment it would only be as a choice between two evils, as I think I should prefer his proposition rather than the proposition of the Bill, though I have not quite made up my mind that universal suffrage is the best for this country. I think it is preferable, because it would minimise the evil consequences which might arise from the appointment of partisan revising officers, because they would not have the same chance of manipulating the lists in the interest of one party. I know it is said that if judges were appointed there would be very little risk of their doing injustice, but at the same time, many of them were politicians before they were appointed, and when it came to deciding whether a piece of land or other property should be valued above or below $150, as these officers would necessarily be chosen from the legal fraternity, they would not be very familiar with the value of property in the country, and they might be led more or less by their political friends in the constituency. It is quite possible that instead of taking the assessor's list they might take a list made up by a candidate who is running an election, and thereby put on or off what names they think proper. In that respect I think the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland is an improvement on the Bill. If the Dominion Government adopts a franchise of its own and appoints officers of its own—partisan officers, who should do injustice to one party or the other in making up their lists—and if the Dominion Government held an election under those lists, and it could be shown to the country that injustice had been done to the party which controls the Local Government, it will be a temptation to the Local Governments in the several Provinces who are opposed politically to the Dominion Government to retaliate by framing an election law that will work to the disadvantage of the Dominion Government; and in that way very serious friction between the Provincial and Dominion Governments will be the outcome of this system of party revising barristers, which may work disaster to this Confederation. I think this view of the case should not be entirely lost sight of. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee. I only rose to explain why I shall vote for the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland; it is only because it is preferable to the Bill introduced by the Government, and that it will minify one at least of the evils which I apprehend from the revising barrister clause; and I hope it will be carried, although I gather from the few remarks the hon. gentleman made on introducing it that he had not very much hope of succeeding. I think, however, that he has struck the right chord, If we are to have a Dominion franchise at all, it is the only uniform Dominion franchise we can have; and I think sooner or later it will be adopted. We may have one election under this Bill, and great evils may arise out of it; but they will excite the indignation of the people to such an extent that they will never be satisfied until a Dominion franchise is instituted upon the basis of the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot allow the remarks of my hon. friend from Sunbury, to pass without notice, inasmuch as they reflect upon my consistency, in the course I have pursued on this Bill. Now, I value the hon. gentleman's good opinion; I have sat in Parliament with him for over twenty years; I have always found him an advocate of liberal views and ideas; I had the honor to be supported by him for many years while I was in the Cabinet of the Province from which we both come, and I do not like the hon. gentleman to make the remarks he has done, in relation to my course on this Bill. Now, I beg to tell the hon. gentleman. and I appeal to the testimony of hon. members, that I am consistent on this Bill. The hon. gentleman says I am inconsistent, because I supported the second reading of this Bill. I made, I think, the third speech that was made on the Bill, and in that speech I indicated the course I would pursue. I stated that there were several issues raised by the introduction of the Bill, and that the greatest one was whether this Parliament should decide for itself who should have the power to elect members to sit in this Parliament, and who should dictate the terms on which they should sit here. That was the vital principle of the Bill; and at the very earliest stage in the debate, which has now lasted for three weeks, I took the position that this Parliament alone should dictate who should, and who should not vote for members to sit in this Parliament. Am I inconsistent because I supported the principle of the Bill and opposed its details? Did I not, at that time, say that I was opposed to the details of the Bill? Did I not point out in general terms why I was opposed to the details, and state that when we came to the particular clauses I would state in what respect I was opposed to them, and why? Then, why should the hon. gentleman, who has known me so long, and known me not to wear two faces under one hat, charge me with inconsistency, or with not having spoken in frank and

candid terms in relation to the course I intended to pursue with regard to this Bill. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House whether I have not been frank and candid in every position I have taken in this matter; and why the hon. member for Sunbury should arraign me before this committee at this time and charge me with inconsistency, I cannot imagine. I am in favor first and above all of the principle of this Bill, that this Parliament should dictate who should sit in this House; but I am opposed to the details of the Bill and I have submitted an amendment, and notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman charges me with inconsistency, he winds up by saying he is going to support my amendment as the lesser of two evils. I am glad the hon. gentleman has taken that position, and I only rose to vindicate the consistency of the course I have pursued. I am against the details of the provisions of this Bill, and I believe that the amendment I have proposed will give practically manhood suffrage, still, I am not tied to it, and, for the sake of harmony, am willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I want to see manhood suffrage throughout the country, and if we can get it, either by amendment or by the suggestion of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., it is not material which of the two is adopted, provided one of them be carried. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Burpee), in justice to me, ought to withdraw the implied censure he has cast upon me by the imputation that I have been inconsistent with my course in regard to this Bill.

Mr. BURPEE. I have no idea of casting any imputation on the hon. gentleman, but I could not understand that, while he is in favor of universal suffrage he should vote for a Bill which is founded on property qualification. The principle of the Bill is property qualification, the principle of his amendment is universal suffrage, the one in direct opposition to the other. I am glad the hon. gentleman has explained his position, because I found it difficult to understand how he could vote for the principle of the Bill and then propose his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. The principle of the Bill is not property qualification alone. There are several features in it, but the main principle is, whether this Parliament of Canada should itself decide who will have the right to elect members to sit in it. That is the main principle, and that principle I support. The other principle, that of property qualification, I have opposed from the first, and the resolution I have submitted gives effect to my opposition. My hon. friend is, therefore, a little mixed when he charges me with inconsistency.

Mr. WILSON. Before this amendment is disposed of, I wish to place on record the views I entertain in reference to it, and I may here say, in passing, that I am very much pleased indeed to have heard the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) deny, as he had a perfect right to do, any insinuation that he was in any way acting inconsistently in moving this amendment. I agree with him that he is consistent; he has from the very outset declared his intention to move an amendment at the earliest opportunity. I, therefore, fully agree with him in reference to the course he has taken in that respect, but I cannot agree with him that the question is whether this Parliament has or has not the right to legislate in this matter. We, on this side, have not pretended to deny that the Dominion of Canada has the right to legislate in this direction, but we questioned the expediency of so doing; we questioned whether it was necessary, whether the Dominion of Canada had suffered sufficient abuses to require that it should take into its own hands this legislation at the present time. Therefore, I do not think that the hon. gentleman is quite correct in stating that the question involved was whether there should or should not be a Dominion franchise; but I am strongly of opinion that if we take into consideration all the facts, whatever slight objection, or whatever grounds of hesitation there may be in supporting manhood suffrage, these objections will be removed on account of the greater importance, under existing circumstances, of accepting manhood suffrage in preference to this Dominion Bill. We know very well that if we accept the Bill in its entirety, as it has been presented to this House by the Government, it will entail a very large expenditure, and that if we accept the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), there will be no expenditure. That of itself is, to my mind, sufficient reason why we should regard the amendment with favor. I was also pleased to hear the hon. gentleman say that he was opposed to the details of the Bill. True, this is not the proper time to discuss them, but no doubt, being true to his word, when we come to the details of the Bill, we will find that hon. gentleman working cordially with the hon. members on this side, and by means of the united efforts of the two parties, the Independent party and the Opposition, we may be able to make the proposed Bill a passable measure; and I have no doubt the Government will be grateful to the hon. gentleman, because they need assistance to make this Bill even acceptable to the general public, to which it is at present very objectionable. The question of manhood suffrage is perhaps, of all the questions that have been discussed in this House, the most important one. We are perfectly well aware that, unless other circumstances were favorable, the introduction of manhood suffrage into the politics of this country would be a dangerous step. We find that it is absolutely necessary there should be something to accompany the right of every man to vote, and I contend it would be a dangerous principle to grant manhood suffrage unless we had accompanying it an almost universal education. Now, the question that naturally arises is, whether we are sufficiently advanced in the Dominion to grant manhood suffrage, so that every man would have a right, in common with his fellow men, in saying what form of government should prevail. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that perpaps there is no country under the sun where more general educational facilities are afforded than in Canada. The school system of Ontario is not only admired by the old world but by our American cousins; our school system is such that it offers facilities to every individual who will take advantage of them for education; I believe that if a comparison were made our people would compare favorably in this respect with the people on the other side of the line; I believe our educational institutions to-day are equal to the educational institutions in the United States. The United States have had experience as to the working of manhood suffrage under a liberal system of education, and if they have found that it has been a success why should we have anything to fear here? I believe that you may go to any Province of the Dominion, and you will find there a school system so extensive that no one may be deprived of a liberal education, that no one need be deprived of becoming sufficiently intelligent to be able to go to the polls and cast his vote intelligently. That being the case, and I do not think anyone doubts it, I think that even those who are opposed to the principle now before the Committee will hesitate to say that our people are not sufficiently educated to exercise the franchise. We know that there may be some cases, we know that there are some who do not take advantage of the educational facilities offered them, who are unable, perhaps, to read or write, and to whom all ordinary rules of arithmetic are unknown, and thus we might say that if we are to make a national standard of education, as to the right of exercising the franchise, some would be debarred. We ought to adopt whatever means we can to educate the people and induce them to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the country. It was given as a reason why we should not extend the franchise to women that they did

not take an interest in political affairs, but, if you withhold the franchise from any number of the citizens, you withhold a powerful stimulant to induce them to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the country. Is it not the duty of a Government to try to educate the public upon political questions? If those on the other side are so well satisfied as to the manner in which they have been conducting the affairs of the country, why should they adopt this means of withholding from the electorate the political knowledge they ought to have? If you go in the direction of the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), you will go a long way to induce the people to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the country. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) last evening said we should try to approach as near as practicable to the views expressed by the Local Legislatures. It is true that the Ontario Legislature have refused to adopt manhood suffrage, but they have virtually adopted it, for they have given a vote to a wage-earner who may receive $100 a year as wages, which, with his board, will amount to $250. If my hon. friend from Cardwell is sincere, why should he record his vote against the adoption of the provincial franchise of Ontario? The time has passed for it to be claimed that property is the basis of the vote. We believe that a man with ordinary intelligence should be entitled to vote. What right have we to disfranchise any of those who are compelled to observe the laws enacted here and to pay 25, 30 or 50 per cent. taxes upon the articles they are compelled to consume and not have the vote? It is a vicious principle to disfranchise these people. I say that every man who is compelled to pay, has a right to say what shall be done with his money; every man who is called upon to perform military service has a right to say how and why he was callled upon to perform that service. I say if we adopt the principle now before the House, you adopt a principle founded upon no logical fact. You say that a man who is assessed in a city for $300 has a right to vote as the owner of the property, and you say that the man who is a tenant of that property can also have a right to vote. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what right has a tenant, if you regard property as the basis of the franchise, to record his vote? You thereby give up the principle of property being the basis of the franchise, and the only reasonable conclusion is that we should go still further and place the vote in the hands of every intelligent person who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a resident. There are other strong reasons why we should extend the franchise in the manner I have mentioned here. We know that all trusts placed in the hands of the powers that be, are given them to use for the benefit of the people. That being the case, every individual has a right to enquire whether that trust is properly or improperly used, and of saying in what manner that trust shall be used. I am well aware that there are strong arguments against the doctrine of manhood suffrage, but I think that the objections to it are counterbalanced by the benefits that would accrue to society, if we are going to enact a Franchise Bill at all. I believe it would be much better to allow each Province to control the franchise, because we know that in many Provinces the people are opposed to manhood suffrage, while in others they may desire to have manhood suffrage. I believe that sooner or later manhood suffrage will be the law of this land. We know that in the Province of Ontario, the Conservative leader in the Legislative Assembly has given it as his opinion that the franchise should be extended to every male subject 21 years of age, and if that opinion be shared by the Conservative party of Ontario, it will only be a matter of time when they will come down to this House and insist upon extending the franchise so as to make it practically universal. That is, indeed, the tendency all over the world. We find that the leading minds of the day, who have considered the matter in all its bearings upon society, agree in saying that the time has arrived, that intelligence has become sufficiently general, when it is advisable to give a vote to every individual who can exercise it in an intelligent manner. Now, we know well that there is a very large class of men whom we do not reach by our present franchise. Every hon. member in this House will admit that when he is canvassing, he does not pay the same amount of attention to a man who has no vote as he does to the man who has a vote. Go to any constituency, and the first question that arises with the candidate is: Has that man a vote? If that man has not a vote he is treated with apparent indifference; if he has a vote you court him, you take opportunities of meeting him and of conversing with him on the political topics of the day. Now I ask if it is right or just that we should treat in this manner a man who happens, for the time being, not to possess the franchise? If certain duties are imposed upon a portion of the population, those individuals should have a voice in the elections. This House has no right to pass legislation that will disfranchise a large number of electors. This will specially apply to school teachers, who certainly have an equal right to vote with occupiers of houses at a rental of $2 a month. This House should consider whether the time has not arrived, in view of the intelligence of the people and the educational facilities possessed in this country, to adopt manhood suffrage. All human beings should be placed upon the plane of equality. It is not right that because a man possesses a considerable amount of money he should have special weight in public affairs, or because a man possesses a large amount of property he should possess additional influence in the selection of the people's representatives. The principle of property qualification is not a correct one. If we are to have a Dominion franchise, and if we cannot retain the Ontario franchise, I prefer manhood or universal suffrage, to the franchise contained in the Bill now before the committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. This motion, which is proposed by an hon. member not connected with the Opposition side of the House, is a very important one and should be fully discussed. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will take the opportunity of expressing their views on this subject. I hope the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) will do so, and that we will also find him recording his vote in favor of this progressive movement. On a former occasion, he expressed his views very strongly in favor of a provincial franchise, and although he has now chosen to change his views, he may find it convenient to change them back again and adopt the views of this resolution. This important question has been discussed in every Parliament on this continent, as well as in Great Britain at great length It has been before the Home Government for many years, as questions of this kind often take a great many years before the public realise their importance, and before they become law. In the old country, we know that they have been making great advances in this subject, and I believe they will continue to make progress. Now that the question of manhood suffrage has come before us, it is well that the people of this Dominion should know what are the views of the members of this House on this question, and I hope that before the discussion has closed, hon. gentlemen opposite will have the manliness to get up and express their views upon it, and say whether they are in favor of extending the franchise or restricting it. I look upon the present Bill as rather a restrictive measure, and although perhaps there may be something in connection with manhood suffrage that we are not all prepared to see adopted, I freely confess that I would be prepared to vote for manhood suffrage rather than the Bill now before the House, and for two reasons. I would do so in the first place because I believe that every man living in this Dominion, who is a taxpayer, ought to have a vote, and I

contend that every man living, whether he be a laborer, a mechanic, or belongs to any other class, that in any way contributes to the revenues of the country is a taxpayer, and has a right to be represented on the floor of this House. Why, as far back as 1291, Edward the First laid down as a maxim that that which touches all should be approved of by all, that every man who is the subject of taxation should be permitted to express his views as to how those taxes shall be extracted from him. It is absurd to say that a man who is the owner of $150 worth of real estate is entitled to be represented, while a man who is the owner of only $100 worth should not be represented. If you admit that it is the man who is to be represented and not the property, why hold to the property qualifications? I admit that in municipal organisations it is necessary that property should be represented, for the purposes of municipal taxation, as for instance, with regard to by-laws for the creation of debt, as to which only those who would be responsible for a portion of that debt, as the owners of property should have a vote. I hold, however, that when you come to the election of members of this House the franchise should be wider than in the case either of municipalities or Provinces. I hold, for instance, that we should have a more extensive franchise here than we have in Ontario, because in the Provincial Legislature the measures are largely confined to municipal Acts, and Acts relating to the holders of property, while here we deal with the rates of duties on imports, and other matters of that kind, and every consumer is subject to the operation of our laws. I hold that the poor man who wears a common cotton shirt, or a pair of Derry pants as he has to pay a certain amount of taxation, has a right to be represented. It is not money which is represented, for if it were we would have a plurality of votes, and the man who owned $100,000 worth of property would have more votes than the man having $1,000. If, then, it is the individual who is represented there should be no restriction, and so long as a man is a resident, and is registered, and so long as he is a naturalised or a natural born subject, he should have a vote. In the second place I prefer manhood suffrage to the provisions of this Bill, because it would be more cheaply operated. The First Minister yesterday gave us an expression of his views with regard to the cost, and he said it would be merely trifling; and that it could be very likely performed by adding a small sum to the present salaries of the judges. I do not know what the judges may be disposed to accept; but I may say that I was pleased to learn that it is the intention of the First Minister to appoint judges, for I believe there will be more satisfaction in the appointment of judges, than there possibly could be in the appointment of revising barristers. I believe that, on the whole, the county judges will perform their duties with credit to themselves; because, from the position of a county judge, he tries to cultivate the respect and esteem in which he should be held, as one occupying a high official position, and consequently he will be more chary of doing anything which would reflect upon himself, than the revising barrister would be. I contend, at the same time, as I have contended on every opportunity heretofore, that there is no necessity for placing such enormous powers in the hands of one man, whether he is a judge or not. I say that no one person should have the right to exercise such an arbitrary power as will be placed in the hands of these officers. I say, notwithstanding the statement of the First Minister, I believe the cost to the country will be a considerable sum. I have before expressed the opinion that it would amount to $400,000. It may possibly be done for less. Supposing the revising barrister only got $400—and I do not think any judge could be found disposed to perform the duties of the position even for that sum—he has to have a clerk, who will perhaps cost $400 more; a constable will require to be paid $200 or $250; and printing will cost about $150 a constituency. I certainly hope the cost will be less, but we have a right to express our fear that instead of being less it may possibly be more. If these estimates are correct, the cost of this Bill in the first year will be $253,000, and for the Parliament, $1,266,000. If this Bill is going to impose on the people of the country any such burden as that, it is wise and prudent on our part to consider whether it should become law. There has been a great deal of discussion about the indebtedness of this Dominion, and conflicting statements have been made as to what it amounts to per capita. I think it can fairly be estimated that the debt of this Dominion is equal to, if not in excess of, the debt per capita of the United States.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself to the amendment and to the particular clause before the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am trying to do so; but if I am not even to draw an inference as to the question of cost, and must confine myself strictly to the words of the amendment, I will do it. But I do not think it will tend to advance matters by being too strict. Now, I simply say I think it we should consider whether it is wise in the interests of our people to incur that additional expense. If the people of this Dominion had the opportunity to cast a ballot for or against this law, I believe they would oppose it on the ground of expense. Consequently of two evils I am willing to choose the less, and therefore the motion for manhood suffrage is decidedly preferable to the Bill. I believe there is nothing to be risked in granting to the laboring classes of this Dominion the privilege of voting. The experience of England during the last twenty or thirty years teaches that that class regard the franchise as a trust and wisely exercise it. I do not think there is any evidence in the civilised world to show that once men are clothed with the right of recording their votes, that right has been abused. The progress of our country is largely due to the poorer classes who have built our railways and canals, cleared our forests, and turned our uncultivated country into a fertile field. The more of that class of men we have in our country the better, and after they come here, we should confer upon them the right to record their votes, as is done in the United States. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said that from the progress made in the past on this question, we must look forward to the time when we shall have to introduce manhood suffrage. In the face of that statement, I ask if it would not be wise, in inaugurating a new system, that we should go slowly and carefully. We should consider in the first place the state of the franchises in the different Provinces; we know that there are two Provinces, in which manhood suffrage is now in force, and which have elected their representatives to this House on that basis; and we should think seriously before we disfranchise a portion of the inhabitants of those Provinces by this Bill. If we do, from year to year, Bills will be introduced to extend the franchise, and eventually we shall have to adopt manhood suffrage; and would it not be better for us to take in the entire population at once and avoid the cost it is now proposed to incur? Now, take the basis upon which we sit here as the people's representatives. There is no qualification attached to a member of Parliament; we may not even be taxpayers; we may not even be enrolled as paying a poll tax; there is no evidence require that we are the holders of property, that we have any personal property, or that we are directly or indirectly interested in the State at all. When such is the fact with regard to ourselves, on what principle, should we be disposed to deny to the people the same rights. Some years ago an Act was passed by this House doing away with all qualifications of members; the people sanctioned that Act; they raised no objection to it; and any

man, aged 21, who is a British subject, can occupy a seat in this House without any property qualification at all, or any evidence that he has paid his taxes. It is nothing but fair, then, that we should consider the question whether it would be wise to extend the same privileges to the people as regards the right to vote, and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will give expression to their views upon that point. Now, the First Minister said something with regard to the assessment rolls, and he assumed that the revising officers would be supposed to accept those rolls as the basis on which he would prepare their lists. I must say that if the revising officer were absolutely committed to the acceptance of the rolls made out for municipal purposes, it would be an amendment to this Bill in the right direction. I am sorry to say, however, he is not compelled to do so. He merely takes them as a guide in forming an opinion with regard to the value of property, and if he comes to the conclusion that on the whole the roll is such that he can endorse it, he is supposed to accept it. But it is not absolutely binding on him to accept that roll.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question before the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall try to confine myself to manhood suffrage. It appears that any reference or attempt at a reference to any other point is not to be permitted. I must say that I believe it is in the interest of the people that the utmost latitude should be granted their representatives in the discussion of this question. However, Sir, if you decide that we must confine ourselves closely to the question of manhood suffrage, I will do so, but I think an opportunity should be at least allowed to draw inferences from facts connected with the Bill under discussion, and to show why we consider it would be prudent to accept manhood suffrage in preference to it. We are discussing manhood suffrage as compared to the suffrage in the Bill before the House. The hon. gentleman who moved the amendment said his reason for moving it was that while he accepted some principles of the Bill, he was opposed to others, and as an alternative he would prefer manhood suffrage to the Bill itself. I think, therefore, we should be allowed to discuss the amendment from that standpoint, and it is that I have been endeavoring to do. However, if I am to be limited, I will confine myself to the question of manhood suffrage. I say it is the duty of every man, whether he be rich or poor, whether he has the privilege of sitting in this House or not, to advocate those principles which extend to every man British liberty, British fair play, and British rights. I hold that every man in the country who pays taxes, who contributes to the progress of the country, whether as a producer in the factory, or the humble laborer, or in any other capacity, should have a voice in the direction of its affairs. By granting the franchise to the poorer classes, you will give them a deeper interest in the affairs of the Dominion, you will give them a desire to become educated on the political issues of the day, and they will become more fitted to exercise intelligently the duties of citizenship. In England, when important changes in the laws of the state are proposed, when any great question arises, whether of home or foreign policy, the people assemble together in mass meetings and give expression to their views, the poorer classes as well as the richer; and this is one of the results which naturally flows from the extension of the franchise. Were we to include in the franchise all the people of this Dominion that could be reasonably expected to be included under the amendment before the Chair, it would tend largely to give them that interest in the country which would be the means of inducing them to take a very decided interest in public questions. Every man in this Dominion is liable to be called on at any time to bear arms in defence of this country; among our volunteers in the North-West there are many no doubt who have not the franchise, but who are just as zealous and honest in the defense of their country as those who have, and no doubt also among them, fighting side by side, are the poor men and the sons and heirs of millionaires. I can see no reason why, when all feel an equally strong interest in the country's welfare, all should not have the right to vote; we know that love of country is not confined to people of independent means; we know that people from the old country, who have probably been driven from their homes by stress of circumstances, oft in memory revert with affection to the hills and meadows of their native land, and we know that in this country the poor cotter who struggles hardily for an existence by the hill side, feels as much pleasure in his humble cot and as much pride and love for his country as the man who lives in a costly residence and has all the comforts that wealth can provide at his command. We make laws here for the poor as well as the rich, every man is amenable to the laws, and it is only right that he should have a voice in the making of those laws. Every man who contributes to the taxation should have a say in the election of members who impose that taxation. If any class suffers by the taxation, it is the poor class.

Mr. McCALLUM. What about the poor Indian?

Mr. McMULLEN. I believe the Indians do not pay taxes.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, they do.

Mr. McMULLEN. They may, in some cases, but I believe not as a rule. The poor man, who contributes to the revenue in a small way, has a right to say in what way he would be represented in this House. It is our duty to look after the interest of the poor as well as the rich, and a law based upon a property qualification is an unjust law. In every Franchise Bill in England, the property qualification has been reduced, and that shows that any franchise based upon property is liable to change, while, if the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland is adopted, we shall save the cost involved in this measure and the necessity of change. This is one of the most important questions involved in this Bill. I admit that the question of the revising barrister is one of the most serious points, but, on the other hand, this is one of the important points. The statement that manhood suffrage is a question to which we will have to look forward and deal with at no distant day, comes from a gentleman of extended parliamentary experience, who is looking forward to become a Cabinet Minister, and we must expect, from the drift of things across the Atlantic, that in a few years this must be adopted. Should we not begin to educate the people of this country on this point? There are a great many in Canada who do not understand what manhood suffrage means, a large percentage of the people do not know what it means. Should we not, then, give full expression to our views on this question in order to educate the people of this country as to what it does mean? I hope that before we have manhood suffrage rushed upon us, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has announced, may possibly be the case, the people will have an opportunity of discussing it, and that no Government, no matter which party may be in power, will bring in a Bill of that important character without first appealing to the electors, and ascertaining whether they are prepared to endorse that measure. Now, Sir, I am glad to be able to fall into line with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in his proposal for what is, practically, a manhood suffrage. I am sorry that in connection with some other measures that he has brought before the House, I have not been able to fall into line with him, but on this particular question, I am glad to be able to say that I fully

endorse his amendment, and prefer it to the Bill that is now before the House. Now, while we are discussing this question of manhood suffrage, I think we should discuss it from a taxation point of view. We have had several arguments presented to the House to show the amount of taxes levied upon the people of this country, and it has been shown that the Customs duties for the year amount to something like $4.45 a head. No doubt there are some who do not pay $4.45, but there are others who pay three times that amount. Now, every man who contributes to the support of the Government has a fair claim to be allowed to exercise the franchise, and I hold that is one of the strongest arguments that can be adduced in favor of universal suffrage. I think that it is wise and prudent and just that a man who pays taxes should have the franchise—I care not if it is only 10 cents a year. The widow who contributed her two mites was just as much appreciated when she cast them into the treasury, as would be the man who cast in his £10; and in that view of the case, we ought just as much to consider the interest of the poor man who contributes his two mites as that of the rich man who contributes his £10. I hope, with the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that the time is not far distant when we shall be able to take this matter up and deal with it satisfactorily. It would be well for us, perhaps, to have universal suffrage now, while the country is new, than later on when the population becomes dense. Take into consideration the North-West, for instance. Along the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway there are a large number of trackmen who will, no doubt, erect their houses along the line. We know that the land along the line is exempt from taxes for twenty years, and there will be no assessment of property for taxation not even for municipal purposes. There will, therefore, be no means of ascertaining what number of those men should be put on the roll so as to have the right to vote. I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite have not discussed this question individually and that the duty has devolved on hon. members on this side of the House. It is too early in the Session to begin to offer interruptions because a large amount of business remains to be done. I congratulate the Chairman on the evident desire he has manifested to maintain order throughout this discussion. I admit he has done so to the best of his ability. We have been occupied during three weeks in endeavoring to make converts of hon. gentlemen opposite and I regret, so far, with little effect. We are not, however, discouraged, and we are still prepared to remain here and do our duty to the country. Before this discussion closes I think hon. gentlemen opposite will be compelled to admit that within a very few years manhood suffrage must be adopted in this Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. The great majority of members who have sat here during former Parliaments must have come to the conclusion that we have had far too much legislation. It is the fault of our country at the present time. Legislation is scarcely considered: measures are suggested by some clerk in a Department to a Minister; they are prepared by the law clerk, submitted to the House at the close of the Session and passed into law. This has been a very serious evil. Looking at what has transpired during the present Session, I think we are making a new departure, and that in the future the utmost care and attention will be given to measures, and consequently we shall have fewer measures, but less objectionable measures from this time forth. The time we have given, Sir, to the consideration of this question is not longer than is usually given to the considerations of this sort in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The First Minister, during the visit he recently made to England, addressed a public assembly in that country, and he told them that one great distinction between the party which he represented and the party which sits on this side of the House was this: That those who followed him, while not perhaps identical in their views with either the Conservative party or the Reform party of England, agree with both parties in this: That they undertook to make the Parliament of England and its proceedings the model of its procedure here. Now, Sir, I do not think that was a fair or a candid representation. I think it was an atrociously unjust statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would call to the recollection of the hon. gentleman that the question before the committee is the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, to sub-section two, of clause three, and as far as I can gather from his present remarks they are not relevant to the subject.

Mr. MILLS. It is not my intention to travel outside the record, and I think I will show you the perfect relevancy of my observations. As I was pointing out the hon. gentleman made this statement. I am now pointing out to you that we, on this side, are adopting the view which he says prevailed in England, with reference to this very Bill, in our discussion of this measure, and the care and attention we give to this subject. We propose to examine it with the minute care and impartiality which an important measure of this sort deserves at our hands. Sir, there is no doubt that we are obliged to enter into this discussion more minutely because this Bill and this very clause propose to enfranchise a class of people who have not hitherto been enfranchised, and to disfranchise a large number of people who have enjoyed the franchise for a long time, and this is being done contrary to that practice which the hon gentleman says he implicitly respects, by dealing with the question without the sanction of the electorate of his country. The hon. member for Cardwell, yesterday, stated that he was not going to support the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland because he saw that in the Province of Ontario the opinion of the country had been taken by the Local Legislature, and that the Local Legislature had not gone so far as the hon. gentleman's own motion goes. The hon. gentleman says that he will not go in favor of manhood suffrage, he will not support that proposition, because he wishes to respect public opinion in the Province of Ontario, and yet while he is ready to accept that public opinion for the purpose of voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, he will not accept it for the purpose of sustaining the very motion to which he appealed. Now, I say that it is impossible for any hon. gentleman to take a more illogical position upon any question than that which the hon. member for Cardwell has taken upon this question. The franchise of manhood suffrage in the neighboring Republic has been referred to. It has been spoken of as prevailing there for more than a century. Well, it has prevailed for a long time, and so far as I remember there is not a State in the American Union where at this moment the franchise is based upon property. There are some States where parties are required to pay a capitation tax, and in Massachusetts they are required to be able to read the constitution. Now, the Province of British Columbia has manhood suffrage, and at the other extremity of the Dominion the Province of Prince Edward Island has manhood suffrage.

Mr. McCALLUM. What about the city of Toronto?

Mr. MILLS. That is beside the question. In both those Provinces the principle of manhood suffrage is in operation. In the Province of Prince Edward Island it has been in operation for thirty years, according to the hon. member for Queen's. Has it produced any mischievous results? Has it led to corruption in the Government, or to putting in charge of public affairs or returning to this Parliament, men disqualified to sit here and act as legislators? Will the hon. member for Monck who interrupts me——

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not interrupt you; I asked you a question—how the city of Toronto stood under the Mowat franchise? According to the Act of the Local Legislature——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman had better not interrupt the speaker.

Mr. McCALLUM. If he allows me, Mr. Chairman, I think I have the right.

Mr. MILLS. Let him go on.

Mr. McCALLUM. As the hon. gentleman allows me I will go on. I ask him what position would the city of Toronto stand in to-day, under that beautiful Franchise Bill of the Local Government. The city of Toronto sends to this House three members, but I understand that by that Bill the electors in the city of Toronto can only vote for two, so that one-third of them are deprived of representation in that Bill; and that is what the hon. gentleman wants us to accept in place of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposes that I shall make a speech for him. I am perfectly willing that he shall, without interruption on my part, state his views on the Ontario measure; but I am here to state my own views with regard to this measure and the amendment. I was calling attention to the fact that Prince Edward Island has returned six members to this House under manhood suffrage. I ask the hon. gentleman who objects to the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland, whether he thinks these hon. gentlemen are less qualified by education, by standing, by intellectual capacity, or by culture than any other hon. members to sit in this House. The hon. gentleman may think that Prince Edward Island has returned men so ill qualified to sit in this House that he is anxious to disfranchise a large number of the inhabitants of that island. I do not take that view; I believe manhood suffrage has worked satisfactorily in Prince Edward Island; and the proposition of the hon. gentleman who has moved this Bill is, to take the right to vote from 125,000 people of this country, who now enjoy the electoral franchise. Besides these, there are a large number of people in the various Provinces, who are, in my opinion, qualified to exercise the franchise, who are not enfranchised by the Bill; but would be under the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland. The principle of manhood suffrage has prevailed in almost every State of the American Union for more than half a century, and when we consider the very large extent of foreign population which has poured into the American Republic, I think we might safely adopt that principle here without injury to the state. There are many reasons why we should adopt it. In the first place, the hon. gentleman proposes to take into his hands the appointment of revising officers, and to give them the power not only to revise the lists, but to prepare the original lists; and that provision affords such great facilities for fraud and partisanship, for doing more than justice to one party and less than justice to another. That in my opinion if we were running much greater risks than we should be by adopting manhood suffrage—the importance of getting rid of so serious an evil as that which the hon. gentleman proposes to inflict upon us, would be sufficient to justify us in taking all the risks, and more, that are presented in the motion for manhood suffrage. Under that principle there would not be the same opportunity for partisanship. All the revising officers could enquire into would be whether a person was a natural born or naturalised British subject, whether he was 21 years of age, and whether he had resided 12 months before the application was made within the constituency or the municipality where he desired to vote. That would be an easy matter; there would be no room for the exercise of discretion; the questions would be simple and plain, and the answers to them yes or no; and, no matter how biassed the officer might be, he could not do an act of injustice to one party more than to the other. I say, then, that it is the action of the hon. First Minister himself that makes it, apart from the merits of the question, a matter of immense consequence that we should adopt the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland rather than the proposition embraced in this third section. What is the theory on which the hon. gentleman starts out in proposing this measure? It is that there should be a uniform franchise for the Dominion which it would not be in the power of the Local Legislature to alter in any way; yet the hon. gentleman has not consistently carried out this provision. The third clause relates to cities and towns. Yet what is a city or town? It is what the Local Legislature chooses to make. For instance the town of Bothwell, which contained a large population during the oil boom, at the present time with 1,000 inhabitants, will have a more restricted franchise than the village of Wallaceburg with 2,000 inhabitants. That is an anomaly. I remember calling the hon. gentleman's attention to this provision thirteen years ago, when he introduced a Franchise Bill; and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has given many instances from the census returns of 1881, in which the population of villages was two or three times as great as the population of towns. Now, whether a municipality is called a town or a village depends not on the action of this Government but on the action of the Local Parliament; and the hon. gentleman in undertaking to deal with municipalities as such, and designating them by the class to which they belong, is himself violating the principle on which he sets out, that he is going to remove the voters under this Bill from any action of the Local Legislature. He has not done so; he has departed from that principle. The question of property is wholly under the control of the Local Legislatures. The question of property is wholly under the control of the Local Government; we have nothing to do with it; we cannot say who shall be the tenant or what shall be the condition of tenancy; we have nothing to do with making laws regulating the relations between landlord and tenant. All these matters are under the control of the Local Government; so that, when you refuse to do what the United States did, after long and careful consideration, when you reject the provincial franchises and undertake to establish a franchise independent of those which the Local Legislatures have provided, you have no logical standing ground on which to proceed other than that of manhood suffrage. Look at the provision of the constitution and what do you find? You will find that we have representation given us here by population. It is the persons who are recognised; we have nothing to do with the question of property; we are as completely dissociated from that as we would be if the local powers were vested in a foreign country. There is another reason why it is of vast consequence we should confer upon all the people of this country the power of the electoral franchise, if we are to adopt the principle of this Bill and prepare an independent franchise, as the hon. member for Northumberland thinks we ought. If we are to have a separate franchise, it ought to be based on population. What are the functions of a citizen in connection with this House? Apart from those commercial pursuits in which we are engaged, we deal with the subject of crime, the responsiblity of man to man, with the subject of defence, the responsibility of each individual to defend his country. It is not a question of property, but a question of inherent personal rights that belongs to every man as a man, and I say the man who is compelled to go to the front and risk his life for his country's sake is as much entitled to vote as the man who stays at home and pays the taxes to meet the expense connected with the defence of our country. Look at the history of the neighboring republic. We know there have been poured into that country half a

million of people a year, for the last 30 years, people of foreign birth, who have been born and brought up under different systems of government, and in many cases have not had the training which free institutions give. Yet those people have been converted into American citizens; they have acquired the habit of self government; they have lost their nationalities and become unified with and merged into the population of the country. That process would not have gone on with the same rapidity or to anything like the same extent, if it had not been for the adoption of the principle of manhood suffrage. It has been a common thing to refer to the city of New York, and to speak about the extravagance of New York, as if the conditions of things in New York were the conditions of things throughout the American republic. But we have to bear in mind that the people who have gone into the United States have generally come from the poorer people of Europe, who made little or no progress in their own country, who had few opportunities in their own country, and the remarkable thing is, not that the American Government has been as honest, capable and efficient as it has been under the existing constitution, but the marvelous feature is that it should have succeeded in so educating and improving all classes of its population, when you consider the character and the materials upon which its institutions have operated. I say that this influence upon foreign populations is of immense consequence, now that we are seeking foreign immigration. It is true the condition of things at this moment, owing to the incapacity and mismanagement of hon. gentlemen opposite, is not favorable to immigration; but we are not to look at the condition of things at this hour, but at the condition of things that existed formerly and is likely to exist again. I say that in order to people our North-West we are seeking foreign immigration. How are we going to promote the settlement of that country? How are we going to convert thousands of people into Canadians, into men who will pay some regard to our institutions, and forget the country from whence they came, and think mainly of the country to which they have immigrated. It is by giving them the rights of citizenship at a period when they have few cares and responsibilities devolving upon them. If you will show me a man in this country who has not taken any part in its political affairs when young, I will show you a man who has taken but little interest in its public affairs, and who, in many cases, would not hesitate to ask compensation for the day before he would be willing to go and record his vote. That is not the class of men we want here. We want men of public spirit who will take an interest in the country, who have opinions and will seek to express them, who will not wait to be dragged to the polls, but will be prompt and anxious to record their votes in favor of the candidate they prefer. To attain that result you must give them the right to vote early in life, when they have few cares and anxieties. One of the great advantages of the system of parliamentary government is its educating influence; it is a school for our people in which their minds are developed, scarcely less so than by the various churches which are established throughout the country. In order to serve this, the highest purpose of constitutional government, it is of vast consequence that the people should have an opportunity of exercising the franchise at an early period in life. Mr. Maine says, in his work on "Ancient Law," that the human race may be divided into two great classes, the progressive and the non-progressive. What we are seeking to attract to this country is the immigration of the progressive class. We hold that we ourselves belong to that class; we do not seek to enfranchise the non-progressive class, the class that have a passive existence, that may exhibit in some instances a very considerable amount of subtlety of intellect, but are wanting in physical energy and the material enterprise which is necessary to develop the resources and contribute to the wealth and progress of the country. The right hon. gentleman in this Bill refuses to enfranchise the Chinese. I do not object to that, for they belong to the class we designate as non-progressive; and I say that the Indian population, except in so far as they will show fitness to be enfranchised, also belong to the same class, and the same rule applies to them. But that rule does not apply to the young men of the country; it does not apply to the Europeans who come here to carve out homes for themselves. The very fact that they come here is proof that they are not wanting in energy. A man does not dissociate himself from the country of his birth, the church in which he has worshipped, the neighborhood where he is acquainted, and come to a strange country to carve out for himself a home and improve the condition of his family, unless he has, in a large degree, within himself the elements of enterprise and progress. That being the case, we can with perfect safety adopt the principle of manhood suffrage set forth in the resolution the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has submitted. What is the first condition or evidence of fitness? Is it property? No, Sir; the right hon. the First Minister himself has admitted it is not when submitting this Bill. He said he did not require it of the Indians because it was no test. If property is no evidence of fitness, why insist in putting it in the Bill and regarding it as an evidence of fitness? It is clear, if the hon. gentleman is consistent with himself that he must agree to withdraw these provisions of his Bill, and support the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland. He told us that Charles James Fox was a spendthrift, that he could not take care of his own estate, and he gave that as an evidence that property was no test of a man's capacity. If that be so, why is that test included in the Bill. We look at history only to profit by it and in order that we may learn the causes which have contributed to the greatness or decay of nations, so that we may profit by the lessons which it affords. In Rome, the important element was the public spirit of its citizens, the enterprise which characterised them, their confidence in the destiny of the country to which they belonged and their disinterestedness in supporting and maintaining the institutions under which they lived. The hon. gentleman last night charged my hon. friend beside me with disingenuousness in his quotation from Mr. Gladstone. He said that Mr. Gladstone did not hold the views which my hon. friend attributed to him and that the quotation was a garbled quotation, calculated to mislead the House as to what were Mr. Gladstone's views. I said then that Mr. Gladstone did hold the view which my hon. friend had attributed to him. Everyone who has watched Mr. Gladstone's course and read his utterances, whether in contributions to the magazines or in speeches on the hustings or in Parliament, will see that that great statesman has advanced, if I may say so, to the view in favor of manhood suffrage. It is true that Mr. Gladstone did not propose manhood suffrage in the Commons of England, but that was not because it was not his own opinion, but because he believed that the Parliament of the United Kingdom would not support that proposition. He proposed what he thought was the best which it was possible to carry, and not what he believed was just and proper in itself. He has declared that the burden of proof is upon him who would refuse to any party the franchise. Let me read an extract from an essay of Mr. Gladstone's in the *Nineteenth Century* of November, 1877. In discussing this question of the franchise, he says:

"That we are considering the case of adult males, neither disqualified by mental infirmity, nor deprived of liberty on account of crime, nor loading the community with the cost of their subsistence; that, in questions of political fitness, we have to deal with this or that section in the mass, and not with the eccentric and exceptional cases of individuals."

That is, there may be other than those parties whom he has named who individually may not be qualified to exercise the elective franchise, but they form so small a proportion that it does not justify us in rejecting the mass on account of the defects of the few.

"That in practice the question before us is simply that of household suffrage in the counties."

That is the practical question, but the abstract question of right is that mentioned before. (The hon. gentleman quoted from "Gladstone's Gleanings," pages 142, 143 and 144.) In a speech delivered at Liverpool shortly after the close of the American war, Mr. Gladstone stated that he had come to the conclusion that manhood suffrage was a source of immense strength to a nation, created a public spirit and an interest in the Government, and without it the American republic could not have succeeded as it did in suppressing that great rebellion. It is sometimes said that the great masses of the people are not qualified, that it is only the educated, the trained classes that are qualified to judge of the affairs of state. This argument is also met by Mr. Gladstone in a way, I think, that is eminently satisfactory and conclusive. There are other than intellectual reasons for the adoption of particular courses in public matters; there are other considerations than those of a mere intellectual character which ought to influence the conduct of men. There are moral considerations, and the man who is poor, the man who is in straitened circumstances, the man who has suffered the consequence of being poor, is likely to have a much stronger sympathy with those who are in that condition, and is much more likely to propose practical legislation of an ameliorative character, than those who are not in such a condition. Mr. Gladstone says on this subject—(the hon. gentleman read several extracts from a speech of Mr. Gladstone's). Then Mr. Gladstone goes on to observe that upon all the great leading constitutional questions, for 100 years, which have divided the people of England, the masses were right and the select few were in the wrong. He mentions, amongst these, the question of Catholic emancipation, the question of parliamentary reform, the question of the repeal of the corn laws, the question of the adoption of free trade as against protection—on all these questions the great masses of the people of England were on the side of these views which were ultimately triumphant, and which experience proves to be right; while the cultured few who some think should alone possess the franchise, were entirely in the wrong. This rule is not confined to political matters alone. It is perfectly obvious that in the progress of the world this same rule holds good to a large degree. Why, Sir, in the very question of our holy religion, how was it? Did the Scribes and the Pharisees, did those men of culture and of leisure, did those men who were the guides of the people on questions of religion—were they the first to accept the doctrines of the Saviour of mankind? We know to the contrary. We know that the disinterested teachers, the men who lead the world into the adoption of a higher faith, were regarded as ignorant fishermen; they were men who were without culture and without training. They forsook their boats and their nets, and they repeated the precepts and the story of the founder of the religion; and although they were opposed by the educated part of mankind, we know that those views ultimately prevailed. How did this progress of reform begin? Did it begin at the top? Did it begin amongst the intellectual and cultured? No, it began at the bottom. Society was improved from below; society was illuminated from below. And, Sir, I say there is no difference in this country, where education is widely diffused, between the cultured few and the great mass of mankind, which would justify us in withholding the franchise from the young men of this country. Sir, what is the object of our educational system? Why do we undertake to diffuse knowledge? Why have we established schools of learning from one end of the country to the other? It has been for the purpose of diffusing knowledge. Lord Macaulay observes that the inequalities of intellect, like the inequalities of the earth's surface, bear but a small proportion to the whole mass, that they may be safely neglected. The light of the sun illuminates the hills but a few minutes before it does the valleys. And so truth is sometimes perceived by great minds before it becomes perceptible to the multitude. They are merely the first to catch and reflect that light which, without their assistance, would bye-and-bye shine upon all. Now, Sir, I say that the condition of things here is such that we are entitled to extend the franchise. I say that the motion made by my hon. friend, if we are to have a Dominion franchise at all is the only logical basis for that franchise, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will secure from his own side of the House so large a number of supporters that it will be substituted for this particular section of the Bill. Then we are to observe this one great advantage that will arise from the extension of the franchise. It prevents the growth of a dangerous class in the country. Mr. Lowe sarcastically said, after the adoption of household suffrage in the boroughs of England, in 1867, that it would be the duty of the gentlemen of England now to educate their masters. Well, Sir, it is a great thing when those who are educated, and those who have property, have a great personal interest in looking after the well-being of others. I say it is of immense consequence in a Government, and it contributes to the well-being of the Government, that those who are themselves in good circumstances should have every possible inducement brought to bear upon them to educate and improve the condition of those who are not so well off as they are themselves. Then the interest of the wealthy classes and the well informed classes, is identical with the general interests of the country, with the general well-being of the country. Every gentleman who sits in this House, when he goes to his electors in order to inform them upon public questions, is he not anxious that they should have facilities for acquiring information, that they should form correct judgments upon public questions? Does he not get on much more satisfactorily with those who are intelligent and well informed, than with those who are not so? And, Sir, by the adoption of the amendment put into your hands by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the interest of the whole community will be identical with the wealthiest section of the community.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. FISHER. During the discussion that has taken place, members of the Opposition have attempted to retain the provincial franchises, but they have been unsuccessful in that struggle. The principle of a universal Dominion franchise has been accepted, and we must bow to that decision. That being the case, it is desirable that the franchise should be as simple in its provisions, as inexpensive in its application, as possible. I see, therefore, the necessity of accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The expense necessary to carry out such a franchise will be very small indeed, very little more than the present expense of the municipal electoral lists, and presenting a marked contrast to the expense involved by the complicated machinery necessary to carry out the provisions of this Bill. But there are other reasons why the amendment should be adopted. At the present time Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and British Columbia have manhood suffrage laws, and to adopt

the present Bill would be to disfranchise a large number of people. If we adopt a uniform Dominion franchise, we should adopt the franchise most extended in any of the Provinces. The member for Cumberland, N.S. (Mr. Tupper), at an earlier period of the debate, announced as one of the reasons why the revising barrister clauses were inserted in the Bill was, that they were necessitated by the fact that we were creating a Dominion franchise, and we must provide machinery to carry it out. I could easily conceive more easily worked machinery than that proposed in the Bill, even if manhood suffrage were not accepted. If there are to be revising barristers or judges acting in every constituency, there must be salaries attached, and secretaries, bailiffs and other officers must likewise be paid. Not only will there be the expenses consequent upon the salaries of officials, but there will be great expense incurred by the electors themselves. This would be obviated by adopting universal suffrage as provided by the amendment. There is a still greater objection to the machinery provided by this Bill, and that is the partisan character of the revising barrister. I am well aware it is in the power of the Government to modify these clauses to such an extent as to render them much less objectionable; but the leader of the Government cannot change them so as to make them unobjectionable. It is in consequence of this——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are not discussing the revising barrister clause at present.

Mr. FISHER. I understand that, but it is because of the objectionable character of this clause that I am desirous of supporting the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, and I am explaining my objections to the clause, which, I think, is relevant to the question before you. If you think, however, that my remarks are not pertinent to the question, I will submit to your ruling. I do not support manhood suffrage because I think it is the best thing we can have in this country, but because, if manhood suffrage was introduced into this Bill, it would remove many objections, and in that case I would be forced to accept what I consider the lesser of two great evils. In the Province of Quebec manhood suffrage is not acceptable to the people; it has not been proposed in the Local Legislature, and I have no idea that any responsible individual in that Province would undertake to support or propose manhood suffrage. One of the objections I have to this Bill is that, in consequence of the uniformity of franchise which is insisted upon over the whole Dominion, some, and perhaps all, of the Provinces will suffer as to their particular conditions and circumstances. In the Province of Quebec the genius of the people has been against the principle of manhood suffrage. The people have been wedded to the principle of property qualification, and it is because this Bill departs from that principle that I support the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland. If that principle is departed from, if that step is once taken, I do not see why it should not be taken further and longer than in this Bill. It is true that in this Bill there is a property qualification, but there are so many other qualifications——

Mr. PAINT. I rise to a point of order. I am credibly informed that the hon. gentleman is repeating a speech which he made at a mass meeting in Montreal the other evening.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask if that is a question of order which it is proper for an hon. gentleman to raise in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman has raised a point of order.

Mr. FISHER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that he has been mistaken, or that his informant has been mistaken on that point.

An hon. MEMBER. It was not a mass meeting.

Mr. FISHER. I was proceeding to show some of the reasons why I consider that manhood suffrage is not so unacceptable as it would be had not the provisions of this Bill been laid before this House and apparently insisted upon by the majority of this House. In this country, Sir, manhood suffrage is not so objectionable as it would be in the older countries of Europe. We have here, Sir, no such depths of ignorance among the people, no such large masses of people, who are not entitled to the franchise, as there are in the large cities of Europe, and as to the country parts of the Dominion, the provisions of this Bill are so extended that a far greater number of people will be enfranchised than there are at present. In the large cities of the mother country there is, no doubt, a large mass of the people who are not entitled and are not fit to enjoy the franchise, but I am glad and proud to be able to say that in the country parts of Quebec there are few people who, under the provisions of this Bill, will not have the franchise, and that being the case, I think it is but a short step to go as far as the hon. member for Northumberland proposes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to see that this sentiment meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen, and perhaps there may be a larger support of the amendment than I had anticipated. One reason why it is necessary that this amendment should be adopted, is that the complicated machinery which is necessitated by the fancy ranchises of this Bill may be done away with. If, Sir, this amendment is not going to make a great deal of difference in the number of people enfranchised, it is all the more reason why it should be adopted, because it will remove many of the objectionable features and obviate many of the difficulties of the Bill. I want it thoroughly understood that I believe the Provinces should be allowed to regulate their own franchises according to the circumstances and conditions in each Province, and I believe the Province of Quebec should be allowed to have such a franchise as it thinks desirable—such a franchise as it has heretofore enjoyed. It is not that I desire to force upon the Province of Quebec the franchise proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland, but I support it as being a lesser evil than the Bill we have before us, with so many objectionable features with regard to revising barristers and the manipulation of voters' lists. I thought before this amendment was put to the vote that it was my duty to myself and my constituency to make these few remarks in explanation of my position with regard to it. I therefore trust that the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland will be adopted.

Mr. CURRAN. I do not think it is fair that the hon. gentleman should take his seat without giving us the true state of the indignation in Montreal Centre.

Mr. FISHER. Perhaps if the hon. member for Montreal Centre will go to Montreal and face the electors, he will find out what the true sentiment is.

Mr. CURRAN. I happened to be there.

Mr. EDGAR. In discussing the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, I cannot forget that I have already voted in favor of retaining the various provincial franchises for the purposes of Dominion elections. I did so because I believed that if the Provinces themselves had been consulted, they would still desire to retain their provincial franchises. That a uniform franchise for the Dominion is not preferred by Prince Edward Island we know from the unanimous vote of its members——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman has finished his speech, although he has continued standing, I may venture to address the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I have not finished my speech. I am only waiting till the First Minister induces his friends to keep order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No hon. member can stop and stand as long as he likes, and say because he is standing that the House is to remember that he is speaking. The hon. gentleman has been standing for a minute——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order. The right hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The right hon. gentleman has risen to a point of order, as I understand.

Mr. EDGAR. If the right hon. gentleman cannot assist the Chairman to keep his followers in order, I shall stay here——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I consider that I had a right to speak, inasmuch as the hon. gentleman had ceased.

Mr. MILLS. That is not a point of order at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not rise to a point of order; I rose to speak.

Mr. MILLS. You have no right to speak.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has no right to address me across the floor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I took the point of order, because my hon. friend behind me was simply waiting until the disorder you yourself noticed had come to a close. When that had come to a close my hon. friend was ready to address the House, and the hon. First Minister had no right to interrupt him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I speak to that point of order. It is well known in parliamentary practice, that when an hon. member has not the ear of the House, and the House is disinclined to hear him, the House allows it to be known by unmistakable signs of inattention, or other means well known to parliamentary men; and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman that it is well understood in England, and ought to be understood here, that no hon. member is to force himself against the will of the House, and continue to preach against the stomach of the House. No hon. member has a right to stand and fold his arms and say: I shall stand here and prevent the debate going on, because there happen to be noises, showing disapproval of the language or the course of the hon. gentleman. That is the settled parliamentary practice, and the hon. gentleman knows it right well.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman did not stop for any such length of time as to warrant the hon. First Minister to raise such a point. The hon. gentleman stopped in order that order might be restored so that he could proceed, and the hon. gentleman knows that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I shall withdraw my claim in favor of the hon. gentleman, hoping that he will not make such long pauses hereafter.

Mr. EDGAR. The right hon. gentleman will find that if hon. gentlemen opposite do not keep order, the debate will be much longer than it otherwise would. My objection to supporting the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), is that it will apply an absolute uniform franchise to the Dominion. I think it is a much less objectionable form of uniform franchise than that which is proposed by the Bill, as it is now before the Committee, and I am free to admit that that form of franchise has been preferred by several of the Provinces. It has been preferred by Prince Edward Island, which has adopted it for provincial purposes, and under it all the members from that Province in this House have been elected. It has been preferred by the Province of British Columbia, because, whatever hon. members from that Province may think about it, and however they may vote upon the subject, the Province of British Columbia has adopted manhood suffrage as the franchise for their own provincial elections and also as the franchise which they consider applicable to the election of members for this House. The Province of Manitoba has practically adopted it. The Province of Ontario, however, has not adopted that suffrage; I may say it has not considered the question yet. There has been no agitation in Ontario for manhood suffrage, it has not been asked for, and has not been discussed at the polls. I dare say the feeling of that Province when the matter shall be discussed will be in favor of manhood suffrage; and one reason why I think so is that within the past two months the Conservative party in that Province has, in the Local Legislature, taken very strong ground in favor of that franchise. The right hon. the First Minister said yesterday that when Mr. Mowat saw what franchise was proposed by this Bill, he adopted a larger franchise, or, to use the classical expression of the First Minister, he went one better. Well, if Mr. Mowat went one better, the right hon. gentleman's followers in the Local Legislature, the leader of the Opposition there, went one better than Mr. Mowat by proposing a manhood suffrage amendment. Now, when we see all that happening in the Province of Ontario, it is quite possible that that Province, when it comes to consider the question, will decide in favor of manhood suffrage, but it has not yet asked for it. Then there is the great Province of Quebec, a very large Province, and I would like to know what indications we have that the Province of Quebec is in favor of manhood suffrage? I think the indications are that it is not. They have not adopted it in their own Local Legislature, where they have entire control, there certainly has been no agitation for it throughout that Province, and I think that, like the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec can afford to wait a little while before they have manhood suffrage thrust upon them by this Dominion Parliament without their asking for it, and undoubtedly against the will of the majority of the people. I am not at all against the abstract proposition of manhood suffrage. Probably it is the most logical of all suffrages. I will not now discuss it, although I believe it is sure to be adopted in Canada, if for the whole of Canada we will have a uniform franchise. If we do not have that uniform franchise, the different Provinces will carry out their own views about the franchise; some will continue having manhood suffrage, as they now have, and others will avoid it altogether. I am not at all surprised at the hon. member for Northumberland making his motion and advocating this franchise, because it is a uniform franchise, and he has declared himself, from the first, in favor of a uniform franchise for the Dominion. I will feel that I have to vote against the amendment, in the first place, because manhood suffrage has not been demanded by the people; then it has never been made the subject of any agitation through the press or by any public meetings or petitions or otherwise; and thirdly it has never been made a question at the polls in Canada; and I am sure, when so very revolutionary a measure as this is proposed, it is only reasonable that the people should be given an opportunity to express their views on the subject at the polls. I object to it also at present because it is the adoption of a principle of uniform franchise to which I am opposed, against which I have voted, and shall yet vote before this Bill is through the House Further, I know that one large and important Province in

the Dominion is not in favor of it. Another reason which influences me, and I should not wonder if it influenced other hon. members here, before giving a vote in favor of so important, so radical measure of change, is that I would like to have an opportunity of knowing what my own constituents think about it. Of course, it is argued very plausibly that manhood suffrage is very necessary to protect us from what may be done by the revising officers, but that part of the Bill has not been adopted, and I have still faith in this House to believe that we are sufficiently amenable to the wishes of the people, that there is sufficient judgment and patriotism left in hon. members, not to pass the Bill as it is. Therefore, until I see that this clause of the revising barristers becomes law, I shall not feel that, in order to defend myself against its defects, it will be necessary to adopt at once manhood suffrage. Perhaps by the time the Bill comes up for its third reading, when we will see what it is as regards the revising barristers, we will be able to form an opinion, and then many of the arguments I have heard in favor of manhood suffrage will have great influence upon my mind in inducing me to adopt this franchise in order to avert the evils which will flow from the clause creating revising barristers.

Mr. McCALLUM. Before you put that motion, Sir, I desire to make a few remarks, and I promise you I will not long detain the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Edgar) the other day, when some dispute arose about petitions, said there were Conservatives enough in my riding asking that this Bill should not pass to defeat me in my county. I think uniformity is very necessary as far as we can possibly get it. In all the provinces of this Dominion, the qualifications of those who send members to this House should be as nearly alike as possible. The hon. gentleman got offended with me because I said that, under the former franchise he was a much defeated member. It was true, but I did not explain to the House how much he was defeated under that franchise. I can tell you out of the "Parliamentary Companion" how much he was defeated under that franchise of which he is now so fond. In 1871, he was defeated for the Local House in Monck; in 1872, he was elected to this House for a short time; in 1874, in Monck, he was defeated, and again same year was defeated in North Oxford; in 1875, he was defeated in Monck; in 1876, he was defeated in South Ontario; in 1878, he was defeated in Monck; and in 1882 he was again defeated, and all under the same franchise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to keep to the question.

Mr. McCALLUM. I will keep to the question. In 1882, under the same franchise, he was defeated in Centre Toronto. It is very extraordinary that he should desire to preserve that franchise. I am referring to a personal attack, and I think I have the right to do that. The hon. gentleman said the other day that the Government had paid me $8,000 for my vote, to keep me in this House. That is a reflection on the Parliament of this country. Whatever I got was by a vote of this House. It is true that a vessel which I owned was damaged in the Welland Canal in 1874. It is true that, after the Government had kept me out of the money for eight years, they paid me, and did not pay me the interest. I have no desire to refer to these matters. The hon. gentleman has come to this House, not over the boom, but through the cabin windows. He says I am here because my county was gerrymandered, but he knows there was no gerrymander from 1872 to 1882, and he has been defeated this number of times under the same franchise during that period. The hon. gentleman thinks he has suffered largely for his country. He told the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), the other night, that before Confederation he was assisting his party to carry Confederation.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. TROW. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. McCALLUM. And I say that, under this franchise Bill——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member is travelling very far from the subject under discussion.

Mr. McCALLUM. I say it is a wonder that he should be so anxious to keep this franchise that he was so much defeated under.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McCALLUM. He should be anxious to get some other franchise. I could not hear very well what he said, from the applause he met with from this side of the House, but, as I understand it, he was not in favor of the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland. He speaks of my having got $8,000 from the Government. It lies well in his mouth to make a statement of that kind, for if there has ever been a political Lazarus in this country, feeding on the crumbs which fell from the table of the Ontario Government, it is that gentleman, and the accounts of the Ontario Government will show it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to give my reasons for voting for this amendment. It is one of the most important nature. It is almost radical in its character. It proposes something which the larger part of this Dominion has not yet adopted, in fact it is proposed to adopt universal suffrage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I intend to be very brief, but I hope hon. gentlemen will have the manliness and the gentlemanly feeling to keep order while I am speaking. During the few years that I have had a seat in this House, I have never interrupted an hon. gentleman while he was speaking, and, if I should have the privilege of sitting here a few years longer, I never intend to abuse good manners so far as to do it. The mover of the amendment, in his remarks in support of it this afternoon, stated his belief that this House ought to fix a Dominion franchise for itself. It is strange that the hon. gentleman, like all others on that side of the House who have preceded him, overlooked the fact that this Dominion has a franchise now, that Parliament has adopted the franchise under which we have been acting without friction or trouble for the last eighteen years. So the mere fact that this House should have a franchise fixed by itself cannot be adduced as a valid reason why this Bill should become law. I have never been an advocate of universal suffrage, and, under ordinary circumstances, I would not vote for this amendment; but, under present circumstances, I shall feel it my duty to do so. One of the reasons why, under ordinary circumstances, I would not vote for it, is that I understand, on good authority, that universal suffrage is distasteful to one of the most important Provinces, the Province of Quebec. I hold it to be a vital principle that, unless some strong necessity exists, we should not do anything in opposition to the feelings of the people of any large Province, unless some great good is to be gained, or some great evil is to be averted. I believe the people of Quebec generally are opposed to universal suffrage, and under ordinary circumstances I should, for that reason, feel it my duty to vote against this amendment. But, Sir, as the gentleman who last spoke remarked, I have always found it a good rule between two evils to choose the least; and I find, in the Bill before us, objection so great that I am unwillingly compelled to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). In the first place, this amendment will save the Dominion a large amount of expense, and will simplify the matter exceedingly. It is the duty of this House, so far as we can, to save the

people from expense, trouble and annoyance. Reference has been made to the trouble of getting up voters' lists. No matter how simple the machinery may be, so long as you impose any qualification, there must be more or less trouble in making up a list. We have to make up one voters' list now, and if this Bill passes we shall just double that trouble for the people of this country. I also feel it my duty to support the amendment because the present Bill disfranchises large numbers that would enjoy the franchise if this Bill did not become law. In British Columbia and Prince Edward Island every adult citizen has a right to vote for members of this House. Now, to deprive any large number of this privilege must be a grievous hardship. Although people who do not possess the franchise may not esteem it very highly, and may not make any great efforts to obtain it, still, when once the privilege has been conferred upon them, and you deprive them of it afterwards, you give them a large grievance. The right hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill stated last night that the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature would not become law until the end of the year. There is a sufficient reason for that. It is well known that the franchise has been largely changed, and that the amended voters' list made out under that franchise, cannot be available until the end of the year. But the very same objection will act against this Bill. The right hon. gentleman claimed that, if an election were to take place during the year it would have to be held upon the old voters' list, and under the old franchise law. Well, Sir, if this Bill becomes law to-morrow, the very same thing would happen, because the lists would not be available until the end of the year. In the Province of Ontario, people who are disfranchised under this Bill that are enfranchised by the Ontario Act, when they come to exercise the franchise under both Acts, will want to know the reason why they are allowed the privilege under one law and denied it under the other. I wish again to draw attention to the classes that are largely going to be disfranchised in Ontario under the present act. First of all, there is the large class whom the raising of the franchise above that of the Ontario Act will deprive of their vote; then there is a large class beside who will be disfranchised under this Bill. These are the the teachers in the rural districts not alone in Ontario, but through the Dominion, the great majority of whom are going to be disfranchised by this Bill. Now I need not tell this House that these are a very intelligent class. They are gentlemen who exercise a great influence in the community; they are gentlemen who, next to the mothers of the land, exercise, probably, the greatest influence in moulding the thoughts and ideas of the youth, those who, in a few years will be voters. I say it is monstrous that they should be deprived of the franchise which they now enjoy. Then, again, there is in Ontario the class of wage-earners, which comprises a vast number of farmers' sons, who are independent enough and manly enough to hire out with the neighboring farmers in order to earn something with which to start in life. These intelligent young men will be completely disfranchised under the present Bill if it becomes law. I wish again to impress upon the committee that it is a serious matter to deprive any class of the community of the right to exercise the franchise without good and sufficient reason. It is a measure which ought not to be resorted to under any ordinary circumstances. As regards the present Bill, I have only to point to the vast number of petitions that have been laid before the House, signed by Conservatives and Reformers alike; to the meetings that are being held throughout the country; to the language in which the Bill is denounced by the Independent as well as the Liberal press; to show that the Bill is extremely distasteful to the great mass of the people. For all these reasons I feel it my duty to support the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the few words I shall address on this subject I hope I shall not be open to the charge of obstructing the business. That charge has been frequently made since this discussion commenced. To it, we, on this side of the House, plead not guilty. In the best sense of the word the Bill before the committee is not public business. It is a partisan measure. We have asked for public business to be brought down; we have repeatedly urged that it be brought down. What has been the answer? Not a thing shall be touched, not a particle of business shall be done, until you have swallowed this infamous measure. The interests of the country are nothing; it matters not what the country suffers; this Bill must be passed; this House must sit day in and day out, and week in and week out, until this Bill becomes law. We are told that hon. gentlemen opposite must be first confirmed in their seats by legislation and not by the votes of the people; nay more, we are practically told that some hon. members on this side must first be legislated out of the House before public business can be done. From half-past one p.m. till two a.m. we are kept at the grind, with the avowed intention of breaking us down. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried this for a considerable time, they may be better satisfied with the trial further on. It is from the Ministerial benches that business is being obstructed, not from this side. We are willing that this charge should go to a higher court, the court of the people of Canada, and let the people decide which party it is that is obstructing business. What is our condition at the present time? Is it the wish of this side to force upon any Province a franchise that is obnoxious to them? By no means. For days, yea for weeks, we have contended day and night for the provincial franchises. What assistance have we received from Ministerialists? What assistance have we obtained from the great Province of Quebec, whose people, I believe, are more closely wedded to their provincial franchise than perhaps those of any other Province of the Dominion? It is true that two gallant sons of Quebec have opposed the adoption of this measure—only two, and one Independent has added his weight to the motion now before the committee. Why have not the hon. members for Quebec, who really wish to preserve their provincial franchise, spoken on this measure and given the House their real inward sentiments? We know what those sentiments are; but the members are silent. We have been desirous of retaining for the various Provinces each its own provincial franchise. We desire it for Ontario and the other Provinces; but it cannot be obtained. Then it becomes the duty of each Province to obtain a franchise as near the franchise that suits the particular Provinces as possible, and what is the position of the representatives of Ontario upon this question to-day? The representatives in the Local Legislature, the representatives fresh from the people, have taken this in hand, and they, for the time, have decided it. We have no reason to suspect that that decision has not been in accordance with the wishes of the people. The decision arrived at was manhood suffrage, all but in name, and the only division in the Legislature was that those who entertained the same political opinion as the hon. gentleman opposite wished it to be manhood suffrage pure and simple, and voted accordingly. But when the Bill, as it now stands, which is, as I have said manhood suffrage in all but name, was finally submitted, it was passed unanimously. Such is the position of the representatives of Ontario in the Local Legislature. What is the position of their representatives here? They, on this side of the House, have, to a man, supported the provincial franchise. I need not ask where hon. gentlemen opposite are. We always know

where to find them. We find them hanging on exactly the same peg that the First Minister last put them on, until he takes them down and puts them on another. This franchise of Ontario was adopted with the clear knowledge that it applied to the election of members to this House; thence it became the franchise for the purpose for which we are dealing. Such being the public will of Ontario, recorded on that occasion, it becomes my duty to attain the nearest possible franchise to that franchise, and the provincial franchise being denied and manhood suffrage coming nearest to it, it is my duty to support the amendment and maintain manhood suffrage here. Unlike the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), I am not an advocate of legislative union. Hence I cannot agree with him in the arguments he gave, all of which centred upon and clustered round the principles lying at the base of and sustaining a legislative union. I do not feel prepared to consent willingly or silently to the disfranchisement of tens of thousands of the people of Ontario. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referring to the Ontario franchise, last evening, referred to the matter whether it increased or diminished the number of voters. He knows as well as any one the extent to which the people will be disfranchised, to the extent of thousands and tens of thousands. Thousands of small property owners will be disfranchised. I do not propose to enter into all the details. I will merely refer to small property owners, to the large wage-earning class, to the large class of young men who will be disfranchised under the Bill and who have votes under the Ontario Bill. It appears to me as a particularly ungracious action in regard to our young men, particularly those engaged at the front, those who are now engaged at the front, many of whom may return to their native Provinces more or less disabled. These men who sprung to arms for the restoration of law and order in that country had votes under the Mowat Bill, and it is not particularly graceful, that because these young men may become incapacitated by their services to the country to earn $400 a year, they will return to find that by our Act they are deprived of their votes. The young men of Canada are as intelligent and as capable as the young men of any other country in the world. Under our excellent educational system they have a capacity to intelligently exercise the franchise, which is not surpassed by any young man on this continent, or any other. In the neighboring Republic they find ready employment and the best positions, and they stand higher as a class than any others. I shall not argue the point that this Bill extends the franchise. Although it perhaps does so in some Provinces, that is a poor compensation to those whom it deprives of the franchise. It would be a small consolation to you or me, if we were robbed of a certain sum of money, to be told that somebody else had been given twice as much. I would ask if there is any Ministerialist—for of course it could not be carried by this side—who is prepared to move a provision in words similar to these: provided, nevertheless, that nothing in this Act shall prevent any citizen of any Province from exercising the franchise which he would have been entitled to exercise under the laws of that Province. If there is, I shall be happy to second it. Ministerial members for Prince Edward Island have spoken in high terms of this measure, but always at the conclusion they express the hope that they will be exempted from it. It is much like the statement that boils are excellent things, but the best place for them is on your neighbors. I was surprised last evening at the temper displayed by the junior member for Victoria, B.C., in relation to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. He seemed particularly annoyed on that occasion. Last Session that hon. gentleman, in able and eloquent terms, urged the limiting of Chinese immigration into British Columbia, views which I humbly supported him in and spoke briefly in favor of. I shall quote briefly some of the reasons he gave for his course on that occasion:

"Various reasons might be given why such a law should not be enacted. One is because the Chinese labor is brought into competition with the labor of the white man. The Chinese work for wages which will not support a white laborer's family. They bring with them none of the responsibilities of our civilisation. They have no wives or children to support, and hence they come stripped, as it were, to do battle with white labor. The white man has his family to feed, to clothe, to educate, churches and other institutions to maintain; and in a thousand other ways, he is called upon to contribute. The Chinaman, his rival in the market, has none of these responsibilities. He has only himself to provide for, and hence he is prepared for the combat; and, however much the Chinaman may desire to get for his labor, he will work for what he can just get. He will not be put on one side on account of the price. The white man, handicapped with the responsibilities of his civilisation, the Chinaman prepared to struggle for his solitary existence—the result is inevitable; free white labor gives place to the slaves of the companies, who are prepared to work at a rate for which the white man cannot subsist, with the cheap and dirty mode of living and their capacity for living in swarms, in wretched dens, where a white man would drop if he did not suffocate."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman is going to make his quotation relevant to the motion.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think you will find that it is quite relevant. The hon. gentleman was stating that the present Bill did not disfranchise to any extent in British Columbia, and he had reference specially to farm laborers. I understood him to say that the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's were not correct—indeed, he said they were not true. Now, one year ago he made these remarks with reference to the Chinese, and I cannot understand how it is that a Bill which gives no vote on an income less than $400, even supposing that at a subsequent stage it should be made to embrace the wage-earner, I cannot see how the Bill would enfranchise these men in British Columbia, if, as he said at that time, Chinese labor was pressing so severely on the white labor of British Columbia that it could not compete with it. The hon. gentleman said further:

"In the Province of British Columbia, white men have had to leave on account of the Chinese monopolising the labor market. It is impossible for white labor to compete with men who work sixteen hours a day, who sleep on shelves in the shop, and who live on a little rice flavored with a chunk of pork. * * * I know that it is argued by some hon. getlemen that they are a necessity, that their labor is required to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Speaker, I differ entirely from that view. They are not a necessity. I received a letter to-day, the contents of which I was very sorry to read; it was from one of the largest employers of labor in that Province, and he says that there are a great many men there who cannot get employment."

I am astonished to learn that in British Columbia there are a great many men who cannot get employment; and still no laborer will be enfranchised who earns less than $400 a year. I do not say it is not the case; but following the gentleman, as I did a year ago, and supporting the principle on the ground that I believed the Province was capable of judging of its local affairs for itself, I find the gentleman who proposed that measure desiring to force an unacceptable franchise on the Province I represent. I do not propose to discuss the abstract question of manhood suffrage. The United States has been referred to. I know that all the people in the United States do not approve of manhood suffrage, principally on the ground of the large immigration of persons into that country who are uneducated in the art of self-government. All here are not in favor of it; but from the expressions of opinion in my own Province, I conclude that the majority of both parties there are in favor of it, or something so near to it that it only lacks the name. But in this connection I wish to enquire what objection there is to manhood suffrage that does not apply with equal force to the $2 rental suffrage. I am not making objection; I am simply pointing out that those who object to manhood suffrage have an equal ground of objection to the $2 rental franchise. Let us test it. Take the case of a man who is unfortunately overcome by the habit of drink; he is

useless; he does not earn $50 a year; his wife, by hard labor, supports him, and pays the $2 a month rental; he is a full-fledged voter. In the same town is a wage-earner who works every day in the year, and earns $1.25 a day, a high rate of average wages for the Dominion of Canada, and owns and occupies property of his own, which is valued at a little less than $300. He has no vote, while the other man has. That is a test of the application of one of these fancy franchises. The world is made up of details, and you have to test the thing by actual practice. I allude to this, more particularly on account of the misconception of the measure by some hon. gentlemen opposite. At a previous stage of this discussion the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) stated that the revising officer would not have more than 1 per cent. of the voters to deal with. Let me call his attention to the fact that about 25 per cent. of the names on the assessment roll are those of tenants. How is the revising officer to ascertain who, in the entire list of tenants on the voters' list, and on the assessment roll, are entitled to be placed on the list of voters he prepares, on the ground of paying a rental above $2 a month. To do this he has to become an assessor; he has to go to all these parties and enquire what rent they pay. Will it be said that he will send his clerk or his bailiff? Is it the clerk or the bailiff we employ to make the list? In my constituency I found, on going over the voters' list, that over 700 of those upon it were marked as tenants, which, I presume, would not be perhaps over one-half of those on the assessment roll. I refer to that as one of the practical difficulties of this measure, and an argument that may be urged in favor of the amendment proposing manhood suffrage, which would of necesity require some cheap and easy method of registration to be made of voters. Now, hon. gentlemen must not suppose that this lengthy discussion we have had on the Franchise Bill is the beginning and end of this measure. When the Bill was introduced it laid the foundation of work not only for future Sessions but for future Parliaments. At every Session of every Parliament for years and years to come we shall have the franchise question before us. Had we left the matter with the Provinces—where it ought to have been left, and where the best precedents on the face of the globe say it should have been left—we should have been relieved of this labor, had our business done, and been home long ago. But henceforth this question will be cropping up at all times, until it is finally settled by perhaps the adoption of manhood suffrage.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I rise to support the amend ment of the hon. member for Northumberland, and in doing so I fully acknowledge that the objections which have been urged against this measure from this side of the House equally apply to that amendment; but I recognise as well the fact that we are now face to face with the question, what shall be the franchise for this Dominion? This committee having refused to endorse the position taken on this side of the House, that the different local franchises in the Provinces should be the franchises for this Dominion, I think that we can travel in no better direction than that indicated in the amendment to which I have just referred. I recognise the fact that no opinion has been had throughout the country on this question; I recognise as fully as any hon. gentleman can the force of the objection, that without having the consent and sanction of our constituents to this proposition we are doing them a great injustice in supporting it. But, Sir, we are obliged to choose between alternative propositions; we are not left free to say whether we shall retain the franchises that now exist in the different Provinces or not, but we have to decide whether we shall have a franchise such as is proposed in this Bill or accept that proposed in the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). One of the objections that I urged against this Bill was that it involved so many different propositions that it became exceedingly complicated. There is no one feature which can be more strongly urged on the attention of this committee than the advantage that will result from having a plain, practicable, simple, common sense franchise for the election of members to any deliberative body. The more a franchise is complicated the greater are the difficulties that will arise in its practical working, and as between the franchise now under discussion and the amendment proposed, I say there are sufficient distinctions to warrant us, if no other reason existed, in supporting the amendment. Independent of that, we have, in the Province of Ontario, and in the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island as well, justification in supporting the amendment, in the fact that the people of these Provinces have endorsed franchises which are much more liberal than that proposed in this Bill. We have debated for a sufficient length of time, possibly, the question as to the relative liberality of the franchise in this Bill and that lately adopted in the Province of Ontario, and it is not my desire, at this particular juncture, to enter into that phase of the case more in detail; but I say that the fact of the existence of more liberal franchises in the Provinces I have mentioned is an additional justification for supporting the amendment. If I were left free to choose the franchise that I consider most suitable to the requirements of the Province from which I come, I would prefer that recently adopted by the Ontario Legislature as the more suitable. Why? Because it has been recently adopted by the majority in that Legislature. Because it has been adopted in the face of an amendment supported by gentlemen representing the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which was similar to that embraced in the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, dealing with manhood suffrage. Consequently, whatever may be my own personal feelings on that question, I concede at once that the decision of the Ontario Legislature determines, to my mind, what Ontario desires as her franchise; but the recent determination of that Province indicates with equal distinctness that they do not want to travel backward in the direction of restricting the franchise. Their recent legislation has been very materially in the direction of extending it, and I say that every hon. gentlemen here, from Ontario, at least, ought to recognise the action of the deliberative Assembly of that Province, and ought to allow that action to influence him in determining here what the franchise should be. I have said that another objection against the franchise proposed in this Bill is the fact that it is involved and complicated, and that as between it and the one embraced in the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland there is a decided advantage in the latter. We know how many difficulties arise in the administration of a franchise law at any election. My experience may not be a very extended one, but it is sufficiently large to warrant me in saying that there is always a good deal of difficulty in determining any act of Parliament dealing with the franchise, and that difficulty is proportionate to the number of franchises that are created. When there are real property franchises, household franchises, and such others as are created by this Bill, the result necessarily follows that the different men charged with making out the voters' lists, under this Bill, will construe its provisions differently. I am aware that the same objection will apply to the franchises in the majority of the Provinces, but the fact has to be recognised, that these are the franchises of the Provinces, and that by adopting the franchise proposed in this Bill we duplicate that difficulty. Those facts furnish a good and sufficient reason, to my mind, why, if we abandon the principle that has been already urged but refused to be recognised by this committee, we should fall back on some such simple proposition as that involved in the amendment before us. I have other reasons, that may

be considered personal to myself, why I believe the franchise should be broadened in the direction suggested in the amendment. Within the years that would have elapsed from the birth of a young man until he is entitled to vote, supposing he were of age and was going to vote this year, the different Provinces of the Dominion have spent something in the neighborhood of $167,000,000 in educating the youth of the country. Now, we have heard a good deal said about franchises based upon property, based on some consideration or other looking in that direction. But I ask you if it is not a matter of considerable consequence to us to bear in mind the fact I have stated, the fact that we have, within the years during which a young man would have lived to entitle him to vote, spent on education a sum nearly equal to what we are given to understand approaches the net amount of our national debt to-day. That being the case, these young men who have had a share in that expenditure, who have acquired a property in the disbursement of that, should be recognised in any franchise that is to be adopted by this House. A man paying $4 a month rent will earn, if he spends all he earns, an income of about $256 a year. I base that estimate on what I think will be admitted as a very general experience, that house rent represents about one-seventh of a man's average expenses. Then, the man who pays $2 a month rental would not have been more than half the earnings of the man who gets $390 a year, and yet the man who pays $2 a month rent will have the franchise, while the man getting less than $400 a year income will not have a vote. The proposed franchise is illogical, and the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland is preferable to it. In dealing with a question of this kind we cannot forget the circumstances of the country contiguous to us, and there we know manhood suffrage practically prevails. The hon. member for Cardwell stated that the franchise would be materially enlarged in the Province of Quebec by this Bill, but if that is a justification for supporting the Bill, is it not an equally good reason for adopting a still more liberal franchise in other Provinces where the present franchise is broader? The Toronto *Globe* sent circulars to the officials in Boston, Lowell, St. Louis, Pittsburg, Louisville, and other cities in the United States, asking for information in reference to the prevailing franchise for municipal purposes. In answer to the question whether the citizens would favor giving the vote to property owners or a vote representing property, the answer invariably was "by no means," and in one case the answer given was, "every man in this country is a sovereign, though poor as a church mouse." In Boston and Lowell the qualification for the franchise for municipal purposes was citizenship, sixty days' residence, with the payment of some one tax, no matter how small, and the ability to read and write. It is possible that a franchise of that character is the truly equitable one. We recognise the value of intelligence as a factor in the creation of the franchise, and it is possible that that is the closest approach to a purely correct franchise. We are now confined, however, to two propositions, and we have to determine whether we will accept the very limited franchise proposed in this Bill or the more liberal franchise which I have announced myself to be in favor of. There is an additional reason why we should follow the more liberal franchise in preference to the restricted franchise proposed in this Bill, and that is that as electoral corruption is lessened the wider the franchise is made. I sincerely believe that the greater the number of those to whom we give the right to vote the more difficult it will be to influence the election by means of corrupt practices. We are aware that one of the strongest reasons for the adoption of the Franchise Bill in England, in 1832, was the scandals of Old Sarum, and some other constituencies in that country, which led public opinion strongly in the direction, not only of wiping out the pocket boroughs, but in the direction of an enlarged franchise as well. Another reason for broadening the franchise in that country was that it would materially lessen corruption in elections. Now, we ought to keep in view the same reason as applicable to our circumstances. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House are, no doubt, sincerely desirous, unless personal interest sways them too strongly, of seeing the will of the people prevail. Well, Sir, if that is the case, their will is much more likely to prevail where the constituency is sufficiently large to have all interests represented, and to prevent the successful operation of corrupt influences. I believe that if our franchise is broadened in the direction suggested by the amendment, it will afford additional security against electoral corruption. It has been well said that where a man has no particular interest you will generally find that he will determine on the side of what is right; and in sitting here and thinking over the circumstances, not as they may apply to ourselves, when we are in the heat of a contest, but as they may apply to others who will succeed us, we shall see in a factor of this kind an additional reason for adopting the amendment. Now, one gentleman who spoke in favor of the English Bill in the British Parliament urged its adoption on the ground that it would admit men to the exercise of the dearest right of a freeman, who would, in consequence, feel the added responsibilities that were imposed by the Act. In doing so he used this language: (The hon. gentleman read an extract). I believe that in admitting as many of our people as possible to the exercise of that right we are giving an assurance for the continued progress of this country, such as no other Act of ours could confer, and therefore I shall vote in favor of the amendment of the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I rise to make a few remarks, in consequence of some misstatements, which have been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank) referred to a matter in which he showed his ignorance, because it has no reference whatever to the Bill before the House. He referred to a speech which was made in this House last year on the Chinese question, when I stated that a number of men in Victoria were unable to get employment. That might very well be, and yet not be an argument against these men having the franchise. The men I referred to came to the Province at that particular season and could not get employment just then, and they had to leave, and so were not residents of the Province. Now, he also made reference to what I said last evening in answer to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). I simply corrected that hon. gentleman for making misstatements on the matter which had been before this House, statements which had been made by other hon. gentlemen opposite and which had been already corrected. I thought it was very unbecoming the hon. gentleman to repeat a statement which he must have known to have been incorrect.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is distinctly out of order in imputing to me the making of a statement which I knew to be incorrect.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No, Sir what I said was——

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has a right to explain what he did say.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. What I said was this: I think the hon. gentleman must have understood that that statement had been made before, and it was very unfair for him to make a statement which had already been corrected, and which he must have known was incorrect.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman explain what statement he refers to?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I refer to your statement that this Franchise Bill before the House would disfranchise a large number of people in British Columbia.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman will see that I made no special reference to British Columbia in the connection in which I spoke of the disfranchising clause of that Bill.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. I said, in my remarks to which he takes exception, that this Franchise Bill would disfranchise a certain number of farm servants in this country. When I made that statement the hon. gentleman corrected me and said "no," and he kept repeating "no," evidently under the impression that I had confined my remarks to British Columbia. I made no special reference to British Columbia at all; I was speaking of the farm servants of Canada.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I am under the impression and belief that the hon. gentleman mentioned in his speech British Columbia; hence I interrupted him.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The *Hansard* will prove it to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIES. The *Hansard* is out now; I have it here.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Order. The hon. member is out of order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman opposite, the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), has no right whatever to interrupt an hon. member without rising from his seat and stating the point of order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for King's has a right to say "order" when an hon. member is out of order; and the hon. member for West Huron has just shown his unacquaintance with the rules of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want your ruling on the point, Mr. Chairman. No member sitting in his seat has a right to interrupt another hon. member.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is not the question. The hon. member for West Huron, with an unfairness all his own——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I repeat, with an unfairness all his own, puts to the Chairman a question that is not before the Chair, and that is, whether a member has a right to interrupt another hon. member. That is not the question. The question is, whether a member in his seat has a right to say "order" when another member is out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question, as I understand it, is whether the hon. member for King's was in order in calling from his seat, "order, order." That is frequently done, and is in order. If an hon. member wants to take a point of order it is his duty to rise and state the point of order; but the hon. member for West Huron said the hon. gentleman had no right to interrupt another hon. member. If an hon. member was doing that he was out of order.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I rise to refer to some remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to the Province of British Columbia. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) stated a few days ago, in his speech, that the members for British Columbia were bartering away the rights of the people of that Province by supporting this measure. I should like to know how we are bartering away the rights of the people of that Province? Has the hon. gentleman been over there; if not, where has he obtained his information which led him to make such a statement? That statement is incorrect. The Franchise Bill now before the committee, to my own knowledge, will not disfranchise any man who works in the districts which I represent—not a single man. And yet the hon. gentlemen, who know nothing of the circumstance of that Province, have the audacity to rise in this House, one after another, after they have been corrected, and state that we are bartering away the rights of the people and disfranchising those who voted for us at the last election. I say we are not. The hon. member for North York also stated that we gave our assent to the Bill because Chinese are not to have votes. How does that hon. gentleman know that? Who gave him that information? That statement is incorrect, every word of it. That hon. gentleman also stated that we applied to the First Minister to have the Bill amended so that Indians could not vote. Who gave the hon. gentleman that information? That is incorrect, every word of it. We have never applied to the Premier to change the Bill in that particular; and yet we are to sit here and listen to such statements, made by hon. gentlemen opposite, without the statements being answered. Not only the member for North York, but other members opposite, have made similar statements. The hon. member for West Huron yesterday repeated the statement, that this Franchise Bill would disfranchise a large number of electors in British Columbia. He was told it would not; but he repeated it three times. How did the hon. gentleman get that information? Surely the representatives of the Province ought to know whether this Bill will disfranchise any voters or not better than those who have never been in the Province. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) stated, in reply to what I said, that I had not the moral courage to rise and state my views. I would be very sorry to have the cheek and audacity that some hon. gentlemen opposite have, to rise, day after day and night after night, and obstruct the business of this House, talking sheer nonsense, not for the purpose of obtaining information, not for the purpose of enlightening members of this House, but for the purpose of killing time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. We have had to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite, who have done nothing but talk for the sake of killing time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. There are some very fine men on the opposite side of the House, and for some of them I have very great respect, but they have got into very bad company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I find an article in a paper edited by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I am told the hon. gentleman wrote the article, from which I am going to read, while sitting in this House. In referring to the members for British Columbia the article says: "They are opposed to the enfranchisement of the Chinese and the enfranchisement of the Indians." Who told the hon. gentleman that we are opposed to the enfranchisement of the Indians. Did any member for British Columbia state that in this House? Not one. We are not opposed to it; we are in favor of it. We have never asked that they shall not be enfranchised.

An hon. MEMBER. He will write it to-morrow, all the same.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The article further says: "Upon both these points the Government have yielded to their representation." These statements are incorrect.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman asks me a question. He asks me who gave me that information, that British Columbians were opposed to that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman objects——

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The article continues: "But British Columbia members continue to vote that Indians shall have the franchise in the other Provinces." Certainly we do. But we do not do, as the hon. gentleman said we did, ask that they shall not have the franchise in our Province. I believe in doing what is right to every one—I would advise the hon. gentleman to do as Shakespeare said, "tell the truth and shame the devil." He says: "These men are determined to impose on the other Provinces a franchise which they are not willing to accept themselves." Sir, that is not correct; it is not true. I am not at all surprised, if that is the course which gentlemen opposite have pursued in the past—making such misstatements from day to day—I am not at all surprised that they have been in the cold shades of Opposition for so many years, and I can tell hon. gentlemen that if they continue the course they have been pursuing they will ever remain there. I had no intention of saying so much as I have said, but I simply intended to rise to correct the misstatements which have been made in regard to the representatives of that Province, and the effect the franchise will have on the people of that Province.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will inform the committee, before he takes his seat, how many Indians in British Columbia vote now—whether the law in British Columbia allows the Indians to vote?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. They are not allowed to vote at any election, but this idea of raising provincial rights in connection with this Franchise Bill is to me simply so much clap-trap, because there is no question of provincial rights in the matter at all. It does not belong to the Provinces—it is a right belonging to this House. We are here to legislate for the Dominion and not for any particular Province. We should have a franchise of our own, and we should not be dictated to by some subordinate body, as has been the case in Ontario and Nova Scotia, we may be elected on one franchise to-day and to-morrow we would be at sea. We would not know upon what franchise we would have to be elected. So far as the Indians in British Columbia are concerned, though they have not the franchise at the present time, I, for one, would be glad to see them have the franchise, and as I told the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in the corridor, when the Bill came up in the House, to my mind the clause referring to the enfranchising of the Indians was one of the most important clauses of the Bill. I believe it will be one of the grandest influences in the Dominion towards settling the disputes, the difficulties and the claims they may have, to allow these men to have votes, so that they would have some person or persons to look after their claims and insist upon their rights.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Chinese?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I have no doubt the day will come when the hon. gentleman will have enough of the Chinese.

Mr. TROW. It is unaccountable that the hon. gentleman should sit in his seat, night after night and week after week, and even lie on pillows, hearing these incorrect statements, and still he did not come to the defence of his own Province.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to say a word with reference to the observations made by the hon. gentleman from British Columbia. He says that I have misrepresented the views of the members from British Columbia on the subject of the Indian franchise. In the first place, I did not for a moment suppose that the members from British Columbia would undertake to misrepresent their own Province on the floor of this House. The hon. gentleman knows that in his Province it is a penal offence to put the name of an Indian on the voters' list. He knows that that list is prepared for the election of members to this House as well as for the election of members to the Local Legislature. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but how came he here? By what authority does he sit in this House?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. If you sit down I will explain it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will have to keep quiet for a few moments, when he will have an opportunity of unburthening himself. The hon. gentleman says there is no list for the election of members to the House of Commons. How came he here? Is he an intruder here? Has he no business in this House? Was he not sent here by certain electors of British Columbia, and if so, how came they to be electors? The local law is the law for the election of members to this Parliament, the law which excludes Indians from the franchise and which makes it a penal offence to put the name of an Indian on the list—that is the law on which the hon. gentleman was elected to this House. Does that law express the public opinion of British Columbia? If it does not, how is it that it has continued on the Statute Book? The hon. gentleman cannot impose on this House by making clap-trap observations, such as those he has addressed to the committee. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that a representative from British Columbia, who has been quite as long in this House as he has, informed me that the members from British Columbia were opposed to granting the suffrage to the Indians. That is my authority; a gentleman who sits here as a member in this House, and was elected by a constituency in British Columbia. We have, besides that, the declaration of the First Minister—although this Bill extends the franchise to the Indians of British Columbia—that it was now his intention not to extend it to them. Is the First Minister disregarding the views of the hon. gentleman? Is the First Minister striking off the Indians in British Columbia from the classes of enfranchised persons against the wishes of the representatives of British Columbia? Is he violating this principle of uniformity which he holds so dear, which he considers of so much consequence to continue in this Bill—is he violating that principle, not only against his own convictions but against the convictions of the representatives of British Columbia? The hon. gentleman will require to make another explanation. He will require to tell the House how it is that the people of British Columbia have been so much opposed to the enfranchisement of the Indians of that Province, that they have made it a penal offence to put the names of Indians on the voters' lists, even if residing off their reservation and paying their taxes—quite as decidedly opposed as they have been opposed to putting the names of the Chinese on the lists. In the face of the statute of British Columbia, in the face of the law on which the hon. gentleman was elected to this House, how is it that he so far disregards the public opinion of the Province and the public declaration of the Prime Minister, that he declares that I have misrepresented the position of the members of British Columbia upon this question?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The hon. gentleman says he was told by some member from British Columbia, who had been in this House as long as I have. Now, Sir, that is not the question. What does he say? He says the members from British Columbia had interviewed the Government, or the leader of the Government, and that the Government had yielded to their request. I say that is not true. Now, Sir, with regard to the Indians not having a vote in British Columbia, and as to myself being an intruder here, I am no more an intruder than the hon. member for Bothwell is. I understand perfectly well that until this Parliament enacts a franchise for itself we have to be elected under the franchises of the several Provinces.

But the British North American Act gives this House the power, at any time it sees fit, to enact a franchise for itself. We are doing that to-day. Therefore, I am no intruder; I know whereof I speak; and I am responsible to my constituents and not to the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat may be justified in resenting the accusation that he has bartered away the rights of his Province; that is a question which I presume he will have to explain to his constituents when he returns to them; but while he accuses members on this side of audacity, and uses other harsh terms, because they have ventured to refer to British Columbia, still, in his capacity as a member of this House, he has not hesitated to assist the Government of the day in forcing on the various Provinces of the Dominion, other than his own, a franchise which is objectionable and obnoxious to them. With regard to the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland, I must say that the debate thus far has shown that among hon. members on this side of the House there is, on the abstract question of manhood suffrage, no concensus of opinion. It is quite evident from the tone of the debate, that the question has been forced upon the House by the Bill of the hon. First Minister. It is true many on this side have spoken in support of the amendment; but the reason generally assigned for doing so is that they have to choose between two evils. The question of manhood suffrage is rapidly forcing itself upon the attention of the people of this country, but nothing could have been done to bring it so speedily to their attention as this measure. I am not prepared to declare in favor of manhood suffrage in the Provinces; but in common with the gentlemen who have spoken on the subject, I have to make a choice between a restricted franchise and an extended franchise, and I say if we are bound to make a change at all, let us extend the franchise rather than restrict it. The great argument advanced in favor of a Dominion franchise is that of uniformity; and if we are to have a uniform franchise for the Dominion, nothing short of manhood suffrage can give us anything like uniformity. It has been urged by those who have spoken on this side, and it has not been answered, that where property is made the basis of the franchise nothing like uniformity can exist. The differences of valuation in the different Provinces and in the different municipalities render uniformity in a property franchise impossible. I presume that when the hon. member for Northumberland proposed this amendment he had in view both the establishment of the principle of manhood suffrage, which he seems to favor, and also the adoption of a uniform franchise, which seems to be the only ground on which he supports this Bill. Property qualification for voters is supposed to be based on the principle that the protection and security of property is the chief object of all legislative bodies; but I question whether we are here to preserve the security of property in this country any more than for the protection of labor. Is not the power to labor as much property as acquired wealth? Every person who has power to support himself and his family, who takes an interest in the affairs of the country, and bears his share of the taxes of the country, can as readily demand, at the hands of this Assembly, protection of his rights, as the man whose property consists in something else than the manner in which he is able to use his hands for the welfare of the nation and his family? If property is taken as a basis of the franchise, on the ground that it is a test of intelligence, then in this country it is an improper basis. The accumulation of wealth may, to a certain extent, indicate intelligence; in years gone by such a test might have been necessary; but at the present day, when the schoolmaster is abroad in the land, when the press finds its way into every hamlet in this Dominion, and when so many facilities exist for education and for our people to become acquainted with the public questions of the day, it is unnecessary for us to apply any test of intelligence to voters. Besides, an extension of the franchise would necessarily reach the younger class of the community; and although the privilege might fall in the hands of some who are unable to read and write, and who are not informed, yet in general you will scarcely find a young man to whom the franchise would be given who would not be able to read and write, and form an intelligent opinion of the questions of the day. I believe that the payment of taxes into the public Treasury should be made the basis of the franchise in this or in any other country. We know that there is not a man, whom the application of manhood suffrage would enfranchise, who is not a tax-payer in every sense of the word. That might not be the case if we were regulating a municipal franchise or a provincial franchise, in the case where direct taxation is imposed; but when we are regulating a franchise for the Dominion and making taxation or the payment of revenue a basis, every man in this country should be enfranchised, because every man is a tax-payer. In support of that opinion, I refer you, Sir, to the remarks of the right hon. the First Minister, when he was addressing the committee on this subject. He then gave us to understand, with reference to the Indians, that it would be an inhuman thing and an unheard of thing to deprive the Indians of the franchise, because they paid taxes into the coffers of the country, since they bought taxed goods and paid excise on the whiskey they consumed, and so forth; therefore, he said, they should be enfranchised. I will read the hon. gentleman's remarks. They are to be found in the *Hansard* of 30th April:

"We are actuated, I believe, by the same desire to give British subjects, red or white, if they have the property qualification, the right to vote as such. The Indian contributes to the revenue just as well as the white man. He buys taxed goods, he wears taxed clothes, he drinks taxed tea, or perhaps excised whiskey, just as well as the white man; and according to the Liberal principle, we are to have taxation without representation in the case of the poor Indian."

Then he goes on to say:

"How hon. gentlemen opposite would exclaim against the crushing tyranny of depriving a man who contributes to the revenue of the right to vote for representatives in Parliament; we should hear the Liberal drum rub-a-dub-dubbing round the country that here was an instance of oppression and tyranny—here, in a country that boasts of representative institutions; here under a Superintendent General who said, in England, that his party drew their inspirations from England, that I imposed taxation on men and then deprived them of representation."

If because the untutored Indian pays taxes into the coffers of this country he is to be given a vote, why, in the name of common sense, should not the laboring class, who pay taxes into the Dominion Treasury and are subject to all the laws of the land, be deprived of that right? Are not the wage-earning classes as well fitted to exercise it as the Indians on the reserve? The hon. gentleman is making a distinction between the Indian and the laboring classes of this country, and he prefers the Indian. I cannot better illustrate the position I take than by repeating to this committee what an old farmer told me a few days ago, and no doubt every hon. gentleman who has visited his home and talked to any of his constituents has heard many similar comments. I was asked by an old and wealthy farmer of my constituency whether the Indians on the reserves were to be enfranchised, and I told him what the First Minister had stated. "Well," said he, "that is one part of the Bill, at any rate, that all reasonable men must be opposed to. So far as I can learn the wage-earners of the country are not to be enfranchised;" and then he proceeded to give his illustration of the absurdity of this measure. "Last summer," said he, "I had working for me on my farm an Indian from one of the adjacent reserves; he proved to be a worthless creature, was drunk whenever he could get the chance, and as for public matters, did not know the difference between the town council and the Parliament of Canada, or whether the capital of the Dominion was at Bloomfield or

at Ottawa. I had to dismiss him in the middle of the summer, and he went back to the reserve, where I suppose he gets drunk as often as he can get whiskey. This summer I have employed a young man, the son of a poor man, to be sure, who works for me by the year at $15 a month. He is an intelligent, bright youth, takes two newspapers, and is better up on public questions than I am; yet this Bill will disfranchise this young man and give the franchise to the Indian I had to discharge." Now, I think that is the position in which this question stands before the House to day. If we are to enfranchise everybody, except the wage-earning class, why not enfranchise them as well? And if they are enfranchised, no class will be excluded, so that we might as well accept the amendment and establish manhood suffrage, the more especially as it will only require very simple machinery to set it in operation. I would like to ask hon. members opposite to explain what classes of the community they are desirous of depriving of the franchise, what class they are afraid of? Is it the wage-earning class? If so, let them acknowledge it and give us some reason for the exclusion of this class. They have seen fit to extend the franchise to those who are considered the most degraded and ignorant of our population; then, why debar any class of that right? If we are to have a Dominion franchise, uniform in all its features and extending as far as possible, give us manhood suffrage and provide suitable machinery to carry it into effect. All these circumstances justify me in concluding, in concurrence with the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, that if hon. gentlemen opposite were left free to vote in accordance with their consciences they would vote for the amendment.

Mr. MULOCK. The junior member for Victoria (Mr. Baker), after a good deal of reflection and time, has referred to a debate that took place in this House the 8th of this month. If he will look at the debate he will find that the reference I made to the members for British Columbia on that occasion and the charge I made against them was that they were said to have agreed to disfranchise a certain number of the citizens of British Columbia. That was the statement I made, and the hon. gentleman asks me what my authority is for that. I read my authority to the committee at that time and I will not again trouble the committee with reading it; but, for the hon. gentleman's information, I will tell him that my authority way the public press. I read to the committee on that occasion an extract from the Montreal *Herald*, which purported to give an account of the transaction as I gave it. That account stated that at a meeting of the Conservative representatives in this House the Premier stated that the members from British Columbia had assented to his Bill, although it disfranchised a few of the citizens of that Province. That statement received publicity, and was brought to the notice of hon. gentlemen within a very short time after it was published, and it has never yet been denied. It has been stated, and not contradicted, that the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia have given their sanction to a Bill which will disfranchise a certain number of the citizens of that Province, by whose votes they sit in the House to-day.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). No, no.

Mr. MULOCK. Hon. gentlemen from British Columbia are in the habit of saying "no, no," but they do not venture to give an argument. A mere denial proves nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is "no," I ask them to get up and state that the report in the Montreal *Herald* is incorrect, which says that the effect of this Bill will be to disfranchise a certain number of people in British Columbia. It has been stated by the Prime Minister himself that this will be the effect of this Bill, and merely to say "no, no" does not disprove that statement. What is the position of the members from British Columbia on this Bill? The hon. member for Victoria spoke of them as "we," assuming to be the mouthpiece of the members from that Province. When he came to the Indian question he also said "we," but when called to question on that point he said that, speaking for himself at least, he was in favor of the enfranchisement of the Indians in British Columbia. Is he going to support a Bill which does not enfranchise the Indians in British Columbia? What are the members from British Columbia in favor of and what are they not in favor of? The Bill originally contained the enfranchisement of the Chinese, and yet they voted for it on the second reading, with all its imperfections. Did they rise then and defend the interests of their Province? No; British Columbia to-day stands without a defender. I think the committee has reason to be grateful to the hon. member for Northumberland for having made this motion. He saw that this Bill contained most objectionable features; he saw that the people took different views as to the propriety of adopting it; he conceived that it was not in the interests of the country that a measure of such importance, and to which there was so much objection by a large portion of the community, should be forced upon an unwilling public, and he therefore proposed this amendment which, in his opinion, would solve the problem. I was not at one time in favor of manhood suffrage for Canada and would not vote for it now except in order to prevent a bad measure being placed upon our Statute Book; but when we look at that principle and become more familiar with it, we find that it has been adopted in every Province of Canada. In Prince Edward Island, the principle of manhood suffrage prevail. The same principle, I believe, prevails in British Columbia and in Manitoba, while in Ontario manhood suffrage prevails to-day to a certain extent. In the Province of Quebec, and I believe also in New Scotia and in New Brunswick, we have the principle of manhood suffrage recognised to a certain extent, and it is a new feature that something in regard to which the Provinces have shown their approval *pro tanto* should be disregarded. The tendency in modern times has been to depart from the property qualification and approach to manhood suffrage. In early days, in England, there were no easy means of communicating between one country and another; the only property which added dignity to a man was real estate, and the feudal system prevailed, and there may have been a reason for making the franchise depend, at that time, on the ownership of real property. But as wealth increased, as the means for the interchange of ideas increased, we find a new kind of property springing up, personal property, and so, step by step, we have found that, whilst real estate has never ceased to furnish a qualification whereby to enfranchise an elector, yet other classes of property have been also considered proper subjects of qualification. We meet this proposition with a certain degree of prejudice, no doubt. But, I ask, what harm has been done by the extension of the franchise to its present degree? It is within the memory of hon. gentlemen in this House when real estate formed the only basis of qualification. Has the State suffered anything because another class of property has received equal importance? It is but a few years since manhood suffrage, to a certain extent, was introduced into the Province of Ontario. Has Ontario suffered anything in any respect by that system?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is very unfair for hon. gentlemen to interrupt the speaker in this way. We know we are a minority in this House who are in favor of manhood suffrage, but I think it is a matter of fair play that the gentlemen who are making these noises should give the

minority an opportunity of being heard. If order is maintained we will very likely get a vote in half an hour.

Mr. MULOCK. When we find that representative institutions have not suffered in those countries where the franchise has been extended, I think we should have no hesitation in going forward in the same direction. Now, what danger is there in adopting manhood suffrage? What is the experience of other countries? Take the great United States, to the south of us. A liberal franchise has existed there since the commencement of that nation. The moment a man lands in the United States and has resided there long enough to be naturalised he enters into the full enjoyment of the rights of citizenship; and the result is, that if we can believe the utterances of the press and statesmen of the United States, there is a national spirit in that country; every man feels that he has a voice in the government of the country. If we take our own Dominion, what has been our experience? Take the Province of British Columbia, a Province that sends to this House such representatives as we find here. Take the Province of Prince Edward Island. Have either of these Provinces suffered from the system of manhood suffrage? Has any country suffered under that system? Can any hon. gentleman point to any country in the world, where representative institutions exists, based on manhood suffrage, and show any evil that has arisen therefrom? Surely we have nothing to fear. There is no evidence that in an intelligent country like Canada, with a stable and loyal population, we have any reason to apprehend the slightest danger from adopting this liberal principle. Observe the inconsistencies a restricted franchise leads us to. Here we have a proposal to enfranchise the Indian because he has a house over his head, and in the same Bill it is proposed to disfranchise the teacher because he does not own the house he lives in. There are armies of men engaged in the various professions of this country between the two oceans who will have no vote under this Bill. Is it a reasonable thing for us deliberately to enfranchise the untutored Indian and to disfranchise the teaching profession of this country? See what inconsistencies an arbitrary principle like this leads to. In view of such inconsistencies and absurdities, I think it becomes us to enquire whether we cannot adopt a system that is founded on a more reasonable basis. Now, what is the object of giving a man a vote? Is it not that he shall exercise that power for the common good? Is it not that he may have a voice in making the laws that are to govern all? The interest of the State is the sole interest, and each individual in the State suffers or profits by the result of his vote. Now, in what class of people is that power likely to be the safest? Is it necessarily the safest with those who have to own property worth $150 or $200? In these days, when education is so general, when we have half a million children attending the public schools in Ontario alone, and when that has been the system for the last twenty years, is there any reason in telling the people of Ontario to-day that they are not sufficiently intelligent to exercise the franchise? What is it that awakens in a man the highest feeling of love to his country? Is it the bit of property that he owns? True, he can say of that property: This is my home—my castle. But, above all that, does he not feel, when exercising the franchise, that his citizenship is recognised that he, by his vote, aids the state, and that in return it affords him protection. If patriotism, if love of country, is promoted by intelligence and education, then intelligent men ought to be considered in a measure of this kind. For these reasons I am an entire convert, under the circumstances, to the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and I thank him for having given us the opportunity of discussing it. On this question, at least, I trust there is no party spirit involved. The last speaker who spoke on this side was against the amendment, and some hon. members opposite are against it. I, for one, offer my tribute to the member for Northumberland for having endeavored, at this crisis, to solve this problem on a basis so fair and just, and so well calculated to promote the best interests of the country.

Mr. DAWSON. The question of universal suffrage is one on which members must naturally desire to record their opinions. For my part, I think the country is hardly ripe for such a sweeping measure. I think this Bill goes quite far enough in the extension of the franchise for the present. As to the future, we cannot say what it may bring forth. I have listened very attentively to the arguments brought forward in favor of universal or manhood suffrage, without being impressed in its favor. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made a very eloquent speech on the subject, and fortified what he said by the examples of other countries. But some of the authorities he referred to were not, I think, so eloquent in arguing that point as were the writings of the Chartists in England many years ago. They dwelt very much on the inalienable rights of man, and that the suffrage should be universal; and though great strides have been made in England since that time, in the direction of universal suffrage, they have not got quite there yet. I hope the day is very far distant in Canada when we will come to such a franchise. We have heard hon. gentlemen become very eloquent as to the extension of the suffrage, as it will affect the farmers of the country. I hope the farmers throughout the Dominion will consider well to what such a measure as universal suffrage would lead us. A farmer, when he has the suffrage, possesses a farm and a house, and his vote represents property. Extend the frachise and give it in the cities, where tens of thousands of people, under manhood suffrage, would exercise it, and the effect would be to swamp the votes of the farmers and the pioneers who have built up this country. A year's residence by foreigners or by navvies working on the railways would enable them to have votes. Members of the Opposition say the navvy has as great an interest in the country as anyone. Go and tell the farmers that those laborers, who have no stake in the country, have as great an interest in the country as they, the farmers, have, and that the franchise should be conferred upon them, and what will be the effect on the farming interest? Take 1,000 farmers, and consider what they represent. They represent a large amount of property. Take 1,000 laborers who would be enfranchised under the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and what do they represent? Their interests may possibly be antagonistic to the country; and under these circumstances the farmers have a right to be protected to the extent they are at present. It is rather singular to see how this idea of manhood suffrage has taken hold of members of the Opposition. There has hardly been a word said about Indian suffrage during this discussion. Would this universal suffrage extend to the Indians, or would there be a special clause depriving the Indians of this manhood suffrage? The amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) would have the effect of giving the Indian a vote as well as the white man. You would have to make it general; you could scarcely do otherwise. A good deal has been said about the working of universal suffrage in the United States. I do not think that should be taken altogether as an example. The circumstances of the United States have been very peculiar, and the century during which universal suffrage has been in operation is but a short time in the life of a nation. As regards the United States, we do not know what this universal suffrage may bring forth in the future. It has not always worked so harmoniously and agreeably as those who wish well to the United States could have desired. The great war

had the effect of enfranchising four millions of negroes under manhood suffrage. Should we deny it to the educated Indian, when the United States gave it to four millions of illiterate negroes? Are we, in Canada, to adopt the system which has certainly not worked there with such satisfaction as is generally supposed. The United States have prospered under their system of government, among other reasons, because they have had immense tracts of unoccupied land, where the population could spread out and not be crowded, and the States now form a very rich country. A great deal of anxiety has been manifested about the volunteers. We have been asked: Would you deprive the gallant defenders of our country of the vote—which it is said this Bill will do. I do not think it will do so. But a great point is supposed to be made out of this. I happened to read in a paper—the idea is not original with myself—a much more reasonable way of recognising the volunteers' services than by adopting universal suffrage. The article conveys an idea that could be very reasonably acted upon, and it is this:

"All of the volunteers who have gone there are delighted with the country, and there can be little doubt of many of them remaining there as settlers. Having regard to the public spirited manner in which they responded to the Government's call, and the splendid courage and dash they have shown throughout the campaign, we should hope that the Government would present each one of them with a prairie farm; and it would be a most fortunate thing for the North-West and the Dominion if the men who so gallantly rushed to the assistance of their country were to become permanent settlers in the North-West. This is the kind of loyal spirit and blood that the North-West needs, and the location of several thousands of these young men there would be a loyal influence that would be a guarantee of future peace."

Mr. MITCHELL. From what paper is that article?

Mr. DAWSON. It is from a paper called the Montreal *Herald*. That is a capital idea, and will be a much more satisfactory way of dealing with the volunteers than by establishing universal suffrage, in order that they may have the franchise. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in his speech, spoke a good deal of the franchise as it existed among the Romans. It certainly did not extend very far in ancient Rome; but there was a system which existed extensively, and that was the system of military colonies. We might have military colonies in the North-West, by establishing some of our volunteers there, and doubtless they would form a very loyal community. In the district which I have the honor to represent we have had household suffrage, and it has worked remarkably well since the district had the privilege of sending members to this House. Many people there have examined this Bill very carefully, in order to asertain whether it would extend or curtail the franchise, and they all agreed that it would make exceedingly little difference; that there was hardly a householder in Algoma but would have a right to vote; in fact, every householder who had a right to vote at present would have a right to vote under this Bill, and it was perfectly satisfactory to them. The experience I have had of the household franchise leads me to believe that it would be far more advantageous to the country, and that it would work far better at all events in the country districts and be much more desirable than universal suffrage.

Mr. MITCHELL. I only rise for the purpose of calling the attention of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down on one or two points. The hon. gentleman has called attention to what he is pleased to refer to as an inconsistency in the amendment which I have proposed to the Bill. Then, in dealing with the question of manhood suffrage, he says we have heard little else but manhood suffrage; we have heard nothing about the Indians, and he says that this amendment would have the effect of giving the suffrage to the Indians, if I understood him aright. Sir, if I recollect the position taken by the hon. gentleman at an early stage of this discussion, he was in favor of giving the Indians the suffrage. He would give the suffrage to those thousands of roaming tribes in the west, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and still he refuses the white men, those very volunteers to whom he has referred, who have gone to defend their country, to put down rebellion in the great West—he would refuse those men the right to vote, and yet he would give it to these Indians. Sir, I would tell my hon. friend that the amendment which I have had the honor to propose does not admit the Indians to the right to vote, as he assumes it does. Indians who are civilised and settled, Indians who have assumed a postion in society or in the community, such as white men have assumed, and such as entitle white men to vote, would also have the right to vote. There is no exclusion of the Indian because of his race, or his blood, but it is because of his condition, his want of intelligence, his want of assimilation to the usages of civilised society in which he happens to be placed. I would not give the Indians who have not taken that position the right to vote, but I would give to every one who has assumed the same position as the white man, who places himself in the position to contribute towards the revenues of the country, towards maintaining the institutions of the country—I would give those Indians the right to vote, but I would not give it to the numberless tribes which my hon. friend, in an earlier portion of this discussion, claimed had the right to vote.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken as to my position with regard to the Indian.

Mr. MITCHELL. Now, my hon. friend has chosen to refer to the fact that the country was not ripe for manhood suffrage, and he hoped it would be a long time before he would see manhood suffrage adopted as the principle of election in Canada. Sir, in what position does he stand here to-day? Is it not patent to everyone that in the election which resulted in the hon. gentleman occupying a place in this House these very railway navvies, to whom he refers, came down by the carloads and voted for my hon. friend.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman is entirely misinformed as to there having been carloads of navvies who came down to vote for me. That was a ridiculous story got up at the time, before the railway was finished, and it was given out here by an abandoned man, that the navvies had come down from Rat Portage to Port Arthur to vote for me. No train had gone over that portion of the road when that story was got up. I did not require navvies to come to vote for me, for in every little hamlet, every village and place in Algoma, with few exceptions, I had majorities. I had majorities in forty-five polling places, and I did not require to resort to any such means. With regard to my position with respect to the Indians, I took the position that our Act should be assimilated with some amendment to the law in existence in Ontario. That was the position which I took, and I have an amendment on the Paper which shows my position. As to depriving the volunteers of a vote, as the hon. gentleman suggested just now, I suggested or said nothing of the kind. Instead of depriving them of votes, I said they should each and all not only have a vote, but further that a lot of land in the North-West should be granted to the gallant defenders of the country. I cannot allow any hon. gentleman to so far misunderstand me as to say that I spoke in that way.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend has made a second speech, and he has corrected himself. I am bound to take his explanation with regard to what he said about the volunteers. Does he mean to imply that I was wrong in assuming that he was opposed to manhood suffrage? Does not everybody know that the class of men who have gone to the North-West within the last few weeks, to fight for and defend their country and put down rebellion, that a

large number of them are men who have not the property qualification contained in this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen say no; I say yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. Yes, yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say that large numbers of them have not; and if that is so, do I understand from the hon. gentleman that he is willing to give to those volunteers who have shown their manhood and love of country and bravery, which does credit to themselves and this country—does he mean to say that he will admit these men to the suffrage, whether they have the property or not, whether they have the income or not, that is required by this Bill? If he does, then I am glad to class him among the defenders of the principle which I have advanced in this amendment, and in which I believe. Sir, with regard to the position which the hon. gentleman took in relation to the Indians, I may have misunderstood him, or the hon. gentleman may have changed the position he took at that time; but I am glad to know that he does not advocate extending the franchise to the Indians, except, as I stated, when they occupy positions which entitle white men to vote, and that then he would be willing that the vote should be given to the Indian. I wish to observe, with regard to the question of the navvies who, it was reported, came down by hundreds to vote for the hon. gentleman, that all I can say is, that that was a statement extensively circulated through the press of this country, and believed. It was pretty generally circulated at the time that my hon. friend's large majority was enhanced very materially by that class of voters—voters on manhood suffrage alone. The hon. gentleman says that is untrue. I am bound to accept his explanation; and therefore I withdraw that part of my remarks; but I was going to observe, in relation to it, that I am sorry it is not true, and for this reason: That if that class of men could make a selection like my hon. friend, who brings so much information and intelligence to bear on every question on which he addresses the House, I say it is but another evidence to show how important it is that we should extend the suffrage to that class of people.

Mr. JENKINS. I am in favor of manhood suffrage, and from an experience of over thirty years of that system in Prince Edward Island I am satisfied that the fears expressed by some hon. gentlemen, that the manhood suffrage vote would swamp the vote of property holders, is a theory which has no foundation. Property holders and the employers of labor will always, unquestionably, to a great extent, affect the votes of those they employ. I have no doubt that the experience of Prince Edward Island has been that property holders and employers always have an influence on the voters on manhood suffrage. Under this suffrage people are elevated, and the privilege is looked upon with great favor. They esteem it very highly. But I feel that I cannot support the amendment of the hon. gentleman, for this reason: that it is very well known that in many of the Provinces manhood suffrage is not looked on with favor. In Quebec, it is very well known, the feeling against manhood suffrage is almost unanimous.

Mr. DAVIES. It has not been expressed in this House.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, the feeling in Quebec is well known to be against it; in the Legislature of Ontario a vote has been recorded against it; and in Nova Scotia, when the Conservative Government, many years ago, brought in a Bill establishing manhood suffrage, a Liberal Government which succeeded abolished it. Therefore I do not think I should be right in giving a vote to force manhood suffrage on any Province that is opposed to it. I believe that in course of time, and when the people see the advantages of manhood suffrage, it will become the suffrage of this Dominion; but until the people of the different Provinces are educated up to it, I think it would be injudicious and unwise, on the part of this House, to force manhood suffrage upon those Provinces. Therefore, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not exactly understand the reasoning of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. Because one of the Provinces of the Dominion, he says, is opposed to the principle of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland, although he thinks it is a true principle, a good thing and a just thing, yet he will sacrifice his own views, and the interests of his constituents, and the views held by his own Province, a Province having the same provincial rights—he will sacrifice all that in order to please the sentiment which he says prevails in another Province. That is a great piece of self-sacrifice. That is really a position which, in one acting for his own interests, might be commended; but when one is in the position of having the interests of his Province committed to his hands, I do not know that one is to be as generous with trusts committed to him by others as with his own. Therefore, I cannot see the position the hon. gentleman takes to be a good one. Nor can I understand, from what has taken place in this House, that the Province of Quebec, to which he has made allusion, is opposed to the principle of manhood suffrage. I have noticed that the representatives of the Province of Quebec at the back of the hon. First Minister—and they comprise, I think, nearly three-fourths of all the representatives from that Province—have, as far as I could judge, wholly and unreservedly endorsed the principles of this Bill. They have been among the strongest advocates and supporters and defenders of the Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They have a right to; it is their privilege.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought that it was the First Minister who was speaking, or I would not have paused. They had a perfect right to do so; but finding them defenders of this Bill, the main defence of which is the principle of uniformity in the franchise in all the Provinces, I cannot see any evidences from the hon. gentlemen opposite representing Quebec that Quebec Province is opposed to the principle of manhood suffrage. By their votes and their declarations they say we want this uniform franchise; and having said that, they are prepared to accept the consequences. They have not expressed any dread that a franchise might this year or in any subsequent year prevail in this House that they are opposed to. They have not stipulated that manhood suffrage should be a tabooed subject for all time to come; they know, as well as any member of the House knows, that if we pass a Franchise Bill the franchise there laid down and the qualifications therein established may not remain so for more than one year. They must know, as an almost absolute certainty, that in every succeeding year there will be amendments and alterations proposed in this Franchise Bill; and they have declared that they are willing to take all those risks. It really, I think, should not concern the representatives of other Provinces so much, having regard to that fact. It is necessary, of course, for them to reflect the views prevailing in their own Provinces, but they would not feel it their duty to force those views on another Province. For these reasons, I cannot see the logic of the hon. gentleman's position. He says he is in favor of manhood suffrage; we knew that all the representatives of the Province from which he comes favor the principle of manhood suffrage; we had it emphatically declared by them on the floor of this House; and yet, knowing that to be the universal view of their constituents—their supporters as well as their opponents—they tell us coolly that they are prepared to withhold that prin-

ciple from the Province of Quebec, although, so far as we can judge from the action of the representatives of that Province in this House, it is not opposed to manhood suffrage. Have we heard a member opposite from the Province of Quebec declare that he is opposed to it? Not one of the gentlemen from the Province of Quebec supporting this Bill has given us to understand, in any form whatever, that he is not in favor of manhood suffrage.

Mr. WHITE. We can tell by their votes.

Mr. PATERSON. But we have not had their votes yet on the subject, and I am not to judge that they are not in favor of the proposition. I suppose, from the remarks of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), that it might fairly be said that he almost claimed to carry their votes in his pocket. I have noticed, and it has been rather remarkable in this debate, that although we had an explanation from the hon. the First Minister last night, with respect to one alteration he proposed to make in this Bill, yet up to that time the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has been constantly in his place, did not seem to be in the confidence of the Government sufficiently to give us the slightest knowledge of the alterations intended to be made in the Bill; and I wondered how the hon. member for East Hastings could tell us, across the floor, that the $400 franchise was going to be reduced to $300. The hon. Minister of Public Works did not say it, but the hon. member for East Hastings did. How did he know it? Was he speaking authoratively? Then, when the hon. member for North Wellington was speaking about the judges, the hon. Minister of Public Works sat still in his place, and gave us no intimation of anything that might be done. But when the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was speaking about the undesirability of these revising officers being appointed, the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) felt himself to be in the position in which the hon. Minister of Public Works did not feel himself to be, for he said, across the floor of the House: Oh, we will give you the judge in your county. Of course it is to be determined by the Governor in Council; it is not to be declared by Act of Parliament, and this hon. gentleman rose and said: Oh, we will give you the judge in your county. On different occasions I have noticed the hon. member for East Hastings has said: We will do so and so; we are going to do this and we are going to do that. I should not wonder but the circumstances will justifiy the hon. member for East Hastings and show that he is right; I should not wonder but they will show that he knew what would be done in advance; but I say it is very remarkable that a private member of the House, for we have always considered the hon. gentleman to be a private member, should be in a position to make declarations as to what the policy of the Government would be, when the Minister of Public Works, who was leading the House, was unable to say a word in reference to it. So the hon. gentleman tells us that the members from Quebec will show, by their votes, what they are going to do. As much as to say, that he understood what they would do; as much as to say: I understand what they will do; they will stand up and vote as I do on this question; they will vote down manhood suffrage or any proposition you will bring in; we have laid down a line, and that line will be followed out. Strong objections, it is true, have been urged against this measure; there has been some effect produced in the country; public opinion is pressing upon us the fact that this is a restrictive franchise, that it shuts out many men who would be enabled to vote under the Ontario franchise, and therefore I presume that the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) must have conferred with the First Minister, when he can tell us authoritatively: Oh, the qualification will be reduced from $400 to $300, and that will bring them in, and therefore you are talking when there is no need to talk.

But we did not recognise the hon. gentleman's authority so fully; we did not know the position he occupied in the House. The Minister of Public Works, who was leading the House, was not prepared to say a word about it, and we did not feel warranted in accepting the statement of the hon. member for East Hastings. So, to resume the subject, I find myself, with reference to this amendment, in this position. It has been my individual opinion, for a great many years, that it would be a desirable thing, as soon as the country was sufficiently advanced, if I might use that expression, as soon as the country had arrived at the conclusion that it would be desirable that a man, being a man and a citizen of the country, with all the rights, liberties and responsibilities—mark you, all the responsibilities—of manhood upon him, it would be a wise thing, especially in elections for the Dominion Parliament, to make a citizen of him in every sense of the word: to give him, in addition to all the other rights, privileges and responsibilities, the right you and I prize so highly, of saying who shall be elected to make the laws under which he dwells. While that has been my individual opinion, an opinion which I have never hesitated to express in private, still the question has not been fully discussed before the electors. The extension of the franchise was discussed in Ontario at the late provincial elections, and I believe that the people of that Province are of opinion that an extension is desirable; but whether it should go the full length of adopting resident manhood suffrage, without restriction, has not been discussed, and I am now brought face to face with the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, without the opportunity of knowing what the views of my constituents are on that particular point. As a representative of a constituency in this House, I do think it is my duty, as I conceive it to be the duty of other representatives, to ascertain, as well as may be ascertained, the wishes of my constituents in regard to this extension of the franchise; but the question is before us, and I am not prepared to shirk any question that may come before us. In the absence of that opportunity, and believing the people of the country are now more ready to accept a very broad franchise than they were, and as my views go in the direction of the hon. gentleman's amendment, I feel disposed to support it. I have another reason. It is charged that we are somewhat inconsistent in arguing for the maintenance of the provincial franchises, where manhood suffrage, in so many words, does not prevail, and in being still prepared to accept manhood suffrage under this amendment. It is true that the people of Ontario, as well as the people of all the other Provinces, I believe, have been content to have the provincial franchises, and on that question I have no difficulty whatever; but that having been voted down, and this question being before the House, I am in the same position as others. I must give my vote, and that is the reason I cast it in that direction; and I do it further, for the reason that the Bill before the House restricts the franchise in Ontario most materially. I pointed out that in one industrial establishment in my own city seventy-eight men would be disfranchised, and seventy-four in another, under the operation of this Bill, who have a vote under the Ontario Act; and I have a letter from a law student in Toronto, a young gentleman who can go out and discuss public questions on the platform, who is one of the rising young men, in which he says, that under this Bill he will be debarred from exercising the franchise, although he can do so under the Mowat Act. Some of our volunteers in the North-West, and many others, will also be cut off by this Bill. The First Minister proposes to enfranchise the Indians, who cannot make their own wills or deed their own property, who are minors in the eyes of the law, and whom he is going to keep in a state of tutelage, and yet he will cut out from the franchise the hard-working mechanics I have referred to. It is a fact

that in the towns and cities throughout Canada the franchise will be taken from men who have the responsibilities of citizenship upon them, and yet it is proposed to confer it upon those who have not the responsibility of citizenship, whom the First Minister will not allow to have the responsibility of citizenship. That is the position of affairs we are under, with reference to this Bill, and for that reason, among many others, for I will draw my remarks to a conclusion, not desiring to occupy the attention of the committee at this late hour, longer, though I have much more to say on the subject, I shall give my support to the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). When I made a remark about the Quebec members, the hon. gentleman went on to make a speech upon my remark, and would not allow me to make clear what I meant. When I said, across the floor of the House, that the judges would be appointed in Ontario, I knew what I was saying was correct. The First Minister announced that that would be the case, and hon. gentlemen opposite, after having abused and insulted the revising barristers, saw they were going too far, and now they hark back. When I said the qualification would be reduced to $300, I only supposed it would be, and that was the only authority I had. I think there is more said in opposition to this Bill than hon. gentlemen opposite are warranted in saying. I was in the county of Hastings the other day, and though I travelled over forty or fifty miles of the county, I did not hear any one person mention the Franchise Bill. The hon. gentleman has said more against the Indians and their qualifications than it becomes him to say. I think the Indian is sufficiently intelligent and well qualified to have a vote. The hon. gentleman says forty mechanics in one shop will not have a vote. The establishments in that county must pay the mechanics very poorly. Of those I employ, not one will be without a vote.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to say one word.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived. Yeas, 37; nays, 81.

Amendment (Mr. Mitchell) negatived. Yeas, 33; nays, 86.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 20th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—VICTORIA RIFLES.

Mr. CURRAN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a statement which has appeared in certain newspapers to the effect that the Victoria Rifles were ordered out for duty at the front, and that a number of bankers and merchants of the city of Montreal forwarded a petition to the Minister of Militia, asking that that regiment be not ordered to the seat of war, inasmuch as it would inconvenience them in their business. As representing the electoral district in which all the banks are situate, and the great body of the mercantile community, I would like to know if any such petition has been received, as I have been informed, on good authority, that the statement is without foundation.

Mr. CARON. In answer to my hon. friend I must say that no such petition has been forwarded to me. No order was given to the Victoria Rifles to go to the front, and if such an order had been given I know perfectly well that it would have been carried out with as much promptitude as by any other battalion in the city of Montreal. It is one of the very best battalions, and I am glad to say that the merchants and bankers have not in any way expressed their unwillingness to allow those who are employed by them to take part in the events which are taking place in Canada at this moment.

FORTY MILE RAILWAY BELT, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish once again to call attention to the fact that the question which I put with reference to the correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, and as to the 40-mile railway belt in British Columbia, have not yet been answered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With reference to the 40-mile railway belt, I have received this memorandum:

"The Government have received from Mr. Pierce S. Hamilton, a well-known journalist of Nova Scotia, but now, it appears, residing in British Columbia, a memorial addressed to His Excellency the Governor in Council, respecting the claims of squatters within the unsurveyed portion of the railway belt in British Columbia. Mr. Hamilton, in the memorial in question, represents himself as secretary to a meeting held at Port Moody, at which the resolutions contained in the memorial were adopted. In reply, Mr. Hamilton was furnished with a copy of the Dominion Lands Act, the provisions of which, he was informed, in so far as they are applicable, would be extended to British Columbia. He was further informed that it was the intention of the Government to protect *bonâ fide* squatters upon the agricultural land, within what is known as the railway belt in British Columbia, and that surveys of the belt were then, as they are now, being prosecuted under instructions from the Department of the Interior, and so soon as they were sufficiently advanced to permit of claims being adjudicated upon, such claims would be at once disposed of. The Surveyor General of Dominion lands is now, and has been for some time, in British Columbia, personally supervising the prosecution of these surveys. The Government have no means of knowing how many people have settled on the unsurveyed lands in the belt, and there is no reason why there should be anxiety or discontent among these settlers. The regulations for the survey, administration and disposal of these lands have been adopted by the Governor in Council, and published in the *Canada Gazette* and *British Columbia Gazette*; and, as already stated, the surveys are now, and were, during the season of 1884, being vigorously prosecuted. Until surveys have been made, it is out of the power of the Government to grant patents to lands, but the Dominion Lands Act and the regulations make ample provision for the protection of the claims of persons settling in advance of survey."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps it would be well, if it does not invite premature discussion, that I should mention at once what amendments I propose to the whole of this third section, and then we can discuss the various paragraphs without wandering over the whole clause. I was a good deal struck with the remarks made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) last night in reference to the Ontario Act, to the effect that the Ontario Government, whatever their individual opinions might be with regard to manhood suffrage, had gone as far as they thought would ensure the success of their measure, which was a step towards, perhaps, the ultimate result of manhood suffrage. In perhaps the same sense I have had occasion to consult the representatives of the people in this House giving their confidence to the Government; I have carefully considered all the clauses and all the suggestions; and I think I have come to the conclusion that in order to ensure the safety of the measure, the Government have gone as far as they can well go in order to secure that support for the measure in this House which is essential to its becoming law. As regards the clause now before us, which

provides that the owner of real property in any city or town must be the owner to the actual value of $300, after full consideration I have come to the conclusion, so far as towns are concerned, to reduce the value to $200. It being the general opinion, so far as I have gathered it, that the value of $200 in what is ordinarily known as a town would be about equivalent to the value of $300 in a city. Then, as regards the next sub-section, that referring to tenancy, there is no alteration in the amount of rental, but there is a verbal alteration in the month, as we consider November and January should be fixed as the date of payment. Hon. gentlemen will see that, according to the 23rd line, the rent must be paid on the quarter day that occurs next before the first day of November in each year; instead of that, I propose that this part of the clause shall read: "Shall be the year's rent up to the last yearly, half-yearly, quarterly, or monthly day of payment, as the case may be, which shall have occurred next before the date of the certificate of the final revision of the voters' list hereinafter mentioned, by the revising officer." As regards the fifth sub-section, that relating to occupancy, I make the same alteration in the date, and change the qualification to $300 for cities, and $200 for towns, instead of $300 for cities or towns. With respect to the income sub-section—sub-section 6—I propose to make an important amendment. I considered at first that there was no necessity for the words I propose to insert, but the discussion—especially the comparisons between this Bill and the Ontario Bill—has shown, I think, the necessity of making this alteration. I propose that the 6th sub-section shall read as follows: "Is a resident within such city or town, or part of a city or town, and derives an income"—I propose to add these words: "as earnings" or—"from some trade, calling, office or profession."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any change in the amount?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; as regards the income, it is reduced from $400 to $300. Then as regards the sons of owners, it was stated in discussion that the absence was too short. The last proviso of this sub-section, sub-section 7, provides that "the occasional absence of a son from the residence of the father or mother, for not more in all than 4 months in the year, shall not disqualify such son as a voter under this Act." It has been expressed strongly and, I think, reasonably, that in certain avocations, 4 months is not sufficient, and I propose to extend that to 6 months.

Mr. MULOCK. Both in sub-sections 7 and 8?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; although it will be 6 months, and I have adopted a clause which I shall propose for the consideration of the Committee—a clause which I find in the Nova Scotia Franchise Bill. I think it is a very good one, and I shall submit for the favorable consideration of the committee:

"The time spent by mariners and fishermen in the transaction of their occupations, and by students in institutions of learning, within the Dominion of Canada, shall be considered as spent at home."

These are the amendments I am going to propose. We will now take up the third clause. I move that it be altered to read as follows:—

"Is the owner of real property within such city or part of a city, of the actual value of $300, or within such town or part of a town, of the actual value of $200."

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest that the amendment go a little farther with regard to cities. In Quebec, the amendment will be very good in so far as it affects cities already constituted by themselves electoral districts, such as Quebec and Montreal. But there are other cities which are rather towns than cities, such as Sherbrooke, Hull, Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe, whose population are not, in some cases, over 6,000 or 7,000 and in others 3,000 or 4,000. In all those the qualification is $200 by the Quebec law. The qualification in all cities entitled to return one or more members is $300, but in others, such as those I have mentioned, it is $200, so that if the amendment proposed be carried as it is, a number of voters in the latter will be disfranchised.

Mr. LANGELIER. In support of what my hon. friend has urged, I might say that in the Province of Quebec it is more a matter of fancy than of permanent rule, whether a place be called a city or town. When I had a seat in the Legislature of Quebec, I have seen places insisting on being called cities, although their population was very small, and they obtained the name of cities by getting an amendment to their charters of incorporation. For instance, Hull was incorporated a city in 1874 or 1875, although its population was then scarcely larger than when it was a town; while Levis, which is a much larger place than Hull, and especially much larger than Sherbrooke and Three Rivers, is only a town by its charter, and does not return a member. The suggestion made by my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) is entirely in the spirit of the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, which were to the effect that a higher qualification should be had in larger places, but not in places which were only towns. In the Province of Quebec that distinction does not exist, for a city there is not supposed to be a larger place than a town. As a matter of fact, there are towns which are much larger than cities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say that is quite true, but we must proceed upon some general rule. Cities are supposed to be towns of such importance that they claim to be elevated in municipal rank, and I am afraid that those cities which have too much ambition must pay the penalty of their ambition. It is something like some merchants and bankers in London, who, in order to raise their credit, pay a larger income tax than they would otherwise pay. I think I must adhere to the general principle that cities are more important than towns as a general rule, and that the property in cities, as a general rule, is more valuable than in towns. Hereafter ambitious towns will think twice, perhaps, before they seek a more important name.

Mr. LAURIER. There is a general rule which can be very easily applied. There are cities that have been deemed so important that they have been constituted electoral districts, such as Quebec, Montreal and Toronto. There are other cities which, though they have the name, have not been entitled to the same privilege, on account of their minor importance. I think, therefore, that you might adopt the language which I find in the Quebec electoral law: "Any city having the right to return one or more members to the House of Commons." That is a general rule which might be applied in this matter.

Mr. GILLMOR. I would ask the First Minister whether he has considered the personal qualification which has been in operation in New Brunswick for a long time, and in regard to whether some of my associates from New Brunswick think a large number will be disfranchised under this Bill. I do not think it will disfranchise as many as some of my associates do, but I think it will disfranchise some very worthy voters. We have many voters on vessel and other property whom we expect to be disqualified under this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After full consideration, we thought it better to adhere to the Bill as it is now. It is true that there are persons who have a large capital invested in ships, but those persons are all householders or have sufficient income or are occupants, so that they are sure to have a vote. I do not believe there is a single man in Canada who owns a ship who has not a vote under this Bill in some shape or other.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think myself that the Bill will embrace a good many who will not depend altogether upon their property, Still many worthy persons will be disfranchised under this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but we cannot provide for every possible case.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to ask the First Minister in regard to the occupant clause, whether he is going to require residence for any particular time before the election at which these people vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When I made this general statement, it was with the expectation that we would not go over the whole of the sections at once, but would take them up as they came. The proposition now is in regard to the ownership in cities and towns. When we come to the occupant clause, I will be glad to discuss it with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I approve of the suggestion of the First Minister as far as it goes, but the other day I looked through the census returns to see how the population of towns compared in the different Provinces, and it seems to me that, if it were possible to put into the clause some figures as to population, it would be better. The greatest inequalities exist in the various Provinces as to the population of towns. In New Brunswick for example, I find a place described in the census of 1881 as a town, having a population of 318. I find a great many towns in the Province of Quebec having a population of some less than 1,000 and a great number under 2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these towns in New Brunswick?

Mr. MULOCK. There is Milltown, with a population of 1,664, and there is Upper Milltown with a population of 318.

Mr. FOSTER. They are not towns.

Mr. MULOCK. They are described as towns in the census. The difficulty arises from adopting the denomination of the municipality, which is entirely the creature of the provincial Legislatures. The First Minister will see that, if we give a qualification to a place called a town, it is necessary to remember that it is a town by virtue of some local Act, and the Local Legislature may, to a certain extent, modify the effects of this legislation by altering the denomination of that place. It may unmake towns and re-convert them into villages, and the moment it does so by a local Act it would enfranchise in that way more than were at first enfranchised by this Bill, and *vice versâ*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You do not object to that?

Mr. MULOCK. I hope my remarks will be considered in the same way in which I intended them. As we are trying to apply a general system through the various Provinces, and as there is no uniform practice as to what shall entitle a place to be called a village, or city, or a town, I suggest whether it would not be possible to put some limitation into the Bill. In Ontario the Legislature has refused to incorporate a village into a town unless it has, I think, 2,000 population.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have a right to claim to be a town if they have a certain population.

Mr. MULOCK. They apply for a special Act.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). No, not in towns; only in cities.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the population required?

Mr. HICKEY. 2,000 for a town.

Mr. MULOCK. I thought that was the number. There cannot be a general rule, however, throughout all the Provinces in that respect, because we find many towns with very different populations. For example, in Nova Scotia I find that Marshall is called a town, with a population of 1,077.

Mr. VAIL. That is not a town.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, in New Brunswick, is Milltown a town?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. In the census of 1881 it had a population of 1,664. In the Province of Quebec, Rimouski is described as a town; it had a population of 1,417. St. Ours is a town with a population of 808. Iberville, in the Province of Quebec, a town with a population of 1,847; Beauharnois, a town with a population of 1,499; Louiseville, a town, 1,381; Terrebonne, a town, 1,398, and so on. If we go from Province to Province we find that what makes a town in one Province will not make a town in another Province. Now, it seems to me it would be reasonable to put in a limitation of what should be a town. Say, any municipality not having a population of 2,000 at the time of a certain census, should be a village, because, I presume, it is the number of people who are congregated together that gives value to the property in their midst on which the voter is to qualify. I have an amendment which I intend to move, namely, that the word "three" in the sixth line, on page 4, be struck out, and the word "two" be inserted in lieu thereof. That would reduce the property qualification required in cities and small towns. The First Minister says he is opposed to that view; but it seems to me that we should adopt it, and require a smaller qualification. We find the qualification in cities and towns in the Province of Ontario, to-day, is $200; in Quebec cities it is $300, as proposed, and in towns, $200; in New Brunswick, $100; in Nova Scotia, $150; Manitoba, $100; Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, manhood suffrage. So that throughout the whole Dominion no property qualification to the extent of $300 is required, except in cities and towns in the Province of Quebec; and if the Premier would reduce that qualification from $300 to $200, the only Province that would be affected by it would be Quebec. I think that would be striking a middle course better than to adhere to $300.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is $300 and $200 in Quebec.

Mr. MULOCK. So I said, but that is the only Province in which $300 is required in cities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Four hundred dollars is required by the present law in Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. When the new law comes into force, it will be $200. Therefore, to-day, a $300 property qualification may be considered as a thing of the past in every Province except Quebec.

Mr. CASEY. Before we settle the amount of the qualification, I wish to move an amendment in regard to real property, namely: That the words "or real and personal" be inserted between the words "real" and "property," in the first line of this third sub-section. A subsequent clause of this Bill, confers the franchise upon fishermen who possess a certain amount of real and personal property combined, the value of their boats and fishing tackle being added to that of their real property. It is proper enough that fishermen should have this privilege, but there are other classes who should have it also. There are in cities and towns small tradesmen and mechanics, whose real estate might not be sufficient to qualify them under this clause, and I think they should be allowed to make up the amount by counting in the value of their machinery, tools or stock-in-trade, or, in fact, that whatever they may have to assist them in carrying on their trade shall be counted, just as in the case of fishermen.

Mr. IVES. I am opposed to that amendment, because it would practically create the greatest possible confusion in the formation of the list. Any man, the merest tramp, coming along to the revising officer, could insist that he was entitled to registration, because he had an old horse somewhere, or an old cart, though not within the knowledge of the officer preparing the list. In the case of fishermen, there is some way of arriving at the amount of their personal property, their boat and tackle are to be seen; but if that privilege is to be extended to others than fishermen, it will create the greatest possible confusion, and I think it is entirely unnecessary. If we are to go beyond the very liberal provision for the franchise, as laid down in the Bill, and as the Prime Minister proposed to amend it, I think we had better adopt manhood suffrage at once.

Mr. MULOCK. The other evening the First Minister was kind enough to endeavor to satisfy the House upon a certain point, and he did satisfy me; but since then I have noticed in the public press that it has been stated that the amendment which he intended to offer to a certain section, did not fully meet the case. I think the public is, to some extent, under a misapprehension as to the right hon. Premier's statement. Perhaps his words did not fully convey his meaning, though they satisfied me. Therefore, I would take the liberty of asking this question: Where a revising officer is appointed who is not the county judge, I understood the right hon. Minister to say that, in that case, there would be an appeal allowed from the finding of the revising officer on all questions of law and fact, to the county judge; that the judge would visit the various municipalities in that riding, and there sit with original jurisdiction. I wish to ask the right hon. Premier if I understood him correctly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not relevant to the present clause, but the hon. gentleman told me he was going to ask this question, and I have no objection to answer it. He is quite right in his idea. In counties where the revising officer is not a judge, there will be an appeal from the revising officer to that judge, both on questions of fact and of law, and the appeal can be made without the discretion of the revising officer, and, as a matter of right; also, on the final revision, he shall go and visit each municipality and have original jurisdiction as well as in appeal.

Mr. CASEY. I think the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) are beside the case. He has conjured up the bugbear of a tramp proposing to qualify on an old horse, which he tells the revising officer he possesses somewhere else. My amendment provides that a man shall qualify on real and personal property, not on an old horse alone. In the first place, we hope that the revising officer would know better than to take the word of a tramp as to the possession of an old horse in some out of the way part of the country, and to give him a vote on the horse. Almost every one will have in mind the case of persons in business, in a small way, in cities and towns, and especially in villages, who would not be able to qualify on real estate alone. For example, small shoe-makers, whose real property was not worth $200 or $300, would be able to qualify if stock-in-trade and implements were included. The same is true of blacksmiths, though, as a rule, their places of business are of some value. The number would not be very large, but I mention these cases for the sake of the principle, and in order to secure uniformity. The proviso with respect to fishermen, one might almost suppose to be a bid for the support of that class. Possibly such is not the case, and it has been inserted with a view to doing justice. If so, there can be no objection to extending the same measure of justice to other classes following different callings. I ask to have the amendment amended so as to read as follows: "or real property and implements of his calling or stock-in-trade." These words to be inserted after "real property" in the first line of paragraph three.

Mr. WILSON. The First Minister will find that in many incorporated cities the value of property is not higher than in towns. No doubt many small store-keepers will be disfranchised if the qualification is held at $300 assessment. I hope the First Minister will see his way to make the concession asked. In the city of St. Thomas there are a number of people who would have a vote under the Ontario Act, and yet would not have a vote at Dominion elections.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the condition of things that would exist under this clause of the Bill. Sandwich is the county town of Essex, and its population is less than 1,000. The population of the village of Essex Centre is 2,000. Under this Bill a person in that village would have the vote if assessed for $150, while in Sandwich he would require to be assessed for $200 to obtain the franchise, In the county of Bothwell, the town of Bothwell has a population between 800 and 1,000. The village of Morrisburg has a population of 2,000. The qualification in the former is $200 and in the latter $150. The First Minister is sacrificing a principle to an end. We do not determine what places shall be a town. If the hon. gentleman were to say that in places having so many thousand population, the qualification should be a certain amount, and in places with a less population it should be a different amount, there would be something definite about the proposition, and we would be conforming with the principle on which the Government set out. I hope, however, the hon. gentleman will agree to abandon the multiplication of qualification. The Ontario Bill provides that $200 shall be the qualification in towns and cities, and $100 in villages and rural districts. It is perfectly obvious we are attaching very little importance to the possession of property. That being the case, a great inconvenience arises from the adoption of the principle of the Bill. A few men may get control of the village council for the time being, and in order to obtain a mayor or police magistrate, they get incorporation as a town. A large number of persons who at the time were qualified might be thereby disqualified by the action of a few men. I am sure if the hon. gentleman will consult the member for Essex, he will find the facts to be as I have stated with regard to that county, and I know them to be as I have stated, in my own constituency. The instances mentioned by the hon. member for North York from the census, show that there are many places under 1,000 inhabitants which are called towns, and many places that have at least 2,000 inhabitants that are still villages.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). So far as my section of the country is concerned, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is quite correct. Take for instance the village of Leamington, or the village of Essex Centre, the population of either of those places is double the population of the town of Sandwich, the county town.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not incorporated.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). It is one of the oldest incorporated towns in Ontario; it has a mayor, a reeve, and all the paraphernalia of a town. I do not know how the matter will affect the other Provinces, but so far as my own part of the country is concerned I think they might be placed in the same category, for it is a very rare thing for a village in Western Ontario to be incorporated unless it has a large population, and, on the other hand, there are many towns that are decaying, while villages are springing up and becoming large places around them. Take, for instance, Tilbury village, which is unincorporated. It is partly in Essex and partly in Kent, and still it has a much larger population

than Sandwich. I believe that the qualification of $200 in a place like Sandwich is a much higher qualification than $100 in Leamington or Essex Centre, which are prosperous places. I know I would rather have $100 worth of property in Essex Centre than $200 in Sandwich.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot settle any franchise based on property so as to meet every possible case. The only way we could have dead uniformity would be to have universal suffrage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared for that, and I want to carry this Bill this Session, and if we commence to re-arrange the franchise *de novo*, I think the Session would be a long one. With respect to Sandwich, it has been unfortunate from a variety of circumstances. From being on the frontier, at the very outside edge of the country, it has not progressed to such an extent as it promised originally. But this is a very young country, and I hope, before my hon. friend who represents that part of the country so worthily, departs from political life, Sandwich will rise with the general progress of the country to its old position.

Mr. MILLS. It is only a suburb of Windsor, now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks about Leamington and its population. Well, if Leamington gets the population of a town it will soon have the ambition to be a town, and then the property, no doubt, will rise in value, and the amount required by the franchise will be equalised. Really, I have considered well how far I can go with any prospect of carrying my Bill, and I cannot yield personally—I do not feel authorised to yield to these suggestions. I will try, as far as possible, to liberalise the Bill, and meet the views of all hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of the hon. gentlemen on this side, as we have heard the argument advanced, and with some force, that we must eventually come to manhood suffrage, we had better go on now, and it will be the agreeable duty of the hon. member for Bothwell, when he gets on this side, if he does not go quite as far as manhood suffrage, to liberalise this measure still further. We must leave something for our successors to do, and we are making substantial progress in the direction in which these hon. gentlemen desire to go.

Mr. MILLS. I must say that the hon. gentleman appears to me to take an extraordinary way of liberalising the Bill. In one case the qualification under the law, as it now stands, is $200, and he proposes to make it $300. In another case it is $100, and he proposes to make it $150. That may be his notion of liberalising the franchise, but it is not mine. The hon. gentleman refers to Leamington and other places, and says they will be ambitious to become towns, but as the conditions upon which they can become towns is the disfranchisement of a considerable number of the poorer classes, it is one which is not likely to be hastily complied with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that in his time and mine a great many towns have become villages, and a great many cities have become towns, and they have done this notwithstanding the different qualification before them. They have not been prevented from changing their condition by the fact of their being obliged to have a higher qualification.

Mr. HESSON. I think it will be found that as it is well known that under the Ontario law property is generally assessed much below its value, to avoid additional taxation the variations which have been spoken of will be adjusted, and that there will be practically no difference as to the classes of property upon which votes will be allowed.

Mr. AUGER. One of the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman wished to pass this Bill was that we might have a uniform franchise, but I think if we cannot have a uniform franchise all over the Dominion we should at least have i t uniform in the same county. But according to the Bill a man in one part of the county will have the right to vote on a property worth $150, while across an imaginary line, in the same county, his property will have to be worth $300 in order that he may have a vote. That is rather incongruous. The Bill will be known for its uniform want of uniformity.

Mr. MITCHELL. I entirely approve of the principle of the amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), but it does not go far enough. Now, in the Province to which I belong the franchise is $100 real estate, $400 personal estate, and $400 income. The experience of the people in that Province has been that the franchise in personal property has not been objectionable in any way. I have had a good deal of experience, I have been thirty years in Parliament, I have run a good many elections, and have had intercourse with most of my constituents, so that I know a good deal about their feelings and wishes, and I believe it is their desire not to limit the franchise, but to widen it if possible. So far as my Province and my county are concerned, this Bill makes a distinct limitation of the franchise, and therefore I move, as an amendment to the amendment, to add the words "or personal property of the value of $400." That qualification has been in existence in New Brunswick for thirty or forty years, and has worked well. I can see no reason why a person who is a good citizen and owns personal property of the value of $400 or $500 or $1,000 should not have the right to vote as well as the owner of real property. So far as the Bill is concerned there is no uniformity in it; I do not expect to see any uniformity grow out of it; but we have determined to adopt it, and it is our duty to make it as perfect as possible in its passage through the committee, without outraging the rights of any individuals anywhere in the Dominion.

Mr. BURPEE. I have great pleasure in seconding that motion. In fact, I have in my hand a motion drawn by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) to the same effect, which I shall put into your hands. In New Brunswick we have a personal property qualification, under which a great many exercise the franchise; and a franchise that does not provide for personal property qualification will exclude a great many from the vote. Even if the amendment is adopted, a great many in the city of St. John will be deprived of the franchise. There they have a freeman's qualification, under which any freeman, who has taken out a license to do business and who has personal property to the value of $100, is a voter.

Mr. DAVIES. I would suggest to the hon. member for Northumberland, that perhaps it would be better for him to withdraw his motion as an amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin. I think that he will find that the wording of the amendment of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Burpee), will attain the object he has in view better than his own, because it provides that the vote on personal property must be based on residence and assessment in addition to ownership to the value of $400. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to consider those two ingredients which are absent from his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thought of the point my hon. friend mentions, because it comes right home to me in my own constituency. There personal property is subject to assessment, and the assessment list is the basis of the list on which we vote. I agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's; but we are met with the fact, that in the Province of Quebec, which seems to be the *bête noire* in the way of obtaining manhood suffrage, personal property is not assessed. Therefore, I think it would be better to leave the amendment as it is, although, if the technicality can be got over in some way, I have no objection to accept the suggestion.

Mr. DAVIES. I think there is a good deal in the objection of the hon. gentleman. I did not think of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. You have always to think of the Province of Quebec in this House.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I would ask whether it would not be well to amend the amendment to make residence an essential.

Mr. IVES. I would suggest that the party should put his personal property into a piece of land, and that would obviate the difficulty.

Mr. DAVIES. That is all very well, but we must consider the circumstances of the various parts of the Dominion as they are. All fishermen—and these are the kind of men who have personal property—must not necessarily have real estate also. In the Province of New Brunswick, I am given to understand, there are a large number of persons whose property is personal and who now possess the franchise, and I am sure the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe would not desire to exclude them.

Mr. IVES. I do not desire to exclude them, but if the qualification is based on assessment that gets rid of the difficulty I find with the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland. In most of the Provinces, so far as I am aware, personal property is not assessed and is not the basis of taxation, and how are you to fix the franchise on personal property when it can only apply to a certain portion of the Dominion where it is assessed ?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would point out that the hon. gentleman's amendment is not an amendment to the amendment. It would come in properly after the amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin is disposed of.

Mr. MITCHELL. If it is not strictly in order, I will withdraw it until it is, and then propose it as a substantive amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the proposal that personal property should continue to form a basis of qualification in New Brunswick, and it would be a pretty fair basis of qualification in other Provinces where it does not now form such a basis. I do not see why a man who has personal property, say in the shape of machinery in his trade or stock in a store, should not be entitled to vote. I do not see why such a person has not as much stake in the country as one who is merely living here for a time and earning a certain income. I think a person who has any kind of property, either real or personal, is more likely to remain a permanent resident than one who is merely living here or there while earning a certain income. I put my motion in its present restricted shape, not because I was opposed to the wider proposal, but to make it exactly parallel with the fisherman's franchise.

Amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the word "three" in the sixth line on page 4, sub-section 3, be struck out, and the word "two" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand that this amendment proposes to substitute, in place of what the First Minister proposes, a uniform franchise of $200 for both cities and towns. Now, the First Minister himself must be aware that one of our main objects, or one of his main objects, is to produce a franchise as uniform as is possible. It appears to me that the introduction, as matters stand in Canada, of a franchise of $300 for cities and $200 for towns, makes a very needless confusion ; and also, that we must consider that proposition in connection with the next clause which fixes the qualification of tenants of real properties in cities and towns. Anybody who is practically acquainted with the operation of a franchise knows perfectly well that if there be any class in the community who are less likely than others to form desirable voters, it is precisely that class of persons who occupy small tenements in cities. I can only speak with knowledge of the class who occupy tenements in the cities of Ontario, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that the possession of the smallest portion of property is a better qualification, if you have a property qualification at all, for the exercise of the franchise, than the fact that men are occupying, as tenants, single rooms very often in cities, at a monthly rental of $2, or an annual rental of $20. Whoever has inspected the poorest quarters of our cities, knows perfectly well that the class of persons who have tenements of that description are, as a rule, very decidedly inferior to that class of voters who have either such qualifications as my hon. friend behind me proposes to insert or the qualification of owning property of the actual value of $200. I can see no consistency or principle whatever in refusing to the owners of real property in cities to the extent of $200 a franchise which you are willing to give to the tenant who may occupy a single room in a lodging house, such as is the only accommodation offered to too many of our people in many quarters of large cities. It appears to me that there is no sort of reason or justification for refusing the qualification to the real property owners of the value my hon. friend proposes to enfranchise, and which if my memory is correct, is that to be used under the Ontario Act, and giving it to the class of persons whom the very next section proposes to enfranchise. This is a matter in which you must have regard to the classes of persons to whom you are about to grant the franchise. I believe that the proposition introduced by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), although I could only support it as an alternative, although I greatly preferred leaving the matter with the Provinces, would have given the franchise to a great many persons more desirable than those the very next clause desires to give it to. I do not see the slightest reason for giving it to tenants at such a very low value and refusing it to proprietors of property worth $200 in cities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The principle of uniformity is not carried out in the Ontario Bill, as the hon. gentleman will see since, in cities and towns, the qualification is $200, and in incorporated villages $100 ; and, as we have heard from several hon. members, there are various incorporated villages much more prosperous than the towns. I think we must adhere to the proposition on the paper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was not precisely the argument to which I was calling the attention of the committee. I was calling its attention to the class of persons to whom the hon. gentleman proposes to give the franchise, under the tenancy clause; that is to say, the occupants of rooms at a very low rent ; and I do not see why we should exclude the owner of property, which is a much better qualification than tenancy.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). If the right hon. gentleman is willing to let in tenants who may only hold a single room at $2 a month, he should not object to letting in the freeholder who owns $200 worth of property. It is noteworthy that in cities and towns, the very places where he requires an extra freehold qualification, this extremely low tenancy qualification is admitted. The Bill admits the very lowest class of tenants in cities and towns, in point of financial resources, but requires a much higher qualification for freeholders than is required in other places. Apart from that, I think the greater uniformity in the Ontario Bill as between cities and towns is worthy of imitation for this reason. I do not think there is any such clearly drawn distinction between cities and towns, taking them merely as they are named cities and towns, as the Bill would seem to imply. Is there any reason why the moment a town attains a population of 10,000 and becomes a

city, as it can under the law of Ontario, the qualification should he raised one-third? Certainly, the value of property does not go up one-third in that time, and there is no reason why the qualification should be raised one-third simply because the place is called a city, while it remains with exactly the same population, and property has exactly the same value as it had before being incorporated. On the other hand, even in a large city, there is no such great difference between the value of property, of the class of properties that would be covered by this clause, as the hon. gentleman seems to think there is. Of course, in the better parts of large cities, property is vastly more valuable than in towns, but the only class of property to which this clause will apply would be very small properties in poorer parts of the city, or perhaps the suburbs; and I do not think that property in the suburbs of a city, where you can get lots for $300, or in the slums of a city, is one-third more valuable than in the best parts of our prosperous towns. Therefore the distinction on that ground is illogical. If you mean to have a distinction between the two, let the higher qualification apply only to such cities as form electoral districts. There you have a perfectly logical and reasonable line of division, because the cities would undoubtedly be much larger than any merely incorporated towns.

Mr. IVES. Question.

Mr. CASEY. We are speaking to the question. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe seems to be tired.

Mr. IVES. I have heard you make forty speeches on it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says he is tired of hearing me. He need not hear me. He need not listen to me. He can quietly pay his attention to something else, as he generally does, but, if he persists in introducing his criticism of me while I am speaking, he will simply delay the proceedings.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. CASEY. I have been put off the line of argument which I was following.

Mr. BOSSÉ. Louder, I cannot hear what you say.

Mr. CASEY. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman feels the loss. There are other people who wish to hear me also, and, if the hon. gentlemen will cease to interrupt me, they will hear me much better. There is no logical reason for the increase in the amount of qualification following the mere fact of a town becoming incorporated as a city. I can conceive that there would be some reason when a town became a really large city, an important place, an electoral district, but to make the mere fact of incorporation as a city raise the qualification by one-third is illogical and unfair. It has been pointed out by quotations from the census that very frequently you will require the higher qualification from so-called cities which are smaller than so-called towns, and that would have an effect directly the opposite of the intention which the First Minister seems to have had in view. It is true, as he says, that you cannot make a Bill which will cover all possible cases, but, when it is pointed out that there is a way of avoiding certain injustice, I think he should give it due consideration, and I do not think the change could, on any reasonable grounds, be objectionable to those gentlemen behind him whom he has consulted. It is simply a further step in the direction of uniformity.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister proposes that the property qualifications in cities shall be $300, and by the next section he proposes that the qualification of a tenant shall be $2 a month. There are many cases in which the proprietor might be disqualified, while the tenant would have a vote. There are many cases where the property has to be valued at less than $300, where the rental would be more than sufficient to give a vote to the tenant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Twenty dollars a year is about 7 per cent on $300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister must know perfectly well that the rents paid by these poor people in large cities are out of all proportion to the selling value of the property. There are a large number of rookeries which, I am sorry to say, are beginning to exist in our own cities, where people are obliged to content themselves with the occupation of one or two rooms only, and in such cases—in the case of joint ownership, for instance—it would be found that the rent demanded was decidedly more than even 10 or 12 per cent. That is a well-known feature in connection with that kind of property, and the hon. gentleman is much too intelligent not to know it, as he is also much too intelligent not to know that the particular class of persons paying the rents which he names are—although I do not want to deprive them of the franchise—probably the class who offer the least security of any for the right of exercising the franchise.

Mr. HICKEY. I do not think we are here to level existing distinctions, if the people choose to make them. If a place calls itself a city, it is for some advantage, and I think we are in duty bound to accept these distinctions here. Hon. gentlemen say it is unjust that a man on one side of an arbitrary line should not have a vote on the same amount of property which qualifies a man on the other side of that line, but we find these arbitrary distinctions in law. There is a six years limitation in regard to a debt, and a ten years limitation in regard to the possession of land. These are arbitrary provisions. It might be unjust that a debt one day over six years could not be collected, but that is the law. It is quite as unjust in the one case as in the other.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When this Bill was first drawn, it is to be supposed after being reasonably well considered, it did not appear to the First Minister that there was any difference between towns and cities. He made the qualification the same, $300, and I think he was right in making it the same. I do not think that, in a great part of Ontario, at any rate, there is any difference in the value of property in the moderately prosperous town and in the moderately prosperous city. Why, then, having laid down originally the doctrine that in towns and cities the value should be uniform, does he depart from the principle which he himself set out with? I agree that it is right to reduce the amount, but I think it is better to make the reduction uniform in both cases.

Mr. WILSON. If the First Minister has been in the habit of renting property, he would find that it would be difficult to charge even as little as $2 a month for a property worth $300 in order to make anything out of it. I believe this will disfranchise many of those living in small tenements in cities, and, I think, if you are going to do what is right, you will reduce the amount to $200, especially in cities which are not of a sufficient size to entitle them to send representatives to this House. If the First Minister owned houses and attempted to rent them, he would find that he would require more than 7 per cent. if he was going to make any money out of it. I know of many places which are assessed at less than $300 but which are renting for $2.50 and $3 a month, and in those cases the owner would be disfranchised, while the tenant could record his vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have in my mind's eye a case in my own town. There is a factory in connection with which eight or nine small houses were built, the man who put them up intending to rent them to operatives in his factory. In some cases he has sold the houses to men who work in the factory. I know that those houses are assessed for $150 each, and for the houses that are not sold he gets a rent of $2 a month. Now everyone of those tenants at $2 a month will have a vote, while those which have bought the houses, which are only assessed for $150, will be deprived of vot-

ing. I know these facts personally, and I think it is an injustice.

Mr. WATSON. I think the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for Quebec should be adopted, as to the size of the town. For instance, there are three towns in my county that are incorporated, and I do not think the population of all of them amounts to more than 1,500. Unless a town has a population of, say, 1,500, it ought to be classed as a village, and the qualification should be $150. At present, in Manitoba, $100 is the qualification in country or town, without distinction. But, according to the explanation of the First Minister, this Bill will provide that in cities it shall be $300 and in towns $200, while in a village it is the same as in a country municipality. A distinction ought to be made as to the size of the town. Most people in a new country are ambitious and get incorporated as a town before they have a sufficient population. I think these small places should be considered the same as a rural municipality, and not counted as a town.

Amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived.

On Mr. Mitchell's amendment, p. 1987,

Mr. VAIL. I mentioned the other day that in the Province of Nova Scotia we have a personal property qualification of $300, or a combined qualification of real and personal property of $200. Now, if we are to have a personal property qualification at all, I think it should be reduced to $300 instead of $400, which would cover New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. I quite approve of the proposal that only residents shall be allowed to vote on personal property; I do not think any man living outside the polling district, or village, or town, should be allowed to vote on personal property. If my right hon. friend would reduce that to $200, it would satisfy my hon. friends from New Brunswick as well as those from Nova Scotia. I am aware that objections will be made to making changes in the Bill, but there are a good many people in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia who will be disfranchised if they are not allowed to vote on a personal property qualification.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not find fault with the remarks of hon. gentlemen from the Lower Provinces, who ask that the franchise based upon personal property, that now exists in the Lower Provinces, should be continued. But I have noticed all through the discussion, that an attempt has been made to make out that a large number of people are being disfranchised by the present Bill. Now, I think that is creating an unfair impression. I have had some experience in regard to the franchise in New Brunswick, at least; and I have no hesitation in saying that, from a pretty close examination of the facts, there will be a considerable increase in the number of voters in the whole Province, as compared with those who are now allowed to vote under the provincial law, and that increase will amount to 16 or 17 per cent. In my own county, the increase will be very much larger. Now, I think when the hon. gentleman stated that a large number of people are going to be disfranchised by this Bill, he ought to qualify that by stating that a much greater number of people are going to be enfranchised by the Bill.

Mr. VAIL. That does not help those who are disfranchised.

Mr. COSTIGAN. But that is a fairer way to treat the Bill. Having established the fact that this Bill does enfranchise a large number of men who could not vote before, then the question comes up: How many are going to be disfranchised? After looking into the matter I must confess that I can hardly find anyone who is going to be disfranchised under this Bill; I cannot imagine a case, You have a franchise there that you never had before; you have the farmers' sons, you have the mechanics' sons, you have the mechanics themselves, and you have what you never had before, to any extent, in the Lower Provinces, an income franchise. In New Brunswick the income clause of the provincial law which was $400, was a dead letter, except in large cities. You will not find in rural constituencies ten men who ever voted under the income clause. This Bill opens it up very widely, and brings in the laboring classes, it brings in every industrious mechanic, and every industrious laboring man in the country. My hon. friend from Queen's—whom I do not see present now—speaking to me the other night about this very clause, said the great objection he had was that a large number of men in his county had invested their capital in ships and coasting vessels, they were assessed upon them as personal property, and these would be excluded from voting. I said: Don't you think these men will come in under the income clause? He said: They will, but that income now is too high, and a great many will be cut off. The right hon. Premier has announced that that clause will be reduced from $400 to $300, so I think all proper cases will be covered. All wage-earners will be included who earn an income of $300, and all who are owners or occupants of real estate to a certain amount. It has been clearly admitted that the assessed value of $100 does not represent the real value of the property in the Province of New Brunswick, and no disqualification will arise on that account.

Mr. GILLMOR. I agree with the Minister in a good deal he has said. I think that this Bill will add a good many to the voters' lists who did not vote before. But I do not agree with the Minister in regard to the personal property qualification. He underestimated the number of those who will be disfranchised if the personal property qualification is not included in the Bill. I believe many who have personal property will vote under some other qualification; but, notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman admits he is going to disqualify some people. It is a mere matter of opinion as to how many; he thinks very few. I do not think the number will be so many as some of my friends think it will be; but the hon. gentleman does disqualify a number of men whom, I am sure, he would not desire to disqualify. They have exercised the right of the franchise for many years on a personal property qualification. There cannot be any desire to disfranchise those who invest in small vessels. Those do not come under the class of shipowners, who, as a general rule, have some other qualification which would entitle them to vote. This clause might, however, disfranchise a class of men who, above all others, have enterprise and energy, and have invested their earnings in personal property, that is in coasting vessels, for a number of those men have no other property upon which to qualify. If you examine the lists made up from the assessment rolls you will find a large number assessed on personal property. By this Bill you disfranchise them, unless they have some other kind of property. I admit that a great many will have some other qualification, but a large number will not. But by this liberal measure is it necessary to disqualify any men having that qualification and those energies and abilities? What injustice will be done if you insert an amendment that will qualify those who have voted on a personal property qualification? Such will not interfere with the Bill or with its objects. The hon. Minister gave a very fair view of the case; but he admitted too much, for he admitted it would disfranchise some, although a very small number. I think it will disfranchise more than he thinks, and I live on the seaboard, and am in a position to know. It will disfranchise some fishermen who have intested in fishing vessels, and some persons investing in coasters or in shares in large vessels. There is no necessity to disfranchise those people; and the hon. gentleman is doing so to some extent, it may not be to a very great extent. That is only a matter of guesswork. You would have to go over the list and find out who were voting on the personal quali-

cation, and whether, under this Bill, they could vote under some other qualification, and that would involve considerable trouble. I asked the First Minister if he had considered this matter, and he told me he had done so, and therefore I thought it useless to say anyhing more about it; but I am quite satisfied from the desire manifested to enfranchise, so far as he can under the system he has adopted, all who should vote, he would be doing a just thing to admit the personal property qualification so far as regards the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MILLS. In this modern age it is an extraordinary practice to adopt that a portion of a community who have hitherto qualified on personal property should now be disfranchised. Formerly, more importance attached to real property than attaches to it at the present time. This was due to the system of feudal obligation. There was very little personal property then in existence. Under the modern condition of things, personal property is increasing in importance, and the amount, as compared with real property, is beyond anything known to the people in former times. If a man invests $1,000 with other partners to buy a ship worth $5,000 or $6,000, he has no vote on that account under this Bill; yet, if he had invested $1,000 in wild land he would have had a vote. Is not that legislative discrimination against the investment of money in particular callings? Now, that is a rule which is not based on equitable principles, to say nothing of common sense, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman has lost sight altogether of the circumstances of the population of the Maritime Provinces. Experience has shown that the rule which is now in force in those Provinces is a fair rule. They have representative government in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The law has been made by legislators who understand the circumstances of the people, and who seek to meet the condition of things as it prevails, and if any evil has grown out of that rule it would have been remedied long since. If the hon. gentleman will consider the circumstances of the population for a moment, he will see how widely they differ from those in the fertile Province of Ontario, and he will see that there is good reason for adopting the rule which prevails there, and it seems to me to be one which might be fairly adopted through the entire Dominion. Upon what principle does the hon. gentleman propose that a man shall have a vote on his fishing tackle, while the man who invests $1,000 or $2,000 in ships shall not have a vote on that property? It does seem an extraordinary proposition that a man should have a vote upon $150 or $300 worth of real estate, and that he should require to have $5,000 in bank stock or other personal property, yielding him $300 a year, before he can have a like privilege. If there is any difference as between the holders of real estate and the holders of personal property, it is in favor of the holders of personal property, because it is less certain, more precarious, more destructible than real property, and the hon. gentleman seems to me to be reversing the rule which ought to be applied, if there is to be any difference.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. gentleman is astray in his calculation. In Nova Scotia we seldom invest in shipping unless it pays 40 per cent. a year, especially in the cod fishery on the Grand Banks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PAINT. In the first place we have to pay 14 per cent. for insurance, and if your profit would only be 10 per cent. where would your venture be?

An hon. MEMBER. Did you say 40 per cent?

Mr. PAINT. I say 40 per cent. and I challenge investigation.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish the hon. gentleman would make public the particular investments that can be made for that return, as I know that there are many in other parts of the Dominion who would like to get even 20 per cent., and I know ship-owners in Prince Edward Island who would be glad to get 10 or 5. The hon. gentleman knows that for some years back, many of them have been running their ships at a loss, and it is perfect nonsense to talk of investments in shipping paying 40 per cent.

Mr. PAINT. If the marine insurance is 14 per cent. per annum, and they would be glad to make 5, as the hon. gentleman says, they would lose 9 per cent.

Mr. DAVIES. I know lots of them that have insured their own ships because they cannot make profit enough to pay the companies. I am astonished that a practical man like the hon. gentleman should talk to the committee in this way, as it is calculated to mislead. I am not quite satisfied with the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, because I think residence should be annexed, and I intend to move the addition of the following words: "And is a resident within such city or town." I do not put in assessment, because in the Province of Quebec they do not assess personal property at all. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), I think in the absence of the First Minister the other day, gave a list of those who would be disfranchised in his own county in the absence of a personal qualification. This list he obtained from the secretary-treasurer of his county, and it showed that ninety-eight votes would be disqualified in that county, though it is not a very large one. Now that seems to me to be a hardship, and it was no answer to his argument that, as the Minister of Inland Revenue stated, twenty or thirty others would be enfranchised. I do not know that the First Minister has had these facts brought to his attention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I heard the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. It seemed to me that he made out a strong case on these facts, and upon them and upon facts within my personal knowledge I should support the personal property qualification.

Mr. BURPEE. I think the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the other amendment might be joined. The hon. gentleman proposes a property qualification without residence, but with assessment. The present amendment includes both. The amendment the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) now proposes is to require residence alone, leaving out the assessment, which will obviate the difficulty in the case of Quebec.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would have no objection whatever to that. But I would object to the hon. gentleman's motion requiring both residence and the location of the property in the district. A man may, for instance, have $1,000 worth of bank stock situated in St. John, while he may live in Northumberland. I have no objection to the residence clause and will amend my motion in that respect.

Mr. VAIL. And reduce the amount to $300?

Mr. MITCHELL. Every reduction is a step in the direction I desire. If the right hon. Premier will consent, I will.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Mitchell) negatived. Yeas, 33; nays, 53.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the right hon. Premier what definition is given to towns under the term used here. I am not speaking now for Ontario or Quebec, but for the Province I know most about, my own Province. We have places there that have been called towns for the last 50 or 60 years; they have never been incorporated, but they have always had the designation of towns, having a population varying from 1,000 to 5,000. I wish to know

whether that group of houses will comprise what is known under this section as a town. Because it may be claimed that it requires to be an incorporated town.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. "A town means a place incorporated as a town or recognised as such by or under any Act of the Parliament of Canada or the Legislature of the Province in which it is situate."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) is a very reasonable one, and I can conceive no reason on earth, if we depart from the provincial franchises, why we should not introduce a limit of this kind. Everybody knows that there are a large number of towns and villages scattered all over this country, especially in Ontario, and everybody knows that there is no practical distinction between them other than that of population. Moreover, a great many are in a state of flux, as the hon. Premier admitted; the population of many of the villages is rising, and the population of a considerable number of the towns, I am sorry to say, is shrinking, so that on every possible ground the limitation proposed by my hon. friend ought to commend itself to the committee. It is especially desirable in such cases as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) mentions. Everybody who has been in Manitoba knows that the towns there are laid out in the most ambitious fashion. I have known three houses to be designated as a city; indeed, I have known places to be designated as cities where there was not a house.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There will not be many people disfranchised there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; but there are a considerable number of small places in Manitoba, and I suspect in the Territories, which have got themselves incorporated as towns, which will not attain the size of ordinary villages in other parts of the Dominion for many years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To fortify myself, as I do sometimes, by referring to the legislation in the Province of Ontario, I would point out that the Bill recently passed there makes no such limitation as the amendment proposes.

Mr. MILLS. There is this distinction between this Bill and the Ontario Act. The Local Legislature has the power of saying what shall be a town or a village; this Legislature has no such power. The hon. gentleman told us he was bringing forward this Bill to emancipate himself from the thraldom in which he has been so long held, and he now wants to insist that he shall not be emancipated. He proposes by the very clause under consideration that this Legislature shall continue in that position of dependence which he declared himself so anxious to emancipate it from. The hon. gentleman pretends that he has been long suffering and wishes to release himself from the thraldom of the Local Legislatures, yet he proposes that the Local Legislature of each Province shall have an opportunity of altering its franchise by declaring that some village shall be a town and some town a village. He, therefore, is continuing a portion of that dependence, to release himself from which he gave as a reason for bringing forward this Bill. We were to have here an independent Legislature elected by independent electors, made independent by the hon. gentleman's independent revising barristers. We see now how much force there was in the observations which the hon. gentleman has been pressing on our attention.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister will see that the exceptional circumstances called to his attention by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and justly insisted on as a reason for this amendment, do not exist in Ontario, to the same extent at any rate, as in a new Province such as Manitoba; so that while there might not be necessity for this in the Ontario Act, it does not follow there is no necessity for it in a Bill which includes the whole Dominion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to correct my hon. friend who says this provision would not affect Ontario. I know of several towns in Ontario that will be affected by it; and I should therefore very much like to see the alteration suggested by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), adopted. The Ontario law provides that, when a village has a certain number of inhabitants, it can be erected into a town by proclamation; but when it has not that number, it requires a special Act before it can be incorporated into a town. I know of several cases where villages have been erected into towns, under special Acts, and owing to special circumstances, such as railways running through them; and which, instead of doing good, have done harm to those places, and their population has not increased as expected. These places, of course, cannot be expected to humiliate themselves by going back to the Legislature, and asking to be incorporated again into villages; but, at the same time, it would be very unjust to disfranchise a number of their inhabitants, as this Bill will do, unless the amendment of my hon. friend be adopted.

Mr. WATSON moved in amendment,

That after the word "town," in the 6th line of section 3, the following words be inserted: "With a population of not less than 1,200."

He said: I think this proposition is a reasonable one, in view of the fact that many places in a new country, such as the Province of Manitoba, being ambitious and expecting to grow rapidly, have become incorporated as towns, although their population is by no means large; for instance, the town of Gladstone has its mayor and councillors although its population is but about 400. The town of Birtle and the town of Minnedosa and Rapid City, each of which has not over 500 or 600 inhabitants, also come within the same category, and under this Bill, as they would have to qualify under the term of town, the qualification in those places would be $200. I do not think that this is right, in view of the fact that in villages which have equally as large populations the qualification is lower. The amendment I propose would give the First Minister a better chance of keeping within the meaning of towns by providing that any place with a less population than 1,200 should not be considered a town, but should be recognised in this Franchise Bill as a village.

Mr. MULOCK. I think that confusion will arise from our adopting a term which is entirely the creature of the Local Legislature. What is the distinction between a town and a village? It is a matter of population. The theory as regards qualification is a question of population. It is said here that the reason for having a different property qualification in cities and towns is because in the larger places property is worth more than where there are less people. The whole question is therefore a matter of population. Now, if that is correct, the mere fact that a Local Legislature chooses to call one community a village or a town or a city, cannot be considered in a matter of this kind. If population is to be the basis, we ought to provide against the real object of this measure being defeated by the action of any Local Legislature. The right hon. the Premier states that the Act of the Local Legislature of Ontario is a reason for the adoption of a similar provision in this Bill, but it is to be remembered that we are now dealing with places that, so far as this Bill is concerned, are not to be amenable to the Legislature of any Province. The Local Legislatures can make and unmake towns; the term "town" is a creature of the Local Legislature; but when we are considering a measure applicable to the Dominion, I think the reason for following the legislation of a particular Province ceases to exist, and I moved my amendment, not knowing that my hon. friend from Marquette had the same idea in his mind. I think

unless we adopt some such suggestion, we shall be passing a measure that is not going to be uniformly general in its application, and I think it is conceded that uniformity is desirable, so far as can be acquired by this measure.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose an amendment to this clause. In the 7th line, I propose to strike out the word "November" and substitute "January." In the 14th line I propose to make an alteration, so that it will read:

Before the date of the certificate of the final revision of the voters' list hereinafter mentioned, made by the revising officer.

That is to say that the voter will be qualified if his rent is paid up to the time when the vote is registered.

Mr. VAIL. That will open the door to a great deal of fraud. Any one can come in and qualify before the final revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If a man has occupied a house for a year, and pays his rent before the final revision, he certainly ought to have a vote.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is a motion of Mr. Lister to strike out all after the word "and" in the 13th line.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I propose an amendment in substitution of the whole clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That will come at the end, when it is proposed that the clause shall be adopted.

Mr. MILLS. My hon. friend proposes to substitute another clause instead of this. If the committee do not approve of that, they can then go on to amend the clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be the more convenient plan, because there would be no use in amending the clause and afterwards substituting another clause. Although it may not be strictly correct it would be more convenient to discuss the proposed substitution first.

Mr. BAIN. When the First Minister spoke, I hoped he would have dealt in some manner with the mode by which the tenant is to be placed upon the voters' list. The concession that was made a few days ago on a previous clause provided, as I underetood, that, to a certain extent, the basis upon which the revising officer should first construct the voters' list should be the assessment roll of the municipality. By this clause the qualification of a tenant is the payment of a certain amount of rent. There are a large number of persons on the assessment roll who are placed there as tenants in occupation of real property of a certain value. It seems to me that, if it were possible to readjust the qualification of tenants in this clause, in such a form as to keep the valuation in sight, it would be an improvement. As the Bill now stands, the entrance of these parties on the roll will give no indication of the amount of rental they pay, by which alone they can here vote, and it appears to me that, in making up the first lists, either the tenants must be entirely left out or they must be all put on, and then application will have to be made to the revising officer to correct them afterwards. This would involve a large amount of trouble, and I therefore intend to propose that the tenants shall go upon the assessment rolls in regard to property similar in valuation to that which would qualify proprietors in cities and towns. We would thus have a basis of tenancy that would be, to a certain extent, uniform. Another difficulty as to the qualification for tenancy is, that while a tenant may be paying rent, either in kind or in cash, there is no provision for a tenant who gives work in exchange for the occupation of his property. In large cities and towns, where there are tenement houses occupied by very many families, and sub-divided very much, this will have a tendency to bring under the provisions of this Act a class very much below the qualification that we require from the owner of the property. Before a man can be an elector in a city as a proprietor, he must own $300 worth of real estate, but a man paying $2 a month rent, which must be for a very small piece of property in a city, can be qualified as a voter. There are other reasons why it is undesirable that the relations between landlord and tenant, as to rent being paid, should have to be shown in order to entitle a man to a vote. A landlord might exercise undue influence over his tenant, either by inducing him to vote in a certain direction by giving him a certificate that he had paid his rent, or by refusing to give him a certificate, perhaps, in case of a dispute, when, perhaps, he had fairly paid his rent. It seems to me, that in all these cases it will make it more difficult to prove his right than if the tenant was simply placed upon the roll as the tenant of property of a certain value. I presume that one object of the First Minister is to simplify as much as possible the working of the Act, so as to make it possible, without undue friction, or undue trouble on the part of the individual, to prove his right to vote, but who, under these circumstances, I think, would have considerable additional trouble in proving his right. Because if tenants, as qualified on the assessment roll, are not to go on the primary list, it is plain there will be a large number of persons who will be obliged to make special application to the revising officer to be put on. On the other hand, if they are put on indiscriminately as tenants, unless this qualification is broad enough to cover every tenant, then there will be the same difficulty in readjusting their rights, and proving that they have no right to be on. It was with that view that I move this amendment:

That sub-section 4 of section 3 be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—Every male person entered as a tenant on the last revised assessment roll of the city or town in which he tenders his vote, and who is residing at the time he tenders his vote within said city or town, and who is rated for real property on the last revised assessment roll of said city or town, of the actual value of not less than $200, and has resided there continuously for at least twelve months next preceding the election at which he votes.

I prepared this clause before the First Minister had made a difference in the qualification of $300 in cities and $200 in towns. Otherwise, the restriction as to residence and other matters in this original clause, I think we all approve of. But I would suggest to him whether it is not desirable to change the basis as I have suggested.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman prepared that amendment with a view to the Province of Ontario only. It is inapplicable to some of the other Provinces. However, Sir, with respect to this clause, I would ask that it be postponed and we go on to the next.

Mr. EDGAR. I wish to draw the attention of the First Minister to one point with reference to that clause. While the assessment roll is made a means of information to the revising barrister, and will give him the information desired, under this clause it would not give him any information whatever. Of course, I am speaking of Ontario, and if the right hon. gentleman will refer to the Revised Statutes of Ontario, page 1876, he will see the form which is to be filled in by the assessors, which gives the names of the owners, the names of the occupants, or rather taxable parties, stating whether they are freeholders, tenants, etc., and gives all the particulars; but it does not give any information as to the amount of rental. Therefore, a very important fact on which the franchise is based under this Bill, could not be ascertained except by special evidence before the revising barrister.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Before that clause is laid over, I wish to remind the First Minister that I called his attention to this matter a few evenings ago, by a question which he said he would answer at the proper time. This matter brings that question up again. With the information which the revising officer can obtain from the voters' list and the assessment roll, will he be able to ascertain anything in rela-

tion to rental? Now, the extent to which that applies is, perhaps, greater than the First Minister would at first suppose, as I mentioned on that occasion, I had gone over the voters' list, not the assessment roll, of my own constituency, and I found upon it over 700 names returned as tenants. Now, upon that voters' list there would only be the names of tenants occupying enough property to give them a vote; upon the assessment rolls there would be a much larger number of names. Hence, the possession of the voters' list and the assessment roll by the revising barrister would give him no information whatever in relation to those he wished to put upon the list in consequence of their paying sufficient rent. In that position, what would he do? He would have to get other information, which would amount, virtually, to making, at least, one-fourth of a new assessment. Without that information his first list would have to leave off all that class, or include all that came under that head, and would virtually make the first list of no value whatever. One point further. The intention is, evidently, to base the vote largely upon the fact of the man being a citizen and an occupant. Under the provision of rent the franchise may rest really upon the existence of a debt due from the tenant to the landlord which may not exceed $2. If the tenant is indebted to the landlord to the extent of $2, he is deprived of his vote. The fact of his being a citizen, the fact of his paying taxes, and all that, does not give him the vote, provided he owes his landlord $2.

Mr. McCALLUM. In assessing property in the Province of Ontario, the assessor goes around and generally assesses the man in occupation, so the point taken by the hon. gentleman does not apply at all. The amount of money that the occupant is assessed for will guide the revising officer as to whether he has a vote or not.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the First Minister reserves this clause for the purpose of further considering it, and I wish to call his attention to this fact: Apart from the objections made by my hon. friend, which seem conclusive against the present plan, in case there was a dispute between the landlord and tenant with regard to his rent, or in consequence of an unsettled account, that tenant would be disfranchised under the provisions of the Bill as it stands.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to draw the First Minister's attention to another point, which I consider a very radical change in the paragraph. Under the Quebec law a tenant not only has to pay a certain amount of rental per annum, but the property on which he pays it has to be of a certain value. This is a very important item in the property qualification, and I trust that whatever may be the new clause the right hon. gentleman intends to draw up, he will keep this in view. As it is now, a tenant may pay an annual rental on a property which will amount to an enormous annual interest. I know many cases in the assessment of my own county, where a tenant pays a rental of $20 a year on a property which is assessed for only $50 annual value; and in that way a good many men will get the right to vote under this clause who really ought not to have it at all, because the property on which their franchise is based, is not of sufficient value to give them a vote. I think the clause ought to be drawn so that the actual value of the property would be the same as would give a vote to the owner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not want to restrict, but to enlarge. A tenant pays on rental, and has nothing to do with the value of the property. As a general rule, people do not pay ridiculous rents in this country.

Mr. FISHER. A tenant ought not to have the privilege of voting on property on which if he were owner he could not vote. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has stated that tenants are inserted on the assessment roll for certain values. The qualification now proposed is not a qualification on the assessed value, but it is a question as to whether the tenant pays a rental of $2 a month. The assessment roll furnishes no information as to the amount of rental a man pays. We can assume that a man on the assessment roll as tenant of property worth $500 is absolutely and clearly within the range of the Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I wish to suggest to the Minister as to whether he cannot readjust the clause so that in some way the value of the property put down on the assessment roll in the tenant's name shall be an indication of his right to vote. A man might pay a rental of $2 a month and yet the property if sold might not be worth $200; and another man occupying property worth four or five times that amount would not be paying rent equivalent to the value of the property. Such a case might occur in regard to partly improved property. A man might occupy a piece of that property with the house and pay $2 or $4 a month rental; yet the property might be worth $2,000, that part of it lying idle not adding to the value of the rental. I have made the suggestion with a view to obviate the difficulty that is apparent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is worthy of consideration.

Mr. EDGAR. The remarks of the hon. member for Monck may have been very profound, but unfortunately they had not the remotest bearing upon either the clause under discussion or upon the amendment. I do not think the hon. gentleman, although he is familiar with the assessment roll and voters' lists for Monck, and I happen to be so also, never saw the amount of a tenant's rental put down on an assessment roll, and so he could not see it on the voters' list. We have been discussing that question and trying to find a remedy for it. The assessment roll gives no information as to the amount of rental paid by the tenant. We think it will be more easy to get at the value if the tenancy were based on value not on rental.

Mr. McCALLUM. With all the profound knowledge of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) I can say this: That to-day in Ontario, if a tenant's name is put down for property worth $200 and the owner's name is put down for the same property, they both can vote on that property. The hon. member who got into this House by the grace of God and of Oliver Mowat can again attempt to give us a profound statement.

Mr. VAIL. I will give the First Minister a point to consider in regard to Halifax. There the assessment is based altogether on real estate, and it is debited against the owner of real estate. I occupy a property, the assessed value of which is $8,000. Under this Bill I will not have a vote, because I am not on the assessment roll, the owner of the property being assessed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You will be entitled to a vote under this Bill.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you are a tenant and pay $20 and upwards you have a vote.

Mr. VAIL. But I am not on the assessment roll.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to do away with the assessment roll.

Mr. FLEMING. The First Minister might meet the views of all parties by adding to the fifth clause the words "as *bonâ fide* occupant or tenant of real property," and then insert a provision for a change of tenancy during the year. The matter would then be settled and all persons would stand on an equal footing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have heard the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and I will give it due consideration. In the meantime I object altogether to the value of the free-

hold being an indication of what the tenant's right to vote should be. I am strongly of the opinion that if a tenant pays a rental he has such an interest in the country as entitles him to a vote, no matter what may be the value of the freehold if put in the market. The rental is, as a general rule, an indication of the value of the freehold to some extent. However, I will consider the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. FLEMING. If rental is to be the basis, the owner of a property may be disfranchised, while the tenant of property of similar value has a vote. I know of cases in my own town where the owner of a house worth $150 would not have a vote, while a tenant living on adjoining property and living in a similar house would have a vote, because he pays $2 a month rent. There is no reason why the same property qualification should not be necessary for the tenant as for the occupant or owner, and that is a basis which everybody could understand.

Mr. McMULLEN. I again draw the attention of the First Minister to a case which I cited in my own section, where the owner of a property worth $150 would be cut out of his vote, while the tenant paying $2 a month would have the right to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These gentlemen are getting very aristocratic. They are now favoring the bloated aristocrat, the landlord, while, for the last three weeks they were trying to take another line altogether. This provision is to give the poor man, the man who has a local habitation and a name, the man who pays this rental, the right to vote, and whether his landlord has sufficient to give him a vote or not, has nothing to do with the matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not a fair way of putting it. This is a proposition to refuse a vote to the poor man who by honest industry has accumulated $200 worth of real estate, while you give the vote to another poor man who has not accumulated property by his industry, but who only pays $2 a month rental.

Mr. BOWELL. With regard to the case mentioned by the hon. member for Wellington, while the property may be assessed for $150, it may be worth, as we know is often the case, double that amount. The rental would be *primâ facie* evidence that it would be worth more, and, although it might be put on the roll for $150, it might be worth $200 or $300. The question is, would the owner who rents it at $2 a month take $150 for it, if it was put on the market.

Mr. McMULLEN. In this case the owner has sold it for $150, and the tenant has the privilege of renting it for $2 or paying that amount.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not think the view presented by the Minister of Customs affects the principle at all. We are talking about the franchise, and, no matter what the property may be valued at, if it is not valued at enough to give the owner a vote he has not a vote, but the tenant has a vote, even if the property is worth more.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman seems to misunderstand the point raised by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He spoke about the assessed value of the property, and I say the assessed value does not indicate the real value.

Mr. SCRIVER. But the assessed value gives or withholds the franchise.

Mr. BOWELL. Not under this Bill. If you can show the revising officer that it is worth $150 in a county, you can insist on the vote.

Mr. SCRIVER. Not so far as the lists are concerned, which are the basis of the roll.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think there is any soundness or relevancy in the principle laid down by the First Minister. He says, what have we to do with the relation between the landlord and tenant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nothing in the world.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask what has the rent paid by a tenant to do with his qualification to vote. If we are anxious to establish a fraudulent system, one which will enable a landlord by connivance with his tenant to multiply votes, to create faggot votes, this system is one just calculated to promote that object, but if our object is to ascertain whether a man is in such circumstances as to warrant him in voting, surely the value of the property is the safest test. Is the interest of the tenant who pays $2 a month rent for a property actually valued at $150 greater than the interest of the man who is the proprietor? It is absurd to speak of bloated aristocrats in connection with the owners of such properties. The hon. gentleman proposes to give the vote to a man who pays $2 a month rent, who may never have paid that rent, who may not be called upon to pay it, and who may be given a receipt, because it is known what his political proclivities are, and he produces that receipt as *prima facie* evidence. Well, Sir, you have some protection against fraud when you say that the property shall be on the assessment roll at $200 or $300, and if the revising officer thinks that is an unfair valuation he can value it higher or lower. Supposing the occupant were to come and say, my property is worth more; though it is only assessed for $300 it is worth $30 a year to me. Why will you not take his value as to the use and profit he derives from the property which he occupies and does not own, and make that the basis of the right to the franchise in the case of the occupant as well as in the case of the tenant? But you do not apply it to the occupant. You say to the occupant, we will not look at the value of the use of the property but the value of the property itself. I say the same test should be applied in the case of the tenant as the occupant, as they stand in exactly the same relation if the occupant has paid nothing for the property.

Mr. AUGER. The hon. gentleman has based some of the clauses of this Bill on the Ontario law, and I ask him now to take a lesson from the Quebec law. There a man who pays rent is qualified to vote only if the owner of the property has a right to vote.

Mr. FISHER. It seems to me perfectly absurd that a tenant occupying property should have a vote when the owner of that property cannot have a vote upon it. Certainly the owner has a greater stake in the country than a tenant can possibly have, who is there only temporarily, perhaps a year and no more. The principle of the Bill seems to me contrary to equity and justice, certainly it is entirely contrary to the spirit of the franchise which has always existed in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if there is very much property in his part of the country worth only $200 that will rent for more than $20 a year. In my part of the country there is none.

Mr. FISHER. There is a great deal of that kind of property in my constituency.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is a poor country, then.

Mr. FISHER. Those hon. members from the Province of Ontario may think so, but there are other Provinces in this Dominion besides the Province of Ontario, and other interests to be considered besides those of Ontario. I am glad to see that the hon. First Minister assented to that view, and I am sorry the same spirit does not actuate the Tory members from Ontario. I know many instances of tenement houses, occupied by five or six tenants, paying $2 a month each, although the whole property would not be valued at more than $300 or $400.

Mr. McCALLUM. Are they Chinese?

Mr. FISHER. I believe they are laboring men living in a respectable manner, and are quite as good as the laboring men of Ontario. It happens on some occasions that men who are occupants, would, if occupancy were not to be considered, call themselves tenants and get the vote, whereas if if they called themselves occupants they would not be able to vote; and we know perfectly that a private arrangement between the owner and the tenant is frequently made by which a man gets a vote when he is really not entitled to it.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman seems to be always ready to point out where a fraud might be committed. When he speaks of a tenement house which is occupied by a half a dozen tenants, does he mean to say that it is occupied by half a dozen men?

Mr. FISHER. Half a dozen people pay rent.

Mr. McCALLUM. How can the owner be disqualified if he receives $2 a month rent from five or six people? The thing is ridiculous in itself.

Mr. AUGER. That there are such cases in the Province of Quebec is shown by the fact that the Legislature has found it necessary to put in that proviso, and it was put there by a Conservative Government. We have poor men in the Province of Quebec, and there may be poor men also in the Province of Ontario. We do not legislate here for rich men only, but for all classes. I am sure I could also find such cases as the hon. member for Brome has mentioned in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It must be evident that hon. gentlemen opposite, who are so anxious to have an extension of the franchise, are now attempting to restrict it; but any one who is used to the renting of houses knows that very few, if any landlords, will be precluded under this clause from voting. If the argument of these hon. gentlemen means anything it means that they do not wish tenants to have a vote under the terms of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The observations of the hon. gentlemen are wholly unwarranted by anything that has been said on this side of the House. The proposition on this side of the House is intended to prevent fraud. We do not propose that a tenant in one part of a Province should have an opportunity of voting on a qualification that would be no qualification elsewhere. If you take the value of the property as the basis, you have a uniform principle which applies to all parties alike. A man might say to his dozen or half dozen tenants, I will let you have this property at $2 a month with the understanding that you will only pay $1, so that you may have a vote. How is this to be prevented, unless there is a scrutiny by way of appeal? Any number of frauds may be committed under this provision, and it is to prevent stuffed voters' lists as well as stuffed ballot boxes that it is objected to on this side of the House.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I understood that the right hon. First Minister proposes to postpone this clause, and I have therefore no disposition to detain the Committee. But the proposition of the hon. member for Brome was this: He gave the case of a tenement house occupied by five or six tenants, workingmen, in the Province of Quebec, who he says are as respectable as those in Ontario—which is quite true, as happily the respectability of workingmen does not depend on the Province they reside in; and he says that the effect of this clause will be to give each tenant that pays $2 a month a vote, whereas the whole property is not worth enough to give more than one man a vote. What does that mean? It means that those five tenants are to be deprived of their votes, although they are respectable workingmen, and yet the hon. gentleman says he does not want a restricted franchise. If his preposition was adopted the effect would be this: This property would not be of sufficient value, divided among the tenants, say five tenants, to give to each a vote, therefore the whole five tenants should be excluded. That is the position taken by hon. gentlemen, and it is entirely inconsistent with the course they have advocated.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman were sincere in his desire to extend the suffrage, he had an opportunity of evincing his sincerity where the motion for manhood suffrage was before the House, but he declined to avail himself of that opportunity. His desire is therefore not to extend the franchise but to limit it. The proposition of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher) is made with the object of preventing fraud. As he has shown in the sixth sub-section, you have adopted the value of property, as the basis upon which an occupant has the right to vote. Why adopt it in the occupant's case, and not in the other? If a workman occupies a property valued under $150, or an agreement to purchase it, paying in instalments with interest at 8 per cent., he is left out of the franchise, but if he occupies the same prooperty as a tenant at $2 a month he will have a vote. What is the object of excluding him in the one case and including him in the other? The object can only be to encourage fraud by the creation of faggot votes, and disfranchise the honest man, and it is with the object not of not preventing an honest man from voting but of preventing unprincipled politicians from creating faggot votes and thus disfranchising an honest man that this amendment is proposed. When the value of property is made the basis in the occupant clause, the same basis should be adopted with regard to tenancy.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) has declared that he proposed his amendment in view of cases which he knows to exist at this moment and which he has cited. Therefore he could not have proposed it with the object of preventing fraud, because in those cases there can have been no fraud. The cases he mentioned are in his own county, and they are cases of *bonâ fide* tenants who are paying regular rents to *bonâ fide* landlords, of respectable workingmen—the hon. gentleman emphasised the term respectable—yet now he says his anxiety to prevent them voting is because these respectable workingmen would enter into a fraudulent conspiracy with their landlords in order to obtain votes for which they were not entitled.

Mr. FISHER. I will explain to the hon. gentleman how the case stands. These people who occupy this property class themselves as occupants; under the Quebec provincial law, an occupant does not require to occupy property of assessed value, and consequently, by calling himself an occupant instead of a tenant, a man may manage to be placed on the voters' list who would not have that right as a tenant. I want to prevent this being done under this Bill by putting tenants and occupants in the same position, by making the value of the property the basis.

Mr. LANGELIER. I was in the Quebec Legislature when the Quebec law was passed. It was presented by a Conservative Government, and the gentleman who had charge of the Bill, Mr. Church, is a great friend of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). The objection now being made was made by him then. There is a clause in the Quebec law which says that in order that a tenant may vote on property, the property must have a real value of $300, and the rental must be $30 a year. What reason was given for combining the two? The reason given by Mr. Church was the same as that given by hon. gentlemen on this side, that otherwise the result in many cases would be that the proprietor would be disfranchised, while the tenant would be enfranchised, which would be something very extraordinary. In many cases, property is assessed for only $250 in cities, and yet the rental is very high compared with the value of the property. That property very often is rented for $3 a month, more than sufficient to qualify the tenant, so that the tenant

would be qualified while the proprietor would not. It was in order to prevent that, and in order to prevent fraud, that the Quebec Legislature exacted the two values in the case of a tenant, that he should pay $30 rental, and that the property should be assessed at $300.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The gist of the whole thing is simply this, there are two properties identical in every respect, standing opposite each other, each worth less than $300. The occupants of both contribute to the revenue and perform all the duties of citizens, but in the one case the occupant who is a proprietor cannot vote, while in the other case the occupant who is a tenant can vote.

On sub-section 5,

Mr. FLEMING moved in amendment:

That after the word "occupant" in the 32nd line, there be inserted the words "or tenant" and after the word "wife" in the 45th line, there be added the following:—Provided that in the case of such tenant, a change of tenancy during the year next before the said first of November, in any such year, shall not deprive the tenant of the right to vote in respect to such real property, if such change is without intermission of time, and the several tenancies are such as would entitle the tenant to vote, had such tenant been in possession under either of them, as such tenant for the year next before the said day of November in any such year.

That will do away with the necessity of the 4th clause altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That altogether restricts the number of tenants and cuts off a great number of workingmen. I am opposed to it altogether.

Mr. FLEMING. The proviso that is added is taken from the proviso in the previous sub-section. There can be no logical argument why tenants should occupy any position different than that occupied by owners or occupants. There is no reason why a person occupying the position of tenant, living in a tenement house, should occupy a different position. Anyone acquainted with the cities will know that these tenement houses are rented sometimes at a very heavy rent for the accommodation they afford. In the poorer parts of cities families in poor circumstances are sometimes obliged to occupy a single room. The improvident classes are driven to the occupation of these tenement houses, and it is with a view of giving these improvident people a better position than the industrious classes of the community that this Bill seems to be framed. I know in my own town of instances where properties, small houses or cottages, sell at $150, for which a rental is paid sufficient to qualify the tenant. I can recall an instance when I sold a small cottage, I had at one time, for $175, which had been rented before at $3 a month. The effect of this section will be that the moment the tenant of such a property purchased it, he would cease to have the right to vote, although he had that right when a tenant. There are numerous instances in towns, where properties are not assessed at sufficient value to entitle the owner to vote, but where the rents are sufficiently high to enable the tenant to vote. So soon as a man becomes a freeholder of a property less than $200 in value, he ceases to be a voter. As long as he pays $2 a month for the same property, he will have a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says he sold a property for $175 which he was receiving $36 a year for. It seems to me that he must have put a monstrous screw on the poor tenant to make him pay $36 a year for a property which was worth only $175. That is a rather Jewish operation. In the next place, if he sold it for $175, there is no accounting for human eccentricity. For a man to sell for $175 a property which brings him in $36 a year, is a most extraordinary instance of eccentricity, and we cannot legislate for such an instance as that. If the hon. gentleman was getting $36 a year for that property, it was his bounden duty to see that it was assessed for more than $200, at all events, and then he could not lose his vote. But, after all, that is not the question. The question of the landlord or the owner is settled by the previous clause. This relates to the amount of annual interest which, as a tenant, should qualify a man to have a vote. The hon. gentleman wants to prevent a man paying rental from having a vote, unless his landlord also has a vote. There is no necessary connection between the two. The workingman pays his rent, and has a right to have a vote. But if you scratch a Liberal, you find an aristocrat. Now, we find that these hon. gentlemen are against giving the workingman, who pays a small rental, the right to vote.

Mr. GILLMOR. It strikes me that we are mixing up two classes of qualifications. There may be objections in regard to the qualification, but I do not see how we are going to better the matter by disqualifying the tenant because the real estate owner does not own property enough to qualify him. There are two classes of voters. We have fixed the qualification for property owners in cities at $300. No matter how many tenants one of them may have, if the property is not worth that, he cannot vote; but, because he cannot vote, I do not see how we are going to better the matter by disfranchising the tenants. It appears to me that we are mixing up the two cases. If the qualification of the owner is too high, make it lower, or, if it is too low, make it higher; but I am in favor of the extension of the franchise, and you are not going to remedy the matter by mixing two things together. If a man has property in a city worth $275 and gets rent for it, he cannot vote under this Bill, but I do not see how you are going to benefit him by preventing the tenant from voting who pays $2 a month rent. There may be frauds under this law as there may be under all laws. Men may qualify their tenants to vote by giving a receipt for rent which they have not received. That cannot be remedied unless it is detected, but I do not think we ought to restrict the franchise by cutting off the tenants because the landlord has not enough property to qualify him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The First Minister made some verbal amendments in this clause. I asked him then something in reference to them which he said he would subsequently explain. Probably he will give the explanation now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will read the 5th subsection as I proposed to have it amended:

"Or is the *bonâ fide* occupant of real property in any such city or part of a city of the actual value of $300, or within any such town or part of a town of $200"——

In order to make the occupancy agree with the ownership clause.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is actual residence a qualification for the vote of the occupant?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An occupant is a person who occupies or resides. There is a difference between possession and occupation. Occupant and resident mean the same thing.

Mr. LADERKIN. In the interpretation clause, is occupant given as a resident?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen professes to be very anxious for the extension of the franchise. He is apprehensive lest some tenant might be disqualified under the amendment of my hon. friend behind me. We have had evidence of the earnest zeal of the hon. gentleman for the qualification of tenants by his votes on the various amendments which have been submitted. We have seen that earnest zeal displayed by his vote on the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland. The question now is whether a tenant shall be placed in a better position than the proprietor. We say that the occupant and the tenant stand in the same position. Take the case of the man who

has agreed to buy the property of another. He goes into possession. If the property is worth $275, he can have no vote, but, if he agrees to pay $2 a month for the property he will have a vote. Upon what principle is the man who pays $2 a month to have the vote while the man who agrees to purchase the same property, who goes into possession, who occupies the same house, and cultivates the same ground is not to have a vote? There is neither reason nor sense in such a proposition. There can be no difficulty in understanding why we have such a proposition before us. The rule is simple and plain. Let us look at the question of convenience. If you take the value of the property, the value is upon the assessment roll. My hon. friend for Lambton (Mr. Fairbank) pointed out that in his constituency there were 1,700 tenants upon the voters' list, and 700, I think he said, upon the roll. Now these 700 were taken out and put on the voters' list because the property occupied by them was valued at a sufficient amount to enable them to go upon the voters' list. How are those parties who are tenants, to get on the voters' list that are paying $2 a month, or $20 a year? You cannot take them from the assessment, you have no means of knowing the amount of rent they pay. It is only necessary that the landlord or his tenants should go before the revising officer and state that they pay a certain rental and therefore have a right to have their names on the list; but if they do not do so, their names do not appear at all. The revising officer has no means of knowing what their rental is. It may be that the man occupying the property as a tenant may be a relative of the proprietor, and may be paying scarcely any rent at all; yet he occupies the land, or is assessed for it, he pays his taxes upon it, and has a large income derived from it. If he is an occupant, his income may be more than $20—may be $50 a year, yet he would not be entitled to vote if it was not assessed at a certain sum. But if he pays—not to the Crown, not to the Government, not to any purpose in which the State is interested—but if he pays to another party, or has agreed to pay to another party, a certain sum, he is not entitled to vote. That is the provision the hon. gentleman makes in his Bill and he undertakes to tell the committee that he does this for—what? Why, in order to extend the franchise. Sir, there is an obvious and an honest way of extending the franchise. The hon. gentleman can fix a lower qualification if he desires; he can say that it shall be $100. If he wishes to give the tenant an opportunity of voting to a greater extent than the tenant has now, let him fix a lower qualification. But here is a provision, not to help the tenant, but to enable frauds to be committed, to permit the manufacture of faggot votes, to do the very thing which every man, on both sides of the House who wishes to have an honest voters' list, seeks to prevent. How are you going to have an honest voters' list under a provision such as this? I say it cannot be had. If the hon. gentleman wants to give us a fair voters' list, if he does not wish, when we get rid of a stuffed ballot box, to give us a stuffed voters' list, let us have a plain, simple and straightforward qualification, that is applicable to all parties who are entitled to vote. If the hon. gentleman wishes to extend the franchise to a larger number of tenants, let him lower his qualification, and he can accomplish his object in a straightforward way. He is not accomplishing that object, but he is facilitating the manufacture of votes by the proposition he has laid before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I can leave the speech the hon. gentleman has just delivered to the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) who has stated the case of the tenant quite clearly. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), all I have got to say is that I desired, from his position, to treat all he said, and the arguments he used, with every respect, but it is a great strain for me to be able to do so. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite with great attention when they direct their minds sincerely, *bona fide*, so far as I can judge, to improving the Bill. I have listened to them with great respect and I give them every consideration. But I put myself in the judgment of the committee whether every word the hon. gentleman from Bothwell has uttered is not directed for a different purpose, for the purpose of annoyance, for the purpose of obstruction.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, but it is.

Mr. MILLS. But it is not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentlemen does not make it a bit stronger by saying it is not. Common sense is common sense. The hon. gentleman repeats again and again and again, over and over again, with what you may call a "damnable iteration" his criticism of the Bill. Now, Sir, we discussed the question of rental. I quite understand the argument that was used with respect to the objection the hon. gentleman takes to rental; I have heard it a dozen times. But the question now is on the 5th sub-section. The hon. gentleman from Peel (Mr. Fleming) has moved an amendment to add the rental to this clause of occupancy, and he has done so upon arguments that were used on a previous clause. There was no necessity to go over them again. We have had the discussion in advance upon this amendment, and I have taken the ground, and I dare say the majority of the committee will agree with me, that it is, in our opinion, a restriction of the right of voting of vast masses of tenantry on the small holdings of the country. Therefore I object to it altogether upon the very sensible ground of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Burpee). Now with respect to this clause about occupancy. It is simply an extension of the 3rd sub-section, and to let in a body of men who, without that clause, would not have a vote. The 3rd sub section deals with the owner of real property, the proprietor of any freehold estate, in a city worth $300, and in a town worth $200. But that only allows the actual proprietor, the freeholder having a legal title, or an equitable title amounting to a legal title, who has a title that may be held valid in a court of law, and it includes only these. But the 5th sub section goes further. It is to enable those parties who otherwise have not strictly a legal title, who are not freeholders, but who are in occupation of property, to exercise the franchise. It is to allow occupants who are assessed for a property under provincial legislation, who hold property to the same amount, that is to say, they are occupants under a license of occupation, or an agreement to purchase from the Crown, or from other persons, who hold their occupation in any other manner than as an owner or as a tenant, and they must be in possession for a year; a man who, in a town, is occupying property for a whole year of the value of $200, or, in cities, a value of $300. If he is not an occupant in the face of the world of that property, he must have such an interest in it as will equitably give him the franchise. The sub-section is simply an extension of the 3rd sub-section being limited to the proprietor and the freeholder, and the 5th sub-section extending it to the person who for a year has held property of that value before the world, and therefore is the ostensible owner, although, perhaps, he may not be the legal owner. It is for the purpose of extending the franchise.

Mr. MILLS. I have no doubt——

Mr. HESSON. We have had quite enough from you.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has had quite enough, and so much so that I think he has not been in his place for nearly a week in this House. I quite understand the observations addressed to me by the First Minister, but they will not in the slightest degree deter

me from the performance of what I believe to be my duty here as a representative of my constituents in this House. The censures of the hon. gentleman have very little influence upon me. I care just as little for his censure as I do for his commendation. I believe one is quite as valuable as the other. The hon. gentleman told the committee that his proposal to base the franchise for the tenant upon rental was with the view to extend the franchise so far as regards tenants. The hon. gentleman gave no reason for his action, which must necessarily lead to faggot votes and to frauds in the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman has provided that the tenant's rent must be paid; so if a dispute arises between the landlord and tenant, the former can give the tenant the choice between exercising the franchise and paying the contested amount. I trust the committee has sufficient independence not to support the proposition submitted.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I beg to move in amendment that the word "two" be substituted for the word "three" in the 3rd line of sub-section 5, and "$200" for "$300" in the amendment just read. I believe this amendment is in the direction which the Minister has indicated as being what he wished. I am in favor of making the franchise as liberal as possible. While I wish to have the franchise as liberal as possible, and more liberal I believe than the proposition of the First Minister, yet I desire that fraud shall be prevented. It is a fact that in the United Provinces before Confederation the system now proposed was abandoned, because of the frauds that occurred under the annual valuations. Subject to the correction of the First Minister, I state that it was during the Administration of which he was the leader before Confederation that we abandoned the principle of annual valuation so far as giving the right to vote, and we adopted the system of actual valuation of property. It was the complaint as to fictitious rentals that proved to be one of the causes that led to the abandonment of the former system. It will be very simple to practice fraud under the clause as proposed. While we admit the possibility of fraud being committed by the adoption of the clause as it stands, we are asked at the same time to adopt a proposition under which a landlord can disfranchise a tenant if he is in arrears for rent. If hon. gentlemen opposite have that desire to protect the interest of the tenant which they have expressed, why do they allow such a proposition to exist in this Bill? It is placing too dangerous a power in the hands of the landlords. A dispute may arise, and the result of a difference of political opinion between landlord and tenant may be the disfranchisement of the tenant. The principle in this case ought to be simply one which would reduce itself to the question of what ought to be the value of the property on which a man should vote, and whatever the amount, it should be some value which would be easily understood and readily reached, and one which, if you will, should enfranchise as far as possible every male of mature years who is a citizen of this country. If you adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Peel to which mine is a rider you will reach something which is tangible and practicable, and something which will give an assurance that every man who has the right to vote will have a vote under this clause. But do not let us leave the Bill open to the introduction of faggot voting, which, if full advantage was taken of it, would render it impossible that the true expression of opinion could be had in any constituency, especially in the neighborhood of large cities. Faggot votes would be quite practicable under the tenancy and occupancy clause as it now stands. Another reason why we should avoid passing the clause in its present shape is that it would be differently construed by different revising officers. There is another detail in this connection to which I would draw the attention of the First Minister, and that is as to the dates at which the year, as defined by the Bill, shall begin and end. He inserted the date of the first of January, as I understood, for the reason that in cities the assessment rolls were made up at a time which made it more convenient for the revising officer to prepare his roll by the 1st of January rather than the 1st of November. If I understood him aright in that respect, it would appear to me that he was conveniencing only one city in Ontario, the city of Toronto, where the assessment roll is prepared at a different time of the year from the usual time in the other parts of the Province. In the towns and rural municipalities, and in fact everywhere outside of Toronto, the assessor is usually appointed at the first or the February meeting of the council in each year, and he goes to work immediately afterwards, finishing his work in the first three months of the year, and in the vast majority of instances the assessment is completed and the voters' list is published by the 15th of July. The fully revised assessment roll could thus be put in the hands of the revising officer by the 1st of October under ordinary circumstances, and in no instance need it be delayed so long as the 1st of November. Now, assuming that he delays dealing with the roll until the beginning of the next year, an election might take place in the latter part of December, and the result would be that they would have to take a roll two years old. I trust the First Minister will give his attention to this feature of the Bill.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. VAIL. If the right hon. First Minister could see his way to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) I think it would simplify the matter very much. It would cover nearly all the right hon. gentleman proposes to cover by these $2, $6, $12 and $20 rentals, and enable the reviser to go to the assessment roll for the names of the tenants or occupants. Otherwise it would be very difficult indeed for the reviser to know where to look for these men; he would have to go to one half of the houses in the city to learn who were entitled to vote, while if the amendment were adopted he could learn from the assessment roll who the occupants were, and in that way he could make up his list very easily. I hope the right hon. gentleman will see his way clear to accept this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the discussion of the fourth paragraph, I heard that and several other arguments which struck me to some extent; therefore I asked the committee to allow the fourth paragraph to stand over, and stated that I would give it my best consideration, for I really want to get an Act which will as far as possible satisfy both sides of the House. Then, when we come to discuss that paragraph, the hon. gentleman can move his amendment. The hon. gentleman must know that I cannot consent to any alterations without due consideration, for they have to be fully considered by the responsible advisers of the Crown. In the meantime, if we confine ourselves to the simple question of occupancy, I think we can get through without much trouble, because this paragraph is merely an expansion of the third paragraph, and the whole question the hon. gentleman refers to will be left open, and can be discussed in a day or two when we come to the paragraph it relates to.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman had stated before what he now states, I do not think my hon. friend would have moved this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has forgotten somewhat what he said. He said to take the value of the property as a basis of the tenancy qualification would be to

restrict the franchise, and he could not consent to that. If he says he does not intend to adhere to that, and admits that there is force in the view taken on this side, that would be a great reason for my hon. friend not pressing the motion, although I think it would have been better to deal with the question in the way my hon. friend proposes in this paragraph, and strike out the fourth paragraph altogether. Everything of course depends on whether the hon. gentleman is disposed to consider seriously the proposition made on this side of the House. We think that if you make it impossible to take the valuation as *primâ facie* evidence of qualification, so as to get the name of the tenant on the voters' list, you enormously increase the cost to every candidate of seeing that the list is properly revised; for, however honest the revising officer might be, he would have no means of knowing whether a tenant should go on the list without enquiry or evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say I am not at all converted to the idea of making the vote of a tenant depend on the value of the property to the landlord. But there were some statements made about the difficulty of ascertaining who the tenants are, the amount of their rental not appearing on the assessment roll, and I think the hon. gentleman suggested that there might be room for fraud. It was in view of those two points principally that I asked the postponement of the paragraph for consideration.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Fleming) negatived.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move

That sub-section five be struck out and the following substituted therefor:--Every male person entered as an occupant on the last revised assessment roll of the city or town in which he tenders his vote, who is residing at the time he tenders his vote in the said city or town, and is rated on the last revised assessment roll of such city or town at not less than $200, and who has resided there continuously for at least 12 months next preceding the election at which he votes.

This does away with the non-resident vote. It is, perhaps, the greatest bane to purity that can possibly exist with regard to an election. It is well known that, under this clause, the door will be opened to a great amount of wrong-doing in connection with elections. Any person who desires it, can be rated as an occupant without being a resident; a person in the occupation of property may exist miles away from the property. I understand the law is clear on that point; I understand such is the case, and it is in order to do away with that I propose this amendment. If the right hon. gentleman would consent to make residence a condition under this clause, I would not move this amendment, but, as the clause stands, a person may have himself rated as an occupant in very many districts, and hence create what are termed faggot votes. The interpretation clause does not state definitely that an elector should reside in the electoral district where he should vote, and I hold that this clause should be made so clear that there can be no possibility of any misunderstanding arising under it from a want of clearness in the interpretation clause. In the Ontario Act the qualification is $200 in cities and towns, while under this it is $300. I understand the First Minister has declared it will be reduced to $200 in towns, but it will remain at $300 in cities, so that in the latter many persons will be disfranchised by this Bill who have a vote under the Ontario Act. It is not desirable to take the franchise from those who already possess it under the provincial law, more especially as the First Minister has said his intention is to extend rather than to restrict the franchise. I hope this amendment will be adopted, because if not, the door will be opened by which an honest expression of the will of the people at the polls may be prevented.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS.

On sub-section 6,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that this sub-section shall read as follows:

"Is a resident within such city of or town or part of a city or town, and derives an income from his earnings or from some trade, calling, office or profession, or from some investment in Canada—striking out the words 'or charge on real property'—of no less than $300 annually, and has so derived such income, and has been such resident for one year next before the first day of January, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, or any subsequent year."

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman would make it $250, it would be the same as the Ontario provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can assure the hon. gentleman there is a good deal of difference of opinion about coming down to even $300 among my friends.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that under the provision that the investment should be in Canada, there will be some difficulty on the part of the revising officer in ascertaining, should any protest be made with regard to an investment, whether it is genuine or not. If it were provided that the investment should be in the city or town where a man claims to vote, there would be no difficulty.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think there will be any difficulty under this clause. It is quite clear we are in favor of extending the franchise, and even if a man had no investment at all, provided he is a resident in the city or town, I should be in favor of giving him a vote; but if it be necessary to provide against any difficulty, we could apply a test by providing that he should be assessed on the property. A man will hardly allow himself to be assessed for the purpose of being allowed to vote as possessing an income, if he really did not enjoy it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can be easily proved that a man has an investment in stock, say in the Bank of Montreal or Bank of Toronto.

On sub-section 7,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am going to move a clause in substitution of this sub-section. I propose to divide the sub-section into two parts so as to make it clear. The first part will read: "If his father is alive," etc., and the second: "If his father is dead," giving in the first place the right in connection with the father, and in the second in regard to the mother, after the father's death, in the same manner. I also propose to amend the proviso by substituting six months for four months' absence as disqualifying the son from the power to exercise the vote.

Mr. VAIL. Suppose the eldest son is away from home, would this Bill give the next eldest the vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. I mean supposing there is only enough property to qualify two persons. I do not think it does. It applies only to the elder son, and, if he had left the Dominion altogether, the next son would not have the vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If the elder son has undertaken the duties of housekeeping on his own account, I question very much whether the second son would have the right to vote, presuming there was only one other vote on the property than the father's. This clause seems to restrict it to the elder son. Perhaps the construction put on it by some revising officers might widen it, but the clause would be open to the more limited construction, which I do not think the First Minister intends or is advisable to adopt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any necessity for an alteration. It says: "The eldest son, or such of the elder sons."

Mr. VAIL. That is supposing the property could qualify more than one son.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the eldest son is away he cannot vote. When the farmers' sons franchise was first introduced it was upon the principle that it is generally supposed that the son of the farmer will be his heir and that he remains with his father and works on the farm without pay, because he works for his inheritance while the other sons are scattered. Afterwards it went further and, I suppose under the law of an equal division of property, it was considered that, if the property was able to bear it, each of the sons would inherit his share of that estate and that, therefore, if it was large enough to justify it, they should each have a vote, if resident on the farm with the father. Of course, if they go off the farm, they are like other persons, and must get their votes as occupants or tenants or upon their income or earnings, as the case may be. I think the clause is right enough.

Mr. MILLS. The point is whether, if the elder son is away from home, the next eldest would have a right to vote on the property.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think it is clear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It says: "The eldest or such of the elder sons."

Mr. MILLS. That is where the property is sufficient to qualify more than the eldest son, but, if it is not more than sufficient to give one a vote, and the eldest is away, can another be given the right?

Mr. EDGAR. What is the use of using the words "elder sons?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There may be five sons, and the property may be only enough to qualify two. It implies priority. I think a couple of words will meet the whole case; if we have the same language as in this Bill in line 20 "shall belong only to the father or to the mother, and such of the eldest sons being resident thereon" striking out the word "mother." Put it this way: "And such of the eldest sons being so resident as aforesaid."

Mr. EDGAR. I would ask the Right hon. gentleman to consider the claims of the sons-in-law and the grandsons. I suppose that under the word "son," in the 3rd line of this clause, step son is included.

Sir JOHN. A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR. Would it not be well to extend the provision to sons-in-law and grandsons? The Right hon. gentleman has admitted that he is willing to take what is good out of the Ontario Law, and it is from that I get this suggestion. The illustration which the First Minister used a little while ago why farmers' sons were first given that franchise, seemed to me a very good one, namely, that the son was working with the father and earning the inheritance. Now I think the first instance that occurs to me of an inheritance being worked for and earned, was by a future son-in-law. When Jacob worked for Laban he worked as a future son-in-law. I think that is a very good reason why we should include sons-in-law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will work for a mother-in-law next. When we were settling the interpretation clause I asked that the definition should stand over until we considered the question about the step-son and grandson. The hon. gentleman can bring up that subject when we go back to the interpretation clause.

Mr. EDGAR. I understood that it was farmers' sons that stood over.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says he wants me to go a step farther.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Put him out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to move an amendment to this clause, namely: "that the words "grandson, step-son or sons-in-law" be inserted after the word "son" in the first line of the 7th clause. I understand from the Premier and other hon. gentlemen opposite, that the intention of the present Act is not to restrict the franchise as it is at present enjoyed, but rather to widen it. So far as all the Provinces are concerned, it will give the franchise to some who would not otherwise be entitled to it, and as regards the Province of Ontario, I simply take the words of the Provincial Act. I think we should not deprive of the franchise any parties who now enjoy it under any of the provincial laws now in force, or that may hereafter come into force. This amendment will also prevent confusion in making up the voters' list, and with this view I move the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BURPEE. I beg to move an amendment relating exclusively to the city of St. John. That city has a franchise which gives a vote to every freeman having been assessed for one year in the sum of $100. The Act reads thus: "And the name of every freeman of the city therein assessed in the sum of $100, shall be added to and inserted in the list." The franchise in the city of St. John has been such, I think, ever since it had a charter. It is a peculiar one, but one which the people are very anxious to retain. I beg to move the amendment which I placed in your hands, to preserve this franchise to the freemen of the city of St. John.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How many freemen are there?

Mr. BURPEE. One hundred and fifty.

Mr. FOSTER. What constitutes them freemen?

Mr. BURPEE. I presume they have a license. The hon. gentleman, who lives in St. John most of the time, ought to know.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg your pardon; I do not live in the city of St. John.

Mr. BURPEE. They take out a license, I think, from the corporation, which constitutes them freemen in case they are assessed for $100 for the year previous.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you mean to say that any one who applies for and pays the license fee, becomes thereby a freeman of the city? Or is it a distinction of honor conferred by the city itself? If so, upon what class of persons is it conferred, and would not these persons have the suffrage on one of the other bases of the franchise?

Mr. MILLS. I do not think we are called upon to consider whether these gentlemen may or may not have the franchise upon some other grounds. We have the fact before us that a certain number of gentlemen, known as freemen of the city of St. John, are entitled to vote as freemen under the law, and have been ever since the city received a royal charter. One of the hon. members from the city of St. John informed me before leaving, that the terms on which those persons were made freemen were that they were to do business in the city and pay taxes on $100, and pay £6 6s into the city corporation for the purpose of the privilege of a freeman; or if they were sons of freemen, they were to do business in the city and pay £1 0s. 6d. There are about 150 freemen. Those parties will be disfranchised unless provision is made for the continuance of this provision of the charter of the city.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we can accept the amendment. No doubt most of those persons if they pay an annual sum of £6 6s. will be holders of pro-

perty, or at all events will come under the income franchise. Again, if they pay $20 rent per year they will have a vote. Besides if we look back at English history we shall find that this class of votes was looked upon with great disfavor. The hon. member for Bothwell knows that the freemen were swept away by the Reform Bills as being one of the nuisances there, they being known under the name of pot-walloppers.

Mr. BURPEE. I am sorry if the First Minister cannot accept this amendment. The freemen have enjoyed the privilege for a long time; some of them may be enfranchised in other ways, but a great many will not be. The sum of $20 paid for the privilege of being a freeman is only paid once, not annually.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Bothwell stated that they would all be disfranchised if the present freeman's qualification was not retained. Is the hon. member sure about that?

Mr. MILLS. I stated precisely what the hon. gentleman knows; that they will be disfranchised as freemen. Whether they will be qualified in any other way, I do not know. If so, it will be a mere accident.

Amendment negatived.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only alteration I propose is the substitution of 1st January, 1886, instead of 1st November, 1886.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have already pointed out that the assessment in towns and townships and villages in Ontario is made between 1st February and 15th May in every year. Under exceptional circumstances towns and cities can adopt a different period of the year, all counties can by a special enactment postpone the assessment to 15th July. The assessment roll has been made the basis of the voters' lists under this Bill. If so, the assessment made in February of one year cannot be acted on by the revising officers until after 1st January in the following year. That leaves a long interval, while as a fact, the voters' list is now prepared or generally distributed by 1st July or at the very latest by 1st August and revised by 1st September or 15th September at the very latest.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong. Persons have a right to appeal until 1st of August. After that the clerk has to make up the voters' list and it is published during one month. It is utterly impossible to have all the appeals in by 1st August.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Most of the hon. members for Ontario will recollect the time at which they receive the voters' lists from the different municipal clerks. They generally reach us about 1st July, and by 1st August in the majority of instances. The voters' list is printed, and upon it, appeals are made. It is true it is not the final list at the time it comes into the possession of those who are entitled to copies.

Mr. MILLS. I think the Minister in charge will see that this is an extremely inconvenient time for making up the lists. How many days does the hon. gentleman propose to give for the examination of the list? If he allows thirty days from the time the list is received it means that the time for examining into it and making changes would be just the time when Parliament would be in session, and how would the hon. gentleman himself, while attending to his duties as a Minister of the Crown, look after the revision of the lists in his own constituency? Every member in the rural constituencies in a large degree will have to look after that work in his own constituency. If the hon. gentleman would say the 1st of August or the 1st of September it would be a much more convenient season.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman and I could pair off.

Mr. MILLS. But we do not happen to represent the same constituency.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member for Lincoln has forgotten the dates. According to the Act, every assessor must deliver over the roll before the 1st of May, the duties of the court of revision must be completed by the 1st of July, and the final revision by the judge must be determined before the 1st of August.

Mr. RYKERT. That is just what I said.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman will therefore see that in Ontario, at least, the list will be ready for the revising officer soon after the 1st of August. I think the First Minister will see that it is postponing it unnecessarily to make the date the 1st of January.

Mr. WALLACE (York). That portion of the Ontario Act is objectionable, because it compels the revision of those lists just at a season of the year when farmers are unable to pay any attention to it, that is during July and August. I think it is much better that the work should be done in the winter, when the people have more time.

Mr. EDGAR. But we cannot alter the Ontario law, and the revising officer bases his calculations on the assessment roll, which is completely finished by the 1st of August. That may be a good or a bad time, but it is the time by law, and the only question we have to consider is whether we shall wait five months before the work shall be gone on with by our own officer.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is astray with reference to his law on this subject. It is true the list must be returned finally revised by the 1st of August, but after that time the voters' list has to be completed. It is provided that immediately after the final revision of the roll the clerk shall proceed to make copies of the voters' lists and publish them for thirty days. The hon. gentleman knows that the court of revision is generally held in the months of September or October—seldom before that time, so that by taking the 1st of January there is a certainty of having the voters' list finally revised by the county judge. Then, in cities the roll is not revised before the end of September, so that there will only be a month or so between the two lists, and the revising officer will have a complete list for the whole electoral district, instead of going on and taking the townships and villages at one time and the cities at another. It would be utterly impossible for him to get a finally completed list before the 1st of October.

Mr. VAIL. So far as my own Province is concerned, I think the right hon. gentleman could not have chosen a more inconvenient time than January. If he had taken November then we could take the lists of the previous year. I do not know how the matter stands in Ontario, but there are other Provinces to be considered. By our law the assessors are not bound to supply a copy of the list until the 20th of January. The revision takes place in March, and the court is held in April. If the leader of the Government will consent to make his time the 1st of March or the 1st of May it would be much better for the lower Provinces. It would be impossible to revise the lists at this time, unless they took the lists of the previous year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nobody can tell when a general or particular election will take place, and I think the time is a matter of no consequence. In 1878 the election was in September; in 1882 it was in June; and it is a mere chance when it may take place. No matter what month the election may fall upon, it may give a long time or a short time, but after full consideration, and after discussing the matter with men who have had a good deal of experience, I thought it would be fair all round to make it

the 1st of January, and it is convenient, for the sake of symmetry, that the same date should apply both for cities and towns.

Mr. VAIL. The revising officer cannot make it by the 1st of January, for he cannot get the roll by that time.

Mr. MILLS. This shows the difficulty of fixing a uniform time. There is the difference of climate and the difference of local circumstances; and what is suitable for one Province is not suitable for another. My hon. friend tells me that the 1st March is as early a period as will suit the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Lincoln seems to confound the voters' list and the assessment roll. The local voters' list is a matter of no consequence to us; we are not following it; we are not adopting the same qualification. What is of consequence to us is the assessment roll, from which the qualification of voters is to be ascertained. As soon as the assessment is carefully revised, we are prepared, in the Province of Ontario, to make up the voters' list. It would be easy to ascertain what would be the most convenient time in each Province, and to provide that the voters' list should be made up in the different Provinces at such times as would be most suitable. I do not see any object in adopting any particular time for all the Provinces when that time is not convenient. It is not desirable to make up the list on an assessment roll eight or ten months old. My observation—and I dare say that of every other hon. gentleman from Ontario coincides with it—is that when you compare the voters' list of one year with that of another year, you find a very large percentage of names on one list which are not on the other, owing to the migrations of our people. Some go to Manitoba and some to the western States, and if the assessment roll is not used until it is eight or ten months old, a considerable number will be left off the voters' list. I therefore think it is desirable that the list should be made up as soon as possible after the assessment roll is completed.

Mr. RYKERT. The assessment roll is not conclusive. There are many names on the voters' list that are not on the assessment roll. The only persons whose names must be put on the voters' list, because they are on the assessment roll, are income voters.

Mr. MILLS. The voters' list which has been prepared under the local law is not a matter of the slightest consequence under this Bill. Under the local law the qualification is $200; and how is a judge or revising officer to know whether the party there named is on the assessment roll for $200 or $500? He cannot tell; and therefore the voters' list is no guide to him; but the assessment roll is, because he sees there the value of the property put there by the assessor, and he transfers the name of every person assessed for the amount required from the assessment roll to the voters' list. He cannot transfer a single name from the voters' list of the Province to the list under this Bill, because you have adopted a different qualification.

Mr. EDGAR. There is another point to which I would like to draw the attention of the committee. The hon. gentleman for Lincoln has spoken of the voters' list being made up after the closing of the assessment roll on the 1st of August; but if the object of the Frst Minister, in fixing the 1st of January, is to give the revising officer an opportunity to refer, after that date, to the lists in cities and towns, he has not fixed the right date; because, by the assessment Act, it is provided that cities and towns separated from the county may pass by-laws regulating the different periods of their assessment; that the assessment must be taken between the 1st of July and the 30th of Septembeber; that the roll must be returned to the clerk on or before the 1st of October, that the time of the closing of the court of revision shall be the 15th of November, and that the final return to the county juge shall be on or before the 31st of December; so that there is no time given for making up the voters' list at all.

Mr. AUGER. There is another reason why November should be chosen instead of January. Those who will be most interested in watching the making up of the lists will be the representatives of the people, and if the list is to be made up in January, the members of Parliament will not be there to look after it. While, if November was chosen, the list might be made between that time and the time Parliament meets.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. First Minister might say why it is that in section 13 it is provided that the revising officer will not publish his list until the 1st of January, 1887, which is a year after the date at which the qualification is to exist. It is very difficult to see why a whole year is allowed to elapse.

Mr. BURPEE. The month of November is the time selected for making up our local lists in New Brunswick, and it is considered the most convenient time for that Province.

On sub-section 2, section 4,

Mr. EDGAR moved in amendment:

That after the word "naturalisation" the following words be added: And, if an Indian or person, with part Indian blood, has been duly enfranchised, and has had the same civil capacity conferred upon him as other persons who are entitled to vote under this Act.

He said: My object in moving this amendment is one of which the House has heard something before. It embraces a protest on the part of those who support it against giving a vote to unenfranchised Indians who are still under the wardship and tutelage of the Crown. Whatever other capacities other voters have, it is proposed by this amendment the Indians shall also have, before being entitled to exercise the franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I promised to make some exceptions with respect to the Indians in some of the Provinces, and I think the proper place to discuss this subject is on the clause which declares who shall not have a vote. This clause declares generally that persons duly qualified as British subjects shall have a vote, and then come the exceptions.

Mr. EDGAR. I was led to propose this amendment from the way the right hon. gentleman has framed the Bill. In the interpretation of the word "person," in the beginning of the Bill, he has considered it necessary to declare that it shall include the Indian. Following that, it seems to me that when we come to this clause, stating the kind of persons who, in counties and towns, shall have a vote, it is the proper place to lay down the rule I propose as regards the Indians. I think the hon. gentleman was right in introducing the interpretation clause at an early stage of the Bill, so as to show its scope, in order that nobody would be surprised. The Indian is one of the large classes that are to be affected by the interpretation of the word "person." You cannot place the Indian in the clause of exceptions, dealing with returning officers and others exempted from the right to vote, but must deal with him under the general clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that because the Indian comes under the interpretation clause of the word "person," this is the proper place to introduce his amendment. Well, a judge is a person, so is a returning officer, so is a paid agent, and yet they are provided for in the next clause. The general principle is that all persons having this qualification shall vote; then, in the next clause, we say that certain persons, who are qualified by the previous clause, shall, for special reasons, be excluded.

Mr. EDGAR. Such as Chinamen. Why did not the hon. gentleman keep Chinamen for the next clause? They are put in the interpretation clause along with the Indian.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be remembered that we had a long discussion on the Indian question, on the interpretation clause of the word "person;" and the First Minister, at the conclusion of that debate, which was somewhat lengthy, stated that we had taken the debate at the wrong clause. He was partly to blame for that, for he lead us into it, or, at any rate, warranted us in entering into it then, because we settled the exclusion of the Chinese on that very same interpretation paragraph on which we discussed the Indian. However, the First Minister has stated that it is his intention to make some alterations. We do not know what they will be or in what direction. I think it would be desirable, before the subject is fully gone into, that we should know what the First Minister intends to do. If he does not care to disclose his intention until he reaches the clause which he thinks is the proper one, I would ask him whether he will consent, should the alterations he will propose be not such as will meet the views of this side, to allow us to move the amendment which my hon. friend is proposing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You may as well discuss it now as at any other time.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman propose to tell us what he is going to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will, when I come to the clause.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman objected to defining the Indian as he meant the word "Indian" to be understood in the Act, when we were discussing the interpretation clause, but he discovered that that was the right place to exclude Chinamen. I understand that definitions are introduced in an interpretation clause for the purpose of explaining and limiting the scope of the technical words that are used in the Act to which those definitions apply. The hon. gentleman said that an Indian meant a person, and that we were making a great ado because he had inserted in the interpretation clause the fact that an Indian is a person. That is a fact in natural history, and it was not of the slightest consequence to introduce it in this Act, except for the purpose of the Act. It does seem to me, and I believe that will be the opinion of every draughtsman, that the proper place to have limited the use of the word "Indian" was in the interpretation clause itself, just as the hon. gentleman uses the word "son" in a technical sense, and states what the meaning of that word is in the interpretation clause. He does not propose to say whether it means step-son, son-in-law or grandson, as well as the son defined in that particular clause. Why does he give those definitions, if not for the purpose of explaining the use of the word "son" in the different clauses of the Bill? Thus, in the use of the word "Indian" in the Bill, unless he intends to enfranchise every Indian in the Dominion who has a certain amount of property that might be credited to him, although held from the Crown as an occupant, the proper place to have defined and limited the use of the word was the interpretation clause. I am not going to argue that point further; it is so clear that it requires no further discussion. It is only necessary to point out that if he intended the word "Indian" to apply to enfranchised Indians and no others—those who have the civil capacity to make civil contracts, who have control over their own affairs, and in whom the possession of property would be the evidence of thrift and foresight, as it would be in any class of the community—the interpretation clause was the proper place to define those limitations. The hon. gentleman objected to that; he said he would not limit and define the use of the word "Indian" there; that that was not the proper place; but he admitted it was the proper place to exclude Chinamen. Now, when we come to this clause, and my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) proposes to limit the term "British subject by birth or naturalisation" by excepting Indians on their reservations, and who are the wards of the Government, the hon. gentleman says again this is not the proper place. Why is this not a proper place? Will it not accomplish the object which my hon. friend has in view? If the hon. the First Minister is prepared to meet the views of those on this side of the House, to meet the views of the country, of the great majority of those outside of Parliament who have put him where he is, and put his supporters where they are, if he is prepared to make a statement to that effect to the House, we on this side will leave the artistic question as to the particular part of the Bill in which that declaration is to be put in to him. But if he is not prepared to meet the wishes of the country he ought to be prepared to discuss this question here just as well as at a future stage of the Bill. I had, to-day, the honor of presenting to the House a petition signed by 113 electors residing in the 3rd division of the township of Sombra.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Seventeen cents' worth.

Mr. MILLS. No; there is not seventeen cents' worth, nor is there much sense in the observation, or good taste either. Hon. gentlemen opposite insult those who petition Parliament. If there is one right which is more sacred than another to the free men living under British institutions, it is the right of petitioning, but hon. gentlemen seem to think it is a serious invasion of their rights that there should be a petition at all. Upon that petition there were the names of 113 out of less than 130 electors in that polling division, and a majority of those electors voted against me at the last election. More than three-fourths of all the electors, Tory or Reform, who reside in that polling sub-division, have signed that petition.

Mr. McCALLUM. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman had better not say no unless he knows. He does not know in this case, and I do. That polling sub-division lies on the banks of the River St. Clair. Half a mile across the Chenal Écarté is Walpole Island, where those people reside whom the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise. Those who best know them, those who support the hon. gentleman and who are my political opponents, or who have been so up to this time, have petitioned him not to do this violence to the constitution. I am willing to give the franchise to any Indian who owns his own land, who is responsible for his own debts, against whom a civil process may run, who is liable to perform the same civil duties as a white man. Further, I am willing to give to every Indian, whether he is qualified or not, who is ready to take the risk of that, the opportunity of making the trial, and when he does, and when he has the same qualification as is required of a white man, I am willing to accord to him the same rights. But the same reason which would prevent the House from giving the franchise to a child ten years of age will apply to an Indian. Why do you not give the franchise to every boy between ten and twenty-one years of age? You will not allow him to jeopardise the property he may inherit; you will not allow him to make a contract which will waste his estate; you say he has not the necessary judgment. You give him the opportunity for his judgment to mature; you exercise control over him in the interest of the State, and I admit that that is a right and proper control. But you go further, and say that he is not prepared to accept the absolute responsibilities of a free man, and therefore he cannot have the elective franchise. You do exactly the same thing with the Indian. What does the hon. gentleman propose? Here are 810 Indians on Walpole Island, according to the returns of the Department of the Interior. Not one of them pays one farthing of municipal taxes, or can be

called upon to serve as a juryman, or can be drafted into the militia, or can be made subject to a civil process, or has the liberty to make a contract for himself. But the hon. gentleman says: I will take the value of Walpole Island; I will have my revising officer estimate how much the island is worth; and, if that island, divided amongst all those Indians resident there, is sufficient to give each one over twenty-one years of age a vote, he shall have a vote. It is rumored that the hon. gentleman proposes some change; that he proposes that the Indians shall have separate holdings. But the Indian may have a separate holding at any time by his will; he can give to any Indian that he can ascertain will support him a separate holding; there is nothing in his way; and that Indian is no more a property-holder, upon any just principle, than is the man who resides in a foreign country. In most of the reservations they have allocations. I believe that every portion of the Moravian town reserve is allotted. Forty acres are allotted to each family; and, under this Bill, the hon. gentleman would give them votes. Yet he knows that, except some two or three, there is not one of them qualified to exercise the elective franchise. Apart from the question of intelligence, there is wanting that public spirit which is necessary to the proper exercise of the elective franchise, which is necessary in order that the franchise may elevate the Indian instead of the Indian degrading the electoral system. Under this provision the hon. gentleman would give to these Indians 200 votes. I believe that about one vote to four of the Indian population would be a fair representation of the number that would be entitled to vote under this law on the various reservations throughout Ontario. It is only necessary to take up the election returns for the last three parliamentary elections, and to take the number of Indians in the different electoral distrits of this country, to see what the effect of that system would be. In 1880 the hon. gentleman reported that he had sent out circulars to all the Indian agents throughout the older Provinces, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the Indians were prepared for a simple municipal system. There was a proposition to establish municipal councils, to which Indians would be elected, and of which the Indian agent would be chairman. They had to deal with the boundary, fences, drains, and the construction of roads through the reservations, questions of the simplest character. And what report did the hon. gentleman receive from all his agents? He was informed that the Indians were not sufficiently intelligent to enable them to work out such a system as that; and yet the hon. gentleman proposes give to them the right to exercise the franchise, the highest privilege that belongs to a free people. I say a more monstruous proposition was never submitted to a Legislature. The proposition is so much at variance with all our conceptions of freedom, that I cannot for a moment suppose that the hon. gentleman had simply the elevation of the Indian in view when he made it. The way to improve the Indian population is not to begin with the most complex features of our political organisation, but to begin with the simplest; not to begin at the top, but at the bottom. Now, I see before me the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General knows that a more unpopular measure than this Indian provision, in his section of the country, and in the very city which he represents, could not be put upon the Statute Book.

Mr. CARLING. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will discover it if he does not know it. I have seen myself several communications from that city, from gentlemen who have hitherto supported him, and who declare that this is a monstrous proposition. I have seen communications from parties who have never given a vote except to a supporter of the First Minister, and who declare that if this Bill becomes law neither he nor a supporter of his will ever receive a vote from them again.

An hon. MEMBER. A good thing for you is it not?

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, I do not propose to do evil that good may come. The damnation of such parties is just who hold that view, and the condemnation of hon. gentlemen would be a most righteous act, there is no doubt about that. We do not seek to do wrong in order that we may profit by it; we leave that to the hon. gentleman. Now, I would say more in regard to this measure if there were not Indians in my own constituency. So far as the constituency of Bothwell is concerned, it does not make the slightest difference to me whether the hon. gentleman enfranchises or disenfranchises these Indians. I am opposing the propostion, not because I expect either to gain or lose by it—that, I think, is a very secondary consideration. I am not so anxious to sit here that I am ready to support a wrong proposition, or to oppose one right in itself, that I may remain in Parliament. But I say that I am not the least afraid of being injured by the proposition which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us. I am confident that the number of men who will be turned against the hon. gentleman in the constituency, on account of this proposition, will exceed the number of Indian voters he expects to secure by it. I say that it is a degradation of Parliament to undertake to introduce into this Assembly representatives of men who place no value upon the electoral franchise, who know nothing about our free institutions, nothing about its history, nothing about the struggles or difficulties by which its freedom has been obtained; and it is because the hon. gentleman has proposed to inflict a serious injury upon the country in this particular that I have entered my protest against this Bill. It is because this Bill possesses so many mischievous features that I have opposed it so long.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is not the Indian question.

Mr. MILLS. I am discussing the principles of the Indian question, and I cannot for one moment admit that you, Sir, or anyone else, can undertake to carve out for me my line of argument upon this question. The proposition before us is so vicious in its principles, so degrading to free institutions, so well calculated to destroy representative Government, that I feel myself called upon to state the consequences which are likely to flow from its adoption. I have stated the reasons why I do so, no matter what may be the political effect of this measure. In the essay which I read yesterday from Mr. Gladstone, there is a statement to which I did not refer, but which is pertinent to this point. That distinguished statesman observes that nothing can be more disagreeable to a party or to a public man, in undertaking to consider the advantages which are to be gained by a particular proposition, than to consider its effect upon the party before he considers whether it is right or proper in itself. And, Sir, it is not a question of party, it is not the advantage which this may give to hon. gentlemen opposite, or the disadvantage which it may inflict upon this side of the House, that is the chief thing for consideration. Our system of government is a system which requires forbearance on the part of parties, a system under which the majority are supposed to put restraints on themselves by the consideration of what is right and just, and not by considerations simply of what will be of particular advantage to the party at the moment. It is not possible to preserve that moral elevation which is necessary for the security of freedom under representative institutions when measures of this sort are thrust upon the attention of Parliament and supported by a whole party. We must remember that when we have a proposition so atrocious as I consider this to be, submitted to Parliament for its consideration, and sought to be forced upon Parliament, there is such a thing as allegiance to party, and we are bound to consider

what is to be the effect on the whole party of the adoption of a course such as this. The principle of allegiance to party and of devotion to party leaders we may admit. It springs from qualities in human nature that tend to elevate rather than degrade it, if it is controlled within proper bounds and by proper principles. We see the devotion of hon. gentlemen opposite to the First Minister, their self-sacrifice, the extent to which they subordinate personal convictions to support measures he may propose; but when you go behind that, instead of a party existing for the purpose of accomplishing some great end, it exists merely as an end in itself. When office is held, not for the purpose of accomplishing some general progress for the benefit of the State, but for the purpose of securing particular individuals in power, then you are degrading party; and when you do that, all the people supporting that party throughout the country are naturally induced, except when the question is such as to revolt their moral senses, to give in their adhension. They are called on to seek for grounds on which to defend what is indefensible; they are asked to adopt lines of defence which, under other circumstances, they would immediately reject, and they so bring a whole party down to the lower level occupied by those who lead it.

Mr. FOSTER. Question, question.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman has not sufficient mental capacity——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. MILLS. I am in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not talking to the question.

Mr. MILLS. I am.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If the hon. gentleman continues to address the Chair in that way I shall name him. I give the hon. gentleman fair warning. He has spoken in a rough manner to the Chair before, and I allowed it to pass; but I will not allow it to pass again. The hon. gentleman is now discussing the subject of allegiance to party and not the subject before the committee; and if he continues to do so I shall call him to order.

Mr. MILLS. I must be guided by my own judgment in these matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. MILLS. I have respect for the Chair, but I should like to exhibit it without sacrificing those feeling of self-respect which I feel due to myself and to those who sent me here. In the line of argument I have taken I have only said what I believe to be strictly pertinent. I am pointing out that this question of the Indian franchise is a most serious question. The proposal is one which I think is most vicious in principle; and I am pointing out that this evil is not merely confined to its effect upon members of the party on that side or on this side of the House, but the mischievous effects of this measure are of a kind calculated to degrade the moral sense of the entire country. You may think, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter pertinent to this question, but I do. It is a matter most pertinent. If this proposal is such as is calculated to bring about the moral degradation of the people that is a most serious objection to the measure proposed. If I can succeed in pointing that out and in making this House believe it as strongly as I feel it, and make the country feel it also, I shall accomplish, in a great measure, the objects I have in view in addressing this House. I care very little in itself whether hon. gentlemen carry this proposition of Indian enfranchisement or not. That is to me a matter of very secondary consideration; but I say it is a matter of grave consequence to see that the country to which I belong, of the people of which I am a humble representative, should be placed in such a position; for since I have had a seat in this Parliament I have never allowed myself to be biased by any personal or mere party consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. MILLS. I do not care a straw what the views of hon. gentlemen opposite are with respect to myself. I know myself what I do and the motive which governs me in my action and conduct. If you, Mr. Chairman, say that the discussion of the effect of this question on the conduct of parties is not in order, I am ready to take my seat. I altogether refuse to admit that that proposition is a sound proposition. It is so unsound I would not be a party to admitting that I have been out of order in discussing the tendency and effect of this proposition upon the people. The First Minister, when he made this proposition, declared it was his intention to enfranchise all Indians who had the qualifications required in this Bill. That would embrace every Indian in Manitoba who resides on a reservation. The hon. gentleman knows it. It would embrace, as he said at the time it was his intention to embrace, all the Indians of the North-West, the moment they had representation on the floor of Parliament. It would embrace all male Indians over 21 years, who reside within the Province of Ontario. I do not know how it will be in Quebec or the Martime Provinces, for their reservations are of less value; but so far as Ontario is concerned, there is not a reservation existing south of the Lakes that has not sufficient intrinsic value to give a vote to every male Indian over 21 years. I have entered my protest against this proposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they choose to persist with this measure, have a sufficient majority in Parliament to place it upon the Statute Book. But the hon. gentleman should remember that the question of right and wrong is not determined by a majority; that in the progress of mankind, general morality, intelligence and independence of the world, there is a minority who may be right, and it is said by one of the first writers on representative government, M. Guizot, a distinguished French statesman, that the acts of a majority are always open to question, because sovereignty does not rest with numbers, nor with the supreme authority of the State, but rests with the principle of natural justice, which lies behind law, upon which law is founded, and by which the maintenance of law must be defended. You may, Sir, as has been observed by another French statesman, defend law by bayonets, but they are uncomfortable things to sit upon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to discuss this proposition further. I have stated my objection to it. I say that the Indians who are not enfranchised, the Indians who are not qualified to accept the responsibilities of free men, are not qualified to accept the highest privilege of free men, the right of the election of members to this House. I say that the young men of this country, to whom yesterday you refused the elective franchise, the school teachers of this country, the students in the various law offices, the laboring men and clerks in the stores and shops, the men who are, by their honest labor, supporting their own families, are infinitely better qualified to exercise the elective franchise than those who are dependents on the State, and who would be reduced to destitution if it were not for Government interference. You have denied to 125,000 of the young white men of Canada the elective franchise; you refused it yesterday by a large majority; and while you voted that they should not have the franchise you now propose to give it to men who do not know one letter from another, who have no property under their own control, and who are in no respect qualified to exercise that high privilege which you propose to confer upon them.

Mr. DAWSON. I intend, a little later in the evening, to move an amendment with respect to the Indians, as sub-

section 10 to section 4, to make the law in regard to the Indians as like as possible to the law as it now exists in Ontario. Hon. gentlemen on that side have spoken very strongly in favor of the law of Ontario in every possible respect. They have spoken in favor of the law in the United States. We had long and eloquent speeches last night in favor of manhood suffrage, and we were pointed to the United States, where they enfranchised 4,000,000 of negroes. Are we to take them as an example and refuse to enfranchise ——

Mr. DAVIES. The negro was a free man when he was given the franchise.

Mr. DAWSON. And the Indians are free. They are certainly British subjects; they are certainly of independent disposition, and through the whole history of all those Indian tribes it was never possible to make slaves of them. They were always a free, independent and high-spirited race. Take the example furnished by the North-West just now. We have heard some hon. gentlemen very eloquent and occasionally very facetious about Pie-a-pot, Strike-him-on-the-back and Poundmaker. It is much to be regretted that these Indians are in rebellion, and we must give every credit to our gallant volunteers who have gone out to that country to subdue the rebellion. But what does General Middleton say of the Indians, or, in other words, of the half-breeds, and in this part of the country, all through Ontario and Quebec, we have only half-breeds—there is not a full-blooded Indian among them? He gave them credit for being possessed of great courage, and he could not do otherwise, when, out of a force of 450, with all the best implements of modern warfare against them, in the hands of the best troops, before they yielded more than one-half of their whole number fell down dead or bleeding where they stood. People that can do that must surely be capable, with proper training, of higher and better things than rebellion. We have had examples which show that the Indians are quite capable of exercising the franchise. Take the half-breeds, the same class of people we have here; the franchise was allowed to them in Manitoba, and it did them a great deal of good. It kept them quiet, and they sent half-breed representatives to the Local Legislature of that Province, some of whom occupied the best offices, one of them being President of the Council, and they certainly were not behind the white men. These people who have been so sweepingly denounced, we must admit, are British subjects; they have some rights, and the question is how far we shall extend to them the privilege of the franchise. I am as much against extending the franchise to those who are not deserving of it as any person could be; but no one has proposed, as has been said here, to give the franchise to the wild Indians of the forests or the plains. By this Act it is provided that they must be possessed of property, they must live like their white neighbors before they can vote. They pay as high taxes, in proportion as any other people in the community. They pay indirect taxes to the Dominion Government, and they tax themselves, where it is required, to make roads through their farms and reservations, and they perform the duties of good citizens all over the country.

Mr. DAVIES. What taxes do they pay?

Mr. DAWSON. I have seen a very elaborate statement of the taxes paid by the Indians, made by a member of the other House, and it showed very clearly that the average taxes paid by the Indians at the present time to the Dominion Treasury is $6 a head.

Mr. DAVIES. Upon what?

Mr. DAWSON. Upon the goods they use.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes; furnished by the Superintendent General.

Mr. DAWSON. A great deal has been said about the annuities paid to the Indians, but they are not gratuities, but simply payments for their lands. We have heard them spoken of here as if they were living on charity; but that is by no means the case. The hon. gentleman spoke very strongly, and he used a string of strong terms, such as "most monstrous," "outrageous," "vicious," "unjust," "degraded," "atrocious," "mischievous," "calculated to degrade the people of this country," and so on. All these terrible terms which have been flung about so eloquently are very strong, but they prove nothing. Saying that an Act is monstrous and atrocious does not make it monstrous or atrocious. I think the speech we have listened to from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) would not do discredit to the darkest period of the dark ages, when the people were kept in thraldom, and were not allowed to assert their rights as men. The old law of Ontario was:

"All Indians or persons with part Indian blood who have been duly enfranchised, and all Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not reside among Indians, though they participate in the annuities, interest-moneys and rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions, as other persons in the electoral district."

That was for a long time the law of Ontario, and it worked exceedingly well in the district I represent. There were very few Indians there who had votes or who asked for votes; but in my district the right to vote was given to them by the British North America Act, which provided a household suffrage for the district of Algoma, which certainly applied to Indians as well as to all other persons in the district. In 1883, it having been, I suppose, represented to the Government of Ontario that the Indians were voting in a certain direction, they amended the law as follows:—

"All Indians or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all unenfranchised Indians or persons with part Indian blood, who do not participate in the annuities, interest-moneys or rents of tribe, band or body of Indians, and do not reside among the Indians."

The fact of receiving the annuity from the Government prevented the Indian from voting under that law; but there was a good deal of discussion about it in different parts of Ontario, and the Government seems to have been, in fact, ashamed of it, for in the last Act they repealed that provision, and went back in the direction of the former law by adopting this provision:

"Where there is a voters' list, all Indians or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all Indians or persons with part Indian blood who do not reside among the Indians, though they participate in their annuities, etc., but the Indians or persons with part Indian blood who are entitled to vote where there is no voters' list, shall be only the following, namely:—All Indians or persons with part Indian blood, who have been duly enfranchised, and all unenfranchised Indians"—

That is one of the things which the hon. gentleman calls monstrous, enacted by the Government of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read on.

Mr. DAWSON—

"or persons with part Indian blood, who do not participate in the annuities, interest-moneys or rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, and do not reside among Indians."

Now, the phrase, "do not reside among Indians," is rather ambiguous; it might be construed to mean a man residing with his own family; but I presume the meaning was the Indians of the forest, who are not civilised in any way. But what I propose now to move is:

That an Indian or a person with part Indian blood, who has been duly enfranchised, or is an unenfranchised Indian or a person with part Indian blood, who lives in a fixed habitation and follows some trade, calling or occupation, common to civilised life, though he participate in the annuities, interest-moneys and rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions, as other persons in the electoral district shall have a right to vote.

Mr. LISTER. That includes them all.

Mr. DAWSON. It does not; it includes only Indians who live like white men.

An hon. MEMBER. It includes Indians on the reserves.

Mr. DAWSON. This question about the reserves just amounts to this: There are some Indians living on reserves who are very far advanced in civilisation, and who do not live among other Indians. There is one reserve on the Island of Manitoulin, which is about forty miles long, and in some parts of which the Indians are exceedingly scattered. There are not many of them in a position to exercise the franchise, and I do not believe that this Bill will give the franchise to a single Indian more than those who now enjoy it. It will deprive a few of the votes they formerly had on household suffrage, and a few outside of the reserves who have not houses of $150 value; but I do not think, on the whole, that it will make any perceptible difference in the number of Indians entitled to vote, at least, in my district. With regard to Walpole Island, which the hon. gentleman who last spoke has mentioned, there seems to be some alarm. I do not know the condition of the Indians on that island. But I should suppose there was no great risk in giving them the franchise, because I have been told that some of them are very far advanced in civilisation. We speak of the moral elevation of the Indians. I think the moral elevation of the Indians can be best brought about by showing them that they have a voice in the government of the country in which they reside, which once belonged to their ancestors, and which they ceded to the white man; and I will give you a very good example of that. In the Province of Manitoba the half-breeds have been conceded a right to a voice in the government. They vote for members of the Local Legislature, and if you compare them with the half-breeds of Ontario and Quebec you will find that they are considerably in advance of them in general intelligence, because they have been treated as men having rights, and I think we ought to pursue a similar course with regard to the Indians in the older Provinces. I think it will be something to be proud of and to rejoice over by this Parliament, that we have enfranchised the Indian race and given them something to lift them up from the condition in which they have always been held. We have but a very small number of Indians, comparatively speaking, between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and I, for one, will support this measure of enfranchisement. I am in favor of treating them as other people are treated. This Bill goes no further than that; it simply says that the Indian shall be a person. I hope the First Minister will adopt my amendment, which defines more clearly what Indians should vote. I think it will be an improvement on this clause, because the question has been raised as to whether Indians are not minors, who receive pay from the Government. The amendment I propose will settle that question; it will give Indians, who are qualified as white men, the right to vote; it will enable them to exercise the franchise if they are in a position to deserve the franchise.

Mr. WATSON. I am surprised to hear the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) make the statements he has just made. He says that Indians have the right to vote in the election of members for the Manitoba Legislature and that they have seats in that House,

Mr. DAWSON. Half-breeds.

Mr. WATSON. Half-breeds are not Indians; they are not recognised as Indians in any sense of the word; they do not receive any annuities, and the Manitoba Act clearly defines that any Indian or any person with Indian blood, who receives an annuity from the Crown shall not be considered enfranchised and shall not have a vote. I am surprised that the hon. member for Algoma should insist that the half-breeds in Manitoba are Indians.

Mr. DAWSON. So they are.

Mr. WATSON. If the hon. gentleman should go out there and call those half-breeds Indians he would probably lose his scalp, if scalping knives were around.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They must be Indians, then; white men do not scalp.

Mr. WATSON. If they were Indian they would probably scalp. The half-breeds in Manitoba are as true and as good business men and as intelligent as any white men in the country. The Indians are not; they still persist in carrying on the barbarous practices of the wild Indians of the forest; they have their sun dances, and torture themselves for the purpose of showing that they are brave men. The hon. gentleman says they are brave; they show themselves very brave by torturing themselves. I do not think that is a class that should be enfranchised in this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that by the Manitoba Act no Indian is allowed to vote who receives an annuity. That is true, because there are no Indian reserves there, and therefore there can be no annuities; but the Manitoba Act allows the unenfranchised Indians to vote.

Mr. WATSON. The Indians in Manitoba who receive annuities from the Crown, who receive annual allowances, are disenfranchised; but as soon as an Indian becomes educated in that Province, as soon as an Indian becomes a person, as the First Minister describes him, as soon as he is able to make a living for himself and does not receive an annuity, he has as good a right to vote as any white man, and I think that is right. The amendment of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is no better than the Bill itself, because it provides that the Indian who is in receipt of an annuity shall have a vote. Those Indians cannot give an independent vote at the Dominion elections; they are subject to the powers that be; they receive any favors they get from the powers that be, and they certainly would be instructed to vote by their agent for the powers that be. The First Minister has stated that he intends to exempt Manitoba and British Columbia from the action of the Indian franchise. I am glad to hear that, but I am still sorry to see that the Indians in any part of the Dominion who are not enfranchised shall have a vote in the Dominion elections.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This question of giving a vote to the Indians has been discussed in this House for a long time, and a great deal has been said with regard to the Indians on reserves. I do not know what position those Indians hold in other sections of the Dominion of Canada, because I am not acquainted with their position in other sections, or with the course they pursue, or with the claims they have against the Government; but I know that, so far as the township of Tyendenaga is concerned, that we get a large amount of taxes from the white settlers living on the reserve in that township. To say that the Indians on that reserve are beggars or beholden to the Government is not saying what is true. The hon. gentleman who sits behind you, and who was born in that township, and ought to be on this side of the House, knows that what I state is true, when I say that the British Government gave to the Mohawks the township of Tyendenaga, that parts of the township was sold and the money was invested for the Indians with this Government and the Ontario Government, and that there is now $100,000 of money which was paid by the white people, as part of that agreement, which has not been credited to the Indians, and which they are claiming and entitled to to-day. The money they get from the Government is the interest on the money received for the sale of their lands and invested for them at 4 per cent.; and there is not an hon. member in this House who, if he got by treaty from the Government the whole township of Tyendenaga, and occupied it as a reserve or rented it, or to whose credit the money for which any portion of it

was sold, if any were sold, was placed in the hands of the Government, the annual interest to be paid to him as annuity, who would not consider that he was under no obligation to the Government for receiving that amount, as it was only his just due. I hold, therefore, that any man who says the Indians are beggars or dependents because they receive this annuity says what is not true. The hon. gentleman says they pay no taxes, but I can tell him that the township gets annually $700 from the white tenants on the Indian reserve. When there is a road made on the reserve or a bridge built the township council pays part of the expense and the Indian council pays the other part. Is there anything wrong in that? I ask hon. gentlemen opposite why they sneer before they know the facts. I contend that is just what one township always does to another. Take two adjoining townships: if there is a boundary bridge or road made between them, does not each pay its share of the expense? If, on the reserve in the township which the Indians own and is now sold to the whites, a bridge or a road is made, the township council pays its share and the Indian council pays its share also. What is there wrong in that? Are the Indians therefore to be called beggars, or dependent, and be told that they are under a compliment to the Government of the day? Not at all; and I say that from the reserve the township gets from the white settlers the sum of $700 per annum. Let me just say that, so far as the Indians of the township of Tyendenaga are concerned, they own their own allotments of land. They make their agreements with the white men, the Indian council carries out those agreements, the rents are collected and paid to them, and they do with their rents as they please. The Government do not lay out the money for them, but send a cheque on the Bank of Montreal, and they take that cheque and do as they please with it. Does any white man do anything different from that? Then, they work their own land, they sell their own grain, they buy their own cattle and reaping machines and buggies, and they go to their church, and you will see them just as well dressed and as well conducted as any gentleman in this House. I say it is contemptible and mean for any hon. gentleman to stand up here and throw slurs upon them. They are just as true, just as loyal, just as generous, just as sober and industrious, as many of the men who stand up here and utter such harsh, unkind words against them. They are just as loyal to the Government and just as true to one another as hon. gentlemen who stand up and use harsh, unkind and unbecoming words in their regard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has made use of the words "contemptible and mean," with reference to remarks of hon. gentlemen in this House. These words are not parliamentary.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps I have spoken too strongly, but have we not heard strong language on the other side? I just heard the member for Algoma read a list of those strong adjectives—yes, very strong. Did you call those gentlemen to order? If I have used a word that is harsh it is because I feel that an injustice is done to a race of people who ought to be assisted, elevated and placed in their proper position. I do not believe there are ten Conservatives in the whole county of Hastings who will object to the Mohawks on the reserve getting a vote, and there are hundreds and thousands of Reformers who will be anxious to have them enfranchised. They have said so to me repeatedly; they have said that they are entitled to enfranchisement. There are Mohawks in the township of Tyendenaga who could sit in this House with benefit to the House and the country, and if this Bill becomes law I believe some members of the Indian bands will be elected to this House, and they will be a credit to it. I wish to-day, from the inmost thoughts of my heart, that there was a member of an Indian band to stand up here and defend his race, for in that case there would not be so many slurs thrown or such unbecoming language used in regard to the Indians. The time is coming when they will. You cannot accuse them of being disloyal to the British Crown. You accuse them of everything bad you possibly can, and in a way which I do not think is becoming to the representatives of the people. I do not know what other Indians in other parts of the country may do, or how they are situated, but I say that, in the township of Tyendenaga, the Indians are entitled to the franchise and I hope they will get it. They are not all Conservatives. A few have votes now, and they are divided. Who can tell how they will vote? I think the member for South Brant will agree with me in that.

Mr. PATERSON. We will try to get some of them.

Mr. WHITE. Of course you will; a few Indians have the vote now, and some vote Conservative and some vote Reform. We are not battling to get them enfranchised because we believe they are all Conservatives, but because we believe it is right and just, and I believe the majority of the House will carry out that right and that justice with scarcely a dissenting voice, so far as the Conservative members are concerned. It has been said that I am very anxious to get the Indians enfranchised. There are lots of hon. members in this House who were not here when I first had the privilege of being a member, though they may have been here occasionally since. I have been here continuously for sixteen Sessions, and I believe that I can carry East Hastings whether the Indians are enfranchised or not. I have worked for many of the electors there for $4 and $5 a month, thirty-three or thirty-four years ago, and I am representing what some call a Reform constituency, though every time, except once, when I was opposed by a Conservative, I have been opposed by a Reformer. The First Minister and his Government did all they could to keep me from being a member of this House—the hon. gentleman who ought to be the leader of the opposite party, but who was treated as they treat the Indians, kicked, cuffed, insulted and put out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WHITE. Order! Is it an insult to tell a man he is not fit to lead a party, that he is not fit for the position? I believe in speaking plainly and truly, and I wish he was now the leader of the Opposition, as he ought to be. But he was in the Ontario Government and he brought his candidate, and I fought the then leader of that Government and the then leader of this Government, and I got elected, and whether the Indians are enfranchised or not I believe I can be elected. But I say that they are entitled to the franchise, and I am satisfied they should get it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has taken occasion to deliver a very violent tirade against some hon. members on this side of the House. What he has spoken about is not the issue we are now discussing. It is not whether the Indians have sufficient intelligence to exercise the franchise properly and discreetly, but what the Opposition contend for is, that so long as they are wards of the Government and under the control of the Indian agent and the Superintendent General, who, I believe, is the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government, it would be the grossest impropriety on the part of this Government, or any other Government, to enfranchise those people. It requires no difficult stretch of the imagination to see that, under the peculair circumstances in which they are situated, influences of every description would be used against these men, guileless as they are, in reference to the political institutions of the country; and the result would inevitably be that their vote would be cast on the side of the Government party. I am delighted to hear from the hon. member for North Hastings or South Hastings, I forget which.——

Mr. BOWELL. He is neither.

Mr. LISTER—that the Indians have in the past few years improved their social and intellectual position to such an extent that they are fit to exercise the franchise properly; but only three years ago, less than five years ago, the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government reported, in a Blue Book which he sent to the House as the result of his enquiries throughout the country, that the Indians, and among them those my hon. friend from East Hastings talks about, were not in a position to be granted the simplest sort of municipal government. Will he tell me that, in these five years, these people have advanced so much in intelligence and become so well acquainted with the system of government that they are now in a prime condition to be entrusted with the ballot and to cast their votes intelligently. I fear the hon. gentleman does not speak in an entirely disinterested manner on this question. I believe he has a lingering hope that, if the franchise is granted to the Indians on the Tyendenega reserve, most of them will be found voting for him. Why does he not come out manfully and admit that these are the motives which actuate him, instead of putting on the mask and representing that his motives are purely and simply for the best interests of the Indian race If it is thought that the Indians are sufficiently advanced in intelligence to exercise the franchise, by all means give it to them. But when you give them the franchise I think you ought to sever the bonds that exist between them and the Government of the day, and cast upon them all the responsibilities and duties of citizens. Why, Sir, if this class of men were placed upon the electorate we would have different reserves throughout this country invaded by such men as invaded Algoma and Muskoka district during the recent elections. The Indians would be influenced by emissaries of the Government. Sir, if these men were not, five short years ago, able to undertake the simplest form of municipal government, is it reasonable to suppose that to-day they are in a position to receive from this Parliament the right to undertake the highest and most complete system of government? Is it not a miserable subterfuge to say that this measure will have any other effect, or is designed to have any other effect, than to destroy one or two Liberal members of Parliament, and to make the seats of a few Conservatives more safe? But is that any compensation for this grievous evil that will be done to the country, by throwing amongst the electorate a class of men totally uneducated and ignorant of the most fundamental principles of responsible government? It is idle to argue anything else, and the men who argue that the Indian, in the condition of bondage in which he now is, should be entrusted with the franchise, I claim are not acting sincerely. I consider that it would be dangerous to the commonwealth to place that class of men among the electorate. The member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) remarked that the United States had enfranchised the Southern negroes. I admit it; but not until they had severed and shaken off the shackles of bondage in which those negroes lived. If you want to enfranchise the Indians of this country, enfranchise them, but cut from their feet the shackles which now bind them to the Government of the country. If these men are sufficiently intelligent to manage their own affairs, why is it necessary that the Government should send an Indian agent amongst them? Why, Sir, it would be in violation of the law for the Indians to sell one stick of timber off the reservation without the consent of the agent. They cannot enter into a contract by which they are bound, in the eye of the law, any more than a minor of 15 years of age. They cannot make a will but that it is subject to be disallowed by the Superintendent General. In every condition in which you look upon them they are as helpless, and more helpless, than the child of 10 years of age in this country. Yet men have the face to stand up in this Parliament and say that these men should be granted the franchise. A more monstrous proposition I never heard from the mouth of any living man—to say that the Government of the day shall keep these Indians in a state of bondage, that they shall keep them in a state of tutelage, to say that they cannot make a will without the sanction of a Government agent, that they can do nothing but what a child could do, that they are to remain under the influence of the agents on the Indian reservations throughout this country—I repeat that a more monstrous proposition was never uttered by the mouth of man, and I say the man who seriously defends that proposition is not sincere.

Mr. WHITE. I am sincere.

Mr. LISTER. I say if the man is sincere who states that, he has some sinister or selfish motive in what he says. Give the Indian a vote if you like. I have 500 of them in my county. I care not whether they are enfranchised or not. They cannot defeat me, if every man voted against me. Enfranchise them if you like, but, with enfranchisement, cast upon them all the responsibilities of other electors of this country. The hon. gentleman from East Hastings (Mr. White) says that a large majority of the Conservatives of his county would support the Indian franchise. I do not know what they would do in that county, but I do know that in other counties that is not the sentiment of the people. I would take the liberty of reading an extract from a letter received only to-day from a prominent and and life-long supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. I say this extract echoes and voices the feeling of large numbers of Conservatives throughout western Canada. He says:

"I have been carefully watching the action of the Government in pushing through Parliament the Franchise Bill, notwithstanding the opposition offered to it by the Opposition. Although a Conservative all my life, and having much sympathy with the party in the past, I am compelled, in justice to myself and to my country, to protest against this most iniquitous measure as it is proposed to pass it."

He says further:

"The extension of the franchise to the Indians, and the revising barrister clause, must be, to every independent mind, an indication of weakness."

He goes on further to say:

"And as for myself, this measure alone compels me to cast off allegiance to the Conservative party and ally myself to the Opposition, who are contending for right against might."

If hon. gentlemen think proper to dispute the correctness of that letter, I say that the man who wrote it is one of the most prominent men in the section of country in which he lives, and that is not in my own county. He has been, as he states, a life-long supporter of the right hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name; give us the name.

Mr. LISTER. I will give you the name if you will promise not to House it. I will let you see the letter. It is a private letter to myself, and I would be committing a breach of privilege to make it public.

Mr. WOODWORTH. When a letter is read to the House, or a portion of a letter, the House is entitled to have that letter laid upon the Table.

Mr. LISTER. Perhaps you would like to have a newspaper article laid upon the Table.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I would like to see the letter.

Mr. LISTER. Well, you are not going to get the letter. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) has told us that the Indians pay taxes. I say the Indians pay taxes in the same way as the rest of the citizens of this country. They pay taxes, of course, if the——

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order. The Chairman has not decided the point I raised, and before the member goes on any farther I would like to have that question decided. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has read here a letter; he has animadverted on that

letter, and stated that it was from a life-long Conservative, a thick-and-thin supporter of the right hon Premier, and then he went on quoting the letter, and he now refuses to give the name of the writer and to place this letter on the Table. He stated it was private, after giving what portions of it he liked. That is not according to the rule. The rule says, any member who chooses to read a letter or portions of a letter is obliged to place that letter or paper on the Table, so that members may see it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read the rule.

Mr. DAVIES. Before you decide the point, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that only last Session a letter was read by a Minister of the Crown—a most important letter, an official letter, a letter affecting the moneys of the public to the extent of $375,000—and that letter, after it was read, was deliberately withheld by the Minister, who refused to place it in the hands of the committee, and to this day the country has never been able to get its hands on that letter. The action of the Minister was endorsed and backed up by the hon. member who has raised this point of order to-night.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member (Mr. Lister) merely stated that he was quoting from a letter. He informed the committee that he did not propose to lay the letter before it, because it was a private communication. There can be no doubt that he stated that all he proposed to do was to quote from it. He practically laid it before this House and the committee when he read those extracts, and all that could be asked would be that he should, with his own hands, copy those extracts and hand them in. The committee could not call an hon. member to violate private correspondence and to lay such a document before the House.

Mr. VAIL. I will refer to a particular case. I remember in 1876-77 a letter was read in this House, and a party somewhat connected with it asked that it be read at the Table, and the Speaker decided that the House could not call for the letter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Hall). In my opinion, the point of order is not well taken. The rule cited refers only to public documents and not to private documents.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I want to state what the rule is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There can be no discussion on the Chairman's ruling, unless there is an appeal to the House.

Mr. LISTER. No doubt, when this Bill was first introduced it was the intention of the First Minister to enfranchise the Indians throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. We have the hon. gentleman's own statement, recorded in *Hansard*, that such was his intention—that the Indians in the North-West and British Columbia should be enfranchised; and we have the satisfaction of knowing that since then he has considerably modified those views; and now, if we can judge from his expressions and the expressions of the hon. member for Algoma, the intention of the First Minister is that this Bill shall only apply to the older Provinces of the Dominion. I admit that upon many of the reservations there are Indians who are probably well able to exercise the electoral franchise. But if that is the case, those Indians, if they want to exercise the franchise, have a method provided by law, by which they can become enfranchised Indians and be entitled to assume the same status as white men. There has never been, from any body of Indians in this country, any petition asking Parliament to confer on them the franchise. Further, there has never been a petition from white people asking this Parliament to confer the franchise upon Indians. The idea of conferring the franchise on Indians was, no doubt, given to the First Minister by an hon. gentleman in this House, probably by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who is greatly interested in their enfranchisement.

Mr. DAWSON. I am not specially interested in Algoma in that way. I have stated already that I do not think this Bill will increase the Indians enfranchised in Algoma, and I say so now.

Mr. LISTER. This Bill must inevitably increase the electors in Algoma. I do not wish to deny the hon. member's statement, that he believes this Bill will not increase the electorate of the district of Algoma, and I am bound to give the hon. member credit for sincerity; but I know something about the district as well as the hon. gentleman, and in my opinion the conferring of the right to vote on Indians will largely increase the vote in that district. This is a recent idea of the First Minister to give Indians the vote. We have the fact that for seventeen years the hon. gentleman has, Session after Session, introduced a Bill to regulate the franchise throughout the Dominion. The Bill now before the House is the first time the hon. gentleman has proposed to give the Indians votes. The First Minister had not such an idea in 1880, because in that year he reported to this House that the Indians were not sufficiently advanced to exercise intelligently the simplest form of municipal government. I believe that in no other country in the world would such a proposition be entertained or be made by the Executive. In the United States they have Indian reservations, the same as we have. In the State of New York there are a number of reservations; in the Western States there are reservations as well as in the Eastern States. The Indians there are under the control of the Government, as are the Indians in Canada. They receive gratuities, just as our Indians do; and in the State of New York, where a large number of them are to be found, they are equally intelligent with our Indians. The facilities for educating them are fully equal, if not superior, to those in this country, and in every respect they are equal, if not superior, to the Canadian Indians. And who ever heard of the United States—that country of manhood suffrage, that country which gives to every immigrant that comes into it the right to exercise the franchise and take a part in the affairs of that great nation—who ever heard suggested or whispered an intention on the part of the Government of that country to confer on the Indians the right to vote? Why, Sir, the proposition is too monstrous to have found a resting place in the minds of any statesmen on the other side of the line. It remained for Canada—that country of queer political doings—to invent the idea of giving the Indians votes. It is not to be wondered at that in Canada this idea should find a place and find advocates, when we remember our peculiar political condition, when we cast our eyes back for a few brief years, and remember what has taken place in this country. I say it is not at all surprising that the First Minister should be found introducing a Bill such as the one now under consideration, a Bill which I have characterised before as a fit companion to the infamous Gerrymander Bill which was passed in 1882. I say we have no right, under any such state of circumstances, to give the Indians a vote. In the eye of the law the Indian is a minor; he has not one of the responsibilities of citizenship cast upon him. He is not able to enter into a contract which is binding upon him; he is unable to make disposition of his goods, by will or otherwise; he is unable to make any disposition of his land, or what pertains to his land; he is under the control of the Superintendent General, through his agents throughout this country. He has a right to expect that advantages might be withheld from him if he does not act in accord with the wishes of the Superintendent General and of the Government of which he is a member. These, Sir, are circumstances which would influence the Indian, and would influence the white man, if

he occupied the same position. The Indians are only human, like ourselves, and with such resistless means of influencing him, is it unreasonable to suppose he would cease to be a free man; that his ballot would be cast under pressure and his vote would be given in support of the Government? Is it a worthy act of the Government; does it redound to their credit; does it show courage on the part of the Government, that they should attempt to take this power into their hands? Surely they are strong enough in the country without doing that. We have heard, over and over again, the changes rung in this House that the party in power are as powerful as ever, and if they are, with two to one in the House, why are they afraid to go back to the country without this piece of legislation, giving the Indians a right to vote under the circumstances I have attempted to describe. Sir, the only reason which the hon. member for Algoma gave for conferring the franchise upon the Indians was that they pay taxes into the Dominion Treasury. Now, if that was the principle upon which the franchise was adopted, then we would have manhood suffrage in this country, in which case there would be some logic in the argument of the hon. gentleman; but, unfortunately for him, that is not a principle which actuates the First Minister in this legislation. The principle here is a different principle altogether. The hon. gentleman has thought proper to quote the law from the statutes of Ontario, but I believe the statute which he quoted is a statute relating to the district of Algoma, and not to the other portions of Ontario—a district which had exceptional legislation, where certain people were allowed to vote, and where people who, perhaps, lived in a tent all night, called themselves householders. But, Sir, the legislation of the Province of Ontario is fair in every respect, because it permits the Indian to vote if he is enfranchised. If he is free from the influences which the Government can exercise over him, and if he is not residing amongst the tribal Indians, he has a vote, provided he has the same property qualification as a white man. In that respect the grounds on which the vote is given are perfectly clear and logical, because there can be no possible influence of the the Government if the Indian is not living on the reserve and ceases to be under the influence of the agent in charge under the Government. Then, I say the measure before the House, as well as the amendment, should be rejected by this House, from the statement made by the First Minister himself in 1880, when he proclaimed that the Indians were not fit to assume the rights and powers of municipal government. It should be rejected because the Indians are infants in the eye of the law, and are in a state of tutelage, under the control of the Government. Until that influence is removed I say it would be unjust and disgraceful for any party to enfranchise these people. If they are intelligent enough to exercise the franchise, give it to them. But give them their money or their property, to do with what they like. If you say they are not provident enough to take care of their property, that they will waste it, then you admit all we contend for; you admit that they should not exercise the right to vote. If you say it is the duty of the State to preserve their property, you admit their want of intelligence, their want of thrift, and all that we complain of as reasons for their not receiving the franchise. That being the case, it would be unwise, unstatesmanlike and disgraceful, on the part of any political party of this country, to confer the franchise on these people, under the circumstances I have stated.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish to offer a word of explanation. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken was kind enough to attribute to me personal motives in the view I take of the Indian franchise. I do not think that was quite parliamentary; but I can assure the House that I have no personal motives in the matter. As regards the district I represesent, I think the Bill will leave the franchise much the same as it is at present, though eventually, as the Indians become civilised, the number enfranchised may be increased. We have not a large number of settled Indians in Algoma, although we have a great number of wild Indians in the forest; and until they begin to settle down, the Indian franchise in the district I represent will not be very large. Again, he says the only reason I gave why Indians should have votes was that they pay taxes. I did not give that as a reason why they should have votes, but why they should not be deprived of votes. If all the Indians in Algoma had votes to-morrow, I have no knowledge that they would vote for me, for a large proportion of the few who had votes voted against me at the last election.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) displayed a good deal of warmth in dealing with this question, and used a good many strong words and phrases in reference to other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject—I thought, perhaps, more than he was justified in using, under the circumstances. He imputed improper motives to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) because he supported the measure, and said that no hon. gentleman who spoke as that hon. gentleman did was sincere. He talked as if he was speaking from principle; but, after a little, he inadvertently let out what was the secret of his warmth on this question. He said there were several hundred Indians in his constituency, and then he went on to say, in a boasting way, that he did not care whether they were enfranchised or not. Any one listening to his argument must reasonably have come to the conclusion that with him there were personal considerations at stake; and if he can impute improper motives to the hon. member for East Hastings and the hon. member for Algoma, we can, with equal propriety, impute improper motives to him in the argument he advanced. He said it was the most monstrous proposition ever submitted to this House; that in no other country in the world would it be undertaken, and that we have no right to give the Indian the privilege of voting; yet his next proposition was that the legislation of Ontario was fair in every particular. If the hon. gentleman had been as fair as he professed to be, he would have admitted that the Province of Ontario has given the Indians the right to vote already, and that they have voted time and again. Yet he says the law which allows them to vote is fair in every particular, but it is not fair for this House to pass a law to give them a right to vote. I know something about how the Indians were dealt with. In the election before last, in the Muskoka district, the timber inspector there, who supported Mr. Mowat's candidate, went out among the Indians, and it was currently reported, and I believe correctly, that he bought up nearly all the Indians in the district, collected them in one place, and took them to the polls and got them to vote. After that he took the Indians away, took their dresses from them and put them on the squaws, and took them in, and got them to poll their votes. That was done under the law of Ontario and by the friends of the Ontario Government. But it was rumored that Mr. Mowat's timber inspectors did not retain that control over the Indians that they would wish, and he inserted in his Bill that nice little clause, that any unenfranchised Indian receiving any money from the Dominion Government should have no right to vote; but as long as he could get the votes of the Indians, he was perfectly willing to give them the right to vote. There is nothing done by this Bill but what has been done before; there is nothing unreasonable in it; and I believe, if there is one thing more than another that will tend to the moral elevation of the Indian to the level of the white man, it is to give him the right to vote, to confer upon him the same privileges, duties and responsibilities conferred upon white men.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I had supposed, after the strongly expressed views of the representatives of the Province of British Columbia, who so firmly support the Government, that the hon. First Minister would have re-considered his Bill and allowed it to apply to the Indians in all the Provinces and to the North-West Territories alike. With reference to this Indian question, if we are to judge hon. members opposite by some of their observations and by the articles we see in the press, it is a question that is not thoroughly understood by them yet, and it is desirable that there should be sufficient discussion to enable us to ascertain what the position of the Indian really is, and what benefits we propose to confer upon him by the Act now before us. Hon. gentlemen opposite profess that they are championing the cause of the Indian, that they are desirous of lifting him up from the lower scale he occupies to a higher level; and they assume to themselves a certain amount of virtue in saying that they desire to do that, and, by necessity, would seek to fasten on members on this side of the House, who are not in favor of extending the vote to the Indians in the manner proposed in this Bill, the charge that they are actuated by a desire to keep some human beings, who are possessed with souls like other people in the community, in a lower sphere than the latter occupy. Do those hon. gentlemen not know that not only in this land, but in all lands where constitutional government prevails, it has been the Liberal party who have maintained the rights of the people, who have sought to elevate the masses, who have ever sought to confer privileges and blessings upon them, who have ever sought to aid those who are stuggling upward in the race for life; and if they have been opposed at all in this good war, they have been opposed by the party represented by hon. gentlemen opposite. The very tradition, the history, the record of the Liberal party, ought itself to be enough to convince hon. gentlemen opposite, without any statements or arguments on this side, that when they interpret the actions of hon. gentlemen on this side as a desire to keep down human beings in this country and not to give to them liberties and rights, they have misapprehended our position and fail to understand the queston. Who opposes the elevation of the Indians and the enfranchisement of the Indians? Is it any one on this side of the House? Is it not the desire of every one on this side, as I trust it is of hon. gentlemen on that side, that the Indian may become elevated, raised in the public scale, and have conferred upon him the rights and privileges to which he is entitled, as soon as he is able to assume the responsibilites of citizenship? But I reiterate what I have stated before, that the Bill in your hands, Sir, the proposition of the Government in this Bill, is not to elevate the Indian one iota, not to elevate him in the slighest degree in the social scale; it is to do nothing for the Indian mentally, physically, morally, or financially—it is simply a proposition to give a vote to the Indian unemancipated, under the management of the Government, and controlled by the Government. In fact, it is a proposition to place a certain number of votes at the control of the Government, for the purpose of strengthening themselves in the position they occupy. This is a question in which there need be no darkness at all. We have the official documents; we have the laws relating to Indians; we have the machinery that has been devised by Governments preceding this Government and continued by this Government, by which the Indian may be elevated, may be enfranchised; and the very resolution, the very amendment that is in your hands, Sir, offered by an hon. member on this side, shows you plainly that there is no desire on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side to keep the Indians unenfranchised. The resolution is that the vote shall be given to all duly enfranchised Indians. We propose to give it to the enfranchised Indian; we want to give it to every enfranchised Indian; we, on this side, desire that the Indians, as soon as they are ready to avail themselves of this right, should have it, because, as I said before, I do not think it should be our policy to force a measure on the Indians, but to give them the privilege and opportunity of becoming enfranchised, when they are prepared to avail themselves of this opportunity. If hon. gentlemen opposite vote down this proposition, they will vote down a proposition to give a vote to every enfranchised Indian, and they will place themselves in the position that their desire is to give the vote to the unemancipated, unenfranchised Indians. Let me point out to you the actual position of hon. gentlemen opposite, as shown by reference to the Indian Act. The hon. member for East Hastings spoke rather warmly, with reference to some expressions which fell from the hon. member for Manitoba (Mr. Watson) and some others with reference to some of the Indian bands. He appeared to resent them as warmly as though some of the descriptions were applicable to the particular band of Indians with which he is more acquainted. This fact must be borne in mind, that there is a difference in the progress which has been made by the Indians, not only in the different Provinces, but in the different bands in the Provinces. There is no doubt about that; the Indian law recognizes that fact, and therefore the proposition to give a vote to, or even to enfranchise the Indians, as a body, in any of the Provinces, is a proposition too general in its scope, for there are but few bands, that I know, of which would be fitted to exercise it. There was a band in the county of Essex, the Wyandotts, who became wholly enfranchised, who assumed the responsibilities of citizenship, and who have a vote, as they are entitled to have. Other advanced Indians in different bands who are in a sufficiently advanced position and desire to become enfranchised, have the means placed in their hands, in the machinery of the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act, to become enfranchised; and in that way alone can you enfranchise the Indians, in that way alone can you make the Indians citizens of this country, receiving its full rights and liberties and assuming its full responsibilities? It is idle to say that the Bill before us enfranchises the Indian, as that word is understood in the Indian Act. It cannot do it; the First Minister himself would tell you, if you asked him, that it cannot do it. In what position are the unemancipated and unenfranchised Indians? Read the opening clauses of the Indian Act alone:

"The expression 'Superintendent General' means the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; the expression 'Deputy Superintendent General' means the Deputy Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs; the expression 'agent' or 'Indian agent' means and includes the commissioner, assistant commissioner, superintendent, agent, or other officer acting under the instructions of the Superintendent General; the expression 'person' means any other than an Indian; the expression 'band' means any tribe, band or body of Indians who are on, or are interested in, a reserve, or in Indian lands in common, of which the legal title is vested in the Crown——"

That is how the lands of these individuals are held. The title is vested in the Crown.

"who share alike in the distribution of any annuities or interest monies for which the Government of Canada is responsible."

Now, when we come to the Department of Indian Affairs, we see how completely the unemancipated, unenfranchised Indian is under the control of the Superintendent General of the Indians and his local agents residing on the reserves:

"The Minister of the Interior, or the head of any other Department appointed for that purpose by the Governor in Council, shall be the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and shall, as such, have the control and management of the lands and properties of the Indians in Canada."

And it is while the Indian's lands and his liberties, and his properties and his rights, are under the management and under the control of the Superintendent General, that the hon. gentleman proposes to give him a vote, to have his lands and the management of his affairs under precisely the same control after the vote is given to him as they were before. And yet some of those hon. gentlemen will venture to say that it is a proposition which it is advisable to adopt:

"There shall be a Department of the Civil Service of Canada which shall be called the Department of Indian Affairs, and which shall have the management, charge and direction of Indian affairs. The Governor in Council may appoint an officer who, shall be called the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and may also appoint such other officers, clerks and servants as are requisite for the proper conduct of the business of the Department. The Governor in Council may also, from time to time, appoint officers and agents to carry out this Act and Orders in Council made under it, which officers and agents shall be paid in such a manner and at such rates as the Governor in Council directs, out of any fund that is appropriated by law for that purpose."

I have read these sections in order to point out how absolutely under the control of the Superintendent General and his local officers and agents the unemancipated, unenfranchised Indians are. They have the sole control and management of the Indians' affairs. While retaining them in that position the hon. gentleman proposes to give them a vote. Without going through the whole Act, which is not necessary, I would point out where the hollowness, if I say not the hypocrisy, of this Bill is, when there is an attempt made to justify it on the ground that it is designed to do the Indian some good or to raise him in the social scale. There is a way by which that can be accomplished, but it is only by the machinery provided in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act. In that way alone can an Indian be elevated, can he be made a free man, can he occupy the same plane occupied by the white citizens of this country. But is there a proposition from the Government to amend the Indian Act in the direction of giving greater facility to the Indian to become enfranchised, by making these clauses less strict, by shortening the term of probation, by making it easier for the Indian to avail himself of the Act, to do away with clauses of the Indian Act which have been revised and are kept in operation with a view of keeping the Indian as an Indian, of keeping him on the reserve, of retarding any desire that might be in him to burst the bonds and to get greater freedom. There are clauses in the Indian Act designed by the parties who put them there to prevent the Indian leaving the reserve and mingling with the white people, and endeavoring to work his way upward, as the other races in the country work their way up in the struggle, in the battle, and in the race of life. The Indian Act, as it will stand after these unemancipated Indians are given the right to vote, inflicts fines and penalties on the Indian who will leave his reserve and try to make a man of himself. Let me read you a section:

"Any Indian who, for five years continuously, has resided in a foreign country, without the consent, in writing, of the Superintendent General or his agent, shall cease to be a member of the band of which he or she was formerly a member, and shall not again become a member of that band, or any other band, unless the consent of such band, with the consent of the Superintendent General or his agent, is first obtained."

If an Indian would like to leave a reserve where his energies are crippled, and has public spirit enough to go to the Republic to the south of us, as many of our sons go, if he goes there and engages in some trade, or calling, or occupation, and works his way up, then the Indian Act imposes a penalty on him if he does not come back within five years and settle on the reserve. Why not give him liberty to go, and wish him God-speed, as you do to your own boy? Why impose the penalty that, if he ventures to do that, his share of the land which he holds in common with the others shall be forfeited, as to the leases. Either the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) has been mistaken in the proposition he laid down as to the Indians in Tyendenaga leasing their holdings, or those Indians who have violated the provisions of the Act and are liable, and the men who have leased from them are liable. The Indian Act is framed to prevent an Indian leasing his land to a white man. I think it would have been a good thing to give the Indian the right, when he desired to do it, to lease his holding to a respectable white man. In that way, they would have intelligent, capable white farmers scattered throughout the reserve, whose example would be an incentive to the Indians engaged in agricultural pursuits to imitate them in their better modes of farming. But our Indian Act is framed on the principle: Do not let the whites get in there at all, or the Indians will become so advanced that they will not want to remain in the state in which they are; and if they do not want to remain in that state, the office, the employment, the services of the local agent will not be wanted. The tendency is to keep the Indiam where he is. It is not so very long ago that our Indian Act was framed in such a manner that this was the effect of it. It was changed, and I take a little credit in a humble way for having it changed; but, under the Act as it stood, if an Indian woman lived in a state of adultry with a white man and had five or six children, she and her children would draw their shares of the interest money of the band; but, if she turned round, and married that white man, and lived according to the laws of God and man, our Indian Act cut her and her children off from receiving their share of that fund. We got that wiped out, and now the Indian woman can marry a white man and get her share, but her children cannot participate in it. Whether we went far enough or not I will leave you to decide, but at any rate we made a step in the right direction. There is the field in which gentlemen opposite, who desire to advance the cause of the Indian, should work. Help the men who desire to see the Indian advanced. By this Bill you do not do anything in that direction, but you should, by amendments to the Indian Act, remove the disabilities under which you put a progressive Indian, you should make more simple the machinery by which the Indian seeking enfranchisement may obtain it. Then you may fairly claim to be the friend of the Indian and one who desires to help him forward in his course. I might go on, for almost every clause of the Indian Act shows the complete state of the tutelage and wardship in which the Indian is held. The first section I read shows that the control and management of his affairs are in the hands of the Government, and every section of the clause defines when, where and how the Government may come in and exercise that control. The clause relating to what I spoke of last, with reference to Indian an woman marrying a white man, stands now in the amended form this way in the Act. (The hon. gentleman read section 11 of the Indian Act, relating to intermarriages). So, any woman who marries a white man forfeits her rights to her share in the land which she has in common with all the other members of the band. I leave it to the committee to say whether that is right or not; but permitting her to share in the annuities, as we do here, is a great advance upon what the law was a few years ago, when, if she married a white man, that would have entailed upon her the further penalty of losing the interest of the money to which she is entitled.

Mr. HICKEY. She would have had a good protector when she married the white man, as much as any other woman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; but the hon. gentleman would hardly say that a white woman, when she marries a man, should therefore forfeit any property she had in her own right. The design of the Indian Act is to keep Indians from intermarrying with the whites, to keep them shut up on their reserves, and to remain in their present state.

Mr. BERGIN. Then you think it desirable that white men should marry Indian women.

Mr. PATERSON. I think if a white man and an Indian woman desire to be united in the bonds of matrimony, this Parliament of Canada ought not to impose any fines or penalties for doing so.

Mr. BERGIN. It does not.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it does; I am pointing that out.

Mr. BERGIN. You are trying to, but you are not succeeding.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I trust, Mr. Chairman, I have convinced you. I have pointed out that the Indian woman, if she married a man remaining on the reserves, has her share in common of the lands there, but if she marries a white man she forfeits her share of the land. And, in addition to forfeiting her share of the land, she at one time forfeited her share of the interest money. We have amended the Indian Act, as concerns the interest money, but the penalty of forfeiting her share in the lands is still upon the Statute Book. I have pointed this out, showing that the whole tendency of the Indian Department and the management of it, is in the direction of keeping the Indians as Indians, of repressing them, of keeping them down. There is a clause which says a man shall forfeit his right in the lands if he lives for five years in the United States, if he has enough courage, if he has enough public spirit, to go over there and work his way up, and does not come back inside five years and go on the reserves. Now, let us take one or two other clauses, just to see the position the Indian occupies. (The hon. gentleman read section 20, where the Indian may devise certain property by will.) Now, he may make his will, but if it is not approved by the Superintendent General that ends the matter.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The approval follows the approval by the band.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; and here again you see the lack of control on the part of the Indian. Even if the Superintendent General was not there, they are controlled, in devising their own property, by the band. Does not that show the absence of self-control on the part of the individual? If he fails to have done that, then he is declared to have died intestate, and the will is of no force at all. They may make their will, but if it is not approved by the band, and also by the Superintendent General, that ends the matter, and the Indian Act declares he shall have died intestate. (The hon. gentleman read section 30, prohibiting the Indians selling their produce under certain fines and penalties.)

Mr. BOWELL. Does this apply to all tribes?

Mr. PATERSON. It applies to the Indians of the Province of Manitoba, the District of Keewatin, and the North-West Territory.

Mr. BOWELL. It does not apply to the Indians of Ontario?

Mr. PATERSON. No. It applies to the Indians to whom this Bill proposes to give votes. These Indians are not able to dispose of their produce, except under certain restrictions. When this Act passes the Manitoba Indians will be in the position of voters.

Mr. WHITE. No, they will not be in that position.

Mr. PATERSON. We have had the member for East Hastings telling us so.

Mr. WHITE. No; you had the First Minister making the statement that the Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia were not to be included in this Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. Minister has changed his mind, because he explicitly answered the hon. member for Bothwell that this Bill would include the Indians of the North-West Territory and British Columbia. The hon. gentleman changed his mind after the question had been debated—about a week afterwards.

Mr. WHITE. On the very same day the conversation occurred with the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS. By looking at *Hansard*, the hon. gentleman will see it was nearly a week afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON. One of the members for British Columbia last night assured us he wanted the Indians to vote. So we have reason to believe that the First Minister has changed his mind again.

Mr. WHITE. It would not apply to them, either.

Mr. PATERSON. It was on 4th May that the Minister made that statement. It was drawn from him by members of the Opposition; and, recollecting this fact, it is rather too much to blame us for the original statement of the First Minister, that he proposed to give the franchise to Indians, who, under the Indian Act, were not at liberty to sell any of their own produce.

Mr. WHITE. Suppose we admit that the First Minister changed his mind. You are arguing now as if he had not changed his mind. Yet you say he has done so.

Mr. PATERSON. Now the hon. member for Cardwell admits——

Mr. WHITE. I admit nothing. I said: Assume he has changed his mind.

Mr. HICKEY. The First Minister asked that the discussion on clause 9 should stand over; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will not wait for the explanation.

Mr. PATERSON. The First Minister was asked to give an explanation, but he said the discussion had better go on.

Mr. BERGIN. Not a discussion on the Indian Act, which is not before the House, but the discussion on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. What I gathered was, that perhaps the First Minister's mind was not fully made up. He says he consults his colleagues, and it may be that after further discussion he will go further than the announcement made on 4th May. He, himself, said that the discussion had better go on; and therefore, at the request of the First Minister, we are going on with the discussion, and it does not come with good grace from hon. gentlemen opposite, after we have been invited to go on, to say we should have taken another opportunity to do so. They must have forgotten that we are discussing this matter at the express wish of the Minister himself.

Mr. BOWELL. In all fairness, does the hon. gentleman think it is right to discuss the Indian Act and then to take the provisions of this Bill as applicable to the tribes in the North-West and in Manitoba, and make the declaration he has done, after the declaration of the First Minister, that he did not intend to enfranchise those Indians. I ask whether that is a fair argument?

Mr. PATERSON. No; I was not using it in that way. Hon. gentlemen have interrupted me so often—and I do not object—that I had not finished the reasons why I entered upon that line of argument. I was pointing out that the First Minister had declared, after discussion, that he would exempt those Indians; and I have just said that I do not know whether the First Minister has not again changed his mind on that matter, whether he does not mean to recede from the position taken on 4th May, and include the Indians of British Columbia and Manitoba, that idea being forced on my mind by the line of argument adopted by the members for British Columbia last night, and their statements that they desired to have Indians enfranchised.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I rise to a point of order. The hon member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) are repeatedly making the statement that the members for British Columbia have said so-and-so regarding the Indians. I beg to remind those hon. gentlemen that because one hon. member—and, as a rule, I have the greatest regard for what he says, and I pay him all legitimate deference to which he is entitled—still I do not allow him to speak for me, or for the whole of the members of British Columbia, whether as regards the enfran-

chisement of the Indians or any other subject. I also wish hon. members of the Opposition to understand that I am not to be coerced into speaking when I do not feel inclined, nor am I going to be retarded when I do feel inclined.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very sorry if I have done injury to the hon. member, as I did not mean to do so. I suppose I used the term "members for British Columbia," instead of saying "the junior member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare)." The senior member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) has not yet expressed himself publicly on this question.

Mr. BAKER. He may, ere long.

Mr. PATERSON. I was going to say that perhaps the First Minister may again change his mind. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I should judge from what they say, mean to exempt Manitoba from the operation of the Bill, in which case the section I read, prohibiting the Indian from selling his produce, or another person from buying it, would not be applicable, and therefore it may be left out of consideration. But every other provision I read as to the disabilities of the Indians applies to the most advanced bands of Indians in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, and to the most advanced Indians in those bands. There are intelligent men, who have made a great deal of progress, so far as opportunity had been given them, on some of the reserves. I will give you an instance in point. One of the Indians from my own reservation came to see me the other day, and he had some business with the Department of Indian Affairs. He belonged originally to another reserve, and he had gone from that reserve to the Six Nation reserve, had married a Six Nation woman, and had lived on the Six Nation reserve for some time. He is acting as interpreter there, and is, besides, a kind of lay missionary. His appearance, his dress and his mode of conversation were as creditable and as gentlemanly as that of many gentlemen in the House at the present time. He was one of the most advanced Indians it was possible to find. I went with him to the Department of Indian Affairs. His mission there was to receive compensation for improvements made on his homestead, on the reserve where he had lived before going to the Six Nation reserve. He told the officer that he came for that purpose, and he was asked on what pay-roll he was entered. "The Six Nation," he said. "Then you are not on the other," said the officer. "No," he said, "and though I am on the pay-roll of the Six Nation, I have no land there." "No, I suppose not," said the officer, "because you have no right, but your wife has." "Yes," he said, "but I have not and I cannot get any." "No," was the reply, "because when you married you should have been sent back to your own reserve with the woman you married." That, Sir, to an educated, intelligent Indian, who acts as a lay missionary and interpreter. The official only did what the law required, but this will show you how absolutely even these intelligent Indians are under the control of the Government—just as absolutely as the most ignorant. Now, allow me to call your attention to section 38, which will show, either that the hon. member for East Hastings was mistaken in what he said, or, if he was correct in stating that the Indians were leasing their own lands, and drawing their own money on their own account, they were acting in violation of the Indian Act. (The hon. gentleman here quoted section 38 of the Act in question). Now, Sir, how shall we advance the Indians. It has been stated several times that in 1880 the Superintendent General sent out enquiries to the different agents throughout the Provinces, but more particularly, I believe, in the Province of Ontario, to ascertain what advancement the Indian tribes had made, with a view of determining whether they might not adopt something in the form of municipal government for the management of their own affairs. In his report the Superintendent General regrets to say that in the great majority of cases the answers were not favorable; that the Indians, even in the Province of Ontario, had not advanced sufficiently to adopt anything like a simple form of municipal government for the management of their own affairs. The matter lay in abeyance, and last year the House passed what is called the Indian Advancement Act, an Act which is designed to enable the more advanced bands of Indians to adopt a simple kind of municipal government, or, in other words, to enable them to substitute councillors to be elected by themselves to manage their own affairs, instead of there being managed by chiefs, as they have been in times past. That Act provides: (The hon. gentleman read several clauses of the Act in question). Last year this House passed this Act, by which the more advanced bodies of Indians, with the consent of the Superintendent General, might try the experiment of managing their municipal affairs by the election of councillors, instead of living them to be managed by their chiefs; and we had no more confidence in the ability of even the most advanced Indians to do that than to provide that, if after trying it, they had found it not to work satisfactorily, the Government could at any time, by Order in Council, compel them to abandon it and return to their former system. And yet it is proposed to give the right to vote for members of this House to Indians of whose ability to elect councillors to manage their municipal affairs we had great doubt. That Act further provides that the local agent of the Superintendent General shall preside at the meetings of those councillors and control and regulate all matters of procedure and form. If the Superintendent General were in his place, I would like to ask him whether any of the Indian tribes have taken advantage of this Advancement Act. I do not know whether any of his colleagues or any hon. gentlemen opposite can give me the information; but I do not myself know of any band having availed itself of the permission there provided. The Indians in my own county, I claim, are as advanced as any other Indians in the Dominion of Canada, and they met the other day to consider whether they should adopt it, and they decided that for the present they would not do so; and yet we propose, in this Bill, to confer upon them the highest duty of citizenship—to vote as to who shall make the laws of the land. The proposition is so indefensible that I do not wonder that hon. gentlemen opposite are so disgusted at hearing the absolute control the Department possesses over these Indians in all their affairs pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. In that Advancement Act the Superintendent General retained pretty summary powers of dealing with the members of the council. If any member should be proved to be a habitual drunkard, to be guilty of taking a bribe, or of dishonesty or immorality, the Superintendent General could remove him from that position; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite will continue to argue that the Indians are entitled to the same rights and privileges as other citizens of this country while in their present position. The proposition is so ridiculous that we have not found hon. gentlemen opposite rise up and discuss it on its merits. Nor has their press discussed it, nor can it be maintained, because it is a proposition not designed to benefit the Indians, but it is a proposition, the effect of which it is hoped will be that strength will be added to the Government in some constituencies, by the aid of the votes given to those Indians, who are so much under the Government's own control. But it has been denied that this provision will give an advantage to the Government. It has been said that the Indians will divide in their political views as they do in religious matters. That is true; I have no doubt that the Indians, individually, have their different views and sentiments; Indians differ, as do white people; and it is probable that very many of these Indians will cast their votes for those whom the Government would not care to have them cast their votes for. But there is no disguising

what is revealed in the laughing, shining face of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White). He sees safety for himself at the next general election in this Indian voting proposition of this Act. There can be no doubt about that. There has not been a happier man in the House since the Bill was before us, and I venture to say there is no way in which that gentleman's face could be lengthened more effectually than if the First Minister were to rise and say that he had arrived at the conclusion that while the Indian was not enfranchised this provision was premature, and that he would propose it should not come into operation for five or ten years. There is no proposition that would have the effect of elongating the hon. gentleman's countenance so much as that. The hon. gentleman boasted that, in an election gone bye, he carried his county against a nominee of the First Minister and against an hon. gentleman on this side; that he ran independently, as he has boasted time and again, and defeated both the Government and the Opposition; but I will tell him that if he thought now he would have the influence of the Government and the Superintendent General against him at the next election, his interest in giving a vote to the Indian would soon die out. I may have misinterpreted the hon. gentleman, but that is my opinion. There is a slightly concealed pleasure exhibited on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite; there has been a good deal of quiet chuckling among them at the probability that perhaps the hon. gentleman who is now addressing you, and two or three others who have not, unfortunately, commended themselves to the good feeling of hon. gentlemen opposite, may, by the operation of these votes that are under the control of the Government, be deprived of a seat in this House. Well, they are welcome to all the satisfaction that thought will give them. It is not a high or a noble sentiment, and they are welcome to all the satisfaction they can take out of it; but I say if it is in the interest of the Indians and the community that they should be given the right to vote, while they remain in a state of tutelage and wardship, it matters not what member of the House may lose his seat or retain his seat. That is but a minor matter. The great principle of the welfare of the nation, and the welfare of those who constitute the nation, must be the paramount interest and the paramount idea in all legislation that is enacted here; but having proved, as I think I have, that this proposition is not in the interest of the Indian, that it does nothing for the Indian, that it can do nothing for the Indian, the conviction is forced upon the mind, not only of hon. members on this side, but of hon. members opposite, that there is a design in giving the vote to the unemancipated, unenfranchised Indians, and that design is that certain members opposite may have their positions strengthened thereby, while the position of certain members on this side may be weakened thereby. The position of a member of Parliament is an honorable position, if it be won in an honorable manner. For my part, I do not wish to occupy a seat in this House if I cannot obtain that seat in an honorable, manly, straightforward manner. I would scorn to accept a seat in Parliament that would not be mine by the free opinion of the free electors of the county that I represent, even if I could get it by legislative enactment, either directly or indirectly, passed in this House, to secure it. There is sometimes too high a price paid for what men esteem an honor, and if a man is willing to sacrifice principles of manliness, of justice, of fair play, of what is right between man and man, in order to weaken or destroy a political opponent or to secure himself in his own position, let him have the honor, if he can enjoy it. He has paid for it a price that every honorable man should revolt against being compelled to pay. No, Sir; we will discuss this question apart from all effect it may have on ourselves. I suppose, if the people of the country think it necessary that certain members in this House shall have positions, even giving the vote to unemancipated Indians will not shut them out; but if it did, other men will be here; the Government of a free country will go on; there are as good men out of the House as in it; and therefore we can discuss this matter regardless of how it will affect individual members, but we cannot speak of it irrespective of the influence it will exercise on the country, and the influence it exercises upon those who, charged with deliberating upon public questions, shall, for the purpose of weakening an opponent or strengthening themselves, vote to do that which they would hesitate to defend in their place in the House, and which they have not defended in their press, but which they must defend and must answer for on the 211 hustings before which they will have to appear when the next general election comes round. Some hon. gentlemen have pointed out that the Indians may not be compelled to vote as the Government may direct, because some of them can read and write, and mark their ballot, and that therefore this proposition is right. I will read you a statement that the First Minister made, and it struck me as a statement not very complimentary to the workingmen and mechanics of this country. He said, on page 1630 of the *Hansard*:

"By the right of the ballot, the Indian is as fully protected and as fully independent as the workingmen of the factory. He is as independent in every way, and the Indian can not only make his mark, but he can write his name, in the older Provinces."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, the hon. member for Cardwell endorses that. Let me put him on record for endorsing it. The statement is there made by the First Minister and endorsed by the hon. member for Cardwell, that the unenfranchised and unemancipated Indian, the sole control and sole management of whose affairs is vested in the Superintendent General, who cannot make a will that will last after his death, if the Superintendent General does not desire he should do so, who cannot enter into contracts, who cannot be sued for debt, who cannot be called upon to serve as a juror, who cannot be ordered out for military service by the Government of the day, is as independent a man, is in every way as good a man, while in that position——

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. PATERSON—while in that position of bondage or tutelage, as the workingman in the factory.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman has put the case in a way not warranted by the quotation he made, and he has done so for the purpose of putting me on record. What the First Minister stated, and what I entirely endorse, is, that while in the act of voting with the ballot—and the whole point of the First Minister's statement is in those words "with the ballot"—the Indian is as independent as any man, whether a workingman in a factory or not.

Mr. PATERSON. It needs no limitation or provision at all. If the Indian is not as independent as the workingman in the factory he is not as well fitted to vote.

Mr. WHITE. That is not the point.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has given away the case. He admits that the workingman of the factory is a man who is freer in some respects than the Indian. He claims that the Indian, having the ballot, may vote independently, because the Government need not know about it, but if the Government did know he would not be independent. In what position does the case stand? Does the hon. gentleman propose in amendment that only the Indian who can read and write can have a vote? No. The Bill proposes to give a vote to the Indian who can neither read nor write, who cannot sign his name or tell what man he is voting for, unless the ballots be of different colors; and we are told this is right, because, under the

ballot, those who can read may vote independently. I deny that; I deny that the man who cannot make a bargain, who is not called upon to serve on the jury, who cannot manage his own affairs, who is completely under the control of the Government, can vote as independently under the ballot as the workingman. I say he cannot, and the Indian himself knows it, and will acknowledge it—the Indian who has to get the permission of the Superintendent General before he can engage in any of those things. I do not wish to detain the committee further, but, before this Act is passed members opposite must make up their minds that this Indian question will be discussed to such an extent that the country outside will thoroughly know it. They know it now. Petitions, with hundreds and thousands of signatures, have already come into the House, stating that they do not approve of this measure, that they do not believe it is in the interests of the country or of the Indians to give them a vote, still leaving them in a state of tutelage. The only argument which has been attempted in favor of giving the Indian a vote was that which the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) alleged to-night, that he contributes to the revenue and pays taxes.

Mr. DAWSON. One of the reasons.

Mr. PATERSON. I will venture to say that our sons over eighteen years of age contribute as much to the revenue in the way of Customs and Excise duties as the average Indian does. They are permitted to enter upon the path of life for themselves; we allow them to make their own arrangements; they secure employment or enter into a profession, and their parents, in the vast majority of cases, allow them to make their own bargains, to draw their salaries and to spend them, and in buying their clothes and their food, and other articles which they use, they are paying the taxes. Just before the amendment was moved by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), you declared carried by this committee a provision that a person to vote must be twenty-one years of age, no matter whether he paid takes or not. If the unemancipated Indian, under the absolute control of the Government, is to have a vote, why shall not the sons of Canada, between eighteen and twenty one years of age have it? They are serving in your volunteer ranks in the North-West now, they are shedding their blood——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. PATERSON. Gentlemen may jeer at the volunteers, but I say they are doing a grand work. The gentlemen who are sneering at them may be commended for it by those who approve of those sentiments, but I say they are there, not one or two, but by the score, defending their country and maintaining its rights, and yet you have declared that, though they are over eighteen and in the ranks, they shall not vote, and you propose now to vote down an amendment which says that an unenfranchised, unemanciped Indian, who is under the control of the Government far more than these young men are under the control of their fathers, shall not vote. The country will have something to say on it. The duty of the Government would have been to take the voice of the country upon this, because they are doing that which they cannot be sure they have the approval of the country for.

Mr. HICKEY. That involves expense.

Mr. PATERSON. It does not necessarily involve a great deal of expense. A general election costs $120,000, and if this Bill passes and the estimate of $500,000 a year for working it is correct, you could have four general elections and save on the amount in one year. The First Minister says the computation has been extravagant, but we do not know what the cost will be. He says he intends to have a simple machinery; but giving him credit for a desire to simplify the machinery, if he gives the work to the judges and they do it in ten days, as the hon. member for West Toronto said, the expense will be lessened, but how on earth are you to have a complete list? You cannot have it done cheaply and correctly and justly and honestly; and above all things we must have it honest. I am sorry the First Minster was not present to hear the powerful reasons I have given and the line of argument I have adopted, because it may be necessary, before the discussion is over, unless he says he is prepared to accept the amendments we are moving in the interests of the country, for me to take advantage of his occasional presence to enforce some of the points which have a material bearing upon the question and which ought to be fully considered. I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman's going out of the House to-night, seeing that he was here very steadily during the afternoon. This is an important question, upon which I can speak without personal feeling. I have my opinions as to what is meant and designed, and I have heard from individuals who seemed rather pleased about it that would naturally stir up some resentment, but we get accustomed to that. Individual interests do not matter, but there are principles concerned; there is the difference between right and wrong, and there is a responsibility upon the Government and upon every member of the committee on this question. The effect will not be good upon the Indian and cannot be good upon the country. If the First Minister has a desire to benefit the Indian no one knows better how it is to be done. It cannot be done through any Franchise Bill, but only through amendments to the Indian Act. Let him introduce those amendments, which will enable the Indian to reach a higher standard, and he will receive the hearty support of members on this side of the House. Our position cannot, unless purposely, be misunderstood by hon. gentlemen on that side; they must not repeat and their press may not repeat, after what has been said, that we are opposed to the enfranchisement of the Indians, for our amendment proposes to give the vote to all enfranchised Indians. We are opposed to the unenfranchised Indian being given a vote while the Government fasten upon him, and keep fastened upon him, the shackles, the tutelage and the wardship in which they have held him, and held him in a degree that I consider has not been in the interest of the Indian nor in the interests of the country. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) gave a description of the Indians voting in Muskoka which the First Minister was not present to hear. He said the agent bought them up bodily, I understood him to say, the whole drove.

Mr. SPROULE. I said it was currently rumored that he bought them up, and I believed it was so.

Mr. PATERSON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has corrected me. He knows what he said. But it was reported, and he believed, that the agents of the Ontario Government had bought up all the Indians in the district.

Mr. SPROULE. Not all. I did not make use of any such expression.

Mr. PATERSON. The expression was that they had bought them up in vast numbers and got them all together, I think he said, in one place, and run them down on the railway, as I understood, and voted them.

Mr. SPROULE. I said nothing at all about the railway.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, run them to the polling booth, and there they voted. I want the First Minister to notice what his own supporter said of the Ontario Government having bought them up, the whole band, and their having voted for the Ontario Government candidate. They took them back, and took the male attire of the Indians who had just voted and put it upon females, and marched them down and voted them also. Is that correct?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. PATERSON. These are Indians who have been exercising the franchise, and apparently under the Ontario Act. These Indians are not under the control of the Dominion Government. Then he goes on to explain that the Dominion Government began to have its power felt a little, and when they began to make their power felt, the Ontario Government's power began to weaken, and when the Ontario Government felt their power weakening, owing to the exercise of power by the Dominion Government here, then the Ontario Government passed an Act disfranchising them.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is making an entirely misleading statement. I said, when they began to find that the Indians were deserting them—I did not say by what power—then Mr. Mowat introduced a measure that would disfranchise them.

Mr. PATERSON. If the Indians were secured by purchasing they could be secured that way again, I suppose. Therefore, if they deserted, there must have been some cause for it. There is the picture drawn by the hon. gentleman's own supporter, his strong defender, the mouthpiece of the Government in this debate, the gentleman who has taken a more active part in it than any Minister of the Crown, and he must therefore be recognised as the exponent of the views of the Government. There is his description of the Indian vote, and how it can be handled. And, Sir, if it be a true picture, will he, in face of that, support a proposition to give to the unenfranchised, unemancipated Indians, wholly under the control of the Dominion Government, the power to cast their votes and be operated upon by the Government in this manner?

Mr. SPROULE. Are the Indians the only parties that can be bought up?

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman wishes to intimate that other parties have been bought in the same way, I leave it to him to make the statement. If such is the case with the enfranchised Indians, what will it be with the unemancipated, unenfranchised Indians? Sir, we need not any further discuss this question as to the advisability of giving a vote to Indians who are unemancipated and under the control of the Government, who would not be, notwithstanding the utterance of the First Minister—certainly, not all of them—at liberty to cast their vote as they wished. My position is: Elevate the Indian, give him every opportunity, force it not upon him, but you can only give it to him through the machinery of the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act, aided and assisted by the Government; but this Bill proposes no relief for the Indian at all, leaves him just where he was, giving the vote to the unenfranchised Indian, who will remain unemancipated and under the control of the Government after he has had the vote given to him; and the sense of hon. gentlemen opposite will tell them whether it is likely that persons in that position can give that free, independent vote, that ought ever to be cast in a free country, for the election of representatives to a free Parliament, to support free institutions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I wish to call attention to the unfairness of the line of argument pursued by the hon. gentleman during a portion of the four speeches which he has just addressed to us—because we have had four perorations from him, at any rate. The hon. gentleman has read the Indian Act with a view of showing what was the condition of the Indians in the North-West Territory, Manitoba and Keewatin, but when I ventured to suggest to him that we already had the announcement from the First Minister that those Indians were not to be included in this Bill, he intimated there was no positive evidence that such was the case. It seems rather strange that the hon. gentleman, with the speech of the First Minister before him—because the quotation which he afterwards made, with reference to the independence of the Indians with the ballot, shows that the speech was before him—I think it was rather unfair of him to fall into that line of argument. I find that on the 4th of May, during the general debate upon the subject of the word "Indian," and before any vote had been taken upon it, the First Minister used these words:

"When the word 'Indian' was put into the Act by myself, I must say that I had reference, in my own mind, to the Indians of the old Provinces, where they are educated and have been under a civilising process for years and years, where they have schools, where they can read and write—the greater portion of them. I take it that the Indians in the Province of Ontario, as a rule, can read as well as the white men. The majority of them were so far advanced in civilisation that the hon. member for Brant himself, in his speech in 1880, wanted to have them enfranchised immediately."

And in another portion of the same speech, the First Minister said:

"I said, however, that when putting in the word 'Indian,' I had reference altogether to the Indians whom I believed had shown themselves qualified to act as electors and be elected; and when we come to the proper portion of the Bill, as the hon. gentleman called it, I had intended and do intend to move an amendment by which it shall be applied only to the older Provinces."

Again, at the conclusion of the speech, the First Minister said:

"In the newer Provinces, in the North-West and in Manitoba, perhaps in British Columbia, they are not yet ready for the franchise; and it is my intention, when we come to the right place, to move an amendment in that direction. But as regards the Indian, the educated Indian of the old Provinces, our brethren living in the same Province with us, under the same laws, and carrying out the same laws as efficiently as we do—they do not fill our prisons in as large a proportion to their number as the whites do. In fact, we seldom hear, comparatively speaking, of Indian crime. You find them steady, respectable, law-abiding and God-fearing people, and I do not see why they should not have the vote."

It does seem to me, with that speech, from which I have quoted passages, lying open before the hon. gentleman when he addressed you, Mr. Chairman, and this committee, it was not fair, to say the least of it, to argue as if it were intended that votes would be given to the Indians of the North-West, Manitoba and Keewatin.

Mr. PATERSON. Did I do that?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, you did.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman does not wish to do me an injustice.

Mr. WHITE. Certainly not.

Mr. PATERSON. When the Minister of Customs called my attention to the point, did I not expressly say so? But I went on to argue that it was a change of mind on the part of the First Minister, and that I did not know but that the members for British Columbia might change his mind back again.

Mr. WHITE. Exactly; and it was hardly fair to the First Minister, who, I think, is entitled, when he makes a statement to this committee, to be assumed to have made that statement truthfully, when he had said: "When we come to the proper portion of the Bill, as the hon. gentleman called it, I had intended and do intend to move an amendment, by which it shall be applied only to the older Provinces;" showing distinctly there was no question of change of mind. But if there had been a change of mind, the change of mind, at all events, had occurred. Even if there has been a change of mind, assuming it had been so, is it right to continue, in the presence of that announcement, to debate the question as if that announcement had never been made. One would imagine from the way hon. gentlemen have dealt with the measure all through, and with this clause particularly, it was an unheard-of thing that when a Bill has been introduced by the Government, passed through the second reading and referred to the committee, that

amendments should be made in it. What do we refer it to the committee for, but for a frank and free consideration and interchange of opinion in regard to the clauses of it. And that a Government should be charged with having changed its mind or been coerced into making changes, because changes have taken place in some of the clauses of a Bill of this importance and size, seems to be an unprecedented line of argument. But, as I was saying, it is rather remarkable how hon. gentlemen can find very different classes of arguments under different conditions. We find, in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think I may fairly say the *Globe* is the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps not of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), but certainly of most of the hon. gentlemen opposite, certainly of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who, I believe, has some little interest in it, as a director of the company —I find there a remarkable statement, made only last week, with respect to the condition of the Indians of the North-West, those very Indians who are denounced here. The *Globe* says :

"Those who know any thing at all of Indian character know that Indians are, as a rule, extremely sensitive. They do not like to be scolded or ridiculed. The average pagan Indian, though he can neither read nor write, has more refinement of feeling, more intelligence, and is governed by an incomparably higher moral standard, than is the average North-West official appointed by Mr. Dewdney."

I do not suppose hon. gentlemen opposite propose, for a single moment, to disfranchise the officials appointed by Mr. Dewdney. As a matter of fact, I am inclined to think that very few of the Indian agents of the North-West have been appointed by Mr. Dewdney. If I mistake not, the Indian agents in the North-West were, to a large extent, at all events, appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the same Indian agents are there to-day.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. WHITE. Does the hon. gentleman say none of them?

Mr. MILLS. I did not say, none of them.

Mr. WHITE. Most of them?

Mr. MILLS. Most of them are not.

Mr. WHITE. I am inclined to think that if there were an analysis made it would be found that most of those agents were appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and not one has been appointed by Mr. Dewdney. Even if they had been, hon. gentlemen opposite do not propose to disfranchise those agents—to provide that all persons who may be agents, even though appointed by Mr. Dewdney are to be disqualified. But beyond that: The hon. member speaks of the Indians of the older Provinces as if they were mere serfs and slaves of the Government, willing to do anything the Government asks them to do. Take an illustration. Chief Jacques, of Caughnawaga, is a tribal Indian and belongs to the tribe to-day; he receives his share of the annuities, money which belongs to him just as much as the interest of Dominion bonds belong to the bondholders.

Mr. MILLS. If he is so thoroughly competent to manage his own affairs, why is not his money put under his own control and at his own disposal?

Mr. WHITE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to finish my argument? That chief is said to be worth from $60,000 to $80,000; he is doing a large business for a place like Caughnawaga. He can transact business just as freely as any hon. member in this House, or outside of it. But because he chooses to retain his tribal relations, to be called one of his own people, because he prefers to remain with those among whom he has always lived, and among whom his ancestors lived, and upon whom he may exercise—and in that respect it may be a great advantage to the country—important influence, by his greater intelligence, he is to be treated, forsooth, as if he were a serf, a slave, a person incapable of and not permitted to manage his own affairs. As I understand it, and I may frankly say I have not given the Indian Act that careful study and attention which some hon. gentlemen opposite have given to it, and if I had closely followed the debate of three days, during which the Indian Act was read over about a dozen times by each speaker, I might have known more about it; but, as a matter of fact, let me point out this, that the only thing an Indian cannot trade with is in relation to the land of the reservation. He cannot dispose of that. If he holds property outside, he can carry on business as much as any one can, and it is only as regards property in the reservation which he cannot deal with, that property being practically held in common. Although it may be sub-divided, still he holds in common, as practically a trust, the property in connection with his tribe, but he carries on his business outside of it, just as much as anybody else. In the older Provinces he can farm and he can sell his grain. I am sure my hon. friend from Brant knows that in his own particular constituency there are well-to-do farmers among the Indians, who raise and sell their own grain, transact business like anybody else, but who, nevertheless, retain their connection with the tribe. Is it to the advantage of the tribe or of the country that the influence of those more intelligent Indians should be retained in connection with it? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that they would not object to giving votes to the Indians, if they only become enfranchised, in the sense in which they use that word. Well, Sir, nobody thanks them for that, for if the Indian withdraw from their tribe and cease to be Indians under the law, they require no consideration from hon. gentlemen to give them the franchise. The franchise comes to them as to every one who is a British subject, and when hon. gentlemen say that they are willing that they should have the privilege of voting under those circumstances, they simply say that they would give the Indian that which would belong to him by right, if he has the ordinary qualifications under the law. It seems to me that our true plan, in connection with this discussion, is to wait until we get to the clause which deals with the qualification of Indians, and if those qualifications are not such as to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not think they are a sufficient guarantee that the Indians exercising the franchise have such an interest in the property on which they become qualified as fairly to entitle them to vote, then we will have an opportunity of discussing that point. But, after the the statement of the First Minister, which I have quoted, to go on discussing the question, as if the intention was to give the Indian, as an Indian—the Indians of the North-West, Manitoba, and Keewatin—the franchise, is simply to do with this Bill what I venture to say hon. gentlemen opposite have done with no other Bill that has been introduced to Parliament. Let us discuss the several clauses on their merits, and in that case I think we will come to a much more reasonable conclusion, and a conclusion which those who have been watching the proceedings of Parliament, and the independent press—which hon. gentlemen have been disposed to regard so much in the past, in connection with this matter—will consider as comporting more with the dignity of Parliament and the duties of an Opposition in Parliament than the course they are now pursuing.

Mr. MILLS. We deal with the Bill as we have it, and as the First Minister construed it.

Mr. SCRIVER. I think the hon. gentleman was hardly candid in the way in which he put some of the views which he expressed with regard to this matter. He speaks of the possibility of some of the Indians becoming enfranchised, and he refers to some particular Indians, and to one in particular, a member of the tribe of Caughnawaga, as being in every way worthy of being enfranchised. Nobody

knows better than the hon. gentleman that the difficulties which have existed, and which still exist, unless this Bill becomes law, in the way of the Indians becoming enfranchised, were placed there by the leader of the Government himself. I remember very well the discussion which took place on the measures which were introduced by the Government, one last year and one several years ago, in which certain provisions were made for enfranchising the Indians; and the hon. gentleman knows very well how great the difficulties were which were placed in the way of enfranchising the Indians. I remember very well some of the appeals which were made by the gentleman alongside of me (Mr. Paterson) to the leader of the Government, in favor of relaxing somewhat the stringency of those measures, and I remember, also, some of the remarks which were made by the hon. gentleman in reply to those appeals. I remember he spoke then, as he does not speak now, of the intelligence of the Indians, even of the older Provinces. He thought it only prudent and proper that we should be very careful in relaxing the difficulties which lay in the way of enfranchising the Indians. The hon. member for Cardwell chose to single out a certain individual.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There are many of them.

Mr. SCRIVER. The man to whom he refers is not the only one in that tribe who is perhaps worthy of enjoying the franchise. But no one knows better than he does, nor than I do, that the great majority of the Indians of that tribe are not worthy to enjoy the franchise. And what may be said of the tribe of Caughnawaga can be said with equal truth of a tribe of which I know more, a tribe in the county I represent. I have seen more or less of those Indians for many years past, and I have necessarily been brought into contact with them. I think I know their qualifications for exercising the franchise as well as any man could possibly know them. They have, no doubt, their good qualities, as the leader of the Government has said with reference to the Indians of the older Provinces generally. They are in some respects quiet and law-abiding citizens; but if I am any judge whatever, they are not such a class of people as I would think it safe, or proper, or prudent, or right, to confer such a trust upon as, if I understand the remark of the leader of the Government rightly, it is proposed to confer upon these men. They number, men, women and children, some ten or eleven hundred. I suppose if this Bill becomes law, and unless some changes which we do not know anything about now are introduced in the Bill, there will be between two and three hundred of them who will be voters in that constitueney. Well, that is a pretty large number to add to a constituency in which there are 1,600 or 1,800 voters, and whatever may be said of the intelligence of those Indians, I appeal to the common sense of any member of this House if it is not reasonable to suppose that these men will vote as the Government wishes them to vote. We all know what the general feeling of those people is with regard to the Government, that the Government represents, to them, the Queen, and the Queen is the Great Mother. Anybody having their confidence and going to them and saying: Now is the time to vote for your Great Mother, they would go with, and go almost as one man. I have no kind of doubt with regard to that matter. For these and many other reasons I feel that this measure, at all events in the form in which it is presented now, is an exceedingly objectionable one, and for my part I am especially opposed to this clause with regard to the Indians.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before this amendment carries, I desire——

An hon. MEMBER. Too late.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, if it is too late, adjourn—I have no objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; go on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is time to adjourn; it is after one o'clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not care if it is after five.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot understand how it is proposed to give the Indians a vote when, the other day, it was denied to many classes of white people in this community. The hon. member for Northumberland proposed that every person in Canada who paid taxes—which virtually means manhood suffrage—should have a vote, and that proposition was voted down. Because a white man chances to be poor, because he lives by his own resources, because it is not his right to live on a reserve, is that any just reason why the Government should deny him a vote, if he is not assessed for $150 worth of property as an owner, or is not an occupant or a tenant? The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) thinks this is not the proper time to discuss this matter; he says we ought to wait till we get further into the details of the Bill; he tells us that the Indians are a very sensitive class; yet he supported the Government when they brought on the discussion of the woman franchise on the interpretation clause. As the clause relates to "A British subject by birth or naturalisation," I think this clause brings before us every person proposed to be enfranchised, and I think this is the proper time to discuss this question. There is no reason why the Indians, if they are enfranchised, if they possess civil rights, if they are free men in every sense of the term, should not vote; but to propose to enfranchise the wild Indians, who live in tribes, who have no civil rights, who are wards of the Government, depending on it in every conceivable way, and to object to enfranchise the white settlers of this country who have not a property qualification of $150, is something I cannot understand. Is it because it has been found, in the district of Algoma, that the Indians were susceptible to the influences of liquor and could be bought? I admire the spirit of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, who, when he discovered that fact, struck them off the list. If you give the Indians the franchise, you give them power to change the law, to bring an influence over Parliament which would be dangerous; you set liquor before them free; they might exercise such power over their representatives, or might become representatives themselves, as to have this barrier removed. You would then have the spectacle of men taking Indians to the polls to vote, and taking the clothes off the Indians and putting them on the squaws, and bringing them up to vote as was stated by the hon. member for East Grey. I appreciate very highly the legislation of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, in depriving that class of people of the right to vote and giving it only to persons who are enfranchised and are citizens in every sense of the term. Now, I believe that measures which are introduced without a due regard to all interests in the country are bad. Measures introduced for the purpose of securing party objects should be beneath the contempt of all parties in the country. It was very different with the measure promoted by Mr. Gladstone; he had commissioners appointed, of all shades of politics, to consider and perfect his measure. Now, we shall find in the Indian Act very many things which go to show why this Act is proposed. (The hon. gentleman quoted a number of the sections of the Indian Act). Now, suppose the Superintendent General were to present himself for election in a constituency where there is a large tribe of Indians, and he reads this clause to the Indians, and tells them they will be dispossessed of their lands, and that all their rights will be taken away unless they support him, will they not feel compelled to yield to his bidding. No Government should put it in the power of their supporters to use coercion of this kind. In section 18 you will find that the Superintendent General has the power to issue

documents granting locations to the Indians. Is it right that the Government should, by giving votes to these Indians, enable the Superintendent General to use this large measure of authority for a partisan purpose? Such legislation is not creditable to any Government or to any party. Again, in clause 23, no Indian can settle, nor reside or hunt upon certain lots, unless he has the license of the Superintendent General. Here, again, we have certain privileges which, in the event of an election contest, the Government, through its agent, can withhold or grant to the Indians, according as the latter are prepared to obey the behests of the Administration. The Government will be enabled to use this influence in elections by the provision of this Bill, which gives the Indians the right to vote, which gives that right to a class of people who have no other of the rights and duties of citizens. The hon. member for Algoma, in supporting this provision, spoke of the courage of the half-breeds and the Indians of the North-West shooting down our volunteers. Is that a good and sufficient reason for giving them a vote?

Mr. DAWSON. I cannot allow myself to be misrepresented in what I said in this House. I called attention to the fact that General Middleton had acknowledged, while giving every credit to the volunteers, the courage of the foe they had conquered.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand quite well what the hon. gentleman said. He spoke of the courage of the half-breeds. Does he deny that?

Mr. DAWSON. I spoke of the courage of the volunteers also. I shall not be misrepresented in this House by any hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, and will let him reconcile that with *Hansard*. But if the courage of those who fought with the volunteers was shown, how could it be shown otherwise than by shooting them, by resisting them, by resisting law and order. I will just leave that question now. In sub-section 2, of section 27, the Indian Act provides that nothing in the Act shall be construed to prevent the Superintendent General from issuing a license to any person to cut and remove trees, timber, and so forth.

Mr. BOWELL. What section of the Dominion does that apply to?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Sub-section 2, of clause 27?

Mr. BOWELL. It applies to the North-West and Manitoba?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. What has that to do with this, when you know the Indians there are not to be enfranchised.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Where does the Bill say so?

An hon. MEMBER. State the facts.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am stating the facts. The First Minister said it applied to the North-West and to the Indians in the North-West, that it applied to Poundmaker, Pie-a-pot, and Strike-him-on-the-back. He has not changed his Bill, so far as I am aware, though, of course, it will not apply to them until representation is given the Territories; but as soon as it is, it will apply.

Mr. BOWELL. It does not, unless they have the qualifications of white men.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you can show me any clause where it is stated they are to have all the qualifications of white men, I will sit down and be content. Where are the other responsibilities given them that whites have? Where is the right to make those tribal Indians pay their debts?

Mr. BOWELL There is nothing in this Bill to make a white man pay his debts. I wish there was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is a Bill to compel a white man to pay his debts. I know that; a white man can be sued; I have been sued myself; everybody knows that.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not know it before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You do not propose to put them on the same footing as white men? The Indian Act is not understood. I do not think the Minister of Customs understands it.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sure I will not go to you for information.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you would study the statute, perhaps you would get the information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, if an hon. gentleman breaks in on my remarks with his interruptions, I have a right to reply to him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is out of order to address an hon. gentleman across the floor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I say that, if an hon. gentleman chooses, he can get his information from the statute. Is that out of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No; but that is not what you said.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Clause 76 of the Bill says the Indians shall be exempt from taxation, and yet they are to be given the franchise for the purpose of increasing the taxes of the people of this country. These Indians are not allowed to buy and sell in the same way as white people, and yet they are to have the vote. There would be a certain amount of fairness in it if they proposed to compel them to pay taxes it they exercised the franchise. The Indian vote would be a very dangerous vote. We have had a sample of it in Algoma, and have discovered that they can be bribed and are susceptible to the influences of liquor. The report of the First Minister indicates on every page that they are not qualified to vote. This is not the way to elevate the Indian. The rule should be, in this Parliament, justice to all and favors to none. Give the Indian justice by giving him a vote on the same terms you give it to the white man, and we will not object to it; but you refuse to give manhood suffrage to the white people and then give it to the Indians. The Act shows that the Indians have ceded their lands by treaty for certain considerations, and you are going to give them the franchise and reject the poor unfortunate whites, who, from poverty, are unable to qualify. If the Indians squander their property will they not squander their votes? This Bill will take away a great safeguard from the Indians themselves, because they will obtain concessions which will be to their disadvantage and against their future welfare. I protest against this measure, because I consider it unjust and unfair, and because I think it would be a dangerous thing to give a vote to the Indians until they conform to the terms proposed in the amendment. I was very much impressed with what the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) stated just now. He has been brought into contact with the Indians, he knows their habits and modes of life, and he states, from personal knowledge, that it would be a dangerous thing to confer upon them the franchise before they had sufficient intelligence to appreciate it. I think this House should pause before adopting so dangerous a principle as is proposed in this measure.

Mr. EDGAR. I think, on an occasion of this kind, when the First Minister has shown some disposition to make reasonable concessions, this clause, in particular, is one on

which the Government might make a concession which, I am sure, would meet with the general approval of the country. The country has gone on for a great many years without this Indian vote, and I do not see why we cannot continue to do without it. I hope that the First Minister, before the Bill is passed, will abandon his Indian clause, and thereby meet the views of a large body of electors, who have already expressed their opinion by the numerous petitions that have been presented here, and by a large number of public meetings; and, I will also venture to say, by the private views of Conservative electors, which have been communicated to hon. members on the other side of this House, because I am perfectly certain, from information I have received, that a large number of electors, supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, have communicated to them their dissatisfaction with this extraordinary and novel feature of the Bill. I therefore hope that the hon. Minister will see his way possible to meet the views of this side of the House; otherwise, we will have to record our dissent of the measure now, and as long as an opportunity is offered to us, at future stages of this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is good enough to say that he sees in me a disposition to meet the wishes of the House, so far as I can. I think I have shown that, but I do not exactly think that I have been met in a similar spirit by hon. gentlemen opposite. That I must leave to them. But I really do think, that for the sake of the country, for the sake of the credit of this House, and on account of expense, there can be no necessity in the world for going over the same thing again and again. There has not been a single argument used to-day that has not been repeated *ad nauseum* already on the discussion about the word "Indian," and therefore it seems to be a criminal waste of time. Hon. gentlemen had plenty of time for discussing this matter on concurrence and on the third reading. Hon. gentlemen must remember that I stated I was going to move in this matter, as I thought at the right time, when we came to the qualification, to say who should not vote, and I would have moved at that time an amendment, adding a paragraph declaring that Indians ought not to vote. I threw that out early, stating that such was my intention; but my suggestion was not accepted. I still, however, will not be prevented from doing as I said I would do. When we come to the right place I shall move with respect to what Indians should not have the vote, and if hon. gentlemen opposite think that is not as much restricted as it should be, they will have time to move that still further classes of Indians should not be permitted to have the electoral franchise. That is what I propose to do, but my proposal was not accepted, and I have rather a right to complain on that ground. However, all I can say is, that we have listened with a good deal of attention—some of us, for we cannot all stay here forever, but by dividing up we endeavor to gather all the ideas—to what has been said by hon. gentlemen. In the meantime, I hope we will take a division, and when we come to the other clause we can discuss it again fully.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the First Minister was hardly fair in one remark he made to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. So far as I am concerned, I went on with the discussion at the request of the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At my request?

Mr. PATERSON. I understood the First Minister to say, let the discussion go on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly understand so, and I proceeded. I asked the First Minister if he was prepared to state what change he would propose. He alluded to British Columbia, and I understood him to say: No, let the discussion go on. And I went on with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The debate had gone on for some time. The hon. members for Bothwell and West Toronto had spoken, and the resolution was not withdrawn and the debate went on. There was no object in stopping the hon. members when other hon. members had spoken at length, and the discussion went on.

Mr. PATERSON. It was before we first got into discussion. I spoke briefly before I entered upon my speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I asked the hon. gentleman to withdraw the motion.

Mr. BOWELL. The First Minister is correct, and the hon. member for Brant is correct, to a certain extent. That hon. member evidently intended to stop the discussion, but the hon. members for Bothwell and Queen's at once said to the hon. gentleman: No, no; we will have it now; and they repeated the phrase three of four times. Then the hon. gentleman still continued to desire to act on the suggestion of the First Minister, but the hon. member for Bothwell made a long speech, and the right hon. gentleman said: If you must discuss it, go on. I think the hon. member for Brant acted in good faith, and intended not to go on with the discussion to-night, but it was forced on him by the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. PATERSON. As it comes to my mind now, I asked, after the hon. member for West Ontario had concluded, if the First Minister did not feel at liberty to make the statement now he should consent to the amendment being moved at a future time. Then I understood the First Minister to say they would take the discussion now.

Amendment (Mr. Edgar), p. 2003, negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps the next clause will be allowed to pass, which fixes the qualification for real property in cities at $150.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not desire to detain the committee unnecessarily, but I know an hon. member desires to move an amendment to that clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will say, in regard to clause 4, that I have changed it, because I ascertained that as drawn it did not quite meet the case, because a man may be employed as a farm laborer and not pay any rent. I have inserted in the clause: An annual rental of $20, or that value in kind or in money's worth.

Mr. MULOCK. With respect to the qualification in rural districts, I shall move to reduce the amount from $150 to $100. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will consider the matter between now and the next sitting of the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid not.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.10 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 21st May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

On the order, reading and receiving petitions,

Mr. WOODWORTH. Before these petitions are received, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that

these petitions have been presented here by hon. members without apparently their having read them or without their understanding that these signatures in most cases are the signatures of one man or two men in most of the petitions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is false. It is not so.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The rule is most clear; and hon. members who have presented them—some of them leading members of Parliament and old parliamentarians—cannot help having recognised it. The rule is laid down in May, page 610:

"The signatures must be written upon the petition itself, and not pasted upon, or otherwise transferred to it. It must have original signatures or marks, not copies from the original."

Again, on page 611:

"Any forgery or fraud in the preparation of petitions, or in the signatures attached, or the being privy to, or cognisant of, such forgery or fraud, will be punished as a breach of privilege. By a resolution of the House of Commons, 2nd June, 1774, it was declared, 'that it is highly unwarrantable, and a breach of the privilege of this House, for any person to set the name of any other person to be presented to this House.'"

Again, on page 616:

"In both Houses it is the duty of members to read petitions which are sent to them, before they are presented, lest any violation of the rules of the House should be apparent on the face of them; in which case it is their duty not to offer them to the House."

We have had bundles after bundles of these petitions presented. The right of petitioning is a sacred right, Her Majesty's subjects have a right to come here in a certain form and a certain way. All of these petitions have been headed in the same way. The same words are used, written by the same persons, concocted by the same friends, executed by the same hands; and apparently, when they came to be signed, in numbers of cases the signatures were written by two or three individuals in each municipality.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I say yes. Let a committee be formed, and you will see whether I am right or whether the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Cameron), who takes up so little of the time of the House, is right. Here is a petition from the municipality of Bentinck, presented by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). There are the signatures of William Hunter, Archy Hunter and John Hunter, in the same handwriting. That is plain on the face of the petition. I have taken some little trouble with these petitions, with regard to the signatures, and had the hon. member for South Grey taken the same trouble, he would not have presented the petitions he laid before the House. Then there are the names of Jocklin, Marshall Jocklin and Michael Finnerty, written by the same hand; one person has evidently written them all, and yet this petition is asked to be received.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks that is all right. There are the signatures of James Puhl, Frederick Puhl, and John Purvis, and Edward Purvis, and Nicholas Schlezhauer, and W. T. Marvick, and James Marshall, written, both signatures in each case, by the one hand.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. WOODWORTH. Because I have looked over them, and have had an expert examine them, and the best authority that can be received in a court of justice in this matter, the authority of a competent expert, can be received before a committee of this House to show that these petitions were signed by the same persons, and that the signatures are in the same handwriting. There is also petition number 2, from Bentinck, South Grey, also presented by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). Nine signatures on it, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 26, 36 and 37, are illegible, and clearly the work of one man. Petition No. 4, from the municipality of Sullivan, in the County of Grey, containing thirty signatures, presented by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allan) yesterday, and asked to be received to-day, has also a large number of signatures in the same handwriting. John Mannerow, August Mannerow, Fred. Schlumske, August Bluhm and Charles Bluhm; Geo. Smith and Geo. A. Smith; Thomas Duff and James Duff; Samuel Palmer and John Palmer; John Reid and Ernest Pike—are in each case in the same handwriting, and there are besides six names illegible. Then there is the municipality of St. Vincent, County of Grey, from which the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. McMullen) presented a petition. On that petition we find the names of James Oliver and J. N. Oliver; Thos. Harris and Alb. T. Harris; A. Thompson and William A. Ellis; James Sparling and Chas. Collier; J. M. Smythe and Chas. Parkin; Amero Tait and Alex. Sauter—all evidently written by the same hand in each case. No. 7 petition, from the municipality of Thamesville, County of Kent, presented by Mr. Miller, shows the same unvarying monotony in the handwriting of the signatures. S. B. Ripley and S. A. Tye; R. M. Logan and Robert Amola; James Rolinson and Sam Singer; Ben Higgins and J. Polewski—show the same writing in each case, and there are several signatures completely illegible. Not only that, but a soft pencil has been used in most of these cases, so that one can hardly decipher any name in a great number of cases. I have only referred to the signatures which it would be patent and clear to a boy ten years of age, are in the same handwriting. In most of the soft pencil signatures, the same man has put down signature after signature, and you cannot tell what the signatures are and what the names are. Not only the petitions I have drawn attention to, but nearly all the petitions against the franchise presented to this House, have the same indelible mark. When the proper time comes, I intend to call the attention of the House to the gross breach of privilege on the part of hon. members in asking that these petitions be received and read when they ought to have known, had they taken the trouble that parliamentary practice requires them to take, that the signatures to these petitions were in many cases in the same handwriting, and that therefore, the petitions should not have been laid on the Table of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. What is the point of order? If I am out of order I shall retract as quickly as possible; but I have yet to learn that I am out of order, when I say that hon. members of this House have dared to ask the clerk of the House to receive petitions which have been concocted here and sent all over the country and are signed by the same hand.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I presented eighteen petitions and looked over them carefully, and am quite certain there is no irregularity in any of them. The hon. gentleman's lynx eyes may discover some irregularity but I failed to discover any. I am sure they are as well signed as any petitions ever received here.

Mr. TROW. No wonder hon. gentlemen opposite feel somewhat restless in their seats, in the face of thousands of signatures against this Bill, probably one-third of them being those of their own supporters. The petitions I presented here I have examined very carefully, and I question very much whether any two signatures on them were written by the same hand. They are genuine signatures, and the hon. gentleman had no right to accuse hon. members on this side of misrepresentation.

Mr. MILLS. I think that the hon. gentleman made, under the circumstances, a highly improper speech. He referred to a rule, but as regards the statements he made, that rule has no bearing; it does not sustain them in any

particular. He has selected names from the petition I presented yesterday or the day before, from the village of Thamesville, and stated they were not genuine. Those signatures are genuine. They are the signatures of the parties themselves. The hon. gentleman may undertake to make a speech of that kind with a view of addressing the country, but the hon. gentlemen who presented those petitions are ready to take the responsibility of them. I know, so far as the signatures to the petitions from my own constituency are concerned, that they are genuine. I do not believe there is a single name put there unless by the party himself, or at his request.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen say "oh, oh," but I say that any party who wishes to petition this House has a right to ask another party to put his name to the petition, just as good a right to do that as he has to do any other act. We assume the responsibility of these petitions. Let the hon. gentleman name some party whose name is recorded on any one of these petitions, who says he did not sign it or authorise his name to be put there. Then there will be something to put before the House, but there is nothing now. The hon. gentleman has nothing except an attempt to cast reflections upon the good faith of those on this side who presented those petitions. I presented a petition to-day signed by 475 persons from the city of London. I cannot say that I know every one of those signatures, but I know the party from whom I received the petition. It was not sent at my instigation, and the hon. member who respresents that city will no doubt be able to identify many of those signatures. It is an extraordinary thing that the hon. member should attack the hon. gentleman who presented those petitions, when no complaint has come from any one whose name appears there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I caused a message to be sent to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) asking him to send me the petitions, and he sent a message back by the page that he did not wish to send me his private papers; so he has been reading from his private papers, and I do not therefore wonder at the irregularity.

Mr. WOODWORTH. A page came to me and asked me for the petitions. I said I had not the petitions, that they were on the Table of the House, but that if Mr. Landerkin wanted to see my private papers, he should send me word. That is just like the ordinary misrepresentation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not got the petitions yet; the hon. gentleman has not sent them. The names of the people he has mentioned are those of very respectable people, and I do not want him to sneer at them. He tries to sneer at the German people who live in my riding, who are very respectable people, and I think it ill becomes him to sneer at a very respectable class of people who have signed their names to these petitions. It is not to be wondered at that the signatures of people in the same family should resemble one another very much. The hon. gentleman says that a boy 10 years of age could discover the similarity. That is no doubt an evidence of the ability of the hon. gentleman, but these are the names of very respectable people.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No doubt of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the hon. gentleman had the courage, or the manliness, or the courtesy——

Mr. WOOWORTH. Is that in order, Mr. Speaker, to accuse me of want of manliness?

Mr. LANDERKIN. If he had either of these attributes, he would have sent me the petition, so that I could have examined the names.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I ask if that is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not in order to make any personal allusions. Try to keep in order.

Mr. MACKENZIE. But the hon. gentleman used words which implied dishonorable conduct on the part of the hon. member. He accused him of forgery.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear any such statement from the hon. member for King's, charging any hon. member with forgery.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He said he had seen petitions that those presenting them must have known were forgeries.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not so understand him.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand that the speech made by the hon. member is the result of groping through all these petitions with two assistants, and with the aid of a very powerful microscope. These are the only results of his efforts. I do not know whether he knows, but he ought to know, that if a person authorises another man to put his name down, that is exactly the same as if he did it himself.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, is it?

Mr. EDGAR. By the law of England, and by the law of Ontario, if you authorise another man to put your name to your will, it is as good as if you did it yourself.

Mr. WOODWORTH. No.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and he knows it.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to accuse any member of this House of presenting petitions knowing that they were signed by one hand, but, in regard to two or three petitions presented from the township of Tyendenaga, in the constituency of my hon. friend from East Hastings, I asked to look at them, and I called the attention of an hon. gentleman of the Opposition, who was passing at the time, to them. I said: Look at these petitions; you will see that they are largely signed by the same hand. This is an instance of the way in which petitions are signed. Out of fifty-one signatures, I counted about thirty which were written by the same pencil, and were all apparently in the same hand. I know most of those gentlemen, and I know that the names that they represent are respectable persons, but that is not the question raised by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth). It was not that these persons do not exist, but that their names had been signed by the same hand; and that, in my opinion, is the fact in the case to which I refer. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) and an hon. gentleman of the Opposition and myself went through those petitions, and the hon. member from the other side, when I called his attention to them, said: "They appear to be all written by one hand." The three petitions were much in the same position. What the petition presented just now by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is, I do not know, for I have not had the pleasure of seeing it yet, when I do I think I shall know who the signers are, whether the hon. gentlemen who presented those petitions knew it or not—and I do not say they did, I do not fancy they did—more than half of the signatures on one petition were signed with one pencil, of the same color, and in the same hand.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to what the hon. gentleman has said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it a personal explanation?

Mr. EDGAR. It is a personal explanation. With reference to the petition which I presented from North Hast-

ings, I can only say that I received it from a gentleman, with a letter from him, whose name heads that list.

Mr. BOWELL. Very likely. I said nothing at all in reference to that petition, because I had not seen it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not going to enter into the discussion of the particular series of petitions which have been brought down just now, because there is a good deal of feeling about it, and it is better to avoid feeling when we can, but I must deny the particular line laid down by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), when he gives us a legal disquisition on *quod fecit per alium fecit per se*, when he states that one man can authorise another to sign any document, and that is the act of the principal. That may be the general rule, but, I think, that on looking back to the precedents, we find that there has always been a close scrutiny into petitions to see that no such unwholesome practice is allowed in regard to them. It destroys the real value of the petitions if anybody lifts up a petition and finds that the names were written in one hand. There is no security to the House, there is no security to the member who presents it. He may be bound to present it if he receives it from a respectable source, as the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) says. He may be blamed if he does not present it, although it may have a suspicious appearance; but it must destroy the value of a petition if a series of names, from one to fifty, are written in the same hand. I have seen, on several occasions in my life, three or four hundred names all written by one hand, and they were afterwards found to have been fraudulent. It is quite evident to the House who receives a petition that twenty or thirty men cannot write the same hand, and it is therefore quite clear that those twenty or thirty individuals did not sign their names. Then there is no evidence whatever that those names were authorised by the owners of the names to be placed on the petition. If a man cannot write, he makes his mark, and the witness is supposed to certify that the man could not write, but if a man can write his name, he is utterly inexcusable in authorising another man to write it for him. I think it is quite clear that the practice ought to be discountenanced. I know it has been discountenanced; I am satisfied, from my general recollection, that it has been greatly discountenanced in England, as being destructive of the value of petitions; because Parliament cannot examine every name and ascertain whether it is a genuine signature, and they have no evidence, if it is not a genuine signature, that it was put on with his assent. It utterly destroys the whole value of parliamentary petitions, and, I think, that must clearly be understood by both sides of the House. I am speaking for the purpose of fencing around and protecting petitions in the future—certainly not with any desire to restrict the right of petition. I regret to hear the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) say: We hold ourselves responsible for all these petitions. He can only hold himself responsible, as a member of Parliament, for the petition he presents himself. But it leads one to suppose that in the hon. gentleman's mind, at all events, it was a party move, and therefore he is bound to take the responsibility. But he cannot know whether the petitions are honest petitions or dishonest—he has no means of knowing that. Yet he says: We assume—speaking for himself and the whole party—we assume the whole responsibility. I am quite sure his leader in this House would not assume any responsibility; I should be very sorry to take any responsibility except for a petition presented by myself, and which I endorsed.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not understand my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that each member of Parliament on this side of the House assumed responsibility for all the petitions. He was speaking, of course, of the distributive responsibility of each hon. member who has presented a petition and holds himself responsible in the sense in which a member of Parliament is responsible with respect to that petition. Now, the right of petition is a sacred right, and it is extremely important that that right, as the hon. gentleman has said, should be fenced in from abuse; but it is extremely important, also, that it should not be unduly restricted; and it would be a very dangerous thing to mark such limits of responsibility as the hon. member for Queen's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) has attempted to mark out for hon. gentlemen who present petitions. If a petition comes to an hon. member from a respectable quarter, and apparently fair upon the face of it—I do not mean as to the substance, but in the surroundings—he ought to present that petition to the House. He may not sympathise with it altogether, but he ought to give the petitioner an opportunity of laying his case before the House. He does not endorse it by doing so. I remember a famous case of that kind, a case in which a Mr. Wasson sent a petition against, I think it was, Lord Chelmsford, with a charge of grossly improper conduct, many years ago, when no less a constitutionalist, no less a venerable statesman than Earl Russell, presented that petition, deeming it his bounden duty to present it, though he could not himself find that there was anything in the charge nor sympathise with it; yet he presented it to the House of Lords, making that statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a different thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I am pointing out how eminent constitutionalists have felt that it was necessary to guard the right of petition by throwing no obstruction in the way of any man approaching this House who desires to do so. Therefore, I say, it would be a very extraordinary petition, within the rules of Parliament—of course every member must consider whether it is in the rules of Parliament—which I should feel myself free to refuse to present, though it might have but little of my sympathy. Now, with reference to this question of signatures. The hon. gentleman has made an observation with which I, to some extent, agree; he said petitions would be more valuable if they were all signed in different hands; but he has said that they utterly lose their value when they are not so signed. I differ with him entirely there. Now, I have seen a good many petitions in the course of my parliamentary experience. I have seen very large numbers of signatures on petitions, the authenticity of which, and the respectability of which, were never questioned, although many of the signatures were, to my mind—I could not swear to it—in the same hand. The hon. gentleman himself says he knew a case in which there were three or four hundred signatures in the same hand, and it happened to be proved in that case that there was a fraud. Of course there may be a fraud in such a case, and there may be fraud when the signatures are different; because if you present a petition on which each signature differs from the other as chalk from cheese, that would not prove the genuineness of any one of the signatures. Now, we should understand what the rule of Parliament is. Is it the rule of Parliament—I do not say whether the practice is commendable or not—that the petition must be signed in every instance by the proper hand of the person whose name is there affixed? I say it has not been the practice, so far as I know, in this Parliament. There were a vast number of petitions presented in the early part of this Session by persons interested in the cause of temperance, and it has been stated that more than 100,000 signatures were appended to those petitions. Now, I would like to know whether all those signatures were by different hands; I would like to know whether there were not scores of persons who signed through the medium of the person who was handing the petition around. I believe that is the case; I believe that it has not been understood through the country at large, or understood by hon. members here, that

it was an improper thing that a petition should be signed in some cases by other than the proper hand of the party. I believe it has been fairly assumed that if a petition came from respectable quarters, and bore other marks of genuineness, such signatures as might seem to be in the same hand, were duly authorised signatures. I do not know any reason why the right of petition should be more restricted than is the right of performing any other more solemn act. He can perform very solemn acts through another. He can authorise a man to do many things in his name, and to sign his name to many instruments which will have most important effects. Nor does he need the written name of a party to powers of attorney or powers under seal. When a man gives his consent on the spot and sees his name signed, it is signed by his hand though it is not written in his proper hand. If we are to lay down this doctrine which is projected that the proper signatures of the party himself must, in all cases, be affixed, then let it be laid down after consideration and established as the general rule and practice of Parliament. But I maintain to cast discredit upon the line of petitions presented during the last few days, because some of the signatures are alleged to be or appear to be in the same handwriting, is an attempt which would react in the way of casting discredit upon the great mass of petitions upon various subjects which have been presented to Parliament during the last few years. I believe it has been a common custom, and there hardly exists a case of a member who has presented, I do not say petitions with few signatures, or petitions for a private Bill, but petitions on some large topic of public importance, to which many signatures were attached—I doubt if there would be a single case found in which an hon. gentleman who had presented such petitions would not have rendered himself open to the censure of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), if these censures are well founded.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has lost his right to speak, except to make a personal explanation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was speaking when the hon. gentleman raised the point of order. I then sat down and have not had an opportunity of speaking since, and I have not finished my speech. Is it fair that I should have been assailed in this House, and the petitions I have presented been assailed, and cannot put myself right?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has been assailed or any reflections cast on the hon. gentlemen who have presented petitions to this House merely because some of the names are signed by one person. That is no reflection on hon. gentlemen. It is the duty of the hon. members to present petitions they receive from respectable sources, if there is a sufficient number of signatures to the petition to justify its presentation. According to the English practice, it is improper for one person to sign the names of other persons except in case of their incapacity from sickness. In England the practice is to refer all petitions to a committee, and the committee reports, whenever it appears that several names are signed by the same person, and recommends that those names be struck from the number of the petitioners. That appears to be the only penalty which exists. I suppose that rule exists here; if several names are signed by the same person the number of such names is struck off from the number of the petitioners. It has not been the practice, I admit, of this House to scrutinise the manner in which names have been signed. The Clerk and his officials have been charged with the duty which pertains to a committee in England, and, if that practice is to be adopted, it will be the duty of the Clerk and his officials to call my attention to cases where more than one signature is in the same handwriting, and then it will be my duty to call the attention of the House to the subject, and the House can order that such names be struck off the number of petitioners. In England, apparently, there is no evidence required.

Mr. BLAKE. That would be a new practice here?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. When a point of order is taken during a speech, and the point is finally decided, does that interruption prevent the hon. member resuming his speech?

Mr. SPEAKER. I decided the point of order, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) did not continue his speech; but the hon. member for West Ontario, the hon. member for Hastings, the hon. member for West Durham, all continued the debate on the subject, not on the point of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have not finished my speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I can get at it in some way. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Of course the hon. member who desires to speak cannot move the motion to adjourn. That must be moved by some other member.

Mr. LISTER. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member has only a few words of personal explanation to offer, I am sure the House will hear him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have only a few words to say. I asked the hon. member for King's to send over the petitions, but he did not return them to me. I found he was not reading from the petitions at all. I find the names of Nicholas Schlozhauer and T. Nicholas Schlozhauer, which the hon. gentleman said were in the same handwriting. They are not in the same handwriting. Also the names of James McMahon and Michael Finnerty, which are said to be in the same handwriting. They are not in the same handwriting. To show in what good faith I acted in this matter, I wish to read two of the letters accompanying those petitions. The first is from John Proctor, as follows:—

"HANOVER, 13th May, 1885.

"DEAR DOCTOR,—Yours of 6th to hand. Thanks for copy of Franchise Bill You ask what do I think of it. It is simply outrageous. It would appear that Sir John would like to drive the Opposition and their supporters to some overt Act. Oh, for a Cromwell! I think some of his friends are getting ashamed, and almost wish he would withdraw the Bill. We must just hope and work so that good may result out of the intended evil."

The next letter is from Dr. McLean, of Ayton, as follows:—

"AYTON, May 13th, 1885.

"DR. LANDERKIN.

"DEAR SIR,—I have just forwarded to Mr. James Trow a petition which has been signed during the last two days. If more time had been allowed the signatures would have been much larger, as everybody signed, both Grit and Tory, with the exception of two lonely Tories, who considered that anything is fair in politics. If you examine you will find that the majority of the names are those of rank Conservatives, but, I must say men who do not want a new Franchise Bill, or any other unfair advantage."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I did not find fault with the member for Perth (Mr. Trow) presenting a petition from East Hastings. An hon. member who receives a petition has a right to present it. I know, although I am very much in favor of the Franchise Bill, that if anyone sent me a petition from my own county, or any other county, I would present it. But the hon. gentleman said when he presented it that thirty of the signatures were of Conservatives. I do not find fault with his saying so. When home, I accidentally met several of them; and I may here say that I believe nineteen-twentieths of the names to the petition were those of persons who act with the Reform party. I met several —and I know every man on the list—I said to one:

"Well, you have signed the petition against the Franchise Bill. Have you read the Bill?" "In truth," he said, "I have neither seen the Bill nor the petition; if a man signed it in my name, he had no right to do so, and it was a forgery." I know many signatures have been signed in the post office, and liberties have been taken with signatures. I will give the hon. gentleman who presented the petition the name of the party who said to me that he had neither seen the petition nor the Bill. I rose only to say that I believe the rule should be applied, and that no petition should be presented to the House unless signed by the parties themselves, or by the mark of a party who cannot sign his name. That would save a great deal of trouble, and we would have less petitions and less inconvenience. So far as my own section is concerned, I may say that there is very little excitement with regard to this Franchise Bill.

The petitions were then received.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be well if it were understood by hon. gentlemen, as well as in the country, that it is irregular for any person to sign the name of other people to petitions.

Mr. HESSON. I have a petition here presented by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), and while I do not deny that each name represents a settler, and each signature is a Grit signature, I venture to say that if you look at the petition yourself, Mr. Speaker, you will find that not more than two or three parties have written all the names. I find at least twenty names written in the one handwriting.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference, Sir, to the announcement which you have just made, I think if we are to change what has been our invariable practice for seventeen or eighteen years it would be well that the change were made by a more solemn act than simply an announcement from the Chair. I think a rule should be adopted, and that the people ought to know that it is the determination of the House that the signatures ought to be signed by those whose names purport to appear on the petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When a petition is presented. I think it is presumed that it is signed by the parties, and unless individuals particularly interested in looking at the petition ascertained to the contrary, it is supposed that the parties sign their own names, and whenever objection has been taken I think the rule has been adhered to. I know that before Confederation in the old Parliament of Canada, the moment it was ascertained that that rule was not complied with, in several cases the petitions were visited with condign punishment. I particularly refer to petitions which were presented when there was great political excitement, and when, therefore, they were carefully scrutinised, and when it was shown that they were false signatures, the rule was acted upon, as I have said. The rule is a common sense one, and it is very strictly observed in England. I hold in my hand a report made to the House of Commons, in 46 Victoria, by a select committee on public petitions, wherein it is stated:

"Your committee have felt it their duty to bring to the notice of the House, a petition in favor of the repeal of the contagious diseases Acts——

Which was a matter which created great excitement in England.——

"which was presented by Mr. Cavendish Bentinck from Whitehaven on the 12th of March last, and which they find to contain serious irregularities.

"Your committee have observed that the petition, though purporting to be signed by 414 persons, is, in fact, signed by 293 only, the remaining 121 signatures being in the same handwriting. Your committee, therefore, having regard to the Orders of the House, have abstained from reckoning such names among the signatures."

I think it is a wholesome rule, and one which should be followed out. I would just say to the House as a whole, that the fact that doubt has been thrown by this debate on the genuineness of those petitions destroys, in a great measure, the effect which the petitioners want to have impressed on the House. It has that effect, and it would have the still greater effect of destroying the value of the petitions for or against any particular measure.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not discuss the question of the older practice, but I simply stated that as we had a settled practice of eighteen years, I thought it should not be altered by a simple announcement from the Chair, but should be altered by means of a rule of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am much disposed to agree with you, Sir, and also with the First Minister, that after due notice given it would be better to provide that all signatures to a petition should be made in people's own handwriting. I agree with the First Minister that it is a security against doubt being thrown upon petitions. But what I call attention to is this, that not only do I believe you will find that this question has not been raised since Confederation, and that the practice has been, as my hon. friend beside me stated, that these petitions were received without this particular objection being taken, but I think, though I am not quite sure, that the First Minister was concerned in a debate which took place prior to Confederation, in which this course was taken on one or two occasions. I think it was with reference to some petitions presented from the Province of Quebec against Confederation, and that notice was taken of the practice by an hon. member. The late Mr. Holton then called attention to what he said he knew, and what I myself know to be the case, that more particularly in the country districts it is a common practice for the parties who are asked to sign petitions to request the parties who bring them around to sign for them. I speak simply as to their custom, a custom which I have observed in one or two cases myself. Now, this practice having prevailed for such a length of time, if a change is to be made I think it should be made part of our orders. The First Minister and everybody else must see that it would be unfair and unreasonable to throw discredit now on a particular batch of petitions, which have been signed in a particular way which has grown into a custom. I do not say that the custom is right, or rather, that it is expedient, but I do say that the custom, within my own knowledge, has extensively prevailed in the past, and this is the first time within my recollection, except on the particular occasion I allude to, which took place before Confederation, that objection has been taken to it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not refer particularly to these particular petitions, but I simply called attention to the advisability of having a strict rule, in order that petitions may have the weight which they ought to have.

Mr. MACKENZIE. In England there is a distinct Order of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There may or may not be, but it is the continual practice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as I can recollect, the practice which has been followed for a very long period, and especially with regard to petitions coming from the Province of Quebec, is this: A large number of people are unable to sign their names to these petitions, nevertheless, after a certain number of names have been signed regularly, other names are written, accompanied by a cross; and when ten or twenty or 100 names are so written, the parties signing the names for the others will then certify that the parties whose names appear on the petition have authorised them to sign their names, and this gives authenticity to the signatures. It would be a very hard thing if persons, because they are unable to sign their names, could not be in a position to petition Parliament and lay their

grievances before it. Therefore, if the rule is to be changed, or if we are to have a new rule, I think it should be provided that although a person may not be able to sign his name, another may be authorised to do so for him; but in that case a certificate ought to be put on the petition.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the House will not think I am suggesting any change in the rule. I am simply pointing out that, according to the practice which has prevailed, this is irregular, and ought not to be pursued if possible; and if hon. members would inform petitioners throughout their constituencies that they ought not to sign for other people, I think that would be desirable. I am not objecting to the reception of these petitions, but the practice is irregular.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CORRESPONDENCE WITH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was there any correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, subsequent to the 18th March, 1885, on the subject of the proposal for a change in the arrangements between the company and the Government? Was there any report from the chief engineer in connection with the matter? Was there any report from the Minister on the matter? Was there an Order in Council on the matter? Was any report from any officer of the company laid before the Government? Has the Government the balance sheets prepared by Mr. Miall, but not appended to his letter?

Mr. POPE. I do not think there has been any correspondence since the date mentioned. There was no report from the Minister; there was no Order in Council; there was no report from an officer of the Company, except that of Mr. Ogden, which has been brought down. Mr. Miall's balance sheet was laid on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Miall's report states that he has prepared two balance sheets, from which he has formed a condensed balance sheet which has been laid on the Table. Those balance sheets are what I want.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not understand that.

BRANDON POSTMASTER.

Mr. LISTER asked, What are the allowances made to the Postmaster at Brandon (1) for rent, (2) for salaries of assistants?

Mr. CARLING. The allowance for rent is $600 per annum. The postmaster's salary includes an allowance of $720 per annum for assistance, granted under exceptional circumstances, as a provisional allowance, and it will be discontinued on the 1st of October, 1885.

NORTH-WEST SURVEYS.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether the Government propose to survey and set out for settlement any lands in the North-West Territory during the present summer? Whether any surveyors have yet been sent to make surveys? Whether the geological staff are yet in the field to carry forward their explorations for the current year? If not, why not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer sent to me is this: The Government does not propose to survey and get out any very large quantity of land in the North-West during the present summer, because, as will be seen by the map herewith, this is not necessary. Several surveyors either are or are about to be sent into the field, to make surveys of trails, and detached settlement surveys. One party of the Geological Survey is already in the field; the others are making preparations, and will leave shortly.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and the working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the months of March and April respectively?

Mr. POPE. For March the earnings were $179,869, and the working expenses $175,544. For April the earnings were $240,295. I have not yet the working expenses for April.

LAVIS'S PATENT TENT POLE.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to adapt to the tents used by the militia Lavis's patent pole?

Mr. CARON. The patent referred to has been submitted to the military branch of the Department for a report. Until that report has been laid before me I cannot say whether the patent will be adapted to the tents used by the militia force or not.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has arranged, and if not, whether the Government will arrange, for the free transport of the bodies of the volunteers who have fallen in the North-West to the homes they left?

Mr. CARON. Up to the present time the applications made to the Department merely asked us to facilitate the transport of the bodies of volunteers who fell in battle, friends seeming to prefer to look after the matter themselves. If any applications be made hereafter for the free transport of the bodies of any volunteers who have fallen, The Government will take measures to arrange for the free transport of the bodies.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government intends to submit to Parliament a proposal for a mark of recognition in the shape of a land grant, land scrip, or otherwise, to the volunteers on active service in the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question has already been asked, and I answer in the same way as I did before, that this question engages the serious attention of the Government.

DOMINION LANDS—GABRIEL DUMONTS' LOT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When did Gabriel Dumont's occupation of the lot on the east bank of the Saskatchewan, near Gabriel's Crossing and St. Laurent, begin, according to the Departmental papers? When was he admitted to homestead entry for that lot? When did he become entitled to his patent? When was his patent issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is nothing on the papers or records of the Department to show when Gabriel Dumont's occupation of the lands on the east side of the Saskatchewan River, for which he obtained entry as a homestead and pre-emption, began. He obtained homestead entry for the south-west quarter of section 20, township 42, range 1, west of the third principle meridian, on the 1st March, 1883, and pre emption entry for the south-east quarter of the same section. There is nothing in the declaration made by Dumont, when he appeared before the land agent to make his entry, to indicate that he occupied, the land previous to that day; and he would not therefore, be entitled to apply for his patent under the homestead provisions of the Dominion Lands Act until three years after the date of perfecting his entry. The patent for this land has not yet issued, nor has any application been received at this Department for its issue.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GOVERNMENT ROUNDHOUSE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the land on which a Government roundhouse is erected, or any property on which Government buildings, occupied by Government or by the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been found to be covered by a patent irregularly issued to a private individual?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government in 1875 appears to have laid out a town site at Selkirk, which was then expected to be the point where the Canadian Pacific Railway would cross the Red River, and to have appropriated, for this purpose, lands occupied at the time of the transfer, and patent for which the occupant was entitled to obtain under the Manitoba Act. The Government appears to have been unaware of this occupation, or if aware, ignored it. The survey was made under instructions from the Surveyor General, and the plan is on record in the Department of the Interior, but there is nothing on record in the Department to show where the Canadian Pacific Railway roundhouse is situated, or indeed to indicate that there is such a building. It has, however, recently come to the knowledge of the officers of the Department, that the roundhouse is upon a lot respecting which the proof of occupation at the time of the transfer required under the Manitoba Act was furnished several years ago and patent issued.

SATURDAY SITTING AND QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that, when the House adjourns on Friday next, it will stand adjourned till Saturday following at 1.30 P.M., and Government measures will have precedence after routine business, and also that, when the House adjourns on Saturday, it will stand adjourned until Tuesday the 26th inst. at 1.30 P.M.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. Before you proceed, Sir, to the other business of the House, I think it my duty to avail myself of my parliamentary right to make a substantive motion in order to raise an important question, as I consider it to be, a question both of gravity and of urgency, which the state of the public business, the order of the House and the procedure which has been pursued, preclude my raising in any other way. I refer to the duties of the Government and the rights and the obligations of this House with reference to information as to past events in the North-West leading up to the troubles which have recently taken place. I have not, since I entered this House, used, for any purpose, the motion which I am now about to use, always believing as I did and do believe, that the use of it should be a sparing use, that it should be reserved for questions and situations, such as the present situation and the present question. I believe that there subsists either a misconception or a misinterpretation of what the duties and obligations and rights of the Government and the House are with reference to this important question, and it is necessary that that subject should be cleared up, and that we should come to an understanding, if possible, as to what our relative position is in the matter. The most limited conception of the fundamental function of Government is the maintenance of security to the citizen against attack from abroad, and against internal discord, and this includes his right to the full enjoyment of justice in the land. Our own constitution acknowledges and rather magnifies that limited conception of the functions of Government, by declaring, as it expressly does, that this Parliament is authorised to make laws for the peace, order and good government of our country; and if it be that peace has been broken, that public order——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In order that we may know the regularity or the irregularity of the hon. gentleman's speech, I must ask that he will make the motion on which he is going to speak.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is entitled to have the motion placed in your hands, Sir, but I have no objection to state my motion. I am about to move that the House adjourn. It is the only motion I can move that will enable me to make this statement. It is the only regular motion, and that being so I thought that the hon. gentleman would have known it. If, as I was saying, the public peace has been broken, if the public order has been disturbed, if the authority of the Government has been violated, if insurrection has raised its head in Canada, I hold it to be the duty of the Government to give, and the duty of this House to demand, and its right to obtain, all the particulars, so that we may ascertain how these things have happened, so that we may deal with the whole subject, as it includes both the Government of the country, and those they rule, so that we may fix the responsibility upon the right shoulders, or share it, if it be a mixed responsibility, among the right shoulders; and I hold it to be the duty of the Government, and our right, that we should be placed in a position to form that judgment at the earliest possible moment. More than eight weeks have now elapsed since the insurrection broke out, and from that time out I have been constantly pressing for those pieces of information which might enable us to reach conclusions upon this subject. We all felt it to be our duty heartily to agree, heartily to assist in measures to restore the public authority, and we felt that that was a duty emergent and doubly incumbent upon us in the particular condition of the North-West country. We did so; whatever the Government proposed to us, they received without an instant's delay, and they received as well the moral support and countenance of every member of Parliament and of the people at large in taking the earliest, the most active, the most energetic, the most complete steps that they could devise in order to the restoration of public authority. But while we have been doing that we must not lose sight of this very important duty of ours, nor must we lose sight of this very important obligation of the Government. I say the obligation of the Government to bring down to Parliament the materials upon which Parliament may pronounce a judgment, is clear and plain. They have full power to govern, and it is difficult to presume that without some neglect, or delay, or wrong, such results as have taken place, could have taken place. But I quite admit it to be true that they may have taken place without neglect, without delay, without mistake, without misgovernment. That is indeed possible; but if there is to be a presumption, the presumption must, at the moment, be against those in authority. The Government of the day may rebut that presumption, but they are obliged to undertake the task, and the condition upon which alone they can accomplish such a rebuttal, is full information and full materials on which a judgment can be reached. We have the right of judgment, and we have the duty of judgment; we are to pass between our fellow citizens lately in arms and their rulers on the political question, and we are to pass on the questions between the Indians and their rulers. Besides having that right, we have a great responsibility, as the last court of appeal, in this matter. We are the people's representatives, the great inquest of the country, upon whom it devolves to enquire thoroughly into such large questions as these. I say the duty of the Government is obvious on general principles. It flows from their position and ours. It has been frequently admitted and acted upon in England. It has been admitted and acted upon here. It was acted upon here by the hon. gentlemen themselves on the occasion

of the former disturbance in 1869-70. We had at that time a disturbance, a serious disturbance, though much less serious than the present one, in connection with our acquisition of the North-West. When we met Parliament on the 15th February, 1870, Louis Riel was in possession of the Red River settlement, as the president of the Government which he had assumed to form in that country; negotiations were going on with the people of the country; an armed force was being organised, or was contemplated at any rate, for progress there in the spring. In that condition of things the Parliament met on the 15th February, 1870. On the 24th day of that month, the Government brought down by Message, not upon solicitation, not upon instance, not upon pressure, but voluntarily by Message from His Excellency, the documents connected with and throwing light upon the causes of that outbreak up to the latest date, and comprising a mass of papers which, when printed exceeded 150 pages of print. The Government did not think that they were justified in picking and choosing for themselves; they felt that the situation was one which entitled both sides of the House to know all that had transpired, and they therefore brought down all the papers. They proposed, on the day on which they brought them down, the formation of a select committee, struck from both sides of the House, on which were the late lamented Mr. Holton, my hon. friend the present member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) and myself, from the Opposition side of the House, to go over the papers which were brought down in the Message, in order that they might report to the House what papers it would be expedient to publish at that time. They felt that, in that peculiar condition, it was for the House to decide, through the medium of a committee struck by the House, and in which both sides had confidence, what papers should be withheld; and they, therefore, brought down all, and left to that committee the duty of deciding what, in the public interest at the moment, ought not to see the light. In a very few days—as I have said, this transaction took place on the 24th, nine days after the opening of the Session—within a very few days thereafter, that select committee reported, and recommended the publication of all the papers brought down, with the exception of one single despatch from the provisional Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. Mr. Macdougall, and the names of two or three persons occurring in two or three places in some of the correspondence, which names were replaced by asterisks. Almost immediately upon the opening of the Session, my hon. friend from East York moved for other papers—not knowing, of course, what the Government would bring down—other papers connected with some details as to the surveys and other points. That motion was granted, and those papers were brought down within a very brief period. What were these papers? What was the general character of these papers and of this information which the Government, upon the occasion to which I refer, with reference to the outbreak that had taken place in the North-West, to prevent our entry into and assumption of the government of that country, with reference to a condition of things in which there was a *de facto* government assumed to be established there, and which was assuming to act; while negotiation was going on for settlement; while an armed expedition was arranged to proceed in the spring—what was the general character of the papers then brought down? They professed to be everything that threw light on the cause of the trouble, that threw light on the conduct of the Government, that threw light on the conduct of the Hudson's Bay Company, that threw light on the conduct of the population, that threw light on the conduct of the officers of the Government; all the instructions, all the despatches, all the correspondence, all the papers from which this House and this country could form its judgment as to how that trouble had arisen, as to what it was due to, as to who were responsible for it, and as to what course should be taken in regard to it, were voluntarily brought down by the Government of the day in discharge of what they felt to be their public duty, their bounden duty, their obvious obligation to the country and to Parliament. I shall trouble the House with a few references to the papers so brought down, in order that I may show by those references the kind of papers that were thought fit to be brought down, and at the same time incidentally throw some light upon the present situation. That situation differed very much from the present. We had bargained for the transfer of the territory, but we were not in control of it, and, as I have always thought, due precautions had not been taken either by the Government of this country or by the Hudson's Bay Company in that respect. I believe that proper preliminary communications with the Hudson Bay Company's authorities and with the people at large, did not take place before those steps were taken, which resulted so unfortunately, the steps with reference to surveys, the steps with reference to the entry of the Governor. I believe that due information with reference to the intentions of the Government as to the constitution to be proposed, and the plan of government of the new Territory, as to the rights of the people in their lands, was not communicated at the proper time. I believe that the surveys, the making of the surveys, the attempt to make the surveys without the extinguishment of the Indian title, and in the condition of feeling amongst certain classes of the population, was a very great mistake, as was the making of them, without full and authoritative and authentic communication to the settlers as to the intentions and object of the surveys, although such information was, to some extent, communicated by Colonel Dennis. As I have said, I believe the Hudson Bay Company's authorities were also to blame. They were to blame for not communicating to the Government of Canada, and, if necessary, to the Imperial Government, the facts which they knew, or ought to have known, as to the condition of feeling among the people, and for not advising the course it would have been proper to take under the circumstances. Now, Sir, these papers, amongst others, contain proofs which seem to me to indicate, as I have said, two things. First, the kind of information which the Government felt it its duty to bring down in order that the House might judge whether it had been right or wrong in its procedure; and, secondly, some things which would help us to a judgment when the time arrives for judgment on the present difficulty. They comprise, amongst others, a letter from Col. Dennis, who had been charged with some duties in connection with the surveys, to Mr. Macdougall, in his capacity as Minister of Public Works at Ottawa, on the 21st August, 1869, a letter written from the Red River settlement, in which he says:

"I find that a considerable degree of irritation exists among the native population in view of surveys and settlements being made without the Indian title having first been extinguished. You will, no doubt, have become aware that the half-breeds lately, in a public meeting, called the company here to account in the matter of the money paid for the transfer to Canada.

"Whatever may have been the views of the Government as to the character of the title to be conveyed by the deed of transfer, whether the expense may or may not be fairly chargeable to the company, I am satisfied that the Government will, in the first place, have to undertake the extinction of the Indian title.

"This question must be regarded as of the very greatest importance. In connection therewith I would reiterate to you my conviction, as expressed while at Ottawa that nothing should be lost. The necessity for prompt action is more apparent to me now than it seemed even then. Supposing the transfer from the company to have been complete, it is possible that the object may be carried out yet, this fall. There can be no question as to the prejudicial effects in retarding the settlement of the country, should the half-breeds and Indians assume a position of hostility to any extent whatever towards the incoming settlers, or towards the Government.

"The difficulties of the position may be much enhanced by giving the discontented parties the winter to brood over and to concert measures in opposition to the views of the Government. In the meantime, the

French half-breeds who constitute about ⅓ or ¼ (say 3,000 souls), of the settlement, are likely to prove a turbulent element. This class have gone so far as to threaten violence should surveys be attempted to be made."

Then, on the 20th of August following, the same gentleman writes to the same Minister a letter, from which I also read a brief extract:

"In the first place I had proposed, until fully advised as to the system of farm surveys which might be adopted by the Government, to employ the time in surveying the belt of lands granted by the company which embraces a strip of two miles in width on each side and extending up the Red River for the distance of say, 40 miles from the mouth, and also along the Assiniboine in the same way for many miles. This I have hesitated to go on with at the present time, in consequence of much of the land being under crop; going through which would involve more or less injury to individual settlers, a measure which, in the present temper of the half-breeds, is to be deprecated."

Again he says:

"I have again to remark an uneasy feeling which exists in the half-breeds and Indian element, with regard to what they conceive to be the premature action taken by the Government in proceeding to effect a survey of the lands without having first extinguished the Indian title, and I beg permission to reiterate the conviction expressed on a former occasion, that this must be the first question of importance to be dealt with by the Government. I have, of course, taken every opportunity to assure this element as to the intention of the Government to deal honorably and fairly in the matter in question, and shall go on quietly with my work. Should, however, this feeling be likely to result in any opposition of a character likely to prejudice a settlement fraught with importance to the immediate future of this country, I shall at once cease operation and await your future orders."

On the 22nd of the September following, Mr. Macdougall as Minister of Public Works, sent a memorandum to the Council stating:

"Mr. Dennis, after consulting with the Crown Lands Departments, both in Canada and the United States, in accordance with the above instructions, has forwarded certain papers embracing a proposed system of surveys and sub-divisions of public lands in that part of the Dominion."

On the 11th October, 1869, Colonel Dennis sends a memorandum giving the circumstances connected with the active opposition of the French half-breeds in this settlement, to the prosecution of the Government surveys:

"This day, about 2 p. m., a messenger arrived, a former chainbearer of Mr. Webb's party, employed in surveying the base line or parallel of latitude between townships 5, 6 and 7, bringing the unwelcome information from Mr. Webb that his further progress with the survey had been stopped by a band of some 18 French half-breeds, headed by a man named Louis Riel."

I read then another extract:

"He was ordered by the leader of the party at once to desist from further running the line, and in fact notified that he must leave the country on the south side of the Assiniboine, which country the party claimed as the property of the French half-breeds, and which they would not allow to be surveyed by the Canadian Government."

Well, Mr. Dennis goes on to say that he applied to Mr. Cowan, who was a magistrate, for magisterial assistance, and he adds:

"I remarked to Mr. Cowan at the same time, that I questioned whether, owing to the unsettled state of the land tenure as regards the half-breeds and Indians, and the peculiar irritation or sensitiveness that existed on the part of the French half-breeds in view of the transfer of the territory, and the assumption of the Government by Canada, it would be politic to take harsh measures towards the offenders in this case."

On the 12th October, 1869, Governor Macdougall wrote a letter to Mr. Smith, Secretary of the Hudson's Bay Company, from which this is an extract:

"I am also sorry to inform you that some of the people here have stopped one of Colonel Dennis' surveying parties, and as usual, of course, the colonel came to us for redress. The men who have thus interfered say they know the survey could proceed without any injury to anyone; but stopping it is always a beginning, and they are desirous to let the Canadian Government know that it is not wanted by them; that they consider, if the Canadians wish to come here, the terms on which they were to enter should have been arranged with the Local Government here, as it is acknowledged by the people in the country."

Mr. Cowan, on the 15th October, 1869, replied to Colonel Dennis:

"I very much regret to say that we have failed entirely in our endeavors to get over the opposition of the French Manitoba settlers to the survey."

On the 12th February, 1870, Colonel Dennis made a long report upon the whole subject to the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa, from which I read a short extract:

"I should here state that I had previously explained the object of such survey to the people, that the survey was not to disturb boundaries or possession, but to ascertain each man's actual occupation, and make a plan thereof, so that the Government would be in a position, at the earliest possible date, to carry out their intention to confirm Government deeds, and all *bonâ fide* occupants of land.

"The English speaking people appeared to understand and appreciate the necessity for the measure, and the boon it would be to have their titles perfected, and showed every facility to the surveyors employed at the work.

"I gave, strict orders, however, not to survey in that portion of the settlement occupied by the French half-breeds and although I had, as early as the day after my arrival from Canada, on the 21st August, called on the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, at the palace of St. Boniface, on which occasion I saw Père Tissot, Père Allard, and the other priests, and explained the same thing to them, and those gentlemen had also expressed themselves most favorably toward the measure, and promised that they would explain the same to their people, and recommend them not to throw any difficulties in the way of these necessary surveys being effected; still, as the outbreak occurred a few weeks after, and I had every desire to avoid any further possible cause of offence to that party, I gave the orders above, and to my knowledge they were not departed from by either of the gentlemen employed."

That finishes the extracts which I think it material to read, showing the degree of information supplied, and the condition of things upon the question of surveys, from August, 1869, onwards. On the 27th October, 1869, Mr. Dennis communicated to Mr. Macdougall, when outside the Territory, I think in the neighborhood of Pembina, a statement in which he declares:

"The attitude of the English speaking portion of the colony may, I think, be fairly stated as follows:—

"They say, we feel a disposition to extend a sincere welcome to the Hon. Mr. Macdougall, as the gentleman who has been selected for our future Governor.

"We regret sincerely that the good name of the colony should be prejudiced by any such action as we are told is contemplated by a portion of the French half-breeds."

Then another extract:

"We feel this way—we feel confidence in the future administration of the Government of this country under Canadian rule; at the same time, we have not been consulted in any way as a people, in entering into the Dominion.

"The character of the new government has been settled in Canada without our being consulted. We are prepared to accept it respectfully, to obey the laws, and to become good subjects; but when you present to us the issue of a conflict with the French party, with whom we have hitherto lived in friendship, backed up, as they would be, by the Roman Catholic Church, which appears probable by the course at present being taken by the priests, in which conflict it is almost certain the aid of the Indians would be invoked, and perhaps obtained, by that party, we feel disinclined to enter upon it, and think that the Dominion should assume the responsibility of establishing amongst us what it, and it alone, has determined upon,"

Next, Mr. Macdougall wrote to Mr. McTavish, who was the local head of the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Garry, a letter in the month of November, in which he pointed out that he thought the duty of the Government was to proclaim the fact that Canada was now the proprietor and the Government of the country. Governor McTavish, on 9th November, 1869, answered Mr. Macdougall, in a letter, from which I will read two extracts:

"The Act in question referred to the prospective transfer of the Territory, but up to this moment we have no official intimation from England or the Dominion of Canada, of the fact of the transfer, or of its conditions, or of the date at which they were to take practical effect upon the Government of this country. In such a state of matters, we think it is evident that any such act on the part of the Red River authorities as that to which we point, would necessarily have been marked by a great degree of vagueness and uncertainty; it was felt that it might affect injuriously the future, as well as the present Government; and we therefore deemed it advisable to await the receipt of official intelligence of the actual transfer of the country, and of all the details which it concerned us to know."

Again:

"It is unquestionable that the preservation of the public peace is the paramount duty of every Government; but while in ordinary circum-

stance it might be reasonable enough to cast upon us the exclusive responsibility of preserving the public peace, it may perhaps at the same time admit of doubt whether some degree of responsibility did not also rest upon others in a case of so exceptional a character as this,—a case in which not merely a whole country is transferred, but also, in a certain sense, a whole people, or where at least the political condition of the people undergo such a great change; and it may moreover be a question whether, on the part of the Government the preliminary arrangements for introducing that change have proceeded upon such a just and accurate appreciation of the condition of the country and the peculiar feelings and habits of its people, as on such an occasion was desirable, if not absolutely essential; and whether the complications by which we are now surrounded may not, to a great extent be owing to that circumstance."

Negotiations were then entered into by the Government at Ottawa with a view to sending out commissioners to deal with the people of the country, and amongst those was Very Reverend Grand Vicar Thibault, to whom, as a part of his instructions, on December 4th, 1869, the late Secretary of State addressed a letter, from which I will read some extracts:

"That the disturbances which have taken place at and around Winnipeg and Fort Garry have grown out of vague apprehensions of danger, incident to the transition state of things which the action of the Imperial Government and Parliament rendered inevitable, there is no reason to doubt; but it is quite apparent that, underlying what is natural and pardonable in this movement, there have been agencies at work which loyal subjects cannot countenance, and that artful attempts have been made to mislead the people by the most flagrant and absurd misrepresentations. Had the Queen's Government or the Government of the Dominion imitated the rash and reckless conduct of some of those who have taken part in this disturbance, there would ere this have been bloodshed and civil war in Rupert's land with the prospect of the flame spreading along the frontier as the fire spreads over the prairie. Fortunately calmer counsels have prevailed both in England and at Ottawa. The proclamation of the Queen's representative, with copies of which you will be furnished in French and English, will convey to her people the solemn words of their Sovereign, who, possessed of ample power to enforce her authority, yet confides in their loyalty and affectionate attachment to her throne."

Another extract:

"All the Provinces of the British Empire which now enjoy representative institutions and responsible government have passed through a probationary period, till the growth of population and some political training prepared them for self government. In the United States the territories are ruled from Washington till the time arrives when they can prove their fitness to be included in the family of state and, in the halls of congress, challenge the full measure of power and free development which American citizenship includes. It is fair to assume that some such training as human society requires in all free countries may be useful, if not indispensible, at Red River; but of this you may be assured, that the Governor General and his council will gladly welcome the period when the Queen can confer, with their entire approbation, the largest measure of self government on her subjects in that region, compatible with the preservation of British interests on this continent and the integrity of the Empire."

A proclamation dated December 6th, 1869, referred to in the dispatch from which I have read some extracts, contains these words:

"Her Majesty commands me to state to you that she will be always ready through me as her representative to redress all well founded grievances, and that she has instructed me to hear and consider any complaints that may be made, or desires that may be expressed to me as Governor General. At the same time she has charged me to exercise all the powers and authority with which she has entrusted me in the support of order and the suppression of unlawful disturbances."

Then again:

"And I do lastly inform you, that in case of your immediate and peaceable obedience and dispersion, I shall order that no legal proceedings be taken against any parties implicated in these unfortunate breaches of the law."

On the day following, namely, December 7th, 1869, the Secretary of State wrote to Mr. Macdougall a letter, from which I take two extracts:

"You will now be in a position in your communications with the residents of the North-West to assure them (1) that all their civil and religious liberties and privileges will be sacredly respected; (2) That all their properties, rights and equities of every kind, as enjoyed under the government of the Hudson's Bay Company, will be continued to them; (3) That in granting titles to land now occupied by the settlers, the most liberal policy will be pursued."

Again:

"(8) That the present Government is to be considered as merely provisional and temporary, and that the Government of Canada will be prepared to submit a measure to Parliament, granting a liberal constitution as soon as you, as Governor, and your Council have had an opportunity of reporting fully on the wants and requirements of the territory."

A question arose at this time as to whether the Imperial Government should pay over to the Hudson's Bay Company the purchase money which had been placed at their disposition to be paid over upon the transfer by the Canadian Parliament, the sum of £300,000 sterling; and in considering that question and in response to the letter of the home authorities upon the subject, and a committee of the Privy Council on December 16th, 1869, made a report which was approved and transmitted to the Colonial Secretary, and which is signed by the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald). From it I will read some extracts:

"That there would be an armed resistance by the inhabitants to the transfer was, it is to be presumed, unexpected by all parties; it certainly was so by the Dominion Government. In this regard the company cannot be acquitted of all blame. They had an old and fully organised government in the country, to which the people appeared to render ready obedience. Their Governor was advised by the Council, in which some of the leading residents had seats. They had every means of information as to the state of feeling existing in the country. They knew, or ought to have known, the light in which the proposed negotiations were viewed by the people under their rule. If they were aware of the feeling of discontent, they ought frankly to have stated it to the Imperial and Canadian Governments. If they were ignorant of the discontent, the responsibility of such wilful blindness on the part of their officers must rest upon them. For more than a year these negotiations have been actively proceeded with, and it was the duty of the company to have prepared the people under its rule for the change—to have explained the precautions taken to protect the interest of the inhabitants, and thus have removed any misapprehensions that may have existed amongst them. It appears that no steps of any kind in that direction were taken. The people have been led to suppose that they have been sold to Canada with an utter disregard of their rights and position. When Governor McTavish visited Canada in June last he was in communication with the Canadian Government, and he never intimated that he had even a suspicion of discontent existing, nor did he make any suggestions as to the best mode of effecting the proposed change with the assent of the inhabitants."

Again:

"Any hasty attempt by the Canadian Government to force their rule upon the insurgents would probably result in armed resistance and bloodshed. Every other course should be tried before resort is had to force. If life were once lost in an encounter between a Canadian force and the inhabitants, the seeds of hostility to Canada and Canadian rule would be sown, and might create an ineradicable hatred to the union of the countries, and thus mar the future prosperity of British America. If anything like hostility should commence, the temptation to the wild Indian tribes and to the restless adventurers who abound in the United States (many of them with military experience gained in the late civil war) to join the insurgents would be almost irresistible. Already it is said that the Fenian organisations look upon this rising as another means of exhibiting their hatred to England. No one can foresee the end of the complications that might thus be occasioned, not only as between Canada and the North-West, but between the United States and England. From a sincere conviction of the gravity of the situation and not from any desire to repudiate or postpone the performance of any of their engagements, the Canadian Government have urged a temporary delay of the transfer. This is not a question of money—it may be one of civil war. It is one in which the present and future prosperity of the British possessions in North America is involved, which prosperity hasty action might permanently prejudice."

Again:

"The Committee would also request your Excellency to assure Lord Granville that the Government have taken and are taking active measures to bring about a happier state of affairs.

"They have sent on a mission of peace to the French half-breeds now in arms, the Very Reverend Mr. Thibault, Vicar General (who has labored among them as a clergyman for thirty-nine years), accompanied by Colonel De Salaberry, a gentleman well acquainted with the country and with the manners and feeling of the inhabitants. These gentlemen are fully informed of the beneficent intentions of the Canadian Government, and can disabuse the minds of the people of the misrepresentations made by designing foreigners."

"(Signed) JOHN A. MACDONALD."

On the 17th of December the Government at Ottawa issued a commission to the Hon. Donald A. Smith, who was well known to and familiar with the country and its people, in his capacity as a resident of many years, and as occupying a responsible position in the Hudson's Bay Company. In that commission it was said:

"And whereas it is expedient that enquiry should be had into the causes and extent of such obstruction, opposition and discontentment aforesaid, * * * and also to enquire into the causes and discontent and dissatisfaction alleged to exist in respect to the proposed union of the said North-West Territories with the Dominion of Canada; and further to explain to the inhabitants of the said country the principle on which the Government of Canada intends to administer the government of the country, according to such instructions as may be given to you by our Governor in Council in this behalf; and to take steps to remove any misapprehension which may exist in respect to the mode of government of the same, and to report to our Governor General the result of such enquiries, and on the best mode of quieting and removing such discontent and dissatisfaction; and also to report on the most proper and fitting mode for effecting the speedy transfer of the government and the country from the authority of the Hudson's Bay Company to the Government of Canada, with the assent of the inhabitants."

We passed the Manitoba Act during that Session, and that Act declares in its 31st clause:

"And whereas it is expedient towards the extinguishment of the Indian titles to the land in the Province, to appropriate a portion of such ungranted lands to the extent of 1,400,000 acres thereof, for the benefit of the families of the half-breed residents, it is hereby enacted that, under regulations to be from time to time made by the Governor General in Council, the Lieutenant Governor shall select such lots or tracts in such parts of the Province as he may deem expedient, to the extent aforesaid, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the said transfer to Canada, and the same shall be granted to the said children respectively, in such mode and on such conditions as to settlement and otherwise as the Governor General in Council may from time to time determine."

The 32nd section dealt with the settlers' titles. The Hudson Bay freehold grants were turned into freehold grants from the Crown; the Hudson Bay grants, less than freehold, were turned into freehold grants from the Crown; titles by occupancy with license of Hudson's Bay Company, when the Indian titles were extinguished, were turned into freehold grants from the Crown; those who were in peaceable possession of lands, in which the Indian title was not extinguished, were declared to have a preemptive right, at a price to be fixed by the Governor in Council; and the hay and common rights were to be recognised, and it was declared that they should be commuted by grants in fee simple. With the view of carrying out the arrangements of the Manitoba Act as to half-breed grants, on the 29th of July, 1870, the late Sir George E. Cartier recommended to Council the appointment of Lieutenant Governor Archibald as administrator of Manitoba Crown lands:

"And that he be required to report when called upon, on the regulations to be made under the Manitoba Act for the selection and division of the grant among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in Manitoba at the time of the transfer to Canada, together with the mode and conditions as to settlement and otherwise which he may consider desirable to embody in such regulations."

There was an Order in Council made on the 2nd of August, 1870, based on that recommendation, and on the 4th of August the Secretary of State, pursuant to that order, wrote to Lieutenant Governor Archibald, communicating the Order and saying:

"I have to request that you will have the goodness at your earliest convenience to report the regulations, etc., etc., in terms of the above Order in Council."

Details were required, in order to the Lieutenant Governor's carrying out this provision, and on the 4th of August, 1870, a letter from the Secretary of State was sent to Lieutenant Governor Archibald, conveying him his instructions, also the 9th paragraph being as follows:—

"In order to enable you to select, under the provisions of the 31st section of the Act, and under the regulations to be, from time to time, made by the Governor General in Council, such lots or tracts from among the ungranted lands in such parts of the Province of Manitoba as you may deem expedient, to the extent mentioned in the said section, and divide the same among the children of the half-breed heads of families residing in the Province at the time of the transfer of the same to Canada—you will cause an enumeration to be made of the half-breed heads of families residing in the said Province at the time of such transfer, and of their children respectively."

On the 1st of October, 1870, the Lieutenant Governor, pursuant to those instructions, divided the Province for enumeration purposes, and appointed the enumerators; and in the same month issued the instructions and forms to the enumerators. Those instructions included the direction to count anyone whose dwelling-house or place of residence was within the Province at the time of the transfer, though, at the time he might have been, or may now be temporarily absent, and the enumeration so far was proceeded with at a comparatively early date, although, of course, it turned out afterwards to be defective, by reason of certain persons not having been in the Province at the time, and evidence not having been brought forward by them at the time of the general enumeration. In the following Session there was brought down also a letter from Hon. Donald A. Smith, in the capacity of chief officer, I presume, of the Hudson's Bay Company, addressed to the Lieutenant Governor, as to the District of Saskatchewan. The letter was written at Fort Garry, and dated 9th September, 1870. In that letter he says:

"For several years past outrages have been of frequent occurrence there, with which the authorities have been powerless effectually to deal; and such are at present the latent elements of disorder that it is impossible to predict how long a general outburst may be delayed, similar possibly in many respects to that of recent occurrence in this place."

And he cites a number of instances. First, a murder on Christmas, 1866; second, liquor riots and orgies; third, encounters between Assiniboines, Crees and Blackfeet, annually becoming more perplexing to the Hudson's Bay Company's people; fourth, the existence of a settlement of French half-breeds at a place named St. Albert, a collision between the inhabitants of which and the Indians had already occurred, while a repetition of such events was much to be dreaded; fifth, the Hudson's Bay Company's people were not likely to be able to live long at peace with the Indians, and he mentions that in 1867, Fort Pitt was forcibly entered by 200 Blackfeet, who pillaged the fort and afterwards the trains of supplies of the fort hunters; sixth, shortly after a Blackfoot severely wounded a clerk at Carlton by a gun shot; seventh, in the spring of 1870 an encounter took place between the Blackfeet and the Crees involving serious danger to the Company's Factor Christie at Edmonton; eighth, in the spring of 1870 W. E. Traill, a clerk at Fort Pitt was savagely assaulted by a half-breed servant, and hit on the head with a hatchet; ninth, advances are a necessary of life to the half-breeds, whose improvidence obliges them to live during the winter on the prospective summer's profits; and the refusal to make these advances would expose the company's stores to certain pillage; tenth, a generally mutinous conduct throughout the settlement. He adds:

"The miners, the missionaries and others who have founded isolated settlements on the Saskatchewan live in the midst of personal dangers far more serious than those which menace the lives of the Company's servants at their posts."

And he requests a force of fifty men at once at Edmonton and a like force next spring at Carlton to meet the pressing difficulties of the case. Now, Sir, these papers, as I have said, sufficiently indicate the character of the information which the Government thought it its duty to bring down, and which was supplied to Parliament at that time; and thus, as I have indicated rather than related, in the end, after the spilling of some blood, though a drop only in comparison with that which has been lately shed; after the expenditure of much treasure, though a trifle only in comparison with that of which we have now to face the expenditure; after the running of great risks; after the creation of much ill-feeling; a small Province—because we must remember what was then done was to create only the original Province of Manitoba—was hastily formed, and a solution of the pressing difficulties was found, though the consequences of the errors then committed have extended far beyond the time of that solution. We bought, Sir, a very dear experience, and with that experience we began our course of governing the great territory of the North-West

Since that time 15 years have elapsed, and we must ask ourselves, how we have used the experience that was acquired, how we have fulfilled our mission, how we have exercised our power; and those questions are to be answered soon. I state them only to-day; I do not propose to attempt to answer them to-day, because my contention is that it is the Government's duty to furnish us authentic means for answering. I state them to-day; but even their statement requires some exposition. As I have said, the actual terms of settlement embraced only the area of a small Province; but beyond that small Province there were vast regions, dotted over here and there with Indian tribes, and here and there, though in very few quarters, with small settlements, if one can call them so, of half-breeds or whites, with a mission, or a Hudson Bay post. As the great settlement of the North-West Territories in the east was on the Red and the Assiniboine rivers, so the great settlement, if you may call it so, in the western part of those Territories was on the mighty Saskatchewan river, and for the same cause. At several points on the Saskatchewan there were very early settlements. The land was very fertile, the river was the great artery of the internal trade of the country, limited though that trade was; and it was also for the people, during a large portion of the year, a chief means of communication. Many years before 1870 the churches had occupied the field. The Church of England, the Roman Catholic church, and other churches, had established missions, some in the very neighborhood of the focus of the present disturbance, and there had been pioneers—some of mixed blood, but very few—there for many years. The settlement was then composed—besides Hudson Bay officials, where they had posts, besides the missionaries—of half-breeds—French, Scotch and English, whom you might call settlers, but who were largely freighters and hunters, and some of whom also farmed a little—and of some old Hudson Bay employés, and other pioneers from Ontario, Quebec and elsewhere. To that settlement had naturally extended under its circumstances the same system of occupying the river fronts which had obtained in the Province of Manitoba. It had not originated there; for Canadian purposes, at any rate, we may say, it had originated in the Province of Quebec, where that system obtained from the very early settlement of the country, and probably for obvious reasons—for the reason that protection from Indian attacks, society and good neighborhood, the facility of communication by the great river which was the chief means of communication, the facility of obtaining what they wanted and going where they wanted, were largely served, by the people living tolerably close together on the edge of the stream; and so you found a system of narrow frontages on the river, and the farms extending a long way back. Both from habit and custom, as well as from reason, those plans of action were adopted in the North-West; and there may be found another reason, for this system gave the advantage of river flats, with meadow lands belonging to them, and a variety to the farm which would be important to the comfort and prosperity of the settlers. Now, the solution which was reached for the Province of Manitoba itself, on any points in which the condition of things was similar in substance would, in equity and in the natural expectations of the people, apply to the territories beyond. If there were just the same class of persons similarly circumstanced as to race, as to claim, as to situation, and as to occupancy, outside of the bounds of Manitoba, as those within that Province, it was not unnatural to say that they should expect similar treatment; and it was not unnatural to suppose that what was just for the one would be just for the other. Under these circumstances, with reference to the extinguishment of the Indian title of the half-breeds, with reference to the rights of occupancy and settlement, with reference to the river front question, and with reference to the question of surveys—upon the jealousy and suspicion attending which I have already indicated the strong view of that class of the population in the early days—on all these questions, I say, we had had experience which should have been profitable to us, and we had established precedents which were calculated at once to raise expectations and to furnish a method of settling difficulties. Of this vast territory to which I have referred, we have for 15 years now had the control; there is no Hudson Bay Company government to blame now; we must bear our own burden, and the control we have had has been that of a paternal or autocratic Government working from Ottawa, and no doubt with large, I may almost say with unlimited powers; for whatever powers it felt in want of, it asked from this Parliament, and whatever powers it asked from this Parliament, this Parliament unflinchingly, and at once, granted to it. This being so, Sir, having so entered into possession and control, and having for 15 years so ruled that country, how stands the case to-day? What has been and what is the condition of affairs? We know how the case has stood since the middle of the month of March. We know that the condition which I suggested hypothetically awhile ago has been the actual state of things; we know that the public peace has been broken, that the public order has been violated, that the public authority has been defied, and that insurrection has raised its head in that country. We know that 5,000 Canadians have been put in battle array by the Government, with the willing support of the Parliament and the people of the country; we know that bloody engagements have been fought; we know that the lives of some of the best and bravest of our sons have been lost; we know that many of those best and bravest have been wounded; we know that some have died, and that many more, in the natural course of events, will suffer permanently from the hardships incidental to war, those hardships which are its chief scourge, which furnish the chief loss in war, a loss far greater than that which is to be traced on the field of battle. We know that those hardships and those difficulties and those infirmities, so produced, have been borne uncomplainingly; and we must remember that though they do not give the honor of a wound, they strike as severely and as hard as any wound can strike. We know that the families and the friends of these volunteers have suffered, not only in feeling but in comfort; we know that the pittance they are paid in many cases does not support them, and that the public of various localities has been obliged to come forward in order to keep the wolf of hunger from the door of the wives and children of those who are fighting our battles in the North-West. Now, Sir, in the course of these transactions, our troops have done nobly. It is not, perhaps, now the time, we have not now the opportunity, the information, to enable us, if we were capable of doing so, to criticise the military conduct of the campaign; but we have quite sufficient information, from the unvarying testimony which reaches us from even quarter, to say so much. We know that in endurance, in the character and rapidity of their marches, in pluck, in dash, in steady courage, in military aptitude, those whom we have sent into the field have surpassed even our glowing expectations, and as they are the flower, from a military point of view, of the Canadian people, they are a flower of which, though it be tinged with a bloody hue we may not like, we have a right to be proud. And let us be just to their foes. They, too, wrong, deeply wrong, in what they did, misled, misguided, unhappy men—they, too, fought with skill, with bravery, and with determination. It would be doing less than justice to our own forces to say less than that, because the character of their deeds depends largely upon the determination, and the force, and the skill, and the power of those with whom they had to contend. They fought desperately, and they, too, have bled and

died in numbers. This is not all. Besides horrid war, there has been more horrid murder. The savage Indian has donned his war paint and opened up his career of slaughter, of rape and pillage; and age, nor sex, nor sacred office, nor faithful friendship has availed to prevent the outrages which he calls war. Horrors have occurred which make the blood run cold, and which the tongue almost refuses to portray; and against these, too, our people, both those who were called by their avocation to resist and those who stood forward at the moment as volunteers, have done nobly. The casualties in these combats, considering the number engaged, have been very great. The deaths, from wounds in battle or from assassination, seem, by the accounts I have seen in the papers, to be on the side of the loyal forces and the people, 66 or more, and the wounded on the same side number 119; and the deaths on the side of the insurgents, at and near Batouche, are said to be 68 or more, and the wounded to be 191, and other deaths there were on that side earlier. Besides this, it is stated that 105 Indians graves were counted after the attack upon the camp of Poundmaker. We have no information as to the numbers wounded on that side upon that occasion. Assuming that a proportion much less than the usual proportion of deaths to wounds occurred there, it seems the lamentable probability that there have on the whole been about 250 deaths and 400 wounded, representing, so far, this phase of the transactions in the North-West during the last two months. I have said that the casualties on the part of the loyal forces are extraordinary in proportion to the numbers. They exceed those recorded of some great historic combats. Instances will occur to every one, but one case came under my notice within a day or two with which I had not been before familiar; I refer to the great battle of Isly which was fought in Algiers, about forty years ago by Marshal Bugeaud, against the forces of the Moors, against the Empire of Morocco. The French troops in that fight, numbered 6,500 foot and 1,500 horse, while the Moors mustered about 50,000 horse and a small body of foot. An obstinate combat took place which lasted several hours. Repeated attacks were made upon the small bodies, sometimes more or less detached, of the French forces. The French forces ultimately obtained a decisive victory, remaining on the enemy's ground with a loss in all of 27 killed and 96 wounded, losses which compare most favorably with those which have occurred on the side of the troops of the people of Canada, who have been fighting the battle of Canada in the North-West. I have said that we rejoice over our soldiers' valor; it is perhaps the one fruit and gain from all this loss and woe. But still while we rejoice, we rejoice, I, at any rate, rejoice with chastened and sober feelings, when I reflect that these are conflicts fought on Canadian soil, that they are conflicts fought between Canadian citizens and subjects, in part with our fellow citizens, in part with our Indian wards, and that the blood shed on both sides is the blood of the commonwealth of Canada. Surely, in the state of circumstances I have depicted, there can be no question more urgent, no question more important than that which I have suggested as the duty of the Government to state and the duty of this House to consider and resolve, how can these things be in Canada? How can these things be in free, self-governing, peaceful, law-abiding Canada? But great as were the perils and toils of the soldier, and deep as is the sympathy of the people which flows out to him, and to those dear to him; yet his fate is in the line he has chosen, in the path allotted and undertaken duty. But the perils and the hardships have not been confined to the soldier; far from it. The perils and the hardships have extended far beyond; they have extended to the peaceful settler who has gone forth with wife and children to make a home in the wilderness, to the pioneer who undertook long and wearisome journeys, who encountered isolation and privation, but who looked for safety and security in every corner of our country. He too and those near to him have suffered; he, too, and those near to him, so far as our information goes, have done well in the great emergencies to which they were exposed. The lives of some have been lost, and, generally, over a wide area, terror, desolation, destruction, privation have prevailed, and of course, over a very much wider area still, anxiety and suspense. Smiling homes have been destroyed, and the labor of years has been swept away in a week, and over a vast district, all the vaster because of the vagueness of information in that country, the ominous cloud of an Indian war has spread. Now let me read you from a local paper, the *Battleford Herald* of the 23rd of April, the account which it gives of the condition of things in its immediate locality:

"One short month ago, the fairest field in Canada was the Saskatchewan country; to-day it is the most desolate. And brightest and most prosperous in all her settlements was the Battle River Valley, whose sons hailed the opening of spring with joy and thankfulness, rejoicing in the prospects of the coming year, impatient to begin the labors that were to bring them their reward. But in one brief day their hopes were blasted; instead of being the masters of peaceful and happy homes, they were at one blow bereft of everything but manhood; reduced from a condition of plenty to one of absolute penury, houseless, homeless and penniless. Blood stains the soil, and the air is thick with the smoke of desolation. Nearly a score of our citizens have been slain without a moment's warning, by ingrates whose interests they guarded as carefully as they did their own, and whose hands were daily open in charity to the men they looked upon as unfortunate and to be pitied. In the town itself, or that part of it lying south of Battle River, there is only enough left to remind the sufferers of their once comfortable homes, and to recall the fact that many things of peculiar value are irretrievably lost and can never be replaced. Their crime was that they were whites; the penalty imposed was death. Of all the fair farms that covered the land, but few remain. Some of these lie under the guns of the fort, while others are held by men in alliance with the Indians; for on no other ground can their owners hope for exemption from the universal ruin. With the exception of these, there is not a home that has not been raided, scarcely a house that has not been burned. It has always been the boast of this district that, taking their numbers all through, their horses and cattle were better bred than in any other district on the Saskatchewan; the people were generally well-off, and made improved stock a specialty in their system of farming; but to-day they are not owners of a hoof. They are afoot and the marauders mounted; their dairies are bare, while their herds are being ruthlessly slaughtered by the thieves. The work of extermination has begun, evidently without a thought for the morrow."

Nor, while that is the condition of things with reference to the settler in the disturbed districts, or those districts which have been the centres of disturbance in three or four points in the North-West, are we to suppose that those who have risen against their countrymen had not, many of them too, a stake to lose, or sufferings for wife and children, hearth and home, to endure. Let us be just again. Let me read you the correspondence of the *Mail* newspaper of last month in regard to a scouting party after the battle of Fish Creek. The correspondent says:

"General Middleton, with Lord Melgund, Boulton's cavalry and Captain French's scouts, left at 9 o'clock sharp to-day, on a reconnoitering expedition down the river. The force was about 80 strong, all mounted. There are two trails down the east bank of the Saskatchewan, one a mile or so distant from the river, which runs through a succession of bluffs and openings; the other nearer the River bank, which, until Gabriel's Crossing is reached, is almost entirely through open plains. We went down the first mentioned trail, returning by the other. The land is of excellent quality, dotted here and there with well built log houses of Metis, near which, in every instance, is land broken and almost ready for the seed it will not receive this spring, averaging from two to twenty or thirty of forty acres. These homes, however, were lonely and deserted, and with what haste their occupants fled, the disordered state of the contents only too plainly told. In nearly all, only such household goods as could not be easily carried off were left. One house almost represented all. A stove, table, chairs, in some even these latter were taken, a bedstead, a mattress, but no blankets. In some, those nearer the scene of that fatal Friday's fight, only a few articles were missing. In one place, the table utensils were neatly left in the cupboard. In another, seed wheat half filled the one room, which usually is the sleeping, dining and parlor of the household. A cat, mewing plaintively, had been left behind in another when the family fled in their haste. At several, hens and their broods of chickens were found, some of the houses were locked, others left with their doors wide open, some people tarried to board up the windows, others to crossbar them as a gaol-window is barred. A few had neatly packed in boxes what they could not take with them, but nearly all showed evidence of a very hurried removal. From each house came the trails of the carts or

waggons in which the hegira had been made. All was still, lonely, deserted, but on every hand were to be seen signs of thrift and industry, and even of prosperity. There was an air of comfort and solidity about these places which compared more than favorably with the homes of their compatriots, or even of the average white settler, of Manitoba. Each place was snugly, warmly built; each farm had its byre, each its storehouse, while some had separate, mud-covered, tent-shaped ovens. Two or three had been enlarging the size of their houses, others had not wasted the winter, as the huge piles of fence-rails and sharpened pickets testified. To sum up their condition, I need only use the involuntary expression of one of the cavalry as we ride along: 'What fools these people must be to leave such homes.' Of course, there was no elegant ease, but there was better: a good plain living without extraordinary exertion. We had not gone many miles when a lot of feathers, the contents of a home-made bed, were found; and near at hand the interior of a moss-bag, that useful contrivance in which the rising generation of the North-West spends its earlier days. Both had been torn to pieces to make bandages for those wounded in the Fish Creek affair. At noon, we reached Gabriel Dumont's Crossing, although he does not run it now, having sold out to a native Manitoban named Vandal, but it still retains his name. About a mile this side of the place, the scouts reported that five half-breeds had hastily left a house and, mounted on their fleet ponies, galloped away Batoche-ward. By the time the scattered little column was collected, the fleeing Metis were disappearing from view. They apparently had seen our slow approach before we noticed their hasty departure. The vacated house was visited, and we found that we had been ungentlemanly enough to disturb their mid-day meal. A fire was burning briskly in the stove, on which the kettle steamed. Some meat, which was at first thought to be horse-flesh, was being cooked; and on the table was a newly baked bannock. Outside the door were discarded strips of old linen clotted with blood, bandages to wrap the wounds of those engaged in the recent fight."

Then again:

"At the crossing there are several buildings, a double one being used as the residence of the 'boss.' The facings of the windows and doors are painted a bright blue, the only attempt at ornamentation we have yet come across. On the left is an open storehouse, and immediately in front on the main entrance is a goodly sized store. In this latter, much to our surprise, is a billiard table, with cues, chalk, pool balls, and all the paraphernalia for rolling the ivories. Dumont's residence was also entered. It was plainly, but for this country nicely furnished. As in nearly all the other domiciles, a sewing machine occupied one corner, and the walls were decorated with cheap colored prints, amongst others vignettes of the Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise. In another house nearer the ferry were found some letters addressed to Gabriel Dumont, one being from Judith Bosin, Montana. There was also one from the Dominion Lands Office, Prince Albert, in reference to patents, and another from a Saskatchewan firm threatening to sue Gabriel if he did not at once pay a long overdue account. So this self sacrificing patriot is no better off than the rest of us, and even in his lonely life on the plains is as much subjected to duns as is the average Winnipeger."

Then again:

"The reconnoissance corroborated the previous impression we had formed that the rebels were overwhelmingly defeated at Fish Creek, and fled in utter demoralisation. All along the route there must have been hurried flitting, and removal of women and children to safer quarters.

"The warriors took care of their own safety. Whether they have gone to Batoche's or not, cannot, of course, be ascertained, but appearances indicate that they have, and that there they will give us battle if at all. In the meantime, as one passes through this desolate but fertile land, and sees the happy homes deserted, the fields untouched, the byres empty, he cannot escape experiencing a feeling of pain that these misguided Metis have taken the suicidal course that they have; of sorrow that so many circles should be rudely broken up; of regret that such well cultivated farms should lie idle and unproductive; of sympathising pity that these unfortunate men should be plunged into deep misery and poverty for the next year or two."

Now, Sir, all over the country, in the regions of the disturbance with the Indians, property has been taken; and if you look at the amount of property taken and destroyed, and count in the year's labor almost lost by these settlers by the want of opportunity to seed, you have a vast amount of present and of potential loss in this regard. Confidence, also, has been shaken. The charm of peace, the habit of submission on the part of the Indian has ended, and our relation to him now from this time forth assumes a new and more difficult phase. While the half-breed rising, as an organised rising is over, the Indian war is not yet over. How long it may last, we cannot state, and it may turn out in the end that hunger, cold, and the want of ammunition may prove our best allies. With us ourselves, as to some parts of the North-West, and still more with those abroad who do not know our magnificent distances, and who cannot realise the fact that there are vast unsettled areas in that country fit for cultivation and so far removed from the scenes of disturbances as to render it utterly impossible that they can be affected—I say with those abroad to whom we may be looking for settlement, and who find it difficult, in view of the smaller ranges of distance by which their vision has been bounded in the past, to realise that fact, our prospects for immigration have been impaired, a blow to immigration has been given which may have effects enduring for a considerable time, and may require us, to some extent, to revise our plans for securing the rapid development of the North-West. The North-West has thus been thrown back at a time most critical for that country, for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and for Canada at large. Millions of the public treasury have been expended or engaged, and as yet we are not in a position to criticise that expenditure. Millions more, in the nature of increased annual charge, are to be demanded for the North-West, and to repair in part so far as it is reparable, the damage done. And thus at the very moment when we are called on to abandon our golden dreams of early and large returns from Custom duties and from land sales, we find increased charge the order of the day, so that both sides of the national balance sheet will at the same instant be adversely affected. That is not all, Sir. Canada's good name among the nations, has suffered. The Government has boasted that we knew best of all how to deal with the settler; that we gave him superior advantages, and gave him great consideration, and had produced in him a feeling of content and satisfaction. The Government has boasted that we knew best of all people how to manage the Indian, and by justice, liberality, firmness, and wisdom, at once to satisfy, improve, tame and develop him. The Government has boasted that we treated the early explorer, the pioneer, the man of mixed blood, wisely, liberally, prudently and paternally; that he had no ground for discontent; that he, too, was happy. The Government has proclaimed that in the great North-West there were no grievances—nothing but peace and prosperity, and what you would see all through that wide extended country, was that "content basking on the cheek of toil." Several Ministers and several high officers of the Government, made their progresses through that country a few months ago. All well! was the cry of these sentinels of Canada in the discharge of their duty there. The Minister of Public Works went up at the desire of his chief, the leader of the Government, to spy out the grievances, if even his microscopic eye could discover that any grievances were there. He called for the grievances, he sought for the grievances, he almost implored the grievances; and he summed up the results of those his arduous labors in a speech in which he said that he had met two men who were discontented, and, if I rightly remember, the ground of discontent which he gave was that there were not enough ladies in the North-West. Some of us thank God that there are no more there now. All well! said the Minister. Now, what is the contrast to those smooth speeches? What is the contrast to those flattering tales? I ask you, Sir, I ask the House, I ask the country, whether the contrast I showed you a moment ago, does not demand an early explanation. The task of the Government, Sir, was one of special responsibility, commensurate with the vast power which they had claimed and obtained. It has been well remarked by a publicist of considerable reputation, that while the parliamentary system is the best for those who are represented, it is the worst for those who are not represented. That is a truth which, it cannot be denied, added largely to the responsibility of the Government, because for a country having as its rule representative and parliamentary institutions, to attempt to govern a part of its home domain on paternal and autocratic principles, necessarily added to the charge and the responsibilities of those who undertook that task. And still more care is required

when it is the case that free institutions exist all around—in the neighboring Province, in the country which governs, in the neighboring States, in the continent at large—in this continent, which, indeed, seems hardly to tolerate any other form of rule. Still more, Sir, is that responsibility increased when you are attempting so to govern men who, besides finding the air of freedom blowing all around them with the vast sweep and force of the wide continent itself, have been accustomed, in their earlier lives, in the Provinces from which they came themselves, to drink full draughts of that vital air. And if you turn even to the pioneer and to the half-breed, the need for care and the consequent responsibility of the Government is not relaxed, because they, too, had lived under an easy rein, they had the power, if not the form, of freedom, they had order almost without law, and but little sense of governmental interference. They were a little like the hunter of the border Western States who came one day to his cabin and said to his wife: "Mary, we must move out; we are getting crowded." "Why," said she, "how is that?" "Yes, we are getting crowded; I heard the crack of a rifle to-day." And such is the intolerance of the crowded haunts of men and of nations, of what are deemed happiness and comfort in what we call civilised society, that those men living as they did on the vast plains had a peculiar freedom which we cannot well appreciate. Still further do we see the need for care in this special case when we remember that, disquieted by the events of 1869-70, and not all recognising the new order of things, many of these men receded before the eastern wave of civilisation and immigration, and departed to the plains to enjoy still the rude freedom to which they had been accustomed. But there was yet another element which added still further to the responsibility of the Administration—the Indian question. The question of the Indian, the aboriginal inhabitant, the untamed savage, resentful of his lost sovereignty, of his appropriated lands, of his vanished subsistence, of his shackled liberties, of the constraints imposed upon him, of the dependence to which he is reduced—whose loyalty in the nature of things must be largely due to policy or fear; whose war is murder, whose tender mercies are cruel; the Indian unaccustomed to labor and not yet resigned to starve—to manage him demands care and vigilance, indeed, and adds to the responsibility of those who undertake the task. When to all this you add a policy of settlement widely extended, sparse, isolated, defenceless, bringing the Indian and the settler at once into close contact at many points, of course, the responsibility is still further increased. There is yet another element which added to the responsibilities of Ministers, and it was that the work of government was to be performed from a very great distance. It was to be performed from this point, by letters, by agents, by officers, and by clerks. And they had therefore, knowing what is likely to happen under such circumstances, to take precautions against, and by their own vigilance and energy to overcome, the evils of officialism, of red tape, of carelessness, of procrastination, of favoritism and of fraud, which all are apt to encrust a departmental and routine system. I say, then, that these conditions required, aye imperatively demanded, from the Government a high degree of energy, of vigilance, of tact, of promptness in arriving at decisions and reaching conclusions, and seeing that these were acted upon with respect to the North-West Territories. However, the Government had some advantages, and considerable advantages. They had, as I have said, the dearly bought experience of 1869. They had learned from that something of the feelings of the people, something of the jealousies existing among them, something of their suspicions, something of their customs. They had the advantage of the settlement made in 1870 for the Province of Manitoba and its application to the North-West Territories. They had all the money they chose to ask, and all the officers they chose to name, and they had plenty of time, years upon years of time, before the questions, even after they were raised, assumed the form of extreme urgency. They had also the advantage of utilising the link between the white men and the Indians—the half-breed. I know that in some cases there has been some jealousy between the half-breeds and the Indians, but those most experienced in the relations, the more recent relations of the half-breeds and the Indians in the North-West, have, from their places in this House, not infrequently stated that such is not the rule. I recollect the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), more than once stating in the strongest manner that there was an assistance which was of the utmost consequence, and of which he deeply regretted the Government did not sufficiently avail themselves, namely, the half-breeds in relation to the Government and in relation to the Indians through the Government; and I recollect his being answered by the First Minister assentingly; and of late years the course has been to some extent adopted by the Government of appointing half-breeds to such positions. I say they had that advantage. They had also the advantage of the missionaries with both; and I believe if there was one thing more than another which has helped us to keep the peace with the Indians and the half-breeds for so long a time, it is the good effect of the missions throughout the North-West from very early years. Those were great advantages they had. As I have said, they had time also; for at Prince Albert, the neighborhood of which was the focus of these disturbances, settlement increased at first but slowly. The incoming tide rose but gradually for some years after the transfer, and nothing was done early with the old settlers. However, in 1878, if I remember rightly, a special survey of a portion of the Prince Albert settlement was made. Meantime many of the half-breeds had moved from Manitoba to various points in the North-West Territory, and some to the neighborhood of Prince Albert. Meantime, also there had been the survey and location of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the Yellow Head Pass, and that had stimulated for a season the immigration to the banks of the Saskatchewan. Many people came in hoping to be along the line of the projected railway, and the tide of immigration rose for a season. All that was changed in later years, and the change, of course, caused disappointment and difficulty. But a large number in the meantime had come in, had come many hundreds of miles in waggons, had come in to be the first, and as they hoped, to live in the most progressive part of the country in consequence of the great fertility of the lands and the great advantage it had in many ways if it was to be considered as a railway centre as well. Difficulties, as I have said, arose during those years. Many questions were raised which one after another, and many of them together, came forward for solution, and those are the questions upon which it seems to me the Government is bound, as I have repeatedly stated this Session, to give to, and the House is bound to insist on receiving the fullest information as to what was represented, what was said, what was done during those years in regard to those questions, so that we may judge how it is, to whom it is due that those unhappy results which I have depicted have at length arisen. There came many questions. The claims of the half-breeds of the territories to scrip for lands, and thus to be placed in the same position as those of Manitoba in regard to the Indian title. The claims of the Manitoba half-breeds, who were omitted from the old enumeration and not provided for out of the 1,400,000 acres granted, of whom many moved to the North-West Territories and have been residing there off and on, some of them altogether and some temporarily since. The half-breed question of surveys on river fronts. I admit that is not exclusively a half-breed question; but it is largely a half-breed question, at all events, in so far as the actual difficulties have arisen, because the first settlement involved, in the view of the Government of that day, a

recognition of the same rule as had been applied in the Red River and the non-user of the general rectangular settlement and the special settlement survey along the river front. Then there are the half-breed settlements generally and the surveys of those settlements, and the adjustment of the claims of the half-breeds to the land by virtue of occupation and settlement. And there are the white settlers' claims of the same character. Then there are the claims with reference to colonisation companies. The hon. Minister, when, a while ago, I mentioned the question of colonisation companies, objected to my doing so. He said that showed the spirit in which I was speaking, and he asked what had that to do with the question of the Metis. I am sorry to say that what it showed was not the spirit in which I treated the question, in the sense of the hon. gentleman, but how little the hon. gentleman knew of what the essentials of the question were; because if he had regarded the memorials and representations which had been made on that subject he would have seen—I am not now judging of any of those claims—but he would have seen, as to the colonisation companies, that the claim was made years ago by the people of this very district, that there were grievances and injustice connected with them; and he would have known that, so far from its having nothing to do with the Metis, it was intimately connected, as it is intimately connected, with the difficulties of the half-breeds as well as the white settlers. Then, Sir, there was the question of the great, the enormous block of railway reserves made early at the instance of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, involving—I cannot remember the exact number of acres—but I think some 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 acres of odd sections in that northern district, which were reserved for them at an early day, in order that they might get a land grant out of it. Then, Sir, there were claims for assistance—for mail accommodation, claims for local improvements, claims for river improvements. Then there was the Indian question, complicated by the questions I have alluded to, complicated by settlement, complicated by the reservations, complicated by starvation; and as to which there is a memorial sent in November indicating the feeling of the people upon it. Then there were questions of police protection, of the home guard, and there was also the question of the militia and volunteer corps—all points necessarily engaging the attention of the Government, upon which they have taken action at different times, action which as I have pointed out more than once requires explanation, and in respect of which reports have been received, as we are informed by the departmental reports and otherwise. Then after all that, with reference to all these questions, an event occurred in the month of June last, which in a sense accentuated the whole situation, and added enormously to the responsibility of the Government from that time forth. I allude to the coming of Louis Riel into the settlement, and his remaining there from that time forth. It is not necessary, Sir, for me to use language of my own upon that subject, because we do not forget the statement of the First Minister of the feelings of those people towards Louis Riel, the influence he had over them, and the things he was doing in the North-West during the summer and fall and winter of the year. I will not now trouble the House by repeating what is to be found in the reports of the *Debates*, by repeating the various pieces of information which I have suggested as certain, as probable, as due; the reports from officers, the orders to the Government officers, the reports from the North-West Council, the petitions and memorials of the people, the declarations and representations of important personages, official and unofficial—I say I will not now weary the House—though I have here a list of these papers, by repeating that list in respect of which I desire to refer to the *Debates* to the efforts we have made to elicit this information from time to time. But I do say that the statement of facts which I have given indicates in my humble opinion, as a clear and inevitable conclusion, that there is much to explain, much to discuss, much which can be explained and discussed only on the production of the documents and papers which are, or ought to be, in the hands of the Government of the day. There was, Sir, an enormous responsibility upon them, and also upon their officers in that country, and it is due to those officers, as between themselves and the Government of the day, it is due to those important personages in the country, who hold unofficial positions, that we should have their reports and statements and communications, which would throw light on the condition of things amongst the people, on their state of feeling, and show the action recommended to the Government from time to time. I say it is due to these persons that we should see what they did say, in order that we may judge whether they did their duty or not. It is due also from the Government to us, in order that we may see whether those demands were made by the Government for information which the notorious facts rendered it their duty to obtain. Now, for these papers I have been pressing almost continuously for the last eight weeks. The hon. gentleman has brought down a few of the less material papers, but the bulk of those papers he has not brought down, and from day to day he has said that they are being copied, that they are being prepared, that they will be ready soon, that he will bring down those which are not confidential, and so forth and so forth. But I cannot compliment him on his having given me or the House a satisfactory answer, with reference to the papers he will bring down and the time when they would be brought down. The Session advances, and it is necessary that these papers should be in our hands in order that we may have the case of the Government, the case of their officers, the case of the people in that country, studied and examined with a view to pronouncing judgment in the great cause which comes before us as the grand inquest of the nation. I have said that the questions to which I have referred demanded care, demanded vigilance, demanded energy, tact, and liberality, from the Government. They demanded promptness too. In these great concerns of state we must not forget the rules which regulate ordinary affairs. Each man's individual concern is dealt with and looked at by him with reference to those rules, and it is proverbial that there should not be delay. He that giveth quickly giveth twice; justice delayed is justice denied; an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure; a stitch in time saves nine, are four homely proverbs; they excite the laughter of the hon. gentleman, but they are the language of the people. They express the way the people look at their concerns, and the way in which they expect to be dealt with, whether by the Government or by their own neighbor or friend or opponent. Now, the white settlers as pioneers, and as disappointed pioneers by reason of the change of the route of railway, were entitled to consideration. The half-breeds as early colonisers and as disappointed men, remembering the events of 1870, and remembering also that link of connection to which I have referred, which was so potent for good or evil, the link between them and the Indian—they were also entitled to be dealt with on the principles to which I have referred. And, therefore, while I am not saying—whatever I may think, whatever information I have been able to accumulate from outside, whatever conclusion that information leads me to, while I am not to-day expressing it, while I am not saying to-day that the Government has not done its duty, I do say that their duty was such as I have described, and that we have a right to the facts in order that we may judge how they have done their duty. Since the Government took power, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884 have passed, and what has been done—that is the question? In the last of these

years, as I have said, a very striking event—the invitation to Louis Riel and his appearance,—took place, and what has been done since that time? Surely that sounded a warning note. Surely it became then, even if it had not been before, the most pressing and paramount duty of the Government without delay, if there had been delay, to redress grievances if grievances there were, to remove misconceptions if misconceptions existed, to attend to precautionary measures. Once again, what are the facts? What was said; what was done? What was done in the way of redress, in the way of removing misconceptions, in the way of security? The Government have, as I have said, hosts of officers in that country; what did they say or do from the Lieutenant Governor down? It has a council there, what did it say or do? It has unofficial but important helps, the ministers of religion, the officials of the Hudson Bay Company, all deeply interested in seeing that a sound policy was pursued, and whose lives and property and dearest interests were concerned in the keeping of the peace. What did they say? What did they do? I have said I do not attempt to answer these questions from my own information; I have some information, which, perhaps, I may submit to the House on another day, upon some other motion; but just now I have been trying to show the House, as I hope I have succeeded, that there is a duty on the part of the Government to inform us, and to inform us fully and very soon, so that we may judge between the people and the Government, between the Government and its officers, and decide the momentous questions which these issues involve. I beg, Sir, to move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This, then, is the result of the hon. gentleman's protracted incubation; this is the cause of his absence from this House—that he has prepared a carefully written essay, and has moved that this House adjourn. It is true he has clothed this very important question with a number of images; poetry, although spoken in prose, has been invoked; the tragic has been exhibited; and, on the motion to adjourn, he appeals to the sympathies of this House, and of the country through the press, by an elaborate essay on the horrors of war. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has taken a course which is an ignoble course. The Government are aware of their responsibilities; they are, of course, aware of the position in which they stand; they know that during their administration of the affairs of the North-West and of the rest of the country there has been a rebellious outbreak; they know that that must be a matter of discussion in Parliament, and they challenge enquiry, and are ready for enquiry. But that the hon. gentleman should, from his rifle pit, suddenly to-day fire this gun—it is an ignoble warfare; it is an Indian warfare; but it won't kill the Government. If I understand the motion of the hon. gentleman, it is that he may make this speech. He says that whatever he may think, he does not now mean to make any charges against the Government; he says he will by and bye, on some other motion, do so. We will abide that motion; we will wait for the hon. gentleman's speech, and we will answer it. But while the hon. gentleman hangs his words and the conclusion of his speech, merely on a desire to get information, I appeal to the common sense and to the judgment of this House if his whole speech was not meant to insinuate what he did not dare to assert—that the Government are to blame. He went back to the events of 1869 and 1870, and gave us a historical detail of what happened then; and he said the Government gave full information at that time. Sir, I was at the head of the Government at that time, and on my responsibility as the head of the Government, I thought it right then to communicate to the House and the country that information. I thought it was safe for that information to be given; and just now as then, in the exercise of my discretion, those papers were brought down, because I thought it was expedient to bring them down, so in the exercise of the same discretion we have withheld much of the information that the hon. gentleman asked for. The hon. gentleman has asked for much that he cannot get; he has asked for much that he will get; but Sir, the House knows and the country knows that if there has been some delay, the continued, the senseless—if I may use the expression without offence—at all events the useless encumbrance of every Department with motions for papers has much to do with the delay in those papers that the Government should bring down; and there are a great many of those papers that the Government refused to bring down upon the ground that it would not be in the interest of the country to do so. The hon. gentleman says: Oh, here are the discontented half-breeds; the Government have not kept up the link—he does not say so, but he insinuates it—betwen the Indian and the white man; he says the half-breed is the civilising influence between the Indian and the white man; the half-breed is the link to connect the two. Then he goes on to speak of the colonisation companies. He does not assert that they have done anything wrong, but that it is alleged that they have done something wrong; and he gives us a number of instances. He does not say that the mode of survey is wrong; he does not say that the half-breeds or the Indians have been ill-used; but from the long detail that he gives, he leads, and he desires to lead this House—not so much to lead this House, because it will not be deceived; it knows his style—but in order to beguile the country to believe that the Government have been laggard in their duty, and have not performed their duty. Let the hon. gentleman bring forward his specific charges; let him bring charge after charge—I care not whether they are for want of judgment or for delay, we are ready to meet him. Do you think Mr. Gladstone would have sprung a motion on the other side in the manner in which the hon. gentleman has sprung his motion this morning? I heard this morning that a gentleman who fetches and carries for him—if that be not an offensive expression—went to the press and said: "Prepare; there is going to be a great speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition, and you must report whatever he is going to say." They did not want that we should know what was going to be said by him, what course was to be taken. I ask if an hon. gentleman on that side did not go to the press and make the statement I now say he did? The hon. gentleman claims that we ought to have brought down the reports of the missionaries and the agents and of all the various officers scattered over that country, and lay those reports before the House. Well, Riel has only been taken the other day. At this moment the hero of that rebellion, Gabriel Dumont, is free; Gabriel Dumont may have a large force behind him; at this moment there may be the lives of white men, women and children, at the mercy of the half-breeds, who may not yet be subdued, although their coward leader has surrendered; the lives of white people may be yet at the mercy of Dumont and his half-breeds, and we are asked to bring down to this House all the statements of the clergy—we will bring them down by and bye—and the statements of the officers, whose lives might be the forfeit of the publication of these statements. The missionaries there have no families, but they have their lives, and the wives and the children of all the others there in authority, all the others there who have been reporting to the Government, are at the mercy of these yet unsubdued bands and the hon. gentleman says that although the half-breed rebellion may be considered to have been put down, there is a long Indian war before us. I hope that is not true. Suppose we will have no more trouble with the half-breeds in arms, still those men are there, and we know they have incited the Indians to rebel, we know that the half-breeds have roused up the Indians

to wage war. The Indians had no cause of complaint, no cause of warfare, they had no reason, no grievance in the world to make them rise in arms, but they were roused and induced to revolt by these half-breeds; and do you think that these men, crushed down, their leaders killed, some of them wounded, suffering now, and perhaps by and bye, from the hardships of a suppressed rebellion, do you think that they will not continue to be behind the Indians, to incite them to war, to arouse them, calling upon them to revenge the wrongs of those who are almost of the same blood? And until that Indian war is over, until that country is kept quiet, it would be madness, it would be cruelty, it would be folly for any Government to put intelligence into the hands of these men by publishing prematurely papers of the kind asked for. If I could believe that the hon. gentleman was acting with a sincere and honest desire to remedy the evils of administration, if I thought he was anxious to impress upon the country the necessity of a new system, I would say he was quite right. But I know, and the country knows, that is not the case; and all the motions that he has made, from the first day the House met, every return he has asked for in respect to the North-West troubles, bore evidence on their face that they were for the purpose of trying to obtain a miserable party triumph over the Government which he hopes to supplant. But if ever there was a man mistaken in that idea it is the hon. gentleman. If he had kept quiet, if he had allowed matters to go on as they have gone on, the country always looking, the people always looking to find some one to punish in the case of a great reverse, he might have a better prospect; but if we had been wrong, if we had been negligent, at all events, we tried to do our duty, we were loyal, we tried to suppress the outbreak—a causeless outbreak—we loyally attempted to put it down, and the hon. gentleman attempted to take advantage at a time when he ought to have rallied around the Government of the day, no matter by whom administered, of our position; and every motion, every question he put, was put with the idea, not of protecting the men, women and children, not of preventing the flow of blood about which he speaks so pathetically, but of bringing discredit upon those whom he hopes to supplant. I tell him the country knows that. As an old parliamentarian, as a man of great experience, and

> "My experience doth attain
> To something like prophetic strain,"

I tell him, never in the world did his prospects in the future stand so dark as they do now, when it is obvious to man, woman and child, when he who runs may read, that the aim, the end, the object of every motion he has made, or every speech he has delivered, of every question he has asked, is the one thing, to attain a party triumph. I tell him he is mistaken. Great has been the sin the hon. gentleman has committed and great will be the retribution. It has happened that there has been placed in my hands, as a chattel mortgage was placed in the hands of the hon. gentleman some time ago, while the hon. gentleman was reading the first part of the Saskatchewan *Herald*, a copy of the same paper. He read a pathetic account, cut out carefully, of all the miseries the people suffered in the valley of the Saskatchewan, after premising that the Government ought to be strong and active and that their responsibility was great. He saw fit to so quote that paper as to infer, because he said he did not state—oh, no, whatever he might think he would not state—that we were wrong; but after working up the House to the idea that it might be possible we were all wrong—though he did not say so, he thought we were wrong, for we could draw no other inference from his language—he read a certain portion of the editorial of the Saskatchewan *Herald*, not knowing, perhaps, that I had the paper in my hand. Let me read what he left out. The part he did read was an account of the miseries and sufferings of the Saskatchewan people, but he left this out:

> "And yet in the face of these awful facts—in spite of the ruin wrought upon an industrious people—men are to be found, and some of them in high positions, who characterise these crimes as 'mistakes,' and suggest that their perpetrators come in and acknowledge it, make new promises as to the future, and resume their old position as petted and pampered wards of the Crown. It is too late for any such suggestions. The Government and people have been deceived as to the civilisation of these wild tribes. They have shown themselves incapable of gratitude; their apparent tractability was cunning; their civilisation but a cloak to hide their hellish plans. They have thrown down the gauntlet, and now that it has been taken up, the issue must be pressed until the fullest justice has been done. But while punishment must be meted out to the Indians, what shall we say to those white men and nominally civilised half-breeds who have instigated this rising? On them rests a fearful responsibility, and on them the penalty must lie. Those who, knowing better, incited to these murders and devastations, put themselves on a level with the savages in all save their animal courage, and, as their crime was greater, so must their punishment be exemplary. The work will not be done in a day, but it must be done thoroughly, and we have confidence that the people of Canada, who have so long ungrudgingly given the vast sum of money spent in feeding the Indians, while apparently settling down to a new mode of life, will, now that the feeding scheme has proved a failure, cheerfully give whatever men and money may be required to fight them, and re-establish peace and order on such foundations as shall not again be shaken."

Why did not the hon. gentleman read that part?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentlemen laugh, but they laugh with their hearts in their boots. I charge it as being a matter of disingenuousness on the part of the hon. gentleman to read so much of the article as to show the miseries of the people, and then try to lead up to a series of carefully prepared insinuations that the Government were responsible for all that, when the same paper says the Government were not responsible, that the Indians were primarily responsible and the half-breeds were more so. It is in the same spirit that the hon. gentleman, during the whole of this Session, has dealt with and treated this subject. Let me go a little further. The hon. gentleman spoke about the poor Indian, discontented, driven by hunger, and so on; and the half-breeds, also driven by hunger; and at the same time he reads an elaborate account of the luxurious furniture and household appurtenances of the great rebel, Gabriel Dumont.

Mr. McCALLUM. That was from the *Mail*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. True, that was from the *Mail*. As to the charge that the Indians have been ill-treated, let me read what the same paper says:

> "The petted Indians are the bad ones. The Stonies have been treated as being of a superior race, and are the first to shed the blood of their benefactors. Poundmaker has been petted and pampered, and stands in the front rank as a raider. Little Pine, bribed to come north and kept in comfort, hastens to the carnage. Big Bear, who has for years enjoyed the privilege of eating of the bread of idleness, shows his gratitude by killing his priests and his best friends in cold blood. Little Poplar, a non-treaty Indian, has been liberally supplied with provisions and other necessaries, and thus enabled to spend all his time in travelling up and down the land, plotting mischief and preparing for this season's carnival of ruin. The petted Indians have proved the bad ones, and this gives weight to the old adage, that the only good Indians are the dead ones."

Now, I say again that the hon. gentleman, in hanging on this motion of adjournement, in stating that he wished to press upon the Government the responsibility that they should bring down the papers, has taken an unworthy advantage. He has given no notice. He has not gone into the discussion. He says he has got the information. Well, let him produce his information. We will send down the papers, all that can be sent down with safety to the lives and property of the people of the North-West.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a sort of sneer over there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They say "hear, hear" to that. The hon. gentleman would like to get the papers. What cares he whether people are dead or alive in the North-West. What cares he whether the production of papers might affect that matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Shame.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What cares he.

Mr. CASEY. Shame.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hear the hon. gentleman say "shame." It is a shame on those who cry it. The shame will rest upon them in the country, and I tell the hon. gentleman that, in the eyes of every dispassionate man, whether of our party or of their party, the speech of this day and the course of hon. gentlemen this day, will disgust the country, will disgust the people.

Mr. KIRK. We will see all about that.

Mr. HICKEY. We have seen two or three times before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say now, is to repeat that any charge, or any number of charges, or any specified instances in which the Government are blameable, or are censurable, either for wilful or ignorant want of performance of their duty, we are ready and willing to answer. I court the enquiry. I believe that sufficient papers can be laid before the House to enable the hon. gentleman to form an accurate idea of what the true position of that country has been, of what the Government have done, and of what the Government has not done, the reasons why they have acted, and the reasons why they have omitted to act. I stand here, on the part of myself and my colleagues, on behalf of the Ministry of which I am, for the present, the leader. We court enquiry. We challenge enquiry. We believe, with all the consciousness of being right, that the judgment of the country will be that we have acted well, that we have acted to the best of our abilities, and that, in this case, our abilities have not been wrongly directed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that, if there be one feeling common to both sides of this House on this occasion, it must be a feeling of profound disappointment, that a man who occupies the position of First Minister of Canada can find no better terms, no better answer to give the reasonable demands preferred by my hon. friend than is contained in the reply to which we have been listening for the past half hour. That hon. gentleman denounced my hon. friend, and for what? For, as he allleges, taking him by surprise. Why, it is known, it is notorious, and to none better than to the First Minister, that my hon. friend has again and again intimated to him that at the earliest moment that he believed consistent with his sense of public duty he would call attention to the shortcomings and to the misdoings of the First Minister and his colleagues.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I say again and again. It has been a matter of notoriety. It has been alluded to by the hon. gentleman's press. It has been alluded to in the course of the late debate by scores of the hon. gentleman's supporters, on the occasions when they took the floor. What does my hon. friend demand? Again and again, for the last two months, he has asked for information which ought long ago to have been placed before us —long, long ago—which, as the First Minister well knows, he, on an equally critical occasion, when he, I will not say understood better, but when he practised far better than he has done of late years, the rules and usages of constitutional government, saw fit to give to the House. I was present on that occasion, along with my hon. friend beside me, and I recollect well that, at a time when a rebellion, which threatened to be quite as formidable as the present, was raging in the North-West, the First Minister, of his own proper motion, as my hon. friend stated, brought down a very voluminous correspondence, containing information far more minute and explicit than any which my hon. friend up to this time has asked for. That was the course of the First Minister then. But well the First Minister knows why it was that the hon. member for West Durham was not able to call the attention of the House to this business before. Why, Sir, what is the reason that we have been kept here, in season and out of season, for the last five or six weeks? The First Minister deliberately precipitated a measure on this House which he knew would meet with the most intense opposition, which he knew involved an almost interminable discussion, and he did that mainly for the reason that he desired, by the introduction of that measure, to deprive my hon. friends and the other gentlemen of this side, of the opportunity of calling him and his friends to account for that misgovernment which has set this country in a flame. Those are the circumstances under which my hon. friend has delayed making any allusion to this matter for eight or nine long weeks; those are the circumstances under which my hon. friend has waited from day to day. Sir, it is in the knowledge of this House with what gross discourtesy the First Minister, again and again, has replied to the most reasonable questions of my hon. friend. In all my parliamentary experience—not as long as the First Minister's, but longer than that of most hon. members of this House—I have never heard the leader of a Government act so discourteously in refusing information on questions which this House and the country had a right to know. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman tells us that the course of the hon. member for West Durham is unpatriotic. Well, we know what unpatriotic means in the mouth of the First Minister; translate that accusuation into plain English, and when you hear him accuse an hon. member on this side of the House of want of patriotism, it means that the course he has taken is likely to be very inconvenient to the interests of the hon. gentleman. Did he not tell us just now that he would give us what information he, in his sovereign pleasure, chose to give? And that he would withhold what, in his sovereign pleasure, he chose to withhold? Is that the way in which the Minister of a nominally free country, of a nominally free Parliament, should respond to the requests for information on matters of the greatest public importance? Sir, Dr. Johnson was in the habit of saying, long ago, that patriotism was the last refuge of a scoundrel. I may supplement that remark of his, and say that the last shift and excuse, for the purpose of refusing just information, to which the First Minister has invariably resorted, is the accusation that it is unpatriotic to ask for it; unpatriotic for the representatives of the people of Canada to inquire, in their places in Parliament, why it is that blood has been wasted, why it is that treasure has been wasted, why it is that the whole future of this country has been seriously imperilled. But it would be more convenient for the First Minister to wait until—when? Until this House has got so exhausted and tired that discussion is impossible; it would be convenient for him to wait, not for a few days or a few weeks, but until a year or more had passed away; it would be convenient for him to wait until public attention had been diverted to other subjects; it would be convenient for him to wait until the memory of these things had faded out of men's minds; it would be most of all convenient to wait until time and opportunity had been given to get rid of disagreeable witnesses, to cook and garble important pieces of evidence, which there has not been time, probably, to cook and garble to his satisfaction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not quite in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A good deal that the First Minister said was not in order, but we did not call him to order; and he must take the consequence of the example which he has set.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I always speak in order'

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is a large order for us to believe. Now, Sir, I say that the leader of the Opposition, on this occasion, was most perfectly in his right; I say more, that he was most perfectly in the line of his duty. What does the hon. gentleman expect? Does he suppose that we, the members of the Opposition, are here to register his decrees? Does he suppose that we are here to express our perfect trust in the Government of this country, which has given, of late, such extraordinary proofs of how well they deserve our confidence, and the confidence of the people of the country? I ask again, has the hon. gentleman volunteered any information to us? Has not every fragment, every scrap, every atom of evidence, every paper that has been brought down here, been wrung from him by repeated protests, by repeated demands, by repeated requirements for this information? What information, I say, has the Government vouchsafed to us? Had they shown any desire to take us into their confidence; had they shown that they were willing, as far as the public interest permitted, to bring down this information, then they might have pleaded, with some degree of justice, that we were unreasonably impatient now. But the House knows perfectly well that it is the present desire of that hon. gentleman to do nothing except by the mode I have indicated, to choke off all discussion until the greater number of the members of this House have ceased their attendance on the floors of Parliament. I say we have abstained for a long period. I say that we are now, probably, in a short time, about to separate. We find that answers to the questions put by us, to the demands for information made by us, are refused and evaded in every possible way. What is the reason given, in this crisis, of dealing with these important matters in this way? The First Minister says he is not able to secure the services of two or three competent copying clerks. That is the excuse given. So great were the demands upon the resources of the copying staff of the Government that, in a matter of first-rate importance, the gravest matter with which we have had to deal for many a year, the First Minister of Canada was not able to secure the services of copying clerks for a few hours. Why, Sir, I believe that all the vital parts of the information which my hon. friend demanded could have been secured by the services of two men, at most, for two or three days out of the sixty days that have elapsed since these requests were made. But then, as my hon. friend truly said, this is not an unusual case. Unhappily for us, under the Government of the First Minister, as he must admit, we have had a rebellion before, and then the necessary papers were brought down. Now, I desire to ask, if we have retrograded so much in the administration of our public affairs since 1870, that those concessions which were freely made to the Opposition—not, I think, numerically, much stronger than the Opposition to-day, perhaps not so strong—that those which were freely made fifteen years ago are refused now? What is the reason? I do not doubt that there is a reason, and a very strong reason, for all this delay. Were these papers which my hon. friend calls for, papers which were likely to give a fair, honest and satisfactory explanation of these most unhappy events, does any gentleman doubt that these papers would have been laid on the Table of this House, and that they would have been printed and circulated from one end of the country to the other long ago? If there be delay, if there be suppression, if there be hesitation, about bringing these documents down and placing them on the Table of the House, all men who are aware of the past record of the Government, and more particularly of the First Minister, will say that I have the strongest possible presumptive evidence for believing that these papers are not brought down because the evidence which they would disclose would be excessively damaging, and would produce in the minds of the people of this country a very strong conviction that had common energy, common vigilance, common prudence, common honesty, ruled the councils of the Government of this country, no rebellion in the North-West, no distruction of human lives, no injury to property, no damage to the prospects of the people of this country, would have occurred, or need have occurred. The First Minister knew it right well; and when the hon. gentleman sat on this side of the House, no one was more urgent in pointing out to the people that if any disaster occurred, if any misfortune, if any unforeseen calamity occurred to this country, the Government of the day were to be held responsible for it. That was the doctrine preached by the hon. gentleman and preached by his colleages, and it was by false representations to the people that the Government which preceded him were responsible for results which arose from causes over which the Government had no control, that the First Minister succeeded in obtaining his present place. And, if that be true in ordinary cases, how much more true in a case like this? How much more true is it in a case where men, in the enjoyment of the advantages which my hon. friend depicted, find themselves so much the victims of misgovernment, that, however dangerous it might be for them to start the flame of war in that country, they yet found themselves compelled to take up arms? I am not going to justify those men at present or to excuse them, inasmuch as we have not the information before us to judge how far they were criminal, or how far they were really the agents of greater criminals, who may, perhaps, be beyond the power of justice for the present. Does the hon. gentleman not know that if a disaster happens to any officer in Her Majesty's service; if, for instance a naval captain loses his ship, although it is clear it was by overwhelming stress of weather, although he may have displayed, and everybody may know he has displayed the utmost energy and heroism in endeavoring to prevent the calamity, still such an officer must of necessity submit to a court martial. I say that the case of the Government of this country is precisely similar. The Government have proved themselves unable to discharge the most fundamental part of their duties; they have proved themselves unable to maintain peace and order in the country which was specially committed to their care, and specially committed to the care of the First Minister, in his capacity as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and, prior to that time, specially entrusted to him in his capacity as Minister of the Interior. Surely, under such circumstances, we have a right to enquire how these things came about. Surely the leader of the Opposition would be wanting in his manifest and plain duty if he allowed this House to separate without doing all that lay in his power to acquire information on which the country will be asked to form an opinion shortly. Hon. gentlemen opposite are condemned by their own acts. If there was no just cause, if there was no misgovernment, if there was no abuse of their power, why did the Government of Canada, while the rebels were still actually in the field, issue a commission for the purpose of investigating the grievances of the half-breeds. I say they stand self-condemned. If there were no grievances, hon. gentlemen would not have issued that commission. If they admit there were grievances, then they stand condemned, because they did not take action before. Hon. gentlemen will remember the innumerable warnings given to the Government from this side of the Chamber and by the public prints,

that there was great dissatisfaction prevailing all over the the North-West for a period, not of a few months, but for a period which must be calculated by years. My hon. friend truly said that we could have no better testimony as to the wilful blindness of the Government than the fact that while two or three members of the Government visited the North-West within the past few months, they all came back proclaiming peace where there was no peace; they all came back to tell us that they had not found any grievances, that they were welcomed with loyal addresses throughout the length and breadth of the North-West; and one Minister, I think the Minister of Public Works, declared publicly he could not find a whisper of discontent with this best of all possible Governments. The hon. First Minister tells us he appeals to the House and his appeal will not fail. I suppose, technically speaking, he is right, that the majority of the House would sustain him though one rose from the dead to testify against him. The hon. gentleman is sorry for the persons exposed to inconveience. He tells us that the Indians are primarily responsible and that the half-breeds are indirectly responsible; and I may add that the members of the Government are most of all responsible for the results which have occurred. The hon. gentleman called attention to a fact which ought, above all other facts, to have caused the Government not to have acted in the way they have done. He called attention to the fact—and the House would hardly fail to comprehend its bearing—that long before the first uprising, which took place at Red River, the Government had obtained full and special warnings from persons in a position to give them useful information as to the result of their policy; and I think my hon. friend would have been perfectly justified in drawing the inference, if he had chosen to draw it, that, after that experience, the Government were bound not to disregard warnings given in the press and repeated on the floor of Parliament—all pointing, unhappily, to just such a result as has taken place—unless the grievances to which those warnings referred were promptly redressed.

An hon. MEMBER. What were the grievances?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The grievances were that that country, which ought to have been administered for the welfare of the whole people, was used by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose of a vast bribery fund, through colonisation companies, leases of coal lands, timber lands, and by every possible mode in which that great heritage could be abused for the advantage of a few needy and unscrupulous partisans. The First Minister, as I have said, has not one word to say in explanation or in defence of himself. He knows, as well as I know, and as well as everyone who has paid any attention to the state of that country knows, how wide is the dissatisfaction, how widespread is the ruin, not merely to the people of the country, which is being ravaged by the half-breeds and Indians, but also to all those, and their numbers are tens of thousands outside of Manitoba, who have invested almost their all in attempting to develop and promote the welfare of that country. He knows how seriously the future of that country is imperilled; yet all we find him stating, in answer to my hon. friend, is simply to impute a few ignoble motives to him. The defence he makes, all he rests upon, is this: Prove what you please, urge what you please; I have got a majority at my back, bound to support me, once when I am right and twice when I am wrong. I call attention to this: The hon. gentleman had the insolence —there is no other parliamentary word to describe it—to charge members of the Opposition with desiring, for the sake of bringing themselves and their party back to power, to injure the future of this country; that they desired, because the hon. gentleman's words implied that, to foment that rebellion; that they desire to aid, assist and abet those men now defying our authority there. I should like to know by whose hands that rebellion was put down. Are there not as many members of the Reform party arrayed in arms for the defence of the Government of Canada, to-day, as there are of those who support hon. gentlemen? Have we no relatives or friends, whose lives have been freely perilled in defence of our country? Are there no friends of ours who have been, during the last few weeks, showing themselves good and true soldiers in the field, for the sake of the defence of Canada. The hon. gentlemen dare not say there are not, and if he did dare say so, there is scarcely a man whom I see here who could not point to some relative or near friend who is now engaged in defending our country in the North-West. Sir, the hon. gentleman, the other day, made use of an extraordinary expression, coming from his lips. The hon. gentleman declared, from his place in this House, that if we did not take care representative government in this country would be found to be on its trial.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I will say I have heard that statement has been made, and I will not say it was made in a previous debate. Something like it was repeated to-day; but whether that was stated or not, I will say this: That in my judgment, to-day, in Canada, representative government is very likely indeed to be on its trial, if we find that legitimate demands for information, preferred by members of this House, who have a perfect right to demand it, are ignored and refused, are made the ground for imputing to us want of patriotism, are made, when circumstances so amply warrant them, a justification for such language as the First Minister has not scrupled to indulge in towards my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Sir, this is not the way in which free government can be maintained in this country. It may be that, in the progress of events, if certain measures which are now being pressed in this House should become law, in the shape they were intended to pass by the First Minister, that the functions of an Opposition, and, for that matter, the true functions of Parliament, will cease to be of any use or value in this country. But until that takes place, so long as we are allowed by the grace of the First Minister to retain our seats in this House; so long as we can say, with some degree of truth, that Parliament is composed of the representatives of a free people—so long as that continues, we have a right to insist, and we will insist, on the right, when such circumstances as my hon. friend depicted have occurred, we will demand the right, whether the Government of this country like it or not, whether it be convenient for them that this demand should be granted or not, we will assert our right, in the interest of the people, whose representatives we are, on all fit and proper occasions, to ask for information respecting the affairs of this country; and we will not submit to be put down by charges of want of patriotism or because it is not pleasant for gentlemen now controlling this Parliament that we should ask for information about matters which they would rather conceal. We will continue to repeat those demands, and if the hon. gentleman, in the exercise of his discretion, chooses to refuse the information, we must appeal from the tribunal of the majority in this House to the tribunal of the people at large, and if that people are worthy of free intitutions, as I hope and believe they are, if that people understand what the duties of their representatives in Parliament are, it is the First Minister, and not the leader of the Opposition, who will find—and that before many days—that the people of Canada will insist on his recognising himself for what he is —their servant and not their master—and will insist upon his obeying their behests, and giving us some account of the stewardship which, I fear, he will be found to have most grieviously abused.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down was asked the question: What are the grievances in the North-West? and though he has gone on for three-quarters of an hour, he never specified a single grievance. He stopped for an answer, and at last he said that the granting of timber limits——

An hon. MEMBER. And gravel pits.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; and the hon. member for West Elgin was kind enough to suggest to him the expression he has just used—gravel pits. The hon. member for West Huron gave a speech in the Opera House at Winnipeg last fall, when the Reform party of that city gave an ovation to the hon. member for East York, and presented him with an address, in which these so-called grievances of the North-West were alluded to. The hon. member for West Huron took up a large portion of his speech in dealing with those grievances, and I have here his speech as reported in the *Free Press*, the Reform paper of Winnipeg, from which I find that though he went over the same old and stale stories about the National Policy, the want of branch lines, the necessity for representation of the North-West Territories, yet he never touched one of the matters which have been referred to in this House to-day. He reiterated the same old questions which have been repeated *ad nauseam* in this Parliament—questions which have been decided by the people and decided in this House; but he did not venture to give utterance to a single statement which he has made in this Parliament to-day. He thought proper to throw an insult across the floor to me, but I tell that hon. gentleman that I have met his friends in court before now, and every time I have met them there, upon the slanders they have uttered against me, I have obtained verdicts against them. I never allowed one of their slanders to go unrebuked, that they had the courage to utter or write over their own names, in a form in which it might be brought into court. They have referred to this gravel pit in the House, and they insinuate that I received a gratuity from this Government. The fact is, that I was one of three who owned a piece of land in the North-West that the Government entered upon; I asked for an arbitration, which they gave me, but the award was not satisfactory. I appealed to the Exchequer Court, and every dollar I got was got on a judgment of the Exchequer Court of this country. These hon. gentlemen know this perfectly well, and still they are willing to utter these slanders, either without knowing that they are foundationless, or if they do know it, they are guilty of reckless statements to that extent. What excuse has the hon. gentleman, when, in discussing in this House a grave matter like this, affecting the whole people of Canada, a matter which the civilised world are all talking about—the grievances in the North-West——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH—the rebellion in the North-West, and when the hon. gentleman is asked to state what the grievances in that country are which caused the rebellion, he stands on his feet, and in a voice as loud as passion can make it, he utters a vile slander against me, a slander which he dare not put over his own signature, or repeat in any way in which he could be made to stand an action at court for that slander. We ask him to state what are the grievances in the North-West, and I say they repeat a slander which they dare not state outside, in a way which the courts can take hold of, and that is the style of warfare which they adopt in this House, in discussing the question of whether the rebellion was caused by substantial grievances, or whether it has not been incited by Grit farmers unionists, or the reckless statements of Grit newspapers. The hon. member for West Durham tried to draw fire from the veteran Premier of the country; he laid his trap, but he did not fall into it; and the hon. gentleman from West Durham went round and round the question like a wolverine circling round the bait, but he does not dare touch it. He sat down in his seat, making no charge or daring to make one. But his lieutenant came to his aid, and with a larger voice and a greater spread, he contented himself with going round and round in the same manner as he did in the Opera House in Winnipeg, and sat down without saying anything. I got up to say this only because, a year ago, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) put a notice on the Paper, and when it came up he dropped it; and yet he rises in his place to say what he dare not say outside of the House, where it would get into the courts.

Mr. CASEY. I rise simply to answer the bitter and unjustifiable attack which has been made upon myself. As to the cry of gravel pits, I do not say anything, because it comes to everybody's recollection. As to the statement that I put a notice on the Paper, and shirked that notice when it came up, I say it is simply untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is not parliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. I say the statement is untrue; I do not say the hon. gentleman knows that it is untrue; I leave him to qualify that as he chooses. If he did not know it was untrue, he may have been laboring under a mistake, but the statement is perfectly untrue. I did not move the motion; it was moved by somebody else.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You were out of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I was out of the House, and a friend moved the motion for me in my absence. It is not a matter of much importance; the hon. gentleman need not think his private affairs are of so much consequence; it was one of the most trifling little things that ever occurred. We asked for information, and the information was brought down, and it appeared that there had been an investigation into the matter. As to the statement that I gave the notice and then shirked it, it is untrue, and I hope the hon. gentleman will retract it. I rose merely to make this personal explanation.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman gave a notice, and when the notice came up he was not here. He put it on the Paper a second day, and he was not here when it was reached, and he got a friend to move it for him.

Mr. CASEY. I did not get a friend to do it. I was not here, and one of my hon. friends moved the motion for me.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think my hon. friend from South Huron had anything to complain of in the speech made by the hon. First Minister; it did not take us by surprise at all; there was nothing extraordinary about it; it was in the usual lines which the First Minister adopts whenever there is any discussion in Parliament upon any great question proposed by the Opposition and in which he is interested. You will have observed, Sir, from your knowledge of his career in Parliament for the last ten or fifteen years, that when he cannot answer successfully any statement made in the House, the hon. gentleman somehow or other works himself up into a great state of excitement; he assumes a passion which, I have no doubt, he does not feel; he becomes abusive and insolent. And so, on this occasion, he could not answer my hon. friend from West Durham. There was no answer to be given; therefore, the First Minister assumed his usual role of becoming insolent and impertinent.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the word insolent is parliamentary.

Mr. CAMERON. I have heard that word used several times.

Mr. CASEY. The First Minister himself used it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, I think he was wrong.

Mr. CAMERON. I have noticed that in the debate in the English Parliament on the Afghan question, Lord Randolph Churchill used much stronger language than that, which was allowed to go unchallenged.

Mr. SPEAKER. Well, I think it is unparliamentary. The hon. member for West Durham called my attention to the fact that the word impudent was used.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that you add the word ignoble to your vocabulary.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there are a great many words used that ought not to be used, and I appeal to the leaders on both sides to set an example to hon. members by not using this language.

Mr. CAMERON. The First Minister used the word ignoble unchallenged by you or by any hon. member in the House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON. I was pointing out, when you left the Chair, that the First Minister, when he had no satisfactory answer to a proposition submitted on this side of the House, resorted to his invariable style of working himself into a passion and abusing and denouncing hon. members on this side. He resorted to the old cry of disloyalty and want of patriotism. That form of argument has aided the hon. gentleman on many occasions; the hon. gentleman may adopt again that line of argument, but it will not go down with the people. It is not a satisfactory line; it does not answer the statements of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). Now, the hon. gentleman says that he assumes all the responsibility of the condition of affairs in the North-West. Well, that is his duty; he and his Government are responsible. We do not say how far they are responsible, for we have not the evidence, but they are responsible for the condition of things, as the Administration of the day. The hon. gentleman says: We assume the responsibility, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite. These are very bold words from the First Minister. He challenges us, and at the same time he retains carefully, he conceals in pigeon-holes, all the evidence, all the documents, all the papers that have the slightest bearing on the whole difficulty which has arisen in the North-West. He told us that in 1869 he submitted to Parliament all the information he considered expedient, and he tells us that he submitts to Parliament all the information now he considers expedient. We all know that in 1869 every particle of testimony, every document, every paper, every proceeding taken by the Government or by the officials of the Government, every communication between the officials of the Government and the Government were all submitted to Parliament, and underwent investigation at the hands of Parliament. But now the hon. gentleman declines to submit the documents bearing on this question to Parliament. Why? If it was the right and proper thing to do in 1869 it is equally the right and proper thing to do in 1885. The people and Parliament of this country are entitled to have all these papers and documents, whatever they are, of whatever nature they are, submitted to Parliament, in order that Parliament may be in a position to pronounce upon the responsibility for the events that have taken place in the North-West Territories. Some person is responsible, somebody must be responsible, for a rebellion does not take place without some cause, and Parliament is entitled to have the facts, in order to ascertain who is responsible. The hon. gentleman tells us he has given some information on this question; he tells us he will give us some more information, but he candidly tells us there is some information he will not give. Why will he not give it? It is his duty, as First Minister, to submit to Parliament the papers and the documents relating to any complaint or grievance, if complaints and grievances have been presented to the Government. It is his duty to submit these papers to Parliament; and to tell Parliament that he will submit some, and that some he will not, is simply doing what the First Minister of any country has no right to do. In 1869 he submitted all the documents. True, in some of the communications some of the names were left out, not by the First Minister, but by the committee to whom the papers were submitted. Why were they left out? I suppose because the committee considered that the names of parties living in the country and concerned more or less in this correspondence should not be published to the world. Could he not do the same thing in this case? Could he not let those papers be brought down? And if there were any names which it would not be wise and judicious should be made known in the North-West, it would be a simple matter to omit them. Parliament does not care so much about the names; what it desires to know is the facts. It is not so anxious to know what names were submitted to the Government before the outbreak, with relation to the difficulties, if difficulties there were, that existed in the North-West Territories, as to ascertain the facts. The hon. gentleman challenges my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) to say that the surveys made there caused these outbreaks and that the Indians or half-breeds were wronged. We do not say so; we want to get the evidence, the papers; we want to see, if there is responsibility resting on the shoulders of anybody, where the responsibility rests. At present we are in the dark. The First Minister conceals those papers; they are in the pigeon-holes, and he says: Some I will bring down, some I will not. That is the way he treats Parliament and the country. He says it is not proper to bring them down. Why? It is true, he says, Riel has been caught, but Gabriel Dumont has not been caught; he is at large; he is still a rebel; he is still upon the plains, surrounded, possibly, by half-breeds and possibly by Indians, and the result of the publication of the documents might be the cause of serious injury to the missionaries and other residents. There is nothing in that statement. Why should they, how should they be prejudiced? I suppose, if any of these complaints mentioned the names of Riel or Dumont, there is no necessity for publishing that; but the communications themselves should be published. The First Minister should have considered that matter six months ago. He then knew well that, laboring among the half-breeds and Indians, were some Missionaries of the Cross, spending their lives among these people, with a view to christianising them and civilising them. He knew that the Indians and the half-breeds had the most implicit and unbounded faith in the missionaries. He knew, further, that the missionaries relied, to a large extent, on the assurances of the Government as to complaints made by the half-breeds, and that the half-breeds received those assurances from the missionaries; yet, during all these years, while these complaints have been existing, nothing has been done, so far as we know, so far as the documents submitted to Parliament, at all events, point out. The result is, these unfortunate missionaries have been slaughtered by the Indians; several reverend Fathers who labored among them for years have lost their lives; the result is, blood has been spilt. He now tells us these documents should not come down because life may be sacrificed. There is no necessity for life being sacrificed. I am sure the publication of these documents, published in a judicious and careful manner, as the documents of 1869 were published, would furnish no occasion for life being risked or lost. The hon. gentleman tells us the Indians have not and never had grievances; that they never made any complaints. I am not concerned at this moment to discuss the question how far the Indians had

grievance and made complaints. I refer the First Minister to his own published reports for the last two years; there he will find something which will not tally exactly with that statement. If I were concerned to established that complaints were made or that grievances existed, I need only take up the hon. gentleman's own report and the reports of his own officials, to show you that for the last five years these Indians—I do not say rightly or on justifiable grounds—have been urging on the Government of this country that they were being systematically swindled and wronged out of the money voted by Parliament for their support. It is nonsense for the First Minister to tell us, who have read his reports and the reports of his officials, and who know something about them, that there were no grievances or complaints. People do not go into rebellion without grievances or complaint. I do not however, intend here to pronounce on that subject, except from what appears in the hon. gentleman's own report; I am not dealing with that now. What the country is entitled to get are the documents on which the First Minister based his report to Parliament, in order that we may form our opinion as to whether or not the half-breeds and the Indians have any real ground of complaint. The hon. gentleman read from a newspaper as to the conduct of the Indians up there. If my memory serves me right, the newspaper did not give them a good character, but treated them as vindictive, harsh, treacherous, dangerous; yet these are the very men the First Minister proposes to enfranchise. The First Minister challenges my hon. friend, and, in regard to every motion and every question he has submitted to Parliament this Session with respect to the North-West, he intimates that those motions were made and those questions were put for purely petty party purposes. I would challenge the First Minister, if he were in his place; I challenge the Government to lay their finger upon any motion or question of my hon. friend which was not put with the purest patriotic motives.

Mr. RYKERT. What rot.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Lincoln says "what rot." That is the kind of argument I should expect from him; it is the kind of argument his intellect is capable of grasping; but I defy any member of the Government, I defy the hon. member with his scrap book, to lay his finger on any motion my hon. friend has made which was not in the interest of the country and in regard to which Parliament was not entitled to get the fullest and fairest information. The hon. gentleman tells us he was loyal, and as a loyalist undertook to suppress the rebellion. The loyalty should have been shown before; loyalty to the country, loyalty to the people of Canada, loyalty to those who have gone there to make their homes, some of whom were born there—that is the loyalty which would be more desirable than the lip-loyalty which we hear so much of in this House. We are entitled to get this information. We are not concerned at this moment to discuss the whole question of the responsibility of hon. gentlemen opposite or the responsibility of any person in the Dominion as to the unfortunate outbreak in the North-West Territories; we want to get the evidence, we want to get the information; and now this Session has arrived at a period, and these difficulties have arrived at a condition that the people of this country and the Parliament of this country are fairly entitled to call upon the Government to submit to Parliament every document, every paper, every resolution passed in the North-West, every petition sent from the North-West, every complaint made from the North-West, and every grievance set forth from the North-West, if any such there are, that have been sent to this Government within the last seven years, respecting the condition of affairs in the North-West Territories. The people of this country are entitled now to the fullest and fairest information upon this question, and upon every question bearing upon the action of the Government and the action of the officials of the Government, from the Lieutenant-Governor downwards. But, when we ask for this information, how are we answered? I have given you some papers; I will give you some more papers, and some more I will not give you. We are not living in an autocratic country; we are not living in a country where there is a one-man power; at least, I hope we are not. I supposed that we were living in a free country, and that Parliament could insist upon the Government giving full and fair information; but we are told that we shall have such papers as it suits his high mightiness to give us and at the time it pleases him to give the papers, and not until then. That is not a satisfactory answer. It is not an answer that the people will be satisfied with. The First Minister admits that Parliament must be called upon very shortly to pronounce some opinion upon the whole question. How are we to pronounce an opinion? Are we to arrive at it by not getting the papers, or by getting only such as the First Minister in his wisdom sees fit to submit to Parliament? I say no. We will not be in a position to give an unbiased and independent judgment until we have all the papers in connection with the North-West submitted to Parliament. The policy of the Government may be challenged; their policy in their dealings with the whole of the North-West, the conduct of the Administration and the conduct of the officials of the Administration, may be called in question; the complaints and grievances of the people in that Territory may be all discussed; and it is impossible to discuss these things intelligently unless we have the papers. We have the right to ask the First Minister to bring them down, to submit them to Parliament. There are questions involved in this matter of the first possible consequence to this whole country, to the progress and to the prosperity of the North-West, to the future of that great country upon which the Dominion of Canada rests with such confident hopes; and yet we are to be told, when we ask for the necessary information to enable us to form an opinion on this question, that we are to get the papers when the First Minister sees fit to bring them down; and, so far, he has brought nothing down that substantially bears upon the question which Parliament will be asked to discuss. The history of this matter goes back some years. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the hon. gentleman's dealings with the North-West for the last fifteen or twenty years. What we demand is, that Parliament shall be put in possession of the documents which are necessary in order that we may understand how far hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for the unfortunate outbreak which has taken place, and which has culminated in the loss of life and the spilling of much blood. I desire to call attention for a moment or two to the course which the Opposition has taken on this matter, to the persistent efforts of the Opposition, and notably of the hon. member for West Durham, to obtain from the Government any satisfaction as to what has taken place. You were Speaker in Parliament in 1883, and you are aware, Sir, that in that Session the hon. member for West Durham called for papers in respect to the grievances in the Prince Albert and Edmonton districts; you are aware that, on that occasion, the matter was fully discussed; that it was discussed by the First Minister, by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), and by the hon. member for West Durham; and you are aware that the House ordered the First Minister to bring those papers down. Did he bring them down? Did he put Parliament in possession of the complaints and grievances of the half-breeds and the white settlers of the North West Territories—settlers in the very spot that has been lately the scene of devastation and death? No, he did not. He did not, up to this Session. For two years, although the First Minister had these papers in his pigeon-holes all that time, he wilfully disre-

garded the resolution of Parliament and refused to submit them. It was only this Session, after persistent efforts, after insisting upon the Order of the House being obeyed by the First Minister, that he submitted to Parliament some of the papers. They did not cover even the Order of the House. The First Minister in this regard wilfully, persistently, disobeyed the Order of Parliament. He brought down a few of the papers, most of them of a date subsequent to the Order of the House. None of them, I think, bore date before the Order of the House. But the few he brought down did not afford any information to the members of this House or to the people of the country. On the 26th March the hon. member for West Durham again pressed upon the First Minister to submit these papers to Parliament. What was the answer then: I have given you some papers, I will give you some more, and some I will not give you? No, that was not the answer at that time; it was an assurance from the First Minister that these papers would be brought down shortly. There was no question then as to the interests of the people in the North-West being affected by the production of those papers; there was no question of its being improper and injudicious to submit those papers. He said: I will bring them down. Were they brought down? No, they were not. On the 27th March the member for West Durham again asked for them; on the 7th April he again asked for them; on the 16th April he again asked for the papers; on the 17th April he again asked for those papers; on the 20th April he again asked for them; on the 29th April again, and on the 6th May he again asked for them. It was not until recently that the First Minister took the ground that these papers should not be submitted to Parliament. He has promised over and over again to submit them, but whenever the question is pressed the First Minister declines to submit them to Parliament. On the 26th March the member for West Durham impressed upon the First Minister the necessity of having these papers, and moved a resolution, and in a powerful argument on the subject, pressed upon the attention of the Government the whole question. Again the Government did not refuse to bring those papers down, but they did not bring them down. What did the First Minister say, in reply to the speech of the hon. member for West Durham on the 26th March? He said that:

"In the meantime, not one of these half-breeds has been disturbed; more than that, they have been personally assured that their possession was just as good as if they had the deeds in their pockets; but, mind you, these men are quarrelling among themselves, just as white speculators do, when they try to jump each other's claims, and it is to settle the residuum of these claims this committee has been appointed."

There the First Minister admits that complaints were made, that the documents were in his possession, that these complaints were dealt with and their claims adjusted. We want to see these papers. We want to know what action the First Minister took with reference to them. We want to know upon what he based his judgment. Yet he tells us coolly that we are only to have such papers as he sees fit. He tells us they were notified. How were they notified? He has not brought down any papers that show these half-breeds were notified, that their claims were recognised. He goes further, and says they were personally notified. I do not know whether what the First Minister states is correct or not, and I want to know. I want to get these papers submitted to Parliament, in order that Parliament may be thoroughly conversant with this whole question. The First Minister has said that some of these complaints were years ago submitted to the Government. What disposition did the Government make of them? We do not know, and we want to know. The First Minister plumed himself, as he always does, upon the wonderful success of his Administration in preserving peace and order in the North-West Territories—the marvellous success that has attended every movement of this wonderfully paternal

administration. He told us that the claims of the half-breeds and aborigines were settled peacefully and quietly, and he challenged the hon. member for West Durham to deny that these half-breeds in Manitoba were properly treated. We want to know what they complained of. If they sent complaints to the Administration I want to know what disposition was made of those complaints. Yet the hon. gentleman coolly tells us that he will give just such information upon the subject as he sees fit. I say that is not the way to treat Parliament, because Parliament is entitled to the fullest information on all these questions. The hon. gentleman said the condition of the half-breeds of the Territories and the claims which have been preferred on their behalf were somewhat similar to those of the half-breeds of the Red River district, and had been receiving careful consideration, with a view to treating them fairly. Now, we want to know how these complaints were considered by the Government, and when they were considered. The First Minister says:

"In the Edmonton district the surveys of lands settled on have been completed, and when the report of the surveyor, to whom the duty was entrusted, has been examined and approved in the usual way, the claims of the actual settlers at that point will be considered and disposed of."

Now, this was some time ago. Is it a fact that complaints were made? Is is a fact that they were disposed of? If they were made and have been settled, I say Parliament is entitled to have the fullest information on these points. The hon. gentleman tells us that the claims of the half-breeds in Manitoba were all peaceably and quietly adjusted. Is it not a fact, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, that when the First Minister made this statement there were 500 claims undisposed of; and is it not a fact that, since the hon. gentleman made that statement, namely, on the 25th April nearly 500 of these Manitoba half-breed claims were then, for the first time, disposed of? Is it not the fact that these Manitoba half breeds were therefore making common cause with their brethren in the North-West Territories, resisting what they considered to be the unjust dealings of this Government? If there are facts of this kind we ought to know them; we ought to have the complaints of these Manitoba half-breeds before us, and we ought to know what disposition the Government has made of them. Yet we are answered by the First Minster, who arrogantly tells us that we will get just such information as he sees fit. Upon the 30th of March, the hon. member for West Durham again drew the attention of the First Minister to these papers, and I believe the assurance was then given that the papers would be brought down. But the First Minister himself, on that day, made use of the following language:—

"In accordance with the principle of the surveyors, the surveyors had commenced and had decided to carry out that principle of laying out all the lines under the normal practice of surveying that has been laid down in the Dominion Land Act; but while that was being done, it was not for the purpose of depriving any man, woman or child of land they had a title to, by possession or otherwise; it was not that they had the remotest idea of taking possession of it. Only, the regular piece of land would be so much in one quarter, so much in another, and so much in another. That was the original arrangement made by the Surveyor-General, and it naturally raised suspicion, as you can quite understand, among the half-breeds, that they were going to be forced out of their irregular tracts, of which they were in possession, and would be compelled to take square blocks. The moment that was brought to the notice of the Department it was altered; and the half-breeds were informed they would keep and get their lands according to their custom. They have got their lands."

From his statement it is manifest these half-breeds had been complaining of the system of surveys which had been adopted by this Government; it is manifest that at that very moment he was in possession of complaints made by the half-breeds of Prince Albert and Edmonton districts, and from what he said one would infer that these complaints had been disposed of satisfactorily to the half-breeds. Is it a fact that this was done? If the complaints were settled by the Department, this Parliament ought to know it, and

we ought to have the documents before us. The hon. gentleman knew how sensitive the half-breeds were upon this question of survey, ever since the rebellion of 1869; he knew that the evidence was overwhelming, that one of the great grievances of the half-breeds in 1869 was the unwise and injudicious system of survey adopted by the Government. The hon. gentleman has only to turn for proof to the evidence given by Lieutenant-Governor McTavish, in 1874, who says:

"Some of the surveys which were made at that time were displeasing to the half-breeds, on whose lands the said surveys were made. The discontent of the half-breeds arose further from the fact that their land was being measured by the surveyors, without explanation being made as to the object, the lands being then cultivated by the half-breeds."

This evidence shows the grievances the half-breeds of Manitoba had in 1869. The hon. gentleman knows also that the Venerable Archbishop Taché, of St. Boniface, gave his testimony before the committee appointed to investigate the matter, when he stated the following:—

"The more remote cause was followed by me, which was more direct, and this may be said to have commenced with the arrival of the surveyors who came into the colony of Assiniboine."

You have the testimony of the Governor of the Hudson Bay Company, and also the testimony of the Archbishop, taken in 1874, both pointing out that the cause of complaint was the system of survey adopted by the Dominion Government. You will find, further, that the Minister of Public Works, who was a witness on that occasion, gave his testimony. Let us see what he stated on that occasion, with respect to the surveys, and how far they caused the difficulty that culminated in the rebellion of 1869. The hon. gentleman knows that the Minister of Public Works, his colleague, declared on oath that:

"Another cause, I believe, is the want of tact—and, in certain cases, the fanaticism of certain Government employés who, instead of showing the half-breeds that they were sent, not to disturb them in the possession of their land, went to work as if their idea had been to deprive those people of their possessions."

Here you have concurrent testimony, one of the witnesses being the Minister of Public Works, who is a Minister to-day, declaring that one cause of the complaints of the half-breeds of Manitoba was the system of surveys, and they complained that the Government sent fanatical officials to assist in the government of that territory. Like causes produce like effects. The same causes, in 1869, culminated in an outbreak. Like causes existed in 1884. I will not say they culminated in an outbreak, for I will leave that for the House to decide when the papers are brought down. It is quite clear that documents of an important character are in the possession of the Government, and that Parliament should be seized of them. The First Minister went on to say:

"To-day, if there is anything Canada ought to be more proud of than another, it is the peace, the quiet and the order that have existed in the North-West ever since the successful result of the Red River expedition, under Lord Wolseley."

That is what the First Minister said on the 26th of March last. Was the hon. gentleman so utterly ignorant of the real condition of affairs in the North-West as to venture, upon his responsibility as First Minister of the Dominion, to state that, if there was one thing more than another that the Government should be proud of, it was the fact that peace and prosperity and contentment existed in the North-West Territories. At that very moment the hon. gentleman must have known, or ought to have known, that the half-breeds had got behind their Winchesters in opposition to the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman must have known, I will not say he did know, that that statement was wholly contrary to the facts. He ought to have known either of his own knowledge or from his officials, if they were not of such a fanatical character as was described by the Minister of Public Works, and unless they were utterly regardless of the best interests of the country, that at that very moment discontent existed in every portion of the North-West. He must have known, if he had examined into his own pigeon-holes at his Department, that complaints, petitions and resolutions, passed in the North-West, protesting against the Government's policy were in those pigeon-holes. He should have known that those claims were brought before the Administration, that charges of a most serious character were made, whether rightly or wrongly I do not now say; but that they were made is beyond a shadow of doubt. He did know that two years before a delegation of half-breeds came all the way down from the valley of the Saskatchewan, at their own expense, to interview the First Minister and insist on the recognition of existing claims throughout the North-West, not only with respect to the half-breeds but with respect to white settlers. The hon. gentleman must have known the condition of the North-West from the speech made by the hon. member for West Durham, and the speech made by the member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), describing the grievances under which the half-breeds were suffering; yet the hon. gentleman told us that if there is one thing more than another of which the Government have reason to be proud, it was that peace, progress and prosperity continued to exist in the North-West. There was no peace. The hon. gentleman was crying peace when there was no peace and no contentment; and the First Minister was derelict in his duty to the people if he was ignorant of the fact that discontentment prevailed, and he was derelict to Parliament if he was at that time aware of the condition of affairs, and yet stated that peace, prosperity and contentment reigned in the whole North-West Territory. The hon. gentleman must have known something of the movements of the half-breeds subsequent to the interview he had with the half-breed delegates from the valley of the Saskatchewan. He must have seen, because I suppose he reads the public press, the address printed by those delegates, and the letter sent by them to Montana, calling on Louis Riel, their old leader, to return from his American home and once more settle among them in the North-West. The hon. gentleman must have seen, unless he were blind, wilfully blind, the reply made by Louis Riel to the delegation, on 4th June, 1884, which was couched in the following language:—

"To Messrs. James Isbister, Gabriel Dumont, Moise Ouillette and Michel Dumas:—

"GENTLEMEN,—You have travelled more than 700 miles, from the Saskatchewan country across the international line, to make me a visit. The communities in the midst of which you live have sent you as their delegates to ask my advice on various difficulties which have rendered the British North-West unhappy under the administration of the Ottawa Government. Moreover, you invite me to go and stay amongst you, your hope being that I, for one, could help to better, in some respects, your condition, and cordial and pressing is your invitation; you want me and my family to accompany you; I am at liberty to excuse myself and say no; yet you are waiting for me; so that I have only to get ready, and your letters of delegation assure me that a friendly welcome awaits me in the midst of those who sent you.

"Gentlemen, your personal visit does me honor and causes great pleasure; but on account of its representative character, your coming to me has the appearance of a remarkable circumstance which I record as one of the gratifications of my life—an event which my family will remember, and I pray to God that my assistance will prove so successful to you as to render this event a blessing amongst the many blessings of this my fortieth year. To be frank is the shortest. I doubt whether my advice given to you on this soil concerning affairs in Canadian territories could cross the border and retain any influence. But here is another view of the matter. I am entitled, according to the 31st and 32nd clauses of the Manitoba treaty, to land, of which the Canadian Government have, directly or indirectly, deprived me, and my claim to which is valid, notwithstanding the fact that I have become an American citizen. Considering then, that my interests are identical with yours, I accept your very kind invitation, and will go and spend some months amongst you, in the hope that by petitioning the Government we will obtain the redress of all our grievances.

"Montana has a population of which the native half-breed element constitutes a considerable proportion; and if we include those white men who, through being connected by marriage, or in other ways have a personal interest in their welfare, I believe it is safe to assert that this element is a pretty strong one. I am just getting acquainted with them, and I am one of those who would like to unite and direct its vote for the

furtherance of their best interests; moreover, I have made friends and acquaintances amongst whom I like to live. I go with you, but I come back in September. I have the honor to be, gentlemen delegates, your humble servant,

"LOUIS RIEL."

Will the Government deny that they had this communication? Will the Government deny that they received petitions from the half-breeds; that resolutions passed by the half-breeds were received here before October, 1884. The evidence is clear. Another letter, bearing date 22nd July, 1884, signed by a half-breed named J. Isbister, has an important bearing on the notification given to the Government. That letter is as follows:—

"PRINCE ALBERT SETTLEMENT,
"ST. CATHARINE'S PARISH,
"July 22, 1884.

"To the Editor of the *Sun*:

"SIR,—A treaty was made in 1875 with the poor Indians out here. The promises were good, but they have never been fulfilled. When the half breeds, both French and English, went to speak to Governor Morris, they were asked not to interfere with the Indian, that there would be no delay, and that the half-breeds would be attended to immediately. Ever since, and up to the present moment, petition upon petition has been drawn up with the the people's grievance, and sent down to the Ottawa Government, but with no result. How many are there in this settlement who can produce a free patent with regard to land taken before 1870, or even as to the lands taken before 1862? I was the first settler in this settlement. I lived alone with my wife and two small children in the wild times of the Indian tribes, and when leaving my home on a hunting excursion after buffalo, with my little family, I found on my return that the house had been burst open, the boxes broken, and clothing and provisions taken. Afterwards, I had to dig large cellars in through the fir wood, between this and Carleton, and cache my stuff, until I made a sufficient hunt for the winter. Then I carted all to the house, where I wintered, and went on with my improvements. To tell how I had to live in bringing the wild Indian to live in peace with the white man would take a great many sheets of paper. But to this day I am not afraid to say that I am respected by the Indians and by others besides. Yet, where is the free patent for my little portion of land, or who should hold the first patent? How has the screw been turned on the poor settlers of the North-West, that they have nothing to show their right to the land occupied? Yet the officials of the Canadian Government here insist on farmers paying timber dues for the fence required to build around a few acres of land, and a little dry wood required to boil a teakettle. Yet I believe a man, the first year settled, can get from this same Government about sixty logs free, which is supposed to do for both himself and stock. Therefore, it is necessary that we should secure the same rights as the people of Manitoba; and we should get, not blame, but sympathy, from those who see how the people of the North-West are dealt with. Having no one in whom we could place confidence to act in our interest, and seeing that our members are satisfied with promises only, we still waited patiently until the timber dues were cut to a fine point, the best surveyed lands were given to colonisation companies, and we were told by a Government official that no provision had been made for the half-breeds of the North-West, and only for those of Manitoba. The people, both English and French half-breeds, appointed a delegation to be sent to Mr. Riel, who could soon give proper satisfaction as to whether the North-West was included in the Manitoba treaty or not. This, to satisfy the people, he has already explained.

"J. ISBISTER."

Sir, does this man tell an untruth? He says that petition after petition, remonstrance after remonstrance, protest after protest, was sent to the Government at Ottawa, but they paid no attention. Complaints made to their officials and to themselves practically passed unheeded; they fell on deaf ears; no attention was paid to them, and still we wonder why rebellion sprung up in the North-West. I do not now discuss the responsibility for that rebellion; it is no part of my argument; but these documents prove beyond doubt that the Administration have in their possession papers of vital importance in discussing this question, papers which the First Minister arrogantly tells us he will submit to Parliament or not, as he thinks best. The First Minister knows well that the settlers at Calgary, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw, Edmonton, and every other centre of population in that country, for the past three or four years, have been sending petitions and remonstrances against the conduct of the hon. gentleman himself, against the irritating and unreasonable delays, against their whole conduct from beginning to end, not only of the Administration but of the officials of the Administration. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that the half-breeds and the white settlers have complained of these

colonisation companies getting possession of these lands which have been settled on for years by those half-breeds and white settlers. They know perfectly well that protests have been presented against the irritating results which were likely to follow his policy of procrastination and delay. He knows perfectly well that not only did he get remonstrances from public meetings, but from private individuals —from his own friends. We know that these documents are in the possession of the Government, but still the hon. gentleman tells us they will be brought down or not, as he thinks fit. Here is what the hon. gentleman himself stated in 1883, with respect to the grievances of the settlers in that country. He said:

"The settlers are scattered along the North Saskatchewan for a great distance. Some of them have complained that they should have long narrow strips of land, running back three or four miles into the country, such as we were obliged to grant to the settlers along the Red River and Assiniboine River, for the purpose of settling all the disputes that existed in that country."

On that occaison the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) said:

"I suppose you are aware that delegates have been sent here by a certain portion of the population of the North-West Territories, respecting the subject which is just now engaging the attention of this House, and is more especially under the notice of the Government. These delegates have laid their grievances—if grievances they are—before some of the hon. Ministers. Their object is to have the title to the lands occupied, owned and improved by some of these people for over twenty years, recognised and confirmed by the Government. Their claims are nothing but just. These lands belong mostly to half-breed people, and pioneers from Ontario, who went west from the Province of Manitoba some five, ten, or fifteen years ago. There is a very important group at Duck Lake, at Prince Albert; another at Edmonton; another at St. Albert, and so on. Last year surveyors went out to carry on the surveys of the Dominion in that part of the country. These surveyors had no instructions to stop whenever they would meet any of the old settlements; and their continuing the line aroused, of course, the suspicion of the old settlers, who held a meeting, and represented to the Government the justice of respecting their property in farms and improvements."

You see by the arguments which were advanced by the hon. member for Provencher that they had meetings there; that they had sent down complaints to the Government here; that they had even sent a delegation here; and yet a single word of those remonstrances or representations, or of what the Government did with them, is not submitted to Parliament; they refuse to submit them, and the hon. gentleman autocratically tells us that he will give them or retain them, as he thinks fit. The hon. gentleman says the Indians are satisfied and contended, but if he will turn to his own reports he will find that the Indians for years have been complaining of the misconduct, the mismanagement and the robbery committed on them by the officials. I do not say that these complaints are true; I do not know whether they are or not; I am not concerned in that; but I say that these complaints and remonstrances ought to be submitted to Parliament, in order that we may be able to judge as to whether these things are true or not. The First Minister says that all this fuss we are making about the claims of the half-breeds is a bagatelle; that it is not to be considered; that it is not a matter of the slightest importance to the people of this country. He says:

"Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the complaint of these people, as published and as alluded to by the hon. gentleman, has very little reference to this land question. This land question is a bagatelle compared with their other complaints. There are a very few things unsettled, and they will be easily settled. There are points which are not yet settled, but these men will not be dispossessed. When the boundaries are settled and all their quarrels with their neighbors are arranged, they will get their patents fully, that they have a right to. But the hon. gentleman went over their 'grievances;' he rolled that word under his tongue as a sweet morsel—the 'grievances' of these people; their 'just claims' denied. But I say there have been no just claims denied. Every just claim has been acknowledged. The most of those just claims have been settled, and those that are not settled will be settled as soon as it can be ascertained beyond that fraud is not being practised upon the people."

Is that true or false? Whether true or false, it is quite clear that the hon. gentleman admits that there are docu-

ments in the possession of the Government in relation to these claims that he has not submitted to Parliament, that Parliament has called for, and that he ought to submit. Whether it is true or false, I am not concerned in establishing just now; only it is somewhat singular that over 200 of these claims have been recognised by the commission since it went up there two months ago. The hon. gentleman says that every claim is settled. If that is the case, let us have the documents, the complaints of the half-breeds, the grounds on which they make their claims, and the adjudication of the Government. The hon. gentleman sent Mr. Pearce up last summer to settle these claims. I know Mr. Pearce; he is a respectable man; but the hon. gentleman tells us he is not capable of investigating these claims, because the half-breeds talk only Cree or French, and Mr. Pearce could not talk a word of either Cree or French. Was it not absurd for the Government to send a man up to settle those grievances who could only speak English? This report was dated the 24th of October of last year, and I suppose that on the 24th of October the hon. gentleman knew the difficulties existing in the North-West, and yet he does not see fit to inform Parliament what was done with regard to them. I am not concerned to consider whether these grievances were founded on a proper basis or not. But I have shown beyond all doubt that there are documents in the possession of the Government which they ought to submit to Parliament, and which they have not submitted to Parliament. I say Parliament ought to be seized of these documents; Parliament ought to be informed of every matter in connection with the whole transaction, from beginning to end. The hon. gentleman treats Parliament and the people of this country with supreme contempt; he does more than that; he treats his own followers with contempt. He tells us that no matter what the policy of the Government is, it will be supported by a majority of the representatives of the people in Parliament. The hon. gentleman is trespassing very greatly upon the forbearance and good nature of hon. gentlemen opposite. I presume that they will not decide questions of this kind without having the evidence before them, and that they will insist on the production of all the documents bearing on this question. The hon. First Minister tells us that he will submit to Parliament such documents as he sees fit. The proper course for him, as for any Government, to pursue, is to take Parliament into his confidence, and to submit all those documents to the consideration of Parliament. Then we shall know whether these half-breeds, Indians, and white settlers in the Territories have any just ground of complaint; but it is treating Parliament with supreme contempt to tell us that we are not to have any documents, except such as he sees fit to submit; and instead of replying to my hon friend calmly and deliberately, to fall back on the old old story of want of patriotism and disloyalty. But the hon. gentleman's misconduct and criminality in all the transactions connected with the whole North-West will be remembered by the people of this country long after hon. gentlemen's bones are as rotten as their loyalty.

Mr. BLAKE. Before my motion is put I desire to say just one or two words with reference to the reply made by the First Minister. The hon. gentleman, not for the first, or second, or third time this Session, has addressed to us language which is wholly unparliamentary, and which would be beneath the dignity of his position, even if he were the humblest member of this House, and which is still more beneath the dignity of his position as the leader of this House. I have not hitherto either commented upon or retorted upon the hon. gentleman when he has adopted this style of argument; but I think the time has arrived, or nearly arrived, when forbearance ceases to be a virtue; and when an hon. gentleman, in his position, chooses persistently and continuously to address such offensive language to an hon. member opposed to him, it is time that an understanding should be reached as to whether that method of conducting the business of Parliament is to be continued. The hon. gentleman said to-day: What care I whether there are people dead or alive in the North-West; and in several other parts of his address he imputed to me the basest, meanest and most unworthy motives for my course in this House. I shall only say to-night, as to my views of the hon. gentleman's conduct, that I believe the hon. gentleman, intoxicated by vanity and by the adulation of his followers, is forgetful of his own dignity, and of the decencies of debate; and I warn him that he will not be suffered unscathed to pursue an unparliamentary course. With reference to the hon. gentleman's statement as to the reasons why he had delayed to produce a portion of these papers, and the reasons why he was not about to produce another portion of them, I have just one or two observations to make. He says, of the delay in the production of the papers which he says will be brought down, that delay is excused in this matter, the most important which has come before the Parliament this Session, which has perhaps ever come before the Parliament of the country, on the ground that there is a deficiency in the copying powers of the Department. It is not necessary to do more than state that excuse to demonstrate its utter absurdity and flimsiness. Are we to be told by the First Minister, eight weeks after the demand is made, that it is because he cannot find men enough to copy the papers that we have not got them? As to the other class of papers, which he has not brought down and says he will not bring down, because he says they are papers, the production of which may imperil the lives and interests of persons in the North-West, I have two observations to make. The first is this; that no papers which should show that the writers of them believed that the half-breeds had grievances or in which they advised the Government to remedy those grievances—no papers which gave a fair and plain statement of the circumstances of the case—could by any possibility, if published, injure or impair the standing of those people in the community in which they live. It is perfectly clear that those papers could but strengthen them in the confidence of the people among whom they live, instead of impairing it. The second observation is this: that we found precisely the same difficulty in the year 1869-70, and the way in which the Government got over that difficulty on that occasion was not by taking upon itself not to produce these papers, but by bringing them down and striking a select committee, composed of members on both sides of the House, who should decide how much of those papers it would be in the interest of the public and of individuals to publish. At that moment Louis Riel, as I said, was the president of the *de facto* Government of the country; he was exercising a certain authority there, and we know how it was exercised, and under those circumstances the Government brought the papers down; but, they said, we will appoint a select committee, which shall go over the papers, and shall expunge such as, for the moment, cannot be published without detriment to the interest of individuals there; and there was an expurgation of certain names and an omission of a certain document which might, if produced, have had that result. That is the precedent of the hon. gentleman himself, set by himself, to deal with the very case he now says he is going to meet without bringing down the documents. In the third place, and it is the last observation I will make, the hon. gentleman, in order to make out any case at all for this argument of his, which I have proved to be no argument, affirmed that the half-breeds were still in insurrection, and that there was still danger, and that they were still and would be still inciting the Indian population to warfare. That must strike us all with a painful surprise, because we have observed, with feelings of gratifica-

tion, I am sure, that the General in command had freed a large number of persons who came in, and told them to return to their homes. If it be the case, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that the half-breeds are still organising, I do not think that was a very prudent thing to do; but I do not think it is the case. I adhere to the statement with which I opened my remarks; I believe General Middleton pursued a prudent course; I believe there was no danger, and in that, as in other respects, the hon. gentleman's argument is wholly without foundation.

Motion negatived on a division.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On sub-section 3, section 4,

Mr. McMULLEN. I move in amendment:

That after the word "is," in the 42nd line, page 5, the following words be added:—rated on the revised assessment roll.

He said: I think this is necessary in order to prevent the manufacturing of votes. If a man is not rated at all, but simply tells the revising barrister that he is the owner of property in any municipality, a revising barrister may put him on the list, and there will be no means of ascertaining that he has been improperly put on, unless by taking the trouble to refer to the registry office. There will be no difficulty in the case of a man who is rated on the assessors' list, because it is not likely he would desire to be taxed unless he had some vested interest.

Mr. CASEY. I think this is a very important amendment. It will secure, at all events, that which we have been contending should be the rule in making the voters' list, namely, that the primary valuations should be made by the municipal authorities. A great deal has been said about the alleged unfairness of Grit assessors, and something might be said about the alleged unfairness of Tory assessors; but as between the revising officer and the assessor, whether Grit or Tory, the latter would be less likely to be mistaken or be guilty of wrong-doing, since his term of office is only for one year, and he is immediately amenable to the people and resides among them. The valuation by assessors is more likely to be, on the average, fair and non-partisan than the assessment by the revising officer, because every rural electoral division contains several municipalities, and the chances are equal that the number of Grit assessors will be balanced by the number of Tory assessors, or *vice versâ*. It is true that politics is sometimes introduced into municipal affairs, but it is only spasmodically, and generally municipal councillors are elected for their services to the municipality, or in the hope that they will render good service to the municipality. In my own township, which is a strong Reform township, we have for years, at a time, elected a Conservative reeve, and sometimes we have had a majority of Conservatives in the council, and the same thing has happened in other townships, where the majority has been been even more strongly Reform. The chances are as great that the assessor will be of one party as of the other. In any case, you cannot expect to get a man free from political leanings, because every intelligent man has them, and our friends opposite do not propose to have the valuation made by a perfectly impartial person, but to place it in the hands of one who will be invariably a Conservative.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen applaud that idea, and look pleased at it, but I do not think they can ask this House or the country to consider the position which they have taken logical or fair. They object to allowing assessors to value property because they may be partisans, and they propose to leave the valuation in every case in the hands of one who is sure to be a partisan. Another objection raised to the valuation by municipal assessors is that they are in the habit of valuing too low, and that in this way the franchise will be restricted; but, in regard to properties of small value, the assessors generally estimate them more nearly at their actual value than they do properties of larger value. Even if the assessor fails to do his duty in this respect, the judges, when they are appealed to, will always adopt the basis laid down in the law, and are in the habit of taking evidence as to the actual value, and so correcting any mistake which the assessors may have made. I contend, therefore, that there is much less liability to partiality on the part of the assessor than on the part of the revising officer, and that there is much less liability to actual error on the part of the former, because he is an actual resident and knows the land personally, and knows what land is worth in the particular neighborhood better than a revising officer could possibly do. In the third place, I contend it will be just as easy, in fact easier, to rectify any errors of judgment the assessor might make, or any breaches of trust of which he might be guilty, than it would be to correct the errors of the revising officer. In the case of the assessor, his mistakes, intentional or otherwise, would probably affect both sides equally in the constituency, and both sides would have to bear the cost of correction; but the mistakes of the revising officer, intentional or other otherwise, would probably be to the detriment of the Opposition party only, and the cost of correcting his blunders or wrong-doing would fall exclusively upon that party.

Mr. McMULLEN. My object in making this amendment was to guard against the manufacture of faggot votes. In England a law has been passed providing that a man must show that he has paid taxes in the year previous to the time when he requires to be put upon the list, that he has been put upon the assessment roll and pays taxes. I wish to provide some similar safeguard. For instance, supposing a man desires to be placed upon the list, he may get some person to convey to him, for the time being, a piece of property. It is not necessary that the deed shall be registered, and he produces it before the revising officer and claims to be put upon the list. The revising officer is not supposed to visit the registration office to see if the deed is *bonâ fide* or not. He accepts the document as *primâ facie* evidence that the man owns the property. I have pointed out a loop whereby deeds might be manufactured and give parties a chance to get put upon the list when they had no right to it.

Mr. BAIN. I suppose it would be hardly fair to ask the First Minister to amend this clause, so as to make assessment rolls absolute with reference to the value of property; but I do think it might be fairly taken as the basis upon which these rolls are made up. I think it would not be equitable to make them final. There might be cases in which it would be only fair, if an appeal remained in the hands of a revising officer, or of the county judge. But I do think, speaking for my own Province, the assessment rolls in the various municipalities should be the basis of the voters' list. I presume there are cases in which the assessors are partisan, and might, perhaps, do scant justice to those opposed to them in politics. But it is to be remembered that they are under the control of the municipal council, and parties aggrieved with their assessment have an opportunity of appealing from him to the council. I think that, when the roll finally comes from the court of revision, it might be accepted as a fair and equitable valuation of property in the municipalities. With respect to the properties which are placed at the low assessment of $150, or $200, my own municipal experi-

ence leads me to the view that, as a rule, those properties are oftener valued to their full amount than any other properties that go upon the roll. There is a tendency on the part of parties who possess properties that are worth just about enough to qualify them to vote to feel aggrieved if they are placed a little below that amount.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman proposes to take the assessment roll as the guide, in the first instance, I do not see that he could have any objections to the amendment of my hon. friend. If he desires to make it more clearly the guide which the revising officer will have to follow, it will be of great advantage to adopt this rule. It will entitle parties whose names are upon the assessment roll to go upon the list as a matter of right, in the first instance, and then, if it is found, upon investigation, that there has been a change of proprietor before the roll is finally made up, it will be the duty of the party in whose hands the property remains to establish that right, but it will give to the party whose name is upon the assessment roll a *primâ facie* right to go upon the voters' list, and to remain there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we can alter this clause, because it would interfere with the other form of expression which we have already passed, with regard to cities and municipalities. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the registration clause it is provided that the assessment roll shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the value of such property.

Mr. BAIN. When the rolls are made up, will the revising officer's clerk place all those tenants on the voters' list which appear from the assessment roll to occupy property of sufficient value to qualify them to vote if they had been owners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, very likely; but I do not want to prejudice the matter.

Mr. CASEY. The fact that a different form has been adopted with respect to the preceding clause is no argument that the present proposition should not be discussed on its merits, and, if necessary, the preceding clause could be changed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The effect of the adoption of this motion would be to make the assessment roll absolute evidence of the right to vote, and no name could be struck off and no name added.

Mr. EDGAR. That is not so. According to the language of this amendment the assessment roll is *primâ facie* evidence of value, but it is necessary that the voter's name shall appear on the assessment roll before it can be placed on the voters' list. But it does not give every man on the assessment roll the right to vote, because it is declared that the actual necessary value shall exist. If the qualification is $200, a man may be on the assessment roll for $250; but still it is always open before the judge revising the list to show that the property is only worth $150, and although the man's name is on the assessment roll it can be struck off the voters' list. In like manner, a name may be on the assessment roll for $150 and the qualification be $200; evidence can be brought to show that the property is worth $200 and the name be inserted on the voters' list.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose a party comes before a revising officer and says: I have obtained a transfer of property. It was assessed on 1st June, and on 1st July I purchased it. Does the hon. gentleman intend that the party who has become the proprietor of the property shall be entitled to have his name substituted for that of the owner at the time the assessment was made? Does he intend that the original proprietor shall stand on the list as the owner when the new proprietor's name appears on the next assessment roll?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Then one of two things must happen. Either both parties must be on the list for the same period, or he must authorise the revising officer to substitute the new for the old proprietor. Does he propose to do that at the time the list is made up, or must the party appear at the revision and establish his right?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I do not object to that, but it should be made absolutely certain that it is the duty of the officer to put the owner's name on as a matter of right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we have done that.

Mr. CASEY. Even under the hon. gentleman's understanding, I do not think that the amendment would do any injustice, because the assessment roll itself, before reaching the stage at which it becomes the basis of the voters' list, is subject to a process of revision and appeal, so that the voter would have every opportunity of having himself assessed at the right figure before the roll was finished.

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the First Minister is correct in his view of the effect of this amendment, but if it were inserted a little lower down I think it would meet the case. It would then read: "Is the owner of real property within any such electoral district, of the value of and rated on the assesment roll, etc."

Mr. BOWELL. Supposing it is not rated on the assessment roll?

Mr. MULOCK. The point of the amendment is, that if a man is not so assessed we assume he is not worth the amount.

Mr. BOWELL. That is making the law worse than the present law in our Province.

Mr. MULOCK. No; because there is an appeal.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman must see that if you put those words in you make it absolutely necessary for the person to be assessed on the roll before he can go on the list.

Mr. MULOCK. He can have the assessment corrected.

Mr. MILLS. By the interpretation clause, the hon. gentleman will see that the roll is only *primâ facie* evidence of value, and not of ownership, so it does not touch the point raised by the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The time to consider that, will be when we come to the clause with regard to the revising officers.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman admits that it shall be the duty of the officer to accept the value on the assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence, and the name is *primâ facie* evidence of ownership.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any objection to that.

Mr. HACKETT. As we have no compulsory assessment rolls in Prince Edward Island, the effect of the amendment would be to disfranchise the whole of the people of some counties.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman must know that special provision must afterwards be made for cases in which there is no assessment roll.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all.

Mr. HACKETT. Leave the Bill as it is at present, and it covers the whole case.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK moved that the words "and fifty" be struck out of the third paragraph of section 4. The effect of that would be to make the qualification in rural districts $100.

Mr. BURPEE. I hope that will be carried; otherwise, this clause will disfranchise more people in New Brunswick than any other clause in the Bill. In that Province $100 real estate has been the qualification for many years. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King) the other night made a statement as to the effect of the clause in his county. He said there were 2,000 voters in Queen's, of whom some 427 were qualified on property between $100 and $150 in value, and the personal qualification in this Bill will disfranchise some 90 more, making a difference in the electorate of some 20 per cent. I do not say that all of those will be disfranchised, because a few few of them may be enfranchised under other clauses of the Bill. But the larger portion will be left off the list altogether. The county of Sunbury adjoins Queen's, on the west, and I think the circumstances there would be about the same. I have written for a list to the secretary-treasurer of the county, and I believe the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has also written to the secretary-treasurer of his county; but we have not yet received replies, which I regret, because I believe we shall be able to show that a very large number of people would be disfranchised in those counties. When we are taking real estate as the basis of the franchise, I think we should make the qualification as low as it is in the Province having the lowest franchise. In Ontario and New Brunswick I believe the franchise is $100, and other Provinces have manhood suffrage; so that I think it would only be fair to reduce this to $100, and I hope the Prime Minister will consent to the amendment. The local member for the county of York, which adjoins my county, writes to me that he has had the official list examined, and that of 3,000 or 3,500 electors outside of the city of Fredericton, this provision will disfranchise 804, who are qualified either on $400 personal property or on between $100 and $150 of real estate. The numbers in the different parishes who will be disqualified, he gives as follows:—St. Mary's, 104; Stanley, 96; Southampton, 76; Queensbury, 32; Kingsclear, 54; Manvers Sutton, 34; New Maryland, 19; North Lake, 57; Prince William, 50; Douglass, 30; Dumfries, 38; Canterbury, 153; and Bright, 59; and he adds, "few if any of the above will come in under other clauses of the Bill." As Sunbury is between the counties I have mentioned, I presume a great many electors would be disfranchised there, as well as in many other counties in the Province. In the district where I live you might scarcely find a man for miles around who would be disfranchised; but six or seven miles to the north, in the back district, you would find them by the score. They live on very small farms, which are assessed for $100. There is another class, who have small farms near coal mines, but who spend a large portion of the year in the mines. I think this Bill ought to take all these classes into consideration.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would prefer to see the qualification at $100; I do not want to see any man disfranchised, but there is one thing to be taken into consideration, and that is the taxable value. Every man in the country can put his property down in order to have it assessed low and taxed low, but when you come to the real value, which is the value to be taken in this Bill, I do not believe that the difference in qualification will amount to anything. I think that every man who has a vote now will have a vote then on that qualification. I do not think there will be any trouble about it, and I am not afraid to meet my constituents on that ground. I would rather have seen it at $100, but if the majority is in favor of $150, I do not see that the difference will really have any effect, and am therefore prepared to accept the higher rate. As regards the statement the hon. member for Queen's N.B., (Mr. King) made the other night, I have not a word to say about it; his statement may be correct, but if so, his county is a great deal poorer than I understood it was, since this qualification will disfranchise 427 of his constituents out of a possible 2,000 votes. That seems to me a very poor representation for the hon. gentleman to make of his county. To make his case stronger, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) also got up, although they knew nothing about the county, not half as much as I do. My view is that where there is so much protesting, the truth is generally lost. As regards the county of York, N.B., the hon. gentleman says there are about 4,500 votes in it; it just happens there is within a trifle of 5,000 votes; and taking the same ratio of disfranchisement as the hon. member for Queen's says this Bill will operate in his county, 1,000 votes would be the disfranchisement in my county. I do not believe that, even admitting the ability of the Attorney-General of New Brunswick. I know him of old; he is a firm Grit, and so I do not place much faith in him. Of course, he takes the assessment roll, which is based on taxable property; but take the Bill as it is, based on real property, and the real value will be just about the same as it is now. As regards the increased vote which the Bill will give, I think it is going to enfranchise at least 1,000 in my county, judging from what I have seen of the measure and the arguments I have heard on both sides. But admitting the other view, that taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Bill will disfranchise 1,000 people in my constituency, the people would never stand it. They would not send me back here next time. Every Conservative in the Province would be wiped out, and hon. gentlemen opposite would have a free course. With reference to the extension of the franchise, I believe the Bill is right. That has been my view from the first, and I am ready to meet my constituents on that ground.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman was a little incorrect in saying that hon. members on this side had tried to put an extreme value on the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King).

Mr. TEMPLE. I did not say extreme; I only said you were trying to help him.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman required any help, for all that was necessary was what he gave, a bare statement of the facts, and these facts he obtained from the secretary-treasurer of his county. There was no party feeling, no attempt to exaggerate or to throw dust in peoples' eyes, and if the statements were incorrect the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Temple), could have sent a communication to Queen's county and found out whether the secretary had over stated the case or not. Unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to controvert the statement of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. King), by some evidence, he should not be so ready to contradict it. With respect to his own county, certain statements have been read, coming from the Attorney General, of facts taken from the lists. The hon. gentleman says he never looked at the list and never had communication with anybody, but that he does not place confidence in the statement of the Attorney General. Surely, when we are fixing the clauses of a Bill it is not a question as to which side of politics a man belongs, and when the Attorney General has stated that the Bill will disfranchise 800 or 900 of the hon. gentleman's constituents, the hon. gentleman, if he is sincere in his desire not to disfranchise anybody, is derelict in his duty in allowing the Bill to go through without taking the means to ascertain whether the statement was correct, and if it be correct, without using his influence to prevent such disfranchisement. It is no

answer to a written statement to say that you do not believe it. Until it is controverted by some tangible testimony, I assume that the members of the committee, on both sides, will act upon the statement of the Attorney-General of the Province. The hon. gentleman opposite says he is in favor of reducing the amount of qualification from $150 to $100, but that, after all, as the assessed value is lower than the real value, it will not make much difference. The assessment roll, containing the assessed value, is the *primâ facie* evidence for the revising barrister, and if a property is assessed at $100 the duty will be thrown on every one of these 800 men to bring evidence to show that the assessed value is not the real value. Does the hon. gentleman wish that that should be the result? Why does he not use his influence with the Government to induce them to adopt the amendment?

Mr. TEMPLE. I would rather see the amount $100 than $150, but I abide by the decision of the majority of the committee. I am only one here. I am not like the hon. gentleman there, who seems to control the whole House.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think I have attempted to control the whole House. I think I am just as modest in the expression of my views as the hon. gentleman is. I wish he would use his influence, or is he only throwing dust in the eyes of his constituents, and pretending that he is in favor of this, when he really is not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no imputation in that. If there is to be a choice made between the two alternatives, I would not assume that the one which disparages the hon. gentleman is the correct one.

Mr. FOSTER. It is refreshing to see how eagerly, and at the same time good-naturedly, my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) always rushes into the breach after a member on that side from New Brunswick has spoken, as if he thought sufficient force had not been given to the propositions advanced. I am sure that the members from New Brunswick will appreciate his kind services. It looks as if he expected to lead that branch of the House from the Maritime Provinces, and I do not doubt that he is well fitted to do it. He will see that a mere statement taken from the assessment roll, as it now exists in one of our counties, is not a sufficient proof that under this Bill the number named will be disfranchised. When the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), stated that 427 would be disfranchised on that basis, the hon. member for Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), made the mistake of taking that as absolute proof, but it is not.

Mr. DAVIES. It is *primâ facie*, at all events.

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is not even *primâ facie* evidence. In my own county there is always a difference between the assessed and the actual value. The reason is plain. If a man can have his property assessed at a sufficient valuation to give him a vote he would rather not be assessed at a higher amount, because he wishes to save the taxes. In the back settlements of our counties, because the settlers are deprived of privileges of market and communication which the front settlers possess, there is a disposition, in order to make them some sort of compensation, to assess their property relatively lower than property of equal value in the front settlements. When the Attorney General of New Brunswick stated that 1,000 or so would be disqualified in York county alone, he did not know what would be the provisions of this Bill, because they have been considerably modified in the way of lowering the franchise since we went into committee, and he does not know what other modifications may be made until the committee passes upon them. He stated also that he had not made a critical examination of the list, in order to see how many of these men would be onfranchised under the other clauses of the Bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am always glad when a reference is made to New Brunswick, because it is like pouring oil upon the waters; the House is always quiet upon such an occasion. I was surprised at the statement of the hon. member for Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King), but no one can doubt that, according to the list he has given, these people would be disfranchised, unless another valuation was put upon the property. When a statement came from the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) substantiating the statement of the hon. member for Queen's, it looked very alarming, as if it were going to disfranchise a great many electors. I have written to Charlotte, and I do not know whether an equal number would not be disqualified in that county. If so, it is a very serious consideration, and I am sure that if the First Minister believed he was going to disfranchise one-fourth of that number he would remedy the matter, if he possibly could. With regard to this valuation for taxes, I am aware that it may not be, perhaps, the actual value, but it does not make any difference whether it is the actual value or a value put on for assessment; because, as long as the valuation of one man's property is relative to another, then it is equal. If you have a certain amount of money to raise, you have only to raise the percentage if it is lower, or to lessen it if it is higher. Therefore, you might make a new valuation, and raise a man's property which is valued at $100 up to $150. I am myself not aware of any properties, with a house and buildings upon them, that could possibly be valued at $100, but we find when we go to the list that there are a good many such. Now, I would like to ask the leader of the Government why he could not put it at $100. If he feels it is going to disfranchise some who ought to vote he might make the change. Now, we have voted on real estate for half a century, and a man who had any interest at all in real estate has always been allowed to vote. Really this clause alarms me, for there are a good many owning real estate that cannot come up to $150, and will be disqualified under this Bill. I do not think my hon. friends opposite want to do that, and if they have any influence with the First Minister they should induce him to reduce the qualification on real estate. I agree that it will not disqualify all this number, but I am afraid it will disqualify a very considerable number. Take it all in all, however, I do not hesitate to say that I do not think the number of voters will be reduced. In my own county, even if some who vote now upon a property qualification of $100 were thrown off, I cannot resist the impression, in fact, I am satisfied, that the increase in the number of those who will come in under the tenant vote will considerably add to the list. But that does not help the case, with regard to those who have voted upon personal property. Real property qualification for all is not the best qualification, but it has always been considered so, and my hon. friends do not want to reduce that. I hope the leader of the Government will yield to my arguments. But whether he is disposed to or not, I am disposed to try and get him to do so, without provoking him to refuse it. When I want to get anything, I want to deal generously, and I expect a generous response.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oil is better than vinegar.

Mr. GILLMOR. I always use it until vinegar is necessary, and when vinegar is necessary I can use it as well as any other man.

Mr. BURPEE. Two hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick have spoken as if property in New Brunswick was valued much below the actual value. Now, I think I know as much about making up the lists as either of them. In New Brunswick we have three valuators, who are appointed by the county council. They go through the county every few years and value the whole county, to the best of their

judgment. After that, every year the assessor makes up a list and revises it annually after the valuator, and I do not think the valuation will be much increased, even under a revising barrister. Now, I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that this clause will disfranchise a large number of people who live on the farm, who are the bone and sinew of the country, and whom we want to retain in the country, though I admit it will enfranchise a good many others. I refer to tenants. Tenants in houses who pay $2 a month will be enfranchised. But these are, comparatively speaking, a floating population, and do not live in the same house more than a year or two. Now, why enfranchise them while you disfranchise the honest yeoman of the country, who works the land and has buildings of his own? You may enfranchise a few Indians in New Brunswick—perhaps 40 or 50 in the county of York. In the county of Sunbury I do not know whether there will be half a dozen. It will enfranchise some householders, but I do not know of any other class, in the country districts.

Mr. FOSTER. In my own county I have in my mind's eye now those who live on real property, those who have farms so little that they can hardly call them farms, and which may not possibly be worth $100. It may be true that their farm and house are not worth more than $100, but it is equally true that no man can live and keep his family on a farm which, combined with the house, is not worth more than $100. I know there are persons of that description. They have a small house, in which their family lives, but they get their living from earnings in quite a different direction, and if their earnings do not come up to sufficient to meet the qualification required by this Bill, when finally passed, I shall be very much mistaken.

Mr. TROW. The system of valuation in New Brunswick seems to be preferable to that in Ontario—it being a system under which valuators go round and value property every three years. The assertion that hundreds of persons will be disfranchised under this clause is well worthy of the consideration of the Government. The qualification under the local Act of New Brunswick is $100, the same as in Ontario. I favor the reduction to $100.

Mr. MOFFAT. The hon. gentleman is in error in stating that valuators go round every three years. New Brunswick had legislation with respect to municipal corporations some nine years ago, and the law provides that a valuation should be made every five years, for the purpose of equalising the amount paid by each parish.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The changes made in this Bill have been secured through the Opposition standing up for the people and demanding their rights, and the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have realised the fact that they will have to answer for this Bill before their constituents, the qualification has been reduced from $400 to $300 in regard to income. I pointed out that, under the Bill as drawn, it would disfranchise hundreds in my own town. A great many of these will be enabled to vote on account of the change, but some will still be shut out. The people will recognise that they are indebted to the Opposition for having secured to them rights of which the Government and their supporters sought to deprive them. I do not know that the $150 qualification will apply with such force to Ontario as to some other Provinces; but this House has been informed that unless the amendment is adopted a large number of persons in New Brunswick will be disfranchised. The Opposition maintain that the Government have no right to take away the right to vote from anyone. I support the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Oil and vinegar policy would do very well if we were approaching some absolute monarch and asking favors. But we are sitting here as representatives of the people, seeking to preserve their rights and liberties. The

hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) has called attention to the fact that he has obtained information from the local member that 804 persons at present qualified to vote will be disfranchised under this provision of the Bill. An hon. gentleman says he does not think that is the case. But no reason has been stated, and it is not asserted that he has taken the trouble to make enquiries as to the assessment between $100 and $150. And how many are entitled to vote on personal property who will be wholly disfranchised by this Bill? Has he taken the trouble to find whether the fact is really as represented by his colleague in the Local Legislature, that 804 free men, who are now entitled to exercise the electoral franchise, will be deprived of that privilege. Now, it is not a matter which we can regard with complacency. A man, if his house is on fire, does not sit down in the burning building to ascertain how the fire originated, or say that he does not know how it began, and he will not trouble himself about the matter. We owe a duty to our constituents. A serious responsibility rests upon us; we are put here as the guardians of the liberties of those who sent us here, and unless a man has committed an offence against the election law, or made himself liable to the penalties of the law, we have no right to disfranchise him without his consent. But here is a proposition to take from the people of the hon. gentleman's own county, and in all probability the people of other counties in his own Province, and in a large proportion over the entire Dominion, the right to vote, and the hon. gentleman proposes to treat the matter with perfect indifference. He says: I would like to see the franchise fixed at $100, but I am going to abide by the voice of the majority; I will stand by $150, which I do not like, because the majority are going to vote that way. The hon. gentleman's complacency reminds me of a story told in the annals of Pennsylvania, about a farmer's son who was lost in the winter time. The farmer was asked why he did not make an effort to find his son, and he replied that if his son found his way back to a neighbor's house he was all right; but if not, that the weather was so cold he was frozen to death, and he would not trouble himself about it. The hon. gentleman has taken the disfranchisement of this large number of the electors of his county with as much coolness as the Pennsylvania farmer did in that case. Then we had the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) appearing on the stage in a new character. The hon. gentleman comes forward and he says to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I.: What business have you interfering in this domestic affair? This is a matter which concerns the Province of New Brunswick. In an early part of the discussion that hon. gentleman forgot that there were provincial lines at all; he wished them obliterated; this Dominion was a sort of political mosaic, the lines of which were too distinctly visible, and he wanted them erased, and this country made one grand unit. Now, he says: What business have you to interfere here in a provincial matter? We are not sitting here representing Canada as a unit, but we are here representing the different Provinces. I am here from the Province of New Brunswick, and why do you interfere with the affairs of that Province? The hon. gentleman's practice to-night, and his precept on a former evening, do not agree; his magniloquent views put forward a few evenings ago are altogether dissipated. He has made a new departure, or rather he has resiled back to the position he occupied when this Bill was introduced for discussion. One hon. gentleman said that he believed 1,000 names would be added to the roll in his county under this Bill. Great is the hon. gentleman's faith! It would, perhaps, be enough to save him at another election, if it were well founded. But what evidence has he given to show that it is well founded? Why, Sir, it is the duty of hon. gentlemen on that side, if the law of compensation, so miscalled, applied in this case—it would be the duty of those gentlemen who come here and ask us to adopt pro-

visions of this sort, to establish beyond controversy that that is the case. It was the duty of the First Minister, when he introduced this Bill, to have explained its precise effects, in the way of enfranchisement or disfranchisement in every Province. Has the committee any evidence of that sort? What evidence is there that the liberties of free men, of Englismen under an English system of parliamentary government, shall not be taken from them, when they have committed no offence, when they have exhibited public spirit, by exercising the franchise, and their ability likely to discharge their duty—I say upon what principle of law or morals are those people to be disfranchised? Sir, these gentlemen ought not to come here with vague generalities in addressing the committee. They ought to be prepared with facts, as the hon. member for Sunbury has shown himself to be prepared with facts. What evidence have these gentlemen presented to show that the effects of this provision will not be what was stated by the hon. member for Sunbury. And if it is so, and hon. gentlemen could show that the effect of the law would be to put on a number equal to that taken off, so long as they could not show that it puts on precisely the samo men they answer nothing. There may be good reasons for putting on some who are not on now, but what are the reasons for taking off those men who now have the franchise? We do not send our neighbors to the penitentiary who commit no crime; we do not deprive a man of his property without compensation, when it is needed for the purpose of the State, and upon what theory, then, do we, who are the servants of the people, to whom a great trust has been committed by those to whom the law has committed the question of deciding who shall represent the people of the whole country in Parliament—upon what ground do we exercise the right of taking from them a great privilege which they have not misused, an important trust which they have not violated? I say it is of the utmost consequence that these hon. gentlemen should begin to understand that the right of voting is a most important right, something which ought to be valued, and that if we, representing the people of this country, do not show by our conduct that we place a high estimation on an elective franchise, how can we expect the people to do so? How can we suppose that they will loyally guard those free institutions which have been committed to us by the mother country? This is a serious matter; it is a matter we ought carefully to consider. It is not a question which involves the fate of the Opposition or the fate of the Government, merely; it is a question which involves the maintenance, on a broad and permanent basis, of representative government in the country; and that being so, every hon. gentleman should throw aside his party inclinations for the time being, and should regard this as a matter of such consequence that he would no more think of taking from a man, who has not violated the law, the franchise he possesses, than he would of breaking into a neighbor's house and taking his property at midnight. Until we approach the question in this spirit we shall not be able properly to discharge our duty. The hon. First Minister, before he proposes to increase the qualification and disfranchise any class of the community, ought to show a sufficient cause, which he has not done. In Prince Edward Island and British Columbia there is no property qualification at all, and even with $100 he will disfranchise some; but in the Provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and New Brunswick, embracing 2,500,000 people, more than half the population of the whole Dominion, the qualification is now $100, and if he fixes it at $100, he will fix it as high as it is already for 2,500,000 people. Then, why disfranchise a considerable number of people? If the hon. gentleman looks at the voters' lists in the Province of Ontario, he will find that a considerable number of persons who are entitled to vote at municipal elections are not entitled to vote for members of the House of Commons, showing that there are a large class of people who hold property valued at less than $150. Now, the burden of proof is on hon. gentlemen opposite, to show that these people are unfit to exercise the electoral franchise, or have abused it, before this right shall be taken away from them. The only justification for such a course is the paramount safety of the State—that the State itself is injured by the existing condition of affairs, which has not heretofore been shown.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not find fault with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., for coming to the front. I congratulated him on doing so; but I was naturally jealous of the talent and ability of my hon. friends from New Brunswick. I hope my hon. friend will long live to represent his people and his party in the House, and if a time should come when he should not be able to get a seat in Prince Edward Island, I hope he will come to New Brunswick, and we shall do the best we can to get him a seat. The hon. member for Bothwell is nothing if he is not certain. There is, in fact, no vague generality about him; everything is always perfectly obvious and logically certain; he is not a man who would ever allow any subject to pass this House without giving his opinion upon it, and after he has given an opinion upon it, that is the last. But would my hon. friend, just for a moment, turn his eyes backward, and ask his friend behind him whether there was perfect certainty in the statement he made. The statement was that in the county of Queen's, N.B., 427 persons are on the present assessment roll for $100 or over, and less than $150. Will any hon. gentleman on that side rise and say that that is altogether out of the region of generality. and that it is an indisputable fact that that number will be disfranchised under this Bill? The Attorney-General of New Brunswick sent up—what statement? Did he send up the statement that 1,000 persons in the county of York would be disfranchised under this Bill, and will he stand sponsor for that?

Mr. BURPEE. 804 is the number I stated.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want any vague generalities, so I take the exact number, 804. Now, I say there is a vague generality on his own side of the House, when the hon. member for Charlotte, the hon. member for Sunbury and the hon. member for Queen's get up and make a statement as to how many would be disfranchised under this clause. I could spend more time in talking about my friend from Bothwell, but it is not worth while. He is the kind of a man, according to his own statement, that if his house was on fire he would not sit down and try to settle how it took fire. He has proved himself to be such a man as that, and, with such men, how can one argue?

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). When the country comes to consider whether hon. gentlemen opposite have been dealing with vinegar or molasses, I think they will decide that it is molasses, or they would not have stuck to the subject so long. I have no doubt that the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., was sent to him, and made by him in good faith; yet, when you look at the figures, and at the county of Queen's, as it is, it appears to me to be perfectly irreconcilable with the facts. I am not prepared to deny absolutely the statement he has made, because I have not seen the list; but in that county there is an acreage of 625,517 of granted lands, which are owned by somebody. They cannot be owned by the female portion, and must be held by the male portion of that community. Now, we find by the census of 1882 that there were 2,373 houses, 263 warehouses and 3,516 barns and stables in that county, making 6,152 buildings for 2,000 voters, of whom he said about 500 would be disfranchised. Now let us take those figures to be correct: 2,000 electors in the county of Queen's, and an acreage of 625,000 acres in that county. We know that in Queen's there is no large city, where one man may own a number of buildings, which he lets out; we know there

is not even a town in the county, but that it is purely a country place, a farming community entirely. How, then, can that 625,000 acres held by farmers be divided among that number of electors without giving each holding a greater value than $150? And mind you, they must be all electors; because, unlike the law in Ontario, the law there allows non-residents to vote, so that they are on the electors' list. How is it possible that these farmers can have such small holdings, taking these figures as correct; that so many of the holdings would be worth only between $100 and $150. That is entirely incomprehensible. According to the census returns of 1882 there are 2,294 owners, and the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), the neighboring county, will agree with me that the holdings are pretty well divided. No doubt some will hold more largely than others, but not to that great extent that he will find 400 odd proprietors out of 2,000 who will hold such small pieces of land that there holdings will be only worth $100. If it be true that there are 400 and some odd people on the assessment roll or voters' lists, assessed at between $100 and $150, I can arrive at no other conclusion than that they are there illegally, that the electoral law of New Brunswick does not authorise them to be there, and that they are put there simply for the purpose of having votes, against the law. That may be a wrong conclusion, but I cannot conceive that there are actually *bonâ fide* owners of real estate in that county to that extent, whose properties are now worth but that low amount.

Mr. DAVIES. Do you draw the same conclusion about York?

Mr. LANDRY. York is over twice as large, and I would draw the same conclusion there. I would draw the conclusion that in any county where there is such a large proportion of electors rated upon property valued between $100 and $150, they are not properly on the list. If they are not this Bill will do them no injury. I cannot deny the statement that has been made, because I have not seen the lists; but I mention these facts to show how highly incredible it is that 6,152 buildings, divided between 2,000 electors, an average of three buildings each taken in connection with the acreage, should in so many cases be so very small as not to be worth more than $150. In a large city, where one holder might have a large number of buildings, this possibly might apply; but in a farming community, where property is pretty evenly divided, this statement is altogether incredible.

Mr. BURPEE. The hon. gentleman has referred to me as knowing something about Queen's county. I do. I did business there for several years; I hold property myself in that county, farms to the amount of $8,000 or $10,000, and know as much about it, almost, as I do about the county of Sunbury, and I believe every word of the statement. I think it is reflecting unfairly on some of the officers in Queen's county to come to the conclusion the hon. gentleman has come to, in his generality of reasoning. I know the county treasurer very well, Mr. Davitt; he has represented that county in the Local Legislature; he is a gentleman who is perfectly reliable; he knows about as much of Queen's county as any man in it, and he has made the statement in good faith, and I believe it. From what knowledge I have of Queen's, I have no reason to dispute it.

Mr. TEMPLE. In answer to a question of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as to how I came to the conclusion that these men could not enjoy the franchise, I would say that there is not a farmer in the county of York whom I do not know, and I believe, if their property is put down at $100, it is rated at below its value. I have been sheriff for the county for nineteen years, and know something about the assessment roll. I have held a great many elections while I was sheriff, and the rolls all went through my hands; and if the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knew as much about Ontario as I do about York, he would not talk so much in the House.

Mr. RYKERT. We can only speak of our counties, and I will give the House to understand exactly how this Bill affects the county I have the honor to represent. In Merriton village there are no persons assessed under $200; in the town of Niagara there are none under $200; in the village of Beamsville there are none under $200; in Port Dalhousie there are none under $200; in Niagara township there are only eight under $200; in Louth there are seven under $200; in Clenhie there are ten under $200; or, altogether, there are fifty in the county of Lincoln who are assessed under $200; and those, if assessed at the actual value, would be properly assessed at $200. All those persons live in houses, and it must be a God-forsaken house indeed, that is not worth $200, with the lot it is built on. This Bill, instead of doing injury to Ontario, will do a great deal of good, because it will enable persons already assessed for $100 on property to appear before the revising barrister and have their property assessed at $150. The best test to take is one's own county, and in the whole county of Lincoln, in which there are 7,000 voters, only fifty will be disfranchised.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) made the mistake of confusing certain conclusions he drew from facts he found in the census returns with the actual facts as they exist, and finding they differred, he says: So much the worse for the facts. The question may not be of importance to the hon. member for Lincoln, taking his figures as correct, but I would suggest this to the First Minister: The impression is sought to be conveyed by a number of hon. gentlemen on that side that there is no actual wish to disfranchise any portion of the community. If that is true, and if, as a matter of fact, this does disfranchise a certain portion of the voters in the Maritime Provinces, and as the question whether the qualification be $100 or $150 is purely arbitrary and does not involve any principle, why refuse to put it down to $100? It has been shown that possibly harm may be done by keeping the qualification at $150. But it is clear that no one will be disfranchised by reducing it to $100.

Mr. WATSON. I hope this will be changed to $100, for several reasons. One of the principal reasons is, that $100 is the qualification of an elector in Manitoba. If it is necessary to have a different franchise for the election of members to this House, still it should be made, as near as possible, the same as the local franchises, as otherwise it will create confusion in making out voters' lists. I have not heard any hon. gentleman opposite give any reason why the qualification should be raised to $150. The hon. member for King's, N.B., stated that the assessors in back districts valued the properties lower because they were removed from a market. I do not think that property which is situated ten or fifteen miles from a market is of equal value with that which is close to a market. In Manitoba, valuators go around every five years to equalise the assessments for judicial purposes, and I do not think any injustice would be done or any interference with the franchise would take place if it were left in their hands. As my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said, in most of the Provinces people have a vote on property worth $100 now, and no reason has been given for raising it to $150. In Manitoba it may disfranchise many electors, particularly in small villages. If the First Minister would reduce this to $100, I have no doubt his followers will be as willing to accept that as to accept $150. I do not think any hon. member should have such views as were expressed by the hon. member for York (Mr. Temple), who stated that, though he thought $100 was right, if the First Minister said

$150, he would agree to it. I think this change ought to be made.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the arguments which have adduced are strongly in favor of the proposed reduction. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), showed that he expected that the voters who, it was said, would be disfranchised, would be looked after by the revising barrister. That is the very thing we want to avoid. In England every householder has a vote, and the man who owns property worth 40 shillings a year is also entitled to vote. Though some hon. gentlemen may object to adopting the provincial franchises, I think it would be well to come as near to them as possible in some Provinces. In Ontario, the largest Province in the Dominion, $100 is the qualification, and no harm would result from adopting the same amount here. A number of people will have the vote as tenants, who, if they were owners of the same property, would not have it. It is a grievance, that any man who is sent here, partly by the votes of these people, should support a proposition to disfranchise them. When once a man has been given the right to vote it is imprudent to deprive him of that right. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) said this Act would positively disfranchise fifty persons in his constitency now having votes, and he stated the other night that under the Mowat Act some 267 persons would be deprived of votes. I claim that under the Mowat Act no one will be deprived of the franchise who now has it, although some may be prevented from duplicating their votes. But the hon. member for Lincoln frankly admits that there are fifty in his constituency who will be absolutely disfranchised by this Act, as being assessed below $200.

Mr. HESSON. My hon. friend from York has been censured by almost every speaker on the other side of the House to-night, because he chooses to follow his own views, and not be dictated to by hon. gentlemen opposite. He is responsible to his constituency, and not to hon. gentlemen opposite. One hon. gentleman opposite, while speaking to-night, referred eight or nine times to the Province of Ontario. Now, that hon. gentleman represents only one constituency in the Province of Ontario, and I think it is quite sufficient for him to speak for his own constituents, and not for the whole Province. Hon. gentlemen on this side have quietly listened to the remarks of Opposition speakers, to see if there was anything in their arguments to induce us to ask the First Minister to change that clause, but we have not seen any such arguments. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has challenged us to appear before the voters that we are disfranchising by our Act here. The gentlemen who have sent us to this House will pass upon our conduct in disfranchising any of the actual voters. Now, speaking for my own constituency, I have lived for forty-two years or upwards in the city situated in the county which I have the honor to represent, and I do not know a single individual—and I profess to know them all—who will be disfranchised by this Bill—not one. I speak of what I know, and I say, with the utmost confidence, that we will have a largely increased number of voters who have never voted before.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear." He himself had to admit that in the Province of Ontario he did not feel it was going to affect the representation to a very large extent, whether the qualification remained at $200 or $150.

Mr. MILLS. I never said so.

Mr. HESSON. I think my hon. friend is straightforward enough to admit, in his cooler moments, at all events, that he cannot, from memory, point to a single constituent of his own, on a house or lot worth $200, and which a family could possibly live in, who will be disfranchised. I know that in my constituency these small holdings run from $200 and $275 upwards, $200 being the lowest value. Therefore, I think my hon. friend has no right to speak for the whole Province in the way he has done. I consider the Bill is a liberal one. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said that they would take the credit of having induced, or having compelled, the Government—not by pouring oil on the troubled waters, not by talking in a molasses style—but compel the Government to make these changes in obedience to their arguments. Now, I think hon. gentlemen in this House heard from the leader of the Government long ago that he proposed, when he reached certain clauses, especially those where the qualification was at issue—he would be prepared to make certain changes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When did he say that?

Mr. HESSON. Several days ago, before we reached this clause; the hon. gentleman knew it, but he will go to the country and claim his party are entitled to all the credit for having forced the Government to change their views upon this Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. I may be mistaken; I cannot speak positively; but I do not recollect that the First Minister, at any time during this debate, stated that he intended, when he reached this clause, to make a reduction in the figures. I think we never had any intimation of it. If the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) thinks I am wrong, let him produce the statement from the *Hansard*.

Mr. MULOCK. I find that in most cases the qualification required throughout the whole Dominion is as follows: In two Provinces manhood suffrage prevails. Therefore, in two Provinces the qualification for this class of voters is less than $100. In two other Provinces the qualification required is over $100; and in three Provinces the qualification is $100. Therefore, by adopting the $100 proposition, we adopt a fair mean between existing qualifications. I think it may be assumed that the average public opinion of the whole Dominion is in favor of adopting $100 as the qualification for this class of voters. The hon. member for York (Mr. Temple) says he is in favor of the motion, and yet he is going to oppose it. The hon. gentleman declares in effect that his opinion is his own, but his vote belongs to someone else. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) objected to the style of criticism indulged in by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), stating that he was indulging in vague generalities. I should like to know if there is any hon. gentleman whose style of debate is more open to that criticism than that of the hon. member for King's. The hon. member for North Perth cut in and stated the case of his own county; and that hon. gentleman took the narrow line, that no member has a right to speak of any section of the Dominion except that which he specially represents.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me. I did not make that statement. I said no hon. member had a right to speak for the whole Province of Ontario, though an hon. member might fairly speak of his own county.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to have such a witness, and I will add nothing to his remarks. It is gratifying to find there are members who take a more liberal view of the question than do those members representing special interests. The hon. member for Prince has taken the same narrow view as his friend from York, and he also declares he is in favor of the motion, and yet will vote against it. He favors it because he knows his constituents would be in favor of it. Every member who represents a Province in which manhood suffrage prevails is bound to carry out the declared will of his constituents, as evidenced by the statute on the subject of the franchise. If any such member votes

against this motion he votes against his own Province. No valid arguments have been presented against the motion, and there is, therefore, no reason why it should not be adopted, as it is a proper motion and one to lower the franchise. The hon. member for King's criticised the action of the hon. member for Queen's, whom he said he would be glad to welcome to public life in New Brunswick. I would advise the hon. member for King's to first consult his own constituents. The hon. gentleman must know that the effect of adopting the clause, as originally drawn, would be to disfranchise some of those voters who sent him here, and I give it as my opinion that we have no authority to vote away the franchise from any one. The hon. gentleman took the ground that because under this Bill the franchise would be given to some we had the right to take it away from others. But we have no right to rob Peter to pay Paul. It would be a most extraordinary thing if a majority should be found to support this clause, as drawn, without a single argument having been advanced in favor of it.

Amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived.

Mr. BURPEE moved the following amendment :—

After the word "dollar," in the third line of the third sub-section, insert : Or personal property of the actual value of $400, or personal and real property, together, of the actual value of $400.

He said : I have taken the wording from the New Brunswick Act. If such an amendment is not adopted the Bill will disfranchise a large class of persons, principally unmarried men owning personal property. Some of them are the sons of small farmers, who sometimes work in the woods, sometimes in vessels, but many of them have personal property of one kind or other, amounting to $400.

Mr. GILLMOR. We have had a personal property qualification for many years in New Brunswick, and if this clause passes in its present shape it will disqualify many worthy citizens—energetic young men, who have invested in vessel property, or lumbering operations, who are now voting on a personal property qualification.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has adopted a personal property qualification with regard to the fishermen, and I cannot see why the holder of personal property should not have a vote. The income franchise clause would only allow a vote for an income of $300, which, at 6 per cent., would represent $5,000 worth of personal property ; whereas, you give a vote to the proprietor of real property amounting to $150, or a tenant at $2 a month. If personal property is to be taken as the evidence of thrift or intelligence, it seems to me that the ownership of a certain amount of personal property would be as good a test as any for the franchise. There are many men earning moderate wages, but who are not earning sufficient to entitle them to vote as wage-earners, but if they have saved sufficient from their earnings to have a deposit in the bank, or in their own possession, amounting to $400, they should have a vote. Young unmarried men of this class would not come in as householders, and you would be encouraging, in practice, the habit of economy by adopting this principle to a certain extent, which you do not do in any other way. Both in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick persons vote on this basis, and a large number who are now entitled to vote would be disfranchised if the hon. gentleman insists on excluding personal property. I hope he will see his way to the adoption of the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I said yesterday, with every desire to meet the wishes of the House, I have ascertained beyond a doubt that even if I were in favor of it I could not carry this resolution in this House.

Amendment (Mr. Burpee) negatived.

On sub-section 4, section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The language of this paragraph is nearly identical with that of the similar paragraph respecting tenants in cities and towns. After having heard the debate on the other resolution, I asked it to be postponed, that it might be considered. On full reflection, I find that I cannot materially alter it. I have altered it, however, in one respect, in order to allow wages to be included as rental, by inserting the words "or in money's worth." It has been pressed upon me, and I think it is a reasonable argument, that if a person is under a rental, say of $20 for a year, he ought to pay the whole of his rent to be qualified ; otherwise, he would be merely under a promise to pay, which would leave room for all kinds of fraud. But, for instance, it has been said to me : A person leases a mill for $1,000 a year, and if he happens to be unable, in a bad year, to pay the whole of his rent, he would have no vote. So I provide, in this clause, that he must have at least paid $20 of his last year's rent, so as to put him on the same footing as a person whose whole rent is $20.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will perhaps tell us how he expects to meet the inconvenience that would arise from the fact that the revising officer will find the assessment roll no longer a guide for a very large percentage of the votes in each constituency. In almost every town and village a large proportion of those entitled to have their names on the voters' list are tenants. The assessment roll has always furnished an easy means of ascertaining who these people are, because the valuation of the property enables those making up the voters' list to transfer the names from the assessment roll to the voters' list. But under this clause it will be necessary to get the names from some other source. Therefore, I think it would be only fair to the committee, before we proceed further, that the hon. gentleman should explain in what way he intends to meet that inconvenience, because otherwise every tenant would be obliged to appear before the revising officer in order to have his name put on the list. It could not be, under this provision, on the voters' list, in the first instance, because the hon. gentleman's intention is that the revising officer shall make up the list from the assessment roll. Now, as the assessment rolls offers no information, so far as the tenants are concerned, and the tenants would necessarily be left off the voters' list in the first instance, it would be when the list was revised that the tenant would vote on it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The assessment roll, of course, will be the *primâ facie* evidence, so far as it goes. If there are any parties who, under this Bill, have any claim as tenants and are not on the assessment roll, they will make application in the ordinary way, by letter, to the revising officer, to be put on the roll. In the Ontario assessment roll there are certain parties marked as tenants, who are assessed as tenants to a certain amount, and the revising officer will at once see that the value of the property gives them a right to be put on the list.

Mr. MILLS. The assessment roll cannot furnish *primâ facie* evidence in the case of a tenant. Supposing a man is assessed for a house and lot valued at $300, how is the revising officer to know the amount of rent that is paid ? There may be little or no rent charged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The value of the property will show it.

Mr. MILLS. No ; because if there is such relation between the rental of property and value, the hon. gentleman's argument in favor of taking the rental is gone altogether. He argued, yesterday, there was no such relation.

Mr. WILSON. There is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for Bothwell has said. In fact, the First Minister will find a great deal of difficulty getting this class of voters placed on the voters' list. He says the value of the property will enable the revising barrister to ascertain what the rent will be. What are the facts ? Yesterday the

First Minister said that $2 a month rental was the proper rental on a valuation of $300, or about 8 per cent.; but in this clause we find the hon. gentleman has reduced the property valuation in the country to $150, or one half, and yet he keeps the rental the same as in the city. How can he claim, then, that the rental will be easily ascertained by the valuation? The First Minister will find he is disfranchising a large number of people. Why should he keep the tenancy clause at $2 a month or $20 a year in a township, when he reduces the property qualification one half. Is it not reasonable that he should equally reduce the rental qualification. He further provides that in the country the rental may be paid either in money or in kind, but in the villages he will not allow that option. Everyone knows that in many villages there are large gardeners, who rent certain quantities of land and return a certain portion of the produce to the owner as rent. Why should he not allow them to have a vote? Why should they be debarred because they pay rent in kind? The hon. gentleman thought yesterday it was an outrageous thing that a man should obtain 15 or 20 per cent. of the value of his holding as rent; yet here, according to his own arrangement, tenants in townships will be paying nearly 14 per cent., because while the value of the property qualification is reduced to $150 that of the rental is kept up to $2 a month. I would advise him to reconsider this clause thoroughly. I know of a large number who are occupying small houses for which they are paying $1.50 per month, which would be $18 a year. They will be deprived of the vote. If you carry the principle to the rural sections, and the value is only half what it is in towns, they should have the vote if they pay $1 a month, or $12 a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. So far as I know of the assessment law of Ontario, the tenant has to be placed on the assessment roll with the owner. The assessment roll is to be taken as the basis, and it is the duty of the assessor to couple the tenant's name with that of the owner. The name must, therefore, go on the assessment roll, and that is taken as the *primâ facie* evidence. The revising officer sees at once the value of the property the tenant occupies. If it amounts to $150 he is placed on the roll; if not, he is not placed on the roll unless he shows to the returning officer that he is paying $2 a month.

Mr. CASEY. This clause does not say that a tenant shall have a vote where the property is worth $150, but that he shall vote if he pays a rental of $2 a month.

Mr. TAYLOR. It says that shall be *primâ facie* evidence.

Mr. CASEY. There are cases in which it cannot be *primâ facie* evidence, and that is one in which it will not be *primâ facie* or *secunda facie*. We might find land assessed for $200 or $300 let out simply for the taxes or for keeping up the fences. I support the contention of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), that if there is to be some well-understood ratio between the value of the property and the rental required to qualify, the ratio should be uniform, in the country as well as in the cities and towns. My hon. friend who spoke last has pointed out that property worth less than $150 might be rented for enough to qualify the tenant. Thus the tenant would have the vote while the freeholder would be deprived of it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). We were told that the qualification was to rest primarily on the assessment roll, but the rental is not shown on that roll. The hon. gentleman admitted the possibility of tenants being placed on the voters' list when the owner was not. Another part to which there is a strong objection is that allowing non-resident tenants the right to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. No; it says "possession."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention of the First Minister that a tenant who leaves the electoral district shall have the vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He must be a tenant for at least one year and pay a certain rental. He can change within the municipality, so that the occupation is continuous.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it the intention of the First Minister that the non-resident tenant should vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He can vote now if he is assessed. A man may be in possession of half a dozen places in the same town, working them all, and yet not in occupation of more than one.

Mr. MILLS. The assessment is not made every year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The principle is the same. It is not necessaay to be an actual occupant at all.

Mr. MILLS. Under this, the tenant who, after the expiration of his tenancy, went to another municipality, would have the right to vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think there is a wider view to be taken of this clause than has been shown yet. I see no other means than those provided in the requirement to have the rent paid, to prevent any amount of fraud being practised under this clause. It is possible for a man who is living adjacent to a number of constituencies to have himself fraudulently assessed in each one of them. It is quite true this clause requires that he shall have paid his rent; but if that is all the protection we have, it is possible for him to get a receipt which may be fraudulent.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not likely the fraud to which the hon. gentleman alludes will be perpetrated to the extent he anticipates, because the man must have paid a year's rent, at least, or a sum equal to $20 a year.

Mr. CAMERON. I am contemplating the possibility of collusion between himself and his landlord, in order to get his receipt; and we are really admitting, in the widest way, the possibility of a number of faggot votes being placed on the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The simple remedy is, that the party can be sworn whether he is paying rent or not.

Mr. CAMERON. That ought not to be our only resource. We know it is disagreeable for men to be sworn, and disagreeable for scrutineers to ask others to be sworn. I have no doubt the First Minister intends that the man in occupancy must be so in good faith, in order to have a right to vote, and if that be so, let it be so stated in the Act. Now, I have a preference for the absolute value of property as being that on which the right to vote as a tenant should be obtained. I beg to move, in amendment to the amendment, that the following be substituted for sub-section 4 of section 4:

Every male person entered as a tenant on the last revised assessment roll in any electoral district in Canada, other than cities and towns in which he tenders his vote, and who is residing at the time he tenders his vote within the municipality, and who is rated for real property on the last revised assessmet roll of said municipality, of the actual value of not less than $100, and has resided there continuously for at least twelve months next preceding the election at which he votes.

I believe this is a much simpler qualification than that which is required in the Bill, and this amendment will simplify the matter very much. The hon. member for Lincoln has stated that in his constituency there were only fifty names appearing on the roll as being assessed for less than $200, and over $100. I have been looking through the voters' list in the rural municipalities of the constituency I have the honor to represent, and I find there are seventy exactly, in five municipalities.

Mr. RYKERT. That is the assessed value, not the actual value.

Mr. CAMERON. Of course it is the assessed value, and we have made the assessed value *primâ facie* evidence. It lies with the man who takes exception to that assessed value to appeal to the revising officer; consequently, the revising officer, unless there are other facts placed before him, has to accept that and treat it as the basis. Now, I recollect where a property is assessed for $100 only, yet I know the individual to be very well qualified to vote. He is a storekeeper, and keeps a post office at a cross road, and does a fair little business, but nothing pretentious. Now, I think that man certainly entitled to vote on the score of intelligence, but last year he was only assessed at $100. In another instance I found on the list the name of a gentleman of intelligence, and a strong supporter of the First Minister, who was assessed for $100, and he occupied almost a similar position, being in business at the cross roads.

Mr. FLEMING. I desire to offer a practical suggestion. I suggest that this sub-section be amended so that a person holding a property of the value of $150 or a lease of the necessary rental shall be on the list. The object is that any person who is on the assessment roll as a tenant of a property worth $150 shall be placed on the voters' list, or if he is paying the necessary amount of rental. In that way the revising officer would he enabled to obtain from the assessment roll the name of the owner and the name of the tenant, bracketed, and the value of the property fixed at $150 or exceeding that amount. He would thus obtain such information as would enable him at once to know all tenants assessed for property of that value, and it would reduce very considerably the number of those who would have to make application. It is not desirable that persons coming under this class of voters should be put to the trouble and annoyance of going before the revising barristers. It is not right that a man's right to the franchise should be dependent upon the vigilance of the party organisers in the different electoral districts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope it will not be considered that I am showing disrespect to the hon. gentleman in not answering at length his arguments, because the matter was discussed at great length yesterday, and the arguments, which were pressed with ability, were not sufficient to induce me to alter the clause in the direction suggested. I do not think there will be any trouble about the matter; names will be entered on the assessment roll, and the practical result will be that the revising officer will put on the list every man who is a tenant, and then it will be for the parties to object. One hon. gentleman to-night spoke against faggot voting, and the hon. member for Bothwell spoke against it last night. Well, it is a new thing for a Liberal party to object to faggot voting, for Bright and Cobden worked for years to establish faggot voting—that is, that one area of property should be sub-divided into smaller portions, so that thereby the people might fight the landed aristocracy. If the hon. gentleman will read "Morley's Life of Cobden" he will find that he labored earnestly all his life for that purpose, and now both parties at this moment are forming associations for the purpose of making faggot votes and breaking up properties into small portions, to give votes to the working classes. That is what they call faggot votes.

Mr. CASEY. What the hon. gentleman says shows distinctly the evils of this principle. Faggot votes are, to all intents and purposes, bogus votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. Sometimes they sell these properties for a certain value, and they reduce the properties to such a size that the purchase money will cover a certain number of votes at a certain figure.

Mr. CASEY. Those are *bonâ fide* votes, which is not what we generally understand by faggot votes. What I object to in this Bill is, that it offers facilities for creating suppositious tenancies, merely for the purpose of creating votes. If people buy land *bonâ fide* for the purpose of giving votes, that is all right, but to give the appearance of tenancy where there is none is a very different thing, and it should not be allowed on the grounds of public policy. The proposal which is now made is to make the tenancy of property worth $150 *primâ facie* evidence of the rental, which is not provided in the Bill. Unless some such change is made the revising officer will not be justified in placing any tenant on the voters' list until he has outside evidence of the amount of the rent, as he has no right to place the people on the roll and then trust to appeals being made to put matters right, as neither the assessment roll nor the voters' list give them any information as to rental. If he chooses to go against the letter and spirit of the law, and put every tenant on the roll, he throws on outsiders his own duty of ascertaining and proving the matter, thereby causing expense, trouble and loss of time to those outsiders. All we ask is that the rolls should be some *primâ facie* evidence of the tenancy. The possessor of a lot of waste land may sub-divide it into very small lots, qualify a number of people at a rental of $20 a year, give them a receipt, and the whole affair would be regulated without costing him a cent; and unless the attention of the opposite party has been called to the matter, the fraud will be put through without anybody being put to the proof. A man might qualify 200 voters on an acre of land in this way. It would be unparliamentary to say that the Bill was intended for such a purpose, but if that were the intention it could not be better arranged.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would like to draw the attention of the First Minister to the position in which this clause would place tenants in some cases. I refer to the voters' list of the only village in my riding, a village in which there are about 200 voters. I find that out of these 200 there are 20 non-residents, 18 of whom are owners and 2 tenants. The balance are in the proportion of about two proprietors to one tenant, being 59 tenants to 130 proprietors, including the non-residents. The hon. First Minister says he assumes that the revising officer, in making up his list, will place all tenants on the voters' list who are on the assessment roll for the requisite qualification; but that is leaving a wide range of option to the revising officer. He may take a strict view of the working of the law, which will have the effect of excluding tenants altogether, because in villages a great many occupy houses the valuation of which will not be much above the qualification, if fixed by the assessed value, and I would suggest to the First Minister that he should consider whether it would not be desirable to make it an instruction to the revising officer to place on the first list all the tenants who are on the assessment roll for the requisite qualification as respects value. In my experience, unless there is the excitement of an election on hand, people are ordinarily careless in seeing that their names are on the voters' list; and if the large proportion of tenants have to trust to the revising officer to put them on, or see that they are put on, by giving previous notice, the practical result will be that unless the leading political friends of both sides pay attention to this matter a great many will be left off. I think it is undesirable to put difficulties in the way of a man having the right to vote, getting his name placed on the list without his having to exert himself to do so, simply because he is not a proprietor of property. I have not much sympathy with the statements made against the assessors' values, and the slight which has been cast upon their oaths. When you come to prove the right of people to be placed on the voters' list, in a great many cases I think you will have to take the oaths of men without any better social standing than the assessors, and with quite as much inducement to bias. I speak freely, with-

out regard to party, when I say that some of us who have gone through a lengthened municipal experience can call to mind, especially in times when there has been strong political feeling abroad, on the eve of an election, a good many enthusiastic supporters of both sides who were inclined to put a pretty high value on the property of their friends. I merely rose to state that in this one village in my own riding, by the present voters' list, actually one-third of all the voters are tenants; and I think it is worthy of the hon. gentleman's consideration, if he declines to accept the alternative proposition of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming), to provide that all those tenants shall go on the first making up of the voters' list who can show, by the assessment roll, that they occupy property which would qualify them if they were proprietors.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank) yesterday stated that 20 per cent. of his constituents are actually tenants. Of course, in towns and cities the tenant class would be very much larger. The hon. gentleman proposes to confer the elective franchise on those who have an income of a certain sum, who have not hitherto had their names on the assessment roll, and who will not, so far as I know, have their names on the assessment roll hereafter, except, perhaps, in the Province of Ontario. If you put the number of tenants as at one-fifth of the whole population, which I think would be a very low percentage, taking the town and city population along with the rural population, of the tenants whose names would be on the assessment roll as tenants, with reference to the value on the property, the revising officer would be unable to put nearly one-third or one-fourth of the population on the list, without some evidence in addition to what he would be able to obtain from the assessment roll. I think the proposition made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) is better than that of the hon. gentleman. But I think the proposition of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) is better than either. There is no doubt that if the hon. gentleman adheres to the rule of rental he would get rid of the difficulty of proving all the tenants, by adopting the rule suggested by the hon. member for Peel, because the assessment roll would furnish a guide for putting on all those assessed above $150, leaving only the very small class who would be assessed under that amount. But it seems to me that it would have been more satisfactory, generally, to have adopted the rule of $100 assessed value, so as to make the assessment roll, as far as possible, conclusive in the preparation of the voters' list. No doubt the hon. gentleman has had far more experience than any of us with regard to parliamentary management, but I fancy that his attention to the preparation of voters' lists has not been as extensive as that of some hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, and I am satisfied that if he knew the difficulties that will grow out of the proposition he has submitted, he would hardly be disposed to persistently adhere to it. One of the great difficulties we have is to induce voters to interest themselves sufficiently to see that their names are put on the list, unless when an election is at hand. In my own constituency, where an assessor had improperly put 40 or 50 names on the list and left out 50 or 60, there was no difficulty in getting struck off those who were improperly put on; but there was much difficulty in getting those who had been left out to appear before the judge and have their names inserted. If the revising officer has to take the assessment roll for the rental, he will say: Here is a property worth $1,000 that certainly will pay more than $20 a year. But there is no legal evidence to justify his putting the name of the tenant of such property on the voters' list. If the value of the property were made a test for the tenant there would be no difficulty. If we look at the intrinsic merits of the question, to which the hon. gentleman referred, that the rental should be taken instead of the value of the property, we will find it difficult to understand why the rental should be taken in the case of a tenant when the equivalent for rental, the amount for use and profit, is not taken in the case of an occupant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When we come to the clause as to the instructions to be given to the revising officer, we will see if we cannot make it so as to meet, to some extent the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). This clause, if persisted in, will eventually bring about the same corrupt practices that created such a scandal in the Midlothian elections, in which the Buccleugh estates were made of service by creating any number of faggot votes in the constituency. Now is the time to anticipate such tendency and avoid it. Years ago we had a qualification for electors similar to the present, but it was abolished in 1868, as the hon. member for Lincoln knows.

Mr. ABBOTT. I understood my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to say that Ontario was the only Province in which the assessment roll made mention of the tenant.

Mr. MILLS. No; I did not say that. I referred to the wage-earners.

Mr. ABBOTT. Because, in the Province of Quebec there would be no necessity whatever for the revising officer to make any valuation in regard to the tenant, inasmuch as the tenants and the amount of rental they pay are mentioned in the valuation rolls.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to call the attention of the First Minister again to a matter of which I spoke when we were on the interpretation clause. In my constituency five men voted who lived in another riding. At the election three of them were sworn, and took the oaths and voted, and two were not sworn. It was known that they were made tenants only to give them a vote.

Mr. RYKERT. Why did you not get them struck off?

Mr. McMULLEN. We did not notice anything until just before the election, but the next year we got them struck off. There will be a great deal of fraud of that kind, and bogus votes, if the clause is left as it is now. The father may rent ten acres from the son, and the son may rent ten acres from the father, and each of them will be able to vote on the other's property. The First Minister also stated that he was going to provide that if a man whose rental was $1,000, had paid $20 of the amount, he should be entitled to vote. The landlord, however, might, for political reasons, refuse to receive anything less than the full rent, and in that case the tenant would be deprived of his vote. I would suggest that a tender of the amount should be sufficient. In regard to the bogus votes to which I have referred, some provision should be made. I feel sincerely honest in this matter, and hope something will be done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That kind of fraud will be practised under any system. The hon. gentleman says that some improper names were put on the assessment roll, and the next year he got them struck off. That was not under this Bill. No one can provide against the infinity of ingenious modes of getting votes by improper means, but this clause does not offer any greater facility than the present law in Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. If a tenant were obliged to be an actual resident on the property it would prevent all that. A tenant may go to the revising officer and produce his lease and claim the right to be put on the list, and no doubt the revising officer will put him on.

Mr. CASEY. The Ontario law provides a remedy against such frauds, but that remedy does not exist in this measure. In Ontario, when a lease is produced as evidence of a

tenancy, the tenant and the lessor must be prepared to swear that it is a *bonâ fide* lease, and not one simply for the purpose of getting the lessee put on the voters' list. That has prevented many cases of fraud. I notice that in the next clause the hon. gentleman has introduced the words "is a *bonâ fide* occupant." I propose, when these amendments are disposed of, to move that the same words shall be inserted in this clause, to provide that the person shall be a *bonâ fide* tenant. I think the requirement of occupancy would be a very fair one, too, in this clause, because a person does not *bonâ fide* rent a small piece of land like this, and pay $20 for it, for any other purpose except to live on it, as a rule. The right hon. gentleman has spoken of the organised attempts to create faggot votes in the old country, as if it was a legitimate part of party practice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CASEY. He said both parties were organised for that purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But I neither expressed approbation or disapprobation.

Mr. CASEY. But he quoted it as a precedent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I expressed surprise that the Liberal gentlemen opposite should take such a different view of these matters from the Liberal party in England.

Mr. CASEY. He said that both English parties are now organised for this purpose. If we are going to have the manufacture of faggot votes in Canada, it is well we should know it at once. That is the suggestion contained by the hon. gentleman's remarks. Of course, it will not be illegal under this Act, if it is put in force. The clause seems meant to make faggot votes legal. I think the hon. gentleman ought to explain why it is that in the case of a tenant alone he takes no account of the value of the land, but merely of the rental. He says the requirement for the payment of rent is not a safeguard. We have known many elections where votes were considered cheap at a higher price than even $20, and $20 is all that is required in this case to qualify a voter. The hon. gentleman ought to explain this inconsistency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I explained it, as fully as I could, last night.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see how this provision is going to be worked. The revising officer, the Premier says, takes the assessment list, and there he finds the names of the tenants, but there is nothing on that paper to show him how much rental the tenant pays, and unless the tenant pays a rental equal in amount to the lowest amount provided by this section, he has no vote. The Premier says the presumption may be drawn, from the assessment list and from the property that is so rented, that the tenant is paying enough to qualify him under this clause; but that is all a matter of guess work, and this is not a manner in which the revising officer should proceed. Under the present system the assessor is sworn to make up the list, setting forth, to the best of his knowledge, the names of the persons entitled to be on that list, the property they occupy, and its value. You then have got something that is of evidence. If the present clause furnishes the best practicable test it is a poor one, and it shows that the scheme itself is an impracticable one. The whole matter is going to be thrown into confusion. How is the question of the amount of rental to be settled? Who will be able to know what is the bargain between landlord and tenant? This provision appears to further strengthen the hands of the landlords, and that is unnecessary, as regards the Province of Ontario. It is to be regretted that this subject, which was postponed from yesterday, has not yet reached a proper solution. It is a provision of the Bill that is going to open the door to all sorts of unsatisfactory results, and proves that it is an unworkable scheme that is offered.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) negatived.

Mr. CASEY moved that the words "*bonâ fide*" be inserted before "tenant," on the first line of paragraph 4.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we cannot put that in, as every tenant is supposed to be *bonâ fide*, and we might as well put *bonâ fide* owner. If a man is not a *bonâ fide* tenant he is not a tenant. It is different with an occupant, as he may be a mere squatter.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the committee, I would ask to have the same amendment made with regard to cities that has been made in this clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANGELIER. I wish to call the attention of the Premier to the fact that by this section a young man occupying a room in a city, and paying $3 a month for it, though he does not pay rent on real estate, but only for furniture, or perhaps for furniture and services combined, would have a vote.

Mr. CURRAN. You will get no room of the kind mentioned in any city in Canada for $3 a month.

Mr. LANGELIER. Suppose it is $5; the real estate may not be worth 25 cents.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask if it is the intention to amend the election law in order to carry out this law. In the case of a voter changing his residence it appears that under the Bill the revising officer's certificate does not altogether disclose the rights of the voter.

Mr. BOWELL. How is it done now? He takes the oath at present and he is qualified, and that would be the case under the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. No; that does not meet this case, because he only swears that he is the person named on the list, that he was a tenant and still resides within the electoral district.

Mr. LANGELIER. In the Province of Quebec the proprietor is responsible for the taxes, and knowing that, very often leases his property so as to make the rent include the taxes. In that case, will the amount of the taxes be deducted from the rent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; that is very common in Canada.

Mr. MILLS. It might be well, in that case, to provide that so much shall be free from taxes.

On sub-section 5, section 4,

Mr. MULOCK. There might be a tenant of a property worth $150, who does not pay sufficient rent to qualify him to vote as a tenant. Would there be any objection to providing for him in this section?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would not do.

Mr. CASEY. I would propose this amendment as an addition:

Provided always, that this section shall not apply to any employé or servant of the Government of Canada in occupation of real property belonging to the Crown.

This is intended to apply chiefly to the case of a caretaker in a drill shed or other Government building, who gets a residence in the building, and who would thereby be qualified under this clause as an occupant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A caretaker is held to be a servant, occupying a portion of your house. In Ireland, when a tenant is evicted, whom the landlord does not

wish to press, he allows him to remain as a caretaker, and he is considered as a servant who holds the property for his master.

Mr. CASEY. Would not a servant, then, occupying a house on a farm, and engaged by the year, be qualified under this clause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; his house is part of his wages.

Mr. CASEY. He would not qualify under this clause, but under the income clause.

Amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived.

On sub-section 6, section 4,

Mr. CASEY. I wish to enter my protest here. I think the income qualification should be put lower than it is for the country; everything else is put lower for the country than for the towns. Wages are lower there also, and the agricultural laborer is as well qualified to vote as the town laborer. There are a great many town laborers getting $300 a year, but a farm laborer does not, on the average, get $300 a year, in Ontario. The average wages for agricultural laborers there is $264 a year, without board, and $170 with board. They are generally farmers' sons or the sons of small land-owners, who work for their neighbors and are just as well qualified to vote as town laborers. I hope the hon. gentleman will review the income franchise in this section for that reason.

Mr. AUGER. Suppose a man hired for a year for $150 and his board, would the board be part of his income?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. I move that the words "earnings in money, or money's worth," be added.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 2:20 a. m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. EDGAR. I see in an extra published by one of the city newspapers it is stated that Poundmaker has sent in a flag of truce to Battleford, and released some prisoners. Has the Government received any information on this subject?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No other information than that which is published through the press, and which the hon. gentleman has received.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On sub-section 7, section 4,

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister stated, when we were at another part of the Bill, that he proposed to consider this clause and the one that immediately followed. When provision was made in the Ontario Act it was simply to enfranchise farmers' sons and not the sons of other property holders. Under this clause it is proposed to enfranchise the sons of all property holders, and these two sub-sections might properly be merged into one sub-section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, when the Bill was first framed, some years ago, there was no question about giving the franchise to other sons than to farmers' sons. I think it will not be well that we should now commence to alter the Bill in regard to such particulars, and the two sub-sections may as well stand. There can be no objection to it in this way, and it will give information; and as we are told that this is merely the commencement of other and perhaps more liberal legislation, it will be the means of gathering in a comparatively large proportion of farmers' and mechanics' sons. It will give that information, which there can be no harm in giving, and I would rather not alter the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. It is a Bill for industrial statistics.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be valuable in that regard, and therefore we may as well leave it as it is. While I am up, I may say that in consequence of the discussion we had last night I have been thinking over the two clauses respecting tenants, as regards both cities and counties, which have been carried in committee. Now, I was struck by some of the remarks that were made, though they had occurred to me before; but in order to go a certain step and to remove the uncertainty that has been complained of by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) and especially another hon. member, if it be understood, as a matter of arrangement, that no other amendment shall be proposed, I propose to take a step that will, to a certain extent, meet the views of hon. gentlemen, and it is this: That in case any assessment roll shows a party to be a tenant but does not show the rent he pays, I propose to add a proviso which, although it does not go as far as the hon. gentleman wishes, goes a considerable step towards it, and I propose to provide that the fact that the property in respect to which he pays a rent is assessed at $150 shall be accepted as *primâ facie* evidence that the tenant has a right to be on the register. I understand that in the Province of Quebec the assessment roll shows the rental that is paid; in Ontario, and perhaps some of the other Provinces, the assessment roll merely marks that he is a tenant, without showing the rent he pays. I propose to go to that extent; I cannot go any farther. If that is accepted as an advance, I shall, in the course of the evening, move that a proviso to that effect be added to the clause, *quoad* cities, and *quoad* counties.

Mr. MILLS. So that in cities the tenant will have one-half the qualification of the owner?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall adapt it to different circumstances.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the First Minister mean that a man must pay a rent on property assessed for that value?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. It was argued last night, with a great deal of force, that in Ontario the assessment roll, for instance, says: John Jones, lot No. 1, value $150, as the assessed value. Then he is marked as tenant, but that does not show what rent he pays at all. But I would make a proviso that if that property is assessed at $150 which gives the franchise to the owner, that shall be *primâ facie* evidence that the tenant has a right to be registered. If it is proved afterwards, on objection, that he does not pay $20 a year, the *primâ facie* evidence is rebutted.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has done well to accept the suggestion proposed by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Fleming) last night. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman, after agreeing to his proposal, if he cannot go a little further, and take some means to prevent the making of fictitious leases, merely for the purpose of manufacturing voters, and to require that the lease shall be *bonâ fide*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would come under some election law providing against fraud and corruption. The whole tenor of this Bill is to settle what the franchise shall be, not to provide against fraud and manufactured votes.

Mr. CASEY. In the next sub-section the right hon. gentleman has provided, and I think successfully, against fraudulent voting under the occupancy clause, and I think a provision of the same sort might be put into this clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When we were at the clause about mechanics' sons and property-owners' sons in cities, I took occasion to remind the committee the clause was originally framed when woman suffrage was in the Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. A man may be a tenant of a very valuable piece of property, and pay a very light ground rent, and if he were assessed on the value of the property, he might have ten votes. Numerous cases occur, in cities like Toronto, where there is only a nominal ground rent. It occurs in other Provinces besides Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS. I was told by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), before he left, that a considerable number of tenants in the city of St. John were paying wharf rent and were entitled to a renewal of their leases. The amount of rent is merely nominal, although the property is very valuable. There is in this city a very considerable number of tenants of the Crown who have leases of parts of the Bye estate, and they pay very small rentals. I am satisfied that, unless some radical changes have been made since I was in the Department of the Interior, some of the parties would be disfranchised, although the property they hold is worth many thousands of dollars.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose to go further than I have stated now; but the suggestion as to tenants of property under ground rent for improvements constitutes a special case, and I will consider it.

Mr. DAVIES. Then I understand some opportunity will be given for the consideration of this question of tenants in the island who pay ground rental?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. EDGAR. When the discussion on the interpretation clause was in progress, it was allowed to stand over. I then proposed to move an amendment respecting the word "farm," setting forth that it should mean 20 acres, and 10 acres in respect of market gardens. It struck me, however, that it was entirely immaterial, as these people would be land-owners, and they and their sons would have votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That interpretation clause stands over. When we go back to it we can discuss the question of 20 acres and the market gardens. In regard to the sons of farmers and property-owners, I think it will be an incidental advantage to keep the farmers' sons distinct, so that we can see the number that have respectively voted at elections.

Mr. MILLS. That object will not be accomplished, because the sons of manufacturers, fishermen and other classes are not particularised. How is the hon. gentleman to ascertain how many sons of merchants, of woollen manufacturers, of cotton manufacturers, or blacksmiths there will be? The hon. gentleman is not going to get the information which he declares it is desirable to obtain in this way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know whether the common sense of the committee will not see that, in counties especially, where the great mass of the population is agricultural, it will add this incidental advantage of showing what proportion are absolutely employed in that industry, and what proportion are drawn from other industrial classes. That is an incidental advantage which I think we might keep, especially as it makes no difference whatever, and is a matter of running two sentences into one.

Mr. DAVIES. Originally the right hon. gentleman intended to give the franchise only to farmers' sons, but afterwards, and I think properly, he extended it to the sons of owners of real estate generally. Now, why retain the two clauses when the effect is only to make trouble, to have an additional column in the reviser's list, and to cause a good deal of trouble and annoyance as to which class these people are to go in. Besides the clause is inartistic, and there is no conceivable advantage which can result from it, unless the hon. gentleman has some ulterior object in seeing how many sons of the owners of real estate vote on more than twenty acres of land.

Mr. CASEY. This will involve the necessity of the revising officer deciding under what heads he shall classify these voters, and if there is any dispute witnesses will have to be called and fees paid. Under this Bill more is now left to the individual than formerly, and it should be drawn so that it will not puzzle the non-legal voter, while the effect of these two clauses will be very puzzling to that class. The language of the Ontario Act, both in the interpretation and the enacting clauses, is very plain, and it covers the whole ground of securing the franchise to all holders of real property, whether farmers' sons or not. When the hon. gentleman decided to include the sons of other owners than farmers, he simply put on another clause, and it seems to me that his explanation is incidental rather than the advantage which he claims will be gained.

Mr. LISTER. The form in which these provisions stand will involve a good deal of expense and trouble. The revising officer will naturally ask himself why it is that farmers' sons and the sons of other land-owners should be distinguished, and he may call upon people to appeal against the list as to whether they are farmers' sons or the sons of other land-holders. The hon. gentleman finding that Mr. Mowat intended to give the franchise to the sons of other owners than farmers, felt that he must be up with the legislation of Ontario, because it seems to be a run between him and Mr. Mowat, as to who shall have the most liberal Act. Why should it be left to the revising officer to say to the sons of farmers, or of other owners, you must come forward and give evidence that you belong to one class or the other. The revising officer will ask himself why this distinction was made. He will say that the Legislature in making it must have had some object in view; and persons seeking to be put on the list under these clauses, must satisfy him as to which class of electors they belong to. It seems to me that the reason given by the First Minister is no reason at all. The object of this Bill is not to procure statistics; its only intent is to provide a list of electors. If section 8 includes the sons of all land-owners, whether residing in a city, or in a village, or in the country, what is the necessity of encumbering the Bill with section 7? The greater includes the less. The distinction is inartistic; there is no reason whatever for it; and it will only lead to confusion, difficulty, and expense. I think the right hon. gentleman ought to consent to expunge that section altogether.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I think there is a very good reason why these two sections should be retained. We know that the assessment roll in Ontario and the voters' list has a column for farmer's sons.

Mr. LISTER. Not now; not after this Act comes in force.

Mr. WALLACE. By the law that is in force in Ontario during the year 1885, there is no provision made for any man's son except the farmer's son. Consequently, when the revising officer has to ascertain who are to be put on

the list, he has the farmers' sons column of the assessment roll to aid him, but he has no aid from it with reference to the sons of landholders.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman will notice that the sons of tenant farmers are not provided for in either of these clauses.

Mr. MILLS. The Ontario statute defines not a farmer's son but a land-holder's son.

Mr. WALLACE (York). That only commences next year; it does not apply to the first list.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman had made sub-section 7 of section 3 apply to this particular matter it would have covered the whole ground. He need not have changed one word to have made that section serve in the place of the two he now proposes. Under this section the son of a land-holder would have to prove the extent of his father's property—whether it was under or over 20 acres—before the revising officer could decide in what class to place his name on the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the answer of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is conclusive. The first voters' list made for Dominion purposes in Ontario will be made in the opening of the spring of 1886, in order to do that they must get the assessment roll of 1885. He will find there the names of the farmers' sons, and he can at once transfer them from the assessment roll of 1885 to his voters' list of 1886. But under the provincial Act which comes in force in 1886, the rolls showing who are land-holders' sons will not be revised except between August and October; and therefore the revising officer, in the spring of 1886, will have to enquire who the land-holders' sons are. Much of that work will be done in the counties especially, by the assessment roll of 1885, which will show who the farmers' sons are.

Mr. DAVIES. To hear the hon. member for West York, and to hear his reasons for retaining this clause endorsed by the Prime Minister, one would imagine that the whole of this Dominion consists of the Province of Ontario. This Bill is not framed only to suit Ontario. In Quebec, in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick, the franchise is not conferred specially on farmers' sons, and in those Provinces the difficulty pointed out from retaining these two clauses will exist the very moment this Act comes into operation.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman ought to yield to the proposal, if he had, we would have been through long ago. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) assumes the names will be got from the voters' list in Ontario this year, that is true, but how is it with regard to the other Provinces, and how will it be with regard to Ontario after this year? The old list will not aid the hon. gentleman, because property is being constantly divided, and the hon. gentleman is simply enormously increasing the difficulties of those who prepare the lists without accomplishing the slightest advantage to any portion of the community.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There ought not be anything like a 20 acre lot mentioned, either in the Ontario Act or the present Act. There are many farmers cultivating land outside of villages and towns, in lots of from 5 to 10 acres, which are of more value in many parts of the country than lots of 20 acres or 100 acres elsewhere, but I do not think that, as regards the farmers' sons, the mention of the number of acres will do any harm. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., asked if we thought there was no other place than Ontario. We do think there is; we reckon for the Dominion, but the great opposition to the Bill comes from Ontario, and were it not for the Act of the Ontario Local House, we would not have one-tenth of the opposition we have. This measure increases the franchise in every part of the Dominion except Prince Edward Island and British Columbia.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman's argument, that the number of acres should not be mentioned, is exactly what we have been arguing. What we want is but a simple provision that the sons of all land-holders whether farmers or not who have sufficient property, should be qualified.

Mr. KIRK. Because certain hon. gentlemen on this side object to certain portions of the Bill, is not an evidence that we are opposed to the Bill, but an evidence of our desire to insist in improving it and making it as perfect a law as possible. From the first, I have objected to this clause as it stands. Farmers' sons and fishermen are the only two classes mentioned with regard to real estate. In the 9th clause, fishermen are entitled to vote if they are owners of real property and boats and tackle, but are not allowed to qualify on any other personal property. In Nova Scotia this will have the effect of decreasing the number of votes in that class of the community. The fact that farmers' sons are mentioned will raise a doubt in the mind of the revising barrister that fishermen are not included, even though the father may have sufficient real estate to give him a vote. Fishermen's sons, as well as farmer's sons, ought to be entitled to vote in their father's own sufficient real estate. The hon. gentleman says the farmers are the largest class in the community, but in the Maritime Provinces the fishermen are also a very important class.

Mr. STAIRS. If the hon. gentleman has read the Bill, he must have seen that fishermen's sons, whose fathers have real estate, may have a vote.

Mr. KIRK. I do not deny that, but I say it is not clear.

Mr. STAIRS. There is no doubt about it at all.

Mr. KIRK. There are large numbers of fishermen who own a considerable quantity of land, and are not called farmers, and their sons might not, under this Act, be entitled to vote. Where is the necessity for saying that farmers' sons shall be entitled to vote when you do not give the same right to the sons of fishermen?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Look at the 8th clause.

Mr. KIRK. They may come in under the 8th clause, but it will create confusion. Supposing the 7th clause was not there, and the words "other than farmers' sons" were struck out of the 8th clause, would not that admit farmers' sons?

Mr. EDGAR. There is a very large class of farmers who do not own the farms which they work, but have a large stake in the country, who own a lot of stock, and whose sons work for them in the same way as the sons of proprietors work for them. In many cases the owners are simply nominal owners, because they have large mortgages on their property, and have not really any more interest than the tenant farmers have. I propose, therefore, an amendment to the clause that the following words be added after the word "son" in the first line of sub-section 7 of section 4: "or tenant farmers' sons."

Mr. McMULLEN. There is no doubt that there are a large number of these tenant farmers whose sons should be entitled to vote as much as the sons of owners, and I therefore hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LANGELIER. In the Province of Quebec there are many of this class. I saw in a paper which is supposed to be more or less under the inspiration of the Minister of Public Works, the *Monde* of Montreal, a statement that members on this side of the House desired to prevent farmers' sons from voting. I have not heard any one on this side express an opinion to that effect, and now we are proposing to increase the number of farmers' sons who should have a vote.

Mr. WILSON. In the neighborhood of cities and towns, very often a large rental is paid for a farm, and the sons of the tenant farmer work for him in the same way as the sons of an owner. They are as intelligent and as much entitled to a vote as the sons of farmers who own their farms. A farmer may have a lease of eighteen or twenty years of his land, and his sons are as much entitled to a vote as those of the owner whose property may be heavily mortgaged. I know that in the section from which I come there are leases of this kind upon property, which run for twenty-one years. The tenants virtually own the land, yet they will all be prevented from voting unless they can get upon the assessment roll by some other means. We ought to try to prevent, as much as possible, the contention in the various courts of revision that usually takes place there. If the First Minister still persists in granting the tenant farmer a right to vote, I can see no reason why these two clauses should be retained. It will be the source of a great deal of annoyance to the revising barrister, and to parties desirous of getting upon the list.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to remind the First Minister of the circumstances existing in Prince Edward Island. Those hon. gentlemen who support him in this House will bear me out in the statement that in that Province nearly all the lands were originally held or leased by tenant farmers. Since then the farms have been bought out by the Government, and bought out by the tenants, of whom a large proportion are now freeholders, and the large number who yet remain tenants are paying a rent. Heretofore, their sons have been accustomed to go with the father and vote on polling day. Whatever effect the Bill may have in other Provinces, it will disqualify large numbers of these farmers' sons in Prince Edward Island, and here is an opportunity, by this amendment, of reinstating the sons of the tenant farmers throughout the Island in the position they held before this Bill was introduced. I suppose there will be hundreds of these men in each county disfranchised by this Bill. I have seen myself as many as three sons go up to the polls with the father and vote. If this amendment is accepted, these sons will be continued in their right, because the farm is of sufficient value to give both father and sons a vote. I am quite sure my hon. friends from the Island, irrespective of politics, will support the amendment so far as our Province is concerned. There can be no harm in it; it is in the direction of extending the franchise, and those gentlemen who expressed a desire, the other day, to extend the franchise in every reasonable direction, ought to be the first to accept this proposition. I would press upon the First Minister the desirability of allowing these farmers' sons to continue to exercise the franchise. They are a very intelligent class, well educated young men, who take a great interest in politics, and are among the most active in promoting the interests of their candidate. I hope my hon. friends from the Island, who support the Government, will use their influence with the Premier to get this amendment accepted.

Mr. AUGER. In the Province of Quebec there is a very large class of tenant farmers who work the farms of large proprietors, while the proprietors are absent in the city or elsewhere. These tenants cannot work those large farms alone, and they keep their sons with them, who live on the farm. You are now giving a vote to a man who owns a farm worth $300, and you give his son a vote, but although the tenant farmer may work a farm worth ten times that amount, and has more at stake than the small proprietor, you propose to deprive his sons of the right to vote. I am afraid it will induce them to leave the farm and emigrate. I hope the First Minister will accept this amendment, because in my Province it will make a great difference with our young men.

Mr. LANGELIER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I doubt whether the attention of the First Minister has been called to the fact, that within the last ten or fifteen years there has been a great alteration in many parts of the country as regards the ownership of land. Notably in Ontario there is a large class of tenant farmers, men possessed of considerable capital, and apparently that class is on the increase. Now, I can quite understand how it may have been very objectionable at a former period to give the franchise to sons of very small tenant farmers, but I submit the position is entirely changed now. I submit that the sons of these tenant farmers, at present are, to say the least, quite as well deserving of the franchise as the small tenants in towns and cities, whom he proposes to enfranchise. If you are going to enfranchise the small tenants in cities, if you are going to enfranchise Indians, as the hon. gentleman proposes, it certainly appears very absurd, and very inconsequent, to refuse the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers of the class who are now becoming a very large proportion of the agricultural population. Then, there is another consideration. It is, as the First Minister knows, very desirable that we should do all we reasonably can to encourage those young men to stay in this country, and remain with their fathers on the farm, and I have no doubt that giving them the franchise would help to secure both these desirable objects.

Mr. MILLS. The new Ontario law on this subject, as the First Minister will observe, if he looks at it, includes, by the interpretation clause, tenants amongst those who are embraced within the definition of "landlord," and "landlord's sons," includes the sons of the owner and the tenant. I know that a great many of the farmers of Ontario are tenant farmers—in fact, I know some parties who were proprietors of land, sold their land, and invested their money, and rented other farms, still continuing the business of farming, and believing that a certain amount of capital invested otherwise than in land, would yield a larger interest than will real estate. They can rent a farm worth $10,000 for very much less than the interest on that sum, so they become tenant farmers. There is a large number of that particular class. The question is, what is best with respect to the safety of the state? Can these sons of tenant farmers be entrusted with the franchise, and are they likely to exercise it as intelligently as proprietors of the soil? They will, no doubt, exercise it quite as intelligently. The sons of tenant farmers are educated with farmers' sons, and are equal to them in ability and intelligence. As a matter of fact, they are members of the same class. It is most extraordinary that we should be legislating to give the wild Indian the franchise and withhold it from the tenant farmers' sons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman has repeated again and again the purpose of giving farmers' sons votes was this; The farmer is the owner of the soil. As a general rule one of his sons remains at home and succeeds to the property at his father's death. The other sons go to the towns on their own account. That was the original idea in Ontario. It was afterwards extended so as to include the sons of property owners.

Mr. MITCHELL. A kind of universal suffrage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, because in this Dominion there is no law of primogeniture. The estate is accordingly divided up. It has been under the usual argument: Why should you prevent an artisan's son or a merchant's son from having the vote, because on his father's death he will obtain the property, and the business stand? This has always been based upon the suggestion that the son had a real interest in the estate. That argument cannot apply to a tenant's son. He has no interest in the land which his father rents for a period of from one to ten years; and so it would be giving a vote without the party

possessing any qualification. The father has a vote on his rental, but the son, as I have said, has no interest in the estate. If you adopt this proposition you must give the vote to sons of tenants in cities and towns who pay $2 a month rent. That is simply manhood suffrage. I am not prepared, and the House is not prepared, to adopt manhood suffrage, which has already been voted down, and I cannot therefore adopt the proposal because it would be in effect manhood suffrage.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the First Minister can have correctly stated the reasons why farmers' sons were given the vote; if he has, they are very flimsy reasons. In Prince Edward Island persons have leases for 99 years at small rentals, and are practically in the same position as owners of the fee. I would point out to the First Minister that the sons of farmers have no vested right in their fathers' estates. The father can leave it to whom he pleases. But in the case of leases for 999 years, you are going to create this extraordinary anomaly. Two farmers may live along side each other. One has a lease for 999 years for which he pays five pounds a year rent, and the other buys out the reversion. The sons of the latter will have a vote while the sons of the tenant for 999 years will have no vote. If the hon. gentleman cannot grant it to every tenant farmer, he should grant it at least to tenant farmers for long terms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already told the hon. gentleman—I promised him that the case of long grant leases would be considered if the Bill will declare that a building lease on a long lease is equivalent to an ownership, if it declares that such a lessee stands in substance as a proprietor, then his sons will have a vote, but until we settle the first point with regard to these *quasi* owners, we cannot deal with their sons.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposed to consider those cases where a party has a right to renew a lease on payment of a small rent, but there is another class of cases where the lease is for a specific time and no matter how long that time is he has a chattel interest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I have promised to consider.

Mr. MILLS. That is an additional case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I speak without prejudice of course, but I stated that those persons holding a 999 years lease would be equivalent to those having an estate for life —would be of equal value, I mean. We might fairly say that such a person should be considered as an owner. A person holding lease twenty-one years, renewable for ever——

Mr. MILLS. Or ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think twenty-one years should be the least, for no person would take a ground rent for the purpose of building a house unless he has a twenty-one years lease renewable, or an increased rental to be settled by arbitration. That is another case to be fairly considered. If we decide that those persons have the same property substantially, though not technically, for life, I should have no objection that the sons of such parties should have a vote, but the major being settled the minor will follow.

Mr. MITCHELL. I call the attention of the right hon. Premier to the fact that there is a class in my own county called lumberers, who have a great deal of money invested in their business, many of whom are not farmers. They may or may not be owners of real estate, but they generally have sons, and their sons work with them, and I would like to know if any provision can be made for them. Sometimes they have $10,000 or $12,000 worth of property, which they do not want to invest in real estate, because they require it in their own business. Then, with respect to this clause about fishermen——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not come to that yet.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, we have not come to it, but everybody has been talking about it. I want a little to say about it; I want my name in *Hansard* as well as other people.

Mr. BOWELL. That's honest any way.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the first time I have opened my mouth for two days, except to eat and drink, and I have been waiting for an hour to get a chance to say what I want to say; but what, with the distinguished orators on the other side, and the right hon. gentleman answering them, I have not had a chance to say a single word. Now, I propose to have a little say at this discussion, and what I shall say will be short, as I am always short—sometimes with my right hon. friend, and sometimes with hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are five feet eight—not very short, rather tall.

Mr. MITCHELL. A little too tall for the right hon. gentleman sometimes. The point I wish to refer to is about the fishermen, and I know the right hon. gentleman will take it in good part. There are quite a number of people in my own county who are fishermen, and we know that the effect upon people who lead the life of fishermen is they generally have large families.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain, explain.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not see that the statement of a truism on that subject should provoke laughter on this occasion, but certainly it is a relief from the very dry speeches we have had for a very long time. It is quite a relief to know that there is a little music left in the House yet. What I want to say to the right hon. gentleman is this: That he is getting very near manhood suffrage; he is going towards it step by step, and soon there will be nothing but the shadow of a shade left of his original franchises. I would like him to consider this question of the fisherman's sons, who perhaps may have real estate to the amount of $200 or $300, or may have personal property to the amount of $700 or $1,000. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if he could not put in some provision for fishermen who have two, three or four grown up sons, who have probably $500 or $600 worth of real estate, or $1,000 worth of personal property in his boats and fishing tackle, etc. Why should he not include these sons of fishermen, even as a matter of fair play if nothing else, as well as the sons of mechanics and farmers. I will not ask him to commit himself at this moment, but I would ask him to consider the matter before we reach the section. I have risen for these two purposes: First as to the merits of the two classes I have mentioned, and, secondly, to get my name in *Hansard*.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman gives a correct account of the grounds upon which this franchise was first granted. The franchise was first commended on some such ground as that—that the farmer's son was supposed to have a real interest in the property. But we have got very far beyond that in this Bill. The hon. gentleman provides here an income franchise and a wage-earner's franchise, which gives a vote to a workingman who has no interest in any property or stake in the country beyond the fact that he has earned $300 a year. That franchise cannot certainly be defended on the ground of interest in land, and it is quite clear that the right hon. gentleman in this Bill, Conservative as he is, has got far away from the idea of the franchise having any connection with a living interest in a piece of land. The question is, then, whether the sons of tenant

farmers should be qualified with their fathers or not; and it must not be decided on the issue whether they have any living interest in the soil or not. Let us compare this class with the classes whom the hon. gentleman does enfranchise. Take the laborer. The tenant farmer employs a laborer, and perhaps pays him $300 a year in wages, or in wages and board combined; and the laborer will be disqualified, while the tenant farmer's own son will not be qualified. Again, compare the tenant farmer's son with the man who rents a room in a city lodging house at $2 a month. There is no comparison; the mere lodger at $2 a month has no such interest in the country as the son of a tenant farmer; and the latter is as well qualified as the former on the ground of intelligence, social position or stake in the country. I do not believe there is any tenant farmer's son in Canada who does not earn as much in the course of the year as would qualify him under the wage-earners' franchise if he got it in money or in money and board combined. But he does not; he simply helps to produce the crop, the price which is shared between the farmer and his sons according to their necessities. He may get $50 in one year, $100 in another, and $25 in another in cash; but he gets no regular wages. He is practically working the farm on shares with his father.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is, practically, wages.

Mr. CASEY. But you are leaving his vote at the mercy of his father, and to some extent at the mercy of the landlord, because if the landlord chooses the farmer's sons can be put on as joint tenants; and where the landlord is of the same political stripe as the tenant, that is done; but in the one case the hon. gentleman leaves the vote of the tenant's sons at the mercy of the landlord, and in another case at the mercy of the father. That is not sound constitutional doctrine. The hon. gentleman has raised the difficulty that if you give the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers, you will be obliged to give it to the sons of all other tenants. I do not think there is any connection between the cases of the farmer-tenant and the lodger-tenant. I think you might naturally be called upon to give the franchise to the sons of other landholders renting a property of the value that would qualify the tenant farmer and his son; but you are not obliged to extend it to the case of the lodger-tenant. The value of the property will be shown by the assessment roll, and it will be easy to determine how many sons will be qualified. I propose that sub-section 8 be amended by inserting after the word "farm" in the second line the words:

Or of any person actually domiciled in any dwelling house as tenant therein where such dwelling house and the land if any held with it are of the actual value of $300.

These words are from the Ontario Act, which does extend the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers. I have shown how it may be extended to the sons of other tenants without going to manhood suffrage, and I put the qualification at $300, following the lines of the Ontario Act, in which the qualification of such tenants is put at $200, double the amount required to qualify a tenant himself.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have gone over the lists of tenants in one of the townships in my riding, and I find there are 78 tenant farmers in it. Are we going to disfranchise the sons of 78 tenant farmers in one township?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). They never had votes.

Mr. McMULLEN. They have votes under the Ontario Act, and it is important they should be allowed to have votes under this. I know one case where a man rents 200 acres of land for which he pays $400 rental, and yet his two sons will not have the right to vote. If a tenant who pays a rental of $20 a year is entitled to vote, why should not the sons of a tenant who pays a sufficient rental to make $20 each, if divided, be entitled to vote?

Mr. LANGELIER. The right hon. gentleman has I understand consented to take into consideration the case of Prince Edward Island. I will bring under his notice a case concerning Quebec. In Napierville there is a whole township which was originally granted by the Crown to the Hon. Mr. Baby. The lands have since been granted to farmers for a certain number of years, and if the sons of those tenants are not to be entitled to vote, there will not be a farmer's son in all that township who will have the right to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. While it may be said that a tenant farmer could give his son a vote by putting him on wages, that is not the usual practice, and to encourage the sons of tenant farmers to remain with their fathers, to encourage filial duty, the franchise should not be limited to the sons of freehold farmers, but should be extended to the sons of farmers who have leases for a reasonable time, say five years.

Mr. SCRIVER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not limit his consideration to the cases of what he calls building leases of twenty-one years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. SCRIVER. There are cases of emphyteutic leases made for 99 years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take care of that.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. This clause provides that only as many farmers' sons shall qualify as the property would qualify if they were joint owners with their fathers. Considering the length we have gone in enfranchising different classes, I do not see any reason for continuing this restriction. All the arguments I have applied to the case of tenant farmers' sons will apply to this case. In my own county, I find by inspection of the lists, 320 farmers' sons were qualified under the late Ontario Act, while I find by the census of 1881 there were 755 farmers' sons in that county. These 400 sons of farmers will be included under Mr. Mowat's Act and excluded under this Act. We should not disfranchise anyone who has a vote in the Provinces. These sons of freeholders might be able to qualify if they were servants instead of sons, and it is not fair that they should be disqualified because they are working on their father's farms. I move that clause 7 be amended by ommitting the proviso in reference to the division of the value of the property. That will leave all the sons of freeholders who are themselves qualified at liberty to vote. That is in consonance with the spirit of this Bill, and particularly in consonance with the spirit of the people of Ontario. I cannot help reminding the First Minister again that Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Conservative party in Ontario, moved a resolution in the Ontario Assembly, in favor of manhood suffrage, so that at the next election Conservative members from Ontario will have a beautiful time. The elections for the Local House and for this House may take place at the same time, and we shall see the Conservative members for a riding in the Local House, asking for support because he advocates manhood suffrage, and the Federal representative of the same riding asking for support because he opposed it. I think that, as the Conservatives of Ontario are in favor of manhood suffrage, we are entitled at least to ask that we should approach so near to it that the intelligent sons of our farmers should be enfranchised.

Mr. LISTER. I think sub section 7 should be eliminated altogether and sub-section 8 should be amended. I think that the tenants of Ontario as well as those of Prince Edward Island, should have the right to exercise the franchise. Any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble to go over the voters' list of his district, will find that at least nine-tenths of the people named on the list are farmers.

Now, this farmers' son suffrage is not a very old one. When it was agitated some years ago it was thought to be a dangerous innovation, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, if I am not mistaken, were not entirely in accord with the proposition to enfranchise the sons of farmers. Experience has proved that it was no mistake; experience has proved that the farmers' sons of this country were thoroughly qualified to exercise the franchise in an intelligent way. Why should not these men still continue to exercise that right for the election of members to this House? Why should not the sons of tenant farmers have the right just as much as the sons of proprietors? As the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, they go to the same school, they associate together, they have the same measure of intelligence, and there is no reason why the son of a farmer who happens to be a tenant, should be excluded from the exercise of the franchise while the son of his neighbor, who happens to be the owner, is included. The reason for giving the franchise to the sons of farmers was, that it would be an inducement to those sons to remain at home and help their aged parents to work the farm. If that argument was good in their case, it is equally good as respects the sons of tenant farmers.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section 8,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am going to move an amendment equivalent to the one that has just been passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that is done I wish to call the First Minister's attention to the word "continuously" in the 19th line of the 8th paragraph. Now, he knows that in all probability these clauses will be considerably fought over by the respective parties, and it is desirable that there should be as little confusion as possible. A considerable number of residents in towns and cities are persons who are getting more and more into the habit of spending a considerable part of the year away from their ordinary residences on which the vote takes place, and I apprehend this word "continuously" might give rise to a considerable amount of wrangling, as the son of such a person could hardly swear that he had been a year continuously in residence, if, as a matter of fact, he had spent several months away from the domicile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The last clause will cover that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think so, because there it provides for occasional absence from the residence of the father and mother. I am referring to the case where a whole family is absent for quite a long period during the summer season.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that word "continuously" would be reasonably interpreted as meaning six months in the year. A person is continuously resident where he has got his domicile, if he has no other. I take it that the hon. gentleman who comes down here to Parliament, is still continuously resident at Kingston.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I raised that objection because this is sure to be litigated a great deal. I think a dispute would arise on the meaning of the word "continuously." The Minister may be correct enough, that a proper construction would be to pay no attention to such a discontinuance of residence as I speak of; but I am certain the point would be taken, and it covers, probably, some thousands of cases throughout the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has never been any difficulty raised. The word "continuously" has always been in the present Act since farmer's sons have had the franchise, and the question has never been raised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But this is a new franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a new franchise, but the question has never been raised as to farmers' sons under the present Act.

Mr. MILLS. It could not be in the case of farmers' sons the question was not likely to arise under the Ontario Act, and could not become a practical question.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to move in amendment that the following words be inserted after the word "farm:"

"Or of any person actually domiciled in any dwelling house of at least he actual value of $200."

I heartily approve of any extension of the franchise in the direction of manhood suffrage. This amendment imposes residence as a necessary qualification. Next, he must be the son of the man who is a landowner to the value of $400.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section 9,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to add after the word "boats," the words "nets, fishing gear and tackle."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. This proposition is one to give the fishermen a vote, and the question is, does it attain that object? The hon. gentleman makes it essentially necessary that the fisherman, *qua* fisherman, shall possess certain real estate—it does not matter how little. If he possesses $5 worth of real estate and $150 worth of fishing gear, he has a vote. I do not think it is desirable, if you wish to confer the franchise on the fishermen, to make it necessary that he should possess any quantity of land. I do not think there is any principle or reason in it, as it is not essential to a fisherman carrying out his calling properly that he should be the owner of real estate at all. He may occupy a temporary stage on shore and carry on his calling in that way, as a great many of them do in the mackerel fisheries. If you wish to confer the franchise upon this class of people, you should not annex a condition which, in nine cases out of ten, will not be complied with, and, as a matter of fact, large numbers of them do not possess real estate. I move to add, after the word "tackle," "or boats, tackle or other implements of his calling."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot agree to that. If the fisherman rents a house he has a vote as a tenant—he has a house of some kind, either as owner, tenant or occupant. He gets a vote under the other provisions of the Bill in that case, but as it is represented to me that the fisherman has a very small tenement generally, and lives most of the year on board his boat, if he is the owner of property, this clause gives him the franchise in addition to the other. It is to give him the right to vote as the owner of property, although it may not be of the value of $150, if it can be supplemented by the value of his boats, his nets, or his gear. This is a substantial concession to the fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES. I go further than the hon. gentleman, and I say that as real estate is not necessary to enable the fisherman to carry on his calling, he should have a vote provided he has sufficient money invested in personal property. Take the case of a fisherman possessing a boat well fitted out and furnished, worth $1,500 or $2,500, he would not have a vote, but if he had $5 worth of real estate in addition he would have a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He must have a house.

Mr. DAVIES. He lives on his boat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not all the year round, and besides he is assessed on his earnings.

Mr. DAVIES. The condition attached is unnecessary and illogical. A fisherman possessing $2,000 or $3,000 worth of personal property will not have a vote; whereas, if he had $150 worth of sand bank, he would.

Mr. KIRK. It seems to me that the amendment of the right hon. gentleman will secure the vote to owners of real estate, who are fishermen; but I do not think it extends the franchise to the sons of these men.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If they are fishermen, they will have their earnings.

Mr. KIRK. But they may not amount to $400 a year. Amendment lost.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not agree with the principle of this clause. I do not object to fishermen being enfranchised in a ready way, but it seems to me that the clause is open to the objection that it is class legislation, and I cannot see on what principle the fishermen are entitled to legislation that is denied to any other of our industrial classes. There are a vast number of mechanics who, for the purpose of their trade and calling, have kits of tools that serve to them the same purpose as do the boats, nets, gear and tackle to the fishermen; and on what principle is it that these men are not granted the same privilege that is conceded to the fishermen. Then, the ordinary carter or the man who carries on business as a cabman——

Mr. MITCHELL. I know my hon. friend does not desire to curtail the privileges of any of the people of the Maritime Provinces—we are getting very few in this Bill—and do not let an hon. gentleman who has a feeling in common with me about manhood suffrage, prevent this one concession. Let us get this fishermen's clause pass, and we will then talk about the carters.

Mr. MULOCK. But the hon. gentleman asks for something for the Maritime Provinces which he will not help me to get for the other Provinces.

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly I will help you, if you do not obstruct.

Mr. MULOCK. Is it not better to get a clause that will apply to all equally meritorious callings? I would ask the Premier if he would have any objection to a similar provision being inserted, applicable to other trades.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has been settled already.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not remember any expression of opinion falling from any person against the argument I advanced, or any decision being arrived at by the committee on that point. However, I will adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Northumberland, and move a substantive motion after this clause is decided upon. The hon. member for Northumberland tells me he is going to support me in that.

Mr. DAVIES. My hon. friend has just anticipated me, I had a motion prepared to the same effect, which I intended to move as soon as this clause was carried.

Mr. KIRK. I would like to ask the First Minister if a fisherman living on property of which he is not the owner, or of which he does not hold the deed in fee simple, would be entitled to vote under this clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. KIRK. Then this clause will disfranchise a great many people who are simply occupants.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will vote as occupants under a previous clause.

Mr. DAVIES. If a man of this class votes as an occupant he must be the *bonâ fide* occupant of real property of the value of $150. He erects his stage on the shore contiguous to the fisheries, but he will not come under the title of occupant, because he does not live there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has his home.

Mr. DAVIES. He certainly cannot qualify on the fishing stage, where he lives in the summer and carries on his trade. If he can qualify as an occupant, there is no necessity of giving him this special privilege. This clause, as it is worded, will not reach a large class.

Mr. KIRK. A fisherman may have a home that will not reach $150 in value.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, he votes on his earnings.

Mr. KIRK. Then, I do not see any necessity for this clause at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman wish to strike it out?

Mr. KIRK. No, I do not.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman really wishes to reach the class of people we are talking about, he must insert, after the word "owner," the words, "tenant or occupant." I do not think he will object to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Indeed I will. I think it is highly objectionable.

Mr. GILLMOR. In the county I represent, there are 5,000 of these people. During certain seasons, the fishermen from the island and the mainland go to some locality where it is convenient to pursue their calling, and while there, they erect their tents; and, so far as I know, they have left their homes to go there. They stay there two or three months, as long as they can catch fish; but, in my constituency, I do not know of any fishermen who have not their homes as well.

Mr. KIRK. If a fisherman owns property sufficient to give him a vote under the occupancy clause, there is no necessity for this clause. But the very fact that it is inserted, shows that there is a necessity for it; and I think the word occupant should be inserted here, to meet the case that this clause is intended to meet.

Mr. DAVIES. I move in amendment that the following words be added:

Is a mechanic or artisan and is the owner of real property and tools or implements of his calling, within any such electoral district, which together are of the actual value of $150.

This will place the mechanics and artisans in the same category as fishermen. There is no reason why the implements in the one case should not count as well as in the other.

Mr. PAINT. The concession extended to the fishermen is necessary, inasmuch as all he has may be swept away several times in one season, which is not the case with the mechanic.

Mr. MILLS. His real property would not be swept away, and it is upon the real property that all parties are qualified. In the case of the fisherman, an exception is made by allowing his personal property to be included, and unless you give other classes the same right, you will be destroying the principle of uniformity, which is so much insisted on. Should the First Minister reject this suggestion, a large number of artisans in this country cannot fail to conclude that he is hostile to their liberties and interests.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that amendment goes far enough. I move that these words be added:

Is engaged in any trade, occupation or calling, and is the owner of chattel property, required for the purposes of such trade, occupation or calling, and real property within such electoral district, which together are of the actual value of $150.

Unless this amendment be adopted, in Toronto alone there will be a great many men employed in industries who will not have a vote. It is unjust to deny to the working-

men in manufactories what is granted to other classes. I hope the Prime Minister, if he does not now decide in favor of the amendment, will take it into consideration, and will be able to meet the views which have been expressed upon this point.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course he will, but do not make your speech too long. You are spoiling it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not making it any longer than necessary, but this is a matter of great importance, and I do not think that, since we have begun to discuss the details of this Bill, we have had a clause proposed which would be more appreciated than that proposed by my hon. friend from Queen's, or one in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. I can hardly think the hon. member for North York is serious in saying that this Bill will disfranchise the mechanics in Toronto. According to the report of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, the mechanics in the city of Toronto and the wage-earners, although they only work 251 days in the year, averaged $444 of earnings. These included blacksmiths, blacksmiths' helpers, boiler makers, boiler makers' helpers, bricklayers and masons, car builders, carpenters and wood workers, cigar makers, cotton mill operatives, laborers, machinists, moulders, painters, plasterers, plasterers' laborers, printers, sewing machine hands, tin and coppersmiths, tool makers, and a large number unspecified, the total number employed being 590.

Mr. MULOCK. What about those who did not get those wages.

Mr. SPROULE. This represents all classes, and I take it that the others would earn a similar amount.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the property of fishermen is very readily distinguishable from the tools of the artisan. The boat of the fisherman very nearly approaches the character of a house. It is, as nearly as you can imagine, equivalent to real property. It is a moveable house.

Mr. DAVIES. How about the nets and the tools of his trade?

Mr. McNEILL. I am not speaking of the nets, but of the boat. I recollect on one occasion having a conversation with the late Lord Cairns on the subject of the *Alabama*, and I remember his making the observation that, in point of fact, a ship, in his opinion, very nearly approached to a tenement.

Mr. TROW. According to the statement read by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), there are very few operatives in the city of Toronto, which has a population of about 130,000, for he states there are only 590.

Mr. SPROULE. No; I said that was a report from 590 wage-earners.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the argument of the hon. member for East Grey improves the matter at all, because he admits that these workmen were earning enough wages to qualify them. Some of the fishermen earn enough to qualify them in the same way, but we are legislating to give them a double chance, and why should we not do the same in regard to the other classes of wage-earners? A proposition of this kind should be applicable to all classes, and I think this principle should be conceded. In any case, it is of sufficient importance to be considered by the First Minister. I would not ask him to give a decision to-day, because no doubt he would require time to consider it, but I hope that, before we get out of committee, we shall have some expression of opinion on the subject from him.

Mr. PAINT. The fisherman is entitled to extra consideration on the ground of his precarious calling.

Mr. DAVIES. Would the hon. gentleman suggest some word in the Bill to show that is the principle on which the concession is granted? The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) suggested it was given to a fisherman because his boats and tackle were looked upon in the nature of a tenement. The hon. gentleman was not aware that we had already moved that the fisherman who possessed $1,000 worth of property in boats and tackle should have a vote, but the leader of the Government thinks he ought to have at least $1 worth of real estate. There may be a reason for that, I do not know. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr Mulock) and accept his amendment to the one I proposed, as being broader and better carrying out my intention that all artisans and mechanics of all kinds engaged in trade should be entitled to vote if they were possessed of personal property, and for the same reason as fishermen. No reason has been given for withholding it from the mechanic and artisan, while giving it to the fisherman.

Mr. BURPEE. I would ask the First Minister to consider the opportunity there is here to make faggot votes. A man may have a joint interest in real estate worth $100, but if his boats and tackle are worth only $149 he cannot have a vote. I cannot see why fishermen should be placed on a different basis from anyone else.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it must be becoming pretty clear to both the First Minister and his colleagues, that they might just as well have accepted the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) which has the merit of being clear, consistent and logical, and vastly less open to fraud than a great many franchises the First Minister is proposing to introduce; and I entertain no doubt whatever that but a very short time will elapse before we will be obliged to come, substantially if not in name, to this amendment. There has not been advanced on the other side of the House one logical argument, even one plausible or specious argument, why the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland should not be accepted. One hon. gentleman tells us that he proposes to give this to fishermen because their trade is precarious. Well, it is only too well known to all of us who pay any attention to these matters, that the wages earned by many classes of mechanics in this country, are very precarious. Indeed, it is a rare thing, and only in prosperous years, that many of the best paid trades have 250 days' employment in the year. Very often they are without employment for many months together, and they are just as subject to the vicissitudes of fortune as the fisherman can be. Then another hon. gentleman stated that because 590 men of different trades in Toronto, very variously paid, earn an average of $440 a year, therefore these men would be entitled, under the wage-earners' franchise, to get a vote. That does not follow at all. One-half of these men may be receiving a great deal more than $440, but probably a great many of them are receiving much less, and if you came to examine it you would find that a large percentage of them were actually in receipt of less than $300. Now there can be no argument advanced for discriminating between fishermen, and ordinary mechanics and artisans. If the one class are entitled to the franchise under this particular law, the other class should be, and within a short time they are sure to get it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in dealing with this question, gave us statistics from the Ontario Bureau of Industries, which dealt exclusively with the wages earned by mechanics in cities, but he will recollect that in rural municipalities mechanics of the same industry and intelligence, do not earn the same wages. The reason is that it is cheaper to live in the country than it is in cities. Therefore, while the mechanic in the cities may secure the right to the franchise, the mechanic in the rural constituencies is deprived of it, though he may be equally intelligent, simply because

he does not earn as much. I think the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) ought to be adopted for this reason; there has been a difference made in the value of real property required to enfranchise a man in cities, and in towns and villages, and so there ought to be a difference made in the amount of wages earned, otherwise some classes are going to be disenfranchised in rural municipalities, while they will have the vote in cities. A great many will be disfranchised under the reduced wage earning qualification. I cannot understand why, if a fisherman invests $150 in boats and nets he should have a right to vote as a result of that investment, but that a carpenter or a mechanic who has invested $150 should be refused it. If we adopt this principle in regard to fishermen, it should be extended to all similar classes.

Mr. WILSON. I support the amendment because, if this privilege is granted to fishermen, it should be extended equally to mechanics. There are mechanics in towns and villages, who though intelligent and industrious men, yet will not be enfranchised on account of earnings. Every day the First Minister is tending in the way of manhood suffrage. It is desirable that such should be adopted, for it would be the means of doing away with all these different qualifications and the enormous expense that would be involved on the country.

Mr. TROW. I do not see why this class of voters have not as good a right to the franchise as any other class, and I cannot see any reason why the fishermen should be favored specially by the First Minister, unless he regards them as the wards of the Government, at least to the tune of $150,000 a year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that is a barefaced observation on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot understand how it is that as chattel property has been acknowledged as the basis of franchise for one class, the various industrial classes of the country, chiefly mechanics, should be excluded from those benefits. Very large number of them are engaged in the different mechanical pursuits, they necessarily require large quantities of tools, and if the fishermen are allowed to exercise the franchise on their kit I think it is only reasonable that a mechanic should have the same privilege. If they do not, a number of very active and intelligent men will be excluded from the franchise. At any rate, this clause is another argument in favor of manhood suffrage.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The proposition of the amendment is one directly in accord with the clause under consideration, and it seems to me that no valid objection can be raised against it. If such a provision is good in the case of the fishermen, why should it not be good with reference to mechanics owning a certain amount of property, consisting of the implements of their trade? If this amendment is not adopted, putting mechanics precisely on the same footing as any other class, I think we would be making a very invidious distinction, though, of course, having voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland, in favor of manhood suffrage, I do not object to the fisherman clause.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not been very fortunate in my suggestions to the First Minister this afternoon, but I think I am justified in expecting that the one I am about to propose will be favorably received. The hon. gentleman has already determined that a fisherman must have a certain amount of real property, though he does not insist on his having the whole amount required by the other classes of the community, and since you give the fisherman a certain status, because he owns real and personal property together, then you must apply to him the same results which flow from his possessing property and having grown up sons. You give farmers' sons a vote, and I approve of that, and you give votes to the sons of other owners of real estate, and I think that is a good provision. I ask you to confer on the sons of fishermen the same rights as you do on the sons of owners of real estate. It frequently happens that the father and several sons live and work together, and they have about equal intelligence and education, and they are equally fitted to enjoy the franchise. If you give the franchise to the sons of those in Ontario, who invest their money in real estate, I do not see how you can deny the right to the sons of fishermen, who invest their capital partly in nets, in gear, and partly in real estate, or if not, you lay yourselves open to very illogical results. If a fisherman has $1,000 worth of boats and fishing gear, and his sons live with him continuously and share with him the dangers of his occupation on the sea, on what principle can you withhold the vote from these young men, while you give it to the sons of farmers who have only $400 of real estate to qualify both alike? You cannot justify it on principle or on reason; and if you make this distinction, you create a good deal of jealousy and give rise to agitation which can only have one result in the long run, that of fishermen's sons being placed on the same footing as farmers' sons. You have properly extended the principle beyond farmers' sons, and you give the franchise to the mechanic or anybody else who has real estate of the value of $400, and to his sons as well. If you apply the same principle to the sons of fishermen, you will be conferring a privilege on an intelligent and industrious class of young men, who are good citizens of the State and in every way worthy of the trust.

Mr. GILLMOR. I endorse what my hon. friend has said. I am not in favor of class legislation, but if there are any class of persons in the Dominion who ought to be favorably considered, I think it is the fishermen, because they do not participate in many of the advantages resulting from the expenditure on railways and other public improvements. The reasons given by the Prime Minister for conferring the franchise on farmers' sons I thought were very good, but with us in New Brunswick farmers' sons do not as a rule remain at home so much as fishermen's sons. If you look at the census, you will find that, while certain portions of our population remain stationary, the fishing population is always increasing. Their young men are not induced to go to the West to take up farms, and they remain at home more than any other class. The object of the young fisherman is not to get a farm; his home is on the water, and his ambition is to become the owner of a vessel as soon as he can save money enough out of his earnings. The farm is rather kept for the father, who, when he reaches a certain age, and that is not very old, is allowed to remain at home and cultivate his little piece of land. It is true, you have admitted the personal property qualification to aid these fishermen. I agree with the hon. member for Sunbury that we ought to leave that with all classes as before; but if we cannot get it for all, I do not wish to deprive the fishermen of that advantage. But I do think it would be doing a wise and generous thing to confer the franchise on fishermen's sons, who, as a class, I can testify, are deserving and intelligent, and if the hon. Prime Minister did so he would not regret it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much that the hon. First Minister cannot see his way to assenting to the proposition made in the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). It appears to me to be a reasonable proposition, and one that can be justified on precisely the same grounds as you justify giving the vote to farmers' sons and landowners' sons. On what principle do

you propose to give the vote to the son of a farmer? The object is to keep him in the country and to make him a citizen by giving him an interest in the country and a voice in making its laws. You also enfranchise the landowner's son, he may not be engaged in any trade or calling; he may be living on twenty or twenty-five acres of land; and you give him a vote for the same reason as you do the farmer's son. We give them a vote in order that they may realise fully that they have a stake in the progress and prosperity of the country. That is the only reason upon which we can justify giving either the farmers' sons or the land-owners' sons a right to vote. Does not precisely the same reason apply to fishermen's sons? They are just as intelligent, just as well able to exercise the franchise, just as likely to make as good citizens in every respect, as the sons of farmers or landholders. It is provided that every fisherman who has real property and boats and tackle to the value of $150 shall have a vote. There is no provision as to how much property he must own; so that should he own but a few dollars worth, he will, provided his boats and fishing gear make up the difference, have the right to vote. Therefore the personal property owned by a fisherman is treated practically as real estate, as he is given the right to vote on that, and treating his personal property as real property, as land, you are bound to give the fisherman's sons the right to vote as you do the farmer's son.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved into Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words with regard to this question of fishermen's sons. I am sorry I was not able during the afternoon to impress on the First Minister the necessity of enfranchising the sons of tenant farmers. The same reasons exist with regard to the sons of fishermen having a vote as to the sons of tenant farmers. If there is any class in the community in which we should endeavor to create an interest in the franchise of the country, it is the young and rising class. The opportunity of taking that interest should be given as early in life as possible. It has been suggested that the farmers might put their sons in the position of wage-earners, but the farmers do not always feel disposed to enter into contract with their sons in order to give their sons the privilege of voting, especially as, after a few years, they might be compelled to pay large amounts as wages to their sons should a quarrel arise. Nor is it desirable that the son's franchise should depend on any action of the parents; we should endeavor to take them completely from the control of the parent in this matter, and no impediment should be placed in giving them the right to exercise the franchise. When we have given this right to farmers' sons we should give it to other sons. I do not see any reason for refusing it to the sons of fishermen. This clause enabling fishermen to vote on real property and personal property qualification is a peculiar clause; it looks as if they have to be the owners of real estate as well as of chattel, and the owners of chattel as well as of real estate, in order to enable them to vote. If a fisherman owns sufficient property to qualify himself and his sons, why should those sons not be enfranchised without requiring the father to make them wage-earners or to give them an interest in his property? I am satisfied that we are disfranchising a large percentage of the electors when we strike out the sons of tenant farmers. That is a class which is increasing, and the sons of fishermen are also increasing in more than one section of the country. We ought in fairness to give the same privilege to the sons of fishermen that we have extended to the sons of farmers. I would call the attention of the First Minister to this point. By the interpretation clause, a son is declard to mean a step-son or a son-in-law or a son. Supposing the son and the son-in-law live on the farm with the father, and the property is only sufficient to qualify one in addition to the father, who is to have the vote the son or the son-in-law? Hon. gentlemen may think we are suggesting these things with a view to delay, but from the commencement of the discussion of this measure we have simply endeavored to present reasonable arguments in favor of reasonable changes. We are sorry to think that, after spending almost the entire afternoon in discussing the question of the enfranchisement of sons, we have not been able to accomplish anything. Still, though we have failed to obtain it in the case of the sons of tenant farmers and mechanics who are tenants and not owners, I should like to assist in securing it for the sons of fishermen.

Mr. LISTER. This is what may be termed a fancy franchise, I suppose the First Minister has introduced it in order to gain a little popularity in the Maritime Provinces. If it is right that the fishermen of the Lower Provinces should vote upon personal property, the same reasoning applies to people in the other Provinces of the Dominion. However, as it has been determined that these people should be entitled to a vote, and as, in the other Provinces, where the franchise is based upon real estate, it has been thought wise to give the franchise to the sons of owners, I can see no reason why the sons of the fishermen in the Maritime Provinces should not also have that right. I do not pretend to urge that personal property should be the basis of the franchise, but, when this House has decided that it should be the basis, it is manifestly unfair and unjust to exclude the sons of those men, when the sons of those who are qualified in the other Provinces are permitted to vote. Will the hon. gentleman say that in granting this privilege, to those people, there is any danger to the commonwealth, that there is any fear that those men who, reared upon the sea, who form our merchant navy, could not safely be entrusted with the franchise? No man will say that they are not loyal, that they are not intelligent, that they are not in every way competent to exercise the franchise intelligently, and for the best interests of the country. If the First Minister persists in refusing them the franchise, he will do an act that cannot be justified. He will exclude from the right to exercise the franchise a large body of men upon whom the future of this country greatly depends, and who largely contribute to its wealth and greatness. I trust the First Minister will consider this matter, and find it to be his duty to admit to the franchise men whom this section of the Act must necessarily exclude. I do not see how hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who come from the Maritime Provinces, can justify this attempt to prevent their fellow citizens from having the same rights as the young men of the older Provinces. I repeat that if it is wise and prudent to give the sons of farmers and the sons of landholders throughout this country the franchise, the reasons are equally cogent why you should give it to the sons of fishermen in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. MILLS. Of course——

Mr. MITCHELL. Come Mills, hold on and let this motion pass.

Mr. MILLS. We have two classes of franchises proposed in this Bill, which is rather an unusual course of procedure. There is a primitive franchise, which rests upon the ownership of property, and there is a derivative franchise, which may depend upon the relation of the voter to some one else. Now, what is the nature of the interest of these fishermen? Is it an ownership in the property upon which he is to qualify, or is it

some interest less than ownership? Or is it an interest similar to that of a tenant? The hon. First Minister has refused to give the franchise to the sons of tenants and occupants. He has admitted that there are certain classes of tenants whose title much resembles that of freeholders, and that it might be right and proper to put their sons' privileges upon the same footing as the sons of freeholders. Now, in the clause that we have adopted, you have the principle that the fisherman is not a person having a limited interest in the property upon which he qualifies, but he have an absolute interest. The property on which he qualifies is his fishing tackle and boats, that is to say, personal property. Another has a freehold estate. Of course, if a fisherman has a freehold interest in a sufficient amount of real estate to enable him to qualify on that alone, his son, if the estate is sufficient, would also be qualified, not as a fisherman's son, but as the son of an ordinary holder of real property. If a fisherman has property worth $300, his son would be entitled to vote under the preceding clause, 8. Now, if that fisherman's son is entitled to vote, why would you refuse the right to the son of another fisherman who is qualified to vote under section 9? Supposing a fisherman had $250 worth of property, in that case his son could not qualify. Suppose in addition to that, that he has $2,000 worth of property in a boat or vessel. You will refuse to the son of that man who has $2,000 worth, the right to vote, and you give it to the son of the fisherman who has $300 worth. It is clear we are proceeding upon no settled rule or principle, nothing you could recognise as a principle on which you would be able to say, if a party is qualified under such a section another party, upon the same kind of reasoning, and upon the same principles, would be qualified under the next section. That you do not recognise. There are no lines laid out that you can trace through this Bill and say that they are lines or principles which may be easily and fairly applied. We are proceeding in a haphazard sort of way, without any recognised rule of conduct; and it does seem to me that we are creating a whole congerie of the most serious difficulties in this Bill, that will be presented to the revising officer. There is no reason or principle which would exclude the son of a fisherman who has $250 worth of real estate, and a vessel worth $2,000, while you admit the son of a fisherman who has $300 worth of real estate, and a boat worth $50. Take, for instance, the son of a fisherman who has $200 worth of real estate. You say he may vote; there is no doubt about that. But you say to the son of a fisherman who has a boat worth $2,000 and $250 worth of real estate, that he may not vote. Now, what reason have you for saying that the son of the one may not be just as safely entrusted with the franchise as the son of the other. Is he more likely to undervalue the electoral privilege; is he likely to be less qualified; or to be less acquainted with the constitutional system under which we live; is he likely to be inferior in point of intelligence, training, and public spirit, for the exercise of the franchise, than is the fisherman who happens to have $300 more of real estate? You can assign no sufficient reason why you should entrust the son of the farmer with the electoral franchise and refuse it to the son of the fisherman. We are simply acting in an arbitrary manner. We have not adopted any settled rule or principle since we passed the third section. We are making provisions in a most arbitrary and capricious manner, and in dealing with a question of such consequence, we ought to proceed in a more rational way. We, on this side, have proposed amendments. We have received no answer except a manifestation of an obstinate desire by the Government not to accept any suggestion from this side of the House. I trust this proposal will receive the attention of the committee. I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to approach this question as fair-minded men, anxious to promote the public interest, and to secure those changes in the Bill that are best suited to secure what is right and fair to all classes of the community in every part of the Dominion. If we desire to do so, the committee will accept the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It may be laid down as a fundamental principle that, in arranging a franchise for the whole country, no class should be discriminated against. This wholesome principle has been departed from, not only in the case now before the committee, but in the case of sons of tenant farmers. It would be desirable to get back to that wholesome rule. The fisherman derives his livelihood and wealth from the sea, and his stock-in-trade, boats, tackle and implements, are just as much his capital as is the farm of the farmer or the workshop and property of the manufacturer. So, if we place him under disabilities, we make an invidious distinction which this committee is not warranted in making. Viewing the matter in this light, it was a mistake to require the fishermen, in order to obtain the franchise, to be rated for real property at all. The clause should have provided that where fishermen have personal property such as boats, fishing tackle, of sufficient value to entitle them to the franchise, they should possess it. It has been objected that a fisherman requires some real estate to live upon. It may not necessarily be so. He may be a batchelor and may board. He may be worth thousands of dollars in boats and fishing tackle, and yet not own a little piece of real estate sufficient to give him a vote. Another class in regard to which the committee have departed from the wholesome rule laid down, is that of tenant farmer's sons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That matter has been decided.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No disability should be thrown on fishermen or on any other class of the community.

Mr. TROW. The franchise might safely be entrusted to the sons of fishermen, who as a rule are well educated and would exercise it usefully to the state. I cannot conceive why the First Minister should have any objection to conferring the franchise on this class, even if they own no real estate. There is no party advantage asked whatever, because in all probability those young men would take sides in politics just the same as any other class.

Mr. MULOCK. Sub-section 9 declares that real estate and the fishing tackle of fishermen shall be considered equal to the real estate of other persons required in order to qualify. If so the fisherman should stand in the same position as regards property qualification and be entitled to all the privileges flowing from it in the same manner as is the owner of real estate under sub-section 8. Under that subsection the owner of real estate, having his son living with him, and they not being entitled to vote, otherwise can have his son's name entered on the list, provided the value of the property is sufficient to entitle two persons to vote on it, as joint owners. If the property qualification of a landsman is to be treated in that way and he must have a certain value in property, whether it be real or personal, on what principle do you deny the franchise to the son of the fisherman which you give to the son of he farmer? We are working up a scheme which was recommended on the ground that the House should establish a uniform franchise, and here we have a franchise given to one class and refused to another. If the fishermen are to be legislated for, well and good, but they should not be singled out as a class, but the whole of our industrial classes should be legislated for in one class. We desire, as far as possible, to meet the views of the Premier, who has invited us to assist him in making this Bill uniform; but do hon. gentlemen now say that they do not want uniformity? If they do, then they have abandoned one of the strong grounds on which the Bill was recommended. All our legislation should stand uniform

over all classes; it should be like the gentle dew from heaven, which falls on the just and the unjust; but this scheme is being worked out in an illogical, partial and unfair way.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I desire to enter my protest against the lack of uniformity which pervades this section of the Bill, and which, if the amendment is not adopted, will be conspicuous for its uniform want of uniformity. When a man's son is placed on the list on the ground of having a certain amount of property, you should not abandon that principle either in connection with fishermen or the tenants of real estate. It must be remarked and recognised that where the enfranchisement of the sons of owners has already been put in practice, it has been successful in a marked degree, and so much so that its success was made the ground for its introduction of this Bill. In Ontario its success was so well recognised that the principle was lately extended. We find that it is proposed in this Bill to give the vote to unenfranchised Indians, on the basis of the land which they have solely in common with their tribe. Now, if we abandon any absolute principle to such an extent as that, does it not seem strange that we should draw the line at the sons of our own people? This clause applies more directly to an important class in the different Provinces, a class who, as the hon. member for West Lambton pointed out, would be largely drawn upon for our naval defence, if we are forced to that alternative, and a class which at present is a very important one in this Dominion. Why, then, do we not hear from the representatives of constituencies where there are a large number of fishermen who will be deprived of the franchise if this amendment is not adopted. I press this amendment strongly because, if its principle is admitted, we will secure the right which should be equally recognised, of giving the franchise to the sons of tenant farmers in Ontario.

Mr. WILSON. Many amendments have been proposed on this side of the House in the direction of an extension of the franchise which hon. gentlemen opposite do not see fit to reply to. Certainly all of these amendments cannot be bad; some of them ought to meet with their approbation. With regard to the amendment now before us, the hon. First Minister in charge of the Bill has expressed neither his willingness nor his unwillingness to accept it. We are advocating what we believe to be a just and proper principle, and we have heard no argument to refute what we propose. We have affirmed the principle that if a farmer after years of industry has acquired a certain amount of property, and his sons are working with him, they ought to be placed on the voters' list; and if the fisherman, instead of using the profits of his avocation in purchasing land, chooses to invest it in fishing tackle and other implements necessary to carry on his pursuit successfully with his sons, both he and his sons ought to have a right to record their votes at an election as well as the farmer and his sons. I ask whether any just reason has been given why these men should be denied the right which has been granted to the farmers. True we hold the farmers of this country in high esteem; we appreciate them very much; they are very important factors in the community; but those who follow the dangerous avocation of fishing, who increase our navy and render it valuable to the country, ought at least to be treated as well as the farmers. The hon. First Minister started out with the proposition that we were going to have a uniform and symmetrical franchise; and yet this distinction is made between the farmers and the fishermen, and hon. gentlemen opposite do not bring any arguments to show why they should not be placed on the same footing. I say this is not treating the House fairly. Unless they can show that it is in the interest of the country that this amendment should not prevail, we are entitled to ask that it should be adopted, and until they give us some reason why they should not accept it this measure ought not to carry. Do they contend that they have made this Bill perfect at the outset, and that they are not going to accept any amendments? We have seen already that this Bill is by no means perfect, and this clause is as faulty as any other. You are going to do an injustice to the sons of the fishermen; you are going to do a wrong to those who are following an important and dangerous calling; you are holding out to them no inducement to continue in that calling. You tell them: If you go and buy a few feet of land we will let your sons have votes, but if you invest your money in boats and fishing tackle we will not let you have that right. Is that a proper principle? I believe hon. gentlemen opposite ought to rise superior to party feeling on this occasion, and do justice to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Will the Government not respond? I hope they will, but I have no faith that they will; I have lost all faith in them, because they have treated other amendments in the same manner; and before the country can get justice these men will have to leave the treasury benches and let men take their places who will deal fairly with every interest in the country.

Mr. DAVIES. I regret very much that while these arguments are advanced on this side, they have never been responded to by the hon. First Minister or by any hon. gentleman opposite. The arguments are either good or bad, and they ought to be accepted or rejected; they ought to be treated with respect. It is not fair to the thousands of sons of fishermen who are to be disfranchised, that this proposition should be treated with silent contempt. I am more than astonished that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) who makes himself from time to time the champion of the people of the Maritime Provinces, and at times with good effect, and meets with a good deal of sympathy on this side, should remain silent when a claim is put forward on behalf of the fishermen. He has a good deal to say about the Indians but not a word about the fishermen, although he represents a county in which there is a large fishing interest. And what has the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) to say on this subject? Is he in favor or opposed to having fishermen's sons put on the same footing as farmers' sons? Either the proposition is just or it is not, and there must be some occult reason why hon. gentlemen opposite will not express an opinion on it.

Mr. PAINT. We have been taunted by hon. gentlemen opposite with not replying to this proposition. There is no necessity, for the reason that the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has admitted, that in his own county this measure would enfranchise a thousand fishermen, and so throughout the rest of the maritime counties.

Mr. GILLMOR. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. PAINT. There is some mistake somewhere; perhaps it was 800; and it is the same throughout all the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I am very much pleased with the high compliment paid me by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., but I may assure him that he knows very little about the county which I have the honor to represent, when he runs away with the idea that I represent a fishing county. I can assure him that the county I represent is an agricultural county, and the sons of farmers there have been enfranchised under the Bill. It is true there are a few fishermen in it, and I can assure my hon. friend that if I know anything about the people, and I think I do, this Bill will practically give manhood suffrage to the people of Inverness.

Mr. MITCHELL. Glad of that.

Mr. CAMERON. When the lists are prepared under the Bill it will, under one provision or another, give to the people of Inverness practically manhood suffrage. There-

fore they have no reason to complain; I believe that will be the case in all rural districts in the Dominion and particularly among the fishermen.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the hon. gentleman object to the enfranchisement of the sons of fishermen?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). The sons of fishermen may be enfranchised under this Bill in my county, because they happen to have the real and personal qualification necessary to give them a vote.

Mr. MILLS. It is rather singular that the hon. gentleman should assign as his reason for supporting this Bill that it will practically give manhood suffrage. Is the hon. gentleman in favor of manhood suffrage? I think he has voted against it. If he is consistent and thinks the Bill will lead to that conclusion he ought to vote against the Bill. He will have to explain his explanation. He will have to tell the House how he is opposed to the principle of manhood suffrage and is in favor of a Bill which he says will practically lead to manhood suffrage. He has not answered the question put him by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) as to whether he is in favor of enfranchising fishermen's sons, but says he thinks they will be enfranchised under this clause. Then from an abundance of caution he ought to vote for the amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I may say to the hon. gentleman that when I am in favor of manhood suffrage I will tell him so.

Mr. PAINT. When the hon. member for Inverness said the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., knew very little about the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, he did him a great deal of injustice, inasmuch as that hon. gentleman received a fee of $8,000 and upwards for advocating the arbitration claims before the Halifax Fishery Commission and is now suing for $8,000 more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And one result was the country was bettered by $4,500,000.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman thinks because a certain counsel received a fee for advocating the fishermen's claims before the Fishery Commission, the hon. gentleman thinks that the fishermen's sons should not be enfranchised. The only reason why I appeal to the hon. member for Richmond is that I notice he takes more than ordinary interest in the public affairs of this country lately, and I hope the rumors we have lately heard have some foundation, that he will have more influence shortly in the affairs of his country than he has had heretofore. I would like him to answer the question I put him; is he or is he not in favor of conferring the franchise on fishermen's sons?

Mr. PAINT. I wish to leave something for the Opposition to do when they get into power.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has said that the sons of fishermen in his county would have votes, because the fishermen there possess the necessary real and personal property to enable them to vote. But the Bill does not allow personal property to count in giving votes to fishermen's sons. It is only where the father owns a sufficient amount of real estate to give himself and his sons a vote that the son can have a vote. Personal property does not count. It may be that in Inverness the fishermen have sufficient real estate to give themselves and sons votes, but that is not the case in all the counties. It is said that the incomes of fishermen's sons ought to give them votes. It is quite possible that fishermen's sons may earn $300 a year in catching fish, but will they get credit for having earned that much whilst they are remaining with their fathers. I do not think it is likely they will. The First Minister explained that the word "owner" in sub-section 9, meant an owner possessing a

title in fee simple. Fishermen who are squatters and do not own $150 dollars worth of real estate would not count as owners, and therefore would not be entitled to a vote, no matter how much they might possess in the way of boats or nets or personal property. I think this clause will deprive of the right to vote a number in Nova Scotia who would have that right if the words "or occupiers" were added after the word "owner."

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

On section 5.

Mr. DAWSON. I beg to move an amendment of which I gave notice some time ago:

That the following be inserted as sub-section 10 of section 4 of the said Act:—Or is an Indian or person with part Indian blood who has been duly enfranchised, or is an unenfranchised Indian or person with part Indian blood who lives in a fixed habitation and follows some trade, calling or occupation common to civilised life, though he participate in the annuities, interest, moneys and rents of a tribe, band or body of Indians, subject to the same qualifications in other respects and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the electoral district.

That is the amendment of which I have given notice; but I have added to it the following:

Provided that, in the case of Indians living on reserves, this Act shall apply only to such as occupy separate holdings or allotmens therein, and Indians so occupying separate holdings or allotments, surveyed or unsurveyed and whether location tickets have been issued therefor or not, shall be entitled to be registered on the list of voters, subject to the same qualifications in other respects, and to the same provisions and restrictions as other persons in the electoral district.

This has been so much discussed that I need say very little about it. We have heard beautiful principles enunciated by our Opposition friends. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) said that it was a wholesome rule that no class of the community should be discriminated against. That is an admirable principle to go upon, and I entirely concur with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We have just carried the section referred to, and this appears to be an addition to it. I do not think I can accept it now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is a new clause.

Mr. DAWSON. I moved it as an addition to the clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, It is an addition to clause 4.

Mr. DAWSON. I move it as sub-section 10, in addition.

Mr. MILLS. I understood that the First Minister was to inform us as to what he proposed on the Indian question when we came to the disabling clauses, and, if the hon. gentleman could make his motion in such a way as to adapt it to the point at which the First Minister proposed to amend the Bill, we should have the one discussion on that matter. If not, we shall have a discussion to-night, and another discussion when the First Minister's proposition is before us.

Mr. DAWSON. I am exceedingly obliged to the hon. gentleman for the suggestion, but, in the meantime, I shall make the few remarks which I intended to make upon the additional clause which I have proposed, leaving it to the House to do what it may think fit in the matter. This addition is very much like the Ontario Act in regard to the Indian. The Ontario Act gives a vote to Indians who "do not reside among Indians." I understand that to mean Indians who live in separate habitations, but it is a rather ambiguous phrase, and I think it will be more clearly understood as I have put it. I think it is unfair to deny the right to vote to those Indians who are named in my amendment, because of the money which they derive from the Government. No Government can exercise any control over those moneys. They are justly due to the Indians and no Government can ever deprive them of them. Therefore to say that those who do not participate in the annuities shall vote and that those who do participate

shall not vote is not a very fair distinction. With regard to Indians living on reserves, I think those deserving of it should have the vote. On these reserves there are clergymen, Indian merchants, and half-breed farmers, and it would be very unfair to deprive them of the franchise simply because they reside on the reserves. Some of the Indians on the reserves are very far advanced, and are entirely fit to exercise the franchise; many of them are far advanced in civilisation and education. I have put in the words "separate holdings on the reserves," also the words "reserves unsurveyed." A great many of the reserves are not surveyed. I know of one reserve 40 miles long, where the Indians live apart from each other and have large farms. Yet these locations have never been surveyed, and they have no location tickets for them. I have no objection that something should be introduced providing that in estimating the value of the Indians' property, the land which he holds on the reserve should not be considered. I am not anxious to give all the Indians on the reserves, the franchise. I know very large reserves on which there are over 1,000 Indians, and I believe this Act would not give votes to more than 30 or 35 of them, at the outside.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the hon. member is not in order. In the first place, it cannot be put as an addition to clause 4, because that is already passed. It cannot be put as a new clause, as it is not in the proper form, and as another opportunity will be given to the hon. gentleman to bring this up, I cannot put it before the committee at present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of putting his motion before the committee and stating his views upon it, and under the ruling of the Chairman, which I think is clearly right, my hon. friend cannot present it just now. I mentioned the other day that this subject would be brought up on the disqualifying clause; that is to say, at this moment an Indian, being a person, shall have the same right to vote when properly qualified, as the whites. When we come to the disqualifying clause, it can be inserted there what Indians shall be excepted, if any, from the general provision of the Bill. I think my hon. friend had better withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DAWSON. I must bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, if the motion is not in order at the present time. But I trust the First Minister, when he brings forward his amendment, will have in view the provisions I have suggested. I think they are very reasonable, and I shall take another opportunity of explaining then. With the consent of the House, I shall withdraw the motion for the present.

Amendment (Mr. Dawson) withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is to apply to such cities, for instance, as Belleville, St. Catharines and Hull, which are not electoral districts.

Mr. MILLS. If the First Minister will look at the definition of town or city, he will see that it means any electoral district, and a corporation that is designated a city or town, by the law of the Province in which it is situated, is wholly independent of any electoral divisions or boundaries, and that being the case this clause is clearly surplusage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have taken the opportunity of stating that I shall alter this clause. The hon. gentleman may remember that it was discussed, and it was stated that there were certain ambitious cities that were really towns; they were not electoral districts. On consideration, I think cities which are portions of counties, should be rated as towns, and that will reduce the qualification to the qualification granted to towns.

Mr. KIRK. Halifax, for instance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Halifax is an electoral district.

Mr. KIRK. No, it includes the county as well as the city.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the 3rd clause it is provided that in cities a property shall be of the value of $100, and in towns $200. I propose that in cities, not being electoral districts, the franchise shall be $200.

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has had new light on this question. I suppose he has been looking from the hill here across the river to Hull, where there are a good number of small holdings, and he has had pointed out to him the importance of making a distinction and bringing them under the lower qualification so as not to do injury to a very excellent friend and an hon. member whom we all admire. When the hon. gentleman has undertaken to go this far, why does he not wipe out the distinction altogether?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will allow this section to stand over so that I can further consider it. The hon. gentleman said I looked across to Hull. But I have had representations from other places as well as from Hull, and therefore I must consider well this sub-section.

Mr. CASEY. This is a point we urged last night. I urged it myself, but not until two or three had done so. The idea was first put forward by the hon. member for Megantic and the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. BURPEE. I desire to call attention to the position of St. John. The electors can vote for three members—for one member for the city and two members for the city and county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the only franchise of the kind in the Dominion. I do not see how the First Minister is going to deal with it, except by making a special provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The electors will vote in the city proper and in the city and county, just as at this moment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to produce uniformity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not pedantic uniformity.

On section 6,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Suppose a property is not sufficiently valuable to qualify two partners, will the property not be represented?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If there are two pieces of land lying side by side and each of them comes up to the value of $150, each of the owners will have a vote. If the whole piece becomes one property held by the same two men and it does not give a vote to both, neither shall have a vote on the property. That is the present law.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been the law in Ontario; but unless I am misinformed it is not the law to-day in Quebec. In that Province the property would be registered in the name of the senior member of the partnership.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Public Works knows that in the Province of Quebec where a property is worth more than is required to give a vote, the person who stands first in the firm is entitled to the vote. In Ontario unless the property is equally divided among all the parties so as to give each a vote, none vote. The hon. gentleman in this section is not proceeding on the principle of valuation, so far as tenants are concerned. With regard to the other

clauses he has adopted a wholly different view. A tenant would require to have provision made that where the rent is $40 two might have a vote, or $60 that three should have a vote.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps on this clause the right hon. gentleman will state more distinctly than he has yet done, whether tribal Indians living on reserves would be qualified.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it was understood that this would be discussed on the qualification clause. While I do not wish to be irregular, I hold this, that while I would not exclude all Indians living on reserves, I would exclude some. But we will discuss that point when we come to the proper clause.

Mr. FLEMING. I would suggest in order to make this clause cover the ground mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell, that after that word "value" in the eleventh line these words should be inserted "or the rent payable is of sufficient amount."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no reason for altering a clause which has stood since 1841. It is the law of the land, and everybody understands it.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman will observe that, under the law, the qualification of the tenant has been based on the actual value of the property under lease. In this Bill it is provided that the amount payable shall be the ground of qualification. My suggestion is for the purpose of making the clause clear, consistent and complete.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot see it at all, as I find that it accords exactly with the clause of the Statutes of Canada of 1859.

Mr. MILLS. My hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Langelier) informed me this morning that the law of Quebec with regard to parties in partnership is, that where a property is not sufficiently divided to give votes to all, the senior partner gets the first vote, then the next, and the third and so on, according to the value of the property.

Mr. CASEY. It is possible that a large number of persons, say eight or ten, might be the joint owners of a piece of property, and it would be rather too bad that none of them should vote, so that I think the clause should indicate which of them would be qualified.

Mr. FISHER. Until 1882, the law of the Province of Quebec was the same in this respect as the present Bill, though I cannot state what changes have been made since. I should think, however, that the hon. member for Megantic would not be likely to be mistaken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I call attention to this fact: an owner of real estate worth $150, as well as the tenant on the same property, would have votes. Now if a property of that value gives two individuals a vote, why should not joint owners in a large property have the same privilege?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a great deal of waste land in the country, but you do not give the vote to the land but to the individual. The land is not represented; the people are represented; and whether they hold jointly or singly, they must have an interest in the land to the amount specified by the Act.

Mr. McMULLEN. I quite agree with the remark of the hon. First Minister, that it is the individual who is represented and not the land, and that is the strongest argument used in favor of manhood suffrage.

Mr. EDGAR. I am afraid that this clause, while very reasonable in some respects, will cut out fishermen who ought to be qualified if they are joint owners, because it refers only to joint owners of real property, whereas fishermen are qualified on a combination of personal and real property. Unless the First Minister wishes to be down on

fishermen, as he was when he declined to give fishermen's sons a vote, I think a change is required here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not in the least.

On section 7,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the old clause.

Mr. EDGAR. I wish to draw the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that by this clause the principle of residence is acknowledged as to the income vote, and I certainly think the same principle ought to be adopted as to all other kinds of votes. We all know that the non-resident vote is a fertile source of illegal expenditure of money. There is nothing that creates such a temptation to illegal expenditure, as we all know who have had to run elections, as the demands made by non-resident voters to have their expenses paid to induce them to come and vote; even where they are willing to give up their time, they are not willing to spend any money. As we are following the Ontario law in various respects, we might follow it, I think, in acknowledging the principle of residence in all cases. For that reason I would move that the words "in respect of income," be struck out. That will make residence essential to all voters.

Mr. CASEY. I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman's object in moving this amendment. We have discussed the question of non-residence somewhat, but it is one which I think should be much more thoroughly discussed. A number of hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the proposal to exclude non-residents from voting as if it disfranchised those voters. The hon member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in particular, deplored the condition his riding would be in if the 450 non-resident voters who vote in that riding were prevented from doing so. I think it was 450.

Mr. WALLACE (York). 600 or 700.

Mr. CASEY. That is stronger still. Those men have votes elsewhere, and the fact that they vote in the west riding of York is an injustice to all the other residents of that riding. They are not content with voting in the riding where they live.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They may not have votes elsewhere.

Mr. CASEY. I fancy that most of them vote for the hon. gentleman, or he would not be so anxious to retain them on the voters' list. As the hon. gentleman's majority is considerably less than 600 or 700, he is in fact elected by persons who do not live in his riding at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They live in Canada.

Mr. CASEY. But it would be as just to allow me to vote in Prince Edward Island as to allow non-residents to vote in West York. This defeats the object of having geographical boundaries to electoral districts altogether The reason why we define an electoral district by geographical boundaries is to secure that the persons who shall elect a member shall be, as a general rule, residents, neighbors in close community with each other. The other view is that, say 600 or 700 non-resident voters of West York, for instance, shall have the right to vote there and also the right to vote where they reside. This destroys the principle of representation we have agreed on. As the hon. gentleman said a few minutes ago, it was not the representation of property but of individuals he desired. Now, however, he says we must go back to property representation. I say it is the individual that should be represented. The hon. gentleman will not allow two persons who own $150 worth of land between them to vote, but he will allow one person to have two votes, provided he has real property of the value of $150 in two different places. The difficulty has been raised

that a proposal to exclude non-resident voters would shut some out of the vote altogether, because they might have no other qualification than the real property in the district where they do not reside. It is hardly possible that such people would not have sufficient income to qualify where they do reside, but to meet these extreme cases these people could be given a vote on their real estate and not be allowed to vote elsewhere. It is time we had a clear expression from hon. members as to whether they wish property to be represented or persons. And even as regards property qualification, the Bill is illogical, for while a man who owns a number of small lots, worth $150 each, in different electoral districts, may have a vote in each, a man who owned $10,000 worth of property in one district can only have one vote. To be logical, the hon. gentleman should give the latter as many votes as the number of times his property is worth $150. For all these reasons, I move that from the words "and persons," in the 4th line of the clause, to "situated," inclusively, be struck out.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, when we had before us the Bill for the distribution of seats in 1882, told us that there was great importance in adhering to what he called the sacred principle of representation by population. Under our constitution we have that principle as between the Provinces, and if we adhere to that principle it is plain that no elector would be entitled to more than one vote. The First Minister told us the other evening, very properly, that the vote is not given to the property but to the man, and that the property is only the evidence of the man's fitness to exercise the vote. That is the obvious principle upon which we are proceeding. We do not give a man one vote because he has $150 worth of property, and two votes because he has $300, and three votes because he has $450. We are not dealing with the Parliament of Canada as if it were a banking corporation, in which each individual represents by his votes the amount of stock he brings to the common fund. We give the vote to the individual and require that he shall have a certain amount of property as the evidence of his fitness to exercise the franchise. The person who is entitled to exercise the franchise may exercise it somewhere, but not everywhere. No matter how much property he may have, and how widely that property may be disseminated over the country, we are departing from the principle of representation which is laid down in the fundamental law when we give him more than one vote. It is to the population that the representation is given. Upon what rule of consistency can you give any man more than one vote, unless you group constituencies, and then you may give each man as many votes as there are members to be represented in that particular group. We provide that the elections must take place on the same day. If a man has property in London, and in Toronto, and in Ottawa, he cannot vote in each place on the same day, so that you practically disfranchise him by the present law, in regard to his voting in more than one place. Why should he be able to vote twice because he owns property in Toronto and in the County of of York, while he could not do so if his property was in Toronto and in Ottawa? In view of the provisions of the constitution and of the reason for requiring a property qualification at all, in view of the fact that it is to the man and not to the property that the vote is given, and that the property is a mere evidence of fitness, it logically follows that the rule should apply—one man, one vote.

Mr. HESSON. How is it that, in the city of Toronto, you give two votes instead of three? The hon. gentleman knows that, under the new Mowat Bill, an elector has the privilege of voting twice in the election of three members. Why should he not vote three times?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman asks a question which is not pertinent to this matter at all. I am not going to enter into the question whether the representation of minorities is better than the simple representation of majorities or not. The Province of Ontario had adopted that principle with regard to Toronto, but that is not involved in the question before us. The First Minister has stated that it is not the property but the individual who gets the vote. We know that if a man has $150 worth of property it is as much evidence of his fitness, under the Bill now before us, as if he had $150,000. Once admit that he has the qualification, and you stop at that point. We have in our universities a certain curriculum, and we say a man who passes an examination shall have a degree. All men who pass it are not of equal intellectual attainments, but there is a qualification to which all are admitted. You are doing the same thing in this Bill. You say what the minimum qualification shall be in each case. A man having shown his fitness by the possession of that qualification, you stop at that point, and you say you will give him a vote. But upon what theory can you give him three or four votes? The very moment you admit the right to vote in a different constituency you also admit that you ought so to alter your law as to enable him to do that. Bnt you make it impossible, because all the elections are to be held on the same day. How is a man who has a property qualification in Winnipeg, and another in Halifax, going to vote in both places? When you say that a man shall have more than one vote, and that a wrong is done him if you do not give him more than one vote, you have no right to have all the elections on the same day, and in doing so you condemn your own policy. I say that we ought to provide that the man shall vote in the place where he resides. Then there is less danger of personation, less danger of fraud, and there is less expense entailed upon committees in bringing up non-resident voters. It seems to me, we are logically called upon to carry out the principle of one man, one vote. The First Minister laid down a rule that property was only an evidence of fitness. That being the case, it does not matter how much property a man has; he is only entitled to one vote. Why should a man who has property in Toronto and York have the privilege of voting twice, while a man who has property in London and Ottawa has only the privilege of voting once? The Minister of Customs said, some time ago, that he would be disfranchised under this Bill, because he is not a voter in this place and has not the necessary qualification in the constituency where he would reside were he not a Minister. Well, I say that is a case to be considered. How are you to decide when a man has no vote where he resides, whether he can produce evidence that he is entitled to be entered upon the register there. If you can say: No matter where the property may be, that man has the necessary qualification; and you accept that as a qualification, the fact that he is resident in one place and his property is situated in another, ought not to entitle him to vote twice, but it ought to entitle him to vote where he resides. The rule of the constitution is, representation by population, which the First Minister called a sacred principle. And the rule of the representation of property, and of interest, and of all that sort of thing, upon any artificial scheme or contrivance, is something that does not belong to our constitution or to our system. I trust the First Minister will accept this amendment, and recognise the rule of one man, one vote. He has laid down a doctrine here to-day consistent with no other principle; he has accepted the principle of holding all the elections on the same day, which is consistent with no other principle, and he has made it impossible for a man who has property in different constituencies, widely apart, to exercise his franchise in each. I do hot know how far the hon. gentleman has looked into this question, but I have given it some attention; and all those who reside in border counties know that, if you take up the voters' list when it is twelve months old, you will find a

considerable percentage of those whose names are on that list residing in a foreign country. Now, those parties are brought back to vote—possibly in a manner contrary to law, and the election is contested. How are you going to contest the election in this case? You cannot issue a summons to bring the parties before the court. They are residing beyond your jurisdiction, in a foreign country. The election trial comes on and the witnesses are not to be obtained, for your court has no power to bring them. The hon. gentleman knows what happened in one of the western constituencies in that particular, and the same thing may happen in a score of others. Now, you get rid of great temptations to fraud, and you get rid of what is of no earthly advantage to one party more than another. Why bring back a man from a foreign country, who has gone abroad and intends to reside abroad, to come here and vote in what is now to him a foreign country? I say, on the very principle of expediency the doctrine of one man, one vote, is the rule that ought to be adopted. If the hon. gentleman proposes an amendment, to give to a man who has a qualification in one part of the country a vote in any other place where he resides, I am prepared to support that.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It seems to me this is a question that can be considered without party violence. I think, speaking of the Province of Ontario, with which I am best acquainted, that no hon. gentleman on that side of the House will contend that there are more property owners in the Province of Ontario who are Conservatives than who are Reformers. There can possibly be no party advantage, unless it is admitted that one party has superior advantages in fetching votes into the constituency. If there is no party advantage, I think we can look upon the question unembarrassed from that point of view. Now, Sir, there is no doubt that the property qualification is merely nominal; the real underlying principle of this measure is the man instead of the property. It will not be maintained for one moment, looking at this Bill as a whole, that it is property that really lies at the bottom of this franchise. Take, for instance, your $2 a month rent. That rental would probably represent property of very small value indeed, property of less than $100 value. I have myself known many properties not worth $200 that rented for three times that amount. It will not be maintained that a shanty representing less than $100 is more important than the man, with a numerous family, who is a large tax-payer to the Dominion, and probably pays more taxes than some owners of considerable property. The real principle is that the man is the voter; that is the principle of representation where there is taxation. It is true, we have not got up to that point yet; but we have gone as far —using the term applied the other night in regard to Mr. Gladstone, that he was a practical statesman—as the hon. gentleman felt he could go. I am sure the First Minister, in this regard, is controlled by some circumstances. What controls him I do not know, but he has, no doubt, gone as far in that direction as he practically can go at the moment. The real underlying principle is that the man instead of the property is represented. Test it by an imaginary case, but one which is not altogether imaginary. A man has property in four constituencies, sufficient to entitle him to a vote in each. It only requires $600 to do that. Hence, $600 of property, so situated, gives this result: One man equals four votes. Again, a man has a property worth $60,000, situated in one constituency. Result: One man equals one vote. The proposition seems absurd. Still, it is the one we are acting upon in giving the man who has the vote to a man who has barely sufficient property to entitle him to a vote. Objection has been made in regard to disfranchising a person if he did not live in the locality. I fully believe that is unjust. If a man has not a vote in the constituency where he resides, and has a vote in another constituency, he should vote in the other constituency. An amendment in that direction would receive my hearty concurrence and endorsement. I believe it is a notorious fact that if you were to take out of past elections protests respecting non-resident voters, you would eliminate one very great cause of litigation. It is a cause of corruption and much bribery. I do not seek the suggested change from personal interest. On that point I am satisfied I should lose by it; but I believe that it is in the general interest of the country as a whole, and of the principle which lies at the bottom of it, that one man should have one vote. In case he has not a vote where he resides, he should be entitled to vote where his property lies.

Mr. McMULLEN. In municipal elections an elector is only entitled to vote in one polling sub-division. In regard to non-resident voters at Dominion elections, there are persons brought considerable distances, and more corruption arises on account of those persons being so brought than in any other way. In my election some parties came from the United States, I believe, on both sides. It is desirable that those people should not have the right to come back here and register their votes. When non-residents are allowed votes an injustice is done to the farmers. People in the cities have, in some cases, votes in different constituencies, whereas this is seldom the case with farmers. On one occasion I voted five times at elections, and rode 40 miles. I do not think that system should continue.

Mr. HESSON. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman as to the practice having been in the past attended with troublesome and dangerous results, and leading to a large amount of fraud. I speak of what I know in the county I represent; and I have pleasure in saying that I do not know, during the last two elections, being advised to assist any gentleman to reach the constituency from outside, and look at this clause as being one of the most beneficial in the Bill. If a man has sufficient interest in elections to go to a constituency and vote, I do not see why he should be deprived of that privilege. The very evidence that a man has distributed his wealth and interests in other parts of the country makes it clear that the individual ought not only to be represented in the county where he resides but in such places as he has accumulated property. The hon. member for South Perth, residing in North Perth, should be disqualified in the constituency which he represents. He would also be disqualified in other counties where he has property. I do not think he should be deprived of that privilege, or that any member should be so disqualified who possesses intelligence. I do not recognise it in that way, and I do not think the hon. gentleman intended it in that way. I think, as long as a person possesses the privileges of a British subject he should not be deprived of those privileges, because circumstances compel him to live out of the country. There is no party advantage to be obtained by this provision, as far as I can see, as I believe the parties who are to be represented would be about equally in both political parties. So far as my own county is concerned, there are a large number of property holders living outside of Stratford who are Reformers, and this is particularly the case with one township, which the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) formerly represented—North East Hope. A large number in that township own property in Stratford, and I believe the whole of them are Reformers, and I think it would be unsafe and unfair to disfranchise those parties. I look upon this class of voters as a class that are well fitted to exercise the franchise, and whose interest in the country is calculated to guide them in doing what is right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not at all mean to say that this is a question which does not present some difficulties on both sides. I believe the objections which have been made by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken would be met if we adopted, with respect to the constituen-

cies at large, the same rule we adopted with respect to constituencies individually, and that is, if the man had the right to vote in half a dozen counties he should be obliged to make his selection, and vote in one particular county, just as at present he has to do, if he has a vote in half a dozen municipalities in one county. It appears to me to be absurd that if I happen to have property in four or five townships in one constituency I am obliged to content myself with one vote; but if immediately outside of this county there are four or five townships in which I happen to have as many votes, in surrounding constituencies, I may, if time permits, cast my vote in those various constituencies. I do not see that there is any sound reason which applies in one case that does not apply in the other. As a matter of fact, I know, as many other hon. gentlemen know, that this practice of bringing in what is called the foreign vote, by which I mean simply persons resident in other parts of Canada, is a most prolific source of expense to the two candidates, and under the present election law is often the ground for contesting elections. In many cases, on that ground alone, elections on both sides of the House might be vitiated if anybody chose to take the trouble. Now, I think this a question which is of interest to the House at large, for I do not think this is a party question. I think the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) was right in stating that one side would not benefit any more than the other by the foreign vote, in the sense in which I use that term. But I found in all hotly contested elections with which I have had anything to do, in some way or other, considerable sums of money are always spent in bringing in outside voters, and in many cases those elections would be vitiated by the money expended, although it may have been expended without the knowledge of the candidates, and may not have come out of their pockets. It seems to me that the whole argument is in favor, not, perhaps, of disfranchising a man unless he votes in the particular locality in which he resides, but of making a selection of the particular constituency in which he shall cast his vote. It appears to me to be absurd that the mere accident of a man holding property in two contiguous constituencies should enable him to cast two votes, when, if they were several hundred miles apart, he is utterly unable to do so.

Mr. WALLACE (York). We have heard a good deal to-night, Sir, about this new principle which has recently been discovered, that one man is to have only one vote. We were also told by the hon. member for Bothwell, the other day, that it is the outcome of the election campaign of 1883 for the Local Legislature of Ontario. But that principle was never heard of during that campaign, so far as I have heard. I do not think it was enunciated in a single election address, or in a speech on a campaign platform, but it was suddenly sprung on the people, for some reason, during the last sitting of the Ontario Legislature, when the new Franchise Bill was introduced. The effect of this principle will be, in a good many cases, that men who should be entitled to vote will have no vote at all. Take the case mentioned by the hon. member for Bothwell, of a man having a vote in London, another in Toronto and another in Ottawa. Well, Sir, if he says the possession of property is evidence of fitness for a vote, and he owns $200 worth of property in London, $2,000 worth in Toronto, and $2,000 worth in Ottawa, if, as he finds, London is hopelessly Tory, and his vote will do no harm there, why should he be prevented from coming down to Ottawa, where he has ten times as much property, and recording his vote here, if he sees fit? But the amendments which have been moved to this clause will prevent him recording his vote in Toronto or in Ottawa, where he holds property, while property is the evidence of fitness. Another view of the matter is this: One person may hold property in a number of different places and be prevented from voting altogether. He may own property in the city of Ottawa; he may be an unmarried man, who boards out or resides with his parents; he may have a business in the city of Ottawa, and reside outside the city limits. He has no vote in the city of Ottawa, because he does not reside there, and he has no vote in the county of Carleton, outside of the city, and there is no way in which he can get a vote. He may not be able to vote on income, because his profits for the year may be nil, and he would not be able to swear that he had an income for that particular year; and therefore he would be disfranchised altogether. Then, by the present law of Ontario, in the city of Toronto a man has two votes for two candidates; that destroys the principle of one vote for one candidate; if a man chooses, he can cast his two votes for one candidate. If three candidates run, two of them being Conservatives and one Reform, a man can plump his two votes for the Reform candidate. I believe that principle is wrong in practice, and the principle enunciated by those amendments is also wrong. A man might have property in two electoral districts and live in the third, and if he is not a man with a household, he is deprived of a vote in the three districts; and so he has no vote at all. I think the clause is better than anything else that has been proposed.

Mr. TROW. I do not think wealth should constitute a man's right to vote. A man with $200 has as much stake in the country as a man with $200,000. I do not see why a monopoly should be given to a man of wealth. I do not know anything that causes more fraud or corruption than bringing foreign voters into a county. The amendment would do away with a great deal of expense to candidates; as a rule, we find that our protests depend very materially on outside voters. There is no advantage in bringing in foreign voters. If there is, I should say it is entirely on the side of the Conservative party, because, as a rule, they are possessed of more means and are more lavish in the expenditure of money than the Reform party. I think the hon. First Minister should confine himself to the principle of one vote to one voter. It will do away with a great deal of trouble and expense to candidates, and give general satisfaction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would say to the hon. member for West York that I recognise the force of the objection he made. What I suggested was, not that a man should be disfranchished, but that he should be compelled to elect where he would record his vote, just as at present; if a man has a vote in six or seven townships, he has to elect which he will cast his vote in.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) said it was unfair to disfranchise a man who had left the country and might still be regarded as a British subject. The hon. gentleman knows that if a tenant leaves a constituency after his tenancy expires he is not at liberty to vote; but if a man is on the assessment roll as an owner, even though he has sold his property and gone to reside in a foreign country, he can come back and vote, so long as his name is on the voters' list. That was the law in Ontario previous to the new law, and that will be the law under this Bill. If the owner of a property is registered on the voters' list, and he sells the property and goes to the State of Michigan, and purchases there and settles down, he can, nevertheless, come back to this country and cast a vote here, until a new voters' list is prepared.

Mr. WALLACE. It might entice him to stay.

Mr. MILLS. That is hardly likely, if he would not stay in the first instance; and it is hardly worth while to furnish facilities for bribery in order to take so improbable a chance of bringing a man back. The change in the population in the Province of Ontario is very great; I mentioned the other night that last year, in one constituency, where the voters' list was about eight months old, there

were 128 non-resident voters, nearly all of whom were residents in the State of Michigan. If these men were all brought back to vote on one side, they would be sufficient to change the result of the election, although they have no longer an interest in the country. That is an undesirable state of things, and is wholly indefensible. What I complain of is, that this Bill will tend to perpetuate that system. By giving a man one vote, you give him all that he is entitled to, and if he votes where he resides, that is sufficient. I remember, in my first election in Bothwell, in 1867, the town had a population of nearly 4,000; the oil business came to an end; a large number of those engaged in that business left; their names were still upon the register; and quite a number of men came down from London, at the instance of my opponent, and personated a number of the parties who had left. Nobody knew whether they were the right parties or not; and I remember five men, who were not out of the country, came to vote for me and found that others had voted in their names. Opportunity is given to do that sort of thing by this system of non-resident votes allowed in this Bill.

Mr. HESSON. While the connection of the tenant with the property ceases as soon as the tenant leaves, it has never been recognised that because the owner of property is out of the country he ceases to have an interest in it. As soon as he separates himself from the ownership, his right to vote should cease, although, in the past, he had the right to vote if still on the voters' list, even after he had parted with the property. There is little chance of there being doubt as to the personalty of owners of property, because they are, as a rule, well known in the community; but in the case of tenants, who change their holdings very often, the difficulty of recognising them is much greater.

Mr. VAIL. It is very unfair to put non-residents in the position to give three or four votes, if their properties are not too far apart, while in cases where the distances are too great the owners of properties cannot exercise their right as non-resident voters. For instance, a man who had property in Nova Scotia and property in Ontario could not vote on both, while a man who had property in two constituencies close together could give a vote in each. A man should be compelled to vote in the district in which he resides; but if he had not sufficient property there and had sufficient property in another district to qualify, he should be allowed to vote on the latter; to meet this case, all that will be necessary will be to make the man swear that he had not property qualification in the district in which he resides, but had it in the district in which he is going to vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I question whether the amendments proposed, while curing one defect, are not likely, perhaps, to have the effect of preventing some persons, perhaps by moving or by other means, from having a vote. One man should have one vote and no more. If the amendments before the committee will have the effect of preventing some men from having a vote at all, that is a subject to which we should address ourselves and which we should remedy; but under the clause, as it stands, a person having property in different electoral districts could vote in each district in which he had the property. I think my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) would agree with me in objecting to that, as he voted for manhood suffrage.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I am in favor of manhood suffrage; but if property is to be the qualification, it is a different thing.

Mr. PATERSON. Under manhood suffrage a man votes because he is a man, and has only one vote. The hon. member for West York voted for that, and he is not in a position to object to the amendment, which carries out, as far as it can, the principle of manhood suffrage. Property is not the basis of this suffrage. You have departed from the basis of property in giving a vote to the wage-earner or a vote to the man who has income and has no property at all. If a man had a large income, part of which was derived from investments in one constituency and part in another, he would not be permitted to divide his income in such a way as to get votes in the different constituencies. When the hon. gentleman voted for manhood suffrage he distinctly took the position that one man should have one vote, and that is reasonable and right. We recognise the fact that a man votes because he is a man and because he contributes to the revenues of the country, and has to assume the responsibilities of citizenship, and has to share in the defence of the country. It is especially a strong argument when it is a franchise, in a case where the contributions to the revenue are obtained almost alike from rich and poor. I can understand a distinction in regard to municipalities; I can understand that a man having property in different municipalities should have the right to vote in these different municipalities, because the revenue of the municipality is derived from taxes levied on property in the municipality. But that is not the case in regard to this House. The man who might vote in six different counties contributes no more to the revenue raised by this Parliament than the man whose property lies in one constituency. Why, then, should he have more than one vote? I would be willing to aid the hon. member for West York in devising some amendment which would prevent a man losing his vote altogether, because his property was in a constituency different from that in which he lived; but no man should vote in more than one electoral district. The suggestion of the hon. member for South Huron is logical, as to a man being permitted to choose in which electoral district he shall vote, if he has property in more than one. It might entail expense, but it would be to the man himself. I think the amendment ought not to be resisted by the Government, because it is fair and equitable.

Mr. TEMPLE. I would ask the hon. gentleman how he would manage in a bye election, where a man owned property in one riding and was residing in the other. He would be disfranchised, unless the plan of the hon. member for West Huron were adopted.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The man, in that case, would be no worse off than any other elector in the constituency. If he elected to be put on that electoral list he would have a vote, and if he did not he would not. That is the position he would occupy in a general election, and he would occupy a no worse and no better position in a bye-election. It is in the direction of the proposition of the amendment, namely, that there should be only one vote for one man. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) remarked that at the local elections, when the principle of an extended franchise for Ontario was submitted and adopted as the result of these elections, we never heard anything of the principle of one man, one vote. Well, in that case, that was a subsidiary principle involved in the great extension of the franchise; but if that is a good argument, how much better argument does it present for this Bill not being proceeded with, because we never heard anything of the Bill at the elections in 1882. If that is a necessary result of the wide extension of the franchise that has taken place in Ontario, it follows, almost of necessity, that this is not an equally great extension of the franchise, no matter what hon. gentlemen may say, unless a similar principle becomes a necessity in the working of this law. It is incontrovertible that this amendment would prevent a great deal of

personation. I sympathise with the views of the hon. member for West York and the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Hesson), that there should be a provision that every man should have one vote; and if, as the Minister of Customs stated the other night, the effect of adopting the one man, one vote principle, would be to deprive him of his vote, I would certainly not advocate it as strongly as I do. I can conceive, within the limits of that principle, that the opportunity should be given to gentlemen occupying similar positions to himself, whereby they could vote; but what I do object to is, that one man should have half a dozen votes.

Amendment negatived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am going to propose an amendment to the 7th section, and leave it to the consideration of the Government. I move, after the word "registration," in the 18th line, to substitute for the remainder of the section, the following words:—

And persons qualified otherwise under this Act as voters shall only be registered as voters, and vote in the electoral district where the property in respect of which they are qualified, is situate; provided always, that persons registered in more than one electoral district shall not vote in more than one district in the same election.

That practically enables every man to vote who has property anywhere, but he must make his selection.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to say that I see no reason why stipendiary and police magistrates should be disqualified. Stipendiary magistrates are not appointed by this Government, and they receive compensation from the municipalities. However, we can express our views on that matter on the motion for the third reading.

Mr. VAIL. The stipendiary magistrates are only paid by fees.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In Quebec, stipendiary magistrates, police magistrates and recorders are all paid.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In towns over 5,000 inhabitants, in Ontario, it is necessary, under the law, to appoint a police magistrate, and the municipalities pay him. It is optional in towns under 5,000 inhabitants for the town to appoint them, and they can pay by salary or fees as they please. In many towns of Ontario, under 5,000 inhabitants, they have appointed police magistrates, and they are paid by fees; but as he is the only magistrate that can act in that town the business is confined to him, which makes it an inducement to the municipality to appoint them. I think it would be clearly an injustice to deprive such an officer of a vote, where he is paid no salary, and where he assumes the responsibilities of the office largely as an honorary officer. Stipendiary magistrates, I believe, are in a different position, and, of course, magistrates in cities are paid by the cities.

Mr. BOWELL. They are appointed by the Local Government.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The principle which applies to a magistrate is on account of his position during election times. If he takes an active part in elections, or if he votes, prisoners may be brought before him at that particular time, and it was with that idea that these officers were disqualified under the old law. It is the same principle that disqualifies judges of the Supreme Court—that they should be perfectly free and independent, and should not mix with politics.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think that there is a stipendiary magistrate in the Province of Nova Scotia, except in the city of Halifax, who is appointed by the Local Government. All the rest are appointed by the municipalities, and, so far as I know, they get no pay—at least, that is the case in Digby.

Mr. BERGIN. The police magistrates are appointed by the Local Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). So are all magistrates, and if the principle is correct, the hon. gentleman should disfranchise all of them. But it is not in towns alone that difficulties arising under the election law are dealt with by the magistrates, as those in townships would be in many cases in the same position. Why you should debar a police magistrate from voting and allow a justice of the peace to vote, who performs the same class of duties, is a distinction which I cannot understand.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. gentleman himself, a moment ago, supplied the reason. Police magistrates are not in the same position as justices of the peace, for, as he told us, they perform all the duties of a magistrate.

Mr. CAMERON. And what does he get for it?

Mr. BERGIN. He is paid.

Mr. CAMERON. It does not follow that a police magistrate gets a salary, as the municipality may get the appointment made without salary.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman may be correct, but I never knew of a case where there was an appointment without salary. In Stratford the salary fixed at first was $700, and shortly after the appointment the magistrate applied for a larger salary and it was increased. The police magistrate has much larger judicial powers than an ordinary justice of the peace, and I think he should be removed as much as possible from the sphere of politics, especially as cases often come before him arising out of elections, where party feelings run high and where suspicion might be aroused, even if it was not justified.

Mr. VAIL. All these magistrates administer the same law. The only difference is, that the stipendiary magistrate is confined within a small radius, while a justice of the peace has jurisdiction over a whole county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is a stipendiary magistrate not paid?

Mr. VAIL. Outside of Halifax I do not think there is one who is paid a salary in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then they are not stipendiary magistrates, because a stipendiary magistrate is one who is paid a stipend.

Mr. VAIL. They are paid by fees.

Mr. KIRK. Whatever may be the case in Halifax in some portions of Nova Scotia they are appointed by the municipal council and are paid by fees. While I can see a good reason why the judges of the various courts should be disfranchised, I cannot see why the judges or the recorders of the Probate Court should be disfranchised. They are not paid by salaries, but by fees, and in many counties the labor and the fees are very small.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the following clause, which I have taken from the Nova Scotia Franchise Bill, and which I think a very good one, be inserted in the section, applicable to all voters:

In the case of sons of farmers or of owners other than farmers, the time spent by such sons, as mariners or fishermen, or as students in any institution of learning, within the Dominion of Canada, shall be considered as spent at home.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have the Government received any further intelligence from the North-West that they are able to communicate to the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only information we have received is from certain sources, but not from an official of the Government—that the prisoners who were taken in the late raid by Poundmaker have been all released, and that Poundmaker or his band have sent a sort of flag of truce, wanting to know on what terms they may surrender.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 23rd May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 9,

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps before the right hon. gentleman moves his motion with regard to the Indian clause, we might, on this side, propose our amendment with regard to revising barristers. The amendment is:

That no revising officer of any electoral district, while he is revising officer, or for five years thereafter, shall be qualified to be a candidate in any electoral district, or in any part of which he has been such revising officer.

It seems to me that is a reasonable proposition. It is, I believe, similar to the provision of the law of England, and is consistent with the principle of equity—that a gentleman who has been engaged in the preparation of the voters' lists in any electoral division, ought not himself to be a candidate in that division while he is revising officer or for some time thereafter; otherwise he might have very strong inducements to prepare a list in his own interest. We ought to seek, so far as we can, under the provisions of the law to prevent parties who have a particular public duty to perform, not to undertake the discharge of that duty where their interest and the public interests may conflict with each other. I think that view is sound, and is strictly applicable in this case. In England the party who acts as revising officer cannot become a candidate for representation in the electoral district for which he has acted.

Mr. CASEY. I think no one can hesitate to adopt this amendment in order to prevent the possibility of the revising officer making a list upon which his own election may turn. It is quite clear that if it be proper for a Government official to make the list in any case, it would be exceedingly improper and fail of any possibility to secure a fair voter's list to allow such person known to be a candidate to prepare the list on which the election would be held. Even although he were a most honest and exemplary person, no one would believe that his decisions were impartial and fair. There is no doubt that the revising officer should be prohibited from being a candidate for a certain period after he has prepared the voters' list, but what that period should be remains to be determined.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would at once say that, if the hon. gentleman would alter his amendment by which it would be provided that no revising officer shall be a candidate at any election where a list settled by him would be used, I would at once assent to it. But I will not go farther and make it a matter of prohibition, of disqualification for five years as though he had done something wrong, in like manner as a man is disqualified during eight years for bribery. I admit the proposition that no revising officer, whether county judge or otherwise, should be a candidate if the list on which the election would be held has been settled by such revising officer.

Mr. BLAKE. I am inclined to think that five years would be too long a time; but the right hon. gentleman also errs in his contention. I cannot remember the provisions of the English Act, but speaking from a memory which is not too strong on the point, I think it mentions two years. However, I have asked an hon. member to obtain the English Act. The principle that this would be a penal disqualification does not apply to the case. What is wanted is so to prevent its being the interest of the revising officer to act unfairly because he knows that he may very soon be a candidate; and it is important to fix a term of years, not so long as five, after the preparation of the list during which the revising officer cannot become a candidate. You want to let the revising officer know that when he is preparing the voters' list, he cannot for a certain number of years, long enough to eliminate all matters so far as questions of self-interest are concerned, become a candidate. That is the object, and, if I mistake not, that object is sought to be accomplished, not by what the hon. gentleman proposes, but by providing a certain specified time after the lists have been prepared during which a revising officer cannot become a candidate. Human nature is much the same across the Atlantic as here, and an analogous clause to that in the English Act should be introduced into this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To show my anxious desire to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, or rather to meet their suggestions whenever reasonable, I will agree, if the term be made two years, to accept the amendment. I will give a reason. If this Bill passes, the voters' lists will be settled in 1886. We must have an election in 1887, and therefore the list in 1886 is the first basis on which the subsequent revision in 1887 may take place. Allowing for the depravity of human nature, if we could suppose such a thing, the revising officer, if he were not fit to be a revising officer, might settle the list in 1886, hoping that his successor in 1887, if he resigned, would not materially alter the lists so as to affect the general election. So without waiting for the English precedent, and the term I do not remember, I have no objection to making the term two years.

Mr. MILLS. I am quite ready to accept that.

Amendment, as amended by inserting two years instead of five, agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I think there is another class of persons who should be excluded from the exercise of the franchise. I refer to a large number of those who constitute the Civil Service of the country. I am not prepared to say how far this exclusion should go, but it is quite evident that there are a very large number of persons in the Dominion, a disproportionate number in this city, and a large number in any city where there is a large Customs and Post Office—persons who are employed in the Civil Service at consider-

able salaries, whose living depends on the places they hold, who are supposed to be non-political in the execution of their duties, and yet who are allowed by this Bill to cast votes, the result of which may be to oust from office those who appointed them, or to bring back to office those from whom they expect favors in their profession. Now I think that is anomalous. I have the highest respect for the greater number of the members of the Civil Service, and I do not think it is derogating from the character of those gentlemen to say that they, as non-political officers, as persons appointed to execute, not the will of the party but the will of the State, persons requiring to deal with both political parties in the country, and to act as impartial instruments in carrying out the will of the Executive—to say that to allow such people to perform political acts is an anomaly. It is always objectionable *primâ facie* to restrict the franchise at all, but it is supposed to be exercised by those who are in a position to exercise it with impartiality, with freedom from dictation and from the extraordinary temptations which a place under the Government brings with it. If we had a non-political service, as they have in England, if people entered the service, not by the will of the political head of the Government of the day, or the political head of the Department in which they are employed, and if by means of competitive examinations or some other means all parties could be admitted, if they held office practically during good behavior, if they were allowed to be promoted on their merits and not by caprice or favoritism of a Minister, those temptations might be less, and it might be possible that they could exercise the franchise without danger to the State, or to their character as impartial servants of the State. But I think that now when appointment to office, continuance in office, promotion in office, and amount of salary, depend upon the will of the head of the Government or the head of the Department for the time being, it is not safe for the State, it is not safe for the Civil Service, to allow those dependent persons to exercise the franchise. It may be said, as it has been said, that the ballot would be an efficient protection to civil servants against the danger of their being driven to the polls *en masse* to vote for their superior. I admit that in certain cases where there are only a few civil servants in a place, the ballot might be a protection, but in a city like Ottawa, where there is a disproportionately large number of servants, or even in Toronto or Montreal, where there is a large number of them, it would be quite possible for the superiors of those employés to know whether they had voted for the Government or not, as cities like those are pretty carefully canvassed and the proportion of Government supporters and opponents in the Civil Service would be pretty well known to their superiors, at all events, sufficiently so, that a count would show pretty clearly how the great majority of their votes were cast. It might not be possible to bring it home to every individual, but the Government would know whether the great majority of them have voted for their party or not, so that in those cases, the ballot will not be an efficient protection to the civil servant himself. But, apart from any fear of compulsion on the part of the Government, it will be in the interest of the civil servants to vote for the party that put them in office, because, under our present partisan system of managing the Civil Service, it is only from that party that he can hope for favors or promotion, unless they are officers of marked efficiency or indispensable in their Departments. Apart, then, from all fear of compulsion, the motive of self-interest will compel the great bulk of the Civil Service of the day to vote for those who appointed them, and when one party has been a long time in office, of course the Civil Service will be almost wholly of the complexion of that party, and the way in which their influence would be cast at the polls, could be determined almost to a certainty. So in a city where the service is large, as in Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal, the proviso allowing the civil servants to vote, puts in the hands of the Government of the day, if it has been long in office and has a majority of its friends in the Civil Service, the power of practically deciding the representation of those cities, because most cities of the size are so closely divided that the Civil Service will be practically able to carry the election one way or the other. There is no doubt that is the case in Ottawa where the Civil Service vote carries the election, whereas, if they were disfranchised, the result might be different. I do not say that it always carries it, but, when the strength of the condidates is nearly equal, it often does carry it. It is unfair also to the civil servant because it places him in the embarrassing and dangerous position of choosing between adhesion to his own political views and his retention in office. It is unfair to the State, because it gives those who, under the present system, are the servants of the Government of the day, the power to decide on the representation of cities in which they form a large proportion of the electorate. I think, therefore, that some measure of restriction should be placed on the franchise for civil servants. Some of my friends have perhaps considered the matter more than I have myself, as to how far that restriction should go, and probably they will present amendments embodying their views. Of course there are some men who, though they belong technically to the Civil Service, hold positions of such trifling value, that they could not be considered as influencing their views, and there are others, such as country postmasters, whom I suppose no one proposes to disfranchise. But I think the great majority of the civil servants should be asked to choose when they are offered a position under the Government, between the certainty of considerable income and provision for their old age, and the exercise of that right of the franchise which they would have if they remained outside the service of the Government. The principle must be established that anybody who becomes a civil servant ceases to be a political individual, to take part in political struggles, or to use his vote one way or the other in deciding the destinies of the country. If you allow civil servants to vote, I do not see on what ground you can prevent them from interfering in an election, making speeches or canvassing for one candidate or the other. I know that is a most objectionable thing, but I think not more objectionable than that they should exercise the ultimate right of citizens. For these reasons I hope the hon. gentleman will accept some restriction of this clause.

Mr. MILLS. I move:

That no person holding any office or place in the Civil Service of Canada, to which an annual or other salary is attached, and who may become under the law entitled to a superannuation allowance, shall be entitled to vote at any election of a member for the House of Commons.

I trust that the Government will be disposed to accept this amendment; I believe it is in the interest both of the public and the Civil Service that it should be carried. Under this Bill not only judges but even police magistrates are disqualified, who are not officers of either Government, and who are in many cases paid only by fees. If the hon. gentleman can go so far—farther than it seems to me in that case than is necessary—it is of infinitely more consequence to the efficiency of the public service and the purity of elections that the principle set out in the amendment I have put into your hands should be accepted. We have in this country adopted the English system of a permanent Civil Service occupied by men who hold office during good behavior. It is of great consequence, in my opinion, that when persons enter the public service they should cease to be partisans. It is just as necessary in the public interest that the persons employed in the various Departments of the Government should be loyal to the Government for the time, being as it is that the judges should be free

from political or personal influence. No one supposes that every judge on the bench, if allowed to exercise the elective franchise, would be biassed in the discharge of his judicial duties on that account; but in order to prevent not only all temptations, and all possibility of being consciously or unconsciously influenced, but also to secure the public confidence in the impartiality of the bench, we provide that those who occupy those judicial positions shall cease to have the right to exercise the elective franchise. Well, it is of just as much public consequence that those employed permanently in the public service should be dealt with in the same way. It is important that every Government should feel that the officers by whom it is surrounded are loyal to it, are not intriguing against it or seeking to embarrass it, and are prepared faithfully to discharge the duties assigned to them. As long as you permit the various public officers to take part in political contests, just so long will it be impossible to have an efficient public service, just so long will it be impossible for the Government to place implicit confidence in those by whom it is surrounded. I would like to know how it is possible that a public officer can discharge his duties in an efficient manner, if he is engaged in a political contest, if he is perhaps seeking to overturn the Government that for the time being he is called on to serve, or is seeking to obtain political support for that Administration, instead of devoting himself loyally to the discharge of the duties of the office which he holds. The present position of our public officials is an anomalous one, and cannot continue. We must choose between neutrality of public officers in politics, or we must determine that those who engage in the public service must go out with the Administration they serve. This is the system prevailing in the United States. It is of great consequence that the public service should be occupied by men of efficiency, but it is of still more consequence that it should be occupied by men who do not endeavor to embarrass the Government. If you adopt the system of allowing persons in the public service to be voters they must make up their minds that their positions cannot be permanent; they must go out with the Government that appoints them. I believe almost every officer in the public service at this time would be pleased to be relieved of the duty of exercising the elective franchise. He is unfairly pressed to go to the polls and vote; if the right of voting is taken away from him, he is no longer to be influenced in that way; he is no longer likely to busy himself about political conflicts, instead of the discharge of his public duties. I remember a public officer who declared that he was sick, who went to a physician and obtained a certificate, and who a week afterwards was found revising the voters' list, contesting the right of some persons in this city to remain on the voters' list, and actively canvassing for a political candidate at the time opposed to the Administration. I know of another public officer who was a member of the municipal council and a member of the Conservative Association of this city, who withdrew himself for some days from the public service and devoted himself to the revision of the voters' list. That condition of things will always continue so long as the present system remains in vogue. In order to get rid of that system and to secure an efficient public service, the right to exercise the elective franchise should be taken away from these permanent public officers, who are expected to serve the public as long as their health remains, and at the end of a long service to be retired on a superannuation allowance. It is open for them to decide, before they enter the public service, whether they will remain freemen to exercise the electoral franchise or become neutral men in politics, devoted to the public service. If they are anxious to exercise the electoral franchise, if they wish to take part in political contests, let them withdraw from the service, and they will stand exactly as other citizens. So long as they are in the public service, so long is it important that they should be excluded from the public arena. I hope the Government will accept this amendment. It is in the public interest, it will contribute to the efficiency of the public service, and will do a great deal to remove suspicion in the minds of Ministers from those who are permanently employed in the different Departments.

Mr. SMALL. I would like to ask if the division court clerks and bailiffs, who are immediately under the superintendence of the Attorney General of Ontario, are disqualified?

Mr. MILLS. I have not looked at the Act, but I know the division court clerk in my constituency, Mr. Stevens, was actively engaged against me.

Mr. SMALL. That is the one exception.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Every license inspector is an agent of the Ontario Government—I will not say so much for the commissioners—and goes from house to house, in every section of the country, canvassing against the Opposition. In Hastings two of the most active men in the county elections, on the side of the Local Government, are the license commissioner and inspector. A man who had a hotel there for 15 years was refused a license by these men, because he would not vote for their candidate. The inspector, as a rule, considers he gets his $400 a year to act as agent of the Local Government and is most active in elections. The hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) will not deny what I say. Why should not Dominion officials be put on the same footing as the Local Government officials?

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand the nature of the amendment. It is proposed to disfranchise those civil servants who are directly entitled to be called civil servants, who reap the benefit of the Superannuation Act, but it is not proposed to disfranchise the outside service. Everybody knows that the license commissioners, division court clerks, and bailiffs, are not civil servants in the technical meaning of the word; they are not subject to promotion or superannuation. The license commissioners are not paid; and these officials are not permanently appointed. There is a wide difference between that class and the class treated in this amendment. The hon. gentleman called attention to the political work of those engaged in the outside service. I will call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the post office of this House, less than a year ago, an official left his place and went canvassing through one of the adjoining counties on behalf of the Government, making speeches to the electors and doing all he could to help the Government candidate. When challenged as being a servant of the Government, he said he had resigned; but within a week after the election he was back in the old place, having been reappointed. There is also the famous Mr. Wilkinson who was appointed to a position in the Weights and Measures Department and as a Government valuator, and who traversed the country from end to end as political agent for his intimate friend the First Minister; and the result was that instead of his being reappointed to the position he had resigned he was given the very valuable and remunerative office of registrar in the North-West. It is all very well for the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) to make the statements he has made, but he has not sustained them by a single particle of evidence. We have the evidence on this side of dozens of cases of Conservatives receiving Government pay and disgracing the position they hold and the Government by taking an active part in elections. The sooner we take the step proposed in the amendment the better. It is not in the interest of any Government, Reform or Conservative, that the men who are engaged in the public Departments

should be partisan. If our Civil Service were on the same basis as the English Civil Service, where the officials are entirely free from all influence of the Government, it would be well to give our civil servants the right to vote. In England it is not the Government, but a commission appointed free from all bias or partiality, which has to do with the appointments. A man who wants to enter the service is not asked whether he is Conservative or Radical or Reform, but has to depend altogether on his qualifications to fill the position. The men who have the right to appoint them are not the members of the Government, and are free from all Government influence. There we have not the disgraceful scenes we have in this country. There we do not find men who have been appointed to positions in the Civil Service having ten or fifteen years added to their time in order that they may receive an enormous superannuation allowance. These men may have been obliged to resign in order that their places may be filled by some partial man selected by the chief of the Department. We know that these things take place in this country, and when the promotion of a civil servant depends on the friendliness of the first Minister, upon the outside influence he can get, upon the faithfulness of his service to the party which appointed him, it is improper, to say the least, that such a man should have the right to exercise the franchise. It will inevitably come to the principle referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that to the victors belong the spoils. You are shaking the tenure upon which these men hold their offices, and when hon. gentlemen on this side succeed to power, as they will in two years, it is not to be expected that they will assume the control of those different Departments while they are full, as they are now, of political partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite. If the result is that these men have to go, and that other men in accord with the principles of those who have the control of affairs have to take their places, they will have to blame hon. gentlemen opposite for it. When we were in power seven years ago, it is a matter of history that many of the civil servants were faithless to their chiefs, and the members of the Government had many difficulties to overcome. It is more than you can expect that hon. gentlemen will submit to have men in direct antagonism to them, without one feeling of sympathy for them, who would rather see difficulties placed in their way than they would help them, remaining in the Civil Service; and, if the destruction of the present system of Civil Service takes place, hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for it. If there are any Reformers in the service—and I doubt if there are very many—we know that they are hounded down, that they are afraid to express an opinion, they are like cowed dogs, afraid to say anything because there are so many around them who will remember what they say; they are afraid to freely exercise the franchise against the party in power for fear that they will lose the position they occupy or the just promotion to which they are entitled. Is it not more just and statesmanlike to say that, when a man accepts a position in the Civil Service, whereby, after a certain number of years of service, he becomes entitled to superannuation, wherein, if he conducts himself properly, he will receive due promotion, is it not better in the interests of Canada and of the service itself that that man should be raised above and beyond all political influence? Would it not have the effect of purifying the Civil Service, of making these men loyal to the country and not to the men who appointed them? Efficiency in the public service is what we are seeking for, it is a desirable thing to attain if it be possible, but, if you allow these men to retain the franchise, as they have it now, it is impossible to have a set of civil servants in the City of Ottawa who can free their minds from the influences which exist. I do not blame them; they cannot help it. No doubt in Ottawa they are very anxious to carry the city, and it is almost impossible for the civil servants to exist in their position if they vote against the Government, or, if they do, they have to vote in a sneaking way and not let anyone know how they vote. Anyone who looks at the matter from an impartial standpoint must see that the position of the civil servants to-day is an unenviable one as far as they are concerned, and is dangerous to the country at large. If we are to have a free, pure civil service, it is absolutely necessary that these men should not exercise the electoral franchise. I hope the First Minister will take this amendment into consideration. These men should be placed above all political parties, they should have but one master to serve, the country at large, not the Conservative party or the Reform party. They should be loyal to the country which pays them, and should take no part whatever in political contests, and, as far as possible, should free their minds from political bias. If the Civil Service were placed in that position, men who came into power would feel that their subordinates would be loyal to them as to those whom they succeeded.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to take advantage of this opportunity to make a stump speech for the country, or to make charges which cannot be substantiated.

Mr. LISTER. You do not do that for nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman say? He does not answer. If he had as much honesty and courage as he has insinuation, he would repeat his statement. We understand then that he will say privately what he dare not say publicly. This question is important, because if the amendment be carried, it will have the effect of disfranchising a large number who now exercise the franchise. I have heard it stated more than once by hon. gentlemen opposite that, if any person were refused the franchise, or were disfranchised, the burden would be on those who disfranchised him to prove why it should be done. This proposition will have the effect of disfranchising hundreds and thousands of capable, intelligent citizens, than whom, I suppose, in this country, we have no more capable or more intelligent; and if we are going to adopt that proposition, I think we had better come down to cool and calm grounds, and look it over thoroughly. I am opposed, on the face of it, to taking the right of suffrage away from any intelligent and capable citizen, who has it now, on the sole ground that he is in the service of the country. Gentlemen say that he is in the service of a Government, but, after all, if we have anything underlying the Government, it is the country that is represented in the Government, and it is in the service of the country that these gentlemen are engaged. Now, if you make a comparison between those who are appointees of a Provincial Government, such as my hon. friend near me has referred to, and those who are in the service of the Dominion, I hold that, on all grounds, the vote cannot be so well taken away from the civil servants of the Dominion as it can be from the appointees of the Local Governments. Now, the interests which will sway a civil servant may be divided into three classes. There is, first, the interest of appointment. He gets the appointment, and he is supposed to be, when getting it, a friend of the appointing power; we will take that for granted in reference to both the Local and the Federal Governments. But in the Local Government there is nothing to intervene between the appointing power and the person. There is no test of fitness, and the appointment is in the discretion of the power that makes it. But when you come to the Civil Service of the Dominion, the case is different. The ultimate appointment may be in the power of the Government, but there is a test of fitness which will generally be found to weed out the more incapable of those who undergo the test. Now the appointee of a local government is altogether and continually in the power of the

authority that appointed him. He can be dismissed at any time by the same power that appointed him. He holds his position, not by virtue of any law, but by the will of the power that appointed him. But in the Civil Service of the Dominion, after the appointees have passed the test of examination, they hold their positions permanently during good behaviour. They may get their appointments under one Government, but you take the civil servants at any period of time, and you will find that a very large portion of them have not got their appointments under the Government which, for the time being, holds sway. Now, there is the other inducement of pay. The local appointees get their pay directly from the Provincial Government, and at the favor and grace of the Provincial Government; but the civil servants of the Dominion get their pay according to fixed law, according to the regulations of the service, and the Government of the day, and the department under the Government, have not sole power with reference to those persons. Their pay is fixed on a regular scale, which is laid down by law, and our appointments in the Civil Service of the Dominion are as a rule, permanent appointments. Then there is the interest of continuation. No one will doubt that in this matter, Dominion civil servants have by far the advantage in the relative argument; they are more permanent, by the very nature of their appointment and the nature of their service, than are the appointees of the Local Governments. So I say, on the comparative view, you cannot consistently deny the civil servants of the Dominion the right of the franchise, because they are interested parties, and yet give it to the appointees of the local powers. Then, if you take the question on the broad ground of right, what reason is there that an intelligent man in the pay of his country, should be denied the highest right of a citizen, to have a practical share in the Government of the country? Does he not know as much, probably, as any other man of similar capacity, about the country, about its needs and requirements? He is able to form a far more intelligent idea, because he is nearer the seat of Government and comes in contact with a great many sources of information that others cannot possibly have. The one ground that is strongly urged against giving him the franchise is this: he may be a partisan. So he may be a partisan, but not necessarily so. I believe, if we take the 700 or 800 civil servants in the Inside Service to-day, you will find that the greater part of them are not amenable to the charge of partisanship, and I believe you will find that very few of them are partisans in the sense in which some hon. gentlemen have spoken. But do hon. gentlemen suppose that refusing the right to vote from an intelligent man takes away from him all interest in politics? If they do think so, they are greatly mistaken. The highest interest a man takes in politics, the deepest patriotism which he feels, does not depend upon the right to vote; it springs from far higher and better motives, and a right to vote is simply one way he has of expressing the interest which, on other grounds, he holds in his country. Is there a man outside who earns his pay any more certainly than the civil servant of this country? Is he not worth that which is given him? Is not the salary paid him as a fair reward for his services?—not as a charity, not as a gratuity, but as earning his pay, and being an intelligent and capable servant, he ought not to be deprived of his right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. So is the judge.

Mr. FOSTER. The position of a judge and that of a civil servant are very different indeed, and the hon. member for Bothwell knows it right well, and the mere captious remark he interjects cannot be fairly sustained. My own belief is that a civil servant, under our present rules, should not be deprived of his franchise. There may be occasionally partisans, but it is not right because one, or two, or three, may be partisans, that the great body of civil servants should be disfranchised.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has assumed that there is a clear distinction between a judge being refused the right to exercise the franchise and a civil servant occupying an equally prominent position; and he assumed that that distinction was present in the minds of every member of the committee; but he failed to tell us wherein that distinction lay. I would have been pleased, and perhaps convinced, had the hon. gentleman shown some reason why he is in favor of disqualifying a judicial officer and in favor of retaining the franchise for Civil Service appointees.

Mr. FOSTER. I supposed you would all know that, without my telling you.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not plain to my mind——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is to my mind.

Mr. DAVIES. And I hope, before the debate closes, that we will have from the hon. gentleman more light. I think he stated very fairly that where it is proposed to disfranchise any class of the community, the onus of proving that they should loose their franchise rests upon those who make the motion. I think the onus does lie upon those who propose to disfranchise the civil servants, of proving that the proposition is a sound one. What good reasons have been advanced? It has been stated already, and it is a statement with which I thoroughly agree, that there is no greater benefit conferred on the State than that of giving it a thoroughly good Civil Service; and if there was a Civil Service in Canada placed upon a foundation which left appointments open to considerations of merit and not of political partisanship of favor, and if subsequent promotion were made upon merit and not upon political favor, then it would appear very harsh to disfranchise civil servants. But does any hon. gentleman imagine that by merely making the statement that appointments to the service, or promotion afterwards, are based on anything approaching merit, any man would believe him? Any man on either side of politics, the veriest child in the country, knows that the only passport to appointments and to promotions is political favor. The civil servants are political partisans, and are thoroughly imbued with the idea that in order to show a reason for their promotion they must prove themselves to be thorough-faced partisans. With respect to the Civil Service in the Maritime Provinces, will the hon. member for King's declare that any man would hope to obtain a position in the Service unless he was a thorough-faced political partisan?

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the inside service?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows more than that: that when a person has been appointed to the Service, if he has any hope of promotion, he bases that hope simply upon service he can do to the party which has appointed him. I take my experience in my own county at the last election. The most bitter partisans I had to meet, the men who went from house to house, the men who worked quickest to circulate political falsehoods and lies, who took the stump against me, were men occupying positions in the Civil Service. There are very few members on this side of the House, especially from the Maritime Provinces, but will support the position I have taken. If you grant these premises, I submit that sufficient grounds have been made out for disfranchising civil servants. You must adopt one or two alternatives. Place the civil servants on a proper basis; and it is the interest of both political parties, of the Service and of the State generally, that the Service should be placed upon a basis other than a political one. The right to enter that Service should depend upon merit, upon the result of competitive examinations, not on having political favor of a supporter of the Government or

member of the Government as a friend. Did the hon. member for King's when he made the statement, as to the test of fitness, mean to imply that appointments are made on the ground of fitness? Does he not know, what the country knows, that the examinations are a farce, and that there are now six or seven hundred young men who have already passed the test and are now awaiting appointments. Will the hon. gentleman say that members of the Reform party are appointed? What a farce it is. The hon. member for King's knows that it is worse than not having any test whatever.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to offer a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman would intimate that I said merit was the test. I distinctly stated that, for argument's sake, I would admit that appointments went by political favor; but, interposing between that and the great mass of applicants, was this test. The hon. gentleman should have been fair enough to have given me credit for that statement.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman argued on two lines. One was a comparative one, and the other was as to the matter of right and wrong. The hon. gentleman drew a distinction in favor of Dominion officials as compared with the officials of the Local Governments, and pointed out that the test of fitness applied to the former appointees and not to the appointees of the Local Governments.

Mr. FOSTER. And I did not state the other.

Mr. DAVIES. I have tried to show, and I think I have succeeded, that the test of fitness is merely a nominal one, which is productive more of evil than of good, because the test of fitness is used for the purpose of leading the public to believe that politics do not enter into the matter of appointments, while, as a matter of fact, they do. Why do the Government not put the Civil Service on a good footing and leave it open to young men, irrespective of politics? Because they want to wield the Civil Service as a political weapon; they have used it as such in times past, and they intend to do so in the future. In some of the Provinces the appointments to the Local Government Service are made on the United States system—to the victors belong the spoils. They take part in political campaigns and assume the responsibility of their actions. If the opposite party come into power, they go out. Here you put up a nominal barrier, which throws the responsibility off their shoulders, while, at the same time, you allow them to become partisans and commit all the evils they can. The other test was to make promotions in the Service depend upon merit. Does the hon. member for King's believe that such is the case?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not heard the hon. gentleman to whom I put this question reply. I assert, with strong confidence, that promotion depends, to a very large extent, upon political favor.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Nonsense.

Mr. DAVIES. I am acquainted with members of the Civil Service in Ottawa, and there is not one but has told me, when I put the question to him, that unless he was a political favorite he had no hope of promotion.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What about Mr. Burgess and Mr. Parmelee?

Mr. DAVIES. I have not heard that Mr. Burgess, of late years, has been a very strong Reformer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not heard it alleged against him, as one of his offences, that he sympathises very strongly with the Reform party. And if hon. gentlemen opposite, out of six hundred cases, are only able to name one case, the exception would simply prove the rule.

Mr. BOWELL. What do you say in regard to my Department, where leading Reformers, appointed by your own people, have been promoted?

Mr. DAVIES. I say nothing about the hon. gentleman's Department; I am dealing with the general condition of things. If I am wrong in my belief that merit, and and merit alone, should be the test of appointment to the Civil Service, of promotion in the Civil Service, of obtaining superannuation—that the ground should be based on fair play and justice—prove that I am wrong, and I will vote against the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER. Not a bit of it.

Mr. DAVIES. I know where men have been superannuated and large sums added to their superannuation amount because of their political services. Hon. gentlemen know it; the names have been brought down to the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Bring them down.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen brought them down last Session, and they were challenged to point out if this was not the case. I think I can advance——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES. I can go on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, do it.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman remembers that a few years ago, when the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway became poorly, he had not been very many years——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hardly think the hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. DAVIES. I am perfectly willing to go into it, and I make the statement, at any rate, that there are such cases within my own knowledge. I have made the statement before, in the presence of the former Minister of Railways, who was responsible for the matter, or I would not make it now. I make the statement that political services and favoritism had a great deal to do with the amount awarded in the superannuation of the late superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway; and I say, therefore, that the basis upon which the hon. member for King's argues the question is a false basis, because he assumes the existence of facts which do not exist; he assumes a proper Civil Service system, one somewhat akin to that of the mother country, where merit alone is required, and political services are ignored. But surely there is hardly a member in this House but will acknowledge that no man in the Civil Service expects promotion unless he is able to show a political record to his superiors which will justify his promotion. If that is the state of facts——

Mr. BOWELL. Those are not the facts.

Mr. DAVIES. If that is the state of affairs, and it is the state of affairs which I derive from an examinatoin of the records——

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. I ask the hon. member for Cardwell to read the superannuation list.

Mr. WHITE. We have been discussing promotions in the Departments.

Mr. DAVIES. If he will look at the number of years added to those who receive superannuation, and inquire into their political opinions, he will find that my statements are correct, and I know it from personal conversation with members of the Civil Service in this city. I find a unanimous consensus of opinion from all of them that political service has a great deal to do with promotion in the Civil Service. That being the case, you must adopt

one or two courses: either put the Service on a basis irrespective of politics altogether, which would be in the interest of both parties and the public in general—either do that or adopt the United States system, and let them go out on a change of Government, as the parties who appoint them go out, and let the next party which comes in have men in the Departments in whom they have confidence—you must do either one or the other of those things, or else you should disfranchise the civil servants from exercising political privileges. The hon. gentleman asserts that, if they are disfranchised, they will still retain their political proclivities, and do a great deal to advance what they believe to be the interest and welfare of the State. But, supposing they do that, that is not where the harm is done.

An hon. MEMBER. The harm is done by the vote, then?

Mr. DAVIES. These men feel themselves in an awkward position; they want to exercise the franchise, but they feel that they dare not do it in the way they would like to——

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What is to prevent them?

Mr. DAVIES. Because they would incur the political enmity of their superiors.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the ballot?

Mr. DAVIES. Is the hon. gentleman green enough, or does he imagine that I am green enough to believe that, because we have the ballot, the way he votes is not known.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose the hon. member comes to this conclusion, that he is willing to let the civil servant deposit his ballot, but he is never, by word or sign, to express his sympathy with one party or the other.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). You do not propose to let him do that by this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. They are merely men, and if they take a strong political view, one way or the other, they will express it or it will be dragged out of them by those who, as an hon. member behind me has said, are nothing more nor less than spies in the Department, who report it to their superiors—I know it myself—report to their political superiors how they vote. I believe, from what I have heard of the Civil Service in Ottawa, that the whole system is a carefully prepared political system, for the purpose of promoting the interest of the present party and continuing them in power. Now, Sir, before I sit down, let me say a word with reference to the hon. member for East Hastings. I was for some time in doubt as to the real secret of the continued success of the Hon. Oliver Mowat and his Administration in Ontario. I think, in listening to this debate, I have discovered it. The Hon. Oliver Mowat has laid down his standard of right and wrong, and it is so perfect in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Let those laugh who win. The hon. gentlemen, I say, believe that the standard laid down by Mr. Mowat is so perfect that he always concludes his arguments by referring to what Mr. Mowat has done, and what he has not done. The question comes up of disfranchising the Civil Service. Well, it may be right or it may be wrong, but the hon. gentleman says, let us see what Mr. Mowat has done. If he has done it, well and good, but if not you cannot vote for it. This is the argument and the only argument, and I appeal to the committee to say if that is not the case with the hon. gentleman. The laughter of the hon. member for East Hastings has ceased. What is the matter? Why does he not laugh now? Mr. Mowat allows division court clerks and bailiffs to vote. Mr. Mowat must be right, and therefore we should not disqualify. Why does not the hon. gentleman argue it as a matter of right and wrong in itself, irrespective of what Mr. Mowat does? Simply because he must believe that the standard set up by Mr Mowat is a perfect standard, and he tries to adapt everything to it; though, if it does not suit him, he is apt to make reflections on the Administration in Ontario. For those reasons, and believing, as I do, that entrance into the Civil Service, promotion in it afterwards, and superannuation subsequently, are largely and improperly based upon political merit and favoritism. Until that system is remodelled and placed on a better basis I will support the principle of the amendment.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman made a remark that the Local Government of Ontario had appointed certain officers. Well, if that is the case, it certainly makes them more partisan, more anxious for the success of the party who appointed them. I remember the time whem municipal councils had the appointment of license inspectors, and we had no such trouble, so far as efficiency is concerned, as we have now. What I was finding fault with was that the license commissioners and inspectors appointed by Mr. Mowat were going around using their influence against the present Government, and in favor of the present Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. Was that right?

Mr. WHITE. I do not think it is right; but where are there any Dominion civil servants who do the same thing? Can the hon. gentleman point out where? Mr. Lalley, the gentleman appointed as inspector in East Hastings, goes from house to house and from place to place electioneering for Gritism. I can take the petitions that have been presented to the House, and I can point out where a party has signed name after name, and he was appointed by Mr. Mowat. If the hon. leader of the Opposition believes that it is wrong for Dominion officials to interfere in elections, why, in the name of common sense, does he not prevent Mr. Mowat from doing wrong? Does he not control him?

Mr. BLAKE. No; no more than he controls me.

Mr. WHITE. I am surprised at a gentleman so candid as the hon. leader of the Opposition making such a statement. Does any man believe to-day that had it not been for the leader of the Opposition Mr. Wheler would have been appointed to the position he occupies? Of course the hon. gentleman got him appointed, and why? Not because he was so much better fitted for the position than any other man, but simply because the Grits knew Mr. Edgar would be elected to the place. It is as plain as noonday. Did not the hon. gentleman write to the Reformers of that county, saying that he wanted Mr. Edgar elected—that he wanted his assistance? If he could control Mr. Mowat to appoint Mr. Wheler, and could control the Reformers of West Ontario to elect Mr. Edgar, I ask him to control Mr. Mowat to appoint men who will not interfere in elections. I ask the hon. gentleman to point out any part of Ontario where Dominion officials have taken an active part in political contests. We do not know of any in our part of the country. We do not ask or expect them to do so. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) made a remark that I think was very unbecoming of an hon. member of this House. He said that when the elections took place the civil servants were forced to go and vote favorably to the Government, and he said they acted like cowardly dogs, or cowed dogs. He compared the civil servants to cowed dogs. I think that is unfair in any hon. gentleman. I believe the members of the Civil Service are as fair, and honest, and impartial a class of men as there are in the country. When the Ballot Bill was introduced into this House I voted against it, and I would do so to-morrow. I like to see what side a man is on; but I would remind the hon. leader of the Opposition that his leader at that time did not vote for the ballot. I remember how he used to say, in that eloquent tone that he is gifted with, that it

was necessary, so that the employés of a large employer of labor should have the ballot to screen them. Well, under the ballot who can tell how a civil servant vote. Who can tell how any man votes who goes behind the screen and marks his ballot? Very few men tell us how they vote, and it is against the law to do it. I never took the trouble to ask a man how he voted; and it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite, before they talk as they do of the Civil Service of the Dominion, to clean their own doorstep, and to cause the man they control and keep in power to prevent his civil servants from taking an active part in elections.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not rise to take any active part in the discussion; but with reference to what the hon. gentleman has said of me, personally, I wish to say that I have no control whatever over Mr. Mowat, any more than Mr. Mowat has control over me. Our spheres of action are, as I have always conceived, entirely different. I have to deal with the politics of the Dominion as the leader, however inadequate, of the Liberal party of the Dominion; my hon. friend, the Attorney General of Ontario, has to deal with the provincial politics of the Province, and in these I interfere very little, indeed, although I have always felt at liberty to interfere, and have interfered, by addressing my fellow-countrymen at times of general elections. With reference to the crucial test to which the hon. gentleman refers, I beg to say to him that neither to Mr. Mowat nor to any member of his Government who had any authority whatever, did I ever say a word or write a word or make an intimation with reference to the appointment of Mr. Wheler; nor did I ever communicate with the constituency of West Ontario, until I was informed by Mr. Wheler himself, as he thought it his duty to inform me, that he was about to accept an appointment, which had been arranged with the Local Government; and upon being so informed, I did what I believe I had a right to do—I sent a letter, in answer to an enquiry from several of my friends, as to the man who I thought should succeed to the nomination of the party for the vacancy about to take place. I answered their enquiry, and named my hon. friend the present member for West Ontario; I said it was not my business to choose; it was their own business; but to those who asked I would not refuse to give my advice. They were good enough to accept my advice, and my hon. friend sits here for the good of his party as well as for the good of the country.

Mr. TASSÉ. I intend to vote against the amendment, for several reasons, which I will explain. In the first place, the object of this Bill is to enlarge the franchise, and the purpose of the amendment is to restrict it. In the second place, it has been stated that the Civil Service employees desire the passage of an amendment of that kind. I think that statement was made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I would like to know on what authority that hon. gentleman says that the Civil Service of the country desire to be deprived of the franchise.

Mr. DAVIES. Their own statements—numbers of them.

Mr. TASSÉ. I would like to know what are those statements; they have not yet been submitted to the House. I believe, on the contrary, that the Civil Service employés desire to continue to exercise the right of voting which they have exercised so far to the satisfaction of the country. It has been stated by the hon. member for Queen's that they could not vote with perfect liberty. For what reason? Is it because we have secret voting in this country? Is it because we have the ballot, which hon. gentlemen opposite advocated for so many years? Is it because the ballot fails to ensure to the voters of this country the utmost freedom that hon. gentlemen opposite desire that an important portion of the population should be deprived of the right to vote? The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), has stated that the Liberal members of the service in Ottawa are considered as mere spies. I have been in Ottawa several years; I had the honor of being an officer of the House, and I know something of what is going on in the various offices, and I beg to say that the statement of the hon. gentleman is most unfounded. We all know that among the most important officers in the Departments are to be found Liberals. Among the various Deputy Ministers are found prominent Liberals; Liberals are found also among the chief clerks and other officials, and none of them are considered as spies; on the contrary they are considered and respected as they should be. I was employed in the service of the House for several years, in the translator's branch, and I may say that of the six officers in that branch I was the only Conservative. This, in itself, is sufficient to show that all the employés of the Government are far from being Conservatives. Now, it has been said that the Government try to influence the civil servants in order to make them vote for Conservative candidates. Well, I have been twice a candidate for the city of Ottawa. The seat which I have the honor to occupy was previously filled by a French-speaking Liberal, and I had the honor to capture that seat in 1878 against all the influence of the Mackenzie Administration. Although the then Prime Minister himself did me the honor of visiting my constituency and addressing the electors against my candidature, I was elected then, despite the influence of the Liberal Government. I was re-elected in 1882, with the influence of the Conservative party, the same influence that elected me in 1878; and if Ottawa was represented from 1874 to 1878 by a Liberal, and since by a Conservative, that fact shows that the civil servants of Ottawa exercise their right to vote with the utmost liberty and freedom. If there is one class of the population which is entitled to vote on account of its intelligence, it is assuredly the Civil Service of Canada, which, both by talent and efficiency, can be compared favorably with any similar class in either the adjoining Republic or Great Britain.

Mr. DAVIES. I desire to correct a very important error into which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) has fallen. He charged me with stating that the Liberal officials in the Civil Service were spies.

Mr. TASSÉ. Were considered spies.

Mr. DAVIES. I not only did not say so, but such a thing was not in my mind. So far from charging the Liberal officials of the Service with being spies, I must say that all those I know are gentlemen. What I said was, that there are members in the Civil Service who are prevented from freely exercising the franchise, or expressing the political sympathies, one way or the other, because of their existence in the Departments of spies. I do not charge Conservative members of the Service with being spies. I know a great many of them who are gentlemen; but I say there are spies, who make it a point to report the political proclivities of officials who oppose the Administration. That is known to the Service.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) told us, quite unnecessarily, that he was going to vote against the amendment "for various reasons." I should suppose he had something between 500 and 700 reasons for opposing it, for that would represent the proportion in which the civil servants of Ottawa voted at his election. Were this amendment adopted it would simply cut away the ground on which he stands, and seriously endanger, probably destroy, his prospect of continuing to hold his seat. No wonder he is opposed to the disfranchisement of civil servants, but the fact that he is opposed to it has nothing to do with the merits of the case. Should the Opposition come into power at the next election, what is there to prevent them making a clean sweep and putting in a considerable number of civil

servants whose votes would elect any member we chose for Ottawa? Would the hon. gentleman then object to the disfranchisement of the service as strongly as he does now? He asked what Civil Service employees desire to be deprived of the right to vote. The hon. member for P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) said that some civil servants did so desire. Perhaps the hon. member for Ottawa would like to know their names, but I think he should be satisfied with the assurance of the hon. gentleman, and not enquire further. I hope he will be satisfied with his assurance that there are some members of the Civil Service who do not want to be called upon to make an invidious choice between their political opinions and those superiors on whom their bread and butter depends. He wants to know whether the ballot does not secure the utmost freedom of action; whether, under the ballot, it is possible to know how people vote, and who can tell how the Civil Service are going to vote? I think the two members for Ottawa city can generally tell how they are going to vote. I think they had an idea before the last election.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The other member for the city of Ottawa says yes, that they had. No doubt they canvassed them. They would have been very foolish not to canvass them, under the present system. It is then established, on the confession of one of the members for the city of Ottawa, that they knew how the Civil Service were going to vote. Does the hon. member for Ottawa who has spoken on this subject (Mr. Tassé), mean to say that the civil servants are of such a character that they cannot tell how they are going to vote—after they have stated how they will vote, that they cannot be believed? I do not believe he has any such intention; I do not believe he saw the consequences of the statement he was making; but in that statement he insulted the whole Civil Service. The idea of asking whether the ballot secures secrecy in reference to the way in which a man votes! I do not suppose that one civil servant out of ten would refuse to answer the question as to how he was going to vote; and, if he did, his refusal would give the answer. That man would have magnificent chances for promotion; he would have a very powerful claim upon the hon. members for Ottawa when the next vacancy occurred! It is clear that the members for the city of Ottawa know to a nicety, know to a man, how every member of the Civil Service will vote, if he votes at all. The only question will be: Does he vote? There can be no mistake of that point. The list is in the hands of the committee, and if they vote it is known whether they voted Reform or Conservative. Is it hard to find how many of the Civil Service have supported their temporary masters, how many have refused to vote, and how many have gone out to support the Opposition? It is not hard to understand what will follow the casting-up of this balance sheet. It is not hard to see that those who voted will feel the effects sooner or later. No one has contended that no civil servant was promoted for merit. The service would not last five years if no one was promoted for merit. They must promote some persons who have made themselves indispensable, but a Reformer must be very indispensable indeed before he has any chance of high promotion. We all know that the general rule is that those who are of Liberal antecedents, and show no extraordinary merit, sufficient to make themselves indispensable, must be content with the annual increment of $50, until they reach the head of their class, and must wait there until the Government is forced to promote one of them occasionally; but, while this process is going on, political friends of the Government are being taken in and put over the heads of those who ought to have been promoted. It is not only this Government that has done these things, but every Government in Canada has done acts of that sort, which might be construed as political favoritism. My hon. friend who sits in front of me may have been misled, but it has been rumored that political favoritism has influenced the acts of every Government in Canada. The question has been asked, in a sneering way, across the House: Can you give any instance of partisanship? I know there are a number of people in the Civil Service who have no particular political views, who have been so long in the Service that they have come to be mere executive machines, and do not care about parties at all. But most of them are not so. They were put in the Service because they were political partisans or the friends of political partisans, and no doubt they preserve the same views, unless they are miserable turncoats, who have been bought by an office to desert their party. I do not say that there are any of that kind; I do not know that there are any; but it is possible to imagine one. We are asked if the Service is partisan as a whole. I think the answer must be, that if it is not partisan as a whole, there is a majority of partisans in it. The length of time the Conservative party has been in power, during the last thirty or forty years, has greatly exceeded the time the Reform party has been in power. As to particular cases. We had an instance of a Mr. Gray, an employé of the House of Commons Post Office, I believe, who was sent out to do political work. Then there was Mr. Evanturel, who was a civil servant when my hon. friend from East York was in power, who canvassed against the Government of which he was a servant. Political partisanship may be exercised both ways. After Mr. Evanturel went out of the Service he received his reward. He received a retiring allowance of $1,000, and he was made the Conservative candidate for Prescott county, for the Local House, against Mr. Hagar. Was he a partisan, and did his partisanship do him any good? The members for Ottawa would answer in the negative, no doubt. But there are more unpleasant ways in which partisanship has been shown. It has been published in the papers that a certain person named Dionne, in connection with one named Garon, the former being an employé of the Department of Public Works, were fined in the police court for inciting a number of persons, mostly belonging to the Civil Service; in fact, for heading a mob of these persons and creating a disturbance in a meeting at St. Anne's, in this city. When the partisanship of the Service breaks out in such a disagreeable form as this we cannot shut our eyes to it. I do not say that the whole of the Service is partisan. There are a number who are impartial, and a number who are indifferent; but the newer part of the Service, those who are fresh from receiving their reward, are active partisans of the Government, and it has never been the policy for the present Government to discourage that partisanship. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) went into a long eulogy of the ability of the civil servants—as if that had anything to do with the case. He was asked: Is not a judge just as able and just as well qualified as a civil servant? And he said there was a great difference between the two cases. So there is a great difference, and it is this: that the judge may be assumed to be an infinitely superior man, mentally, and to have a greater stake in the country, and to have a clearer comprehension of political issue, than any member, except the highest grade, of the Civil Service. Another difference is, that the judge is absolutely independent of the Government of the day. He holds his office during good behavior, and can only be removed by misconduct, or a breach of trust of his office. But the civil servant can be removed any morning by his political head. There is no parallel between the two cases. If the judge, highly educated, and with the knowledge of law and statesmanship he must possess, is not qualified to vote, on the ground of dependence, how can the Civil Service clerk be qualified, whose salary is the only means of maintenance he has in the world, whose existence as a servant is dependent on the mere caprice or the ill-humor of his political superior? All legislators have decided, as a

rule, not to enfranchise judges, and all the more strongly should we decide not to enfranchise civil servants, who, as compared with the judges, are mere creatures of the Minister's will and pleasure. But the hon. member for King's, N. B., went on the draw a parallel between the case of the civil servants of the Dominion and those of the Provinces; and he said the appointee of the Local Government was entirely in the power of that Government, and that it was not so in the case of the Dominion appointee. Well, Sir, whose creature is the Dominion civil servant, if he is not the creature of the Government who appoints him? He says there is a test of fitness imposed that excludes men who are ignorant of matters contained in examination papers. But the passing of that test does not give them a right to be in the Service. The law only provides that they may not be appointed unless they pass that test. We do not object to that, but we complain that no man can be appointed unless he is a Tory, or the particular friend of a Tory. We do not complain that the civil servants are ignorant, and not able to vote intelligently, but we complain that many of them are partisans, and that they are unable to exercise the franchise freely and intelligently, from the knowledge of what is hanging over them if they go against the Government. He says that in the Dominion Service officials are appointed during good behavior. I was astonished to hear him say that; we know it is not the case. A judge is appointed during good behavior, but a civil servant is not; he is appointed during the pleasure of the Minister, and is liable to be dismissed at any moment, with or without reason given. Of course, it is usual to give a reason, but he may be discharged, so far as the law goes, with or without a reason. The hon. gentleman says that in the Provinces they get their pay direct from the Government, and that it is not so in the Dominion Service. Well, where in the name of goodness do they get their pay in the Dominion Service, if it is not from the Government? Are they paid by fees? Are they paid from the proceeds of concerts held for their benefit? If they do not get their pay direct from the Government, where do they get it from? Certainly, they get their salaries from the Government, and the Government may raise them, by promoting the civil servants, or lower them, by degrading the civil servants. They are utterly dependent on the will of the Government. The hon. gentleman goes on to say that promotion goes by examination in the Dominion Service, and here again I was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman say that. Promotion goes by the same rule as appointments. A man cannot be promoted until he has passed a certain examination, but his promotion afterwards is entirely at the discretion of his superior. The superior can say to this man: Step up; or to the other man: Step down. The hon. gentleman's contention that the Dominion Civil Service is more independent than that of the Provinces is absurd on the face of it. His argument is based on the assumption that the Provinces have no Civil Service Acts; but surely a gentleman of his political knowledge cannot be ignorant of the fact that most of the Provinces have a Civil Service Act, and in the Province of Ontario the Civil Service Act is every bit as severe as the Dominion Act, and therefore every check that exists here, exists in the largest Province of the Dominion, and in most of the others. I am bound, however, to agree with the hon. gentleman, when he says that a man's interest in the country springs from other motives than the right to cast a vote. Now, that very truth demolishes all the house of cards that he tried to build up in opposition to this amendment. Why, Sir, if a man's interest in the country and his desire to do his duty to the country does not depend on his right to vote, why oppose taking the right to vote away from him? His loyalty to the country and his desire to do his duty to the country are manifested in doing his duty in the position he holds as a civil servant. That is what he is hired for, that is what he is paid for—to exercise his loyalty to the country as a civil servant. That is where he can exercise all those great abilities which the hon. gentleman credited him with, and which so many of the civil servants undoubtedly possess. An attempt has been made to make a great point about the partisanship of certain Ontario officials. But these are not of the same class as those who will not be touched by this amendment.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They are worse. They go out when the Government goes out.

Mr. CASEY. We are willing to allow the hon. gentleman to have all such officials in his county to help him.

Mr. WHITE. I help myself, without officials.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman is much worse treated than his *confrères*.

Mr. WHITE. How would I get them appointed, when there are no positions for them.

Mr. CASEY. This Bill will make positions. If the McCarthy Act is sustained there will be plenty of positions. In my county there has been an inspector of licenses, at a salary of $600. One year he had no licenses to inspect; another year he had one. If the McCarthy Act is sustained by the Privy Council, this amendment will not prevent officials appointed under it from voting and helping the hon. member for East Hasting.

Mr. WHITE. I do not want their help.

Mr. CASEY. I deny that all officials in Ontario are Grit partisans. I am informed that the Ontario license inspector at Ottawa was a Conservative when he was appointed, and has never since aided the Reform Government.

Mr. TASSÉ. Do you mean to say he has interfered against the local Government.

Mr. CASEY. He has not interfered at all. I am so informed; I do not know personally.

Mr. WHITE. He could not hold his position if he did not.

Mr. CASEY. I am informed that the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) was a license commissioner under the Mowat Government.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Mowat at first appointed two Reform commissioners and one Conservative commissioner in each district. He soon changed his idea, and he now appoints all Reformers.

Mr. CASEY. There is the case of a body of officers who were wiped out by the stroke of a pen—I mean the inspectors of weights and measures appointed by the Reformers. The hon. member for East Hastings has declared he thought interference by officials in politics was wrong, and asked us to stop Mowat. In turn, I ask him and his colleagues to stop the First Minister. He should unite with some hon. gentlemen opposite, not including the hon. members for Ottawa city, who do not feel in that way, in producing an impression on their leader, so as to lead him not to allow the servants of the country and not of any party to become political partisans and take part in political contests.

Mr. HACKETT. It is very unreasonable that the civil servants of the country, who form a very intelligent class, should be deprived of the privilege of casting their ballot. There could not be a greater hardship inflicted on them, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite, who pretend to be very much in favor of extending the franchise, should seek to so much restrict it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has make a stirring appeal to this House, and has spoken very strongly with regard to the civil servants. He said that in 1882, at the time of his election, some of his most prominent opponents were civil servants, who went from place to place and opposed him on

every possible occasion. This is the first time I have heard the statement made in public. Of course I do not doubt the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in my county.

Mr. HACKETT. No; I was looking after my own county. So far as relates to the county of Prince, in 1882 civil servants, and there are civil servants there on both sides of politics, did not take any active part in the campaign. I am of the opinion that if such active measures had been taken by them in Queen's county as the hon. gentleman mentions, we should have heard of it in the Opposition press at that time, and that press would have called the attention of the country to the stand taken by the civil servants. But the hon. gentleman's experience on that occasion was only the experience I had in 1878, when I first contested Prince. The whole Civil Service of the Island was in the hands of the Opposition. In 1874 a sweeping change was made, and all civil servants who were appointed by the Conservative party were dismissed without cause. They were all removed; one or two were appointed again, but the great majority of the civil servants of the Island of Prince Edward were Liberals in 1878. Sir, if active measures had been taken by the Conservative Civil Service in 1882, I want to point out to the hon. gentleman what measures were taken by the Liberal Civil Service in 1878. We all know that the superintendent of the Island Railway, Mr. McKechnie, a respectable gentleman in other respects, who was appointed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) issued a circular letter—I do not know if he had the authority of the Minister, but he was acting directly under him—but he issued this letter to every employé on the railway, instructing them to vote for the Liberal candidate.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. It is a fact, for the letter was published and I saw it in the hands of a section-man. It was sent to all the workmen on the road.

Mr. MACKENZIE. All that I can say is, that I never heard of it.

Mr. HACKETT. I am sure the hon. gentleman would be too fair a man; but nevertheless the superintendent of the Island Railway on that occasion did as I state. It is a matter of public notoriety, and we know, Sir, that when the pressmen visited Prince Edward Island, I think in 1877, a gentleman who was the editor of the Conservative paper in my own county, and who, I think, is within the sound of my voice at this moment, made application to Mr. Mackenzie to have a pass over the railway, the same as the other members of the Press Association, but he was refused, and he was told that it was not customary to give passes to Opposition editors. You can imagine the contest we must have fought, contending for the Conservative cause in Prince Edward Island in 1878, with such partisans controlling the Departments there. Some of the Grits—some of my opponents in 1878—were Customs officers who went from meeting to meeting and took the platform against me, and made the most stirring speeches.

Mr. DAVIES. As they do now.

Mr. HACKETT. The most exciting election, almost, that we ever had on the Island, took place last summer, when the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Mr. Jenkins) was returned; and I have not seen it stated in the press, nor has it been brought to my notice, that the Custom house officials, or the railway officials, in the county, holding Dominion offices, took the stump and canvassed in favor of the Government candidate. Now, a great deal has been said about the superannuation of Mr. McNabb. He was not superannuated for any services he rendered in Prince Edward Island; he was not there during any election contest. He was for twenty-five or thirty years in the service of his country elsewhere as a railway engineer. He was a competent and capable man, until he met with an accident; but he was of that nervous temperament and disposition, and felt so badly the effect of the accident which he met with, that he applied for superannuation. The doctors sent very strong certificates to the Government; and in compliance with his request, having served his country so long, he was superannuated, and I do not think he received anything more than justice at the hands of the Government.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." We have men in Prince Edward Island in the service of the railway who are 75 years of age. Perhaps they have not applied for superannuation; I do not think they have. I believe they are not able to perform their duties, but the right hon. the First Minister, in a mistaken feeling of sympathy, no doubt, has stood by them, and would not superannuate them, simply because he thinks it would be unfair, and because they have not been a sufficiently long time in the service to entitle them to any great amount of superannuation. I hope that his kindness in this respect will be rewarded. I do not think that very strong pressure has been brought to bear on him from the Island, at all events, and I think those who have been a long time in the service should not be put out of their positions without receiving fair superannuation. I say it would be an unreasonable thing, it would be a terrible mistake, that the intelligent civil servants of this country, from one end to the other, should be disfranchised, and more especially by the acts of hon. gentlemen opposite. We know the stand they took with regard to the Indians; how hotly and strongly they opposed granting the franchise to the Indians possessing property qualifications, the same as white men; and now they go so far as to say that the capable and intelligent civil servant of the country should be disfranchised. The principal reason they had that the Indians should not be enfranchised was that they were not intelligent men, but here we have intelligent and competent men, and they would place these men in the same category with the Indians. I think it would be a mistake if the amendment were adopted, and I shall oppose it.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has used some arguments which I think are very strongly in favor of the amendment. If the hon. gentleman's statements can be received and full credence given to them, the facts appear to be, that every Liberal appointee on the Island disgraces his position by making himself a strong political partisan. On every hustings he says that these men appeared——

Mr. HACKETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Does he approve of it?

Mr. HACKETT. I say that is not done now.

Mr. DAVIES. He says that they work day and night in the interest of the Reform party, but that the Conservative appointees are the most immaculate men that ever lived. Does the bitterest partisan on that side of the House believe it?

An hon. MEMBER. If you say so, we must believe it.

Mr. DAVIES. I notice the hon. member for Toronto is one exception, and I am glad of it; no, I see the hon. member for Richmond signifies his approval, too. The fact is, that the appointees made in 1873 and dismissed by the Mackenzie Government were appointments made by a moribund Tory Government, just as they were going out of office. We need not go back to these old sores, but many of those on the Island who hold Customs offices, or who have been railway superintendents—no, I will not say the

present superintendent of the railway, because he has acted impartially in political matters, but some men under him, the men who control the subordinates of the railway, exercise their influence without hesitation in getting the employés to vote in favor of the political party to which they belong. It is notorious that, in the last election, officials took the stump and canvassed from house to house against me.

Mr. HACKETT. Name.

Mr. DAVIES. The first one that occurs to me is the collector of Customs at Rustico, who did nothing for five weeks, except to draw his pay and attend to politics. Talk about the press; that was named in the press at the time, but perhaps the hon. gentleman does not read the papers of the Opposition side of politics very carefully. He was not on the Island at the time, but perhaps his colleague, who knows the facts, will say whether I am over-stating them or not. The hon. gentleman has made an attack on Mr. McKechnie. I am not concerned in defending him, but I had an intimate acquaintance with him, and I must say that there was less politics on the Prince Edward Island Railway then than there has been since, and that the politicians of both sides were allowed full liberty to visit the railway works to canvass, a liberty which is now refused. I say the statements of the hon. gentleman, applied to his political opponents, show conclusively that the amendment should be adopted, because his opponents, at least, appear to have no right to the franchise, because they would abuse it. He wishes the House to assume that the Conservative appointments are all immaculate. That is always the case. The appointees of the Conservative party are always pure and spotless in their political life. He always does his duty, never interferes in politics, and is always pure and spotless in his political life—that is what he wants us to assume. He knows that is nonsense.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman has totally misrepresented what I said. I said that in 1878 officials took part in politics, but that in 1882 they did not; they appeared then to have a proper sense of their duty. The hon. gentleman named one; but he is a man who only receives $100 per annum, and who does not occupy a very high or important position. Although I think a public official has no right to go on a public platform and make speeches, I think he would have a right to deposit his ballot; and that is what the great bulk of the civil servants on Prince Edward Island do.

Mr. TASSÉ. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not yet made good their contention, that the men who constitute the Civil Service desire to be deprived of their political rights, and I do not think they can do so. During the last few days this House has been flooded with petitions signed by Liberal supporters of the Opposition——

Mr. LISTER. And Conservatives.

Mr. TASSÉ. Well, before taking the responsibility of asking the committee to deprive the men who compose the Civil Service of the right to vote, I think hon. gentlemen opposite should at least present to the House a petition, signed by a sufficient number of those gentlemen, expressing their desire to be deprived of that right which they have exercised so far.

Mr. MACKENZIE. And be dismissed for sending such a petition.

Mr. TASSÉ. If it had been presented under the Administration of the hon. gentleman, that might have occurred. No such petition has been presented to us, and I deny that hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House have a right to pose here as the mouthpieces of the Civil Service, because they have not been authorised by them to state that they desire to be deprived of the franchise. I believe it is contrary to the public welfare that public employés should interfere actively in politics; but the members of the Civil Service, who are intelligent men, who possess a deep acquaintance with the public affairs of this country, who are thoroughly posted as to the political antecedents of the public men of this country, are in a better position, owing to these exceptional causes, to give an intelligent vote than almost any other class of the community; and we ought not to take the responsibility of depriving these men of the right of voting, without knowing that such is their desire. I deny that all the members of the Civil Service in Ottawa belong to the Conservative party. A very fair percentage of them belong, as we all know, to the Liberal party.

Mr. LISTER. Not many.

Mr. TASSÉ. Well, if my hon. friend had been in Ottawa during the Administration of the Liberal party, extending from 1874 to 1878, when hundreds of appointments were made, he would, perhaps, have come to another conclusion. I deny that the voting members of the Civil Service are all on the Conservative side, but I say now, that they ought to be, after the effort that has been made by their Liberal friends on the other side of the House to deprive them of the right of giving an independent opinion on the public affairs of the country. I would say to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the Conservative candidates of this city do not depend on the votes of the Civil Service to be elected. It is true, we receive a majority of their votes, and I am proud of it, because they are votes of men who are capable of making an intelligent choice between the candidates who offer themselves for conducting the public affairs of the Dominion. There are in the city 5,000 votes, out of which 300 or 400 belong to the Civil Service; and a better proof that the Conservative candidates of this city are not elected mainly by the Civil Service vote lies in the fact that at the last election, as well as in that of 1878, the Conservative candidates had a majority, not only in the section of the capital where the Civil Service vote is situated, but we had the honor to secure a majority in every ward, and especially in that section of Ottawa where the working classes live—in the ward of Ottawa, in the ward of Victoria, and in By ward, as well as in every other ward of this city. This fact proves conclusively that the Conservative candidates have not to depend on the Civil Service vote to obtain seats in this House as the representatives of Ottawa. Is it surprising that the city of Ottawa should have expressed itself on the Conservative side either at the last or the previous election? The city of Ottawa has only done what has been done by every great city of the Dominion.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. TASSE. My hon. friend says, "no." On what side was the great city of Montreal, the great city of Toronto, the great city of Hamilton, which elects Liberals to the Local House, the city of Halifax, and a great many other cities and towns that I could mention? The city of Ottawa has maintained its political principles, and I am afraid, for the sake of my friends on the other side of the House, that as long as they fail to submit to the people of this country a better policy than they have now, it will be many years before the people of the city of Ottawa elect members to support them.

Mr. IRVINE. I would regret very much to give my vote to prevent any resident of Canada from exercising the franchise, but I am not sure, from the course some persons in the Outside Service have pursued, however the members of the Inside Service may act, that it would be a very wholesome provision to deprive them of the use of the franchise. With reference to the officials in my own county, many of whom are Conservatives, in both elections in which I have run I must say that they have pursued a wisely reticent course, and I have not the slightest fault to find with

them. I cannot say the same in reference to those in the constituency the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue represents. In my first election two or three officers in the Outside Service came down to my constituency and canvassed and spoke against me. There names were Mr. Bedel, collector, who worked in the parish of Kent, on the east side of the River St. John, and Mr. Baird, preventive officer, who worked in Wicklow, on the east side. They had not, however, much influence in those parishes, for they were given to understand, very early in the day, that they had much better attend to their own business. Men such as these may make very good partisan officers, but are very poor men to be trusted with the franchise.

Mr. FOSTER. It occurred to me that possibly the zeal now manifested by hon. gentlemen opposite on this question had not its counterpart when they held office. From 1873 to 1878 they held office, and it will be interesting to see how far they then held to the principle they lay down to-day. From Confederation until 1873 the election laws of Canada in force previous to Confederation were continued, and in 1873 a temporary Act was passed, which perpetuated nearly all the principles of that law. In 1874, however, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they introduced an election Act, and in that Act they did away with all the disabilities of the old Act, as regards people in the pay of the Government, except in the case of judges. These disabilities were enacted in the old statutes as follows:—

"The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors of Upper Canada,—the Chief Justice and Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada,—the Chief Justices and Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas in Upper Canada, and of the Superior Court in Lower Canada,—the Judge of the Court of Vice-Admiralty in Lower Canada,—the Judge of any Court of Escheats,—all county and circuit judges, all commissioners of bankrupts,—all recorders of cities,—all officers of the Customs,—all clerks of the Peace, registrars, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, deputy clerks of the Crown and agents for the sale of Crown lands,—and officers employed in the collection of any duties payable to Her Majesty, in the nature of duties of Excise,—shall be disqualified, and incompetent to vote at any election of a member of the Legislative Council or of the Legislative Assembly."

This section was repealed and section 39 of Act of 1874 was put in its place, as follows:

"The Chancellor and Vice-Chancellors of Ontario and the judges of any court now existing or to be hereafter created, whose appointment shall rest with the Governor-General of the Dominion, shall be disqualified and incompetent to vote at the election of a member to the House of Commons of Canada."

These very officials whom those hon. gentlemen now want to see disqualified were disqualified under the old Act; their disqualification was continued under the Act of 1873, but it was removed by the Act of 1874, the work of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, and some of those hon. gentlemen then had seats in this House. We have had a great many mature opinions as to what the ballot would and would not do; and it is remarkable how differently hon. gentlemen opposite regard its working in this particular compared with their views as to its effect when introducing the measure. The hon. Mr. Dorion, in introducing his election Bill, giving the ballot and removing the disabilities hon. gentlemen now wish to restore, said:

"He would add that secret voting, while it did not prevent candidates paying away as much money as they pleased, would so regulate matters that the party who paid money would not know how the party to whom he paid it had exercised the franchise, and thus the ballot would take away one of the principal inducements to bribery."

Now, if any man in the world would be apt to know how a person voted under the ballot it would be the man who paid money to get him to vote a certain way. Later on, we find that when the hon. Chief Justice's opinion was asked as to the advisability of excluding Civil Service clerks, he said:

"Under the ballot, he could not see why Government officials, including Customs officers, should not vote. He thought every one should vote under the ballot. His motives for prohibiting judges from voting [and I commend this to my hon. friend, my intelligent, learned, good-natured friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies)] was that he did not consider it was desirable they should mix themselves up in politics, because, if they did, they would not have the confidence reposed in them by the public it was desirable they should have."

Mr. DAVIES. That is the kernel of the whole thing.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend understands that a judge has to do with trials, and if he takes part in politics he will be apt to lose the confidence of those who appear before him, who may belong to the opposite political party. I commend these salutary lessons to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to none more than to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who, if I mistake not, with all his philosophical lore and depth of logic, had a seat in the House at that time.

Mr. FISHER. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side have stated, and stated fairly enough, that the onus of proof was laid upon those who desire to disfranchise any individual in this country. It is a great pity that the right hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, and his colleagues, were not possessed of that opinion when he proposed to disfranchise so many individuals as are disfranchised under this Bill. My hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., however, has fully accepted the responsibility laid upon us in supporting this amendment, of providing the necessity of disfranchising those civil servants whom it is intended to disfranchise. The germ of that proof is in the statement that those civil servants are open to charges of partisanship. I do not mean that, as civil servants, they have not the right to be partisans; but, unfortunately for the Civil Service and for the country, I believe that the results of their partisanship will work to their detriment or to their advancement in the Civil Service. In a Service which was not managed by the political chiefs of one great party, it would not matter much whether a person showed political partisanship or not; but when the chiefs of the Service are leading one of the great political parties we can see very easily that the partizanship of the employé must be very closely connected with his remuneration or advancement. I do not wish to charge hon. gentlemen opposite with being more partisan than are the chiefs of the other political party. I believe this would be the case under either political party. I believe it is almost necessitated by the party system of our Government, and as long as we have the country governed by party I believe that this argument will hold good. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island gave some instances of gross partisanship which had been performed by Liberals in the Civil Service. I do not know whether his statements are well founded or not, but whether Liberals or Conservatives had done this, it does not matter; the deed itself is the best argument which can possibly be advanced for the adoption of the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. I have known one or two instances of a similar kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite have intimated that civil servants are not partisans, and have not been used in political campaigns. I know that, in my own political contests, I have had to contend with one, if not two, of the servants of hon. gentlemen opposite, who stumped my county against me. It was not in the election in which I was successful, in 1882, but in the bye-election of 1880, when I was defeated by a small majority, and when I had the whole political influence of hon. gentlemen opposite thrown into my county. At that time, a gentleman in the employment of the Department of Agriculture came into my county and stumped it thoroughly, and met me on almost every platform. I do not mean to attribute my defeat on that occasion to the services of that gentleman on the platform. Whatever other services he may have performed, I am not well enough acquainted with him to say; but on that occasion I met him frequently, and I believe I am perfectly correct in saying that he was sent by the Department in whose service he was. At all events, he came, and I have never been able to find out, although I have asked for the information, what

other business he had in the Eastern Townships at that time or that any remuneration which he was receiving for the services he owed to his country was decreased in consequence of the services he performed for his party and his political chief. I do not consider that that is a sufficient reason why the Civil Service should be disfranchised. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) has said that the Civil Service do not desire to be disfranchised. I am not in a position to say that they all desire to be disfranchised. I can only say that I remember four different individuals in the Civil Service, residing in this city, one of whom is a Liberal, and, in regard to the other three, I do not know that they have any political bias, but they all informed me that they would like to be disfranchised. The one who was a Liberal told me that, in consequence of being a Liberal, he did not dare to vote openly, or to announce that he had voted against hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not very familiar with the members of the Civil Service, but in one or two discussions in which I have taken part, when members of the Service have been present, I have not heard one single civil servant express the desire to have the franchise continued to them. I do not think that this is a very strong argument either, because I do not think it is necessary that the civil servants should want to be disfranchised. If their enfranchisement is a wrong to the country and a disadvantage to the service, it is not necessary to ask them whether they want it or not. I vote for the amendment of my hon. friend from Bothwell on other grounds. I vote for it because I believe it is for the benefit of the Civil Service itself and for the benefit of the country that they should not have the franchise. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that they vote by ballot, and that it is not known how they vote. Do those hon. gentlemen want the civil servants to conceal their sentiments? If a civil servant is known to be a Liberal, and casts his vote for a Liberal candidate, it is known, almost to a certainty, and that is enough to imperil his advancement in the Service. I suppose it can be made secret, and I suppose in some case it is made secret, but in many cases it is perfectly well known how the individuals vote, though they vote by ballot. In the Province of Quebec a larger number of civil servants are disfranchised than it is proposed to disfranchise by this amendment. In that Province not only the provincial civil servants, but the servants of the Dominion Government, are prevented from voting. The law of that Province disfranchises the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Superior Court, the judge of the Vice-Admiralty court, the judges of Sessions, the district magistrates and recorders, the officers of Customs, the clerks of the Crown, the clerks of the peace, the registrars, the sheriffs, deputy sheriffs deputy clerks of Crown, the officers and men of the provincial and municipal police force; and further than that, agents for the sale of Crown lands, postmasters in cities and towns, all officers employed in the collection of duties payable to Her Majesty, in the nature of duties of Excise, including collectors, as well of federal as of local revenues. This law, be it observed, was passed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite; it was the Conservative Government in the Province of Quebec who disfranchised all those civil servants, not only the servants over whom they had control, but the servants of the Government of their own friends here at Ottawa. And much more, therefore, is it necessary, that the servants of this Government should not be allowed to vote for the Government who has control of their remuneration and advancement. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), contended that the civil servants were men of high intelligence. I have no quarrel with that statement; I believe that they are fully of the average intelligence of the community. But I am not aware that any hon. gentleman on this side of the House desire that they should be disfranchised on account of their lack of intelligence. We do not wish to disfranchise them because they are less intelligent than the rest of the community, but upon a wholly different ground, which has been clearly set forth. The hon. gentleman implied that the test of intelligence was sufficient to put them out of the range of political partisanship. I do not think it is the less intelligent classes of our community alone who are open to the charge of partisanship, or of strong party bias. I believe there are men sitting in this House, of the highest intelligence in the land, who are as strong political partisans as can possibly be found among the most ignorant people of the country. But unfortunately the intelligence test of these civil servants is not carried far enough to remove them from the political arena. If that test were made as it is in the English Civil Service examinations, then the test of intelligence would not only show that these people had a right to vote, but it would remove them from the political arena, by making them independent of party control. The test of which the hon. gentleman has spoken only shows that those who pass it have sufficient intelligence to perform the lowest duties connected with that branch. But their appointment still lies in the hands of the chief of the Department, as well as their promotion and dismissal. The hon. Minister of Customs has pointed to some examples in which men have been promoted, irrespective of their political opinions. I am glad to hear that that is so; I am willing to admit there are many such examples; and that only shows how very able and competent must be the Liberals in the Service, who have been able to obtain that promotion, in the face of their political opinions. I have no doubt, however, that for the sake of that advancement they did not sacrifice their political opinions, but I am afraid there are many gentlemen in the Service who have not as much moral courage, and who, for the sake of promotion, might change their opinions. Hon. gentlemen opposite have contended, I think the hon. member for Ottawa claimed, that the civil servants are not partisan. Now, I think no one who is acquainted with the administration of our Civil Service system will deny that appointments to that service are nearly always made to recompense some political service. Men are appointed to the Service simply because they have been partisans, and their political services enable them to curry favor with the Government and to press their claim for appointment. The greatest argument that can be used to the head of a Department for the appointment of a person, is that so and so was able to do me (the member for his county) some political service in the last election. Now, I think it is very desirable that this disfranchising clause should go much farther than it does; I think we, on this side of the House, have clearly established our proposition that members of the Civil Service should be disfranchised, and I intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell,

Mr. CASGRAIN. The question with me is whether the benefit that would accrue from disfranchising civil servants would outweigh the possible evil. I admit that they are so much under the control of the Government that they can scarcely give an unbiassed vote. There is another class of civil servants who have a dread of the powers that be, and accordingly vote in a certain direction. So they do not give a free vote, as they would do if they were not under the influence of the Government. The Government and heads of the Departments use the civil servants as canvassers at elections, and for that reason, among others, I would not allow them to exercise the franchise. No doubt some of the civil servants simply exercise their right to vote, but there are others who act very differently. I can quote an instance in my own case. An employé in the office of the Board of Works canvassed my county openly, and of course it was to the neglect of his other duties. I

would not object to that, if the individual opposed me as a citizen and assumed the responsibility of his vote. Although this step proposed is a grave step to take, yet in view of the evils arising from the system, I am in favor of the adoption of the amendment, and I believe that a number of the civil servants would prefer that they did not possess the right of the franchise.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I am very reluctant to continue this debate, because the subject has been very fully discussed, and it may be that what I am going to say may not throw any light on the subject, or convince anyone. But perhaps it may be as well, as I have pretty strong opinions on the subject of Government officials voting, and the way in which they should exercise the franchise, that I should give expression to those views, so that I may not be accused of having failed to give, when this subject was before the House and was so thoroughly discussed, my views, because they are quite strong views. I am strongly of the opinion that the civil servants should not be disfranchised. They should have the same privileges as other citizens, if they possess the qualifications that other men are required to possess in order to exercise the franchise. That is the first principle I lay down. The second principle is, that they should be at perfect liberty to exercise the franchise, irrespective of party. They should exercise it in a way so as not to make themselves offensive, not to make themselves incur the enmity of one party or the liking of the other party. That is the course I think they should pursue, if they want to retain their offices. If, however, they want to throw themselves into election conflicts, they must take the risk into their own hands; that is, they must stand or fall by the party; and civil servants should be at liberty to take that active position. Let them, if they please, take the hustings and act as would the candidate or his friends. Then they must accept the fate of their party, and go down with it. If their party stands, they will stand with it, and *vice versa*. If he mixes in politics, and holds very strong opinions, and desires to do all he can for one of the parties, and takes the hustings, or otherwise makes himself a political partisan or a canvasser, while I admit he has a right to do that, and no fault can be found with him, if the party remains in power he will remain in power; still, if it does not, he should be put out. He should take the fate of the party, and go out with it. Those are the principles I entertain. In the county I represent I know several people who hold Government offices and who voted against me. I find no fault with them for having voted against me, and even if they have, in an inoffensive way, said something against me. I would never ask for their dismissal on such grounds, because they have a right to exercise the franchise. But when a civil servant takes the stump and goes to the extent that some have gone to in my county, of breaking the election laws for the purpose of defeating the candidate whom they knew to be friendly to the Government, then I think such an officer should be dismissed. I say this publicly, in this House and in the presence of the Government. But if civil servants only go to the extent of simply exercising the franchise they should not be disturbed. These are the three principles I lay down as guiding me in giving my vote: Civil servants should have the franchise. If they simply exercise it they should not be disturbed. If they exercise it in any other way, they should accept the fate of their party, and either stand or fall with it.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we consider that there are between 3,000 and 3,500 civil servants, we must recognise that this is an important question, and I do not think the time devoted to its discussion has been in any sense lost. In 1874 the ballot was introduced, and no doubt the Liberal Government were quite willing to extend the franchise to as many people as possible. Consequently, this class was not excluded. We have had ten years' experience of the ballot, and we have some reason to believe that those people have not followed the course indicated by my esteemed friend who has just sat down. If the civil servants had adopted the course of simply voting and taking no active part in support of either political party, this discussion might not have taken place. But we know that, notwithstanding the fact that they have had the privilege of exercising the franchise in a quiet way, under the operation of the ballot, there has been great evidence, on the part of individuals at least, if not on the part of the whole Civil Service, that they have, in many cases, shown themselves to be partisan, and taken a prominent and open part in the elections of this Dominion. Now, I contend, in the interests of the Dominion, that it is highly desirable that those people should be completely removed from any political influence or sympathy which they might exercise on behalf of any party. In the first place, take the Civil Service in Ottawa. It is desirable that when there is a change of Government the Government that comes in should meet with a class of civil servants who have no bitter political feelings, but are prepared to discharge their duties as honestly and faithfully under the Government coming into power as under the preceding Government. Now, we have reason to believe that when the hon. member for East York went into power in 1873 there were in the Departments at Ottawa people who were willing, from day to day and from week to week, to make known to journals on the Opposition side little incidents which transpired in the offices — they were anxious to pick up and communicate anything with which fault might be found, to their opponents. Now, I care not what Government is in power, I hold that as long as you perpetuate to those people the right to exercise the franchise you continue the feeling which will lead them to do little things of that kind, that are very objectionable. Now, is it not desirable to guard the franchise so as to secure for the people of this Dominion the free and independent exercise of that franchise, and, as far as possible, thus secure the free and independent exercise of their citizenship. We are now considering the enfranchisement of something over 3,000 individuals. If you scatter them among a number of evenly-balanced constituencies, where there are a dozen or two in the service of the Government, you may affect the returns of a dozen constituencies. I dare say there are in this House a dozen or more who have been returned with from ten to twenty of a majority. Well, if you permit a certain number of civil servants in any particular constituency to exercise the franchise, you are, to that extent, aiding the Government of the day. I find that there is on the list, at the present moment, no less than 1,753 civil servant officers who are eligible to be superannuated to-morrow—that is, officers who have served in the Civil Service over ten years. When they serve that time they are eligible to be superannuated, and can fairly claim retiring allowances or superannuation under that system. I am sure that any gentleman who understands the extent of the influence that, no doubt, can be exercised on the part of the Government upon any of those who are seeking retiring allowances under the operation of this statute, will easily see how far their influence will go in a matter of that kind. When you consider that they are looking forward, after the expiration of those ten years, to some day getting a retiring allowance at the hands of the Government, and that their retiring allowance will largely depend on their apparent service, along with the favor and kindness of the Government, you must see that it would be natural on their part to cultivate a kindly feeling on the part of those who are in power. They are anxious in their own interests to place themselves in a position, so that if it was necessary to approach the head of the Department they would meet with the kindly turn, which they might naturally expect if they

were politically devoted to the cause of the head of that Department. So I say that it is natural that they should support the party in power, whichever party it may happen to be. I say that this is not an independent and untrammeled exercise of the franchise by any means. You are giving ballots to men who are going to cast them in their own personal and individual interest. He cannot possibly separate himself from the fact that it is his interest to keep on the best terms with the party in power. Politics has little consideration for him, unless in his own personal interest, and it is natural to suppose that he would cast his ballot in favor of the head of the Department, simply because he wants to be on good terms with him. There is another point. I understand that those civil servants pay no taxes; they are not liable to be taxed for their income, and therefore I do not think it is right that they should be permitted to exercise the franchise. It is a well known principle in England that those who do not pay taxes should not be permitted to vote, and it is a principle carried out in a good many of the United States, so that I think the case of our civil servants would not be worse than the case of others who are similarly situated. The hon. member for King's referred to the fact that Mr. Dorion, in introducing his Bill, did not suggest the disfranchisement of that particular class. But if you look back to the discussion, you will find that the former member for Ca.dwell, the late Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, strongly advocated the continuation of the provincial voters' lists. Other members of the Conservative party took the same political view, but hon. gentlemen opposite now turn round and hold an opposite view. We can point to dozens of cases in which hon. gentlemen opposite expressed different political opinions in the past from those they entertain now. I cannot deny the propriety of the hon. members for Ottawa city advocating the enfranchisement of the Civil Service. No doubt it is in their own interest. It reminds me of a story about a member of the Scotch Church, at the time of the disruption. He was asked why he did not come out and join the Free Church, and he said he had five living reasons why he should not leave the church to which he belonged—a wife and four children, and that the church contributed a certain sum annually to his support. I dare say there are 600 living reasons why the hon. members for Ottawa should support the enfranchisement of the Civil Service, because no doubt their strong advocacy of this matter will create a kindly feeling which may be of advantage to them on a future occasion. I believe, if we were privately and individually to consult the feelings of the Civil Service, we would find that a very large percentage of them would prefer being placed in a position where they would not be asked or driven to exercise the franchise by either party. In the next place, it is unreasonable to expect them to sign petitions in favor of their being disfranchised. that would be virtually saying to the party in power: We do not want to support you; we do not choose to give you our votes; we wish to be placed in the position of not being obliged to vote for anybody. You would not expect them to say to the party in power: We are opposed to you. It would be unfair to them to place them in that position. We know from the returns which have been laid before Parliament, that there are in the city of Ottawa, at the present time, 140 civil servants, who have received not only their annual salary for the services they perform, but something like $57,000 during the last year for extra services, or an average of $412 apiece. You can hardly expect that an officer placed under obligations of this kind to the Government he serves would be likely to give a very independent vote. He would naturally say to himself: I have been favored in a good many ways, and it is desirable, in my own interest, in every way, that I should support the party in power, who have treated me so kindly. You deprive the judges of the right to exercise the franchise—why? Simply because they are the higher servants of the Dominion; they are supposed to adjudicate on issues between the two political parties; and it is proper that they should be free from any bias. That is perfectly right; but it is just as necessary that the Civil Service of this country should be kept absolutely free from political influence, in order that they may efficiently and faithfully discharge their duties to the public. I have heard it stated that, in one of the Departments in this city, from week to week and from month to month, financial statements have been prepared for publication in the *Mail* newspaper in Toronto, setting forth the financial condition of this Dominion in a very bright and glowing color. If this is done in any Department of the Civil Service it is very wrong. I do not desire to prevent any journal in the Dominion from using any just means to procure information; but, for an official of any Department to prepare statements for publication, in order to put a bright side on the financial condition of the Dominion, is exceedingly wrong and imprudent, and should not be permitted. In order to prevent anything of that kind, the Civil Service should be kept absolutely free from political control; and unless you disfranchise them altogether, so that they will have no interest in the political issues that come before the country from time to time, their political feeling will undoubtedly grow upon them, because we know perfectly well that a man who exercises the franchise from year to year becomes more and more interested in the success of his party. We know, too, that men who are freed from the exercise of the franchise gradually lose that one sidedness and that interest in party politics which they might otherwise feel. We know that men who have had seats in Parliament, and are appointed county judges, at first show a little favoritism to their friends, but after being on the bench a number of years they lose that feeling, and it would be almost impossible to decide on which side of politics they were. It is just as important that the members of the Civil Service should be free from that kind of influence as the judges. With regard to the superannuations, it is unfair to place the civil servants in a positon to claim an increased number of year's service when they come to retire. We know that in the past a great many years have been added to the service of those who have retired on the superannuation list, and the expenses of the country have been very seriously increased thereby. It has been stated by one gentleman that there are grounds to believe that these additions have been made in some instances through political favoritism. I do not say whether that is the case or not, but it is highly desirable that such a state of things should not be continued. The civil servant who goes out at an election and does all kinds of dirty work, whether he is a Conservative or a Reformer, will naturally expect to receive some favor in return. In every election you will find public officials in almost every constituency of the Dominion. It is decidedly wrong that they should be required or permitted to do such duty. They should not be permitted to have any opportunity whatever of taking part in any political contest. During the last ten years they have proved themselves unworthy of the exercise of the ballot; if they have taken part in elections to such an extent as to warrant this House in believing they are unable to make a prudent and judicious exercise of the franchise under the ballot, it is but right, in the interests of the country and of the Departments, that this privilege should be taken from them. Men so devoted to one political party will, in the discharge of their duties, try to make matters in their own offices to appear in such a shape as to put the best side they possibly can, on even a black cause. If the country requires anything, it is a well prepared statement of its affairs every year, it is an unvarnished and unbiased showing of the actual facts in the Blue Books; and in order to have that

we must have a class of civil servants completely free from party bias. I think very warmly on this question; I have taken an active part in the investigation of the superannuation question since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and I have been able to ferret out some of the evils of the system. In many cases additions have been made to our annual expenditure under the system, which would not have been made if those in the service of the country had not been devoted political partisans. Year after year people have been superannuated, who, if they had not given that evidence of deserving more than fair and reasonable treatment at the hands of the Government, would not be to-day in the receipt of the very large amounts they are drawing from the resources of the Dominion, living in comfort and ease. I will take another opportunity of making some remarks on the subject of superannuation. I am opposed to the enfranchisement of any class which is not in a position of exercising the privilege conferred upon them as British subjects with that independence which should characterise the exercise of the franchise, no matter by whom it may be exercised. No doubt the city of Ottawa is held in the interests of the Government simply because a large number of civil servants vote for the Government candidate; no doubt they consider it their interests to continue in power any Government which is so kind as to give to 140 of them $57,000 in a year for extra services; it is but human that they should. Just so long as they exercise the franchise so long will the Government deem it desirable to increase the expenditure year by year. We are anxious, on this side, that the franchise should be given to all who, by their circumstances and intelligence, are in a position to exercise it independently and intelligently; but as regards the Civil Service, I am of opinion that they are not in this position. I take the same stand in their regard as in the case of the Indian; to give the franchise to the one is equally objectionable as to give it to the other.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), in dealing with this question, evidently had in his mind's eye the large class of civil servants in this city and the advantage that must necessarily result to himself in being put on record as the defender of that class. As I understand it, at his last election the hon. gentleman had a majority of 317, while, as a matter of fact, there are 400 Civil Service employés in the Departments, supposed to be Conservatives. The hon. gentleman said he had not only a majority in the quarters of the city where the civil servants reside, but also where the workingmen reside; but it is well known that at that particular time there was a very large development of dandelions on the Parliament grounds, which required a large number of the workingmen of this city to clear away. Hence originated the name "the dandelion brigade." The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), in reading the Consolidated Statutes of 1859 and those of 1874, omitted to read a subsequent clause in the latter, which materially alters the case. It is to the effect that all persons qualified to vote at the provincial elections shall be entitled to vote at the Dominion elections. In Ontario, officials similar to those it is now proposed to disfranchise have been disfranchised, such as postmasters in cities and towns, and Customs officials. The hon. gentleman said that these Civil Service officials occupy positions after passing examinations under the Civil Service Act, but he omitted to state that the Act exempts a number of officials from its operation. I do not wish to further detain the committee, but as it is alleged that the license inspectors and Division Court officials in Ontario are active political agents, I may state that in the riding I represent the chairman of the Conservative Association is the Division Court clerk, and the inspector of licenses under the Dominion License Act is the vice-president.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MCMULLEN.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to speak for a moment on a question which I suppose is a question of privilege. I will guard myself against bringing up anything to provoke discussion. On the 18th May the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) felt himself constrained to appeal from a decision given by you, Mr. Chairman. After that appeal had been taken I rose and attempted to address you. The committee, misunderstanding the object for which I rose, asked me to maintain order, called upon me to sit down, and I need not read the *Hansard* report which I have beside me, which shows that there was a good deal of disorder in the House. I attempted to make myself heard, but the committee got beyond your control, and I therefore was unfortunate enough not to be able to attain that object. I suppose the committee were fully of the opinion, as the reporters in the press gallery seem to have been, that I desired to thrust myself on the committee and on your ruling, and, after you had decided that it should not be argued, to argue it. I do not care personally for the comments in the press which have appeared in consequence of the misconception of the position which I took, but I simply desire to read to the committee what the *Hansard* shows was the position which I took:

"Listen to me. When the House was appealed to before, when the Speaker was in the Chair, the Speaker said that, before the appeal was decided upon, there should be a discussion as to the point."

When I rose, it was not to challenge your ruling, it was not to refer to your ruling, but it was to avail myself of the privilege which I understood, by the ruling of the Speaker before, I had, that before a point was submitted to him it should be argued in the committee. The committee, being in such disorder, thought I was endeavoring to force myself on you and on the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As this resolution has been disposed of, and as there is another resolution on this head which I intend to present, I do not think it would be worth while to go into it now. Still, I do not think that hon. gentlemen have carried out the arrangement, which was that I was to have the opportunity of moving that to-day. That was frustrated by the debate which arose, and in which the hon. members have been repeating the same thing over and over. I do not think the arrangement has been carried out in a good spirit.

Mr. MILLS. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. He said he wished to carry the two sub-sections of the 9th section without carrying the section, and I told him that there were three amendments which we desired to make, one relating to the revising officer, the one just voted down, and the one relating to the Indians. I thought that, as the discussion on the Indian question was likely to be longer than that on the other two, it would be more convenient to take the other two first, and I intimated that when I rose. I would have taken my seat if the hon. gentleman had intimated that it was his desire to begin with the Indians; but knowing what the nature of the amendment was and what sort of discussion was likely to take place on this particularly short day, I thought it was more desirable to get the others disposed of, than to bring up a discussion which we certainly could not have got through to-day. I do not think the Minister is doing me justice in saying that there was any violation of the understanding.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There may be a misunderstanding, but I stated to the hon. gentleman that the First Minister would make his motion about the Indians to-day as section *c*, and that the hon. gentleman would then make his motion about the civil servants and that about the other matter. I thought the hon. gentleman understood fully that the First Minister was to move first, because I told him it would be section *c*, coming immediately after sections *a* and *b*.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know anything about the arrangement, because I was not here, but I heard my hon. friend from Bothwell make the suggestion that it would be more convenient that these amendments should be moved first, and the First Minister certainly did not indicate any dissent. It was, in a manner, placed in his hands, and instead of suggesting that there was any violation of an arrangement, he entered into the question of the revising officer, and we settled it, and the present discussion has been participated in equally by both sides of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the hon. gentleman moved his amendment I thought the discussion would be so short that I did not object to it, but the hon. gentleman was actually writing it while the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) got up and refused to sit down, and spoke at large, without any amendment being before the Chair, until the hon. gentleman made his motion. I thought that unfair.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will remember that I rose before the hon. member for West Elgin and stated the effect of the amendment I intended to propose. The amendment was in the hands of my hon. friend beside me, but he was not here and his desk was locked, and I had to write out another amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a misunderstanding, and I shall say no more about it. Under these circumstances, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6:5 p. m., until 1:30 p. m. on Tuesday, the 26th May.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

PRIVILEGE—PETITIONS AGAINST THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to an article of the Ottawa *Citizen*, of this city. On a former occasion, when I received a petition which I asked the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to present, on which he had alleged there were twenty-eight Conservative signatures, the *Citizen* made the charge that these signatures were probably obtained by forging them. A short discussion arose, and an impression was attempted to be left upon the House that, if those names were not forgeries, they were obtained by fraud or misrepresentation. I do not think, in justice to those twenty-eight men who signed that petition, and in justice to the hon. member who presented it, and to myself, who asked him to do so, the matter should remain in that position. Especially is this the case, as I to-day received a communication from Wiarton, the place where the electors were who signed the petition, from over twenty of those Conservatives who were alleged to have signed it by fraud and misrepresentation; and I ask permission to read this communication to the House on the subject, as a matter of privilege. It is addressed to myself, and is as follows:—

"We, the undersigned Conservatives (and electors), desire, in the most emphatic manner, to contradict the gross insinuation made in the House of Commons, to the effect that our names were secured on the Wiarton petition against the proposed Franchise Bill by fraud and misrepresentation; and we further desire so say that we think it quite consistent with the principles professed by the Liberal Conservative party to protest against a measure which we consider is intended to stifle public opinion and the free exercise of the franchise."

This document is signed by (A C) Samuel Atkinson, Conservative; (A C) John West (his mark), Conservative; (A C) Thomas Vogan, Conservative; (C) Frank Campbell, M.D., Conservative; (A B C) A. G. Staley, Conservative; (A B C) E. A. Pinnock, Conservative; (A B C) J. J. Clark, Conservative; (A B C) Charles Reckin, Conservative; (A B C) Henry Richmond Anthony Ealy, Liberal Conservative; (C) A. R. Davis, Liberal Conservative; (C) James Hunter, Liberal Conservative; (C) J. Robinson, Liberal Conservative; (C) Sableir Brothers, Liberal Conservatives; (C) John A. James, Liberal Conservative; (B C) W. Heath, Liberal Conservative; (B C) James McKim, Independent Conservative; (C) W. J. Clark, printer, Liberal Conservative; (B C) Nathaniel E. Low, P. L. Surveyor, Liberal Conservative; (C D) James Redfern, Liberal Conservative; (C) R. Collins, Liberal Conservative. There is another name, J. F. Kent. It may have been struck out as there is a mark through it, but I cannot tell. In connection with the document there are two declarations, as follows:—

CANADA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, COUNTY OF BRUCE,
WIARTON, 21st May, 1885.

I, Alexander A. Campbell, of the village of Wiarton, county of Bruce, hereby certify that I did personally wait on the parties marked "C," signers to foregoing declaration; that I used no improper means nor misrepresented facts to obtain their signatures, and that the above signatures are *bonâ fide*, and I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true.

ALEXANDER A. CAMPBELL

Sworn before me, the day and year first above mentioned, at Wiarton, in the county of Bruce.

A. M. TYSON, J. P.,
County of Bruce.

We, the undersigned, Samuel Atkinson, Walter Roach Holdin and Herman J. Spence, all of the village of Wiarton, in the county of Bruce, hereby certify that we did accompany one Alexander A. Campbell when he waited on the parties signing the above declaration, opposite whose names are appended our several letters, and that the parties so indicated did freely sign their respective names, without improper solicitation on the part of Campbell aforesaid, and that the signatures to which we vouch are the *bonâ fide* signatures of the parties therein named.

SAMUEL ATKINSON, for letter "A," 8 names.
W. R. HOLDIN, for letter "B," 8 names.
HERMAN J. SPENCE, for letter "D," 2 names.

Sworn before me this 21st day of May, 1885, at Wiarton, in the county of Bruce.

A. M. TYSON, J. P.,
County of Bruce.

I think, in the face of these facts, the allegation that the signatures were obtained by fraud and misrepresentation cannot be maintained.

Mr. McNEILL. I suppose it devolves upon me to make a personal explanation with respect to the matter which the hon. gentleman has just brought before the House. I received a letter from a gentleman living in Wiarton, who is, as every one will admit who knows him, as much respected for his conscientiousness and for his strict probity as any man in the county of Bruce or in the Province of Ontario. That gentleman wrote to me in a letter, which I have not here at this moment, but which I will take an opportunity of reading to the House, that the signatures of the Conservatives on the petitions were obtained by misrepresentation of the grossest kind; and among other misrepresentations used was the statement that it was proposed by the First Minister to enfranchise the North-West Indians. And, if the names which have just been read were obtained under such a statement, after the explanation made by the First Minister to the House, I contend they were obtained by misrepresentation—I do not wish to make use of stronger terms. I contend that the names so obtained were perfectly valueless; and I am satisfied that when I hear from Wiarton on the subject—I will write to my correspondent—I will find that those gentlemen are still under that apprehension, and those who have signed the document just read to the House did so on account of the representation made to them on the second as well as the first occasion, that it was proposed to

enfranchise Strike-him-on-the-back and all the other Indians mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. And so it was.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

On section 9,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was arranged that this matter respecting the Indians should be finally concluded and voted upon on Saturday, and that on Tuesday we should commence with the clause respecting the registration of voters; but better late than never. I stated on several occasions, when we were discussing matters with reference to the franchise of the Indians, that the proper time to bring them up would be on the qualification of voters. I have prepared a sub-paragraph, which I shall read. The clause points out who shall not vote at elections, and as we have adopted a sub-section, providing that the revising barrister shall not vote for two years after revising the lists, that would be paragraph *c* and this will be *d*:

Indians in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories, and Indians on any reserve elsewhere in Canada, who are not in possession and occupation of separate and distinct tracts of land on such reserves, and whose improvements on such separate tracts are not to the value of at least $150

Mr. MACKENZIE. Occupation as owners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is a distinction without a difference.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman may think so, but I do not. It is drawn up by myself, though I think it is rather unfair that Indians should not vote who have a right in the soil on which their improvements have been made. But in order to prevent, as far as I can, any objection, I hold that Indians on a reserve, who have distinct and separate holdings, who have made improvements —a house or other improvements—to the value of $150, should have a vote, just as much as any other occupant or tenant. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of the question of the propriety or impropriety of allowing Indians on the reserves to vote at all. It has been discussed *ad nauseam*, first on the interpretation clause and subsequently at great length by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite. I shall move this amendment.

Mr. MACKENZIE. They will vote *ad nauseam*, too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt the votes we have given are a good deal of a sickener for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that the question as to the propriety or impropriety of Indians on reserves voting has been very much discussed, that he does not propose to add any discussion to what has already taken place on that question, because it has been discussed *ad nauseam*. Well, I do not think the hon. gentleman has discussed that question very much himself. I do not think the hon. gentleman has said very much in defence of this clause, and from the benches which are filled by his usual followers, there have proceeded, from time to time, from more than one of his supporters, observations indicative of opposition to this clause, as now proposed to be amended. Now, Sir, although the hon. gentleman thinks that there has been quite sufficient discussion to enable the committee to dispose of this clause, I do not share his opinion, because I have not yet heard any ground upon which this clause, with its qualifications, can be properly adopted. When the hon. gentleman first brought forward this measure he was asked, upon the interpretation clause, what he meant with reference to the Indians, and he told us it was intended to include the Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia. He stated that positively, in answer to my hon. friend. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Mills) was unable, as most of us were unable, to understand how it could be that the hon. gentleman was bringing forward this proposition, and he wanted further explanation than that which was accorded by the language of the Bill itself, and this was the explanation which the hon. gentleman made—that it was to include the Indians of Manitoba and of British Columbia. My hon. friend then asked as to the Indians of the Territories, and the hon. gentleman answered in the affirmative. We at that time supposed that the intention of the hon. gentleman was somewhat like that which he now proposes by this amendment, namely, that if it was the Indian on the reserve who was to have a vote, it should be when he had a location ticket, or a separate holding. We did not then conceive that the hon. gentleman could have in his own mind the idea of permitting the Indian to vote who had no such holding, but had simply his share of the title which his band had in the reserve itself. It subsequently appeared, however, that the language of the Bill was capable of such an interpretation, and now the hon. gentleman proposes that, as to the Indian on the reserve who shall have a vote he shall vote if he has in effect a separate location ticket, on property improved to the value of $150. With reference to the explanation which the hon. gentleman makes, he stated a very considerable time—I think, perhaps, a fortnight or more—after his original statement, that it was intended to include the Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia—he stated that it was not his intention that they should vote. He stated that when he introduced the provision in the Bill, his mind had been rather directed to the Indian of the Eastern Province, but of course he could not get over the proposition that the language of the Bill really included them, and that his intention really did include the Western Indians as well, because the language of the Bill itself clearly included them, as we now find confessed from the proposal which is brought before us, and also because, in answer to a question by my hon. friend from Bothwell, the hon. gentleman stated distinctly that such was his intention. I suppose, Sir, that the little plan to exclude the Island of Prince Edward from the uniform application of the franchise having fallen through, it having been found that if that little plan succeeded, it could only succeed by virtue of the destruction of the general principle of uniformity. We are now to apply the hon. gentleman's vague observations on the second reading of the Bill as to pedantic uniformity, to the Indian of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman, the declared friend of uniformity, was not friendly to pedantic uniformity; and he intimated that there would be occasions to assert the virtue of diversity and non-uniformity—as I say, most of us supposed that this was applicable to Prince Edward Island; but after a considerable time that plan failed, and now we have got where the pedantic uniformity comes in. It would be pedantic uniformity to give the Indians of Manitoba a vote; and, therefore, the Indians of Manitoba are disqualified, while those of the other Provinces are allowed to vote. Well, I suppose it is really because the hon. gentleman felt that these Indians were in too close proximity to those euphemistically named chiefs which the hon. member for North Bruce alluded to a moment ago—Strike-him-on-the Back, Poundmaker, Big Bear, and the others—in too close proximity to them, at any rate in the minds of the people, and too much associated with recent tragic events, to attempt to force the proposition with reference to them on the people; but if it was his intention that the Indians of Manitoba should have a vote, then we find that a very large number of the Indians of that Province, by virtue of the hon. gentleman's second thought and better advice, are

placed in a different position. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has not, as I have said, argued out this question. He strikes out the Indians in Manitoba, in Keewatin, and in the North-West Territories; he therefore admits that under the Bill, not merely the Indian in Manitoba, but also the Indian of the District of Keewatin, and the Indian in the North-West Territories, would have a vote. You will observe that the hon. member for North Bruce and others have said that it was not intended by this Bill to give the Indians in the North-West Territories a vote, but if the Bill does not do that why does the hon. gentleman exclude him just now? Of course, we know perfectly well that at this instant the North West Territories have not representation in Parliament, and therefore at this instant the Indians of the North-West Territories would not have a vote; but this Bill is intended to be the imperishable memorial of the hon. gentleman's name and fame, to be handed down to future generations. It therefore ought to be prepared *totus, teres, atque rotundus*, so as to require no alteration or change to be made in that day when the North-West Territories shall have representation. He anticipates that day; he is providing for including the people of the North-West Territories with the view of giving them representation; and the hon. gentleman, anxious to prescribe how they shall be represented, what persons shall be qualified to exercise the franchise in those Territories, when they are to be represented, takes time by the forelock—or shall I say by the scalplock?—and says beforehand to Poundmaker, and Big Bear—perhaps neutralising the conciliatory efforts of his agents who are now engaged operating with those eminent citizens: Gentlemen, to you I give notice even now, that in the happy day which is coming when the North-West Territories shall be represented, you shall be excluded from that most valuable privilege of the capable citizen. Now, with reference to the Indians on the reserves, elsewhere in Canada, the hon. gentleman proposes to exclude the Indian, who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct piece of land in the reserve, and whose such separate tract is not of the value of $150. The hon. gentleman does not by that proposition in the slightest degree answer the difficulties suggested from this side of the House. He does not answer the difficulty as to the dependent position of the Indian there, as to the wardship of that Indian, as to the character of his holding, by whose grace he gets it and holds it, and what his relations are to the band and to the Superintendent General. On the contrary, under the provision as it stood before, the Indian was more independent than he is under this provision, because under the law as it stood, if the whole reserve was divided up amongst the Indians would amount in value to such an amount as would give the qualification, any one of the Indians would have the right to vote, a right which the hon. gentleman could not deprive him of—a right which he would hold by Act of Parliament, not by the grace of the Superintendent General; but the hon. gentleman, pretending to give an advantage, says to the House that though he thinks it rather unfair to the poor Indian to deprive the other Indians of their votes, he will not give it as a right, but as a favor to those to whom he gives location tickets or who have separate holdings; so that no Indian shall have a right to the vote unless he gets a location ticket—that which he does not hold absolutely or by a form of title, as any other citizen. Now, Sir, we are considering the question of the future franchise of the inhabitants of Canada, and we have a proposal from the hon. gentleman with reference to the Indian franchise which ought to have been accompanied by those statements which, as a Minister of the Crown, as the First Minister, as the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, as the promoter of this Bill, it was the hon. gentleman's duty to have laid before us. We ought to have learned from the hon. gentleman how many Indians would have been enfranchised under this proposal. We ought to have learned what the present condition of things is, and what he expects it to be. In discussions in the English House of Commons, upon proposals to enlarge the franchise, statements with reference to the effect of the proposed enlargement, and calculations as to the numbers of citizens who would be made capable of enjoying that franchise, have always been made and have formed the subjects of discussion. Here, after a long, after, the hon. gentleman says, a too long discussion, he brings down a proposal to us which he did not choose to indicate earlier, and we have no statement of its probable effects, or of the number of persons out of the 105,000 Indians in the Dominion of Canada who are to be enfranchised by it. Is it a measure for the enfranchisement of the Indians as a whole, in the body? How does it affect British Columbia? I am not prepared to say, but I daresay my hon. friends from that Province—except the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Baker), who, I believe, declared the other day that he thought the Indians ought to have a vote—are, some of them, at any rate, pretty well satisfied with the Bill. I presume that out of the 35,000 Indians in British Columbia, a very small number will get the franchise, and I presume that they may have a pretty good expectation that the system of giving separate holdings upon the comparatively small reserves that exist in that Province, will be more extensively applied. But with reference to the older Provinces, to which the hon. gentleman says his attention was especially directed in preparing this measure, I ask what is to be the effect of the franchise? How many have such separate holdings? Is the amount to be confined even to the location ticket? The question is brought before the House by the hon. gentleman once again saying that he is reluctant in making this change, that he thinks it is hardly fair to a great many of the Indians. To how many of them is it unfair? What proportion of the Indians are being treated with harshness in restricting the franchise to them, as he says it will be restricted? And what proportion are now being benefited? The latter will be a very variable quantity; it will depend largely upon the urgency and pressure of the local agent and of the Superintendent General as to the expedience of separate holdings on the reserves and the conditions upon which these holdings are to be given. Now, a good many gentlemen have been disposed to treat this question, as the hon. gentleman, in the words he threw out, treated it—that it was hardly fair to the Indians, that he was sorry to do it—in a somewhat sentimental manner. I maintain that those of us who object to the hon. gentleman's proposal to give votes to the tribal Indians living on the reserve are not, by any such objection, in the slightest degree, open to the charge of want of sympathy with the Indian. On the contrary, we have sympathised in time past, and in spite of the tragic events of the past few weeks we, too, to-day do sympathise—who but can sympathise?—with the nature and condition of these, if not original, at any rate immemorial, owners of the soil upon which our ancestors intruded. But it is not the case that sympathy is to be the ground upon which the franchise is to be extended. I had occasion myself, when I filled the office of Minister of Justice, to consider a case with reference to some of these Indians whom the hon. gentleman to-day is excluding—Indians in the district, I think, of Keewatin, and I felt a very deep sympathy with two of them, two sons. I will state the circumstances. They had deliberately murdered their aged mother. I was called upon to say what, if any, proceedings should be taken against them; and it appeared from incontestible testimony that these unfortunate heathen Indians had nourished for generations the belief that an aged woman, such as she was, approaching the period of death, under certain circum-

stances became possessed of supernatural but maleficent powers, and could and would, unless slaughtered, be the death, not merely of her family, but also of large numbers of the tribe to which she belonged. Under their religion, if you can so use the phrase, it became a part of the duty of these two sons to put an end to their mother; and they discharged it with tears and grief, as a religious duty incumbent upon them by their laws, rites and ceremonies, to avert the result to which I have referred. That is the sort of people who are to be excluded from the franchise by the hon. gentleman's amendment, and who, but for that amendment, would be included. Being satisfied this was their ancient rule, I felt it would not do to take proceedings with the view to hang those two, and I ordered a personal visit to be made to every individual of the band, the law and customs of our country to be explained to them, and to be pointed out to them that any repetition or attempt to repeat such a crime would be followed by the utmost rigor of the law; but I felt that, under the circumstances, it would do more harm than good to take further proceedings with reference to the act that was past. These are the class to which the hon. gentleman, but for his amendment of to-day, was going to give the franchise; and I can say we can sympathise with these people, we can bear with them, we can tolerate many things as due to ancient, ingrained habit, customs, and religion so called, we can deal tenderly with them—without at all agreeing that they are capable citizens, proper to be entrusted with the franchise. They are not, in a word, fit to vote. For innumerable generations they lived, as hunters principally, a nomad life, and they had their own civilisation, their own rules, their own notions of manly virtue, their own vices and faults, and we came here and we added some of our vices to them. We gave them the appetite and the means of drink, and we gave them painful and loathsome disease, and our efforts to civilise them have been very largely, no doubt, a failure. I once before, on an Indian debate, adverted to the strength of the wild strain in the blood of the Indian. I told the House some years ago of two cases, to my own knowledge, of young men, school fellows of my own for many years, apparently very civilised, well instructed, capable in all respects, but who, after they had grown up among the haunts of men so instructed and with the opportunities of leading such a life as we would prefer, returned, at mature years to the band, and to the wild life of the Indian. You cannot hope in any brief space, in a space which you can measure, even in a few generations, to extinguish that wild strain in the blood, and those longings for the tribal life, and the free life and the wild life of the Indian. It is useless, therefore, to discuss this question, as if such a solution of it were to be obtained by all the efforts we can use, and by all the efforts we have been putting forward by example, by local agents, by school teachers, by missionaries, by priests, by their being surrounded by the habitations of white settled people. If all that has done so little, what is the giving of a vote going to do more? It is not going to help the Indians; it is going, as you propose to give it, to add another element to his degredation, and to degrade the white along with him. Now what is the position? I stated the position with reference to the Indian early in this debate, immediately after the hon. gentleman had made his explanation, and I reinforced that position then by a perusal of the relevant parts of the Indian Act. I am not about to advert again to them, though the hon. gentleman's amendment and the language with which he put it in your hands, Sir, renders it absolutely necessary that they should be adverted to again, to show how utterly he has mistaken or chooses to misread the whole discussion. I am not myself, however, about to advert again in detail to the provisions of the Act, but I say they are provisions—and I read them and I proved it—which show that the Indian is not within the meaning of those words as applied to the exercise of the

franchise, which show that the tribal Indian living on his reserve, even although he has this separate holding, under the hon. gentleman, is not a capable citizen. I say he is not. I say you disqualify him, you incapacitate him in many of those respects which we call the primary and essential elements of manhood and citizenship; and while you disqualify him and incapacitate him in these, you have no right to give him the crowning badge, the flower of freedom—the vote. You tell him: You shall not deal with your own, with what we call by courtesy your own, as you like. Why? Because you have not capacity to do it, because you will be deceived, because you are too improvident, because you must have a Superintendent General, a Deputy Superintendent General and a local agent to look after you, to control you, to manage you, to husband your reserve, to decide which of you shall have a holding, to dispense favors among you, to assist you in the determination of whom shall be your chief and so forth. But you say to him: There is a process by which, by certain gradations, after an interval of years, having proved by your conduct in the first place and by your conduct later, having undergone a period of probation, that you are fit for enfranchisement, you shall be enfranchised and become a free man, and shall have a vote as you ought to have a vote. But now, you say, while all these badges of war, of tutelage, of inferiority, of incapacity remain—while they remain upon your Statute Book marked upon the Indian and his life, while they remain in actual practice, while you declare it would be the worst thing in the world for the Indian to remove them, while you say the operation of enfranchisement cannot be even accelerated without danger, while this is your own description in your own laws of the condition of the Indian, you say to this Indian so circumstanced: We will give the franchise. He cannot take care of himself, we have to take care of him; but, incapable as he is of taking care and controlling his own, we will give him the right to manage our affairs. We have to manage his, he shall manage ours. Now the Province of Ontario has a number of equally balanced constituencies, in several of which there are Indian reserves, and the attempt of the hon. gentleman is practically to control the white vote in those constituencies by the addition of the Indian vote. And he has two great forces to assist him in his government. He, the First Minister, the dispenser of the favors of Parliament, the dispenser of the bounty of the nation, the ruler of the Indian, his guardian, can help himself well enough; but that, perhaps, is not alone enough, so he has the hon. gentleman his colleaugue beside him, the hon. the Minister of Customs; for I see by the *Orange Sentinel*, in its last edition, that there is an outburst of joy on the proposal to give the tribal Indians the vote because of the number of Orange lodges among them. So that, with what the hon. gentleman the First Minister as Superintendent General and the hon. the Minister of Customs as the representative in this Government of the Orange body, the hon. gentleman is quite sure that the Indians of Ontario will vote right, anyway. The whites are to be so ruled, the white electors in the constituencies are to be so ruled, are to be ruled by virtue of the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Customs, as an influential Orangeman, having an influence over the Indians. As I have said, I am not about to advert in detail to the clauses of the Act, but I am about to do what I have not done hitherto, I am about to refer you to some passages in the hon. gentleman's own report; not the report of his deputy, not the report of his local agents, important as they are; but every passage which I shall read to you is a passage in the hon. gentleman's own report, signed by himself as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, indicating to my mind as clearly as possible the monstrous character of the proposal he now brings forward. In the report for the year ended the 30th June, 1879, the hon. gentleman stated this:

"It will give your Excellency pleasure to learn that the condition of the aboriginal inhabitants of the Dominion is, on the whole, not only satisfactory, but gradually and surely improving. In the older Provinces, they have in many cases attained to an intellectual and educational standard not second to that of their white neighbors, engaging with much success in agriculture, mechanics, commerce, and the learned professions, and taking a creditable part in social and religious life and in the political government of the country.

I need hardly say that these observations applied as a rule—at any rate the last one—to the enfranchised Indian because the unenfranchised Indian had no vote. But now, after that rose-colored statement of the condition of the Indian in the older Provinces has been read—and I should like to hear the number of instances to which it applies in the Province of Nova Scotia——

Mr. KIRK. Not one.

Mr. BLAKE—In the Province of New Brunswick, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, and in the Province of Quebec, and even in the Province of Ontario—I do not deny that it applies to some cases, but they are *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*—the majority are in the other condition—what does he say?

"In Ontario, more especially, they are abandoning the old tribal system and the state of tutelage which it involves, assimilating with the rest of the population, and assuming all the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens."

The hon. gentleman's general observation, you will thus find, is applied particularly by him to the Province of Ontario, and, when he comes to give us the description of the most advanced in the Province of Ontario, what is the test of advancement which he gives us, what is the main and crucial test of advancement which he gives? It is this:

"In Ontario, more especially, they are abandoning the old tribal system and the state of tutelage which it involves, assimilating with the rest of the population, and assuming all the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens."

There is the process of emancipation, there is the process of enfranchisement which the hon. gentleman rejoiced to see going on, which he was desirous to see go on still further, and which was to result, after the abandonment of the tribal system, after the abandonment of the state of tutelage which the tribal system involves, in an assimilation with the rest of the population, and then the assumption of all the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens. But now, while yet they are tribal Indians, while yet they do not abandon, and do not choose to abandon, the tribal system, while yet they are in the state of tutelage which that tribal system involves, as I have here confessed under the signature "John A. Macdonald," which follows a page or two further on, while yet they are in that state of tutelage while yet they decline to assimilate with the rest of the population, while yet they decline so to acquire, so to assume, to repeat the hon. gentleman's language, all the rights, privileges and immunities of citizens, the hon. gentleman proposes to give them rights, privileges and immunities which we should rejoice to see them have if they were citizens like ourselves, but which the hon. then and always hitherto thought incompatible with the retention of the tribal system, incompatible with the state of tutelage which it involves, incompatible with a non-assimilation with the rest of the population, incompatible with the non-assumption of all the rights, privileges and responsibilities of citizens. How shall these men decide for us what the political government of the country is to be? How shall they decide for us what our rights are to be? How shall they decide for us what is the due and the proper course of a free man, when they are not free men themselves? That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. Is it fitting that those who are in a state of tutelage should control the free men? And yet the hon. gentleman says here that the tribal system involves a state of tutelage. And he says that those who are in the state of tutelage shall control the free men. The hon. gentleman adheres to the view that, because he is their tutor, because he is the man who has them in a state of tutelage, they shall vote, so as to control the free expression of the free citizens of this country. Then, in the reports for the next year, the hon. gentleman himself—for I say I adhere only to reports which are signed by his own name—says:

"The small Wyandotte band, whose reserve is situate l in the township of Anderdon, in the county of Essex, will this year have completed their three years term of probation for enfranchisement, and will then be entitled, under the provisions of the Indian Act of 1880, to letters patent for their respective holdings, and to have the capital at their credit in the hands of the Government divided among them, and, upon this taking place, they will cease to be Indians in every respect within the meaning of the law."

So there is a statement, obviously with gratification, of the result of the provisions for enfranchisement in their practical application. Then, when the hon. gentleman goes on to discuss the conditions of some of the Indians who are to be enfranchised, he, as I have said, indicates time and again, their dependent condition. For example, speaking of the Indians of the Province of Quebec, whose reserves are more favorably situated, as respects soil and climate, he says:

"They are less nomadic in their habits, they live in villages or on reserves, and the wigwam is, with them, a thing of the past. There is, however, but little progress among them; although they have, as a rule, abundance of land of good quality, from the cultivation of which, if prosecuted with ordinary vigor, they might procure an ample subsistence for themselves and families, and, in order to encourage them to do so, seed grain, potatoes and garden seeds, are supplied to such of them as have land prepared for the same."

Take your Indian, give him his allotment, let him have his separate holding, his shanty worth $150, and his fence and so forth worth $150 of improvements upon it, and then let the Superintendent General, forsooth, decide that he has properly prepared his ground and is entitled to some seed grain—potatoes or garden seeds—or the contrary; and, the Superintendent General having decided whether he shall have the raw material for the cultivation of the ground, give him the vote, the free vote which he will exercise, no doubt without the slightest regard to the power of the Superintendent General to say to him: You shall have the seeds and roots for planting your ground, or not, and it is in my judgment whether you shall have them or not. The hon. gentleman goes on to speak of the western counties of Nova Scotia:

"The Indians of these counties pay but little attention to the cultivation of the soil. The efforts of the Department have been for several years unceasingly directed towards inducing them to settle on and cultivate lands on their reserves, and in the furtherance of this object seed grain, potatoes and garden seeds are distributed every spring among such of them as are disposed to use them; and although, as a general thing, the attempt to make an agricultural people of them has hitherto proved unsuccessful, yet the reports from some localities of Indians adopting that mode of obtaining a subsistence are sufficiently encouraging to justify increased efforts being put forth in that direction."

There is your free man again; there are the Indians of the western paat of the Province of Nova Scotia, living on their holdings, and being persuaded by the Superintendent General to cultivate the soil by an annual distribution of seed grain, potatoes and garden seeds, amongst those disposed to use it. Of course they will vote against the Superintendent General:

"In the eastern counties of the Province a healthier condition of matters exist, especially is this the case in the Island of Cape Breton, where the Indians live for the most part in houses, make good use of the seed given them by cultivating their lands and raising crops of sufficient importance to materially aid in the support of themselves and their families."

There you see where they are better off, where they actually live in houses—the most part of them—even there, Sir, the seed annually given them to persuade them to cultivate the soil, and not to support themselves—O no, that is not to be expected—but to aid materially in supporting themselves. Such is the case in your own Province, Mr. Chairman, and I have no doubt that you, Sir, free to speak, and untied, as you have been to that Chair for a long time, we would hear

you strongly denouncing this proposition of the hon. gentleman, from the intimate knowledge you must have of the red men in whose vicinity you live:

"The Superintendent of the Indians in the northern and eastern counties of the Province of New Brunswick, reports an improvement on the whole in their condition, and he anticipates a continuance of the same, owing to the commencement last spring"——

Now, what improved these Indians in the year 1880? What made them better off? What made them more capable citizens to exercise the franchise? I will tell you what it was:

"Owing to the commencement last spring of the system of distributing seed among such of the Indians as were cultivating land, instead of handing the money to them as had been previously the practise, when it was used for other purposes than that for which it was intended."

They had a present each spring to buy seed. They were not to be trusted with the money, because they used it for other purposes. The Department had to go back and treat them like children, and give them the seed itself, and, Sir John A. Macdonald, the Superintendent-General, reports a material improvement in the condition of the Indians of New Brunswick, because the Superintendent had resorted to the practice of restraining them by giving them the actual seed instead of the money. There is a similarity among them to the Indians I recollect reading about whom the hon. gentleman is disfranchising in the North-West, who boiled the seed potatoes, who cooked the seed grain, and who ate the oxen for the plow, and the cows that were intended to give milk and for breeding purposes. Even giving them in kind did not always answer the purpose. I should not be surprised—in point of fact I have it in some of these reports, that even giving the seed in kind did not always secure the planting of the seed by the more civilised Indians in the eastern part of the country. That is the better part; then on the west side of New Brunswick there is a statement with reference to Victoria and Madawaska, where the agent says:

"The Indians of those counties are industrious, temperate and contented, and that they are every year advancing slowly but surely towards a higher state of civilisation."

Then he goes on to say of the Indians on the west side New Brunswick:

"Those Indians, like their brethren of the western counties of Nova Scotia, are unsettled in their habits;"

Now, Sir, what is the independent voter, the independent Indian voter in western New Brunswick, in the habit of doing? What do you think the Superintendant General complains of?

"And the constant appeals to the Department for increased assistance indicates but little advancement towards their becoming self supporting and independent."

It was rather an annoyance, you know, to be called on to give out the public money to assist the Indian before he was an independent voter, but now that he has become a free and independent voter, how rejoiced the hon. gentleman must be to know that the Indian on the west side of New Brunswick is improvident, that he uses up his money and means too fast, because he will have to come to him and say: Please let me have some money; please give me some assistance, some blankets, some food, something to cultivate my land with. And the Superintendent General will be generous, the Superintendent General will be gracious, he will scold him no more, and he will take care that his just and reasonable requests for pauper relief are acceded to; and so he will secure his independent vote. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to discuss a most interesting topic—the elevation of the Indians by means of education. Of course, we know that the process of elevation is slow, and that it is by dealing with the young alone that we can hope for material progress. He says:

"The greatest obstacle to the successful education of Indian children at day schools consists in the irregularity of their attendance, caused in part by the neglect of their parents to oblige them to attend, and by the frequent absence of many families from the reserves while fishing, hunting and berry-picking. In order to remedy this state of things as far as possible, the teachers have been instructed to adapt to the periods of vacation the time when the Indians will be absent from the reserve."

There you see the difficulty. The Indian is not merely irregular, nomadic, absent himself, but he does not cause he children to attend, and he frequently takes the child away from the reserves on his expedition. Then, the plan recently adopted in connection with Indian day schools in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territory, of granting bonuses to teachers, etc., is stated. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to deal with general observations of high consequence:

"And the Indian day school is, however, under the best of circumstances, attended with unsatisfactory results, the Indian youth, to enable him to cope successfully with his brother of white origin, must be disassociated from the prejudicial influences by which he is surrounded on the reserves of his band."

There is the statement—the reserve band surrounds the Indian with prejudicial influences, and if you are going to elevate the young Indian, if you are going to put him on a par, and bring him by degrees up to the standard of his white brother, you must disassociate him from the prejudicial influences of the surrounding band.

"And the necessity for the establishment more generally of institutions whereat Indian children, besides being instructed in the usual branches of education will be lodged, fed, clothed"——

Now what? Listen, fathers of families throughout Canada; listen to the character of the persons who are to have votes and control your destinies. What is to be done with the children who are to be elevated?——

"kept separate from home influences, taught trades and instructed in agriculture, is becoming every year more apparent."

Kept separate from home influences! That is the character of the Indian parent, that is the character of the Indian voter. That is the elevated condition in which the Superintendent General says the Indian voter of to-morrow occupies—not merely of to-morrow but of "of old to-morrow." That is the character of the parent—that if the Indian daughter, or the Indian son, is to be advanced, if real progress is to be made, if he is to be put in a position in which he can cope with his white brother, one of the conditions stated by the right hon. gentleman is, that he is to be taken away from the reserves, and a second condition, is, that he is to be kept separate from home influences. It is these people who are to control our destinies. Every year it is becoming more apparent, in spite of the hon. gentleman's long continued effort, that if you are going to make anything of the Indian in the sense of the white man, you must do it through education of the young, and that if you are going to educate the young Indian successfully You must take him from the prejudicial influences of the reserves, you must keep him separated from home influences, and it is these home influences which have been potent enough and prejudicial enough to induce the hon. gentleman to give the tribal Indians the franchise. Then the hon. gentleman has pointed out the prejudicial condition of affairs upon the bands, and goes on to discuss the question of tribal government:

"Convinced of the desirability of introducing, as soon as Indian bands are prepared for it, a better system of managing their local affairs than the one which at present prevails among them, under which the chiefs (who in many cases are hereditary, and therefore may or may not fairly represent the intelligence of the band) control such matters—the Department despatched a circular to the various Indian superintendents and agents calling upon them to report whether the bands under their supervision were sufficiently enlightened to justify the conclusion that the inauguration of a simple form of municipal government among them would be attended with success."

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) read this extract a little while ago; but the hon. gentleman must have forgotten it, and it is to bring it to his remembrance that I read it again.

Mr. HESSON. It is to take up time.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it is to take up time. I deny the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. HESSON. It looks very much like it. That quotation has been read half a dozen times.

Mr. BLAKE. I tell the hon. gentleman that I have yet hope that even the hon. gentleman may yet see light upon this question. I yet entertain the hope that though the hon. gentleman cannot answer our arguments, yet he may be convinced by them, even though it may require a surgical operation to achieve that result. I do not know whether it will require chloroform in order that that surgical operation may be performed; but whatever is possible must be done in order to convince him, and if not to convince, to convict the hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman said he was convinced as to the advisability of introducing as soon as possible among the Indians a better system of government. What was that better system? A simple form of municipal government was that better system, according to the hon. gentleman's own words. He was not, however, satisfied as to their being sufficiently enlightened for a simple form of municipal government, so he sent his agents to find out whether, in their opinion, the Indians were sufficiently enlightened for the introduction among them of such a system with success. The question was whether the Indians were sufficiently enlightened to justify the conclusion that they should have a simple form of municipal government. What was the answer?

"From the majority of its officers who have replied to the circular, the reports received led to the conclusion that the Indian bands within their respective districts are not sufficiently advanced in intelligence for the change."

We have it in these reports; they have not been brought down. Allusion is made to some of them, and extracts are given; but it would be most interesting to know what was the view of these agents in regard to the condition of the Indians. But we have the summing up of the right hon. gentleman—a most favorable summing up, for he wanted to accomplish his plan, and his only doubt was whether his wards were sufficiently enlightened to permit of their being entrusted with a simple form of municipal government with success. He enquires of the local superintendent. He receives as an answer that they are not sufficiently enlightened to have such a system as is proposed. In 1881 the Indians are deemed to be sufficiently enlightened to introduce among them a simple form of municipal government; and yet the right hon. gentleman now proposes to give them power to govern this whole Dominion.

"An attempt will, however, be made at an early date to obtain the consent of the more advanced bands to the establishment of some such system."

It is stated how it was to be done:

"It is thought that a council, proportionate in number to the population of the band, elected by the male members thereof, of twenty-one years and over, and presided over by a functionary similar to the reeve of a township, might answer the purpose; or in its initiatory stage the council might be presided over, with better results, by the local Indian superintendent or agent."

There you have the same hon. gentleman; you have the suggestion that the hon. gentleman's deputy might with better results preside over the municipal council. Now I pass to the next year, where I find the hon. gentleman deals with the Indians of the older Provinces again. He says:

"It is to be regretted that so many of the Indians of the older Provinces, although possessing lands of first-class quality, situated within easy reach of good markets, and residing in the vicinity of white farmers from whom they might, if so disposed, acquire a knowledge of farming profitably, evince such inability to profit by these advantages."

That is their condition. They have first-class land, they are within easy reach of good markets, they reside near white farmers from whom they could acquire a knowledge of profitable farming; but even with all these advantages they were unable to farm with advantage. Yet the hon. gentleman now proposes to enfranchise them and give them power to decide our destinies and to vote for members of this House.

"Their farms, generally speaking, are not only managed in such a way as to afford profitable returns, but in too many cases they do not produce sufficient to meet the wants of their families."

They have no rent to pay, they have first-class lands, but with all these advantages they are unable to produce sufficient to provide for their families.

"And consequently basket making, axehandle manufacturing, bead work, moccasin making and other Indian handicraft have to be resorted to in order to supply the deficit; and to dispose of these articles the Indians have to visit numerous places, and thus their old, and to them, congenial habit of wandering about the country is fostered, which is attended with evil results to them, morally and materially."

What is to be done for the Indian after this description of his condition; with the Indian in the older Provinces who possesses such advantages and is surroundered by such favorable circumstances? Is he to be left to himself?

"The appointment of local agents possessing a practical knowledge of farming, who would instruct the Indians in that art, and in raising and taking care of live stock, and in keeping their buildings and fences in repair, would no doubt effect a change for the better in the condition of the Indians of these Provinces."

You want to establish a man who will be his guardian, who will teach him to farm, how to care for stock, how to keep up his fences and his buildings. He could not do those things himself. *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes.*

"The services of an active inspector, possessing sufficient knowledge in such matters, to enable him to judge whether or not matters were being properly managed on the reserve, would also be of incalculable benefit."

You want some one over the Indian as instructor, you want a local superintendent to go there with authority from headquarters, to show that headquarters are watching over the local agents who are watching over the Indians, and thus see that everything is going smoothly.

"Until a system of the kind above indicated be inaugurated, no material improvement in the condition of the Indians of the older Provinces may be expected."

There the hon. gentleman declared that until a system of this description be inaugurated, a system, namely, under which there will be persons to teach them farming, to keep up their fences, to manage their stock, to look after them to see that everything is right, no material improvement in the condition of the Indians may be expected. But the right hon. gentleman is now going to improve the Indian by giving him the franchise. The right hon. gentleman says:

"The strange aversion evinced by very many of the Indian bands in these Provinces to their reserves being sub-divided into locations for different families has prevented the issue generally (as was contemplated) of location tickets to individual occupants covering the land held by them."

They are averse at present to a sub division of locations. Until the hon. gentleman wanted it they did not do it generally, and it has not been much done. But now if the Indians know they are going to have a vote, which is a species of property, a new right capable of being turned to their personal advantage, perhaps the hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of giving them more location tickets, and thus will have power over them to be recompensed in due time.

"Some bands however whose reserves were sub-divided many years since, willingly agreed to accept the tickets; the holders of the same appearing to understand that they gave them individually a better title to their respective holdings than they previously possessed."

And perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell them: Now the location ticket and the franchise. You shall have the vote if you have the location ticket; you shall have the ticket if you are a good Indian, and if you are a bad Indian I

shall exercise my power and deal with you with reference to those holdings. Won't you take the ticket? And the Indian answers yes, and votes accordingly.

"And it is hoped that in time all of the bands will consent to their reserves being sub-divided and location tickets being given to individual occupants of land therein. It is worthy of consideration whether legislative measures should not be adopted for the establishment of some kind of municipal system among such bands as are found sufficiently advanced to justify the experiment being tried. It is hoped that a system may be adopted which will have the effect of accustoming the Indians to the mode of government prevalent in the white communities surrounding them, and that it will thus tend to prepare them for earlier amalgamation with the general population of the country."

There is the hon. gentleman's system. He feels that the tribal, the separate system, the holding system, is one which holds the Indian back, which does not either entitle him to or fit him for the rights, the privileges and the responsibilities of citizenship, and he bends himself in every way to getting rid of it. He hopes to educate him to farming, he hopes to educate his children away from home, he hopes to get him to adopt a municipal system of government, he hopes to get him to adopt a system of enfranchisement, and he hopes that something may be done by slow degrees to prepare him for early amalgamation with the white population of the country. And now, all of a sudden, while all these things are as yet unaccomplished, he proposes to make him one of the white population of the country, at once, and in its most distinctive badge, the badge of the franchise. Then, dealing with the Ontario Indians on reserves, and referring to the Indians at Fort William, he says with reference to the schools there:

"They erected a new council house during the past year. There are two schools on the reservation, one for boys and the other for girls. Both are conducted efficiently. The attendance is, however, small, mainly owing to the fact that the parents do not provide for sufficient clothing for the children."

There is the hon. gentleman's statement, that the Indians who are to have a vote presently do not provide enough clothing for their children, so that the poor, naked creatures are not able to go to school. But the parents are to have a vote, and no doubt that will make up for the want of clothing on the part of children. An hon. friend beside me says they will vote *in puris naturalibus*, and perhaps we will find that something may be done to enable them to vote in this way without their being dealt with for violating the laws. Then he goes on, referring to the Western Superintendency of Ontario:

"The Chippewas of Sarnia occupy a valuable tract of land capable of being successfully farmed, and affording rich compensation to those so cultivating it. But far from this being the case with the present occupants a recent investigation into their condition reveals the fact that a large majority of them not only fail to cultivate the land successfully, but are living in actual misery.

There is the hon. gentleman's own statement of the Chippewa band. Then he says with reference to the Indians on Walpole Island and other points in that neighborhood:

"Resident agents should be stationed on or in the immediate vicinity of the several reserves, possessing qualifications that will enable them to instruct the Indians in farming, and to energetically protect their interests in the timber and other valuables on the reserve; and it is proposed at an early day to effect a change in the manner indicated."

They want protection, they want a protector, an energetic protector, they cannot take care of their own timber on their own reserves, they are lost and ruined for want of a protector, and he says they shall have an energetic protector in the person of my deputy, and they shall vote as well. Then the hon. gentleman, referring to the Wyandottes, says:

"These Indians are also under the superintendent stationed at Sarnia. The large majority of them were enfranchised during the past year, having served the term of probation required by the law; they received letters patent conveying to them in fee-simple the lands individually assigned themselves and their families."

There he shows a case under which the existing laws have sufficed to enable the Indians to become citizens on equal terms with the white population. Then, as to the Indians of Quebec, the Algonquins, and the Têtes de Boule of the Rivers Desert and Gatineau, he says:

"The agent reports that in a reasonable time these Indians will become as good farmers as many of their white neighbors. Location tickets covering their individual holdings were this year issued to them."

So there is slow but satisfactory progress going on there. Then, Sir, with reference to Nova Scotia, speaking of the Micmacs in Richmond county let us see what was the position of those independent voters in that year. They are described generally as being industrious, honest and temperate, but notwithstanding that how are they off?

"A few of them, however, do not pay much attention to the cultivation of their lands, being given to wandering habits. The crops of last year, especially oats and potatoes (on which the Indians chiefly depend) were a failure."

And had it not been for something, which the Superintendent states took place, they would have been in sore straits, and what was it? What was it prevented the Indians of Richmond county from being in sore straits? Sir, it was the relief money sent them by the Department. The hon. gentleman sent them poor relief, and this was the dole which prevented starvation among them, although they are sober, honest, temperate, and industrious Indians. They were dependent, notwithstanding these good qualities, on the generosity administered by the hon. gentleman at his discretion, to keep them from starvation, so you see how amply qualified they are for exercising the vote freely. We do not assume that they are base enough not to entertain the sentiment of gratitude; we do not assume that they are unintelligent enough not to know from whom they received that relief from starvation; we do not assume that they are of a level low enough not to know what they may hope or dread from the good or ill will of the Superintendent General at such times, and knowing these things we know how the tribal Indians will vote. The next year the hon. gentleman goes on to discuss the condition of Indian matters in the older Provinces, and he says in his report for the year 1882:

"The condition of Indian matters in these Provinces is, on the whole, satisfactory. Any suffering of consequence during the year was confined to certain bands in Nova Scotia which found the scanty stores laid in by them quite insufficient to tide them over the unusually protracted winter. * * * * The increased desire among the Indians of the older Provinces for additional schools on reserves on which none have as yet been established or where those already in operation are deemed insufficient, may be regarded as an indication that the much-to-be-desired demand for enfranchisement on the part of some if not of many, of the bands, may follow as the result of this inclination for further enlightment, and every facility compatible with reason to enable them to become enfranchised should be afforded those anxious for the step.

Admirable statement! He says there is a greater demand for schools and what does that point to? It points to an indication that there may follow what he much desires—a demand for enfranchisement on the part of some; he thinks it is likely to follow because the request for schools is an indication of further enlightenment, and further enlightenment will lead to that much-to-be-desired demand for enfranchisement. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to give them the vote without enfranchising them, to enable them to vote without making them free, to leave them subject to their present disabilities and incapacities, and nominally to enfranchise them so far as the vote is concerned, while in all the material ingredients which involve the requisites for a free vote he leaves them in a position of tutelage and wardship. He says:

"The law might possibly be with advantage amended in this respect, so as to give the Indians desirous of enfranchisement increased facilities for accomplishing their object.

"I am pleased to be able to report that five bands in the Province of Ontario, and two bands in the Province of Quebec, accepted location tickets covering their individual holdings. And thirty-six members of the Wandotte band of Anderdon, County of Essey, having, as stated in my report of last year, been enfranchised, received letters patent covering the lands individually covered by them."

So you see there is slow progress, but some progress, towards the hon. gentleman's aspirations, which were to educate the Indians and they asked for more education; to get the Indians to accept separate holdings and they accept separate holdings; and to get the Indian to apprehend slightly in some degree, the opportunities of enfranchisement, and the hon. gentleman thinks there is some movement in that direction. Speaking of the Ontario Indians, and speaking with reference to the band on the Sarnia reserve he says:

"There should and would be some fine farms on this reserve, if they were properly managed. As it is, the Indian owners either overcrop the land until the soil becomes worn out, or they allow it to become overgrown with weeds. On the reserve at Kettle Point and the Rivière aux Sables there are some tolerably well cultivated farms and good orchards. On Walpole Island matters are somewhat better than on the Sarnia reserve. The same remark, however, in regard to overcropping the land, applies also there."

Then, with reference to the crops on the reserves of the Chippewas and the Munceys, he says:

"Leases of lots and parts of lots which are not used by the Indians have been, with the consent of the band and others, will probably be rented, to respectable white farmers, on leases of short terms which bind the lessee to pay a handsome rental, make valuable improvements on the land, till it in a husbandlike manner, and at the expiration of the term of lease, peaceably give up possession of the land without compensation for improvement."

Remember that this is a proposal to lease to white men lands which are claimed by individual Indians, and to charge for these leases. What has the hon. gentleman to say to the individual Indian?

"The individual Indian claimants of the location leased will receive the rent."

Why, of course, he should receive the rent; it is the rent of his own holding which he has agreed so lease to the white man. Why should he not receive the rent? Ah, but he only receives it on one condition.

"Provided they work the parcels of land retained by them in a proper manner, otherwise, the rent will be placed at the credit of the whole band."

The local superintendent is to decide whether the individual Indian retaining a portion of his own holding, and allowing a portion to be leased to the white man, is working his own proportion in a proper manner. If the Indian superintendent says to him: Lo (or whatever his name is), yes, you are operating it in a proper manner, you will have the land; or he says: Lo, you are negligent; you went picking berries or hunting or basket-making—yes, and you went to the polls, and I am afraid you did not vote right; you cannot have the land—I will take it away from you. You will observe how fully these persons have the capacity of citizens, what sort of right they have to possess their own; they are to have the right of renting a piece of their own land to the white man, provided they work the rest in a proper manner to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General. The local superintendent may say: See, here, Lo, you are not working that piece properly; and if Lo does not do the right thing by the Superintendent General, why, he is not to have his rent. Now, you may suppose that the Indian has been improving very much during this series of years, and that what would be very bad a few years ago would be very good now. Let me read what the hon. gentleman himself said in his report for the year 1883:

"The condition of Indian affairs in the older Provinces remains unchanged to any important degree. The Indians of Ontario and Quebec, with the exception of the bands on the North Shore of the lower St. Lawrence, are mainly self-supporting; and those in the Province of Ontario, with the assistance of their annuities and the interest on their invested capital, may be considered as being, on the whole, in comfortable circumstances. These Indians cost the country nothing except the support of schools for a few of the bands who have not funds sufficient in the hands of the Government from which to pay the expense of teachers salaries, etc."

So that, even among the best classes of Indians, so pleasantly described, the Superintendent General can at his discretion devote a portion of the public funds for a portion of their expenditure.

"The Indians in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are not in so satisfactory a condition as their brethren in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This is probably to be accounted for by the fact that they were not treated with the same liberality before these Provinces formed part of the Dominion. Their wright to ample reserves never having been recognised; consequently tney have no funds at their credit, and the assistance rendered them is from appropriations annually made by Parliament for the relief of the necessities of the most aged and helpless among them."

There you are. The Superintendent General asks yearly from Parliament money for the assistance of the poor relations of these Indians; and they are to form voters, capable citizens, fit to be trusted with the franchise. In dealing with details the hon. gentleman, speaking of the Indians in the county of Northumberland, says:

"In the same county, in the township of Alnwick, there is also a Mississagua band, who, I regret to say, like their brethren on the Rice Lake reserve, persist in illegally renting their land to white people, who farm it very badly and take all that they can off without putting anything on the soil to renew it. The result is that the land is being impoverished. The Department has endeavored to check this state of things, but with only limited success."

You see that these capable citizens cannot legally rent their lands, but sometimes they do it illegally, and the Superintendent General points out the deplorable result. They do not know what is good for them; they cannot be trusted to act for themselves in the renting of their own lands, but they can be trusted with deciding the destinies of Canada.

"It is hoped that the agents for the Rice Lake and Alnwick bands who were appointed but recently, will be able to adopt such measures as will check the evil and promote agriculture among these Indians which is one of the principal reasons for local agents being appointed."

Then speaking of the Parry Sound district, he says:

"In order to stimulate the Indians of the Parry Sound district to increased efforts in farming, the Department offered prizes for the best produce raised on their lands, and an Indian agricultural exhibition was held at Parry Sound, but it proved a failure."

There is the paternal rule of the Indians. I do not object to the offering of prizes for an agricultural exhibition or to using a portion of the public moneys to help them along in any way: but when the Superintendent General has to decide whether the exhibition shall take place, or whether any public money shall be given to it, he shows that he is not in such relationship with them or they with him that it is right to trust them with the franchise. Then speaking of some of the Quebec Indians, the hon. gentleman points out w th reference to the Caughnawaga reserve:

"A sub-division survey of the reserve (which has hitherto been held in common by the band), has been in course of prosecution for the past few years. It is thought that the survey will be completed next spring, when a fair distribution of the farms, in 50 acre lots, will be made among the members of the community."

It is the Superintendent General who is to make a fair distribution of the estate among them, and afterwards to receive their votes. With regard to Nova Scotia he says:

"In the county of Antigonish there are several reserves, all of which are occupied by Micmacs, who, during the year, erected a few new houses. Owing, however, to the migratory character of these Indians, they only occupy their houses for a short time in the year. In the county of Halifax"——

Here, Sir, I find your friends. Listen to the character of your new voters:

"In the county of Halifax there are several reserves, but it is regretted that few of the Indians reside upon them; they prefer frequenting the suburbs of the towns and cities where they manufac'ure baskets, tubs and other articles of Indian ware, from the sale of which they derive sufficient revenue to support themselves and their families. Many of them are addicted to the inordinate use of intoxicants."

There you are! I am glad to know that there are not many of them; but that is the condition of the Halifax county Indians as described by the Superintendent General who proposes to give them votes. Then, in the report for 1884, the very last year, the hon. gentleman states:

"Indian affairs in Manitoba, Keewatin, and in the older Provinces of the Dominion, have moved on in very much the same groove as heretofore."

So that you see there is no sudden change which fits the Indian to vote which he was not fit to do before. If there is progress, it is very gradual; it is the same old rule, the same old rut. Then there are some pleasing statements made as to demands for agricultural machinery, the formation of agricultural societies, the erection of more commodious school houses and so on.

"In this last respect, however, there is still much room for improvement. Schools for the higher education of Indian youth should be established in the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in which the brightest and most promising pupils of the day schools might be trained in industrial pursuits, the knowledge of which would enable them eventually to raise in the social scale to an equality with the white citizen or husbandman."

Here is the process of natural selection by which you can get an Indian who shall, in the end, rise to the condition of a white artisan or husbandman. First of all, drop the father and drop the mother; they are too old dogs to learn to dance, you can do nothing with them. Secondly, take the child away from them, because, not doing anything themselves, they will hurt the child if you leave it under their control. Thirdly, take the child to a day school. Fourthly, select the brightest and most promising pupils out of the children at the day school, and establish a school for the higher education of the Indian youth, in which you will put those brightest most promising, those select of the select of the children, and train them in industrial pursuits; and thus, when you have consigned to the low level in which they are, the father and the mother, when you have put the children in a day school away from the tribal and parental influences, when you have selected out of those the best and brightest, when you have taken the best and brightest away from the average children and put them in a special industrial school, you may be able to enable those eventually "to rise in the social scale to an equality with the white artisan and husbandman." There is the process by which you will get a man who is on an equality with your ordinary voter—the ordinary white artisan or husbandman. And if that is all necessary in order to get a man who shall be on an equality with the ordinary voter, how much below that condition of equality is the adult Indian, the tribal Indian on the reserve, without all this process of weaning away, education and selection, which, in its last and highest result, as its crowning glory and power, is to raise a few of the children to an equality with the white artisan and husbandman.

"The interesting reports, published as appendices to this report, from the principals of several institutions of this kind which are in operation in the Province of Ontario, furnish pleasing evidence of the happy results of such training to the Indian youths who have completed their course in them; and that the Indians appreciate such advantages is proved by the large number of applicants for admission to the more central institutions, already exceeding the capacity of the buildings to accommodate them. The progress of Indian children at day schools, however efficiently conducted as such institutions may be, is very greatly hampered and injuriously affected by the associations of their home life, and by the frequency of their absence, and the indifference of the parents to the regular attendance of their children to such schools. Industrial schools, at which the children are not only educated, instructed in industries, fed and clothed, but in which they are also severed during the school term from all connection with home life, are obviously preferable, as in them the obstructions to education, complained of in the case of day schools, do not exist."

There is the hon. gentleman's method of ultimately bringing the young generation, the children of the Indian of the present day, up to a condition of social equality with the white artisan and husbandman:

"The Indians of the Province of Quebec and the Maritimes Provinces certainly merit more liberal treatment in the matter of education than they have hitherto received at the hands of the Government; and unless improved methods for educating and training the children are adopted, but little hope for the intellectual enlightenment or social elevation of the Indians of those Provinces need be entertained."

So no enlightenment, no social elevation, can be attained under your present system; you must, beside the day school, have select schools to which the best children will be sent. Then out of this select few, out of this small minority of all the Indians, you may, in some future generation, produce, in some instance, social elevation and intellectual enlightenment.

"I would suggest, that in order to give practical effect to the above ideas, two schools of the industrial type, with accommodation for at least 80 pupils in each, should be established in the Province of Quebec, and one of such institutions in each of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that into either of the latter institutions, Indian children from Prince Edward Island, be also admitted; the number of schools to be hereafter increased, should the success of those first established justify such augmentation."

There is the hon. gentleman's statements as to his process for ultimately bringing a few young Indians up to the scale of the white artisan and husbandman. I maintain that this series of statements, given in the hon. gentleman's own report, under his own signature, upon his responsibility as Superintendent General, as Minister of the Crown, as First Minister of the country, with reference to the wardship, the tutelage, the necessary dependent condition of the Indian population, with reference to their condition in respect of elevation and enlightenment, with reference to the difficulties in taking any steps towards that, are proof positive that the proposal before us is to give the franchise to incapable citizens, to men who are not citizens in the true sense of the term, who are not fellow citizens with us, because they have not, to use the spirit of the hon. gentleman's language, though not his exact words, the rights, privileges and responsibilities; and not having the duties and responsibilities, neither ought they to have the rights, the privileges, or the immunities of citizens.

Mr. FLEMING. The First Minister has been good enough to give us his opinion that the proposal to give votes to the Indians has been discussed *ad nauseam*. The hon. gentleman has not heard one-tenth of the discussion; he will become aware, ere long, that in every home in this country the question of giving a vote to the Indian yet under the hon. gentleman's control is being discussed; he will be aware, ere long, that the free men of this country are earnestly discussing the rights of the wards of the Government to be put in the same position as responsible citizens. For that reason, the hon. gentleman has not heard the last of the discussion. For that reason, although I did advert to this subject some days ago, I cannot permit myself to remain silent to-day. I fear that the influence which the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs may exercise over some bands of Indians may have the effect of disfranchising my whole county. My county may, in the exercise of the rights which free men have, choose to send me or some other gentleman to this House as representing their views; but that expression in the future may be rendered valueless by the votes of some of those Indian bands which are under the control of the Superintendent General; and I cannot remain silent while there is a possibility of such a result being brought about. This proposition is a new one; it is an unheard-of proposition. The leader of the Opposition has read from the report of the Superintendent-General himself, signed in his own hand, a declaration, clear and distinct, that the people to whom he is now about to give the right to vote are not capable of exercising the simplest right. In 1880, as it appears by the report, he ascertained that the Indians were not capable of having introduced among them the simplest form of municipal government, were not able to elect a reeve and councillors or to pass by-laws for the making of bridges and roads throughout the reserve, even though their by-laws and resolutions were to be revised by the Superintendent General himself, even though the local agent sat at their head as their chief officer. Yet it is upon these people that he proposes to confer the highest rights of freemen. Why is this new proposition now introduced? It was not in contemplation in any previous

election Bill, or until this year. It is not here now for any good public purpose; there is no public demand for it, the rights of the free people of this country are not going to be enhanced by it, and no advantage will be conferred upon the Indians by it. It is simply here because the hon. gentleman knows that the free citizens of this country are beginning to find out that the Government of which he is the head are governing this country to its injury, and because he knows that unless he can adopt some means of strengthening his position by exercising a control over a large number of electors throughout the country, many of the counties he now holds will be wrested from him. Therefore he proposes to take away the right from a number of the free citizens of this country and to confer it upon the unenfranchised Indians. Is not that the effect of it? If the controlling voice of any county is in the hands of the Indians, and the Indians are in the hand of the Superintendent General, he is stealing the vote of some other constituency and preventing it from receiving free expression in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a party measure, that it is not a measure in the public interest, but is one which he himself has determined, in the exigencies of party to push through this House at all hazards. He knows that he controls the voice of hon. members on that side of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman says that the right hon. gentleman controls the votes or the voice of hon. members in this House. That is not a parliamentary expression.

Mr. FLEMING. I beg to withdraw the unparliamentary expression. I will say that he knows that the views which he may give to hon. gentlemen opposite will be adopted, and he also knows that hon. gentlemen who have expressed themselves on that side in reference to this proposition have expressed themselves in a sense contrary to the hon. gentleman's proposition. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) declared a few days ago that it was not the intention of the Bill to give Indians upon reserves the vote.

Mr. DAWSON. No; I said unqualified Indians on reserves.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. member for New Brunswick said the proposition of the Bill was not to give to Indians, situated in any other way than white people were, the right to vote. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) said:

"I say it matters not what nationality a man belongs to, whether he be Indian or negro, if he possesses the same qualifications for the franchise that a white man does, he ought to receive it. This Bill does not propose anything else."

The hon. gentleman misunderstood the Bill.—

"Why should not the Indians have the franchise as well as anybody else, provided they stand upon the same footing as others?"

That is the proposition which has come from this side of the House, that, so soon as you have put the Indian upon the same footing as others, he should have the franchise, but why should he have the franchise before he is put upon that footing? and that is what the hon. gentleman proposes by his Bill and his amendment. He proposes that Indians living on reserves, that have not the capacities of white people, that are not subject to the same laws so far as civil rights are concerned, shall be put on a footing different from that upon which many white people of this country are put. Many artisans and others, who are making the wealth of this country, have been deprived of the franchise by this Bill, which is more restrictive than a number that have been adopted in the Local Legislatures. The industrial class of the community has been in many cases deprived of the right they would otherwise exercise, and their right is handed over to the Indian that is under the control of the hon. the First Minister and his agents. It is an outrage upon freedom. The hon. member for Kent went on to say:

"All this Bill proposes to do is simply to place the Indians on an equal footing with other men, and to give them equal privileges whenever their conditions are equal. That is the interpretation I put upon the Bill, and I believe the country will so understand it."

I wonder whether the hon. gentleman so understands the Bill now. Are the conditions of Indians residing upon reserves equal to the conditions of the white settlers or the colored people of this country? No matter what the color may be, those who are subject to the responsibilities of citizenship ought to have the right to vote, and as soon as the red man assumes those responsibilities, he should have the vote, and would have it by the law of the land. The hon. gentleman proposes, however, to give this right to those who are not subject to those responsibilities. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), went on to say.

"While we refuse to give them the same privileges as we give white men, does such a policy not tend to keep them down? Does it not tend to keep them in that humble and lowly position? The sooner we, by legislation, give them a helping hand and raise them to a higher level, the better it will be for them and the better it will be for this Dominion. In view of these facts, I think there is no harm in adopting this clause of this Bill and enfranchising those Indians who are equally qualified with white men to exercise the franchise. If it should be found, after a few years' experience, that they do not exercise the franchise in a proper way, then we can change the policy and adapt it to circumstances. But let us give them a trial, at any rate; if they do not use the franchise properly, we can take it away from them."

He does not propose to cast upon them any of the civil rights of which they are now deprived, but he proposes simply to give them the right to vote, and we know they are not any more free to exercise that right than they are to exercise any other right they possess. They are not free to sell their lands, or to dispose of their property, or to contract debts, and yet they are to be entrusted with the highest rights a free man can exercise. Sir, we have not heard from the other side of this House, a single utterance from hon. gentlemen in defence of this monstrous proposition. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), declared on page 1491 of the *Hansard:*

"But no one proposes to give it to the wild Indians of the forest, or to the Indians upon their reserves."

Now, the proposition is, according to the explanation made by the hon. Minister to-day, to give the franchise to Indians on the reserves, and on separate holdings. Now, we all know that the great majority of the Indians upon these reserves, in Ontario at least, are living in separate houses. The wife, in a large number of instances, supports the husband by her labor, and the husband is to be entitled to exercise the franchise but not the wife. While there are a number of intelligent Indians on the reserves capable of intelligently exercising the franchise, and who would make capable citizens, I complain that we draw no distinction between these and Indians who are not so. But even the intelligent Indians are not subject to the liabilities of other citizens, they pay no taxes, they have no municipal government except such as the Government imposes upon them by the local agent under the superintendent. What will be the practical working out of this proposition? The revising officer, in other portions of this Bill, is instructed to obtain assessment rolls, and to make them *primâ facie* evidence that the person is entitled to vote. But there are no assessment rolls on the Indian reserve, no means by which the revising officer can obtain this knowledge unless he goes to the reserve and makes an assessment himself. The officer from whom the revising barrister is to receive his information, is the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, the officer of the First Minister here, who can tell him what persons are entitled to be put upon the roll, and what persons are not. Does the hon. Minister suppose he can make us believe that these local superintendents and agents are going to give the right to vote to Indians with-

out obliging them, in some way, to vote for their party? Why, the whole Bill is a party measure. It takes precedence over every other public measure simply because it is a party measure, and it is being pushed through from day to day because it is supposed that it will advance the party interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. gentleman is pushing this measure because he wants the votes of his Indian wards. He will need votes at the next election and he knows it, and so he is now laying up a store of votes that will be ready to his hand in time of need. It is just another instance of what we have had years ago. The Indians are to have votes in order that the Superintendent General, by the influence he exercises over them, may secure those votes for himself. We know that the hon. gentleman, some years ago, called for $10,000 more when he was in a strait for votes, and it would be the last time of calling. But the hon. gentleman does not propose this time to ask for another $10,000; he proposes to enfranchise a number of Indians whose votes he will control, and so avoid the necessity of asking for another $10,000. For these reasons, and for a number of other reasons which I shall take occasion to present at a future stage of the debate, I am opposed to the proposition to enfranchise the Indians who are not placed in the same position as white men.

Mr. GILLMOR. This Bill, which we have been discussing for many weeks, was originally introduced by the hon. leader of the Government. The Bill as presented some months ago was the deliberate conclusion at which the First Minister had arrived as the measure he intended to lay before Parliament to be enacted into law. Of course, there have been some alterations made and some improvements made in the details; but after this Bill has been perfected so far as it may be, it reminds me of a story told of a doctor who was asked his opinion with respect to cucumbers. He said: Pick the cucumber, peel it, salt it, put vinegar on it, and then throw it out of doors. My opinion of this Bill is that it was never needed by the country, and should be treated as the cucumber.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must discuss the amendment.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not want to trespass on the patience of the committee; but I contend we must have considerable latitude in discussing this Indian question. It involves the character of the electorate of the Dominion. If it does not mean that, it means nothing. If we are not at liberty to express our opinions with respect to the electorate, the discussion will be very much curtailed. But everything I will say will be relevant to the question before the committee. This is a very broad question. We have been discussing the extension of the franchise, and this is an extension of the franchise. It will be perfectly in order, if we are going to extend the franchise to one class of persons, to refer to other classes. The Government propose by this Bill to extend the franchise to Indians. It is quite proper for me to state how the electorate will be improved or affected by extending the franchise to other classes. Instead of extending the franchise to Indians, there are 300,000 white men who have advantages of education, religious instruction and civilisation, and yet do not possess the franchise. The franchise could be conferred upon them without degrading the electorate or society. In the early part of the discussion with respect to Indians the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who is very much better acquainted with Indian character than I am, moved an amendment, to add in the fourteenth line the words: "who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act, and has had conferred on him the same civil rights as other persons qualified under this Act."

Mr. DAWSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Some other member proposed that amendment.

Mr. GILLMOR. I thought it was the hon. member. That, however, was a very good amendment, and I am quite in accord with it. I contend that no man is entitled to exercise the franchise who has not taken upon himself the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, and throughout this discussion no one on this side of this House has objected to giving Indians the franchise after they have attained that position. The proposition to extend the franchise to a class of persons who, notwithstanding all that has been done for them, have not reached the position of citizenship, is a monstrous proposition and a degradation to the electorate of the country. It may be thought that this debate has occupied a long time; but when we see the position taken by supporters of the Government, the fact that they have not taken part in perfecting this great measure of reform, it appears to me, if they understand the question, as if they are not very anxious to discuss the question before the House and the country. The First Minister has stated in this House that not a single Indian has been enfranchised. The leader of the Opposition interrupted, and said the Wyandotte band had been; whereupon the First Minister said he had forgotten that circumstance; that that was a small band, which had been broken up and had subsequently acted as individuals. Now, here is the pith of the whole question. The Wyandotte band had risen in the scale of civilisation, after many years of assistance, and separated themselves from their tribal relations, and acted as other men, by assuming the responsibilities of citizenship and with all the duties belonging thereto. When they assume these duties we are in favor of their enfranchisement, and personally I sympathise as deeply with them as any other member. When we remember them in their rude and savage state, there was something grand about the Indians; but unfortunately they are in a different condition to-day. Until the Indians separate themselves from their tribal relations they cannot be enfranchised with safety to the State or with any advantage to the Indians. When they occupy the position of citizens, I repeat, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will be as ready to extend the franchise to them as are hon. gentlemen opposite; for when an Indian occupies that position he is as free as any man. He is not under the control of the Superintendent General or of any other man, unless he chooses to put himself under that control. He is free to act as independently as any representative sitting in Parliament. I have heard it stated by some hon. gentlemen, including the Premier himself, that this was giving the Indian a chance to rise. Well, Sir, the Indian has had a chance to rise. The tax-payers of this country have given the Indians a chance to rise, the Government of this country has been aiding and fostering them for years and years past, and they have had opportunities. But it seems to me that they are destined as a race to fade away before civilisation. In some respects I regret it, but because such is the case is it wise for us, if we cannot raise them to this level, is it wise for the country to go down to the same scale as themselves? I speak advisedly, and I say that no good to the Indians and a great deal of evil and degradation and disgrace will be heaped upon the electorate of this country, by making these people voters; and I say that the electorate of this country are not better than they should be, with all the advantages of our civilisation. I was much pleased that, although my hon. friend from Kent, N.B., spoke from the Government side, and was supposed to represent their views—I was pleased with the sympathy he expressed for the Indians, and I agree with him that when they arrive at a certain stage of advancement they should occupy the same privileges as the whites. I agree with him when he said that the Indian, after he has arrived at that stage of civilisation and that condition which entitled him to vote, and when

he had the same qualification as the white man, he should have the franchise. In this we are at one with him. I also agree with something my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Foster) said, as to the Indians, and I will take occasion to quote what he said with reference to the matter. He said:

"You say the Indians ought not to be enfranchised,"——

There, I think, the hon. gentleman was mistaken. We do not say that certain Indians should not be enfranchised, because there are certain Indians who are already enfranchised and have the qualifications:

"You say the Indians ought not to be enfranchised, and you make a comparison between the Indians whom you say this Bill will enfranchise and the gentle and sweet women of our country; you say it is an outrage that the Indians should be enfranchised and that the women should not. Now, I hold as strongly as hon. gentlemen opposite can, and just as honestly as hon. gentlemen opposite do—not more honestly; I do not say that—just as honestly as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and his honest countenance tells me that he holds it honestly—I say I hold as honestly as he does in favor of the complete enfranchisement of women, married, single or widows, who have an equal property qualification with men, when once you fix the condition of a franchise by a property qualification. But I say, too, that I believe in enfranchising the Indian. I believe that the Indian who earns a living for himself, the Indian who has real property, who occupies a home, who has a salary or income, who is looking up to that greatest boon which men in a civilised country can claim, and which men in a savage country can aspire to—the boon of full and perfect citizenship—I say I could not, in justice to history and my own convictions, deny the right of the franchise to that man. Hon. gentlemen opposite get up and they thunder away for hours and hours, in a futile attempt to mislead the country into the thought that every savage Indian in the great North-West is, forsooth, to be enfranchised, and made a voter under this Bill; that Pi-a-pot, and Pat-him-on-the-back, and those other Indians, with whose names hon. gentlemen are suspiciously familiar, shall have votes"

Now, I agree with the conclusions to which my hon. friend comes with regard to the class of Indians that ought to be allowed to vote. But he must have learned by this time that this Bill includes a great many more than he referred to; and I am curious to know how he, and my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry) are going to meet the proposal to enfranchise Indians who have not arrived at that condition, who have not become citizens in the full sense of the word. With regard to the sweet and gentle women of the country, I would rather have heard him make that speech, and make such a speech as I expected of him, when that subject was under discussion. But he was silent, I believe, when that discussion was going on. But after his expressions of admiration for the women of our country, I do not understand how he has managed to live so long in single blessedness. With regard to the qualifications of women for voting——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hardly think the hon. gentleman is in order in referring to female franchise.

Mr. GILLMOR. Well, he was speaking on the Indian question at this time, and I was just following him. I am surprised that the hon. member who sees so much sweetness in the fair sex should not ere this have wo'ed and won some fair one to himself. He seems disposed rather to imitate the bee:

"And like the busy bee improve each shining hour,
And gather honey all the day from every opening flower."

I wanted him to speak on the enfranchisement of women, because I think he could have used language which would have convinced hon. gentlemen on the Government side, but he chose to put it off. He did not think anything of the sweet women when they were under discussion, but when we are on the Indian clause new light fell upon him, when it was too late. I endorse every word that has been said by my hon. friends from New Brunswick with reference to the enfranchisement of the Indians. New Brunswick is my native Province; I have lived there all my life; I have been acquainted with the Indians in our vicinity for over half a century, and though I have seen Indians in my own county who could read and write and have adopted the customs of the whites, I say deliberately that I never saw an Indian who, with safety to society or advantage to himself, could enjoy the franchise. I think my hon. friend from Northumberland will endorse those sentiments.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Will this amendment give one of them a vote?

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not know whether it will or not, but I presume it will to others, who have no better qualifications than the Indians to whom I refer. Perhaps my hon. friend and those who have Indians residing on reserves in their own localities will know about that better than I do. But this I do know, that for half a century at least the ratepayers of New Brunswick have been contributing to the support of the Indians, that the Indians have been under the control of the Government of that Province up to the time of Confederation, and that then the General Government took them under their care. That was a declaration that the 30,000 or 40,000 Indians in the older Provinces were unable to take care of themselves. This Parliament saw that it was necessary that these people should be guarded and protected, and to that end passed the Indian Act. I have read that Act from one end to the other, some 113 clauses, and what do I find in it? Do I find that it has reference to a class of persons whom Parliament thought could be trusted with the franchise? Not at all. I find three classes referred to in that Act—the Superintendent General, who is the chief man, his officials under him, and the Indians, who are totally helpless, who have not the intelligence necessary for the management of their own affairs in the least degree. (The hon. gentleman read a portion of the Act.) These Indians cannot sell to a white man or to an Indian; their property cannot be taken for debt, and they cannot dispose of it to anybody without the consent of the Superintendent General. I remember that many years ago there was a great man down at the seaboard whom the people reverenced so much that when the children were asked who made them, they answered Colonel McBane. That is something like the influence of the Superintendent General over these Indian tribes. They cannot be free men while they are under the control of himself and his officials; and I am surprised that it should have entered into the mind of any man or body of men to extend the franchise to this class of persons, when there are so many men in this country who are well qualified to exercise that privilege, but who are denied it. I have always been in favor of manhood suffrage; I think the best qualifications for the franchise are intelligence, independence, and a good moral character; and we step over 300,000 men of that character to give the franchise to the Indians, whose progress is slow, and few indeed of whom have arrived at that stage of intelligence and independence to entitle them to vote. No doubt, in the older Provinces of Canada there are a few who have risen to that condition of intelligence and cultivation; but they can vote now if they choose to throw off their tribal relations. When an Indian becomes intelligent enough to do business for himself he ought to see the beauties of our civilisation sufficiently to withdraw from his tribal relations and to become, in every sense of the word, a free and independent man. It is a bold thing to come into this Parliament, at this age of the world, at this time of civilisation and refinement, and propose to enfranchise a class of men, most of whom are little raised above the barbarous condition of their race. I cannot understand the motive; I do not wish to attribute motives; I know that now, with all the advantages we possess, the electorate of Canada has become exceedingly degraded and corrupt. That such a state of things exists in this country is more to be deplored than anything else. I thought that the corruption of the electorate had reached its culminating point when the attempt to bribe members of Parliament took place in Ontario; but if it is the intention of this Government and its supporters to

enfranchise the Indians of this country, in order to bring them to the polls to support their party, it is the crowning act of political rascality. We have continued this debate because it is important, because we want the electors of this Dominion to understand it and come to the rescue. This thing has been sprung upon the country, and the voice of the people, wherever it has been expressed, has been overwhelmingly pronounced against this measure. We have continued it for two reasons. For the reason that we want the electorate of this country to be pure and independent. If white men can be corrupted, we do not want whole tribes to be brought into the electorate who can be taken to the polls as sheep to the shambles. There is good reason for the long continuance of this debate, and I can give a personal illustration why a man should hold on when he is safe, an illustration which, I think, applies to the revising barristers and the Indians in this Bill. Very early in my career, during a political canvass, I went to a farmer's house, and as I took hold of the latch I heard the growl of a very big dog inside. I held on to the door, refusing to allow the people inside to open it, although they assured me that I need not be alarmed, that they knew the dog and he would not hurt me. But I did not know the dog, and therefore held on to the door. Finally, however, after a good deal of pressing on their part, I allowed them to open it. What was the consequence? As the dog went by, he grabbed my trowsers and took one leg of my pants, together with a part of the skin. I made up my mind then that when I had an animal so dangerous under my control I would not open the door until I was confident he was taken good care of. We have got this Indian now; he is not our Indian. We have this revising barrister now; he is not our barrister. We are, therefore, afraid of them, we hold them there, and they will never get out at us and do any harm until we open the door. But the moment we do, I am afraid we will be served as I was by the dog, which, I was assured, would not bite if let at large. I do not know how long we can hold on to the door, but I will hold on to it until that dog is taken care of, if I have the strength. This Bill is not brought out to show fair play between party and party; it is not intended, in my humble opinion, to do justice to all parties; it is not based upon principles of open-handed justice and fair play. I believe the free men of this country do not believe in this Bill. I do not know how many Liberals and how many Conservatives signed the petitions against it, but I know that every letter that I have received is against the Bill, and one of them is from a man who usually votes Conservative. With regard to the qualifications of the Indians to use the franchise, you have only to turn over the reports of the agents to see the class of people they are. We have to pay agents all over the Dominion to look after them, to see that they use the means we furnish them with in a proper way. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) described one who was worth some $75,000. I wish they were all worth that much, so that we could relieve the people from the tax of supporting them; but the man who had the ability of accumulating that money ought to assume all the responsibilities of free men, he ought to separate himself from the tribe and become a man and a brother, and have the right to vote as other citizens. We have been endeavoring to induce the Indians to change their habits of life, but we find singularly few of them who have any inclination to change. They retain their instincts, and refuse to settle down, as a class, to farming operations and mercantile pursuits, or to any of the industrial pursuits of the white men. It is not in their nature to do so; the most we can do is to act generously towards them, help them, feed and clothe them, if necessary; but to admit them to the franchise, to allow them to come in and offset an equal number of white voters, cannot be defended on any line of argument. It cannot be considered in any other light than that of a miserable party stratagem. Let hon. gentlemen opposite put themselves in the place of their opponents and see how this thing would work. If the leader of a Government I were supporting were to make any such proposition I would leave him the moment he made it; but I venture the assertion that we will never have such a proposition as that coming from the leader of the Liberal party. I do not wish to enter into the minds and hearts of hon. gentlemen opposite, but the fact that they have not given to the country arguments in favor of this proposition is an evidence that they do not feel themselves very safe; the fact that their press has not, ever since this discussion commenced, given the truth to the people, is an evidence they dare not put the case as it stands. Our view is, that when the Indian has arrived at that stage of civilisation and advancement to entitle him to become a free man he should have the franchise; but the Government press endeavor to give a contrary impression, and refuse to discuss the question on its merits. They say the Session is late, and the time is precious, and we know what we want, and that is enough for you to know. That is not the way the country expects to be enlightened on an important measure of this kind. This is not a measure which should be brought down, with any show of decency, at the close of a Session. The leader of the Government said, some years ago, that a measure of this kind would require a three months' Session to be discussed properly; and we will see that, although it has been brought down at the end of the Session, it will not fail to be properly discussed. We have got the Indian and we have got the revising barrister, and we do not intend to let them out, so long as we can, consistently with our duty to the country, keep them in.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. FISHER. It was with the deepest disappointment that I listened to the statement of the First Minister. When, a little while ago, he promised to introduce some changes in regard to the Indian franchise, I fully expected that he intended to make some radical change, and not that he intended to trifle with the intelligence of the House so much as to leave the matter practically as it was before or, possibly, to make it a little worse. I did not suppose that he ever intended to meet the views of this side of the House, for I do not think that is the plan or the practice of the right hon. gentleman; but I thought his followers, finding the opinion which was entertained in the country, had urged upon him some radical change which he had accepted, so I was deeply disappointed to find that he was not doing anything of the kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite, this afternoon, interrupted my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) to ask him how many Indians in his Province were going to be enfranchised by this measure. It is not the place of any hon. member on this side, but of the First Minister, to answer that question, and if those hon. gentlemen have not received that information in their caucuses they should ask it here, so that the First Minister may answer it in public. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it is quite sufficient that they should know what is intended by the Bill, and do not give us or the public any information in reference to it. If the public know anything of its provisions it is due to the action of hon. gentlemen on this side, in upholding this protracted debate and in causing the country to learn the effects which the provisions of this Bill will have. The leader of the Government has not seen fit to tell us how many Indians will be enfranchised under this Bill. The first reason of his silence which is likely to occur to us is that he does not know. I doubt if he or his colleagues have ever considered the scope of this Bill, in regard to the general electorate of the country, though no doubt they have carefully and wilily considered its effect on certain constituencies which they wish to influence. There is, however, another possible reason for the silence of the First Minister, and a most discreditable one, if it be true, and that

is, that if he told us how many Indians would be enfranchised under the provisions of this Bill we might be able to compare his statement with the number who may become enfranchised under it before the next general election. It is true that to-day the Indians of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Quebec may not to any extent be enfranchised by this Bill and the amendment, as very few of them have their location tickets and have improvements worth $150, but it is quite possible that when the Bill is passed the Indian agents of the right hon. gentleman may give location tickets to such a large number of Indians in constituencies where their votes are desirable for Government supporters that, in a short time and, at all events, before the next general election, the number may be largely increased. If the hon. gentleman has such an intention in his mind it would explain his not giving the information, because it might be compared with the results in those constituencies. Since this question first came before the House I have gained some more knowledge about it. The proposition then laid before the House was different from the present one, and the present proposition is still very objectionable. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House then contended that the present proposition was the real proposition involved in the Bill, and although I was disappointed at the statement of the First Minister this afternoon, I was somewhat comforted by the reflection that he had completely disposed of the statement of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), in speaking of the disingenuous manner in which signatures had been obtained to a petition from his county. He stated that those signatures had been obtained under the pretence that this Bill intended to enfranchise the Indians of the North-West; and he went on to contend that such was not the case, as the Bill was originally brought down. But when the leader of the Government placed this amendment in your hands, he impliedly admitted that the contention that the Indians of the North-West were to be enfranchised under the original proposition was correct. He says that was the intention of the Bill. If that had not been the intention, why did the hon. Minister, in this amendment, propose the enfranchisement of the Indians in the North-West Territories? Meagre as his remarks were, they removed any ground for the accusation against gentlemen who had obtained signatures to that petition, and against the hon. gentleman who presented it to this House. In studying the Indian Act, since this question was first discussed, I have discovered some things that surprised me. Hon. gentlemen on this side contended at first that only the enfranchised Indians should be given votes, whilst no Indians maintaining their tribal relations ought to be given a vote, in the interest of this country. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) who, I am glad to acknowledge, is a great authority on Indian questions, replied that it was unfair to ask the Indians, proud as they were of their tribal relations, to cut themselves away from those relations in order to have a vote. I supposed, of course, that when they became enfranchised they would necessarily have to abandon their tribal relations. But in examining this Act I find that such is not the case. I find that nothwithstanding that he may be enfranchised under the Indian Act, he still remains a member of the band, in so far as all the privileges and advantages of that band are concerned, but he is cut away from the band in so far as the disabilities are concerned which place him in a state of tutelage. In order to make this clear, I will read some clauses from the Indian Act. (The hon. gentleman read the 99th and some following sections of the Indian Act, to show the condition of the enfranchised Indian.) There is one exception here which I wish particularly to be noticed, namely, that which carefully reserves to the Indians enfranchised under the Indian Act such privileges and rights as enable them to remain members of their band, and enables them to participate in the annuities, allowances, rents and interest money of their band. Furthermore, it allows them to participate in the councils of their band; and here, I contend, is the only real privilege which the Indians can possibly claim as attendant on connection with their band. If they are allowed still to vote for their chief, or to be elected chief, nobody can pretend that they are no longer allowed to participate in the advantages and benefits accruing to them as members of that band; and if this is the case, these Indians cannot have any reasonable objection to becoming enfranchised under the terms of the Indian Act. Then the hon. member for Algoma wished to preserve to the Indians all those traditions and sympathies which they hold as belonging to an ancient race. I contend that under this Act there is nothing which prevents them so retaining their sympathies and their traditions. When they are enfranchised under the Indian Act the only thing they part with is their civil disability; they are removed from the state of tutelage which the First Minister has so often referred to in his Indian reports. But it still leaves the enfranchised Indians all their peculiar ideas and race sympathies. Therefore, those who desire that the Indian must be enfranchised under the Indian Act before he obtains a vote can no longer be open to the charge of dealing harshly with the Indians, because they still retain all the advantages which their tribal relations give them. It is true that by their enfranchisement they lose all their tribal relations which are disadvantageous to them, by which they are kept from being citizens; and in asking the Indians to so enfranchise themselves and relieve themselves from this disability, this mark of inferiority and servitude, we are not asking them to do anything contrary to their self-respect, or anything against their tribe and race. Until the Indian is enfranchised he is really in a state of servitude. Questions have been raised during the discussion as to why we should give the vote to negroes and others besides whites, apart from Indians. It is not our object to deprive Indians of the right to vote when they occupy the same conditions as white men, negroes, Mahomedans or East Indians. I desire, as do all hon. members on this side of the House, that the Indian shall be placed on the same plane with other people, with respect to the privilege of voting. What we object to is, that Indians under a different set of conditions shall be allowed a privilege denied to other races and colors. Under the Indian Act the Indian is not allowed to will property. Under the twentieth section, although he may hold a location ticket—which, under the present amendment, would entitle him to vote—he is not allowed to will property. That is a privilege which white men, and Africans, and anyone else is allowed. That is absolute entail, and it shows that the property is not his to do what he pleases with, but is really Crown property, held under the Superintendent General. Any Indian who, previous to the selection of a reserve, happens to hold any property in it which would not be supposed to be in common, which he may have created, just as a settler creates improvements, has not the right to such property; but by the twenty-first section, if it happens to be taken as portion of a reserve for a particular band, he has only the same privilege as any Indian who holds under a location ticket. Although an Indian may have obtained the property before he became part of the band, still, after the Government chooses to take the land as a portion of the reserve, he then has to give up the property to the Government, and it is held by the Superintendent General. Under the twenty-second and twenty-third sections the Superintendent General can lease or occupy lands belonging to Indians. He can allow other people to go on a reserve and, by his license, take possession of a portion of the land, cut timber, mine, or otherwise work and occupy the land. This is not just and right to the Indian, if he has an inalienable right to the property. It proves conclusively that the Superintendent General and his

agents have control of the reserves, and not the Indians themselves. Furthermore, under the thirty-fourth section, Indians who may have shown their advanced state by undertaking agricultural operations upon locations, and are called upon to do road work and statute labor, not in the same way as citizens are called upon by municipalities, are called upon to do the work by direction of agents appointed by the Government. Here, again, is a means by which the Government and the Superintendent General can control and influence the Indians with respect to voting. By the thirty-eighth section it is conclusively shown that the Indians are minors and in a state of tutelage. I allude to the restriction with respect to intoxicating liquors, which are not allowed to be sold on Indian reserves. In view of my well-known opinions in regard to the liquor traffic, it is far from my wish to complain of this restriction upon the Indians; but when I find such a restriction is not imposed on other classes, that all other classes are allowed free access to liquor, unless they see fit by their vote to exclude it, I hold that this is a state of things proving that the Indians are not free men and are not entitled to the vote. We find also, by another section of this Act, that the Indians are allowed to elect their chiefs, and that, in fact, a certain kind of municipal organisation is allowed to them; and one would suppose, at first sight, that such a permission would entail upon them a certain amount of independence and give them a certain amount of training in political work. But if you read the Act you will find that that permission is simply given to them when the Superintendent General or the local agent chooses to allow it. They cannot demand it for themselves, no matter how far advanced in civilisation they may consider themselves to be, for they must prove to the satisfaction of the agent and the First Minister that they are likely to exercise that privilege as pleases those autocratic individuals. I believe this right will be given to them just so often and so long as they show that they are amenable to the instructions of the agents who control them; just so long as they show themselves sufficiently subservient to the Government who controls their destinies, that right may be given them. But that such a right would be given to a band who would perversely—as the hon. gentleman would think—oppose the hon. gentleman, I do not think it would be expected that such would be the case by anybody who is conversant with the methods by which those hon. gentlemen carry on their political work in this country. Then the Indian is not taxable. (The hon. gentleman here read section 75 of the Act.) There, Sir, you see the essential and fundamental difference between the Indian upon the reserve and the white man or the Indian living off the reserve. The tribal Indian on the reserve is not liable to bear his share of the burthens of the country and to assume those responsibilities of citizenship upon which the right to vote should depend. By section 77 we find that no person may sue an unenfranchised Indian for a debt, or take any security or lien upon his property. Any particular article which an Indian may buy may be seized again for the payment of its price, but no other personal property or real estate of the Indian is liable to seizure. The right hon. gentleman proposes to give the vote only to such Indians as obtain a location ticket from the local agent. Those who do not know the Act may think that the right hon. gentleman has made a restriction by this amendment, that he has made the Act better, fairer, and more just to the two great political parties of the country, and to the Indian himself, than it was before. But when I come to examine the way in which the Indian gets his location ticket I find that such is not the case. I find, on the contrary, that this amendment provides machinery by which the right hon. gentleman can more surely and safely control the votes of the Indian. Under the original proposition of the Bill every Indian in a tribe living on a reserve, the valuation of which, when divided up among the total number of adult male Indians, would give each a vote, would have a vote. If, however, a reserve was worth, say $10,000, and there were in the band 100 Indians, none of them would have a vote, because the amount represented by each would only be $100, which would not be sufficient to qualify. But under the present proposition the agent who controls the destinies of the band can issue his location ticket to as many as he pleases, so long as the value of each is represented by not less than $150. The agent has in his own hands the absolute power of conferring the right to vote on certain Indians, and restraining others from voting, and by his political foresight he can select those whom he knows to be subservient to himself and the Government, or grateful to them for services they have rendered. He can exclude every Indian who may happen to have been fractious or rebellious to the authority of the agent, or who may have been intelligent enough to form his own opinion in political matters. By this proposition the right hon. gentleman is really taking to himself and to his agents a greater power for the control and the creation of votes than he had by the Bill as it originally stood. By the Bill as it originally stood, if that band held a reserve valued at $30,000 every man of them would have the right to vote, on the basis of holding the property as partners and occupants in common, each of whom held a share worth $200. Under the present amendment none of these Indians have the right to vote at all; their vote is only given by the agent, who controls the band, and their right is absolutely done away with. I cannot call that a right for which these men have to sue at the hands of an irresponsible Indian agent. Under the Bill, as it was introduced, they would have a chance to show their right; but under this amendment the power to vote is not a matter of right at all; it is a matter of favor, which can only be exerted by the political supporters of the right hon. gentleman. I do not wish to attribute motives to the right hon. gentleman or to any of his followers, but if I had heard a single word from any one of these hon. gentlemen, explaining that this amendment had been introduced for the purpose of restricting the vote, or giving it to such Indians as really deserved it, and explaining how it was intended to bring that about, one might have attributed to them a proper motive in introducing it; one might have confined oneself to endeavoring to show that they were not going the right way to attain their object; one might have attempted to show that they were not going to give the vote necessarily to the Indians who had the right to vote, but only to such as might have curried favor with the agent in charge of the reserve. But the right hon. gentleman in introducing his amendment, did not deign to tell this House or the country anything of the kind; he did not give us more than a minute, I cannot call it explanation, but of speech; he simply stated that he had determined to do this. Well, such autocratic action on the part of a Minister of the Crown may be pleasing to that hon. gentleman himself; it may be pleasing to his colleagues and supporters in this House; but I have reason to believe that it is not pleasing to his supporters in the country. I believe the day has come when those who have hitherto supported the right hon. gentleman and his followers are dissatisfied with such an autocratic proceeding. The people of this country are looking with wonder at this Parliament, where argument after argument is advanced by this side of the House, showing why this Bill should not become law; and they are gazing in wonder upon the spectacle of the great majority of the members of this House sitting silent and not attempting to support the Bill by argument, statement or explanation. It reflects very little credit, indeed, upon hon. gentlemen opposite that they do not try to support or defend the action of their chief in this House. I know that I can speak for those around me when I say that we are reasonable enough to receive argument

and explanation if we can get them; but while we cannot get these, we cannot, in justice to ourselves, attribute to them any other than an improper motive for the course they are taking. It is because they dare not explain their motive that they do not do it. I can well understand that there are motives which they do not choose to put on record, which they are ashamed to place before this House and the country. I regret that this House has been so long detained by the consideration of this Bill. If reasonable explanations had been given of it on its first introduction into this House, and proper discussion had been held upon it as it passed through committee, I believe the discussion might have been very much shortened; but we have tried again and again, day after day, to lay before the committee our reasons for opposing this Bill, and we have not had these reasons answered, except on two or three occasions, when the hon. gentlemen who attempted to answer them did not know what they were talking about. We have been discussing this measure from day to day, longer than we wished, so that hon. gentlemen opposite might thoroughly understand it; and, still more, so that the country at large might understand it. It is evident from the words of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to-day, that he did not thoroughly understand this question of the Indians; it is evident that the country at large does not understand it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attributed a meaning to the Bill, which the right hon. gentleman explained was not the true meaning, and the amendment really bears his meaning. I oppose the meaning of this amendment, and I believe the country will oppose it. I oppose it in consequence of what I believe to be its insidious character, and because it will have a worse effect than even the original Bill. It is in consequence of this feeling that I felt it to be my duty to my constituents and this House to say a few words upon the amendment before you put it to the vote.

Mr. BURPEE. Among the provisions of this very bad Bill, I consider that before us to be one of the worst. The longer it is discussed the more apparent its perniciousness becomes. For my part, I will not characterise it as I feel it should be characterised, but I do think that the country and the House should have sufficient time to fully consider this provision of the Bill. Since 1867 we have had several Franchise Bills proposed to the House of Commons, and all of them, for prudential motives, were withdrawn by the leader of the Government. The provision of the measure before you was not in any of those Bills. This is a new proposition, and should, therefore, be all the more fully discussed. If the Bills introduced before were too objectionable for the House to consider, what can we say of this measure, with its Indian franchise? No free country, no country enjoying British institutions, no House of Commons, should pass such a provision as the one before us. I have been gathering what information I could from different parts of the country, as to the sentiment of the people on this measure, and I must say that while they object strongly to many of its provisions, this particular one which we are now discussing is received with amazement. Knowing the Indians, as the people in their vicinity know them, they are astonished that they should be entrusted with the franchise, to the exclusion of other citizens whom this Bill will disfranchise. Why not, some people say, allow this measure to be passed and leave the Senate to deal with it, whose business it is to stop hasty, objectionable legislation? If I thought the Senate would deal with the Bill on its merits I would be willing to leave it to be dealt with by them, but it is well known that the Senate is mainly composed of politieal partisans, and the decision they will come to, we are confident, will be in favor of the Government measure. As the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has put it, having the door in our own hands we had better not allow it to be opened, for if this provision be allowed to escape out of our hands I am afraid the Senate will not stop it. I am in favor of giving a vote to all on equal terms, provided they take upon themselves all the burthens of the State, and are capable of exercising the franchise as free citizens. We have already excluded one race from the Bill, we are now about to enfranchise another. There is as good reason for excluding the Indians as for excluding the Chinese. The Chinese who have acquired property, and have become British subjects, and are doing business in the country, are developing the country, and I think those portions of them have a better right to vote than the tribal Indian, who is not a free agent but a ward of the Government. I do not say that the Chinese are a desirable class of people to encourage, but I say that if they are here and take an interest in the country and aid in its development, they are better fitted to be entrusted with the franchise than the tribal Indians who, under the amendment in your hands, Sir, will not be able to vote unless they have a location ticket, which is in the discretion of the Government agent to give them or not, as he choses. This question, after the many days of discussion it has had, does not appear to be quite fairly understood by the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite are so reticent in expressing their views that only one side of the House is represented in the discussion, and that portion of the electorate who only read the press representing gentlemen opposite are scarcely acquainted with the provisions of the Bill yet. I believe an Indian should not have a vote unless he puts himself on equal terms with a white man, and then I have no more objection to his having a vote than I have to an African or a Chinaman having it, or in fact any citizen. But the Indians cannot get their location tickets unless it is the will of the Government agent to give them, and they cannot do business for themselves in any shape. They are wards of the Government, and are minors, in the eye of the law, and are upon an entirely different footing from others who are to have the vote. I do not think the Government should ask to enfranchise some 10,000 voters over whom they have direct and entire control. We make very stringent laws with reference to bribery and corruption, and forbid candidates using any influence, directly or indirectly, to obtain a vote; but the Indian is under the entire control of the Government, and to propose to give him a vote is worse than absurdity; it is an outrage upon the franchise. There are only about 1,550 Indians in New Brunswick, but their votes will be considerable, and a few votes some times turn an election. They are more directly dependent upon the Government than even the Indians in the Upper Provinces, for the $5,000 to $6,000 which they receive annually is controlled in its distribution by the agent, who gives to one Indian what he likes and withholds from another what he likes. Of course, there are reserves in New Brunswick belonging to Indians, but they are not so valuable as they are elsewhere, and, in my opinion, would not give them a vote if they were divided among them at a proper value of $150. That, however, is for the executive to deal with, and the Indian agent, and will give the latter more power still. In fact, he has the whole of the power. An Indian is prohibited from drinking liquor, and if you sell a glass of liquor to an Indian you are fined $200, which is a very heavy penalty. That shows the manner in which the Indian is regarded. They are not looked upon as having intelligence, and are therefore not in a position to exercise the elective franchise; they are not intelligent; there are very few Indians who can write at all. Every Indian child in New Brunswick has the opportunity of going to school, but their disposition to rove from one portion of the country to the other prevents their attending school. In fact, their disposition is entirely opposed to education. As to politics and the constitution, they know no more about them than a child two years old. They are, therefore,

entirely incompetent to exercise the franchise in a rational or intelligent manner. In New Bruswick, the Indian report states that there are somewhere in the neighborhood of 1,520 Indians, of whom 1,150 are stated to be resident on their reserves. The Indian agent has put down their residence, but I know, of my own knowledge, that a large portion of them reside for only a short time on the reserves. They are wandering tribes, so much so, that although they reside in several counties, the Indian agent grouped them altogether, because he could not distinguished which of them belonged to one county and which to another. The description given of them the other day by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was anything but flattering, but I have no doubt, from my experience of them, that it is correct. He represents them as wholly incompetent to exercise the elective franchise, and I believe it is a fact. The quantity of cultivated land put down as occupied by the 1,500 Indians and upwards in New Brunswick last year is 2,074 acres; new land broken up, 22 acres; number of houses or huts, 227. Well, I never saw but one house built by an Indian in my life; their dwellings are mere huts or wigwams. They are said to have 76 barns and stables, 17 ploughs, 26 harrows, 10 waggons, 24 horses, 29 cows, 15 sheep, 60 swine, and so on, in about that proportion. Then they raised 2,365 bushels of oats, 1,190 bushels of buckwheat, 6,980 bushels of potatoes; and they caught fish to the value of some $5,000.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. BURPEE. Before six o'clock I was giving you a statement, from the report of the Indian agent of New Brunswick, of the amount of stock held by the Indians and the crops produced by them during the previous year. The amounts given by him, I apprehend, are quite as large as the facts would warrant. He explains that it was very difficult to get an exact account from the Indians themselves; they were scarcely intelligent enough even to do that, but he has done the best he could under the circumstances. Notwithstanding that the amounts are so small, compared with the number of Indians, they are quite as large as you could expect, from the manner in which they do their farming. The fact is, they are bad farmers. They merely scratch the earth and throw in a little grain, or plant a few potatoes, and that is the amount of their farming. In order to give you an idea of the manner in which they farm, I will read you an extract from the agent himself. (The hon. gentleman read from the Indian report the statement of the agent concerning the farm operations of the Indians in the counties of York, Charlotte, Woodstock and St. John). Here it seems that the agent expended nothing for seed upon the reserves in Woodstock, because he feared that they would eat the seed instead of putting it into the ground. Now, Sir, these are the parties, or a portion of them, whom the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise by the Bill. Some portion of the press of New Brunswick has stated that the Indians were to be enfranchised under this Bill upon the same conditions as white people; yet they occupy a different position and are to be enfranchised under different conditions, as I have fully proved. The Indians almost entirely depend upon the Government and their agents. The location tickets come from the Government or their agents. The Government agent at each reserve can give a location ticket to any party he pleases, and withhold one from any party. But the Indians cannot sell the land, or lease it, or sell the timber from it, or the agricultural products grown on it, without first consulting and obtaining the consent of the Government. Indians cannot make contracts and cannot make a will. In fact, the agent has to be consulted in everything they do, and he holds them, so to speak, in the hollow of his hand. The Indians of New Brunswick receive between $5,000 and $6,000. The Government agent can give it to such parties as he pleases, and withhold it from others; the money is entirely at his disposition. Indians so largely dependent upon the good will of the agent of the Government should not be allowed to vote and have influence on the results of elections. If the Government divided up the reserves, and gave each Indian his own share in fee simple, and thus relieve him from all control by the Government or his agent, if the Indians thus became free men and managed their own property, they would be fit to exercise the voting power if they have the necessary amount of property qualification. But it is highly improper that while we disfranchise two or three very large classes of young men we should propose to enfranchise Indians. In New Brunswick there will be not less than 20 per cent. disfranchised of persons owning real estate between $100 and $150, and another class, because this Bill has not a personal property qualification. I do not deny that some of those will come in under other qualifications. But I maintain that one-half will not do so. Large numbers, equal to about 10 per cent. of young men, will be disfranchised in New Brunswick, and these form a most intelligent class and should be retained in the country. It is said that there will be very few Indians enfranchised in New Brunswick. No doubt that is the case, as compared with the member in Ontario and Quebec; but there are large reserves in New Brunswick, and no doubt the Government candidates will see that those reserves are well represented at the polls and that location tickets are procured for a great many Indians. Even if few are enfranchised in New Brunswick, still the principle of this clause of the Bill is wrong, and I strongly protest against it. I beg to move, in amendment to the amendment, the following:—

No Indian shall vote for the election of a member of the House of Commons who has not been enfranchised and has not had conferred upon him the same civil capacities, and who is not in possession of the same qualifications as are required in other voters under this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. A similar motion has already been negatived by the committee, and I cannot receive this one.

Mr. MILLS. If a comparison is made with the amendment published on page 1540 of *Hansard*, it will be evident that this motion is not the same. This is a negative proposition, and the other was an amendment to a proposition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It was not only an amendment to a proposition, but there was an amendment moved by Mr. Edgar, declaring "that no Indian shall be enfranchised who does not possess the same civil capacities as other voters under this Bill," which was negatived. I, therefore, cannot receive this amendment, which is a similar amendment.

Mr. WILSON. I believe the majority of the members of this committee will agree with me that there is no justification for extending a different rule to one class of the community than to another, and will agree also that a first element of a man's ability to exercise the franchise intelligently is that he should have a certain amount of qualification, so that he may be able to record his vote in the interest of the commonwealth. If the hon. gentleman could show that the Indians, whom he proposes to enfranchise, are capable of an intelligent vote, then he has made out his case; but if you find that neither he nor the papers throughout the country, which are always so ready and anxious to extol him and do his bidding, have not a word in the defence of this proposal, then I say there is no justification for such a proposition. We find that he himself is perfectly indifferent with regard to this proposal, and he gives no just reason why it should be accepted. I say that it is not dealing fairly with the committee and is not giving due weight to the intelligence of the members of this House—that he should

not think proper, that he should not condescend to give a single reason why these Indians should be enfranchised. It is perfectly monstrous that we should be asked to adopt a proposition to enfranchise a class who have never been enfranchised in any country in the world.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear; but I venture to say that no other Premier in any country in the world has ever come down to a Parliament with such a monstrous proposition as this, and a proposition as to which no explanation has been given. I say he is treating the House, and not only the House, but the whole country, with that contempt which I think the country will ultimately resent. I ask the First Minister to go to England, from which he is so fond of bringing precedents, and though he claims to be a true and loyal representative of the mother country, though he claims that none but the Conservative party are loyal, and that all intelligent Englishmen coming to this country adopt his views—I ask him if he can point out in the mother country any proposal to enfranchise such a class as these people—the Indian to whom he proposes to give votes. I think every member of this committee must contend, as has always been contended, that a man in order to be an elector, should have some fitness, some qualification, that he should in some way be trained, educated or cultivated to an intelligent exercise of the franchise. But would an Indian coming to the poll be able to decide intelligently which of the candidates would be a fit and proper person to receive his vote? Would he be competent to cast his vote in an intelligent manner? I say that no member of this committee who knows that class can say that he would. As showing what the opinions of others are as to the qualifications of electors, I refer the First Minister to the writings of Mr. Mill, and though I do not agree with all his sentiments, still the extract will show the class whom this writer considers ought to be enfranchised. (The hon. gentleman then proceeded to read the extract.) Now, I ask whether the Indians who are about to be enfranchised under this Bill will be able to go to the polls and cast an intelligent and independent vote? I think you will agree with me that they will not. The very first provision we make with respect to voters is that they must be of the age of twenty-one years and upwards; we do that because we believe a minor, under the control and guardianship of his parents, would be unlikely to cast an independent and impartial vote. Is there not just as much reason why an Indian, who is under the supervision and tutelage and dictation of the Superintendent General, should be prevented from casting a vote? While I should be willing to give to a regularly enfranchised Indian the same rights and privileges that other people possess, under similar circumstances, that is all that we should be asked to do. All we have to do to learn the actual condition of the Indian in his tribal state is to refer to the annual reports of the Superintendent General and his agents; and I am sorry the hon. First Minister did not peruse them before he brought in his Bill. If he had done so, although I have very little faith in his doing that which is in the interest of the country when his own political interest stands in the way, yet I believe he would not have attempted to force upon the House this proposition. There may be a reason why the First Minister desires these Indians to be enfranchised. We know that there is a very active agent among them; we know that Dr. Oronyhtekha has been doing a very large amount of missionary work among them, as the hon. Postmaster-General well knows. He gives the whole of his time to that work, although he does not devote himself to one lodge; he has a multiplicity of lodges to attend to; and withal he is a good Tory. I am a little inclined to think that he may be an official of the Government to-day. Dr. Oronyhtekha goes from one band to another to organise lodges; perhaps they may be temperance lodges, but they are generally Orange lodges.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not correct.

Mr. WILSON. I can show to my hon. friend where he has organised an Orange lodge in the county of Middlesex, and where a building has been erected for the use of the Orange Indians. I can refer him also to the county of Hastings, where there are a good many Orange lodges among the Indians, and it looks to me as if the object of enfranchising these Indians was to increase the strength of the Orange organisation in this House. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. We know his sincere desire for the success of the Orange organisation; we know how his heart would leap with joy if he could succeed in getting a few more Orangemen here, and if he could succeed in fastening on the people of Canada that particular Bill which he desires to have fastened upon them. We know that this Dr. Oronyhtekha is a devoted Orangeman; we know that in the Province of Ontario nine out of ten of the enfranchised Indians will be Orange voters; and we know full well how they will vote. We know that the Orange organisation is a political organisation—perhaps it may be religious, or the two combined. If we find the First Minister so anxious to have these Indians enfranchised, may there not be a sinister motive in his desire. I should not be surprised if my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, should have a visit from this Dr. Oronyhtekha down in his locality, with the view of enfranchising some of the Indians down there; but they must become good Orangemen before they get the right to be placed on the voters' list. It may be that the First Minister, a brother Orangeman, desires to have this provision passed for the purpose of giving increased strength to the Orange voter, and obtaining a larger Orange representation in this House; and therefore he may send the doctor down there for the purpose of organising some Orange lodges in that locality. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to be upon his guard, as the Commissioner of Customs may, perhaps, have a little more influence with the First Minister than the hon. gentleman. He may find there may be too many Orange votes, and the Blues may not, in the future as they have been in the past, be able to resist the agents brought in by the First Minister. An article which appeared in the *Orange Sentinel* lately will show that I am not exaggerating when I say that it will be dangerous to enfranchise these Indians, as they will become a danger to the State on account of the organisation to which many of them belong, the Orange society, being hostile to the religious views and sentiments entertained by our friends from the Province of Quebec. The *Orange Sentinel* says:

"It is claimed that the proposition to confer the right of franchise upon our civilised and loyal Indian population, as contemplated in the Franchise Bill now before the House of Commons, is a true solution of this difficult Indian problem, and it is contended that it will lead our Indian brethren gradually from one step to another, until they will have taken their places side by side with us as citizens of the Dominion. The question is of interest to us now—(No doubt that falls sweetly on the ears of the hon. Minister of Public Works)—for, as is well known, we have flourishing Orange lodges in many of these reserves, and we speak what we know when we say that many of the members of these lodges are as intelligent, well-informed and capable men as are to be found any where in the Dominion. If given the franchise, they would be able to exercise the right as intelligently as any other voters. Those who hold a different view will do well to read the able letter of Dr. Oronyhtekha to the London *Free Press*. It is a calm and dignified appeal on behalf of his race, such as may be expected from our eminent brother, which answers every objection urged against the enfranchisement, and is all the more powerful because of its being thoroughly non-partisan in its character, and coming from the Indian standpoint."

Now, you will see that it is a matter of urgency which the Orange body ought to consider well—so says the *Orange Sentinel*—the enfranchisement of the Indian. Why should the *Orange Sentinel* be so anxious

about it? The writer states that they are as intelligent and capable as their fellow white citizens. Well, if they do not take the trouble to become enfranchised under the Dominion Act they cannot be as capable as the white citizens. I am perfectly willing that they should be enfranchised under the Dominion Act, and if they are as intelligent as the *Sentinel* says they are, we are willing to give those who come up to the standard of the Act the privilege of voting. I deny, however, that Dr. Oronyhtekha is a non-political man. I say he is not only an out-and-out Conservative, but is besides an Orangeman of the first water, and my hon. friends from Quebec will learn to their cost, perhaps too late, that his object is to organise these various lodges, and that probably the First Minister in introducing this clause has had a similar motive. I ask my hon. friend to go over the records and see whether the Indians have complied with the requirements that a white man must comply with in order to vote. He will find such is not the case. Let us consider the effect the enfranchising of those Indians will have. You remember the pathetic appeals made by the First Minister, when he said he desired to introduce a Bill that would remove all discord, so that every individual, no matter in what Province, might have the same right to go to the polls. Has he adopted that course? He is going to enfranchise some of the Indians, and others he will not. We know the Indian nature; we have heard the First Minister state, time and again, that they are a jealous race, and if he gives a vote to some and deprives others of it he will create discord. We have to-day an evidence in the North-West of the consequences of creating discord; and I would advise the First Minister that the course he is now taking may be the source of a great amount of irritation among the various classes of Indians; I warn him that instead of having his difficulties confined to the North-West, he may create difficulties in the older Provinces. I would appeal to the Government not to run the risk of doing anything that might create difficulty in Canada. Let us for a short time look at the condition in which we find the Indians in the various parts of the Provinces, and I am very glad that the amendment moved by the First Minister gives me the opportunity of referring to the North-West Indians without being out of order. If you will turn to the report of 1884 you will find that the Superintendent General does not give a very glowing picture of the prosperity and the advancement of the people you are now asking us to enfranchise. (The hon. gentleman read from the report references to the Indians of Metlahkatla, the Qu'Apppelle district, and the Chippewa, Muncey and Oneida bands.) The First Minister proposed to enfranchise the Indians in British Columbia, and the most intelligent class of them probably were concerned in the difficulties he here refers to. He intended to enfranchise the Indians in the North-West Territories had not his attention been specially called to that matter. The Chippewas, the Munceys and the Oneidas live in sections of the country not far from the county which I have the honor to represent, and yet the report shows that their progress is small. The Minister of Customs should not complain of me for referring to the fact of these Indians being Orangemen, when the Indian agent himself, in his report, states that the Oneidas are building a council hall which is to serve also as a lodge room for the Good Templars and the Orange society. The report shows that the schools on these reserves are not well attended. The number of Indians living in that locality is said to be 1,345, and the probabilities are that 500 or 600 would be enfranchised under the present Bill. (The hon. gentleman read from the report concerning the Indians in the county of Hastings.) Every means possible have been used to elevate these Indians and make them competent citizens. Various religious denominations, especially the Methodists, have labored persistently among them, and have established a school, which is supported to a great extent by the contributions of that very liberal body, the Methodists. Yet the fact is notorious that all these efforts have produced very little results indeed. Coming to our locality, what is the condition in which you find them? They are ever anxious to obtain something to drink, and when they do succeed in getting something to drink, they become thoroughly intoxicated, and have to be put in the lock-up, and thereby become a source of annoyance and vexation to peaceable citizens. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read from the report of the Indian agent at Mount Elgin, giving an account of the operations of the industrial institution established amongst them, and of the extent to which the Indian youth availed themselves of the school facilities afforded them.) Almost every statement in the reports goes to show that the Government of the day have up to the present time considered that the condition of the Indians is not such as warranted their general enfranchisement. If they are not competent to be enfranchised it is not in the interest of the Dominion and of good government that they should be allowed to cast their votes at parliamentary elections. To say this proposition is a monstrous one is to express but feebly the iniquity that is concealed under this clause. Let the First Minister appeal to the country on this Bill, if he dare. Let him tell the people that he intended to give all the Indians votes, until he ascertained that such would not be a popular measure, and then proposed that the franchise should be given to such as obtained location tickets. If the Indians had been suffering hardships I could understand such a proposal. But such is not the case, except in so far as it has been caused by neglect on the part of the Interior Department. I am decidedly opposed to the First Minister's proposition, and it would be much better for the country if we hesitated before taking a leap in that direction, which cannot fail but be fraught with serious consequences. I look upon the amendment of the First Minister as illusory. If it were to pass, it would be even worse than the original clause, for it would leave it optional with the Government to say whether Indians should be enfranchised or should not. Furthermore, it would place the Indians under the direct control of the Minister. On account of these and many other reasons, I feel it my duty to vote against this clause, as I have voted against the principle of the Bill. The voice of the country has been one of protest against this proposition, such popular sentiment being represented by petitions, public meetings and expressions from the pulpit, and the Government ought to listen to the voice of the people. Let them even now amend the Bill, by wiping out the clause enfranchising Indians. When the Indian becomes enfranchised, when he subjects himself to all the duties and all the requirements of the State, let him then have the privilege of voting, but not till then. I shall vote against the amendment of the First Minister.

Mr. DAWSON. I am surprised at the reception which this amendment has met with from the Opposition. When this question was first discussed the great objection to it was that the Indian of the North-West—the savage of the forest and the plain—would have votes, and we had some amusing descriptions of Pie-a-pot, Slap-him-on-the-back, Poundmaker and Big Bear, voting. They all alluded very eloquently to the subject. By this amendment the Indians of the North-West and Keewatin are excluded, and in the older provinces it expressly provides that only such Indians as live on reserves and have farms of their own, which they cultivate and improve, shall have the franchise, irrespective of the value of their land. Surely there can be nothing fairer than that. As far as my experience and observation go, this proposition will not greatly extend the franchise amongst the Indians. It will simply give the franchise to those who are possessed of enough property arising from their own industry to enable them to vote, and surely there

can be no great risk in that; surely that is not a very sweeping measure. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to Indians totally uncivilised, to the savages of the forest and prairie, and the impression goes abroad that it is to those men that the Bill is to give the franchise. But the Bill means nothing of the kind. He referred to a murder having taken place in the district of Keewatin, but all Indians are not so degraded as that, and it would be easy to cite instances amongst white people where crimes just as great as those committed by Indians have taken place. The leader of the Opposition also said that they led a nomad life, but except with regard to the Indians on the prairies that is not the case, as they have certain regular hunting grounds and places where they can find food easily, but they are not at all such wanderers as they are supposed to be. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they have no objection to giving to advanced Indians, Indians who are capable of exercising the franchise intelligently, the right to vote. Now, Sir, that is just what the amendment proposes to do, because it provides that no Indian shall have the right to vote unless he is qualified as a white man is qualified. A great deal has been said, to the effect that the Indian living on the reserve cannot have the same qualifications, because he draws annuities from the Government; that he is under a sort of tutelage, that he does not pay taxes, etc. Well, Sir, he taxes himself sufficiently to make roads through his reserves and to other settlements, and he pays taxes to the Dominion Government. The reserve of the Indian may, I think, be looked upon in the light of an entailed estate in England. In such an estate the proprietor has only a life interest, and the estate is not liable for his debts; but still the life proprietor is not deprived of his civil privileges on that account, and he is not looked upon as being in a state of tutelage. I would draw attention for a moment to a misapplication of the name "Indian," which has been repeated very frequently in this debate. The half-breeds of Manitoba are Indians; they are of the same class of people that we call Indians here, for the Indians of the older Provinces are not full Indian —they are simply half-breeds. When Manitoba became a Province of the Dominion these half-breeds elected representatives to the Parliament of Manitoba; they took positions in the Ministry, and they certainly were not behind their white neighbors, either in intelligence or in general knowledge. Two hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick have described the Indians of that Province as being in a very inferior position, as being exceedingly degraded and unfit to exercise the franchise. Now, if that is the case, it must be simply from the manner in which those Indians have been treated. For 200 years they have been in the midst of civilisation, and if the system adopted towards them has been no better than to produce such a class of men as they describe, it is time that system were altered. But I say, Sir, that the adoption of this new system, which gives them the franchise when they have advanced to a certain stage, will have a tendency to elevate them, to make them take an interest in the country, and make them good citizens. It is unfair to the Indians to draw a comparison with those who owe their degradation to the white man, as those Indians in New Brunswick seem to do. These hon. gentlemen spoke of the Indians as living on the tax-payers of the country. It may be in the memory of some hon. gentlemen that the Imperial Government, in 1857, appointed a commission to enquire into the condition of the Indians in Ontario; and what did they say in their report? They expressed themselves in the strongest language they could command, as to the injustice that had been done to the Indians, by depriving them of their lands, robbing them of vast territories, for what they considered a mere nominal consideration. So that all that the Indians have received from the white man they have repaid ten fold. If the white man has kept the Indians in a degraded position, it is high time that he should adopt another system, and endeavor to lead them forward and lift them up in the social scale, and try to make good citizens of them. The enfranchisement under the Indian Act, which is spoken of so often, is no enfranchisement at all. That is a mere catch word; it is merely a scheme to divide up the reserve and give to each Indian his portion. An Indian, to become enfranchised under that Act, no matter how advanced he may be, has to give up his holding elsewhere, and go and live on the reserve, and go through a probationary course. But that is no enfranchisement. It is merely designed to break up the reserves into allotments and to do away with the tribal system. Whether it is a wise plan or not, it is an enfranchisement that does not apply to the present case at all. But it has been claimed that the enfranchisement of the Indian would degrade the electorate of this Dominion. Could anything be more absurd than to suppose that the enfranchisement of a few thousand Indians in the older Provinces—no more than one-fifth of the whole number—would produce this terrible effect on the electorate of 5,000,000 of people. This old system has been tried long enough. It is surely time now that instead of keeping the Indians in tutelage and treating them as mere children, a more advanced method of dealing with them should be tried. The first French settlers in this country dealt with them in a far different way. They granted lands to the white people who allied themselves with the Indians; and that system worked very well indeed, in bringing about friendship and union between them, and I believe the two races became largely amalgamated in portions of Lower Canada. Those early French settlers treated the Indians much more humanely than they have been treated since. Taking this Bill as it stands, with this amendment, and comparing it with the Ontario Act, the difference is not so very great. Hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches generally admire the Ontario Franchise Bill; and as it provides for the exercise of the franchise by the Indians, I do not see why they should not accept this amendment. The only difference between the two Bills is, that in the Ontario Act the Indians who receive pay from the Government are excluded under certain conditions, while this Bill does not make that a ground of exclusion; but it excludes them if they are not otherwise qualified. In fact, I think the Ontario Act goes quite as far as this Bill does; and I must say that I rather like this Ontario Act, if some slight amendments were made in it. As to this cry, which has been raised both in the papers and in this House, as to the enfranchisement of the wild Indians, the Indians of the plains, surely this amendment has done away with all cause for that cry; and now that such an immense step has been taken towards meeting the wishes of the Opposition, I think it would be only fair and reasonable to suppose that they would advance a step to meet the views of the other side. I cannot conceive of this opposition, which describes everything that is proposed as something monstrous, something terrible, something atrocious. Here is a step towards making this Bill similar to the Ontario Act, and giving our hon. friends on the Opposition side almost all they could reasonably desire, and still the opposition is as strong as ever.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have arrived at that stage which the hon. First Minister saw fit to tell us was the proper stage at which to deal with the Indian question; and he promised that when we arrived at that stage he would propose some amendments, showing what he really designed when he first framed this Franchise Bill. The amendment is in your hands, Sir; we see what the First Minister designs now, whether he designed it originally or not. I am not in favor of this proposition. I am one who believes that this Bill is uncalled for and unnecessary at all,

I do not wish to widen the discussion; but the persistency with which this measure is urged by the First Minister, without its being asked for by any one, from one ocean to the other, so far as we know—and they have been challenged to say if any one has asked for it—how he should be the means of obstructing public business, of unsettling the credit of the country, and damaging the private financial interests of many people of the country, and why it is that his supporters behind him, many of whom I know cannot approve, in their heart of hearts, of that Bill, have not the manliness and courage to say so, are things I cannot comprehend. It is time for you to withdraw your Bill; it is evident, from all we hear, that the country does not want the Bill, that they never asked for the Bill; it is evident that the country has pronounced against the Bill in a manner so unmistakable that it cannot be misunderstood by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the petitions which have come in from ridings represented by hon. gentlemen in this House who are supporting the Government, petitions from their own constituents, praying that the Bill may not become law, there are enough names entered of those who supported some hon. gentlemen opposite, who have signed these petitions, to wipe out the majority by which those hon. gentlemen obtained their seats; yet we find them still maintaining their adhesion to the First Minister and endeavoring, at the expense of all public business, to push through a measure which their own constituents tell them they do not want. We are forced to ask the reason why? It cannot be argued any longer, with any show of decency, that they are endeavoring to carry out this measure for the good of the public; and when we see the persistency with which they still cling to it, we are forced to the conclusion that was borne in on our minds when we first saw it, that they are pushing forward a measure conceived for the purpose of strengthening their own party and damaging the chances of their opponents. That conclusion is forced home on us irresistibly. But, though that be the case, we are not contending against the Bill on that ground. If hon. gentlemen opposite are willing to take all the discredit that their action will bring upon them, they are welcome to all the advantage they can secure from the passage of the Bill. They may now cast all the scorn and contumely they please on the signatures of the respectable people who have petitioned them to desist in their course, but when again they have to face their electors and acknowledge that they were deaf to these remonstances of their constituents, it may perhaps dawn upon them that, instead of strengthening their own position, they have done that which materially weakened it; and they may find that in their desire to weaken some of the members on this side, they have failed in that attempt. It is more than possible, it is even probable, that many who are destined to be excluded from this may, after all, find that they have not had their position so terribly weakned as the result of the Bill. The people of this country like something that is manly, something like fair play; they have been nurtured with British notions. They like the idea of British fair play, as between man and man; they do not like a sneaking attempt to legislate men out of the House whom they are afraid to meet in a manly way. There is a moral sentiment in the country that revolts at the perpetration of an Act such as meditated by hon. gentlemen opposite. I read in the *Mail* newspaper a letter from a Dr. P. E. Jones, an Indian chief, written evidently in a strong partisan frame, in which he is pleased to allude to the fact that the opposition to this measure is because the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) are to lose their seats by it, and that is the cause, he says, of the whole tempest in the teapot. Who told that gentleman that either of these seats will be lost, as a necessity of this measure? He speaks about being snubbed during Mr. Mackenzie's reign, by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, when endeavoring to get certain claims of his band settled, but since Sir John assumed the reins he has had them settled. Was there an understanding, when that claim was settled, that there was to be a compensation given in return for it? Was it talked over between the Superintendent General and this Indian chief, that as a result of their giving the Indian votes, the latter would pledge himself it would have the effect desired on certain members of this House? Are we to understand that from the letter of Dr. Jones, who writes to the *Mail* in a partisan strain? These are questions I would like to have the First Minister in his seat to give us an understanding about, so that we may know what was the aim, intent and scope of the Bill, so far as hon. gentlemen on this side are concerned, when hon. gentlemen opposite advised it, meditated it, and carried it out, with their own secret desires hidden from us. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) thinks we are unreasonable on this side, because, he says, the First Minister has met our views in reference to this matter. Well, at an earlier stage, the hon. member for Algoma, with all his learning and ability, gave us a clear illustration that he had failed to comprehend this Indian question at all. It was not till after I had challenged the First Minister himself, and he rose from his place and told the hon member for Algoma that he had misunderstood the Bill, that the hon. member was set right. I hope now my hon. friend will not feel annoyed if I tell him that, if he is sincere, he is still in profound ignorance of the nature of the amendment, or the new clause proposed by the First Minister. Is it designed to wipe out the objections taken by members on this side? What is the ground of our contention? Is it that the Indians should be kept down? Again and again we have repeated, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the Opposition have but one desire, and that is to elevate the Indians. What we have contended, what we have proved so conclusively, that no hon. gentleman opposite, or newspaper supporting the party opposite has dared attempt to controvert, is that, in this Bill, you do not elevate the Indian, you do not lift them up one iota; he remains in the same state of tutelage, the same low, unenfranchised condition, under the Bill itself, with this clause in, which is proposed to be added, as he does at present. It is but giving a vote to him while he is in the absolute control of the Government, to be told by the Government, through its agents, to march to the ballot box and mark his ballot, and if he cannot put a mark there, in the ear of the agent of the Government, the servant of the Superintendent General, to declare that he cast his vote on behalf of the Government candidate. What effect will this "living in separate holdings," being inserted as a proviso, have? What unenfranchised Indian does that shut out? Do people suppose that the Indians all live in one vast tent? Do not they live on their reserves, in their little holdings, some larger and some smaller, and cannot the revising barrister easily state whether, in any one of them, there is an amount of work, or work done to the land to improve the soil, to the extent of $150? The unenfranchised Indian is given the right to vote in this clause just as effectually as before. Nay, more so; for if there was an Indian of sufficient independence to let it be known that he would vote against this Government, what power has the Government in their hands? The Superintendent General can remove him from his possession by giving him a sum of money for it, thus taking him off the holding upon which he has the right to vote. And this personal property that you propose to give him to vote upon is personal property in what sense? That he can sell it, dispose of it, manage it, as he pleases? No; nothing of the kind. He cannot do anything with it, except with the consent of band and the approval of the Superintendent General. That clause, I can tell the hon. member for Algoma, is just

designed to give the vote to all the unenfranchised Indians, virtually, that there are in this country, ignorant or learned, rich or poor. The only effect of that resolution is to provide that the Indians in Manitoba and the North-West Territory shall not have the right to vote. In the other Provinces it leaves the Indian question just where it was and where the First Minister designed it should be, that these wards of the Government, who are in a state of tutelage, should have the power to cast their votes while they are under the control of the Government of the day. It might be said that it would be humiliating for the First Minister to withdraw his Bill now. Granted; I grant it freely. But would it be a greater humiliation than the hon. gentleman has gone through half a dozen times since he introduced this Bill. At first he told us he was in favor of giving a vote to unmarried women, but as the debate proceeded, we judged from the actions of hon. gentlemen opposite that he had given them to understand that, though he had expressed himself in that way, they should vote it down. At the inception of the Indian debate, in answer to the hon. member for Bothwell, the First Minister stated that the unenfranchised Indians of the plains would have a vote under this Bill. (See page 1484.) What humiliation he has undergone at the hands of his followers since then; how many hon. gentlemen opposite have virtually given the lie to the utterances of their leader, have virtually said that, when he uttered those words, he stated what was not true. One of them said that, when he used those words, with all the solemn duty of a Minister of the Crown resting upon him, he was using bye-play. The First Minister has not said he was using bye-play or that what he said then was not true, but the resolution put in your hands this afternoon declares that, when Sir John Macdonald used those words, he stated what was true. Otherwise, why was it necessary? The hon. gentleman had to submit to these humiliations, and we have had the humiliation of seeing him also state that he always, in his own mind, meant to confine it to the Indians of the older Provinces. What humiliation is that, that a gentleman of the profound learning and legal knowledge of the First Minister, who fully intended that the Indian clause should apply only to the Indians of the older Provinces, should so frame his Bill that it included the Indians of the other Provinces and of the North-West Territories, and should have told the hon. member for Bothwell that its effect would be to enfranchise the Indians of the west. I cannot conceive of humiliations much greater than that, even if the Bill were withdrawn. Again, we heard speeches from the members from British Columbia, and after they had spoken we find that the effect of this proposition is not to confine the Bill to the Indians of the older Provinces, for the Indians of British Columbia are not excluded. These are some of the various phases, states and conditions of mind in which the hon. gentleman has been since the introduction of this Bill; these are some of the contradictory statements made by him and his supporters in reference to this matter. All Indians are not in the same state of advancement in this country. My hon. friend from Essex has in his county perhaps the most advanced band; they have availed themselves of the provisions in the Indian Act for enfranchising and emancipating themselves, and the Superintendent General tells us they have proved the wisdom of their application and his wisdom in granting it. They stand in this country free men to exercise their right. I wish that were the case with more of our Indians. I believe there are more who are fitted for it. I believe that, on the reserve in my own county, many have attained to a stage which, if they were emanciped from Government control and free to manage their own affairs, would fit them to give a vote, if they desired to do so; but I do not believe that any good will be accomplished by the Government trying to thrust upon them what they have never asked for. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite what I would tell the First Minister if he was in his place, as he ought to be, for, if his aim is to strike a blow at some members of this Opposition he ought to have the manliness to face them and get his answer. I tell them that I question whether many of the leading Indians in these bands will avail themselves of the privilege of voting. What is reported to have been uttered by a young and intelligent Indian of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinté will, I believe, apply to the vast majority of Indians in my own county. I do not believe that, if this Bill is put into effect, you will be able, unless compulsory means are used, to get the Indians of the Six Nations to cast a vote for one candidate or the other, because they take the position that they are not subjects of the Crown, but allies, and they will use such language as is reported to have been used by this young Indian:

"In a recent interview with one of their intelligent young men, he stated that his people did not want the franchise on the basis of tribal lands. These lands are secured to them by treaty with the Crown, free from all taxation—a perpetual inheritance. He said they considered this attempted legislation as being part of a scheme to place their reserve under ordinary municipal control and taxation, and finally to deprive them or their children of their birthright.

"They fully recognise that, under existing election laws, they are subjected to no privation or unfairness, for it is open to any tribesman to go off the reserve and achieve a franchise 'on an equal footing with Europeans.' The above remarks represent the general feeling of the Mohawks, notwithstanding the assertion of their fellow-tribesman, Dr. Oronhyatekha, of London. His statements must therefore be made rather as a paid Government official than as an heir of the original proprietors of this continent."

Sir, this is an attempt to force upon the advanced and educated Indians that are in the possession of the Six Nation reserves, who were the original proprietors of the soil, who settled upon the lands that were given to them as a reservation, and who wished to maintain their independence and not be bought. For they will know that if they exercise the right to vote and participate in the government it will not be long before their white brethren surrounding them will raise an agitation that they shall be under municipal taxation and pay their share of the county and municipal taxes. Therefore, the very class that, if any, were fitted to enjoy the franchise, will be the very class that, I believe, will not avail themselves of it, but will say that it was not their own demand, that if they touch it at all, it will compromise them in their tribal relations, which they wish to preserve. Those who will get the franchise will be those of less intelligence, those who have not advanced as far as the others. But it is claimed we are doing them an injustice, because they live in this country, and they ought to have the right to vote. Sir, they will have the right to vote the moment they desire to become one of us, to become citizens, and avail themselves of the machinery provided for that purpose. But they do not want to become citizens. They want to maintain their tribal relations, to preserve their identity as a separate people, and in doing that they want to follow their own desires. If Dr. Jones, the chieftain who writes that letter in the *Mail* from that partisan standpoint, were here, I would ask him this question: Are you prepared to let the white people that surround your reserve take part in your elections, to take part in the election of yourself as a chief of the Mississaguas? What would be the reply? He would say: No; we have nothing to do with you. We are a distinct people; we are our own nation, and you have no right to come in and interfere with us at all. Would not they tell us that, and would not they be right in telling us that? Most undoubtedly they would be. Keeping themselves in that position, they can say who shall be chief among themselves. But if they are able to say who shall be chief here, who shall bear rule here, there will be a very good reason why others will say: We want to have something to say in your affairs if you are going to take part in ours. Would it not be reasonable? Would it not be right?

Have any one of us any right to go on these Indian reserves and vote in reference to their selection of a chief? and do you think they will avail themselves of what the hon. gentleman wishes to force upon them when they have that alternative staring them in the face? No, Sir; the proposition of this Bill is not to enfranchise the Indian in the full sense, not to do him a particle of good, but to gain a party advantage through the agency of these Indians. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they think they are going to accomplish a great party end and damage hon. gentlemen on this side of the House by it, they have all the discredit of the attempt, and I question very much if they will derive much benefit from it. Dr. Jones truly says that if two or three members of Parliament are to be deprived of their seats in order to do an act of justice to another race of people, is that a reason why they should not have it? Dr. Jones is right when he uses that argument. The seat of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has no business to be secured to him if, through the securing of it, an act of injustice is done to a large body of people, or to any individual in this country. Now, Sir, other amendments will be put into your hands upon which I shall avail myself of the opportunity of speaking. I am willing to assume my full share of responsibility for having talked too much on this question before the House. But I desire now to point out to you the effect of the amendment in your hands. I venture to say that the clause proposed to be put in by the First Minister will not go into the Bill as it is. The Minister has brought it in after full consideration as to its effect, as to its bearing, and it may be rather a difficult thing for him to yield in the matter, but I say it will not go in in that way; if it does, the people of the country will have something to say about it. What does it do? It excludes the Indians of Keewatin and Manitoba, and admits the Indians of British Columbia. What is the effect of that? Let me read to you—and bear in mind that every word I shall read will be the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, the description of Sir John A. Macdonald of those Indians, in his report to His Excellency the Governor General. This is what he says, with reference to those Indians that he is excluding from Manitoba and Keewatin:—

"The band who occupy the reserve at Lac Seul are in a very prosperous condition, possessing fine fields, in which they raise crops of cereals and roots. They also occupy well-built houses, and keep them neat and clean. There is considerable competition among them as to who shall have the best farm. These Indians have adopted the system so uncommon in Indian communities, and yet so desirable, of residing on separate farms, instead of all living in close proximity to each other. The latter system is disadvantageous from a sanitary point of view, and it retards greatly the progress of the Indians in industry, self-reliance and enterprise. A very good school is in operation in the vicinity of the reserve, and the Indian children who attend it are making satisfactory progress."

These are the Manitoba Indians described by Sir John A. Macdonald in his report, whom he proposes to shut out from participating in that inalienable right of the Indians to vote as mentioned by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson):

"The Indians owning the reserves at the Manitou River possess large and very well cultivated fields of potatoes and corn. They are described as a remarkably energetic and industrious class of Indians."

Further down the report goes on to say, and let me direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this:

"Adverting to the reserves and bands which come under Treaty No. 1, the principal reserve is that of St. Peter's, situated on the Red River; and the band of Chippewa and Swampy Cree Indians, who occupy it, comprise the most numerous Indian community in the Province of Manitoba. These Indians raise large quantities of produce, and the hay on the reserve is generally an enormous crop. The crops of the past year were, however, not as abundant as is usually the case. These Indians own a large number of live stock, and many of them are the possessors of improved kinds of machinery, such as reapers, mowers threshing machines, etc.; also owning light carriages for driving purposes, and large double waggons for use in their farming operations, the old 'Red River cart' being discarded for the more modern conveyance. The catch of fish by these Indians is usually very large, and that of last year was no exception.

"They constructed a road of four miles in length, besides building a number of bridges and ditches on the reserve during the year.

"There are several good schools in operation on this reserve."

They are christian people, I believe. They are, however, shut out by the First Minister, after days of considering this Indian question. You cannot find, in any of the Provinces, a description of a band of Indians more advanced than this band in Manitoba. Yet the hon. gentleman deliberately excludes them from this Bill. Yet we are having a uniform Bill. Here the most advanced and the most intelligent of the Indians are to be shut out. By-and-bye I shall show what classes of Indians are to have votes. Here is another extract from the First Minister's report:

"The band occupying the reserve at Fort Alexander found themselves in rather trying circumstances last winter, owing to the failure of the grain crop of the previous season, the scarcity of fish and the absence of remunerative labor, which they formerly had no difficulty in obtaining at a saw mill which was operated for several years on the reserve, but which was last year removed to another point.

"Two schools are conducted on the reserve. One of these institutions, which is established in the interests of the children of the Roman Catholic portion of the community, is described as being most ably managed."

Yet they are deliberately excluded by this measure. Here is another extract:

"The band occupying the reserve at Fairford are in a most satisfactory condition. Every year the progress of this community is noticeable; and in no year was it more remarkable than last season, the crops having been greatly in excess of those of previous years, and consisting of wheat, barley, oats, potatoes and hay. Their cattle are also increasing in number.

"The council of this band framed, with the assistance of the agent, rules and regulations for the better government of the reserve, under the provisions of the Indian Act, 1880, and these having been submitted to Your Excellency in Council, were duly approved of, and thus have become law.

"There are two good schools on the reserve, and the pupils in attendance are making very satisfactory progress in their studies."

But these are Indians purposely and designedly shut out from voting by the First Minister. Here is another extract:

"On the reserve at Crane River a much better state of things exists. The Indians have fine gardens, and their splendid fields of potatoes, the superintendent reports, are kept scrupulously free of weeds. These Indians devote almost their entire time to agriculture. Their cattle are increasing in number and are well cared for.

"The school on this reserve is ably conducted and the pupils are making very satisfactory progress. The school house recently erected is reported to be an ornament to the reserve.

"The band who own the reserve on Water Hen River are in equally as good, if not in rather better circumstances, than the band last referred to. They display remarkable industry in the tillage of the soil, which is amply rewarded by the comfort in which they live, their families being well clothed and fed, and the number of new dwelling houses and stables erected by them affords a further gratifying indication of improvement in their tastes and habits. These Indians also possess a splendid herd of cattle, in which they take great pride.

"They have a very excellent school on the reserve, at which the pupils are instructed in the English, French and Ojibewa languages, and show remarkable proficiency in these as well as in their other studies."

These are Indian bands purposely excluded by the hon. gentleman's proposition from the right to vote. Let me read a description of some of the bands to whom the First Minister proposes, among others, to give the right to vote, while at the same time he shuts out these Christian Indians. Here is a description of the condition of Indians in British Columbia, to whom the hon. gentleman gives the right to vote, while he refuses to give that right to the Indians of Manitoba:

"A considerable amount of immorality, arising from the use of intoxicants, and the cohabitation of Indian men and women with other than their own consorts, is reported to exist on this reserve (Williams Lake). This condition of things results, as a matter of course, in the prevalence of disease and poverty, and in the existence of great unhappiness.

"Special legislation to put a stop to this evil of illicit intercourse on the part of Indians who, at least, profess to be christianised, appears to be necessary.

"In heathen tribes of Indians, however, the kindred evil of polygamy has always been practised, and heathen Indians will only be brought to refrain from practising it when the enlightenment, which ever attends

the inauguration of the christian religion among the heathen, shall have changed their views in this as well as in other matters.

"On the other hand, were legislation, having for its object the forcible suppression of the evil, to be introduced, I fear that, if it proved operative at all, it would only become so after very serious trouble had ensued, especially with the more populous tribes; and the enforcement of such a law, would certainly be attended with difficulties of a most complicated character when it came to be applied to individual cases. For instance, the settlement of the question of priority of right when several women claimed the same man as husband would be most difficult; and then another question, most difficult of solution, would arise, in regard to the legal rights of the children, issue of such marriages. I apprehend, however, that the enforcement of any law that would interfere with their preconceived ideas as to marital rights would be so strongly resisted by heathen tribes generally as to render it inoperative. Moreover, the inculcation in the minds of Indians of principles that will lead them, from conscientious convictions, to abandon voluntarily the habit of polygamy, as well as other heathenish practices, is, I submit, the work of those who charge themselves with the responsibility of imparting instruction to them in the tenets of christianity."

I have read from the First Minister's own report. What are we asked to do? I ask no favor from the Conservative press; but I desire, in the interests of the people, and in the interests of morality and of righteousness, that they do for once publish what is the truth; that they for once let that class of the community who take their intelligence from their papers know that the First Minister has this afternoon submitted to the committee a clause, the effect of which is, within the walls of this great national temple of justice and righteousness, to ask this christian Parliament to put a clause on the Statute Book of Canada that exalts heathen polygamy, with its practices, above christian religion, with its virtues.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has expressed surprise at the action of Opposition members in connection with the matter before the committee. The Opposition will cease expressing surprise at his opinions if the hon. gentleman speaks many more times on the Indian question. He seems to have undertaken to enlighten the House as to the bearing of whatever amendment is proposed on the Indian clauses of this Bill. He has expressed pleasure at almost every amendment made by the First Minister, and he allows an amendment which he suggested himself to be superseded by another; and yet this hon. gentleman now has the boldness to tell the Opposition that that amendment should suffice. I suppose the hon. gentleman will allow members of the Opposition to judge for themselves of the meaning of this particular amendment. If we take the construction put upon it by him, or if we had accepted his construction of the original clause, we might have been satisfied. It meant anything or nothing, according to the hon. gentleman's opinion, and he instills his opinion into the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, until they are led themselves to believe that the meaning of the clause was entirely different from that which the First Minister said it was. Now, the First Minister has not vouchsafed an explanation of the amendment, and the hon. member for Algoma has given his explanation. By-and-bye, when the First Minister gives his explanation, it will be found as different from that of the member for Algoma as was his explanation of the original statement from the explanation given by that hon. gentleman. Well, Sir, the amendment in your hands certainly has given rise to disappointment on both sides of the House. It must have been a disappointment to members on the Government side, when they found an amendment proposed which gives a flat contradiction to nearly all the arguments they have advanced in relation to the Indian clause. They have been telling us that the tribal Indians were not to be enfranchised, and several of them expressed themselves to the effect that, if that were the meaning of the clause, the House would not find them supporting the measure; and that is one of the reasons why the First Minister has seen fit to make the change. He has had a double purpose in view. He wished to lead the Opposition and the country to suppose that he was meeting us half way, and he was convincing his own followers that he was removing an objectionable feature from the measure when he placed the amendment in your hands. Well, he may have convinced those supporters who were opposed to the original clause of the Bill, but I can assure you that he has not convinced us on this side that he has made any advance in the direction he pointed out, or lessened the obnoxious character of the clause of which we complained before. I say, so far as the two clauses are concerned, the original and the amendment, as far as I am personally concerned, I prefer the original clause. In that we had uniformity; in this we have destroyed uniformity and have increased the power placed in the hands of the Indian agent. I find that the Indians have been given such location tickets as are mentioned in the proposed amendment, and I do not know exactly what it means. I find that it is stated in the report with regard to the Golden Lake agency, South Algoma: (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the report in question.) I would like some hon. gentleman to state whether it is his own land—whether the Government have issued a patent to him? If so, in what position does he stand? Does he own the lands in fee simple? And owning his own land, working it for his own benefit, paying no municipal or provincial taxes, is it not a misnomer to call the land his own? Is not that land still at the disposal of the agent and the Superintendent General? Is it not competent for the agent, or the Superintendent General, to remove those Indians from those locations? They have simply got holdings by the grace and favor of the agent, and they feel a greater obligation after receiving those tickets than before receiving them, and, therefore, giving votes only to such Indians as receive separate location tickets increases the power and influence of the agent and the Government to a dangerous extent. He will have in that very way the making up of the list. Before the voters' list is made up at all the Indian agent can go through the reserve, locating such as he thinks proper, giving tickets only to those who are friends and supporters of the Government. If there are some Indians who, in his opinion, will not vote as he wishes, they will not get location tickets, and only those will get them who, in his opinion, will support himself and his friends. For that reason I am justified in saying that the amendment is even more obnoxious to hon. gentlemen on this side than was the original clause. But, after all, does the amendment relieve the Indian from those disabilities under which he lives at the present time? Is he any less the ward of the Government? I say no. Is he any less responsible to the Government for almost his every act? The amendment does nothing towards removing those disabilities which have heretofore been held sufficient to disqualify him from casting his vote. Why, Sir, the Superintendent General to-day, under the Bill proposed, as in years gone by, will have power of being almost supreme upon the reserves. He is the man who favors the Indian in finding a market for his flour or his fish, he gives him seeds and, perhaps, some of the implements upon his farm. He may give them permission to cut wood; he is the man who pays the annuity; he assists in the managing of their schools and the employment of their teachers, and to some extent he assists in the payment of those teachers. He writes their wills, or sanctions them after they are written. He is the man who gives them the location ticket upon which they are to qualify as voters. More than that; he is supreme amongst them, in a judicial capacity. Let me give you a description of the extent to which the Indian agent has shown himself capable of exercising judicial powers on the Indian reserve. (The hon. gentleman then quoted from the report on Indian Affairs for 1885.) The Indian agent is supreme; and for that reason we have objected to the enfranchisement of the Indians on the reserves while they are under the control of the Indian agent.

This amendment, as the previous speaker has pointed out, does not destroy the effect of the measure, so far as its apparent intent is concerned. The hon. gentleman has been very careful in this amendment not to exclude from the operation of the Act the Indians of Ontario. In no instance do we find any change made, where there is a possibility of the Indians acting beneficially to certain politicians in Ontario. The allusions to the Ontario statute show that the fight over this Bill is not a fight between two parties here so much as a fight between hon. gentlemen opposite and the Legislature of Ontario; and if there is a pernicious clause in that Act, that is deemed sufficient justification for inserting it here. With regard to the question of uniformity, the right hon. gentleman seems willing to sacrifice it on every occasion. It was at first the crowning argument for this Bill; now it is of no necessity whatever; but the right hon. gentleman is careful not to sacrifice that principle unless there is something to be gained by the sacrifice. It would be a sacrifice of uniformity to disfranchise a part of the Civil Service. That has been steadily resisted. It was a sacrifice of uniformity when a portion of the fishermen were excepted. In every instance in which there has been a breach of the principle of uniformity it has not been done by depriving of the franchise those people who, to a certain extent, might be said to be under the influence of the Government. The fishermen receive a bounty, therefore we must add them to the list; the Civil Service are under the control of the Government, therefore they must not be disfranchised. While we cast off the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, we must retain the Indians of Ontario, because we need them for a purpose. It has been made easy for the classes I have mentioned to become registered, but there are a class of voters whose registration the Government have taken care to make difficult. I will not refer at any great length to the exclusion of the Indians of Manitoba and the North-West Territories by this amendment; but I am surprised that the right hon. gentleman should have run the risk of dealing so partially with the Indians. One would think that as Superintendent General he would have been very careful indeed not to do so, for fear he would rouse the jealousy of some and excite the admiration of others of those savage tribes. The hon. gentleman once expressed his opinion that this Parliament should act very carefully towards the Indians of this country. In 1872, when an election Bill was before this Parliament, promoted by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, one of his followers, Mr. Chauveau, proposed to restore the right to vote to a small Indian tribe which had been deprived of the right by some arrangement of the municipal list, and Sir John Macdonald spoke as follows:—

"As a matter of necessity, if these thirty-four Indians were allowed to have an assessment list, other Indians similarly situated must have the same right. The question was, were we prepared to allow Indians all over the Dominion to vote. His hon. friend must admit that these thirty-four Indians should not be accorded privileges which were denied to others. It would be soothing the feelings of thirty-four Indians and wounding the feelings of 3,400. His hon. friend would see that it would be the giving of every Indian throughout the Dominion, being a householder to the value of $20 rental, the right to vote, and he did not think the Government was prepared to go so far."

The hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten the necessity of dealing impartially with the Indians; and now he is going to gratify the feelings of one section of the Indians of this country and wound the feelings of another section. What he was very careful not to do in 1872 he is willing to do in 1885, whatever may be the results of his action. He finds it necessary to depart from the rule of impartiality, and to adopt a rule of very great partiality in dealing with the Indians. We have heard a great deal said about the inability of the Indians, about their being disqualified in various ways from exerting influence on the political affairs of the day at the ballot box, but whether he be an Indian or not, what is the first qualification of a voter? When about to pass a Bill adding to the present electorate, what class of people should we feel naturally called upon to add? Are we to choose from amongst the most ignorant in the land or from among the more intelligent? I say the first qualification for a voter is an adequate knowledge of the duties and responsibilities of a member of Parliament. A man who does not know what is required of his representative is not a man upon whom we should seek to thrust the franchise. If he has it, well and good; but a man who has not adequate knowledge to understand what he wishes his representatives to do for him and what his representative is empowered to do, is not a fit and proper person to have thrust upon him the responsibility of the franchise. Then, the voter should have the disposition to act in the interest of the country; he should have the desire to do right. Have we any evidence whatever that the Indians, especially those who are living on a reserve and are separated to a great extent from the rest of the community, are desirous mainly of the public good? What is there to induce them to act in concert with the rest of their fellow citizens throughout the rest of the Dominion, and in the interest of the country? We have it laid down as a law by Bailley, that: "Any part of a community that may be separated from the rest—any body of men, however large or however small, will prefer its own interest to that of the whole when these two interests interfere with each other." Is it likely that the interest of the public and the interest of the Indians on the reserves will be identical for many years? Is it not rather likely that the two will interfere? Do we not know that the impression of the white people is that these reserves and the Indians upon them are a great drawback to the advancement of civilisation and commerce? Are not our people anxious these tribal relations should be broken up and the Indians now on the reserve be scattered, and become mingled with the community at large, and those tracts which are now almost unproductive be made to blossom as a rose, and become equal in value with the surrounding country? For many years to come, so long as these reserves are upheld, a diversity of interests will exist between the Indians and the whites, and so long these men, whom we are now about to constitute voters, will act in their own individual interest and not in the interest of the public at large. Hon. gentlemen opposite are no doubt much disappointed at the continuation of the debate, but many on this side are likewise disappointed. I say the First Minister is responsible for its continuation. Before he placed the amendment in your hands, Sir, he could have made such concessions as would have been acceptable to this House and to the country, for enough has been said to lead him to a correct conclusion as to the wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides. Had he even shown a desire to meet the wishes of the House and the people, the debate would have ceased long ago; were the wishes of both sides consulted, the unanimous advice would be to strike out the Indian clause altogether and let the Indians become enfranchised through the only method by which we can enfranchise them. The Indian Act was intended for that very purpose; we have laid down the road by which the Indian can travel to the privilege which hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to give him without an effort on his part, and when he will have reached that goal, we will have accomplished a double purpose. We will have given him the franchise which he can exercise with discretion and to the benefit of the country, and, to a certain extent, we will have rid ourselves of the difficulty and trouble of maintaining these reserves. I may say that the Indian Act might be amended. Let us adopt an easier method. By all means let us enfranchise the Indian and place upon him all the responsibilities of citizenship before we entitle him to vote. There are many reasons

against giving the tribal Indians that right; there are the difficulties that will occur at election times from these people taking part in elections, such as the danger of strong drink being distributed among them. We have two measures, both of which professedly are intended for the elevation of the Indians—the Indian Act and this Bill. The one tends to elevate the Indian in a particular sense, lift him up step by step from the foot of the ladder, until he becomes a true, genuine citizen of the country, when he will have conferred upon him, as a matter of course, the privilege of exercising the franchise. This Bill seems rather an instrument calculated to further degrade the Indians. It will not lift him up a single step, but will thrust upon him a responsibility he dare not and cannot exercise of his own free will. What a great contrast between the two measures. I have here a couple of articles written by different authors, which describe exactly the effect of the two. The following remarks from Baillie aptly illustrates the Indian Act:

"Far from enslaving, it makes more and more free those on whom it is exercised; and in this respect it differs wholly from the vulgar sway which ambition thirsts for. It awakens a kindred power in others, calls their faculties into new life, and particularly strengthens them to follow their own deliberate convictions of truth and duty. It breathes conscious energy, self-respect, moral independence, and a scorn of every foreign yoke."

That explains the aim and result of the Indian Act, if carried to its legitimate conclusion; but the Bill we are now considering is aptly described in the words of Dr. Channing:

"There is another power over man very different from this; a power, not to quicken and relevate, but to crush and subdue; a power which robs men of the free use of their nature, takes them out of their own hands, and compels them to bend to another's will. This is the sway which men grasp at most eagerly, and which it is our great purpose to expose. To reign, to give laws, to clothe their own wills with omnipotence, to annihilate all other wills, to spoil the individual of that self direction which is his most precious right—this has ever been deemed, by multitudes, the highest prize for competition and conflict. The most envied men are those who have succeeded in prostrating multitudes, in subjecting whole communities to their single will. It is the love of this power, in all its forms, which we are anxious to hold up to reprobation. If any crime should be placed by society beyond pardon, it is this."

Here, I think, we have a brief and apt description of the intent and purpose and aims of the two Bills which we have been considering in comparison with each other. Let us amend or enlarge the Indian Act, so that we can carry out the purpose for which it was enacted, and leave the enfranchisement of the Indian where it was left when that Act was placed on the Statute Book, and when they have gone up grade by grade and arrived at the true status of a citizen they will obtain the franchise and be able to exercise it with benefit to himself and the country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). This question, it may be admitted by all parties, has been pretty fully discussed, at least on this side of the House. There can be no doubt in the minds of the people that the Opposition have endeavored to do their duty in this matter. Parliament is supposed to be a deliberative body. It is supposed that the gentlemen who are sent here to represent the people will express their opinions on the various subjects which are brought up for discussion, but during this debate we have had a peculiar spectacle presented to the people. We have had introduced one of the most important measures ever proposed since Confederation, and we have on record the opinion expressed by the Premier himself, that this Act was of such great importance that it would require the whole of one Session to discuss it properly. In the face of that statement, we are perfectly justified in discussing it clause by clause; but I fail to understand why it is that hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side are so loath to express their opinions on this important question, and how they can justify their course in studiously remaining silent. Occasionally, goaded on by the arguments and the taunts which have been thrown at them from this side of the House, they have endeavored to say something in justification of the Bill, but in all the speeches I have heard and read from that side they have studiously avoided coming to the discussion of the question before the House. They have attempted, in their own way, to make the country believe that the views expressed by the Opposition are not sound, and the Government press, in the Province of Ontario, at least, have taken the same position; they have refused to publish the actual facts in connection with this measure, or to give the Bill itself, and they have misrepresented the arguments presented in this House, and the statements made by the Premier in introducing this measure. They have persisted in publishing statements which have been proved to be false on the floor of the House, and by the Opposition press in their contentions with the Government organs. I do not wonder that that portion of the press which voices the sentiments of gentlemen opposite has acted in this way. We know that the Ministerial press is a subsidised press; that it is not a free press; that the organs of the Government are bought up by the money which belongs to the people of this country; that they are, like the Indians, the wards of the Government, sustained by the pap which is fed to them by the Government; that they meet around the Government table, and pick up the crumbs scattered to them from time to time. The Government press of this country is not free. It is bound in the same shackles which bind the Indians, to whom this Bill proposes to give votes, and, therefore, it does not voice the sentiments of the people. I am glad to know there are some independent Conservatives in this country, who have signed petitions expressing disapprobation of this measure. I know that this fact has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among gentlemen opposite, who have seen these petitions presented day after day, and have been convinced that there is a feeling aroused throughout this Dominion which will tell upon them. Notwithstanding all the statements that these signatures have been placed there without authority, in fact, that they have been forged, hon. gentlemen are, no doubt, uncomfortable in their positions. They know, after examining those petitions, that names of many prominent Conservatives in several constituencies are to be found appended to them. The day will come when they will have to give an account of their stewardship, and will have to show why they have sat there in dumb silence when such an important measure has been under discussion—why they have refused to open their mouths, either by the agreement come to in their caucus or the mandate given forth by the First Minister, which compels them to remain silent. They are not worthy representatives of a free people in a country possessed of free institutions and a free government. They are not men worthy of being entrusted with the task of representing free constituencies, men who dare not lift up their voices in justification of the course they are pursuing. Do we find the First Minister attempting to justify this section of the Bill? Not a bit of it. We find he pretends that he is making a concession, and he gets up in the House and announces that after weeks and weeks of consideration of this important Indian clause he has come to the conclusion that he will make some alteration in the original Bill. But does he make any statements to justify the change, or to justify giving the vote to the Indians at all? Not one word in justification either of the change or of the original proposition to give all the Indians of the Dominion a vote. I contend that the Government supporters and the Government organs may say what they please with regard to this matter, but it is on the records of this House that the First Minister contemplated by the Bill, and the Bill shows it, giving votes to all the Indians throughout, not only the older Provinces, but the North-West Territories and British Columbia. If we want any more evidence of this, we have it in the fact that the First Minister has come down here to-day with an amendment which excludes Manitoba, Kee-

watin and the North-West Territories; and yet the newspapers supporting the Government have been stating for weeks past that the First Minister never contemplated passing such a measure as this, and I believe the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) read a statement from the Montreal *Gazette* to the same effect. All the organs of the Government must know that it was the original intention of the First Minister that all these Indians should be given votes, but not enfranchised. But to-day we find the First Minister bringing down a proposition that Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West shall be exempted from the provisions of this Bill. Sir, we contend that the amendment is no improvement, so far as the older Provinces are concerned, on his original proposition; we find, in fact, that the amendment is even more objectionable, and I have no doubt it will be more objectionable to the country at large than the original Bill. The original Bill contemplated dividing up the reserve and giving votes to all the Indians on the reserve; but this amendment gives a vote to the men who obtain a location ticket from the Indian agent. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether it is likely that the Indian agent will be found giving location tickets to bad Indians? because, I presume the agent will think that all the Indians are bad who will not vote for the representative of the Great Mother in this country, who will not vote for constitutional Tory government, who will not vote for the perpetuation of the power of the right hon. gentleman and his supporters. I fancy that the Indians who will support the Government will be considered good Indians, and will get their location tickets, and be entitled to vote. Therefore, I do not see that any concession has been made by the First Minister in this amendment. I have heard it sometimes remarked by hon. gentlemen opposite that no special advantage was proposed to be given to the Indians by giving them the vote. I do not know whether these hon. gentlemen believe that or not. I think my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has often contended that no advantage over other citizens would be given to the Indians in giving them a right to vote. Now, I think the facts are all against this assumption. I contend that every man in this country is entitled to a vote, and I believe it would have been better for the Dominion at large if we had adopted manhood suffrage than the provisions of this Bill. But, Sir, I am forced to the conclusion that this Indian clause is an effort to introduce class legislation here. The Act contemplates that the white man or the colored man shall be possessed of a certain property qualification to entitle him to vote. With regard to the Indian it is different. He is not responsible, in a great many ways, as the white or the colored man are responsible—he is not, in fact, a free agent at all, but is, to all intents and purposes, an infant in the eye of the law, and yet we are proposing to give these men votes in Dominion elections. The First Minister has often described them as wards of the Government. They are not considered fit to be entrusted with the management of their own affairs; they cannot control their own lands; they cannot rent their own farms; they have not sufficient enterprise, in many instances, to provide their own seed grain; and when it is given to them, as was stated here to-day, they have not sense enough to put it into the earth, but prefer rather to eat it up. They are, according to the First Minister, unable to undertake the most simple form of municipal government, and yet he proposes to give them a vote, in order, as I believe, to swamp the votes of white men in some counties of this Dominion, especially in the Province of Ontario. And in other respects the Indian is not a free man. He is not required to do jury duty, and in that case the conclusion of the Government is a wise one, as no intelligent man in this country would desire to have his case tried before an Indian jury, for the simple reason that Indians, as a rule, are not possessed of the necessary intelligence which would enable them to arrive at a proper conclusion with respect to any matter that might come under the consideration of any court. They are not responsible in other ways. They are not in a position to be sued. If they contract a debt, no one can recover. They are not, even in this respect, on the same level as your own child, because, if a white man's child contracts a debt, the father may be made responsible. But these Indians, who are not responsible for any debts they may contract, are to be entrusted with votes, while our boys, now fighting for the liberties of the people in the North-West, who may be over 18 years of age, are not entrusted with that power. Those young men have undertaken responsibilities which are greater than any which the Indians are required to assume. Furthermore, I wish to note the fact that a large number of intelligent citizens of this country will be disfranchised by this Bill. This, of course, is denied by some hon. gentlemen opposite, and by some of the organs of the Government. But I noticed the other day a report of a meeting held at Brantford, where careful calculations had been made as to the number of mechanics and other laboring men in that city who would be disfranchised by this Bill. I suppose the calculation was correct, or it would not have been made at a public meeting, at which parties in favor of the Bill could have denied its accuracy. The calculation was that several hundreds would be so disfranchised. When the Bill is applied to other cities and towns it will likewise be found that a large number of intelligent people will be disfranchised, while the Government proposes to enfranchise the tribal Indians on the reserves. We have had the statement of the representative of East Toronto (Mr. Small), that the Bill will not disfranchise more than 50 of the Toronto volunteers in the North-West. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman what right he has to disfranchise even 50 voters? What will the people think of their representative, when he rises in this House and says the Bill will only disfranchise 50 volunteers in the North-West?

Mr. SMALL. The 50 volunteers to whom I referred would not have votes in consequence of being minors.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman said it would disfranchise them.

Mr. SMALL. No; of course not. They will have to be enfranchised first. But they will not have votes.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The statement of the hon. gentleman was, that only 50 volunteers of those now fighting in the North-West would be disfranchised by this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Every hon. gentleman knows that was his statement. He knows himself that was his statement. But the hon. gentleman now rises and endeavors to creep out of the difficulty in which he placed himself, by saying that they would not be disfranchised because they were not now enfranchised.

Mr. SMALL. I cannot make the hon. gentleman understand what I said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Probably not. The utterances of the hon. gentleman are so hedged about that it is difficult for anyone to understand them. I am surprised that the people of East Toronto understood him, and that they should have sent him here to misrepresent them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member must not say that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He misrepresents the volunteers, certainly. If, however, I have said anything unparliamentary, I am prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. SMALL. The hon. gentleman is accustomed to that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying I am accustomed to that. I do not trouble the

House frequently, and so the hon. gentleman cannot say to what I am accustomed.

Mr. SMALL. I have heard you talking a great deal of rubbish.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Algoma stated, with a good deal of force, that the Indians are brave men. Is that any reason why they should be given a vote? The Zulus of Africa are brave men, and they showed bravery in all engagements with British forces. I see no reason why, because Indians show bravery, they should be given the vote. Then the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) went on to take the same line of argument that organs of the Government have taken, that it never was the intention of the Government to give a vote to the wild Indians of the west, which, I think, has been satisfactorily explained already. But I should like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in Ontario we have some Indians who may be said to be yet wild Indians. There is a large number of pagan Indians on the Grand River, men who are not civilised in any way whatever; but they are said to be more trustworthy than some of the civilised Indians. They, no doubt, have holdings and pieces of land which they cultivate, and on which they live, and according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, they should be entitled to vote. They are not quite so savage as some of the Indians who have taken up arms in the North-West, but there are quite a number of such Indians in one of the best districts of Ontario. Then I find the hon. gentleman referring to the New Brunswick Indians. The hon. member for Algoma has said they have been degraded by the white men.

Mr. DAWSON. I said they were so represented by one of the representatives of New Brunswick.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If the statement was not correct the hon. gentleman should not have repeated it here. It must have been correct, or the hon. gentleman would not have said they were degraded if they were not degraded. The hon. gentleman is willing to have those degraded Indians vote. I do not think he can justify this proceeding.

Mr. DAWSON. I said the representatives said that.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman assumed from the statement made that it was correct. If the degraded Indians are to be given votes in New Brunswick and the West how can the hon. member for Algoma justify that position?

Mr. DAWSON. I did not say that. I said if it was correct it afforded very good ground for our believing why a different system should be adopted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in a short speech, talked very eloquently about some Indian chief at Caughnawaga, who was an enterprising man and able to manage his own affairs. There are, of course, some exceptional cases where Indians are possessed of intelligence and are capable of doing business and managing their own affairs. When they reach such a condition they should step out of the Indian reserve and become free citizens of a free country, and then they should be properly enfranchised, and would have to assume all the responsibilities of white men. But I do not think it is right, Sir, that one single Indian should be selected out of a band, or that a certain number of Indians out of the whole Indian population of the Dominion should be selected as a justification for the proposition that all Indians should be given votes. And then, as a sample of the intelligence of these Indians, whom this House now proposes to enfranchise, I might refer to what was stated by the hon. member for East Grey, in a short speech which he delivered here the other evening:

"In the election before last, in the Muskoka district, the timber inspector there, who supported Mr. Mowat's candidate, went out among the Indians, and it was currently reported, and I believe correctly, that he bought up nearly all the Indians in the district, collected them all in one place, and took them to the polls and got them to vote. After that he took the Indians away, took their dresses from them and put them on the squaws, and took them in, and got them to poll their votes."

Now, are those the kind of voters we want in this country? Are those the kind of voters the hon. member for Cardwell would like to have?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I can tell the hon. member that it was just such voters that defeated me in Montreal—voters by the telegraph system, as it was called, where people changed their dresses and voted as other people.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Were they Indians?

Mr. WHITE. No; white people.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Did the men put their clothes on the women, and did the women vote? I think, Sir, if the women of Montreal voted against the hon. gentleman they showed their good sense, but I doubt if they were so degraded as to dress themselves in men's clothing and go to the polls, and put in their votes against the hon. gentleman. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, assuming that his statement is correct—and not knowing the facts, I assume it is correct—is that any justification for him giving those men votes who have been degraded to such a degree—the voters in the district of Algoma?

Mr. DAWSON. Not Algoma—Muskoka.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, Muskoka. You have a particular regard for Algoma. I would ask the hon. member for Cardwell if he can justify, before the House and the country, or before the electors of Cardwell, the proposition to give votes to the class of people whose actions have been described by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. HESSON. Who was most to blame, the Indians or Mowat's white men?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman is awfully troubled about Mr. Mowat. If there is anything he dislikes it is the name of Mowat.

Mr. BEATY. It is a mote in his eye.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is well to see that some of the hon. gentlemen representing Toronto are waking up. We have had two speeches from them to-night, one from the hon. member for East Toronto, and the other by the hon. member for West Toronto, the latter being a joke, or an attempt at a joke. I would just say that it is rather surprising that the name of Mr. Mowat should have such a baneful influence on hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever it is mentioned in a discussion here. They seem to think that he is capable of doing all that it is possible to do in Ontario. I know that their leader has assumed, in times past, that he was a greater constitutional lawyer than Mr. Mowat, but the courts of this country, and of the old country, have decided that Mr. Mowat is the greater constitutional lawyer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is getting very far away from the question.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will try to get back to the Indians, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Get back to the squaws.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Perhaps you have some Indians in your county, and you will be getting back to the squaws. Among the hon. members of the House who are heartily in accord with the Premier in regard to this Bill, we find the hon. member for East Hastings, who is very anxious that the Bill should pass. He has substantial reasons for desiring that the Bill should pass. He is one of the men repre-

senting the Conservative side in this House, who are bold enough to say that he believes in the provisions of this Bill, and that the Indians should have votes. And why? Simply because there is, in his constituency, a band of Indians, and in that constituency there are a large number of Orange lodges, which are mainly composed of Indians. There are Orange lodges composed entirely of Indians, and we all know the hon. member for East Hastings is a bright and shining light in the Orange order. No doubt it would be very convenient for him to go out on the Indian reserve in his constituency at election time and address his brethren in his regalia. No doubt it would be inspiring to them, that their representative in Parliament should come and address them in their lodges, and try to induce them to vote for himself, as the Government candidate, in any election which might take place there. But it is well to inquire what the First Minister expects to gain by the passage of this Indian clause of his Franchise Bill. Does he introduce it from patriotic motives? Is it from a desire to elevate the Indian and make him a better man and a better citizen? I think it must be perfectly clear to the mind of every gentleman in this House that no such reason actuates the First Minister in introducing this clause. I am satisfied that there are not half a dozen gentlemen supporting him who believe that he is actuated by any such desire. I am satisfied they do not believe it, simply because they do not get up here and express their opinion in support of this Bill, and because the First Minister does not himself say so. I am forced, therefore, to the conclusion that he does not care for the elevation of the Indian, that he does not hope to raise him out of the serfdom which he is placed under, as a ward of the Government, dependent on the generosity and, in many cases, the charity of the Government. His idea in introducing this clause is of another character altogether. He knows that with his local agent and his revising barrister he will be able to secure on all the reserves of this Dominion the almost solid vote of the Indians; and this is his only and sole object in introducing this clause into this Bill. He says he was only imitating the example set by the Hon. Oliver Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, in doing so. Now, I want to read the enactment of the Ontario law with regard to this, to show that the enfranchisement of the Indians by the two Acts is not placed on the same basis. (The hon. gentleman read from the law referred to). I contend that there is no similarity between the provisions of the Ontario Act and those of this Bill with regard to the enfranchising of the Indians; and the statement of the First Minister that he was simply adopting the enactment of Mr. Mowat cannot be substantiated or justified, for the simple reason that it is not founded upon fact. Then, we are told that by this amendment the Indian who resides on a reserve, and who has improvements to the value of $150, and a location ticket, is to be entitled to vote; but I want to call the attention of this committee to the fact that on a large number of the reserves in Ontario the improvements have been made, even the houses and the fences have been built, by and at the expense of the Government. These improvements are not the improvements made by the Indians themselves, but are made at the expense of the people of this country, for infants under the care and management of the Indian agent; and therefore an Indian in those circumstances does not occupy the same position as another elector of the country, who has made his own improvements on his own property. There is not much difficulty in discovering the motive which has actuated the hon. First Minister in seeking to give votes to all the Indians of the Dominion, except those of Manitoba and the North-West. There are fifteen counties in Ontario alone which will be more or less affected by this Indian vote. There are a number of gentlemen who occupy seats in this House and who give a vigorous opposition occasionally to the measures proposed by the Government, whose positions will be endangered by this provision; and no doubt the motive of the First Minister was not to elevate the Indians or to place them in a better position to secure the rights and privileges of the white man, but to try to defeat several of the gentlemen who sit on the Opposition benches in this House; and I would like to ask how such a course can be justified? I think I can demonstrate to this House that the liberties of the entire people of this Dominion may be injured, the very expression of their opinion may be thwarted by giving votes to the Indians on the reserves. Suppose that after the next general election parties come to this House about equally divided; suppose the First Minister comes back here with only two or three of a majority, though I fancy he will not have that, and suppose this Bill is passed in the meantime, and the Indians on the reserves are enfranchised: I would like to ask this House if it is not manifest that the whole freedom of the citizens of this country may be injured by this Bill; they would have obtained their small majority through the influence of the Indian vote, and thereby be enabled to retain power and place here against the will of the great majority of the white voters of this Dominion. They would be robbing the free citizens of this country of the right to say who should be the members of the Government to control the affairs of this country and who should represent them in this Parliament. In that case, I would like to ask if the voice and the free will of the people of this Dominion would not be subverted by this Bill. Could the Czar of Russia introduce a more tyrannical measure than this? I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has any right to endanger the whole electorate of this Dominion by such a measure as this, in order to bolster up the party in power. I believe in party government; I believe that in this country, as well as in others possessing representative institutions, we must have government by party; but I fail to see where party government is in existence at the present time. It is a one-man Government we have here, as clearly evinced in the discussion of this measure. The supporters of the First Minister have taken no part in the discussion whatever; the First Minister introduced a Bill, he decided it should be put through, and his supporters will come to his rescue, no doubt, when the vote takes place; but I believe there is a day of retribution coming, I believe the time will come when these men will have to stand before their electors and justify their course in this House in supporting this monstrous proposition to give votes to the wards of the Government and give them the opportunity of out-voting the free citizens of the Dominion. I would like to ask how it is that, for the first time in the history of the world, a measure of this kind has been introduced here? In no country enjoying responsible government has the vote been given to the Indians. In the United States no attempt has ever been made to give them votes, although in many of the older States there are bands of Indians just as intelligent as any we have in our Provinces. There has been no party man or statesman in the American Republic who has ever dared to outrage the people of that country by attempting to grant the suffrage to the Indians on reserves. We all know the course pursued by the First Minister at former elections, in order that he might retain place and power; but in introducing this measure, and in forcing his supporters to vote it through, he has excelled himself. His supporters have not had the courage to stand up like men and express their reasons for the vote they propose to give; they have not stood up like representatives of a free people and attempted to argue against the propositions laid down and sustained so ably by hon. gentlemen on this side; and I say it is a shame that men who come here to represent the people should sit here, as they have sat for weeks past, not daring to open their mouths. They sit there quietly, occupying the position of serfs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The word is not parliamentary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not want to say anything offensive to hon. gentlemen opposite; they are really not serfs, I believe, and I will call them simply a mechanical majority. They believe, with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), that it is the duty of gentlemen who represent the constituencies of the Dominion to come here merely for the purpose of recording the will of the Premier or the will of the Government. But I think that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to have some respect for themselves and some respect for their constituencies, and ought to discuss this as intelligent men; they ought to have some respect for the electors who sent them here. If they had, they would express their opinions on this Indian clause. The men who sent them here will require some explanation at their hands. I do not believe that the members on this side could be induced to support any Government, or the leader of any Government, who introduced any such outrageous proposition as this; I believe there is an independent feeling amongst the Reform representatives in this House, which precludes the possibility of their supporting anything of the kind. Further, I do not believe that any Reform leader would introduce any such outrageous proposition. No intelligent elector in this Dominion, Conservative or Reformer, will justify this measure. We have had expressions of opinion from Independent Conservatives and Liberal Conservatives and Conservatives pure and simple, who have declared, by signing the petitions sent here, that they are not prepared to uphold the Government in enacting this measure. The people should be consulted before such a measure as this is made law. We are not afraid to go to the people; we are anxious to go; we believe the people are not prepared to sustain this Government in this outrageous attempt to thwart the will of the people; we would be only *too* glad if the First Minister would dissolve this House to-morrow and go to the country, and I am satisfied that not only on this Bill, but on all other subjects, the First Minister would find he is not sustained by the people. It is somewhat strange that the First Minister should claim that this measure is a reform measure; it would be strange, indeed, if a reform measure should emanate from the leader of the Government or his colleagues. The history of the world indicates that reforms have been fought for always by Reformers, and any reforms which the people have secured have been secured through the exertions of the Reformers. But I fancy this is merely a pretence of the Government to protect themselves before the electorate. I fancy that the indignation of the people of Canada will be widespread with regard to this outrageous proposition, and that the meetings which have been held in a large number of the towns and cities of Ontario indicate only a tithe of the feeling which is spreading through the Dominion in regard to it. I am satisfied that if the Government does not retrace its steps and withdraw this Bill, or take out the obnoxious clauses before the House rises a wave of indignation will spread throughout the Dominion, and the gentlemen on the Treasury benches will yet discover that they have made a mistake in attempting, by this Bill, to strengthen their power and injure the freedom of the citizens of this country, by giving a vote to tribal Indians, who are not capable of managing their own affairs, and who, in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, are not sufficiently intelligent to mark their ballots, and who will be directly under the control of the Government agent and the revising barrister. If time would permit, thousands more would sign petitions against the passage of this Bill; but I hope that good sense will yet prevail, and that the Government will see they are not justified in pursuing the course they have adopted. How is it that no members of the Government, except the First Minister, have said anything in justification of this measure? We know they are capable of doing so if they could justify it, and I am forced to the conclusion that they cannot justify it, and I believe they will find at the next election that the people cannot be induced, by the bonds of party allegiance, to forget their manhood and desert those principles of justice which every free man ought to uphold.

Mr. TROW. Every member ought to enter his protest against this measure, which has probably created more excitement throughout the country than any which has emanated from the Government during its career. The numerous petitions which we receive are signed, evidently, by members of both political parties. This has been denied by some hon. gentlemen opposite; but I can vouch for the fact that those I have received from my constituency are signed by many leading Conservatives. I have no doubt that, if the Government persist in pushing this measure through this House, they will lose prestige with the people. I do not know but that the Opposition, in discussing this measure, is conducting a political contest much cheaper than they could in going round their respective counties. This discussion has been confined almost entirely to members of the Opposition. It is an unfair fight—a one-sided fight.

Mr. BOWELL. You cannot complain, if you have it all your own way.

Mr. TROW. We should not have it our own way.

Mr. BOWELL. Your leader did not say so.

Mr. TROW. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, who has so much debating ability, when he was on this side of the House would not allow any measure to pass without having a fling at its promoters. The hon. gentleman who just took his seat said hon. gentlemen opposite were a servile following. I do not wish to say that, but they are an obedient following. I do not know that there is any man in the Dominion or on the continent of America who has so much control over his followers as Sir John Macdonald has. I have known him in this debate to raise his hand when an hon. gentleman got up to speak, and he fell down instantaneously, as if he was shot. There was no displeasure; it was simply a jack-in-the-box; it was instantaneously and effectively done. It is surprising that they have not a spirit of independence, that they do not say: This is a measure which affects my riding; petitions have been sent in, signed by supporters of mine, and I must speak and explain my views in reference to it. I have noticed many hon. gentlemen who have attempted to speak, but they dare not. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who is a very fluent and flowery speaker, is very anxious to bear his part in the discussion, but he is dumb, like the rest. I am surprised, also, that the Conservative press is so reticent of late. You will find that that end of the gallery, which is usually filled by reporters in the Conservative interest, has been vacated.

An hon. MEMBER. Talked to death.

Mr. TROW. They have nothing to do. They are lying dormant. There is no item of news in the Conservative press in reference to the Franchise Bill. They are anxious for some information; they are anxious for the hon. gentlemen who represent their views here to express themselves on the floor of the House. There are two sides to every question. The Bill before the House is revolutionary in its nature, and ought never to be brought before this Parliament without first having been pronounced upon by the people. It has not been asked for by anyone, that I have heard of.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself to the motion before the House, and not discuss the Bill.

Mr. TROW. Very well, Mr. Chairman. Now, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who has resided among

the Indians for half a century, and who understands them, if anybody does, says that the Indians having the same qualifications as the white men certainly should not be deprived of the franchise. Who is to be the valuator of their lands? An Indian having three or four acres of improved land certainly would be valued by the Indian agent at $150, so that all Indians on the reserve would be qualified to vote. It would not exclude any Indian, so far as I know. At the same time, their relations with the Government are such that they would vote as the agent dictated to them. Probably ninety-nine out of every hundred of them cannot write, and they would have to go before the agent or the deputy returning officer and ask which way they should vote. Of course, he, as their instructor, as their father confessor, almost, would naturally advise them to vote with the Government of the day. We find by the reports that even the Indians who, by having a few acres of improved land, would be qualified to vote, are not proper parties to be entrusted with the franchise, the dearest right that any Briton can possess. I will read a few lines from the Indian report of the First Minister. (The hon. gentleman read from the report concerning the Chippewa bands on Lake Huron, showing their indifference to the school facilities provided for their children. He also read from the report concerning the condition of the Indians of Vancouver Island, and the immorality prevailing amongst them.) The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) stated that the half-breeds of Manitoba, properly speaking, were Indians. I am surprised that he made that statement, because he has been in Manitoba, and must know that the half-breeds, as a rule, are educated, and most of them are agriculturists. They are not wards of the Government, and are entirely different from the Indians whom the First Minister wishes to enfranchise. Numerous meetings have been held throughout the country to protest against the passing of this Bill. We find that on Saturday night last a very large mass meeting was held in the city of Montreal, attended by over 3,000 people.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). About 175.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Three hundred.

Mr. TROW. The paper says there were over 3,000 electors present, of all shades of politics, who were unanimous in condemning the Bill. Meetings were also held at Ingersol and at Embro. I think it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to use their influence with the First Minister to induce him to modify the Bill, especially in one or two particulars. It is an extraordinary fact that the First Minister has not met the Opposition at the general elections since Confederation in a fair fight. First, he spent money lavishly. Next, it was misrepresentation. Next, by cutting and carving 50 or 60 different ridings. His present object is to take charge of the voters' lists, to give revising barristers an opportunity of putting on such voters as they please. We consider it our duty to fight this matter out manfully. We are satisfied there is a piece of leaven that is leavening the whole lump; that the discussions here have convinced many of the Conservative voters in South Perth; and that, as regards North Perth, in view of the petition I presented to-day and the petition I presented a few days ago, the case of the present representative of that riding is hopeless. The measure should be withdrawn.

Mr. HESSON. I wish to refer briefly to the remarks made by the last speaker. The hon. gentleman has referred to the petition he presented from North Perth, which he thinks goes to prove that Conservatives are largely petitioning the House. I cannot allow the matter to pass without entering my protest against the hon. gentleman's statements. I think I know the electors of Stratford, after a residence there of over forty years, as well as does the hon. gentleman, who has only latterly gone to reside there, although he formerly lived at Shakespeare. I have gone carefully through the list he presented from Stratford, on which there were 163 names, after the petition had been peddled round from house to house and from hotel to hotel—I know all about it because I spent a week at home, and the hon. gentleman did nothing of the kind—and I find only nine names which I would pronounce as those of Conservatives out of the whole 163. If I wrote to each of those gentlemen, they would respectively give very good reasons why they signed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. Those reasons would be very good on their side, but not in justification of the Reform party, whose members pressed them to sign. With respect to the whole petitions presented by the hon. gentleman, I find but nine Conservatives out of 574 electors. I do not pretend to say that those gentlemen had not some reasonable cause urged upon them; but every one of them who signed it would not only be willing to sign a petition to send the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) to Batouche's Crossing, or anywhere else, but also to transport the whole Grit party out of the House. I must confess that I never saw more indignation expressed by intelligent electors than I met with on my journey, and especially during the week I spent in my own town—expressions almost of contempt, for the manner in which the House was spending its time, and the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite were wasting the time of the House, causing expense to the people, and inconvenience to the business men of Canada, simply because the Government were discharging their duty, in bringing down a Bill entirely within their power and jurisdiction. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite expected that the country was going to rise in arms and express terrible indignation. The hon. gentleman speaks of meetings that have been held, but what are those meetings? There is one city of 9,000 inhabitants in the county of Perth, and they have not had sufficient indignation to get up a meeting, and the same is true of every town and township in the county the hon. gentleman represents. Now, if that is evidence of indignation with this Bill, I am at a loss to know what indignation really means. The hon. gentleman has referred to meetings held elsewhere. Well, if he had read the *Mail* of to-day he would have seen an account of a meeting which was not quite according to his mind. It is headed "A Grit Indignation Meeting closes with cheers for Sir John." I do not think we will object to that kind of meeting, especially when I inform you it was attended by Mr. Preston, the paid agent of the Reform party, who travels throughout the country, as the agents of the Farmer's Union did, to stir up indignation and misrepresent the case to those who did not read the matter for themselves, and had not heard it explained. We find that the paid agent of the Reform party was sent down to Ridgetown, where he called a meeting to misrepresent the case.

Mr. DAVIES. What were the misrepresentations?

Mr. HESSON. It was represented there that an attempt was made to enfranchise the Indians of the North-West.

Mr. DAVIES. And was not that attempted at first?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why is there an amendment excluding them?

Mr. HESSON. It is too late in the day to utter such statements to the people. I believe the electors of Canada understand the question, because the press has discussed it; but hon. gentlemen were not satisfied with that. They complain that hon. gentlemen on this side have chosen to sit still and allow them a full opportunity of debating this question; they speak of the followers of the Government being dumb, of their being servile followers, and they apply to them nearly all the harsh names they can find in their vocabulary, because we allow them to debate this

question undisturbed. The reason we did not engage in the discussion was not because we could not find something in favor of the Bill, not because the Government had not a right to pass the Bill, not because they had not fully considered every clause, though changes might be found desirable as the Bill proceeded. The Government have never proposed to legislate for the whole people, without consulting them, they do consult their friends from time to time, and that is what has made them strong in the House, and strong in the confidence of the people behind them. Now, with regard to the challenge of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), to appeal to the people, we have, in our recollection, challenges of that kind made on former occasions, when hon. gentlemen had to go to the country a year too soon for them, and I do not think they had much to boast of.

Mr. PATERSON. You gerrymandered the country.

Mr. HESSON. They had nothing to boast of, and when they came back, they came back, if not in a smaller minority, at least not in increased numbers. I do not suppose it is the duty of the Government to dissolve the House at the will of any particular individual in this House, but hon. gentlemen seem to think that they alone represent the will of the people of Canada, and that really we had no right here except to listen to them. Now, that we listen quietly, now that the press has been quiet, though their own papers have not been silent, why should they complain if the Government is going to do something which is to prove so disastrous to the country, and especially to the Conservative party; and if Conservatives are signing these petitions, it is the very thing which should gratify them. We are silent, and Ministers are silent, because the Minister in charge of the Bill has, I think, in sufficiently clear language for the comprehension of any hon. gentleman, explained his views. I do not think the Bill required much explanation, because each clause explains itself as it goes on. I rose to say, with regard to these petitions, that I have looked over the names carefully, and that I know the names of the electors as well as the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) does, and that I challenge him to a test in that matter. I do not think hon. gentlemen on this side should be lectured as we have been, night after night, because we chose to sit silently and allow hon. gentlemen opposite to have the time they desire, because we treat them in a courteous manner, although every one of them, almost, without exception, has been called to order during the discussion. The hon. gentleman says "no," but if he will look at *Hansard* he will find that not only has the Chairman called them to order, but that they have been called to order by hon. gentlemen on this side, who felt their temper riled by the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite throughout this long debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had the hon. member for North Perth delivered his speech a little earlier in the discussion, possibly it might have deterred hon. members on this side from proceeding further. His remarks have shown pointedly the position which hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to take with regard to this measure. He stated that when he was at home he found a unanimous condemnation of the course adopted by the Opposition. Well, I must say that it is the first time that we have heard of any announcement of that kind; and possibly, had he gone to the Opposition and quietly whispered about the indignation he found in the country, without exposing us to the House, we might have quietly withdrawn from the discussion, and not made a further exhibition of ourselves to the country and to the House. However, I think the duty performed by the Opposition, so far, in place of being condemned by the people of this Dominion has been fully appreciated by them. It has been said that a great deal of time has been taken up by us, and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) mentioned the number of times that one hon. member addressed the House on this and, I believe, a number of other questions. Hon. gentlemen opposite were once in Opposition, and I have quietly looked over the discussions of 1877 and 1878, to see how much time they occupied. I find that the Minister of Customs addressed the House in 1877, 110 times, and in 1878, 95 times; Sir Charles Tupper, in 1877, addressed the House 158 times, and in 1878, 144 times; the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) spoke, in 1877, 148 times, and in 1878, 112 times; the hon. First Minister, himself, thought it necessary, as leader of the Opposition, to address the House, in 1877, 253 times, and in 1878, 129 times; and the Minister of Public Works was not silent on these occasions, either, but in 1878 addressed the House 129 times. So that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they felt it their duty to oppose the measures before the House, did not hesitate to take up the time of the House; but because we feel it our duty, on this occasion, to offer our objections and criticisms, they say it is obstruction.

Mr. HESSON. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to say that when I referred to the number of times an hon. member addressed this House it was on one single Bill, on which he spoke seventy-three times. If I had taken the trouble to ascertain the number of times he and others addressed the House during the whole Session, the number would have been very much larger.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have been giving our opinion on two very important questions—the enfranchisement of civil servants and the enfranchisement of the Indians. I took occasion, when this Bill was introduced, to warn the Government of the extended discussion which would, no doubt, take place on a measure of this kind. I think there is no question that could be introduced into Parliament more likely to secure extended discussion than one relating to the franchise. It affects every man who sits in this House, and it is one in which the people are deeply interested. In England, when measures relating to the franchise are brought forward, they are discussed at great length, and it should certainly be expected that these criticisms would take place in this country upon a Bill of such an important character. If you should take one of the shorthand reporters out to a private room with the members who are supporting the Government, and ask them to state privately what their views are with regard to the intention of the First Minister as to the enfranchisement of the Indians, and what they said was taken down and published, I venture to say that it would be the most ridiculous exposure of their views in connection with that matter that could be conceived of; because I do not believe there are half a dozen men on the Government side who can give a clear and distinct statement of what the First Minister means by this measure. He stated, at one time, that he intended to enfranchise all the Indians of the North-West: he afterwards withdrew from that position, and now he confines the enfranchisement to the Indians of the older Provinces and those of British Columbia. I understood that one of the members stated that it was not the intention to enfranchise the Indians of British Columbia; but I see nothing in the amendment to show me that that statement is true. We have been creeping from one point to another, and changes have been made in the Bill continuously. It is difficult to state what further amendments may not yet be made. The hon. First Minister has not yet, evidently, settled in his own mind what he intends on this whole question. Perhaps it is because the Opposition have so intelligently discussed the question that he has obtained light upon it. I would like to see a question of the importance of this question fully and fairly discussed on all sides; and I have felt somewhat surprised that the followers of the Government have, from day to day, declined to raise their voices in sup-

port of the possition taken by the First Minister. Perhaps they do not agree with the views he holds, or else they have decided to place the matter entirely in his charge, and allow him simply to carry the Bill, with whatever amendments he thinks proper to introduce, and then do as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) says, register the will of the Government. Now, there are two great objections to the enfranchisement of the Indians. In the first place, they are absolutely and completely under the control of the Superintendent General, and in the next place they will be absolutely under the control of the revising barrister. If they are to be permitted to vote at all on a portion of the reserve, it will be through the kindness and assistance of the Superintendent General. Their names will not be on the assessment roll, because they will not be taxed; and they will only be put on the voters' list through the operations of the Superintendent General and the revising barrister. It is very easy for any person, knowing the influence the Superintendent General exercises over them, to tell how these people will probably vote. I do not think there is any doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite that they will only be granted their privilege of voting because they will be expected to give their votes to the Government in power. It is extremely objectionable that any percentage of electors should be placed in that position. If there is anything that we should hold sacred and dear, it is the right of the franchise to be exercised by a free and independent people, without danger of its being overbalanced by the votes of those whom the Government control. There is no necessity why we should so far depart from the ordinary course followed in enfranchising the people of the Dominion. Judging from the reports, those Indians are only a class of semi-civilised creatures, not possessed of the education or information sufficient to enable them intelligently to discharge the duties of electors. What appears to be exceedingly ridiculous in the whole proceeding is, that this Bill should exclude the sons of tenant farmers, intelligent young men, who have had the advantages of a liberal school education and have been brought up in a christian community, from the franchise, and give it to these untutored, semi-civilised, irresponsible beings. In the United States no Indian can vote who does not pay taxes and discharge the duties of an ordinary citizen; and, fulfilling those obligations, he is, as a matter of course, placed on a level with other people. The word "Indian" need not be used at all. It will be time enough for us to consider this Indian question when we will have manhood suffrage, which, perhaps, we will have before very long. But until we reach that point we should not pass a special clause giving the franchise to the Indians. The only conclusion we can arrive at with regard to this Bill is that it was introduced for a political purpose, that of strengthening the Government and weakening the Opposition. A device similar in its intent to this was adopted at the last elections, and now, before another general election, we find the Government taking this means to avoid defeat. It is the intention of the First Minister, I believe, to press this measure through at any cost, but if he thinks that we will at all weaken in the discharge of our duty he is greatly mistaken. At the last general election I heard it often said that the Opposition were charging the Government with acts which they did not charge against them on the floor of the House. As regards the Franchise Bill, we are determined that no such charge will be advanced, with the slightest basis for the assertion. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) urged that the Indians should be enfranchised, on the ground that many of them might have houses on the reserve, and might have made improvements on their lots to the extent of $150; but he omitted to mention that they pay no taxes or assessments of any kind. Instead of thrusting upon these people the privilege of citizenship, we should try and raise them from the position they occupy, by educational influences; and then, when they showed their willingness to assume all the obligations, as well as enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, I would have no objection to give them votes. You might as well, in South Brant, for instance, say that 100 Conservatives, instead of having one ballot, should have two. Under the amendment introduced by the First Minister it would be possible to enfranchise every Indian living on a reserve in the older Provinces, and I have no doubt it is the intention to do that. The hon. member for Cardwell, the other evening, stated it was only the intention to enfranchise Indians who held property separate altogether from reserves, but the member for Algoma says the amendment is to enfranchise Indians who live upon reserves and have improvements worth $150, over and above the property they hold. I should like to know which is right. We might know if the First Minister were here, but he is not, and we are talking to empty benches. Still, we shall continue to offer our objections. The First Minister's time may be taken up by other important measures, and I sympathise with him in that particular, but he should be here to listen to remonstrances from this side, and we should have a fair hearing for any amendments we have to propose. We have been offering amendments and making objections, but we have not been successful in getting any of our amendments accepted. I offered one myself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall come to the Indian.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You are going into the whole matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very hard to confine us to the Indian, because we have not been successful in our amendments on other clauses. However, I shall refer to the Indian. We should educate the Indians to the standard of intelligence before we place the franchise in their hands. They will require, in many cases, to have their ballots marked for them, and if the subordinates of the Superintendent General are at the polls, is it not reasonable to suppose that the Indians will vote for the Government from whom they get their allowance every year. I would like to hear hon. gentlemen opposite give their reasons for supporting this Bill, but in place of that they pin themselves right down to the clause and shut their eyes to every objection. I would not like to say that the First Minister has gagged his followers; I am glad to say that there is at least one hon. gentleman who cannot be gagged, and that is the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). He has broken through the rule to night and offered some remarks with regard to the Indians. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is also largely interested in the Indian question, as there are a good many of them in his constituency, and I should like very well to hear his views on the subject of giving them the franchise. I have been a good deal through the Algoma district, and I must say in all my travels I never met an Indian that I believe you could educate in half an hour what a vote was, let alone marking the ballot. They are people who never heard of such a thing, and I do not think they have any idea of the honor there is to be conferred upon them. I am sure that in place of their discharging the duty intelligently the revising barrister and Superintendent General will do the whole work for them. It is stated, with respect to the Indians, that on receiving potatoes for seed they planted them whole, and shortly afterwards dug them up and eat them. Yet it is proposed to enfranchise such Indians. Again, it has been found, with respect to Indians in the woods, that they cannot be depended upon. I desire the representatives from Quebec to understand that there is no ground for the assertion that this Bill has been introduced because the present Ontario Government

has introduced a Bill to disfranchise a number of people in that Province. Such is not the fact, and the Mowat Bill has widely extended the suffrage. I was in Montreal on Saturday, and had an interview with a Conservative with respect to this Bill. He told me that the general feeling in Montreal among moderate Conservatives is antagonistic to the Bill. They were in favor of retaining the present franchise. In discussing this measure we are simply discharging our duty, and when our party come to occupy the Treasury benches we shall amend the Act in the way we have indicated.

Mr. MULOCK. I entirely agree with the sentiments which the hon. member for North Perth says were expressed by his constituents: that it is not in the interest of the country that the time of the House should be taken up by obstruction, or whatever it may be called, but this debate has been a most important one, dealing with a measure which is most unnecessary, and which should not, at all events, have been introduced at the time it was introduced. When the Indian clause was first introduced it proposed to give the franchise to every Indian possessing the necessary qualification, but as time went on various views were presented by various members. I will not raise any verbal criticism of the amendment, except with regard to this point: that I think the amendment will be open to the construction of enfranchising a whole band, merely because they jointly occupy a separate property, and that the whole band jointly have made improvements to the extent of $150, so that I think a verbal amendment is necessary to limit it in accordance with what appears to be the intention of the First Minister. The various changes which have been made in this Indian clause have, so far as they have gone, met the prejudices or criticisms which have been raised against the measure, but I am sorry to say that I cannot give my assent to the amendment. Whatever may be the opinion of hon. members as to property qualification, or manhood suffrage, I think all are agreed that it is most desirable that voters should possess some degree of intelligence and education, so that they may exercise the franchise wisely; and though it may be difficult to test such a qualification, yet in this Bill intelligence or education appears to have been left out of the question, and now an amendment is proposed, containing a general proposition which, I think, in its language, will overreach the object of the promoter of the Bill. I think it is impossible to enfranchise a class in this way and do justice. There are Indians and Indians. There are some Indians who are capable of exercising the franchise intelligently, and others who are not, but the amendment provides no means of discrimination. I refer for a moment to some remarks which were made last Session, and reported in *Hansard*, second volume, page 1110. (The hon. gentle- quoted from the debates in question). The hon. member for Northumberland, who speaks from a long experience, said he was not aware of a single Indian in the Province of New Brunswick who was to-day able, intelligently, to exercise the franchise, and it is clear that the Indians of Nova Scotia, as a class, are not entitled to enjoy the franchise. On the same page of *Hansard* the Premier said, speaking of the Indians of British Columbia: (The hon. gentleman again quoted from *Hansard*). The hon. gentleman, then the Minister of Public Works, gave his opinion on the Indians on the 22nd of May, 1883—I read from *Hansard*, page 1376—referring principally to the Indians of the North-West:

"If you wish to educate these children you must separate them from their parents during the time they are educated. If you leave them in the family they may know how to read and write, but they still remain savages."

A year ago he told us that, and to-day he proposes to give them the franchise. In 1876 there was a Bill before the House to consolidate the Indian Act; and the Premier, then in Opposition, used these words in regard to the Indian race. I read from *Hansard*, page 1991, vol. 2:

"We have seen the Indian race improved by education, but you can not make the Indian a white man."

The Minister of Public Works endorsed that statement; and yet these Indians, who, in the opinion of the Government, were children in 1876 and savages in 1883, are, in 1885, to be put on a par with the white man. Now, I am going to read some extracts from the Indian report, to show the condition of the Indians in British Columbia and elsewhere. (The hon. gentleman read a number of extracts from the Indian report for 1884).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is time to adjourn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Go on; it is early yet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is a quarter past two. I think our constituents will feel that we have done our duty to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. And more than your duty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost; carried.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the noes have it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we could possibly get through to night. I know there are several other gentlemen who wish to speak on this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the fifth week we have been discussing this measure, and the Indian question has been discussed, I think, three out of the five weeks. Then, again, there was a positive pledge made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that this clause was to be voted on by Saturday night, and that we were to have the next clause, relating to revising barristers, on Tuesday morning. That arrangement has been shamelessly broken, in order that the hon. member for West Durham might make his speech to-day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was that arrangement made? Because I was present on Friday night, and I do not recollect that any agreement was made as to anything more than that two or three motions should be made, if the disqualification clauses were allowed to go on. Was this pledge made on Saturday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it was made on Friday night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But on Friday night I was present myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman was not present when the arrangement was made between Mr. Mills and Sir Hector Langevin.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was here until the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, and I did not understand, certainly, that any arrangement was made as to taking the vote on the Indian question on Saturday.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Bothwell, on Saturday, most distinctly repudiated having come to any such arrangement, and he repudiated it in the presence of the Minister of Public Works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated in the presence of the hon. member what I state now, and it was this: It was understood that we would pass the 7th and 8th clauses, and the First Minister would move his motion between the 7th and 8th clauses, and then we would take up the 9th clause; but, inasmuch as there were amendments to be made to the 9th clause, we would only pass the paragraph on the printed Bill, but we would not finally pass the 9th clause, in order that the next day, Saturday, the First Minister might make

his motion, adding a new paragraph concerning the Indians, which would be paragraph C, and that the hon. member, on his side, was to move one or two additional paragraphs; one was about the Civil Service, and the other about revising barristers. He wanted to amend paragraph B, and to add a new paragraph about civil servants, and it was well understood these would be gone through on Saturday. But when we met here on Saturday, instead of the hon. gentleman allowing the First Minister to go on with his motion, he got up and made a speech, and moved the revising barrister paragraph, which was lost. Immediately afterwards, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) made a speech, as if he were to make a motion to the paragraph about the Civil Service; but it was only to give time to the hon. member for Bothwell to prepare his motion, which he was then preparing, and he then got up and made his motion. The First Minister was, therefore, prevented from making his motion, because these gentlemen, along with others, took all the time, until six o'clock on Saturday. That was the understanding. Of course, the hon. gentleman thought otherwise on Saturday, and here we are, at nearly half-past two o'clock, about this motion, and we are now asked to adjourn.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this was a private arrangement which took place between him and the hon. member for Bothwell. There was no understanding on the floor of the House. The hon. member for Bothwell is not here to speak for himself. But he did not understand it as the Minister of Public Works now understands it, when it was mentioned on Saturday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mentioned it twice, and certainly he did not rise in his place to deny it.

Mr. DAVIES. He stated he would take the earliest opportunity to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not venture to do it then.

Mr. DAVIES. I was sitting alongside of him, and I heard him say that he did not make any such arrangement as the Minister of Public Works now states. But that arrangement was a private one, and is a matter between the Minister of Public Works and the member for Bothwell, when he is present; and therefore I think that if any misunderstanding took place between them the member for Bothwell should be present when the Minister of Public Works makes his statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says it was a private arrangement. We all know perfectly well what it was.

Mr. DAVIES. I say I assume it was, because no public arrangement was made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Arrangements are generally made in that way. We know perfectly well that the nominal leader of the Opposition has, to a certain degree, abdicated his functions, and Mr. Mills was obviously leading on that side, and I think hon. gentlemen of the Opposition were bound by any arrangement he made, public or private.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no doubt about that. If Mr. Mills so understood the matter, everybody here would hold themselves, and rightly hold themselves, to be bound by it. But, I must say this: I was present here myself up to 12 o'clock on Friday night, up to the time the House adjourned, and I recollect very well the hon. member for Bothwell coming to me and telling me that he thought it would be well to adjourn, if we got clause 7 and 8, I think, passed, and the two sub-sections of the other one, to which there were some amendments to be made. He asked me if I was willing to agree to that, and I said yes. That is all I recollect about the matter. I had no conversation with the Minister of Public Works, though I am quite sure the Minister of Public Works would not make any statement he did not believe to be correct, and I am certain the hon. member for Bothwell would not have made an arrangement of that kind and then broken it. I do not understand the First Minister to have been concerned in it in any way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; but I have given my sense of it from the information I got from my hon. friend. The two gentlemen met behind the Speaker's Chair and made the arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I got my information from the member for Bothwell. As a matter of fact, I may say to the hon. gentleman that I was, myself, responsible for the conduct of the Opposition on Friday—not Saturday, as I was not here then. But on Friday evening I was here, and I perfectly recollect that the hon. member for Bothwell came to me and mentioned the matter, as I have stated. I was a good deal astonished to hear that there had been any dispute on Saturday about the matter. I think it unfortunate there should be any misunderstanding of this kind, because, of course, if there is, there is an end to any possibility of making other arrangements. At the present moment, I may say that I do not think that the discussion is likely to be protracted long to-morrow, but I do know that two or three hon. gentleman desire to speak. The hon. gentleman must recollect that the amendment which he proposed, and which I have just had an opportunity of inspecting, was one of some serious importance, differing materially from the proposition those gentlemen had supposed was likely to be made with respect to the Indians.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not understand from the Minister of Public Works that we were to have a vote on the Indian question on Saturday. I think the hon. gentleman did not say so. I understood an opportunity would be given to the First Minister to propose his amendment. Of course, if he says he had an understanding with the hon. member for Bothwell that a vote should be taken on the Indian question on Saturday, that places a different question upon it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That was the understanding.

Mr. PATERSON. That is certainly a surprise to me. I do not see how the hon. member for Bothwell made the proposition, knowing that a great many members desired to speak. He certainly says he did not do so. The Minister of Public Works had not stated, until now, that there was to be a vote. I know the hon. member for Bothwell wants to speak himself on this question, as do several other members, and I think it would be unfair to him. Certainly, I do not want to be a party, nor does the hon. member for Bothwell, to anything like a violation of good faith. That should not be charged, especially when the hon. member is not present.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, the hon. gentleman opposite has taken the responsibility, across the floor, of stating that to-morrow this will be disposed of within reasonable time——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; within reasonable time. This particular Indian question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I shall move the committee rise.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it understood that no amendments are to be permitted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I understand is, that the Indian question is to be closed to-morrow—this debate you have introduced on your proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This whole question, so that we may get upon the next clause. It will not shut out amendments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to repeat what I said before he came in. I desire to know whether by this amendment it is intended to require each Indian to have improvements to the value of $150?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. My attention has been called to the matter; and now that we have got into good humor again, I should like to amend it by wording it in the singular instead of the plural.

Committee rose and reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:30 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. I received to-day, from General Middleton, a telegram, dated Battleford, which I think will possess interest to the House. It is as follows:

"I have made prisoners of Poundmaker, Lame Man, Yellow Mud, Blanket, Breaking-through-the-ice—about the most influential and dangerous men about him. I also have two men who killed Payne, Indian instructor, and Treemont, the rancher—White Bear, who killed Payne, and Wahwanite, who killed Treemont. My next task will be Big Bear. Poundmaker brought in two teams and gave up 210 arms and five revolvers. I ordered them to give up flour, horses and cattle, and am sending part of the police to see that they are all given up. The 90th just arrived in camp by steamer; rest coming by land. If obliged, propose to organise force of mounted infantry from police, Boulton's mounted scouts and some mounted artillery—in all about 300 men—with light carts and as little baggage and supplies as possible, so as to scour the whole country and strike rapidly. I expect Big Bear will soon give up. If he does, I shall treat him as I have done Poundmaker; if he does not, I shall attack him."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Probably it would have been better if the Minister of Militia had read this dispatch in support of the First Minister's admendment now under the consideration of the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A suggestion was made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), as to the wording of my amendment, and I quite agree with him in regard to it. I therefore propose that the latter part of the clause should be put in the singular instead of the plural. At the same time, I desire to provide for a case which certainly did not occur to me. It might happen that an Indian living on a reserve might not have a vote there, but he might have property elsewhere. I would propose, with the consent of the committee, that after the word "Territories," the following words be inserted:

And any Indian on any reserve elsewhere in Canada, who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land in such reserve, and whose improvements on such separate tract are not of the value at least of $150, and is not otherwise possessed of the qualifications entitling him to be registered on the list of voters under this Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Would it not be better to divide it into two paragraphs, paragraph "C" to be "Indians in Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories," and the remainder of the paragraph to be sub-section "B."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Before I address myself to the subject of the amendment and the clause of the Bill before the committee, I wish to make an observation or two with reference to the statement made by the First Minister last evening during my absence. The First Minister informed the committee that an arrangement had been made between the Minister of Public Works and myself, and that that arrangement had been departed from—in fact, that we had broken through the arrangement, and the hon. gentleman said we had shamefully disregarded the arrangement which had been had between us. Now, I beg leave to give to that statement a most explicit denial. The hon. gentleman and myself had a discussion with regard to the point at which the committee should stop on Friday evening. I suggested to the Minister of Public Works that we should stop when we reached the end of section 8. The hon. gentleman expressed his desire that we should go through the provisions of clause 9. I mentioned to him that we had amendments to move, and three of those amendments, of which I had a knowledge, I mentioned to him. He also stated that the First Minister intended—as we knew, from his announcement, if he adhered to his intention—to move an amendment to this section, and I agreed on behalf of our friends here—for my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was leading the Opposition that evening—that we should consider the provisions of section 9, with the understanding that the section was not carried, and that it should be open to us next day to move the amendments we desired. Now, the understanding between the hon. gentleman and myself had reference solely to the point we should reach, and the condition in which clause 9 should stand when we closed our proceedings in the committee on Friday evening. We had no discussion as to the length of time which should be taken up with the consideration of section 9, or any amendment to it, on the following day. Sir, I had no authority to agree to any such understanding, and the hon. gentleman did not propose it. There was no intimation that there would be any such agreement between us; the sole subject of discussion between the Minister of Public Works and myself was the condition in which we should leave section 9 when the debate closed; and when the hon. the First Minister proposed an amendment I supposed he was proposing to carry the clause, and I objected. The committee remember that very well. Now, the subject of this clause, and of the arrangement between the hon. gentleman and myself, was referred to by the First Minister in the discussion on Saturday. The First Minister said:

"As this resolution has been disposed of"——

This was a resolution proposing to exclude the Civil Service from the list of voters—

"and as there is another resolution on this head which I intend to present, I do not think it would be worth while to go into it now. Still, I do not think that hon. gentlemen have carried out the arrangement, which was that I was to have the opportunity of moving that to-day."

Now, that was what the hon. gentleman stated the arrangement to be. He did not for one moment, on Saturday, hint that we were to take up the subject of the Indian, and that we were to close the discussion on that day. He never intimated such a thing on that day. He added:

"That was frustrated by the debate which arose, and in which the hon. members have been repeating the same thing over and over. I do not think the arrangement has been carried out in a good spirit."

I took exception to that statement. I said:

"I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. He said he wished to carry the two sub-sections of the 9th section, without carrying the section and I toldhim that there were three amendments which we desired to make, one relating to the revising officer, the one just voted down, and the one relating to the Indians. I thought that, as the discussion on the Indian question was likely to be longer than that on the other two, it would be more convenient to take the other two first, and I intimated that when I rose. I would have taken my seat if the hon. gentleman had intimated that it was his desire to begin with the Indians; but knowing what the nature of the amendment was and what sort of discussion was likely to take place on this particularly short day, I thought it was more desirable to get the others disposed of than to bring up a discussion which we certainly could not have got through to-day."

Now, Sir, there was an expressed declaration of the reasons I proposed to move those two amendments first, and I waited for a moment, in order that the First Minister might object, if he saw proper. I did so because I believed the discussion on them would be comparatively short, and we would be able to get through with them, and I stated I thought it was more desirable to do that than to take up the discussion of the Indian question, which we certainly could not have got through with on Saturday. Now, if there was any such understanding, why did not the hon. gentleman take exception to my observations then? But he did not do it, and the conclusive answer to his statement now is, that he did not do it because there was no such understanding. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman never intimated to me that he desired any such understanding, and he knew we came to no such understanding. All the hon. gentleman proposed to discuss was: Shall we stop at the end of section 8 or go on to section 9 as it stands? I wished to stop at section 8, because we had these amendments to move, and the hon. gentleman said we will go through section 9 as it is here, but not carry it, and leave it open till next day. But as to what we might do on that section, there was no understanding whatever. I reported the matter precisely as it was to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), because he was in charge of the Opposition on that day. I do not propose to make any further observations on this matter, but I must express my astonishment that any statement like that should have been made to the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I was not a party to that arrangement at all. I can only speak, from the statement made to me by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, as to what that arrangement was. As I understood it from him, it was this—that all the amendments that might be moved by hon. gentlemen on the other side would be moved the next day, that I should have an opportunity of moving my resolution respecting the Indians on the same day, that that clause should be got rid of on that day, and that on Tuesday morning we should commence the discussion on the revising barrister; and my hon. friend reiterated that statement last night. I was going on with my amendment, when the hon. gentleman rose and moved his amendment respecting revising barristers, I think it was. I could have no objection to that, as I really understood from my hon. friend that the whole thing was to be finished. Then the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) rose and commenced speaking, and did not sit down until the hon. member for Bothwell had prepared hurriedly the second resolution, and then the one sat down and the other got up and proposed the second amendment. That was about the Civil Service. That was rather remarkable, but still believing that the arrangement would be carried out, I thought there would be plenty of time to dispose of it; but when we approached six o'clock, I found that the whole time had been taken up in discussing these two amendments. Therefore, I gave up the matter, and I said I really did not think the arrangement had been carried out in the correct spirit.

My hon. friend, I think, will reiterate the statement that it was a decided bargain that that whole clause relating to the Indians should be disposed of on Saturday, so that on Tuesday we might commence the discussion of the registration clause, and the appointment of the revising barristers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry that there should be any misunderstanding; but when the matter was fresher in our memories than it is to-day, that is to say, on Saturday, I stated the case as I understood it, and I repeated it yesterday. I find in the *Hansard* that I stated this:

"There may be a misunderstanding, but I stated to the hon. gentleman that the First Minister would make his motion about the Indians to-day as section C, and that the hon. gentleman would then make his motion about the civil servants and that about the other matter. I thought the hon. gentleman understood fully that the First Minister was to move first, because I told him it would be section C, coming immediately after sections A and B."

What confirms me in my recollection of that statement is that, when the House went into Committee of the Whole on this matter on Saturday, the hon. member for Bothwell said:

"Perhaps before the right hon. gentleman moves his motion with regard to the Indian clause, we might, on this side, propose our amendment with regard to revising barristers."

Showing that the hon. gentleman expected that the First Minister would make his motion about the Indians as subsection C, which was to come after sections A and B sections, which had been accepted on Friday night; so I think the hon. gentleman will see that the statement I made was perfectly in accord with the understanding between us. Of course, I do not say that the hon. gentleman had any intention of deceiving us; I would never say that of any hon. member of this House. It is an unfortunate thing that there should be a misunderstanding; but I inferred from these statements that the intention was that the hon. First Minister should make his motion first, and that after that was disposed of, the hon. gentleman should move about the Civil Service and the revising officers.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two entirely distinct questions. One is the question which was discussed the other day; the other is the question now raised, and which, I believe, was raised last night. The question as to whether the Indian amendment should be moved first, is one thing; the other as to whether the debate should terminate on this clause on Saturday is quite another thing. The hon. member for Bothwell stated in my hearing on Saturday, upon the suggestion of the hon. First Minister, that the arrangement had not been carried out in a good spirit, that he himself at the opening of the discussion had suggested to the First Minister that probably it would be more convenient to take the two amendments of the Opposition before he moved his amendment. I heard him say that, and the hon. gentleman appeared to assent to it; he acknowledges having assented to it. The hon. First Minister did not object, and permitted those two amendments to be moved. I therefore do not see that there was anything improper in the hon. member for Bothwell making that suggestion, and leaving it to him to decide whether he should make his proposition with reference to the Indians first, or whether these two amendments should be taken first; but upon that day there was no statement made to this House that there was an agreement that the debate on this particular clause should close on Saturday and that the debate on the revising barristers should commence on Tuesday. I agree with the hon. Minister of Public Works not only in form but in spirit; and what I regretted was to hear that the hon. First Minister had used a phrase, which I hope on reflection he will recall, that there had been a shameless disregard of an arrangement. Of course, if there is a misunderstanding it is to be regretted, because arrangements privately made across the floor are for the convenience of public business, and unless they are clearly

understood, and fairly and honorably observed on both sides, it will be much to be regretted. But it would be infinitely more lamentable if there should be a suspicion on one side or the other that there had been a wilful violation of good faith. In what spirit did the hon. First Minister and the hon. Minister of Public Works meet this House on Saturday? The First Minister stated that the arrangement had not been carried out in good spirit. He moved the adjournment of the House at six o'clock, having got rid of the two amendments; and he did not then say that it had been agreed that the debate should close on his amendment that night; he said he was to have the opportunity of moving first. Then the hon. Minister of Public Works, in the fair way in which he conducts business, began his observations by saying that there must have been a misunderstanding, and then he said that he had stated to my hon. friend from Bothwell that the First Minister would make his motion first. My hon. friend has acknowledged that, and said he offered that suggestion to the First Minister for the convenience of business, which the First Minister adopted, and which occasioned that departure from the arrangement which my hon. friend would have made. But the Minister of Public Works did not upon Saturday say that it was agreed between him and my hon. friend from Bothwell that the discussion should close upon that clause. He made no statement then, nor has he said to-day that that was part of the arrangement. That is the charge which the First Minister made, I understand, during the absence of my hon. friend from Bothwell last night. My hon. friend had therefore nothing to answer upon that Saturday upon the subject. The First Minister moved the adjournment at six, because it was impossible to get through the discussion in time, and be in a position to move his Indian clause upon the resumption of the House. He did not then declare, nor has the Minister of Public Works declared, that there had been anything said as to the discussion being closed on that day. It was not until yesterday that statement was made. Then the First Minister closed the whole matter by saying, it is a misunderstanding, and I shall say no more about it. Then, upon the Tuesday, he resumed not merely the discussion of the original alleged misunderstanding as to the order of the motion, but he makes a fresh statement, and says upon further consideration it has been recollected there was another term in the agreement which was not merely what should be done, but also the course the discussion should take in the way of its being concluded. I do not know what the First Minister said, but he has repeated his statement just now, and the Minister of Public Works has said to-day, that was part of the arrangement as he understood it. If he did so understand it, of course I will accept his statement, but it was unfortunate it was not stated on the occasion when the nature of the understanding came under discussion, namely, on the Saturday itself; and it makes it plain that my hon. friend, from his point of view, is equally warranted in stating very positively that it was not his understanding. I have heard nothing but what was said in the committee on Saturday, and there was not the slightest pretence on Saturday, when the hon. gentleman was making his explanation, with his colleague beside him, that there was an arrangement that the discussion should be closed on Saturday. He said it was a misunderstanding, and that he would say no more about it. It is a pity he did not adhere to that statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The reason why I acceded to the hon. gentleman going on with his two motions on Friday was very obvious. It was in my mind that all the amendments were to be concluded on that day. It was a matter of little consequence in what manner these different amendments should be moved, but it was more proper that this amendment *quo ad* the revising barrister should be moved before the Indian new clause, because the clause read before it referred to the revising barristers and others who were to be disqualified. I saw, when the proposition was made, that it was a very reasonable one, and I acceded to it; it was in my mind that the whole thing would be closed on that day. True, as the hon. gentleman says, there was no express mention made of the understanding that we should go on to the next clause relating to the revising barristers the next day, and that was rather an omission. But having said it was a misunderstanding, there was no more to be said about it. I would certainly not have said more about it, if it had not been that yesterday the debate on the Indian clause was pressed, as I and every hon. gentleman felt, and argued for the purpose of throwing over the division yesterday; and I considered, when it was really understood by my hon. friend, and conveyed to me as the understanding, that the whole thing was to be closed on Saturday night, and when it was debated with the obvious object of preventing division being taken last night, that certainly the agreement was broken, both in spirit and in letter.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I had that understanding with the member for Bothwell, I stated to him exactly what I have stated here, and I will show why the inference I drew was the proper one. I stated that the First Minister would make his motion about Indians Saturday, as section C, and that the hon. gentleman would then make his motion about the Civil Service, and also about the other matter. I knew perfectly well, that of the three motions, the one about the Indians would be debated more than the other; and when I stated to the hon. gentleman, that on the following day, Saturday, the First Minister would make his motion as Section C, and then would take the other, the inference was, that the motion of the First Minister would go through that day. It is only a recollection that came to my mind whilst the discussion was going on, that when I had an understanding with the hon. member for Bothwell about the work to be completed on Friday, he suggested to take sections 7 and 8 only, and I said: That is not work enough, the First Minister has a motion to make that will come between 7 and 8, and then we shall take section 9 down to the revising barrister, so as to finish that work. Then he said: We cannot finish section 9, because I will have a motion or two to make in addition. I answered the First Minister has his motion about the Indians and will make that as clause C. He said, we had better take section 9, so that we can consider it, without finally passing it. I stated then, my hon. friend, the First Minister, would make his motion section C on Saturday. It stands to reason, coming after A and B, that it should be the first motion; and I am very sorry there should be any misunderstanding about it. Of course, the work being completed about section 9 on Saturday, the revising barrister clause was the next one to come up on Tuesday, and it was perfectly well understood it would be so. The discussion was quite different on Saturday. Instead of the First Minister moving his motion about the Indians, the hon. member for Bothwell made his motion, with the prefix that I read just now, about the revising barrister, and then the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) got up and began to make a speech on the Civil Service, immediately after which the hon. member for Bothwell made a second motion, so that my hon. friend on my right had no chance whatever to make his motion about the Indians with advantage, the discussion continuing until six o'clock.

Mr. BLAKE. I must differ once again from the Minister of Public Works. I heard my hon. friend make a suggestion to the First Minister, as to the comparative convenience of the order of motions, and the First Minister assented to his views. It was in that way alone they came to be taken in that way; but, with reference to the state-

ment of the First Minister as to the other part, I am very glad he made it, and it was worthy of himself to have made it. It appears to be perfectly plain, it was an inference the Minister of Public Works drew; and he drew the inference because the First Minister was going to move the other clause first, and the other amendments following, all would be completed Saturday. The Minister of Public Works has not stated it was argued between himself and the hon. member for Bothwell, these three amendments would be completed Saturday.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated to the hon. gentleman that the First Minister would make his motion about the Indians on Saturday, as section C, and that the hon. gentleman would then make his motions about the Civil Service and the other matter. That was Saturday. Of course we cannot tie hon. members on both sides and prevent them speaking; but, so far as we were concerned, I thought this motion would go through, and the three amendments with it.

Mr. BLAKE. We know all the views of the arrangement. What my hon. friend says is that his inference was the order would be, first the motion about the Indians, and then the two motions of my hon. friend from Bothwell. There was not a distinct statement that the two motions would be read that day, still less concluded. And so the whole tissue of statement upon which the First Minister declared that there had been a shameless disregard of an arrangement comes to this, that an inference was drawn by the Minister of Public Works, from his own statement as to the order in which the motions would be taken up, that the debate would then be concluded. I do not say he drew an unwarrantable inference, though I think he drew a strong one, but, if there was an arrangement that the debate should be closed that day, it would have been more convenient that it should have been stated here. It does not appear to have been so stated, and it is very easy to understand, from the very fair statement of the Minister of Public Works, that there was a misunderstanding, and that my hon. friend from Bothwell did not mean to agree to anything except as to the order in which the discussion should take place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The inference I drew, and the understanding I suggested in regard to the section was so clear to me that, when I related to my hon. friend on my right that the understanding was such, he stated that his motion would come first, and the hon. gentleman's two motions would come afterwards, and that therefore we should be free for the revising barristers on the Tuesday. That is what I thought was understood between the hon. gentleman and myself, and I can only repeat that it is a pity that there should be any misunderstanding.

Mr. MILLS. When the hon. gentleman came to section 9, when you, Mr. Chairman, were in the Chair, I got up and repeated what I understood to be the understanding, in order that the whole committee might be informed as to the terms upon which the adjournment was to take place. I have looked at *Hansard*, and I find there is no report of that, but I daresay it will be in the recollection of the committee that that took place. There were two matters about which we were anxious to come to an understanding. One was where we should stop, whether at section 8 or section 9; the second was in what state section 9 was to be left when we did stop. The reason for leaving it in that way was that the hon. gentleman said the First Minister wished to move an amendment. I said I wished to move certain amendments. I did not understand that there was any agreement as to the order in which those amendments were to be moved, and, when I asked the consent of the First Minister to move my amendments first, it was because, as the leader of the House, as the Minister in charge of the Bill, as the member who moved the adjournment of the House, I supposed it was his right to move his amendment first; not because I thought there was any arrangement on that subject between the Minister of Public Works and myself. Our discussion with regard to the motions that were to be made was merely for the purpose of giving him our reasons for keeping section 9 open, and he stated the First Minister's intention to make the amendment in order to assure me that there was no intention to prevent us from amending section 9. That is precisely how the matter stood

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose that is the end of it. As to the motion now before you there is a suggestion by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), that the amendment had better be divided into two. I have no objection to that, but, for Heaven's sake do not let us have a separate discussion on the two motions.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course not.

Mr. MILLS. Before I enter into the general discussion of this question, I would say with regard to the amendment that, whether the First Minister intends it or not, the result will be that, if an Indian, who is part holder or a holder along with his tribe of an Indian reservation, chooses to live off the reservation, even though he may have made no improvements, he will be still entitled to a vote under this amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, that is clear. The hon. gentleman disqualifies certain Indians from voting, he states what Indians are to be disqualified. An Indian who is a resident upon a reservation, if the reservation is sufficient, when divided amongst the band, apart from this amendment, would be entitled to his vote as a part holder in the reservation. If he does not reside on the reservation, he is not disqualified; this amendment does not reach him. If a whole band of Indians were to live off the reservation, although they had no improvements upon it, if the reservation was sufficient in value to give all the Indians over 21 years of age a vote, such Indians would be entitled to vote. They are not excluded by this amendment. I think this is a very important departure from anything that we have had in the electoral law of Canada before, and I think it is entitled to more careful consideration than it has hitherto received. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen from Ontario who know the character of the Indians residing within their electoral districts can have so long remained silent and allowed the Bill to reach this stage without making an earnest protest. It is necessary to look at the history of the Indian population and to see what the policy of the Imperial Government has been in regard to them. Hon. gentleman sometimes forget that some of these Indian bands have been under the influence and jurisdiction of the Crown for more than two centuries. We know, in looking at the history of the discovery of this continent, that the Indian population was held to be in such a condition that they had no rights of property in the soil. The Crown took possession of the country, and it was recognised as the property of the Crown, notwithstanding that the Indians occupied it for the purpose of hunting. As early as the time of James I, we find the law officers of the Crown declaring that the recognition of any right of the Indians in the soil was based on public policy and on a desire to secure peace in the settlement of the country. and not because the Indians had any property in the soil. In fact, you find grants made to the Hudson Bay Company, to Sir Fernando Gorges, to the Plymouth Company, to Attorney-General Heath, to Ogilvie and a number of others, to William Penn and the Duke of York, in fee simple, of large extents of territory, without any attempt being made to deal with the Indian population. In

fact, the Indians were held to be in so low a state of civilisation that they had no rights of property in the soil. This same rule we find recognised in nearly all the colonies, and the policy of the Crown was, when grants were made, not to deal with the Indians at all with reference to the possession of the country, but to leave those to whom a proprietary right had been conceded, to make such terms as they might think proper with the Indian population. This was the case in the State of New York when that colony was granted to the Duke of York, and when certain parties undertook to deal with the Indians, and to obtain from them a title to the soil and to hold lands in opposition to the grantees of the Duke of York. Chief Justices Holt and Polloxfen were consulted by the Lords of Trade and Plantation who were advised that the Indians had no property whatever in the soil, and that the Crown might deal with them as a matter of public policy or convenience for the purpose of protecting their interest and securing peace to the settlers; but that when the Crown made a grant of a large extent of territory to any of its subjects, it was the business of those subjects to deal with the Indian population. So you will find that in the early history of the English colonies of North America, the Government established no Indian Department and made no arrangement with the Indian population, but they left the lord proprietors, to whom this vast extent of territory had been granted by the Crown, to deal with the Indians in their own particular districts. Thus, on the grant made to the Duke of York, of the Province of New York, the Duke, or his governors, dealt with the Indians in this manner. They were his wards, they were under his control, they stood in the same relation to the lord proprietors of the country that the serfs in England, before the abolition of slavery, stood to the noblemen upon whose estates they resided. That was their position, and when William Penn came into the possession of the colony of Pennsylvania, and when he dealt with the Indian population, he professed to purchase the country from them, he made treaties with them in order to secure their good will, and to prevent any injury happening to his people whom he brought out for the purpose of colonising the large extent of country which the Crown had granted him. In dealing with the Indian population he dealt with them as his wards, and that policy was continued by the English Government, who completely ignored the Indian population in all their transactions. I say the policy of treating the Indians as wards or villeins of the proprietors of those extensive grants was continued down until the year 1755. At that time the French were making inroads upon the borders of the country claimed by Great Britain along the Ohio, and along the south shores of the lakes. They were making treaties and establishing friendly relations with the Indian population, seeking to secure their trade, seeking to secure their support as allies, against the various English colonists to the south. Well, there was a convention called in the colony of New York, in 1755, to consider the question of a federal union of all the British possessions in North America, and as a preliminary to carrying out that scheme, it was provided that the Indians should be taken from under the control of the different proprietary governments, and placed under the control of two superintendents. There was a Mr. Stone, who was made superintendent of what was called the Southern Department, and Sir William Johnson, the superintendent of what was called the Northern Department. Two superintendencies were established, and the Indians who, up to that time, had been treated as wards under the control of the proprietary governments on the continent, were afterwards treated as wards of the Crown. That, I say, was the beginning of the system of taking recognition of the Indian population on behalf of the Crown. Shortly after this, certain treaty arrangements were made between the English Government and the Six Nations through these two superintendents, and the policy of dealing with the Indians of securing to them certain reservations and protecting them in certain rights was adopted as a matter of public policy, in order to prevent a renewal of those conflicts which arose shortly after the conquest of Canada. It is true that some English moralists, men like Governor Endicott, Roger Williams and Wm. Penn, undertook to deal with the Indians as having certain proprietary rights. But this was not the general policy of the Imperial Government; on the contrary, they held that the Sovereign was lord of the fee, and that the Indian population were to be treated with by the different proprietors, and paid such sums as these might think necessary to secure peace and security to those who were engaged in colonising those parts of the proprietary governments as were set out for settlement.

Mr. DAWSON. I rise to a point of order. The discussion which the hon. gentleman is bringing up is a very good one, and might be necessary at a future period, but it is evidently intended to influence a case now before the courts as to the rights of the Indians in the soil. He has no right to do this on the question of enfranchising the Indians. There ought to be some notice given before a discussion of this kind is started, in order that others might be prepared to have something to say about it.

Mr. MILLS. I have no intention whatever to influence any pending case. I am only entering into this discussion to trace the policy of the English Government towards the Indians and to point out the present condition of the Indians. I want to show what the Government has undertaken to do for the Indians, and to show what progress they had made during the 200 years that they were wards of the lord proprietors who had obtained the lands under grant from the Crown itself. I wish to call the attention of the committee to this question, whether the condition of the Indians is such as to lead us to suppose that they are likely to make such progress at an early day as to fit them for the exercise of the franchise that is about to be conferred upon them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is a question of order; and I think the question is well taken.

Mr. MILLS. I deny there is any such proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A point of order has been taken, and must be decided. Let us argue upon that.

Mr. MILLS. I am speaking to the point of order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is going on with his speech.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. I was showing the pertinence of my remarks to this question. We are here proposing to confer the franchise upon a population that are in a semi-barbarous condition—upon people who are not allowed to hold their lands, and I wish to show that this population have been under the surveillance of the Government for two centuries, and it is my right to do so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now, about this point of order. The hon. gentleman commenced with an elaborate argument to show that the Indians never had any right in their own country, that the whole country belonged to the Crown. That has nothing to do with this question, which is, whether the Indian on reserves shall be qualified or disqualified. Now, the hon. gentleman will not argue that reserves, specially set aside by the Crown, do not belong to the tribe of which each individual Indian is a member, so that the general argument whether the whole country originally belonged to the Indians or not, or whether they had any title, has nothing to do with this motion. The hon. gentleman is clearly out of order. The committee has already decided that the tribal Indians may have a vote, and this is simply the disqualification of a portion of them.

The hon. gentleman is making a speech in order to prove that the decision could be overridden by saying that certain tribal Indians should not have votes. That is not the question; that has been decided by the committee. The question is what individuals shall be excepted from the general principle that tribal Indians might vote, if otherwise qualified.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman is right in his contention, if the committee has already decided that the tribal Indians shall vote, why does he now propose an amendment that tribal Indians in Manitoba and the North-West shall not vote. We can limit it still further. The whole question of the limitation and fitness of the Indians to vote is before the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. If the committee has decided that a particular class, the Indians of the North-West, shall vote, how is it in order for the hon. gentleman to propose an amendment to take away that right? That is what the hon. gentleman is doing. If the committee has so decided, the hon. gentleman is out of order. If the committee has not so decided, it is open to move that Indians in Ontario, New Brunswick, or any part of Canada should be excluded, and therefore the whole question is open.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. With respect to the point last raised, I think the question of the enfranchisement of the Indians was passed and confirmed by this committee on the amendment, and it was clearly understood that exceptions should be made, and that therefore reopens the question. So I do not think any reference to that point is out of order. A discussion as to the proprietary rights of the Indians as affecting anything outside of this House,—if the hon. gentleman pursues that course of reasoning I shall certainly consider his remarks out of order. I do not, however, know that he has done so thus far.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no objection to a discussion of the proprietary rights of the Indians, if it is understood that we all shall be allowed equal latitude.

Mr. MILLS. I am not proposing to discuss the proprietary rights of the Indians. No doubt we shall have an opportunity of doing so on another motion. Looking at the progress made with this Bill we shall have quite enough to attend to within the four corners of the Bill, and the public are specially interested in this Indian question at the present moment, not in the proprietary rights of the Indian population. It is the political right which the hon. gentleman proposes to confer upon Indians in which the public are particularly interested; and it is to that question I propose to invite the attention of the committee. In order that we may be better able to consider the political enfranchisement of the Indians, it is important to know what is the intellectual and industrial status of that population and what progress they have made—whether that special class to whom it is proposed to confer the franchise is likely to elevate them or to lower the political institutions of the country. The relations of the Indians to the Crown are to some extent involved in this question, for, as the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) has said, some of the Indian tribes residing within Canada have always denied that they were subjects of the Crown. They say they are allies of the Crown, that treaty relations recognises them as such, and this is specially applicable to the Six Nation Indians, who reside near Brantford, in the county of Hastings and in other portions of the Dominion. The 15th article of the Treaty of Utrecht recognizes them as allies of the Crown. There was an alliance made between them and the Imperial Government for the purpose of resisting French encroachments on the Ohio, and in other portions of the King's Dominion between what was the French country and the Thirteen Colonies. The hon. gentleman proposes to deal with the Indians contrary to the

terms of the treaty which exists between them and the Crown. I do not know how far, in a court of law, those Indians would be held to be regarded as British subjects.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. There are the Treaties of Lancaster, Logstown and Utrecht between England and France, which recognises them not as subjects, but as allies. They refused to be called subjects, and the hon. gentleman knows they have refused to accept enfranchisement in many cases because they thought they would be making concessions which would interfere with the ancient pretensions which they have on all fitting occasions invariably upheld. Those Indians were under the control of the British Government for more than two centuries. Before that time the Six Nation Indians were under the control of the Dutch. They were armed by the Dutch, and they were able to make conquests among the surrounding tribes, even exterminating many tribes in Ontario, and they settled down in the vicinity of Albany and had placed over them an English superintendent who gave them instruction and rendered them assistance. School teachers were appointed, clergymen were sent amongst them for the purpose of giving them religious instruction; and this was done for more than a century before the United States ceased to be British colonies. After the war of independence, they left their reservations in the State of New York and had reservations granted to them in Ontario. Since 1783, for more than a century, they have been under British influence, under the instruction of religious and secular teachers, and we see at this day that a large number of them adhere to their ancient habits, and that a considerable number of them living in Brantford still claim to be pagan Indians. If they have shown themselves so much opposed to assimilation, to the adoption of the habits of the white population, how does the hon. gentleman expect that by conferring upon them the electoral franchise it will better fit them for citizenship? Most people from other countries who come and settle here are soon absorbed in the surrounding population. They forget their ancient language and habits. They bring a certain amount of knowledge and industrial practices to the common stock, but these and they too are merged in the rest of the population. But the Indians are in a wholly different position. They do not readily adopt the habits of civilised life. They do not intermingle with the white population. They have no disposition to assimilate, no desire to imitate the white population, preferring to maintain their ancient habits and usages. And it does seem to me an extraordinary proposition, when these people have made scarcely any progress for two centuries, that the hon. gentleman should transfer them to the voters' lists. Now, Sir, we know that this provision of the hon. gentleman's Bill, although brought forward for the first time, has been under consideration for the last two or three years. It has not been announced to the public; the public have not been informed of his intentions; but I remember very well that the party who ran in opposition to me at the last election announced to his friends that the First Minister was to introduce a Bill enfranchising the Indians of Moraviantown on the Thames, the Indians of Walpole Island, and the Indians in the vicinity of Brantford, and that it was at that time seriously contemplated to enfranchise the Indian population. Well, Sir, I now wish to call the attention of the committee to the preparation the hon. gentleman has been making with a view to the enfranchisement of the Indians. The hon. gentleman felt it would not do to suddenly enfranchise the Indian population without some preparatory steps being taken to secure the good opinion, and to make a favorable impression on the minds of the Indian population. It would seem that there are certain Indian bands scat-

tered through Ontario, were a portion of the reserves they received from the Government have been sold by the Crown, and the moneys have not been accounted for. I believe it is stated that some of these sales took place as early as 1820, and from that day to this, the moneys derived from those sales have not been accounted for by the Superintendent General or the party administering Indian affairs. Let me call the attention of the committee to an Order in Council which the hon. gentleman adopted and which, although I do not know that he has laid it before Parliament, would be of very great importance in the discussion of this Bill. On the 30th of June last an Order in Council was carried, in which it is stated :

"On a report dated 7th June, 1884, from the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, stating with reference to a claim made by a band of Indians known as the Mississaguas, of the Credit, who at one time occupied a reserve in the township of Toronto, Ontario, but who subsequently removed to the Grand River, and are now settled upon lands in the township of Onandaga, which forms part of the Six Nations Indian reserve, that certain moneys which were received by the Crown Lands Department of the old Province of Canada, in payment for lands surrendered by these Indians in the year 1820, to be sold for their benefit, but which moneys were never placed to their credit, and that after careful enquiry has been made in this matter it has been ascertained that the claim of the Indians is a just one.

"The Minister reports on the subject under consideration as follows: That in the year 1858 the special commissioners who were appointed for the purpose of investigating Indian matters in the old Province of Canada reported, with reference to the Mississagua band in question, that in 1828 there was a balance then due these Indians amounting to $8,303.50, together with interest thereon, and on comparing the total quantity of land in the reserves which were surrendered, and which were situated at Port Credit, Oakville and Bronte, with the quantity ascertained to have been subsequently sold, the statement of the commissioners as to the amount due in 1828 appears to be correct; and subsequently to that year the sales recorded of the lands at Port Credit, described in the surrender as block F, would appear to have produced the sum of $6,316.37, and the interest on this amount, calculated from the dates of the different sales at six per cent., amounts to $18,362.61, making a total sum due these Indians for the sales at Port Credit of $24,678.98.

"That with regard to the sales of lots in what was formerly known as the Bronte Reserve, and which is described as Block G in the surrender, it would appear from a statement received from the Crown Lands Department, that the amount collected from the purchasers was $2,218.25, upon which sum the interest at six per cent. from the dates of sales amounts to $6,069.73, the total amount therefore due these Indians on account of the land last referred to, is $8,287.98.

"That with regard to the lands at Oakville, which are described as Block B in the surrender, it is concluded from the papers and statements of record in the Department, that the amount received therefor, viz: $4,080, is included in the amount stated by the special commissioners to have been due these Indians in 1828 as above described.

"It will thus be seen that the several amounts due these Indians are as follows:—

BLOCK B.

Amount due by the Commissioners' Report, in 1858, to be due in the year 1828—	
Principal	$ 8,303 50
Interest thereon at 6 per cent	27,401 55
	$35,705 05

BLOCK F.

Amount shown by the Statement from the Crown Lands Department, Toronto, to have been paid on account of Sales—	
Principal	$ 6,316 37
Interest thereon at 6 per cent. from dates of sales	18,362 61
	$24,678 98

BLOCK G.

Amount shown to have been paid as per Statement from Crown Lands Department—	
Principal	$ 2,218 25
Interest at 6 per cent	6,069 78
	$ 8,287 98
Total	$68,672 01

Let me say here that the hon. gentleman seems at once to have communicated to the Indians at Brantford, this report which he made to Council and the Order in Council itself. The hon. gentleman informed these Indians, without communicating with the Government of Ontario or the Government of Quebec, that this sum was due them. I understand that the invariable rule has been that no sum or charge was to be made to the debt of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, without the assent of the Governments of those Provinces, and without communication first having been made to them. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but that rule has been adhered to so far as I know in every instance except this, and the hon. gentleman himself has refused, since the adoption of this report, to entertain a similar proposition without first having communication with the Governments of those Provinces. In 1841, when the union took place between Upper and Lower Canada, the debt of the old Provinces was assumed jointly by the new Government. This debt was a debt existing before the union ; it is a debt chargeable to the Government of the two Provinces if it were a just debt. Yet the hon. gentleman has taken upon himself, without any legal authority whatever, to make a charge against the Government of Ontario and the Government of Quebec. How could he do that? This is a debt sixty years old and I say, Mr. Chairman,—and this is my point in this case—that the whole charge was made for the purpose of securing the political good will of those Indians before the franchise was conferred on them. I say it was a most improper proceeding. It was not only contrary to law, contrary to the practice prevailing, contrary to the conduct required by good faith towards the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, but it was a most improper action looking at what the hon. gentleman intended to do. For three years the hon. gentleman has been contemplating conferring the elective franchise upon the Indians, and before doing that he has raked up an old claim, which for aught I know may have already been properly met, and he has admitted it to the Indians as against the Local Government without any communication to the Government on the subject. Here is a communication, dated the 5th of September, addressed to the Superintendent-General by the local superintendent at Brantford :

"Sir, I have the honor to acquaint you that at a meeting of the Mississaguas of the Credit in council held yesterday, the following resolution was unanimously adopted :—Moved by John Cheechok, seconded by James A. Wood, Resolved: This council do heartily thank the right hon. the Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, for his kind attention and consideration, in having the claims of the band satisfied, in the manner set forth in the Order in Council of the 30th June last."

There is the expressed good will of the Indian, and for what? For this, that the hon. gentleman has made a charge against Ontario and Quebec of $70,000 without the knowledge or assent of either of those Provinces. Like Artemus Ward, who was ready to sacrifice his wife's relations for the purpose of upholding the union, the hon. gentleman is prepared to impose any amount of burdens upon the Governments of Ontario and Quebec for the purpose of securing the good will of the Indian population upon the eve of their political enfranchisement. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to whether this was a valid claim or not; in point of law it is not; but I do not pretend to say that it ought to be ruled out on that ground, if it could be shown that this money had never been accounted for, and that the Indians had not received the sum for which the reservations had been sold. But the hon. gentleman had not the facts to enable him to decide conclusively that that was the case. It was an obligation of sixty years old, which he had not considered before, although he had been in office nearly forty years; and it was his bounden duty to call the attention of the Governments of Ontario and Quebec to the matter, so as to give them the opportunity to say whether they were willing to assume this obligation or not. The hon. gentleman gave them no such opportunity, and he has exhibited this extraordinary haste to incur this liability on behalf of these two Governments on the eve of introducing the Bill to enfranchise

the Indians. First he employs agents to organise them into Orange societies, then he proposes to vote them this large sum of money, and then to confer upon them the elective franchise. This question was before the Legislature of Ontario last winter, and I wish to call the attention of the committee to the observations made upon it by the treasurer, and the committee will then be better able to judge of the propriety of the hon. gentleman's course. The treasurer says:

"We are confronted with a claim of $68,000——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It has been pointed out to me that this has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. MILLS. I think it has very much to do with the franchise. If the hon. gentleman undertakes to give the Indians a bribe, and then to confer the franchise upon them, it is something the House should take notice of; and I wish to state these facts to the committee so as to enable them to judge whether persons so treated can exercise the franchise independently. If the hon. gentleman proposes to recognise debts of 60 years' standing——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think we can go into the merits of that. It is not relevant.

Mr. MILLS. It is relevant as showing the nature of the transaction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What has that to do with the franchise?

Mr. MILLS. It has everything to do with it. The hon. gentleman proposes to confer the elective franchise upon men to whom he has given, without the sanction of Parliament, at the expense of the Local Governments and without their sanction, a large sum of money, and then to confer the elective franchise upon them. If that is not relevant, it is impossible for me to understand what is relevant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman is able to point out that the Government possesses certain influences that they can exercise over those who are being enfranchised by this Bill, and further proceeds to show that there is a danger that they might use those influences, it seems to me pertinent to the question. It would be one of the reasons that might be urged, and urged strongly against giving Indians in that position a vote. The hon. member for Bothwell claims that they are not only in that position, but that they have exercised that influence. As I understand, that is his line of argument.

Mr. MILLS. That is precisely my position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The charge is that some Indians have been bribed by the Government declaring that a certain sum of money was due them, that the Government acted improperly in bribing them, and that therefore the Indians must be disfranchised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, I think one main argument my hon. friend is bringing against giving the Indians votes is that the Indians are, from the nature of the case, to a great extent in the hands of the Government of the day, and in illustration of that he is pointing out that particular transaction. It seems to me that it is a very pertinent thing, and a very strong argument. If the relations which exist between the Government of the day and the Indians are such that the interests of a whole band may be largely affected by the Government of the day, there is no doubt that they are in a very special sense at the mercy of the Government, far more than ordinary white men would be. It seems to me that to establish that my hon. friend should be allowed to give illustrations showing what has actually occurred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government decides that certain contractors on the railway have a right to a certain sum of money; there is a report saying that a certain sum is due them—therefore we should pass a Bill that all contractors shall have no vote.

Mr. VAIL. You are now proposing to enfranchise a certain class which had not the franchise before, and it is perfectly right that any hon. member debating this question should state why he believes this class is not an independent class and should not have the franchise. My hon. friend from Bothwell is attempting to show why it should not enjoy the franchise, and he ought to be allowed to state the circumstances which warrant that assertion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is going much further. He is discussing whether, with reference to a certain debt, these people are entitled to it or not. Such a discussion is not relevant to the case. He can refer to certain facts that have transpired, but cannot enter into them as a discussion.

Mr. MILLS. I had no intention of going into the merits of the case. I was showing that no matter what the merits might be, this was not a thing that the First Minister ought to have done, and that if there was a debt at all it was a debt to the Provinces which it was for the Provinces to decide whether they would recognise or not. I was stating that the First Minister had departed from the recognised rule, and that he was doing so for some object or other, which object was being developed in the Bill now before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman brings a charge of that kind, I will be glad to meet him; but it has nothing to do with the subject under discussion. He is taking an unworthy advantage of his position to make statements which he has no right to make, and which are utterly false and untrue, like all the statements of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the statement made by the First Minister, that my hon. friend from Bothwell is in the habit of habitually making false statements, comes within the limits of the ordinary rules of debate. If you so rule, we will be happy to meet the hon. gentleman as to the value of his statements.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understood the hon. the First Minister to say that, like many of the statements or most of the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), this one was false. I do not think that was saying he always makes false statements.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I raise another point, that the First Minister, having charged my hon. friend from Bothwell with making a false statement, my hon. friend must be permitted to prove that the statement he is making is not false.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said that whenever the hon. gentleman brought up the charge, I would be ready to answer it; but he has no right, and it is an unworthy and unparliamentary course to try and raise it in this discussion.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman said a good deal more than that. He has said a good deal more than that many times this Session, in the House and out of the House. I have not thought it worth while to notice many of the hon. gentleman's statements, but I will tell him this, that he has made statements that are untrue, and I will at a fitting opportunity prove they are untrue.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All right.

Mr. MILLS. I will do more. I say the hon. gentleman is not believed on his own side any more than he is on this side. You have ruled, Sir, that I am not at liberty to read

the statement of the treasurer of the Province of Ontario for the purpose of showing the true inwardness of this transaction, as a part of this enfranchisement Bill. I submit to your ruling, and will not discuss that question further, but I will take another opportunity, if not in the House somewhere else, of bringing the whole of those facts before the public, in order that they may judge precisely the character of the hon. gentleman's transactions. I hold in my hand the report of the First Minister, and among the other things which the hon. gentleman has stated in this report is the following:

"The Oneida band erected a new building to serve as a council hall and as a lodge for the Good Templars and the Orange society."

Mr. WALLACE (West York). Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS. No doubt the hon. gentleman is pleased with that. I told the Minister of Public Works when this Bill was introduced, that the object was to get rid of hon. gentlemen on this side, and to transfer his followers from that side to this, after the hon. gentleman had been duly strengthened by the Indian vote and the lodges that are established amongst them. The hon. gentleman has, in this report, mentioned only one lodge, that on the Oneida reserve, but he knows that the Indians of Walpole have been so organised, that the Moravian Indians through the exertions of his agent, Mr. Beaty, of Highgate, have also been organised into Orange lodges, and we have no doubt that the same policy and practice has been generally pursued, and that in this Bill, as well as by these liberal donations, the Indian population is being fitted for the exercise of the franchise in the way best suited to the hon. gentleman's interests. I say that the Indian population are unfitted for the exercise of the franchise; I say that, as a race, they are not capable of any great improvement. There is, here and there, an Indian amongst them who is qualified for enfranchisement, and where he is, the elective franchise ought to be conferred upon him as an incident of those qualifications which he possesses, as any other citizen. But the hon. gentleman's Bill proposes to do more than that; it proposes to enfranchise the Indians of the various reserves where their improvements are worth the small sum he mentions, although their ability to hold those improvements is wholly due to the interference of the Government in protecting the property as an Indian possession. Let me call the attention of the House to this fact that the Indian fund, which raises some of those Indian bands above want, is not due to the industry and thrift of the bands themselves. What is their position? When many of those bands came across from the United States, after the American revolution, reserves of very considerable size were marked out for them. Those reserves were larger than were required for their own immediate interest, and they consented to the surrender and sale of a portion of the soil. This surrender and sale has created an Indian fund belonging to the band to whom the reservation belongs, and that fund has principally contributed to the support of the Indian population. It is impossible to show that there are any Indian bands in this country which have any money accumulated, except that which has been accumulated for them by the Government through the selling of a portion of the reserve so surrendered; yet the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise those Indians who have exhibited none of the elements of progress and thrift required on the part of any other population of Canada. The Chippawas, the Ottawas, the Delawares, the Oneidas, the Six Nations, are all the Indians who reside south of Lake Huron and north of Lake Erie and Ontario and who came across the border. They were Indians under the control of the Crown before Canada became a British possession, and, when the territories south of the lakes ceased to be British, these Indians came across into Canada, and had reserves granted to them, and the moneys which have been accumulated and constituted funds belonging to the different bands have been moneys derived from the sale of a portion of the reserves in the way I have indicated. The condition of the Indian population in the Maritime Provinces and in some parts of the Province of Quebec, where the reserves are of very limited extent, shows what the Indian will do when he has no special advantage conferred upon him by the special interference of the Government. It is well known that the maxims of the Indians are that it is better to lie than to sit, better to sit than to stand, better to stand than to walk, better to walk than to run. These are the maxims of a thriftless population, who do not desire improvement, who will not make those exertions that are necessary for improvement. Great sacrifices have been made on behalf of the Indian population. Missionaries and school teachers have gone among them, Government interference has been exercised over them, special officers are appointed for the purpose of protecting these wards of the Government who are incapable of protecting themselves. I should like to know of any Province in which there are not agents for the purpose of looking after the Indians. You know what would become of the Indian if the Government did not interfere in his behalf. You do not allow the natural law of the survival of the fittest to operate in regard to him. You prevent his extinction by want or disease by special interference in his behalf. Yet these are the men, these objects of charity, upon whom you propose to confer the electoral franchise. Let me call the attention of the committee to the relation which exists between the Government and the Indian population. There is not a rule that you apply under the Independence of Parliament Act for the purpose of disqualifying certain parties from sitting in this House that does not apply against giving the Indian the elective franchise. He is not in a position of independence. His relations to the Government are of such a character that it is against his interest, as it is against the interest of the State, that the elective franchise should be conferred upon him. Before Confederation we had an Act providing for the enfranchisement of the Indian population, and the only band of Indians enfranchised under that Act were the Wyandottes, a band of so-called Indians that had almost ceased to be Indians, and in whom you could hardly trace any Indian blood. The Indian Act places the control of the Indians entirely in the hands of the Superintendent-General. The hon. gentleman proposes to give to Indians having a separate holding the vote, but whether they have a separate holding or not depends upon his will. The law says that he, in the exercise of his own discretion as Superintendent-General, shall decide whether the Indian reservation shall remain a unit or shall be sub-divided and allotted to different individuals. That is not an exercise of the judicial power. It is purely a matter of discretion and it is an arbitrary discretion, bound by no rule, and it is in the power of the Superintendent-General to refuse a division of the property when he thinks the Indians in any band are politically hostile to him. If his improvements are taken from an Indian, the Superintendent-General can say whether the sum to be paid for them shall be taken out of the funds of the Indians or shall be obtained from other sources, so that it is in his power to impose charges upon the band and to withhold compensation from particular Indians. The fact is that the power over the Indian is absolute, and it is a population of that character on whom the hon. gentleman proposes to confer the elective franchise. No people could be more helpless. When the first English settlements were taking place on this continent, when the Crown sold its property to an individual, the Indians became the wards of the purchaser from the Crown. They stood in the same relation to him that the serfs did to the

lord of the manor in England before serfdom was abolished. That state of things lasted until 1755, and from that time downward, the Government have assumed the wardship of the Indian population. They took it out of the hands of the lords proprietors, who had purchased from the Crown large estates on this continent, and the Government still retain that hold over the Indians. In reading the sections of this Bill, you recognise the relation between the villein and the lord of the manor, and there would have been as much propriety in conferring the franchise upon the villeins on an estate in former times as upon the Indians while they stand in this relation to the Crown. By this Indian Act it is provided that the Superintendent-General may issue a location ticket when he approves of it and not before. He is the sole judge. He is not obliged to assign any reason to anybody—to his colleague or to the Indian who may make the application. When the Indian gets a location ticket, he cannot transfer to anyone out of the band his interest in the land and cannot transfer to another Indian without having the consent of the Superintendent-General. Why, Sir, is such a man a free man? Can he exercise the elective franchise freely? Can he vote against a Minister of the Crown, or against a candidate who supports the Minister of the Crown, while such power rests in the hands of the Minister? Then we find with regard to leaseholds, that if an Indian who has a location ticket, chooses to lease part of his lands to another party with the consent of the superintendent, unless he cultivates it in a way to suit the superintendent, then this officer may refuse to allow him to receive the rents and profits of his own land. Is that man free to vote as he thinks proper? I do not care how intelligent he is; apart altogether from the question of the general intelligence of the Indians, you place him in such a position that if he had the intelligence of an ordinary white man, he could not exercise his freedom in voting while his relation to the Crown is such as it is at present. Now, Sir, this Indian discussion has presented many phases since this Bill was first introduced. When it was introduced I asked the First Minister whether his intention was to enfranchise the Indians of British Columbia and Manitoba, and he replied, "Yes." I asked him whether it was his intention to enfranchise the Indians of the North-West Territories as soon as they were represented in this House, and he said it was. In fact he made a broad declaration as to these Indians with regard to the electoral franchise. After some discussion had taken place it was discovered that this might not, after all, be a very popular proposition, especially as the Indians of the North-West were engaged in committing depredations, and the hon. gentleman wished to resile from that position. He endeavored to explain that he only had the Indians of the older Provinces in his mind. It is true, his attention was specially called to the Indians of British Columbia and Manitoba; it is true that the consequences of the adoption of this Bill with regard to the North-West Territory, as soon as they would be represented, were also called to his attention, and he gave, with regard to all these, an affirmative answer as to what Indians were to vote. At a later period he resiled somewhat from that position, and he said that only the Indians of the older Provinces were to vote. Now we have this amendment before us. We find he has gone back from the position he took with regard to the Indians of British Columbia, and he now intends that they shall exercise the electoral franchise. Well, Sir, I have no doubt that there has been a change in that particular again, because one hon. member on that side declared he was most anxious that the Indians of British Columbia should have the elective franchise. The Indians in that country are numerous and formidable, they have overawed the white population, have created not a little anxiety, and are still subject to their ancient habits, as was shown by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson). I say we are very sure that when the hon. member spoke, the First Minister had again made up his mind not to leave British Columbia out, but to include the Indians of that Province in the class who were to be enfranchised. But, Sir, we find that the organs of the hon. gentleman everywhere represent that he only proposed to put the Indians upon the same footing as white men and to give them the same opportunities; and yet to-day, when the hon. gentleman put that amendment in your hands, he assured the House he was doing the Indian an injustice, that he was requiring of him a larger qualification than he was requiring of other citizens.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. MILLS. I so understood the hon. gentleman. We find, Sir, under the provision of this Bill, that these Indians scattered throughout Ontario, who have homes upon reservations, if they withdraw from reservations, would be entitled to vote. Sir, if you look at the reservations in that Province, you will find that there are twelve constituencies, at least, that may have their political complexion changed by the Indian vote. In fact, whether there are twenty-four Reformers or twenty-four Tories sitting in this House as representatives of those particular constituencies, may depend upon the direction in which this Indian vote shall be cast. Now, the hon. gentleman may think that a matter of small consequence, but I have known Governments in the United Kingdom to last for a considerable period of time with a smaller majority than twenty-four. I call the attention of the members of this House to this point, whether they are from Ontario or other Provinces, that the question as to which party shall control the Government of this country at the next election may depend solely upon the votes of the Indians in the Province of Ontario alone. Sir, I regard this as a matter of no little importance, whatever hon. gentlemen may think. But let me tell this House that the vote of this country will not be the vote of the white population as it is, with the Indian population added to one side. The petitions which have been received from nearly every constituency, and especially from those constituencies in which Indians reside, show that there has been no question before this country since 1837 that has so deeply moved the population of the Province of Ontario as this Franchise Bill, and no portion of that Bill has created so profound an impression upon the people as that section which we are at this moment considering. Whatever the hon. gentleman may think, I am satisfied of this, that in the county I represent if the hon. gentleman adds two hundred Indian votes to his own side, there will be more than 200 Conservative votes, which were on his side, that will be found on the other side at the next election. There can be no doubt that will be the result.

Mr. HESSON. Then what are you complaining about?

Mr. MILLS. I am complaining about the infamy of the proposition.

Mr. HESSON. If the proposition gives you a majority, that is all you desire.

Mr. MILLS. I have stated, and I repeat it, that I do not propose to admit as a principle that we are bound to do evil that good may come; to accept a measure wrong in itself, because I believe it will not work to the injury of myself and my friends, which was the object the hon. gentleman had in view when he proposed it. We know the malevolent motive from which the proposition has emanated. It has been declared again and again. The hon. gentleman's supporters—I will not use a stronger expression—in the country have admitted that the measure was for the purpose of strangling certain representatives on this side that the Gerrymander Bill failed to defeat. But I tell the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for North Perth

that it is not every scheme of political janissarianism that succeeds. Men are not so easily strangled except by public opinion, and there is too much sense of fairness among the people to allow them to be led to adopt a course so discreditable to themselves and so disastrous to the well being of the country. Whenever our condition is such that members on either side of the House are disposed to support that which they believe to be wrong in itself because it is proposed by their leaders, we have reached a condition very closely bordering on revolution. We know how the civil war in the neighboring republic grew up, and how nearly the hon. gentleman is standing on the brink of a precipice which may lead to serious disaster to the country. But we trust there is sufficient moral strength in the country, sufficient sense of fairness in the Conservative party, not to follow the hon. gentleman in the atrocious course in which he is now leading his followers.

Mr. DAWSON. I have only a word to say, and it is with respect to the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) opened his speech with the question of the Indian territorial rights, but as he has not persisted in discussing that matter it is quite unnecessary for me to enter into it now, further than in reply to the few words he uttered, to say that when that question comes up I shall be prepared to show that the right to the soil was originally in the Indians, that it was acknowledged to be so by the Imperial Government of Great Britain, that it has been acknowledged to be so by the Federal Government of the United States, and that both the Imperial Government of Great Britain and the Federal Government of the United States simply exercised a preemptive right to purchase from the Indians. In the United States the separate States were prevented from purchasing from the Indians. By the rule of Great Britain, whatever may have occurred in the early settlement of the country, latterly when the country became organised, and even before the cession of this country by France, there was a well considered system by which the rights of the Indians were acknowledged That being the case, I shall be prepared to show that it was the policy of the Crown to acknowledge the Indians' territorial rights. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) yesterday read extracts from the report of the Indian Department, showing how far advanced some of the Indians were in the Province of Manitoba, and how unjust it was to deprive them of the franchise and give it to other Indians. I will read a short extract relating to the band to which the discussion which has just taken place has particular reference. It is as follows :—

"The Six Nation Indians, whose reserve is situated on the Grand River, in the Counties of Brant and Haldimand, are increasing in numbers and in prosperity. Many of their farms are well cultivated, and the products of the soil and of the dairy exhibited at their annual agricultural exhibitions command the admiration of all persons who attend them. Their exhibition of this year was remarkably successful; and the Six Nations combined with it the centennial celebration of the grant made to them by the Crown of the tract of land of which their reserve forms a part, in recognition of their loyalty and valor, as practically proved on numerous occasions on the field of battle, in defence of the British flag. The exhibition was well attended, and addresses commendatory of the fealty and prowess of their ancestors, and of the progress made by the present generation in civilisation were delivered by members of the Senate and of the House of Commons, and by other distinguished persons. The quantity of new land broken by these Indians during the year amounted to nearly six hundred acres. They have an excellent school system on the reserve; and the institutions are efficiently conducted."

Surely there is not great risk in giving the franchise to such people ?

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have no desire to enter into the larger question which has been suggested by the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, but it is evident that we have a considerable amount of Indian discussion yet before us. I intend, however, to confine myself to the question of the propriety of conferring the right to vote on unenfranchised Indians. That proposal has still the same characteristics that marked it when the Bill was originally introduced. In the first discussion of the clause there was a general concensus of opinion that it was not the intention of the Government to confer the franchise on Indians in the Territories and Dominion generally; that it was to be conferred upon a particular class of Indians, the Indian who had practically assumed all the responsibilities of a civilised state, the Indian who held a holding in his own right. Eventually, that construction of the Bill was abandoned. The First Minister explained in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that the intention was to give votes to the Indians of the eastern Provinces, and the Indians in Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia. Subsequently, the First Minister said it was his intention to confine this provision to the Indians in the eastern Provinces, and we had a proposition submitted as an amendment to the clause by that hon. gentleman, apparently giving a still different phase to the case, and to-day we have still another phase given to it. These changes have each, apparently, been made to meet objections made on this side of the House, as well as the representations made by supporters of the Government to members of the Government. But, notwithstanding these objections and representations, notwithstanding the feelings expressed in the country with reference to this provision of the Bill, practically we have come back to where we started and to the original intention of the Bill. There is the same intention and determination of the First Minister in these amendments to give a vote to all the tribal Indians, as was originally intended by him. It has been contended that the Indian has arrived at such a stage of mental, moral and material development as to entitle him to the franchise equally with the white citizen. I should have been glad if that were the case, but the reports on Indian affairs do not convey that assurance with any strength or definiteness. The First Minister in speaking on this question on the 4th of May, said he took it that the Indians of the Province of Ontario, could, as a rule, read as well as the white men. Now, if that were the case it would not only be contrary to the well known desire of the Reform party throughout the Dominion to refuse them the franchise, but it would be contrary to right and justice in every respect. I think that phase of the question has been amply and satisfactorily settled by the views already expressed on this side of the House. Hon. gentlemen have been told over and over again that the tribal Indian is still a minor, that the state administers all his material affairs, and yet it is proposed by the present amendment, that the Indian, no matter what his relationship to the state or to the remainder of the community, should have the right to a vote. I wish to refer for a moment to the position which the Indian in the neighboring country occupies toward the state, because it is stated in an organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and one which must more than usually be held to express their opinions, that the Indian in the United States has the same privileges as the white men. Now, I have looked over the State constitutions and I find only in the State of Minnesota, is the Indian dealt with in any way whatever. The constitution of that State provides that every male of 21 years, of the following classes shall have votes: First, white citizens of the United States; secondly, white foreigners who have declared their intention to become citizens; third, persons of mixed white and Indian blood, who have adopted the customs and habits of civilisation; fourthly, persons of Indian blood residing in the State, who have adopted the language, customs, and habits of civilisation, after an examination before any district court of the State, in such manner as may be provided by law, and shall have been proved by such court, capable of enjoying the rights of citizenship

within the State. Now, that is the most liberal provision which exists in any State in the Union, and it may commend itself to hon. gentlemen opposite who, though they show a disposition to follow the instincts of British institutions, are disposed, in many cases, to follow the procedure that has been adopted in the country to the south of us. I should be glad if they adopted in this instance the very wise limitation that has been made in the constitution of the State to which I have referred, that limitation being the most liberal in any state of the Union. Moreover, the language of the Act of Congress, of 1866, which dealt with the question of citizenship, and involved the then recent enfranchisement of the negro, provided:

"All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding the Indian, if not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States."

Morse on "Citizenship," defining this clause, says:

"This does not include Indians born in and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; but an Indian, if taxed, and if his tribal relations have been abandoned, is a citizen."

Similar to this is the position which has been taken on this side of the House with reference to conferring the right to vote on the Indian, and we have invariably shown the distinction which has arisen for the first time upon the introduction of this Bill, regarding the status of the Indian; that he is to be enfranchised for the purpose of voting, but is not to be enfranchised in any other respect; he still remains a minor, with respect to the disposition of anything he acquires, and with respect to the management of his private affairs. While he still remains under the control of the Superintendent-General he is to receive the most sacred rights of citizenship, the right to say who shall govern him, and in what way he shall be governed; and it is proposed to do that while white people who do not possess property of the value of $300, who do not earn $300 a year, and who do not pay a rental of $20 a year, are not entitled to vote. If we have thought it well to restrict the qualifications in these respects, is it sufficient to say that the Indian who shall have made improvements on his private reservation to the value of $150 shall be capable of voting? How are these improvements made? It does not require a very careful examination of the report of the Indian Department to see that in many instances not only are the Indians aided in their means of subsistence, but in building houses and in furnishing them with appliances for tilling their land. Are these the means by which the white citizen secures the right to vote? Is it by virtue of a grant from the Department of Indian Affairs that he has the right to say who shall represent him in this House? Not by any means; he has to secure the necessary qualifications by his own labor. Under these circumstances is the Indian going to be a free citizen in the exercise of the franchise? It is fatal to free institutions and unbecoming of hon. gentlemen opposite to submit a proposition of that kind to any representative body which has a proper respect for British institutions. It is fatal to the principles on which our constitution is founded; and the undermining of our constitution is begun when such a proposition as this is seriously contemplated. It has been held by the First Minister that the Indians in the Province of Ontario are in a fit condition, in the way of education and intelligence, to exercise the franchise. I will refer to the report of the Superintendent General for the year 1884 to see whether that is the case or not. (The hon. gentleman read from the report referred to.) Any Indian who is disposed to accept the full privileges of enfranchisement can become enfranchised under the Indian Act. Wherever the pernicious influences of the liquor traffic have been brought to bear on the Indian, he has retrograded perceptibly, and it is to people susceptible to such influences that it is proposed to give the franchise. Stringent provisions have been made against the exercise

of undue influence over the electorate, and yet this provision gives the right to vote to an Indian, while the Indian Department has the power to give him or to withhold from him, that sustenance which may be necessary to him in consequence of his own improvidence and lack of thrift. The reports of the Superintendent General show that but little educational progress has been made amongst the Indians, even of the most advanced bands, and by these it appears that everywhere the Indian is still under the direct supervision of the Government. He may be refused a concession, or given a concession, but in every instance he can be made to understand that the concession is dependent on the course he will pursue towards the Government candidate. Now, Sir, I will quote one or two more cases from the report as it regards the Province of Quebec, to show that both in regard to the intellectual development of the Indians, and in regard to their industrial progress, they are still far behind the white settlers. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read from the report concerning the Indians of Cornwall Island, St. Louis, County of Laprairie, and Caughnawaga.) In Caughnawaga, I understand the Indians are supposed to be the most intelligent and progressive of any, and still it is stated here that there are only a few successful farmers among them. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read from the report concerning the Micmac Indians of New Brunswick, in the County of Richmond, and the Indians in the Counties of Pictou and Colchester, Nova Scotia, showing the condition of agriculture among them, and their low intellectual development) In Prince Edward Island also the condition of affairs is reported to be unsatisfactory. I have endeavored to show, from the Superintendent General's own report, the condition of the Indians at the present time as regards their qualification to exercise the franchise. The report incontestably proves that the qualifications deemed necessary for freemen to exercise the franchise are not possessed by the Indians. It would be very interesting, if I were not precluded from doing so, to glance at the returns indicating the condition of the bands under Chief Beardy, under the Chief occupying the Duck Lake reserve, Big Bear, Poundmaker and others in the North-West Territories, who have recently occupied a hostile attitude towards this country. They are spoken of as being industrious and frugal, but this statement must be a comparative one, because these bands who are spoken of as industrious are really dissatisfied with their surroundings and are in revolt. It is important that this committee should anticipate the ultimate consequences of enfranchising the Indians. With respect to the Indians of British Columbia, it was at first understood that the First Minister did not propose to give them the right to vote, and an hon. member was even ruled out of order on the ground that the Act did not apply to them. We are, however, informed by the most recent amendment of the First Minister, that the Indians of British Columbia are to be enfranchised. In the report for 1884, the hope was expressed that some of the more civilised bands in these Provinces, will avail themselves of the provisions of the Indian Advancement Act. It was only a hope that was indulged in, that they would take advantage of these small municipal privileges and facilities, and yet it is seriously proposed that we shall now give to these Indians the power of determining who shall or who shall not be members of this House, notwithstanding that they are still participants in the advantages conferred by the Crown. (The hon. gentleman here quoted a number of other extracts from the report of the Superintendent General as to the Indians of British Columbia.) We are not to assume by any means that they are to have these separate holdings in fee; they are merely to acquire the right of occupancy in each of those holdings, they are still wards and minors, and yet they are to exercise the right of voting. Then as to the schools, in those particular localities in British Columbia, I find the following. (The

hon. gentleman here quoted further from the report.) Such is the idea held by these Indians whom it is now proposed to give the right of franchise as to the advantages of education, and such are their actions when facilities are afforded them to obtain that education. Within the last 21 years the white people of this country have absolutely expended a sum approaching $200,000,000 in order to perfect the education of their children, and yet, while they have voluntarily submitted to this taxation, the House solemnly refused the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland in favor of manhood suffrage, and it is proposed to give the franchise to these Indians, who are not only not educated, but who are indisposed to take advantage of the offers which missionaries and others present, in order that they might acquire an education. Such men, I say, have not the first qualification which is expected in citizens who exercise the franchise, and it is false to one of our most sacred political bulwarks that such men should be empowered to say who shall or shall not be legislators, occupying seats in this House. (The hon. gentleman quoted further from the report, with reference to the Indians of British Columbia.) The Tyendenaga reserve, in the County of Hastings, which has been referred to more than once, I am prepared to admit, is one of the best reserves in the Province of Ontario, so far as material improvement is concerned, but let us see what the relation of that band is to the Government and to the Superintendent General.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They are independent of both the Government and the Superintendent General. The money that is given to them is their own money; they do not thank the Government for it. The land was sold, and they invested their money with the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). According to the report, the money was not distributed alone as annuities, and consequently they are to some extent under the control of the Government. If it were an annuity such as I would be glad to know the hon. gentleman possessed, an annuity he had purchased from the Government, under any provision the Government would make, and that would leave him entirely independent of the Government of the day, or, for that matter, the Opposition, I would say there was no point in the objection I am making; but I contend that, excluding the annuity, there are objections sufficient in the other items that are distributed by the Government to make good my contention that these men cannot enjoy the freedom which it is absolutely necessary they should enjoy in order that we may have from them an expression of opinion at the polls as free as that from others.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I say they are as free as you are.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think it would be better if the hon. gentleman would get up and give his view of the case fairly at length.

Mr. WHITE. I have done so.

Mr. CAMERON. Since this amendment has been submitted, the hon. gentleman has made no remark except in an interjectory manner, in answer to the observations I have made. I do not know whether the First Minister has given him particular instructions to remain silent, but I say if these amendments are not open to the objections we make, hon. gentlemen opposite should endeavor to give some proof that they are not. Since this question has been under discussion, we have had any number of different constructions placed on the clause before us. It is contended that it applies to no Indians who have not separate reserves, that, in fact, it means practically what is defined in the Ontario Act. That however has been contradicted more than once by the First Minister himself. Then we have had the amendment submitted yesterday, and which has been changed again to-day. We have had all these amendments made with the one purpose, to give a vote to Indians, no matter whether they have severed themselves from the tribal relations or not, no matter whether they have acquired any property in the reserve that would be of the flimsiest character or not, and no matter whether they practically work the reserves upon which they are or not. The evident purpose and intention of the Bill, as amended, is to admit to the franchise all the Indians that a partisan revising officer will consider himself justified in admitting. Its intention is to enfranchise as many of the Indians as it is possible to find of mature age on a reserve. The hon. member for Algoma has more than once stated, and stated explicitly, that he would not support any such proposition, and he endeavors to shelter himself now behind the contention that this would not be effected by the amendment before us. But I hold it will, and it is for hon. gentlemen opposite, who are not desirous that the clause should have that wide latitude, to suggest some other wording which will confine it within the limits they desire to give it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have demured to our contention that the provision has the width we allege. Well, if it is not their intention that it should have that width, why should they be adverse to such a change being made in the construction of the clause as will more definitely determine its intention. We are not opposed to the vote being given to the enfranchised Indian. He can secure that right under the law as it now stands; under the Act of 1880, he has all the same facilities to acquire the right to vote as any citizen has. Consequently there would be no reason or purpose whatever in this clause we are discussing, if it was not intended the unenfranchised Indian should secure the right of which the enactments now on the Statute Book deprived him. I hope that the provisions of this clause will yet be limited to those Indians who would be enfranchised under the Indian Act. The First Minister has expressed his opinion that it is unfortunate that the Indians have not been relieved from their tribal relations long before this. It is in his power to make such a proposition to this House as will facilitate the emancipation of those Indians, and nothing would be more popular in the localities lying contiguous to the Indian reservations. I do not attempt to show that that course would be a judicious one. I do not propose it. I leave it for hon. gentlemen opposite to judge, but, if they maintain that the Indian has reached that stage of intellectual development that makes him a capable citizen, we have no right to retain him in the position of minority which he now occupies, and we have no right to hamper the development of the locality in which he lives by retaining him in the tribal relationship while we give him the right to vote. In regard to other classes of the community, provisions are made that they must live in houses of a certain value, or pay a certain amount of rent, or derive a certain amount of income or wages, but we are abandoning those provisions in reference to the least educated class of the community, and are making qualifications apply to the Indians which we ourselves furnish them. The Department has the liberty to give the Indian the aid from the Indian funds that his necessities may require, and on that expenditure by the Department he may acquire the right to the franchise. That is not what the country understands by this Bill, and it would be becoming on the part of the Government to await the verdict of the country in relation to this measure. If hon. gentlemen opposite are as confident of the popular approval of this measure as they pretend to be, why do they not appeal to the people of the country in defence of it? But it is because they dare not do so, it is because they desire to appeal at the next election to another electorate than the one to which they appealed in 1882. We have heard no defence of this measure from hon. gentlemen

opposite—if I except the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) who, I really believe, wishes to deal honestly and fairly about this matter. We have had no defence of this proposition in its altered form. The alteration, Sir, has not removed our objections to the Bill. We find that the same principle underlies it still, namely, the principle of giving a vote to the enfranchised Indian instead of giving it to the Indian on the interest that he holds in the tribal reservation. Sir, I would be glad to see this provision of the Bill eliminated; I would be glad if hon. gentlemen opposite would have the courage of their convictions and vote it down before it is too late. If they expect to derive any personal advantage from it, I think they will be mistaken. I believe that the people, independently of their political predilections, will condemn this measure when they have an opportunity. We have already seen many of them change their political allegiance when the question of the National Policy was submitted to them in 1878, and in 1882. I am prepared to admit the fact, while I question the reasons that induced them to change their allegiance. But I say that fact proves conclusively that the people of Canada are not so bigoted in their adherence to party, that they will not follow their own convictions of what is to their interest and best in the interest of the country. And I do not believe that the people are so bound down by party thraldom that they will follow hon. gentlemen opposite to the length of submitting to the degradation involved by the passage of this Bill; and from an intimate acquaintance with a few constituencies, at least, I am satisfied that when the time comes they will mark their disapproval of this iniquitous measure.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am glad that there are a few minutes left for me to express my opinion on this clause. It is true that I said a few words upon it on a former occasion, but it was under most unfavorable circumstances, at the beginning of the last day of that now well-known Session of fifty-seven hours, while the sunlight was breaking through those windows.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Give us something fresh.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The first question claiming our attention is, what was the the state of the Indians under the Bill as introduced? As I understood it, it clearly defined how it was that Indians, who jointly or separately had property qualification, whether in a band or out of a band, on a reserve or off a reserve in any Province, having representation here, and in any Territory as soon as it had representation here, should have the franchise. The remarks made by the First Minister in answer to the pertinent questions propounded by the hon. member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills), have been referred to sufficiently often that I need not repeat them. However, they are questions and answers which hon. gentlemen opposite have not heard the last of. On a subsequent day the member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) put the same questions to the First Minister. His answer was: I have already answered that question. That answer had been treated by the Ministerial press as a joke. It was no joking matter. To use the First Minister's phrase, that allegation is too thin. In the present amendment that question is fully stated and finally settled. It defines by excluding from the Bill some provisions that were in it before. If they were not in, there was no necessity for putting them out.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the few moments allotted to me before the committee rose, I endeavored to point out the scope of the Bill as it passed the second reading and went to the committee. I pointed out that it embraced the entire Dominion. There have been contrary contentions maintained by hon. gentlemen opposite and by their press. The amendments introduced by the First Minister will for ever settle this question. It has been claimed that the Bill only applied to the older Provinces. To-day, under the amendment submitted, British Columbia is included and made subject to the provisions of the Bill. I am chiefly interested at this time in enquiring its effect within the older Provinces. The amendment provides, what the Bill did not provide for, that the Indians to whom is to be given the vote should have a separate holding; that is to say, that they, with the consent of the band and what is more important with the consent of the Superintendent General, Indians should have allotted to them respectively a portion of land. It provides that there shall be improvements upon this land. This point of improvement is intended to convey the idea that it is evidence of the Indian's industry, intelligence and fitness to vote. When hon. gentlemen opposite at some further stage of the discussion are uncorked, and we hear from them, we shall hear them dwell upon this point to a certain extent. They will say that those Indians have a property qualification, and why should they not vote as other men? Throughout the discussion in the Ministerial press the point has been kept out of view that giving the vote was not enfranchising. The enfranchisement of the Indians is provided for by law. It is a certain process by which he is made free from the disabilities under which he labored, and he is released from his tribal condition. I wish to examine for a moment into this question of improvements. I am well aware that much consolation is expected to be drawn from it; that it is to let hon. gentlemen opposite down more easily. I have said that the allotment was made by the consent of the band and Superintendent General; indeed, without the consent of the latter the Indians could do very little indeed. The improvements must amount to the value of $150. Let us for a moment consider them. They will consist in part of the dwelling. It is not very extravagant that we should estimate the value at $70, even as an Indian's dwelling, then it remains to provide for $80 more of improvements. In Ontario the lands occupied by Indians were at one period heavily timbered. The average value of clearing land there may be said to be $20 per acre. Lands slashed would be classed as partially improved—say $10 per acre, therefore, if an Indian has a log cabin or a house worth $70 and has slashed eight acres of timber for the purpose of selling the timber to somebody else, he will have made the necessary improvements under this Bill. He will have given evidence of the industry and the intelligence which hon. gentlemen ask for. It will not matter though the Government has made this clearing, as they have made it in many instances, or erected the building, still the man is qualified to vote. It would be far better if a very small piece of land is tilled, if there is a small corn patch cultivated entirely by the squaw, that will all be evidence of his fitness to vote. Who is to make this valuation? The Ministerial press, to some extent at all events, have stated that the list which goes before the revising barrister will be the list prepared by the municipal officers. But how is it to reach the reserve? Is there not a high wall around the reserve which will prevent the municipal list from entering it? This will be worked by the revising barrister, or by the judge who, the member for West Toronto said, would do the work so quickly that it would not occupy more than ten days in any constituency. But if the value of improvements were much greater, it does not touch the point. The point is giving a vote to a man who does not possess the liberty to exercise the right as we possess it.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They have as much liberty as you have.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Unfortunately, I cannot hear the gentleman. I say the point of the question was the giving of votes to men who are not citizens in the same sense in which we are citizens, and who are not amenable to all the laws, as we are. The question has been asked from the Ministerial side of the House, how many Indians this Bill would enfranchise, and though it has not been answered, I think we can approximate the number which it is intended to enfranchise or to give the vote to. In Bothwell, I believe, it is expected to give a sufficient number of votes to finish the work which the gerrymander and the returning officer could not do. In South Brant it is hoped to furnish a sufficient number to serve the hon. gentleman who now represents the constituency in the same manner. In East Hastings it is hoped that there will be a sufficient number of Indian votes to make what was a doubtful constituency, secure for the hon. gentleman who represents it now.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). That has been said for 16 years.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In other constituencies it is expected to do the same kind of work. The First Minister, yesterday, in answer to an observation of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), told us what was expected from this measure. He said of the Indian votes, that these votes will make you sick. It is expected that the Indian votes, of which one end is held by the Superintendent General, will make the Grits sick. Sir, it seems to me in the nature of an Indian alliance. We had one in the North-West lately—an attempt at an alliance between Louis Riel and the Indians of that section. It did not succeed, and this attempted alliance may succeed no better. After the explanation we have had, it is hardly necessary to enquire how the Indians came into the Bill. Who put them there, and when? Who asked for it? Was it himself? Was it his neighbors? The petitions which have been presented to the House show whether it was his neighbors who have asked him to be put there or not. The Indian was not there a short time ago. Who put him there? The First Minister has answered that question—to make the Grits sick. We were not in much doubt about it. The expressions of joy from some members on the Ministerial side indicated quite clearly who it was asked to have them put there. Sir, a short time ago woman was in the Bill before us. The Indian was not in it. Woman is now out and the Indian is in. He was quietly led in, bare-footed or in moccasins so as not to make any noise. Woman was publicly kicked out, and I think she will remember the manner of her exit. Mr. Disraeli said that Lord Palmerston had caught the Reform party in bathing, and had stolen their clothes. I think the First Minister has been bathing in the stream of promises, of which he is fond. The women of Canada chanced to go by there and they seated themselves upon his clothes; he cannot get ashore, and now he seems to be paddling to the other shore to a wigwam standing there, where he hopes to borrow a blanket to keep him warm in the winter of his discontent. Sir, when the Indian assumes the responsibilities, the liabilities, and duties of white men, I would be the last man in Canada to stand up and oppose his enfranchisement. I give place to no man in my friendly feelings towards the Indian, but until he assumes those duties and responsibilities, I believe the vote will be anything but beneficial to him, if it is given to the banded Indian, and he accepts it, because there are serious doubts in my mind whether his own discretion and judgment will not lead him to decline it, but if it is given and accepted it will not be beneficial to the Indian. Will he vote as an individual? No, Sir; he will vote as a band; the council fires will be lighted when he goes to the polls. If it is accepted and has the effects in certain districts which it is expected to have, if it overcomes the white majority, ill-feeling between the white man and the Indian will be inevitable. That is not in the Indian's interest. The citizens of a constituency who are in the majority, the full citizens, liable to all the provisions of the law, on finding their will thwarted by an unemancipated Indian vote, will not be satisfied, and the impressions formed by them will not be beneficial to the Indians. We shall hear the plea: Why should the Indian not have a vote if he has the property qualifications of a white man? Sir, does the tax collector enter the Indian reservation? Does the collector of debt enter the Indian reservation? Has the militia bugle any note that calls the Indian to military duty? When a public highway strikes an Indian reserve it has to go around it or bridge it. Has the head of the Indian Department any papers in his pigeon-holes to-day asking for contributions to those so situated? Sir, did the picture ever present itself to you of a Minister canvassing an Indian reserve for votes? Fancy the Minister of Customs visiting an Indian reserve for votes, making his approaches gradually. He commences with the young, disposed to teach the young idea how to shoot, by putting coppers on a stick; he makes a further advance, not with the three R's, but with the three B's—brooms, baskets and beads; still further, he carries on a fur trade, buys muskrat skins, and pays with bits of mink. The thought occurs to my mind, how are the mighty fallen! A right hon. gentleman whom we have recently heard much of as having been forty years in public life, who has for a quarter of a century directed the destinies of Canada, who has heretofore been accustomed annually to hunt for political elephants, coming down to set traps for rats and mice on an Indian reserve! Sir, has he so little confidence in the white man that he has to fall back on the Indian? Is the white man to have no rights that the Indian need regard? The proposition to place the ballot box on the Indian reserve meets with approval nowhere. It suits the purpose of gentlemen opposite to ridicule the petitions that have been presented to this House. They may see the day when they will regret that. I have not referred to the petitions which have been presented by myself; but those petitions contain the names of as intelligent and prominent Conservatives as there are in the district I represent. For the Indian I would ask that he be allowed to enjoy his council, his bands and his traditions, that he be treated with kindness, with liberality, with honesty and with truth, and that the best men be brought in contact with him. The Indian of North America has suffered enough; add no new sufferings to him. Do not introduce him into political warfare; do not force him to come to Parliament and sit up until two o'clock in the morning; do not lay upon him the charge of obstructing business because the Government will not bring business down; do not force him into a position to be found fault with because he will not support a measure designed and intended to perpetuate a party in power, and having no other design.

Mr. LISTER. I feel that I need offer no apology to this House for asking their attention for a few moments while I discuss the measure now under consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The eighth time.

Mr. LISTER. Sir, the hon. member for East Hastings is becoming a nuisance in this House.

Mr. WHITE. You apologise to the House for the eighth time.

Mr. LISTER. This Bill has been for the last four or five weeks debated by this House, but the section now under discussion has only been incidentally referred to. The question of giving the Indian a vote is one of momentous importance; it is a question which should receive the serious consideration of all the members of this House, whether they be supporters or opponents of the Government. It is proposed by this Bill to confer upon a class of the community rights they have never had before; it is proposed to throw into the electorate of this country a class of

people totally unacquainted with the affairs of the country, with the political issues which come before this Parliament, and with everything that should fit a man to fulfil the duties of a citizen of the country. In discussing this question there are several things to be considered. In the first place, it is the duty of Parliament, before they confer upon the Indian that great privilege, to be satisfied beyond all peradventure that the person to whom they are giving this right is sufficiently intelligent and sufficiently advanced in civilisation to appreciate that right and to exercise it intelligently. If the person who is to be enfranchised does not possess these qualifications it is a dangerous thing for the Government to add to the electorate of the country that class of people. I need only refer to the reports of the hon. gentleman who leads this Government, to show that the Indian is not fitted to exercise the franchise. I will confine myself, however, to that portion of the report which deals with the Walpole Indians, and the band of Chippewas residing near the town of Sarnia. I find that, so far as the Chippewa band is concerned, living near the town of Sarnia, the hon. gentleman reports that, with the exception of two or three of them, they have made no advancement during a number of years; that much of the land which was originally cleared by the Government for the Indians has been neglected, and is covered with brush wood. Speaking of the Chippewas, the hon. gentleman gives a similar account; their cleared land is less in extent than it was ten or twelve years ago. I have referred to those two instances simply to show that, so far as those Indians are concerned, for the last twenty or thirty years no advancement has been made by them, according to the report of the Superintendent General; and they are a very favorable portion, compared with the other Indians the hon. gentleman also proposes to enfranchise. To a very small extent do they associate with the whites; they are totally unacquainted with the ways and manners of the whites, and I believe only within the last year have they attempted to elect their own chiefs. Their reserves are a source of injury instead of benefit to the country. One of the most important roads in the county of Lambton runs along the reserve, and there is no worse road in the country; repeated applications have been made to the Indian office to obtain assistance for the purpose of putting that road in condition, but so far these efforts have been fruitless. The applicants have been told that they must go to the Indians on the reserves to get their permission to have the funds in the hands of the Indian Department expended on the road; but it is well known the Indians will not, under any consideration, give their consent to a proposal of that kind. The consequence is, that one of the best situated roads in the county of Lambton is left in a state dangerous to public travel.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You say the Government control the Indians, and you now say the Indians control their own funds.

Mr. LISTER. They do not. The Indian superintendent says to the people who ask for the assistance to build the roads that they must go to the Indians and get their sanction before the Government will be willing to pay the money; but it does not follow that the Indian superintendent has not the right, if he thinks proper, to take the money for the purpose of building the road. I only mention the fact to show the difficulty people living near the reserves have to encounter in dealing with the reserves. In the county of Lambton there are 6,000 acres of land on the reserves, 5,600 of which have never had a plough put through it. No effort is made to cultivate the land, and instead of that large block being fertile, and an advantage to the country at large, it lies there useless. Another objection which has been urged over and over again is, that so long as the Indians labor under disabilities they should not have the right conferred upon them to vote. Before giving the Indian the franchise you should remove from him the disabilities which now exist, and by law declare him a free man, and relieve him from the control of the Superintendent General and his minions. This is the most preposterous proposition ever submitted to Parliament, that a man who controls 16,000 or 18,000 Indians in the Province of Ontaro, as absolutely as the Southerner did his slaves, should ask this free Parliament to give these people the right to vote and to allow their votes to weigh against those of the white men who assume all the responsibilities of citizenship and render service to the country in various ways. It has been stated that we took days in discussing whether an Indian was a person, but the Superintendent General, in his interpretation clause, declares that the expression "person" means any individual other than an Indian, so that, according to him, an Indian is not a person. The clauses of the Indian Act provide a very simple means by which those Indians who desire it can obtain enfranchisement, but this Bill proposes to give the vote to those who have no responsibility, who pay no taxes, and whom the First Minister has declared unfit for the simplest form of municipal government. If Indians do not take advantage of the enfranchising clauses of the existing law, simple as they are, that is a most convincing proof that they do not wish to obtain the privileges of citizenship. It is pretended that an Indian has a right to acquire property, and it is said that that property belongs to the Indian. But if that property belongs to the Indian, accumulated by his thrift and industry, the Government step in and say that he shall have no right to dispose of it as he pleases, that the will of the deceased Indian shall be frustrated if the First Minister thinks proper to disallow it. That is the man who the First Minister says is intelligent enough to have the right to vote. Then the Indian cannot dispose of or sell his timber; he cannot lease his land.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, he can. I say that the Indians do lease their land.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman says he can sell it.

Mr. WHITE. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. LISTER. That shows the utter ignorance of the hon. gentleman who undertook to correct me, as he will see by reading section 21 of the Indian Act. (The hon. gentleman read section 21). Does the hon. gentleman still say that the Indians have a right to lease their land?

Mr. WHITE. I do. I say they do it, too.

Mr. LISTER. There is one ground upon which the hon. gentleman has been basing the giving of the franchise to the Indian, namely, because he has a right to lease his land. But the statute law of this country says distinctly that he shall not sell, nor shall he lease, the land upon which he resides. Then, Sir, it is proposed that the man who has no proprietary interest in the land, who cannot sell it, who cannot mortgage it, who cannot lease it—it is proposed by the infamous measure now under consideration to give that man the right to cast his ballot for members of this House. More than that: if the hon. gentleman will look at section 26 of the same Act he will find that the Indian cannot even sell the timber which is growing upon his land. (The hon. gentleman read section 26). So he will see that the Indian cannot even sell the timber, or the minerals, or the stone upon the land he is entitled to occupy upon the reserve without the written consent of the Superintendent General. Yet the hon. gentleman will get up in this House and say that that man shall exercise his right as a citizen of this country, the highest

right of a citizen, that of casting a ballot for a member of Parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The farmers' sons and the mechanics' sons who are enfranchised here, have they a right to sell land? Have they a right to mortgage land?

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman compares the farmers' sons of the country with the Indians.

Mr. WHITE. No, I do not.

Mr. LISTER. I want the House to take notice of that.

Mr. WHITE. I consider the Indians as good as you or I, or any other man in this country.

Mr. LISTER. All right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member for Hastings is out of order. He has no right to interrupt an hon. gentleman when he is speaking, and I hope he will not do it again.

Mr. LISTER. Then, Sir, let us go a step further. It is proposed to give the vote to the unenfranchised Indian. What are his legal rights? I again refer the hon. gentleman to the Indian Act, section 78. (The hon. gentleman reads the section in question). So that an Indian may have $10,000 worth upon his holding on the reserve; he may contract debts to any amount, yet no judgment can have any force or effect against his property upon that reserve. No property can be seized under execution against that Indian except it is property on the reserve that is liable to taxation. Even the poorest man in this country, if he contracts a debt, has to pay it. He is brought up before a judge, on a judgment summons, and if he does not pay the debt the chances are that he is incarcerated in gaol. But the privileged Indian of this country, the particular ward of the Government, the individual over whom the Government takes such a lively interest, and protects his land and timber for him, he may contract a debt to any amount, from one end of the country to the other, and yet no one has any redress against him, by execution or otherwise, as long as that Indian holds his property upon the reserve. What is proposed to be done is dangerous to the Indians themselves, and it is an injustice to them. The Indians have not asked for representation in this House, and that they shall have the right to vote conferred on them. There has been no petition, no evidence whatever, that the Indians want to exercise the franchise. I believe they do not want this right conferred on them, because the moment it is conferred the thin end of the wedge enters into the Indian system under which they have lived. Hon. gentlemen opposite may talk, but when an election comes round no doubt we shall find the hon. member for East Hastings canvassing the Indians in his county, going through the reserve with a horde of camp followers, using every possible argument to persuade the Indians to vote for him. To place the Indians who have not had the simplest form of municipal government, who know nothing of the institutions under which they live, at the mercy of a horde of politicians looking for votes, unscrupulous as to the means to be used to obtain votes, is to place the Indians in an unenviable position. The effect will surely be to destroy the Indian system which has existed here for 50 or 60 years. The moment they begin to appreciate their strength and to find they are able to control the election in a county—because in some counties they will be able to thwart the will of the white men—at that moment the danger arises. Portions of the Indians will be found to be anxious to have lands granted them, and they will bring such strong pressure to bear upon the representatives that they will be compelled to yield to their wishes. If hon. gentlemen think that such is in the interest of the Indians they will support the Bill. But if the effect of giving the franchise to Indians, when they have not asked for it and do not want it, is as I have stated, then a man is no friend to the Indians who will urge that they be given the vote. The First Minister has this matter under consideration no doubt some little time. Within the last year he has dismissed the Liberal agents throughout Ontario and substituted Conservatives, whom I will not call tools of his own. He had a motive in doing that, and it was that when he gave the Indians the vote he would have them under his control. The position of the agents themselves, for in the event of a change of Government they must understand they cannot retain their position, is also imperilled. It has been said that Mr. Mowat has given the right to vote to the Indians. I admit that is the case, to a certain extent. There are two classes which are given the right to vote under the Ontario Act. First, those who have been enfranchised; second, those not enfranchised, but who do not live with the tribes, and who do not receive any annuity or interest money, and who do not reside among Indians. If Indians occupy such a position as that of the latter class they are not under the influence of the Dominion Government, and so far as outside influence goes, they are the same as any other members of the community; and if those men have, by thrift, acquired property, there is no reason why they should not be allowed to vote. They pay taxes, do not reside upon reserves and have severed their tribal relations, and there is no reason why those men should not be entitled to vote. It is impossible, under the hon. gentleman's Act, that these men can exercise the franchise freely, because anybody who reads the Indian Act must satisfy himself that the influence of the Government is all-powerful with the Indian, and that if the Indian does not yield to the will of the Government it may thwart him in every possible way. In fact, it is almost impossible for the Indian to get along unless he yields to the wishes of the powers that be. Under these circumstances, I say that there never was so monstrous and scandalous a proposition made to any Parliament in the wide world as to enfranchise these men, who are dependent on the will of the Government, who have no rights whatever, so far as the law is concerned, and who have no control over their own property. I mistake the feelings of the people of this country if they are prepared to accept and consent to so monstrous a proposition. I believe it will never be sanctioned by the people of the country. I believe it is an innovation upon our parliamentary system; that it is a revolutionary measure. If hon. gentlemen had submitted such a Bill as this before the elections of 1882 I believe they would have been defeated, and that when they go to the country again the people will show their utter condemnation of the measure by defeating the men who have so misused the confidence which the people put in their hands. There never was, in the whole history of this country such a measure proposed, and I believe it is impossible for men ever again to introduce to this or any other Parliament so iniquitous a measure.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I notice that there are a number of young members in this House, and I am glad to see young men in the House, because they are generally kind, energetic and intelligent. The younger members of this House, in addressing the committee, have frequently referred to the east riding of Hastings. I have said before, and I now repeat, though I do not like to repeat what I formerly said—I do not like to listen to speeches prepared and written on paper. I do not like to see men rising to address the House, and having to read a lot of books in order to make a few remarks. I have no notes of what I am going to say, and no blue book, and I have not written down the remarks I intend to make. I have had the honor of being sixteen years a member of this House, and surely it does not stand well for young members to say that I fear re-election. Like every other member of the House,

I am in the hands of my friends. They may not select me, but if they do, I will guarantee, with or without the Indian vote, that I will carry the east riding of Hastings by the parties I have worked for at $4 or $5 a month thirty-three or thirty-four years ago—those who know who I am, what I am, where I came from, and how I live. The statement has been made by three of the gentlemen who have addressed the House that among the Indians in their section of the country there is not a man entitled to the franchise. In addressing you the other evening I said I would not refer to other Indian reserves, but I think I have a right to refer to the reserve in East Hastings. The statement was made last night that there are a number of Orange lodges in that reserve. It is not true; there is one. There are some of the Indians on that reserve who belong to Orange lodges, some to temperance lodges, some to Masonic lodges, and some to Oddfellows. I think they generally belong to the Church of England, and on the reserve they have two churches. They pay a minister, but if the bishop sends a clergyman to them of whom they do not approve, they make the bishop remove him. Some members of the band insisted that they should employ Church of England school teachers, but let me say to their credit that they employ teachers, no matter whether they are Catholics or Protestants, no matter what Protestant church they belong to. To say they are not independent of the Government is to say what is not correct. They got from the Crown of Great Britain a whole township; they surrendered three-fourths of that territory, and the money which is invested out of the sale of these lands is theirs. It belongs to no one but the Indian band. I ask, in the name of common sense, if it is not right, when the land is sold, and the money is collected and invested, that they should be entitled to the interest of it? Is it not as much theirs as any money that is invested in Government funds?

Mr. LISTER. Give them the deed of their lands.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I was speaking of the land which was sold and the money invested. I say they are just as well entitled to the interest of that money as any party in this House or in this country who invests money in the Post Office Department or in Government bonds. Who will deny it? No man can. They are asked by Mr. Mowat's Bill to resign the interest of this money in order to be enfranchised, but I say that it would not be fair, right or just. Then we are told that they do not rent their lands. The Indians in our township make their own arrangements; they go to the Indian council and make the arrangements with the white men to rent their land. They go to the council and lease their lands, the lease is signed, and the rents are collected. The rents are claimed in advance. They are sent to Ottawa, and the check is sent back on the Bank of Montreal to the Indians.

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the law permits them to do that?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I think if the law did not permit them they would not do it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why does the check come to Ottawa, if they do their own work?

Mr. WHITE. I will tell the hon. gentleman. A few years ago, since I became a member of this House, a number of people bought the rents in advance; they got the orders from the Indians, and sent the orders to Ottawa, and the Government allowed them to collect the rents through the orders; but I insisted that the money should be paid at Ottawa, and that the checks should go back to the Indians, who could do as they liked with them. In my township, the rents are collected six months in advance; they are sent to Ottawa, and in less than one week the checks on the Bank of Montreal are returned to the Indians. The Indians are treated in the same way as the hon. gentleman himself or any other man who has business with the Government. Is there anything wrong in that, and have the Government any control over men in that position? They have not. It is said that the Indians have no roads. The Indian band, last year or the year before, purchased from an Indian woman of that tribe, a lot of land at Deseronto for $8,000; they cut it into lots and sold half of it for $35,000; they paid the owner the $8,000 and invested $27,000 with the Government; and they are going to draw $20,000 to put up wire, board, and cedar fences on their lands; and I have no hesitation in saying that two years from to-day there will not be any land better fenced than the Indian reserve in the county of Hastings. Why do you not go and teach your Indians to do likewise? Go and do your duty by the Indians and you will find them worthy of every position. In our township some of their lands are rented to white men and we collect from the white men on the Indian reserve $700, which goes into the municipal treasury. When a road is to be built the Indian council pays part, and the township council the other part, but in fact the Indians pay the whole, because $700 are collected on the reserve. Now, are they not just as much enfranchised as any man in this House? Do they not pay taxes? Do they not build roads? I say they do. We have no trouble in building roads in that township. We have seven miles of gravel road running from Richmond to the village of Deseronto; it is a free gravel road, passing through the reserve; it has to be kept up by the municipal council; but all other roads are built partly by the council and partly by the Indians. They support their churches and schools; they employ common school teachers, without regard to the church they belong to, which shows them to be as independent and free as other citizens in the community. They belong to what organisation they please, they are as well entitled to vote as the white man. Then, we are told that they have not a right to make a bargain, or to buy or sell. They sell their barley; they send their milk to the cheese factories; they buy and sell their horses, their buggies, their reaping and mowing machines, the same as white citizens. I could name a gentleman employed by this House who lends money to the Indians on the reserves, and who gets his interest as regularly as from white men, and perhaps more so. Under these circumstances, why should they not vote? But hon. gentlemen opposite say we compare the farmers' sons with the Indians. I contend in many cases that the Indian is as good as a white man, I care not whether he is English, Irish, Scotch, German or Canadian. Why is he not? Is he not a responsible being? He is just as loyal and good as the Grits who sneer at him. I ask if the farmer's son has a right to sell or lease his father's farm. Has the mechanic's son the right to sell or lease his father's property? Not at all; yet he has the right to vote. Then, the Indian who has his land allotted to him, and has $150 worth of improvements made upon it, will, under this Bill, have a vote. I ask, does the Indian not pay cash for the lumber, nails, glass and putty he uses in his buildings, as well as the white man? If he puts barns and other buildings on his land why, in the name of common sense, should he not have the right to vote, if he has $150 worth of property? Is he not responsible to the laws of the country? Does he not wear clothes, and smoke tobacco, and pay duty, as well as anybody else? And does he not pay taxes upon these articles? Yet it is said we are not a friend of the Indian in allowing him to be enfranchised. I contend that we are. If hon. gentlemen opposite discharge their duty on the different reserves, as I have tried, in my

humble way, to discharge mine to the Indians of the east riding of Hastings, they would find the Indians qualified to vote as intelligent men. The hon. member for Middlesex said, and I was proud to hear him say so, that he was quite willing to admit the Indians of the east riding of Hastings were further advanced in civilisation than any other Indians in the country. Why do not hon. gentlemen opposite discharge their duty to the Indians? Why do they not advise them? Tell them what is in their own interest and benefit; insist upon the Government doing their duty to them; and then you will have as good and intelligent Indians as there are in the east riding of Hastings. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we are going to have 100,000 votes less under this Bill than under the Mowat Act. I say it is not true; I say it will increase the vote; because property will be represented, no matter where situated, and a man will have the right to vote where he has taxable property, anywhere in the country. Take the Bill, as it is now proposed to be passed, and it will be seen that the difference of income between $250 and $300 is very slight. There is no industrious mechanic or laborer who will not earn $300, and when you take a $100 assessed value, you will find it will give $150 real value, and thus give the vote to men who are on the assessment roll for $100. I am satisfied, as soon as this Bill passes, there will be no trouble over it in any part of the country. I have had the pleasure of meeting my constituents two or three times since the Bill has been introduced, and did not hear a person say a word about the franchise; their only cry was: Why is the House remaining so long in Session, for we see nothing wrong or injurious in the Bill, and when we get Mr. Mowat's Bill, and put the two side by side, we are satisfied the difference will be so slight that there is nothing to find fault with? Hon. gentlemen opposite are keeping this House in session a great deal longer than they should; they know that very few hon. gentlemen can afford to remain here from their business and their homes, and it becomes exceedingly monotonous to have to listen from day day to the same speeches. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, made a few remarks on this question. But how many times had he addressed the House already? Some eight or nine times. Has he not read the same clause eight or nine times over? I believe this Bill should pass. Do we not give votes to Africans and all other people, and if the African, coming from the South perhaps, a slave, has the right to vote, why should not the Indian have that right? The Indians on the Mohawk reserve celebrated their centennial in September; they left their homes in order to live under the British flag; they have, for a hundred years, owned property and managed it and paid their debts, and why should they not be given the vote, as other men? How is it that the Province of Quebec is not finding fault with this Bill, or Nova Scotia, or New Brunswick, or Manitoba? The whole objection comes from the Province of Ontario. I contend that the changes made in this Bill are not as great as those made by Mr. Mowat in his Bill of last spring, yet where did the Conservative party hold meetings, get up petitions, and keep the House in session, as hon. gentlemen are doing? Hon. gentlemen opposite criticised the Bill unfairly and not impartially. The best evidence that the right hon. the leader of the Government is acting in the best interests of the country is that scarcely one of the leaders of the Opposition remains in the House, with the exception of the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and he is not satisfied with the tactics pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite. They can sit there till September so can we, and until October, November and December. We have just as much interest in the progress of this country as hon. gentlemen opposite, and are as anxious as they to have good laws, and we discharge our duties as citizens just as well. They can keep the House in session as long as they please; the Government supporters will do their duty and stand true to the Government, even should this Session run into the next. We, on this side, when in Opposition, did not pursue this course. We had a policy; we educated the country up to it, and appealed to the country successfully on it at two elections.

Mr. MILLS. Did not the hon. gentleman's leader say that if the gerrymandering Bill had been proposed by us on that side, and he had been with the Opposition, he would have taken care that the House would have been in session until August before he would allow it to pass.

Mr. WHITE. Did you hear him say so? I think you must have dreamed it; no person in this House heard him say so. The hon. gentleman would not make such rash statements. The Opposition said, withdraw your Franchise Bill; but it will not be withdrawn. It will become law, and hon. gentlemen opposite may as well know it first as last.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister ought to be able to speak for himself.

Mr. WHITE. I am proud of the Indians in the east riding of Hastings. I am happy to say they will intelligently and impartially exercise the franchise, without being compelled to vote. They do not allow the Government to control them; they control their own business, and I hope the Indian will live to see the day when he will have a seat in this House. He will not then be criticised, and misrepresented, and slandered, as he is now. I say the criticism of the Indians by hon. gentlemen opposite is unfair and untruthful.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not intend to take up the time of the committee with a speech to-night. I had intended to speak on the Indian question, but the debate has been so prolonged that I will content myself with moving an amendment to the amendment which the hon. the First Minister has submitted to the House, and I will do it almost in silence. I have a few words, however, to say, in order to make my amendment intelligible With reference to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, which I suppose were intended not for the House but for the country, I think his charge against hon. gentlemen on this side is most unfair and unjust. The remark made by his own leader, who has had more experience in Parliament than even he, with his boasted sixteen years' sittings here, should suffice to convince him that a Bill of such a radical nature as this cannot be disposed of in the summary way in which ordinary legislation is disposed of. The First Minister is on record as saying in his place, as leader of the House, that a Bill of this kind, to be properly considered, should occupy the attention of Parliament for a whole Session, and the hon. gentleman knows—or if not, he has learned by this time, and those associated with him have learned also—that, if important Bills of this character are brought down in the expiring days of a Session, in the hope that they will be forced through without criticism or debate, those hon. gentlemen have counted without their host, so far as the Opposition in this House are concerned. If the hon. gentleman intended that this Bill should receive that consideration which its importance deserves, it might have been brought down, and should have been brought down, within a fortnight or three weeks of the opening of the House; and the six or eight weeks we spent here, doing little or nothing, meeting and adjourning, after conversation on some trivial subjects, might very well have been devoted to the consideration of this Bill, and the cost——

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Are you aware that we have been forty-two days on this Bill now?

Mr. DAVIES—and the expense which he intimates the country will suffer from the prolongation of this debate

would have been entirely saved, had the First Minister brought down the Bill at the time he ought, when it could have been considered and discussed, and passed through without any undue prolongation of the Session. The hon. gentleman devoted himself to proving that the Indians on the reserve in his district are worthy of the franchise; and, to hear him argue, one would suppose that they did not come within the provisions of the Indian Act at all. They are free men, he tells us; they own their land; they lease their land; they buy, they sell, they make contracts, they incur liabilities and discharge them. The hon. gentleman must either be very ignorant or, if the facts exist as he says they do, matters are carried on there in direct violation of the law of the land, and he should at once take steps to withdraw the Indians on his reserve from the operation of the Indian Act. The hon. gentleman ought to know, and if he will take the trouble to read the Act before him, he will see at once, that his statement that they have the power to lease any lands on their reserve is not correct. No matter how educated they may be, no matter how civilised they may be, the law has declared that every one of them, until he is enfranchised, is a minor, a child, a ward of the Superintendent General. The 38th section expressly enacts that:

"No reserve or portion of a reserve shall be sold, alienated or leased, until it has been released or surrendered to the Crown for the purposes of this Act."

And then follow the exceptions:

"Excepting that in cases of aged, sick and infirm Indians, and widows or children left without a guardian, or in the cases of Indians engaged in the practice of any one of the learned professions, or in teaching schools, or in pursuing a trade which interferes with their cultivating land on the reserve, the Superintendent General shall have the power to lease, for their support or benefit, the lands to which they are entitled."

So that, even if an Indian on his reserve has become an educated man, has joined one of the learned professions, standing on a par with one of the most educated men in the first city of Dominion, the law tells him he is a minor in its eyes, and he cannot sell or lease or dispose of one acre of that land. When the hon. gentlemen removes these disqualifications from the Indians on his reserve, when he places them on the footing he says they stand upon, the footing of free men, who are able to contract, and have incurred the liabilities and have the privileges, and possess the qualifications and the disqualifications of citizens, the conclusion of his argument would be a sound one—they should have the right to vote. But, until he establishes these facts, and until he exempts them from the operation of the Indian Act, or until they themselves take advantage of the provisions of the Indian Act and become enfranchised, and own the location on which they live, and in accordance with the 88th section of the Act:

"From the date of such letters patent all distinction between the legal rights, privileges, disabilities and liabilities of Indians, and those of Her Majesty's other subjects, shall cease to apply to such Indian, or to the wife or minor unmarried children of such Indian."

Until that time he must not talk about their standing in the same position or upon the same footing as farmers' sons or mechanics' sons, or any other free men. The hon. gentleman, although I have no doubt, in my own mind, that it was farthest from his thoughts, deliberately insulted every farmer's son in this Dominion, I do not think he intended to do it, but when he told the farmers' sons and the mechanics' sons that they were no better and no freer, and occupied no better position, and were no more independent, *quoad* their vote, than the Indian on the reserve, who cannot buy or sell, who is not independent in any respect, who is the ward of the Superintendent General, and cannot do anything without his consent, he insulted the free and independent sons of the farmers and mechanics of this country. In looking at the amendment proposed by the First Minister, I notice that, although Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories are mentioned, British Columbia is not mentioned at all. I think I may fairly say that the House has not been treated fairly with respect to that amendment. Although my own parliamentary experience has been very short, I have read a good deal of parliamentary history, and I think I might fairly challenge, in Britain itself, or in any one of its dependencies, the production of a Bill of one-half the radical importance of this Bill, affecting so deeply, as this does, the very constitution of the country, by which so many thousands of the hitherto free citizens of this Dominion are disqualified, and so many more thousands are enfranchised, who have never been thought of or recognised as free citizens, who have never been dreamt of as exercising the crowning privilege of a free citizen, namely, a vote, which has been thrust upon the Table without any explanation whatever. I want to know if there is a gentleman sitting on this committee who understands why British Columbia has been excluded from this amendment.

Mr. WHITE. They are good Indians.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not ask the hon. member for East Hastings. He makes such ridiculous and childish remarks that I do not think they are worth noticing. I ask any hon. gentleman in this committee, why have the Indians of British Columbia been placed upon a different footing from the Indians of Manitoba? Is it because they are better educated? Is it because they are better qualified? I am not going to weary the committee by reading extracts from the Indian report of the First Minister, with respect to the Indians of British Columbia, but I am going to call attention to the silence, to the ominous silence of hon. gentlemen who represent British Columbia in this House. There has not been a statement made by any responsible gentleman in this committee to justify the giving the franchise to the British Columbia Indian while witholding it from the Manitoba Indian. We are voting in the dark; we are voting without explanation. The First Minister evidently does not consider it necessary to give any explanation whatever. There is one curious fact in connection with the Indians of British Columbia, to which I wish to call attention. Since this debate began I may say that I have read more Indian literature than I ever did before, and I find that while, according to the Indian Act, the Indians of many of the Provinces are entitled, after undergoing a certain probation, and by getting the sanction of the band to which they belong, and by getting the approval of the Superintendent General, to become free men and possess the rights and disabilities and liabilities that belong to a free citizen of a free country, that while that right extends to the Indians of all the other Provinces, it does not extend to those of British Columbia. The British Columbia Indian must always remain a ward and a slave, and these are the men, numbering, approximately, 40,000, that you propose to enfranchise and place on a par with the free citizens of this Dominion; these are the men who, by your own legislation, you have declared are unfit even to be enfranchised, who never can become enfranchised, who cannot own land, who cannot contract to sell or to buy, who are slaves, to all intents and purposes—these are the men you single out by your Bill for enfranchisement. Sir, while you are doing that in British Columbia, on the shores of the Pacific Ocean, what are you doing down in the Provinces on the Atlantic Ocean? In Prince Edward Island you are taking 1,500 or 2,000 of the best young men in the island and disfranchising them. You have committed a cruel and wicked wrong, and you know it; and you justify that according to the law, or the principles, laid down by the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), as the law of compensation—the only answer he gives to it. The 2,000, the 4,000, the 5,000 Indians who are not capable of being enfranchised under the Indian Act in British Columbia, are given the privileges of free citizens, but you are depriving

young men who, for thirty years, have exercised that right in Prince Edward Island, from exercising the franchise hereafter. And that is the law of compensation. That is the just, the fair, the honest Bill that you want us to accept, without criticism, without remark, and more than that, not only in this House, but through your press, you condemn us for raising a voice against it. It is based upon iniquity from beginning to end, and you know it. The hon. gentleman knows it. It cannot be defended, either here or in the press, or on the platform, where the facts are acknowledged. You do more than that. You go to the Province of New Brunswick and you disfranchise men by the hundred. We have had a report from the county of York alone of 800 free men who are to be disfranchised, of 500 in adjoining county of Sunbury, 500 in the constituency of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King), and the same proportion, no doubt, exists in other constituencies of New Brunswick, from which we have not yet got returns. You do this, and you do it, as it becomes you, in solemn silence, and you complain because we, on this side, raise our voices in protest against the iniquitous outrage. I can tell hon. gentlemen that throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion an agitation is spreading, but nowhere is it so strong as in the Province of New Brunswick, if I can believe the letters that come from there and the reports of my hon. friends around me.

Mr. TEMPLE. I can show you some letters, also, that perhaps you would like to read.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman does receive letters—and I don't dispute it—they are directly opposed to those I have seen received by gentlemen on this side of the House; and it is a most extraordinary thing, and no doubt it will seem extraordinary to the people, that although, in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, where these men are being disfranchised—the hon. gentleman cannot deny it—not only does he view this Bill with complacency but, with positive approval.

Mr. TEMPLE. Well, I do deny it.

Mr. DAVIES. You deny the figures which are given? Does the hon. gentleman deny the figures which are taken from the assessment rolls of Sunbury, Queen's and York counties? Here is the paper which I have in my hand, giving the names, a paper which comes from his own county.

Mr. TEMPLE. What is the name of the paper?

Mr. DAVIES. The York *Gleaner*.

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, oh!

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman laughs, but his laughter is no answer. This paper gives the name of every parish in his constituency; it gives the number in each parish that has been disfranchised by this Bill; it shows that 804 persons, outside the city of Fredericton, have been disfranchised. And the hon. gentleman has formally accepted the disfranchisement, and given his reasons for it. But what I am discussing now is the abominable injustice, the double injustice, you are doing, that while you are disfranchising these free men who, certainly, have never shown themselves unfit to exercise the franchise, you are, acting upon this wonderful law of compensation, making up for it by giving the franchise to the Indians of British Columbia, who are not capable, even by your own standard, of ever becoming free citizens. The law does not allow them. The law says—I suppose there must be some object in exempting them from the privilege offered to other Indians—they shall not become enfranchised; they shall not own the land and become free citizens. Still you are enfranchising them. That is a matter, to a large extent, resting with the members from British Columbia. An hon. member from that Province, I think, a few days ago expressed approval of this enfranchising clause, so far as Indians are concerned in that Province. At all events, all the members from British Columbia voted for it. The way we look at it is that, when the members for a Province vote for a particular scheme, we think they must know more about it than other members. My amendment does not propose to touch British Columbia. The hon. members from that Province must take the responsibility of their actions and must give an account to their constituents. But I propose to add to the amendment the words Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. In other words, I seek to place those five Provinces in the same position, in regard to the Indians, as is Manitoba. The hon. member for East Hastings says that in this country we admit the blacks and persons irrespective of color to the franchise. Thank God, in this country there is no distinction of color. If a man is a free citizen we do not care whether he is black, brown or white; but we draw a distinction between a slave and a free man. I, in common with, I think, two members, hold peculiar views with respect to the Chinese. I was not in favor of their being disfranchised; but both sides of the House were in wonderful unanimity, and favored it. The hon. member for East Hastings was in favor of disfranchising the Chinese.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I was not in the House at the time when the vote was taken.

Mr. DAVIES. Then you are in favor of enfranchising the Chinese.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; I am in favor of enfranchising the Chinese.

Mr. DAVIES. Then there are four of us, and we make quite a strong party. The hon. member for East Hastings spoke of the Indians on his reserve, not only as being free men in all respects, but as being liable to taxation and subject to all the disabilities and liabilities of white men.

Mr. WHITE. I said they pay taxes.

Mr. DAVIES. The law says distinctly that they shall not be liable to any taxation. (The hon. gentleman quoted a section of the Act). So the hon. gentleman's statement of facts is without foundation.

Mr. WHITE. I said that Indians, equally with white men, pay taxes to municipalities; that money is taken to build roads and bridges. The Indian council provides money to build half the bridges and keep them in repair.

Mr. DAVIES. I am dealing with the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that Indians were liable to taxation, the same as white men. I say that every statement on which the hon. gentleman has based a conclusion is erroneous.

Mr. WHITE. I say they pay taxes—they pay duties to this Government, the same as other citizens.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says they pay duties, the same as white men pay, on the reserves.

Mr. WHITE. The same as any other men.

Mr. DAVIES. I repeat that the facts on which the hon. gentleman has based his conclusion are erroneous. There is no tax payable on a reserve. The hon. member (Mr. White) wound up by saying that the Indians were just as much entitled to enfranchisement as a white man. They are taught from childhood to look up to the Superintendent General, at whose dictation they will vote when this Bill becomes law. So far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, no one member has dared to rise in his place and say there is an Indian in the three Maritime Provinces who is fit to exercise the franchise. They are a degraded and dying race, going down before civilisation; they are deteriorating year by year; they are a degraded and

ignorant race, who will not have the slightest conception of what Parliament means by this legislation, but who will be ready to sell their vote to the highest bidder when they get it. The attempt to confer the franchise on such Indians and to disfranchise white people is one of the most infamous propositions ever submitted to a christian Parliament. I challange any hon. member from the Maritime Provinces, on either side of the House, to rise and tell the committee that in his opinion the Indians of those Provinces form a class of men who are worthy of being enfranchised. I turn up to the reports of the Indian Department—and if the reports with respect to other Provinces are on a par with this one, they are very misleading—and I find the following with respect to the Indians of Prince Edward Island :

"In the case of some of the non-resident Indians—for instance, those at Rocky Point—it is perhaps better that they should remain where they are, as they are doing tolerably well, from an industrial point of view, and occupy comfortable houses."

It is absurd to talk about those Indians occupying comfortable houses and doing pretty well. They live in wretched cabins and in birch-bark wigwams,and depend on the charity of the people in the towns. Every hon. member from the Province knows that fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES. The jeers and sneers of hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to make matters any better. There will be a day of reckoning, when hon. gentlemen opposite will have to come face to face with those whom they have disfranchised. And I do not know that, perhaps, you will be as much the gainers as you imagine you will be. I move, in amendment, to add after the words "North-West Territories" the words, "Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said he would move his resolution silently, or that he would merely make a few remarks. He has kept his word.

Mr. DAVIES. You have to thank the hon. member for East Hastings for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My attention has been called to a statement made some time ago, in the discussion on the word "Indian"—that Manitoba, the North-West Territories, Keewatin and British Columbia, should be excepted. Since that time I have heard a good deal of debate on the matter. I have heard some hon. gentlemen of the other side speak about the Indians of British Columbia, and state that they were superior to the North-West Indians, that they were much more industrious than the prairie Indians, or the Indians of the plain. One hon gentleman from British Columbia spoke in favor of their being allowed the franchise, and I had the impression that that was the general impression. I have, however, been reminded that I had made that speech, and I would now move that the words "British Columbia" should be inserted as well as Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories.

Mr. MILLS. I referred, in the early part of the afternoon, to a matter with reference to the amendment which the First Minister has put in your hands. I again call the attention of the committee to the phraseology of this amendment. It states the Indians "in Manitoba, Keewatin, the North-West Territories, or any Indian on any reserve, who is not in possession, etc.," shall be disqualified, except on the conditions herein stated. Now, what would be the effect if we were to adopt the provision of this Act without this amendment? I think it is clear that the Indian would be entitled to vote upon precisely the same conditions, with regard to property, whether that property be their interest in the reservation, as any other class of the community similarly situated. The occupant on an Indian reservation would have the same right to vote, under section 6, which we have already adopted, as the occupant of any other property in the country. I ask the attention of any lawyer in this House to the wording of that section, and I say that, so long as an Indian is on a reserve, he must, under the amendment, have improvements worth, the value of at least $150. But if he is not on a reserve what is his position? Supposing he is one of a band, and chooses to withdraw from the reserve, then he does not require these improvements and the provisions of section 6 will apply to him; and if the whole of an Indian band were to withdraw from the reservation and reside elswhere, the value of that reserve must be considered, and if it is sufficient to give each one a vote, he is entitled to such a vote. I think that is as plain as any matter can well be, and as to the legal construction there is really no room for doubt. Apart from that, I wish to call the attention of the committee to some observations made by the First Minister, as to the ground for enfranchising the Indians under the provisions of this Act. The hon. gentleman said :

"Oh, let me get through. When the word "Indian" was put into the Act by myself, I must say that I had reference in my own mind to the Indians of the old Provinces, where they are educated and have been under a civilising process for years and years, where they have schools, where they can read and write—the greater portion of them. I take it that the Indians in the Province of Ontario, as a rule, can read as well as the white man."

And again he said :

"If you go to any of the reserves in the older Provinces, you will find that the Indians have good houses, that they and their families are well clad, the education of their children is well attended to, their morals are good, their strong religious feeling is evident. You will find as good churches and as regular church-goers among the red men as among the white men. You will find that in every respect they have a right to be considered as equal with the whites."

Now, against his statement that the education of their children is well attended to, that their morals are good, and that their religious feeling is evident, I put the statements he has made in his report to His Excellency the Governor General, in which he says that the Indian children, in order to have any chance of success, must be taken from under the control of their parents and from under parental influence. I ask the hon. gentleman to reconcile the one statement with the other. He declares that the Indians are living in good houses. I contest that statement, and I challenge him to the proof. I declare that it is not true. I declare that if he grants a commission I will prove that it is not true—that it is wanting in accuracy in every particular. I will show that Indians are not educated, as he says they are educated, that they are not attending schools, as he says they are attending schools. I will show that they are not attending church, as he says they are attending churches. Why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman will only examine his own reports he will see that his statement is not a true statement. It does not represent the facts as they are, and I charge the hon. gentleman with making a statement which was intended to mislead the committee and the country in this particular. Sir, let him look at these reports and compare the statements made in them during the past five years with the statements made in that speech.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is exceeding the limits when he says the First Minister intended to mislead the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to a point of order, and I call attention to your own ruling. I must say that, after what passed from the First Minister to my hon. friend from Bothwell to-day already, which you ruled in order, I cannot conceive that my hon. friend can be out of order in making this statement.

Mr. MILLS. I would just say that the First Minister stated to-day that I deliberately misstated facts to the House—that I did so constantly. You ruled that it was not out of order for one hon. gentleman to accuse another of making

statements that were not true—of making false statements. Now, I am not making a charge the evidence of which is not before the committee. I referred here to a speech, and I read the words. I turned to his own report and I referred him to the words of that report. He says in that report that the parental influence of the Indians is such that the children cannot be improved without taking them out of reach of that influence. He declares that their influence is as good as that of the white population, and that they are as intelligent. Why, Sir, I tell him that four-fifths of the Indian population over twenty-one years of age cannot read or write.

Mr. FARROW. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS. I know that is so, and I am ready to establish the fact if it is contested; and yet, Sir, here is a statement made as a pretext for the enfranchisement of these Indians that is not accurate in any one particular. Now, I call the attention of the committee to that fact, and I ask them whether they are ready to vote that these men ought to be enfranchised upon the hon. First Minister's statement, which every hon. gentleman in this House, knowing anything of the Indian population, knows is wholly at variance with the facts.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived, Yeas, 42; nays, 68.

On amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald,

Mr. BLAKE. If a reason were wanted for the protraction of this debate, which the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) said was too protracted, it would be found in the proposal now before us. The hon. First Minister has felt the situation to be so extraordinary that he began yesterday afternoon by proposing to amend his own clause; and that having been before the committee for two days, he is now proposing to amend his own amendment. I do not object, on the point of form; I do not insist that he shall find a colleague to amend his amendment for him. Yet the hon. member for East Hastings says the debate ought not to be protracted. Why, if it had not been protracted up to this time the hon. First Minister would not have seen light. His mind has been in a state of flux and fluctuation. There are 125,000 Indians in the Dominion, by the census. And he began by telling us that he was going to enfranchise them all—at least, all the male adults, or very nearly all. Well, after a fortnight or so of discussion, he decided that he would not enfranchise the Indians of Manitoba, the North-West Territories, Keewatin or British Columbia. After the lapse of another fortnight he comes down and says: I have changed my mind again. I am not going to enfranchise the Indians of Manitoba, Keewatin and the North-West Territories, but I will enfranchise the Indians of British Columbia. And now we have, I will not say his last thoughts, but his last thoughts up to this moment, and some 35,000 Indians who, an hour ago, were to have the franchise are disfranchised again. Consider what a proportion of the population of British Columbia that is. Why, it is the largest half of the whole population of British Columbia that the hon. gentleman is disfranchising.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. How many are there altogether in British Columbia, does the hon. gentleman say? I suppose he does not know. Well, it is a fluctuating quantity. Of course, the hon. gentleman will understand that when I say the larger half I was not including the disfranchised Chinese. The census returns give the whites as 19,000 odd, the Indians as 25,000 odd and the Chinese as 4,350. Since that time, of course, we know there has been a considerable increase in the Chinese population.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. And the whites have doubled.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going to say something about the whites, but the hon. gentleman will allow me, considering his views, not to mix the whites and the Chinese together; I was dealing with the Chinese separately. I say the Chinese have very largely increased; but a considerable time ago we decided that the Chinese should not have the franchise. I do not include them in the population of British Columbia; but when I find by the census that there are 25,000 Indians, and by the last Indian report of the hon. First Minister that there are some 35,000, I want to know how many whites there are, and whether my statement is incorrect, that as to the voting population of British Columbia, as it was an hour ago, the Indians are the larger half of it.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. The white population has increased since then some 15,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware that the white population has very considerably increased since that time, that a considerable proportion of that population are engaged in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it is uncertain how many of that portion of the population will remain in the country. But I will accept the hon. gentleman's figures; I will assume that there is an increase of 15,000. Well, 15,000 and 9,000 make 34,000, and the tabulated statement in the hon. First Minister's report for 1884 gives the number of Indians as 34,617. So that the larger moiety of the voting population of British Columbia, as it was an hour ago, as it is this minute, until this amendment carries, is the Indian population. Well, I say this is an important question. It is a question with reference to the Province of British Columbia, about which the hon. First Minister has been in a state of doubt and suspense for this long time; he has been hither and thither, up and down, forward and backward. What motives, what arguments, what views, have procured the results he has indicated to the House from time to time as his intentions? We do not know. We are told without reasonable explanation what the hon. gentleman's conclusions are. He begins by telling my hon. friend: Yes, the Indians of British Columbia are to be enfranchised. Some time afterwards he said: I do not think very much of them; I do not intend to enfranchise the Indians of British Columbia. Two days ago he said: Yes, I do. Now, after two days' debate he says: No, I do not. I do not know whether this may lead to the conclusion that, as the hon. gentleman began by intending to enfranchise the whole Indian population in all the Provinces, numbering 131,000, and as of these 131,000 he has now excluded by this amendment the great bulk from the franchise, perhaps, if the debate continues a little longer, at a subsequent stage of the Bill the hon. gentleman may continue in the same path; and although he is not disposed this evening, although he is not yet ready to adopt the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), yet considering what we have found has taken place in the hon. gentleman's mind, after the deliberation and discussion, although one-sided, during which we have been endeavoring to convince him, further discussion may have its effect; each drop of water affects the rock, and equally good results may ensue with regard to the small remnant of the Indian population the hon. gentleman now proposes to enfranchise. I am sure that would be the result, were not the hon. gentleman's secret object, nay his obvious object, in the whole matter, connected with the Indians of the older Provinces, and not with the Indians of the other Provinces. I am sure the hon. gentleman from Victoria, who furnished the right hon. gentleman with figures with reference to British Columbia, has heard with confusion and shame this last declaration of the First Minister. We know, from what he said the other day, what his feelings are. He was anxious that the red man should be given the franchise as a free and independent voter, and for a fortnight he was in gloom

because the hon. gentleman said the Indians in British Columbia would not be enfranchised; but after a fortnight, the First Minister declared that, after listening to the hon. gentleman's appeal, he would enfranchise the Indians. Two days later, however, after the hon. gentleman felt that the few words which had fallen from him on the floor of the committee had changed the iron will of the First Minister, he finds the iron will has become bent again, and his Indian friends are not to be enfranchised after all. We will, no doubt, have another eloquent appeal from him, with a view to preventing the passage of the amendment, and to securing for those Indians in tribal communities the rights and liberties he thought he had obtained for them, but which now he finds snatched from the lip that was about to drink. If anything was wanting to show that this debate has not been so needlessly protracted as the hon. member for East Hastings declares it has, it is these fluctuations of the First Minister. He has been gathering light from various quarters. At one time he has viewed the subject in one way; at another time he has viewed it in another way; his mind changes as the debate progresses. We now find him settled to the view that, of 131,000 Indians in the Dominion, only that smaller portion resident in the older Provinces of the Dominion is to be enfranchised. I am not, myself, about to oppose the hon. gentleman's amendment to the amendment; I think it is a very good one. Second and third thoughts are better, but I think this is about the fourth thought, and fourth thoughts are the best on this occasion, for on them he has arrived at a right conclusion with reference to the Indians of British Columbia; and perhaps, at the second stage of the Bill, we may find the hon. gentleman has reached a right conclusion with reference to the Indians elsewhere.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I ventured, in the few remarks that I made to the committee last night, to say that the clause as proposed by the First Minister would not become law in the shape in which it was. Though not claiming to have the gift of prophecy, I claim to have that prophetic utterance fulfilled. The clause has been amended; the Province of British Columbia has been added, whether as the result of the extracts I read from the reports of the First Minister himself to His Excellency the Governor General, I cannot say. It has been added, at any rate, to the great displeasure of the junior member for British Columbia (Mr. Shakespeare), who has been so anxious to have the Indians of that Province enfranchised. I read extracts from the report of the First Minister himself, where he pointed out that heathen polygamous tribes engaged in their heathenish practices, and maintained that it would be impossible, or at least unwise, by process of law, to attempt preventing their indulging in heathenish rites, and I contrasted that condition with the condition of some of the tribes of Manitoba that were being excluded, notably the St. Peter Indians, to whom he has in his report given a good character. We have now, as the result of more mature consideration, the proposition of the First Minister to do what I ventured last night to say he would have to do, exclude those polygamous tribes of British Columbia from participating in the vote he is about to confer on other Indians. The First Minister said the reason he would exclude the Indians of the newer Provinces was because they had not the same facilities of education that the Indians of the older Provinces had. But what are the figures given by the Minister himself, in his report to the Governor General, with reference to the education of the different Indian bands in the different Provinces. He reports that out of 33,559 Indians in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, 1,261 are attending school; while in the Province of Quebec, out of 1,223, only 467 attend school; so that there are as many Indians attending school in Manitoba and the North-West, in proportion, as are in the Province of Quebec. Only 107 attend school in Nova Scotia, 118 in New Brunswick and 15 in Prince Edward Island, yet deliberately he is excluding the Indians of Manitoba, who have more children, in proportion, going to school, than have the Indians in some other Provinces. There has been no straight line pursued by the Minister in this question, and hon. gentlemen stand there convicted in dealing with this Indian question, from their own action, from the change in their purposes and designs, of what they have been charged with, that the whole proposition to bring the Indians into the electorate of this country has been designed to weaken the force of one political party and to strengthen another. It is evident that it is not for the elevation of the Indian. The amendment that is offered is based upon no line that can be justified, by reason, by common sense, or, I was going to say, by decency. There are Indians and Indians, as the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) said last night, and if the desire was to deal with these Indians in an intelligent manner, the way to deal with them is that laid down in the Indian Act, not to give the vote to whole bodies at once. In the Province of Ontario there are bands of Indians and there are bands of Indians. There are some members of a band who are intelligent, and who are far more advanced than other members of the same band. There are other bands which have attained to comparative intelligence, and according to the report of the Minister, there are those which are sunk low in ignorance and low in habit, and yet there is no distinction drawn, no educational distinction, no distinction other than that of property, which the most ignorant Indian in any Province may have as well as anyone else. I hold, then, that it is proved that this proposition is not for the advancement or the benefit of the Indian. If the First Minister has determined to throw aside the consideration that we think is of importance and that leads us to vote against his whole proposition, the fact that the most intelligent as well as the most ignorant Indian is under his control, has not the management of his own affairs, and is a minor in the eye of the law; if he will not regard that, and is determined to enfranchise some Indians, let him not do it by Provinces, or even by bands; let him have some kind of educational test, some test of capacity, but do not let him, in an indiscriminate way, give the vote to all the Indians in the Provinces, whether they be barbarian or civilised, ignorant or educated. True statesmanship would make that imperative on the part of the First Minister. You are doing discredit to the more advanced Indians, the Indians described by my hon. friend from East Hastings, by giving the most ignorant and debased Indians in the Provinces the same right, provided they have $150 worth of improvements made, in the judgment of a revising officer. If the First Minister will not regard it as an objection that these men are not free men—and that they do not desire to become free men is evidenced by their not taking advantage of the Indian Act—there might be some justification for selecting some individuals out of the bands of the hon. member for East Hastings, some of the bands in my own county, and many others; but this proposition is to force this vote upon the most debased, uneducated and illiterate Indians. There is more involved in this Indian question than I think the First Minister has comprehended. I can speak disinterestedly in this matter, for the effect upon an individual should have no weight in doing an act of justice, if it be an act of justice, to a community, but there are questions involved in this which require more serious consideration before they are dealt with. Why do not the educated and intelligent Indians avail themselves of the machinery for enfranchisement contained in the Indian Act? The First Minister would tell you that it is because they desire to preserve their tribal relations. Is not that a declaration on the part of those educated and intelligent Indians that they do not want to become citizens of this country in the

ull acceptation of the term, but that they want to remain part of their tribes, and to preserve their separate nationality, and to have their voice and their influence there. As they would resent any attempt on the part of their white brethern who surround them to enter upon their reserves, and vote for their chiefs, and make their rules and regulations, they will be precluded—and no doubt they will look at it in that light—from exercising the vote which is propose to be given to them. There are other considerations. Has the First Minister considered the whole cost? How are you to vote many of these ignorant Indians? Will your voters' list be printed in their language? Will the notices you give them be in their language? In the more intelligent bands in my own county, when some Indian cases come up in the courts of justice, the interpreter has to be there, and how will the Indian interpret your law, how will he know what answer to give when the question is put to him, "For whom do you vote?" The interpreter will have to be there. These Indians speak different languages and dialects, and many of them refuse to converse in English, though, perhaps, in a measure, they understand it. We are indiscriminately bringing into the electorate of this country a people who are foreign to us in a certain sense, and who desire to remain so. If the First Minister desires, as I believe he does, to see wiped out the distinctions that exist, I am at one with him in that. But this Bill does not propose to do that. That is provided for in the Indian law; under that law those Indians who desire enfranchisement must get people to vouch for them, and after they have been vouched for, the Superintendent General must exercise his discretion, and then they must serve a probationary term of three years before they are allowed to obtain their land in fee simple, which is then entailed, so that they cannot part with it. There you have a process of selection, and yet, while proposing to retain those provisions, the hon. gentleman proposes to give them all the right to vote at once, making no distinction between the intelligent and the unintelligent, the heathen and the Christian, the semi-civilised and the civilised Indian. I hold that if the First Minister is earnest in his desire to benefit the Indian, to elevate him, he should, at any rate, let this matter stand over till he has given it a little more consideration, and until he sees that this Bill will be perfectly useless to accomplish in the slightest degree the elevation of any Indian in this country, and to consider the way in which the different bands of Indians view their relation to the Crown, and are likely to view this clause, which, I believe, many of them will not avail themselves of. If the First Minister will not recognise, as we do, that the Indians, being in a state of tutelage, not free men, in the full sense of the word, without the responsibility of citizens, they should therefore not be given the right to vote, I do ask him to have some process of selection, whereby those who are best fitted should be given the vote. It is a new thing altogether that an Indian should have the vote, and if he will bring some of them within the electorate it is but reasonable that some distinction should guide us in giving the vote to other than the mere possession by the Indian of $150 worth of improvements on the land he holds.

Amendment to amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

Mr. TROW. There are a certain class of men on each of the reserves who, from their superior intelligence over the bands with whom they associate, and with whom they are connected, should have the right to the franchise—I refer to those half-breeds who are still the wards of the Government and are connected with the band, but are of superior education and intelligence. I move, in amendment to the amendment:

Indians or persons of part Indian blood who have not been partly enfranchised, and Indians or persons with part Indian blood who reside among Indians.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think this amendment is in order, in view of the amendment which the committee has already voted down.

Mr. MILLS. That was a different clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a disabling clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a distinction; it is going a step farther than we went before. The proposition we offered before was voted down, and that was that only enfranchised Indians should have a vote. This proposition includes Indians who have not been enfranchised under the Indian Act, but who are living among white people, who have property, and are subject to the responsibilities of property, occupying a different position from Indians on the reserves, whose property is not liable to seizure. This proposition is that of the Mowat Act, word for word, that has been commended, and which the First Minister said he was humbly following. It embraces the very class of voters that the Mowat Act does.

Mr. BLAKE. We are now upon the clause proposed by the First Minister to disqualify certain classes of Indians, which disqualifies all Indians who, but for this proposed amendment, would be qualified, all Indians excepting those who have improvements to the value of $150. Now, has the committee decided that these Indians shall have a vote? If it has, then the hon. gentleman's amendment is not in order. But the hon. gentleman's amendment proposes to disqualify a certain class of Indians who, but for this proposal, would have a vote, and it cannot but be in order to make another proposition with reference to the disqualification of certain classes of Indians. It cannot be only the First Minister's proposals that are in order and those of other hon. members of the House that are to be out of order. You will observe he proposes the disqualification of certain Indians who, under the Bill as it now stands, would be qualified. I think he is quite right to propose that, because there was a distinct understanding that when the disqualifying clauses came we should be able to propose disqualifying amendments, and the First Minister, in pursuance of that, has proposed, without objection, a disqualifying amendment; and now my hon. friend proposes to disqualify all those Indians who are living on the reserves. He proposes to leave the vote to the Indians who are enfranchised, who are not living on the reserves. It is simply an enlargement of the disqualifying amendment of the First Minister. The First Minister says: I will disqualify the reserve Indian, unless he lives on a separate allotment and his improvements are worth $150. That you consider in order. Now my hon. friend says: I want to disqualify the Indian who is living on the reserve altogether. It is a question of degree, not of order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It brings up the whole question we have been discussing. It is in order.

Mr. FLEMING. The proposition of my hon. friend is to exclude from the franchise all Indians except those not wholly enfranchised under the Indian Act, or such as have not separated themselves from the band and acquired property, the same as other people in the country. I urge upon the First Minister the adoption of this amendment, for the reasons, already urged, and for other reasons. I urge it because the House has, at his instance, adopted the proposition to require a holder of property in cities and towns to have property to the value of $300 and $200 before entitled to vote. I urge it because the workingmen of this country, for whom the hon. gentleman has professed in the past very warm regard, are required to have $300 of property as a necessity for them to exercise the franchise. The hon. gentleman proposes to confer upon Indians, who have no civil capacity, who do not add to the wealth of the country, the right of vote, and in some instances to hold the balance

of power in counties, on possessing $150 of improvements on the reserve, no matter how the improvements may have been obtained—no matter whether they were created by the Government or by any other means, whether the Government have cleared the farm or furnished the lumber to build the house. The hon. gentleman professes to be giving an enlarged franchise, and says this will be the means of giving the working people an influence in public affairs not hitherto possessed by them. But the hon. gentleman is not reducing the franchise as low as obtains in some of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman is increasing the property qualification in Ontario for workingmen, but he is taking away from the working people rights they would possess but for this Bill, and giving the franchise to men who have a simple voting power of $150. I commend to the workingmen the hon. gentleman's conduct in this matter as their professed friend, and I urge upon him that while he requires a workingman to acquire, by his own industry, $300 worth of property to entitle him to vote, he is taking away that little influence left to the workingmen by giving the vote to Indians under his own control.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Trow) negatived.

Mr. KING. The members for New Brunswick have already called the attention of the Government to the fact that the Indians of that Province do not possess the qualifications which should entitle them to the franchise. I have not yet heard any hon. member from that Province rise and dispute the statement made by us in that regard. I might call attention to the report of the First Minister, but I desire specially to read a short extract from a speech delivered in this House by the hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). That hon. gentleman said :

"I may tell the right hon. Premier that I disagree entirely with the views he has expressed in relation to the Indians, so far as the section of country from which I come is concerned, at least. My Province is amongst the oldest Provinces of this Dominion. The early settlement of what was the Province of Nova Scotia, which covered the country from which I come, dates back several centuries, and it may be classed amongst the older Provinces of the Dominion ; and I can tell the right hon. gentleman that the descriptions he has given of the Indians of the other Provinces are as far from the actual fact as day is from night ; and I can fully endorse the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that any man who knows the tribal condition of these Indians—the miserable, wretched state in which they exist, their beggary, humiliating and debased condition—I speak of it with regret—and knowing it, could for one moment think of giving that class of people the elective franchise, simply could not have fairly considered what he was attempting to do. Sir, I am speaking my honest convictions, and I intend to do it to the end in this matter. The elective franchise is too sacred to be dealt with by prejudices, by party purposes or by whims."

Those are the words of that hon. member, a gentleman who, I believe, on most occasions supports the Government. I fully endorse the statement contained in that speech. I believe it is as near the truth as anything yet stated, or that can be stated, in regard to the Indians of New Brunswick. If those statements made by the hon. member for Northumberland are not correct, I should like any hon. member to rise in his place and contradict them. If those statements are true, and they have gone uncontradicted, should not an exception be made in favor of New Brunswick? If that statement be true, why should the Government seek to enfranchise the Indians of that Province? There is no reason why the Indians of New Brunswick should have the franchise conferred upon them. I will not say but that some hon. members may expect this proposition to affect their elections. I do not believe it will influence many elections. I know, in the county of Kent, there are Indians, some of whom might be enfranchised under this Act.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I do not believe it will give one of them a vote.

Mr. KING. If, under this Bill, not one Indian in New Brunswick will be entitled to vote, then why impose it on the Province? If, after one hundred years, the Indians are not qualified to vote under this Bill, why does the hon. gentleman insist on this clause?

Mr. LANDRY. Because it does no harm.

Mr. KING. It has the effect of interfering with people of the other Provinces.

Mr. LANDRY. We want to enlighten them.

Mr. KING. I do not consider it necessary that the Indians of New Brunswick should be enfranchised. There is not one Indian in New Brunswick who has $150 worth, or is fit to have the franchise conferred on him.

Mr. LANDRY. I was speaking of my own county, and I said I did not believe it would give one of them a vote.

Mr. KING. I believe they are as well qualified there as in any part of New Brunswick, and I know something about them. I say it is an outrage that these Indians should have the franchise conferred on them while the Bill would disfranchise a large number of the white people of New Brunswick. I procured from an officer in my county a statement of the number who would be disfranchised, and I am informed that, during my absence, the accuracy of that statement has been questioned. I can only say that the secretary-treasurer of my county is a gentleman standing high in the estimation of the people of that county, that he is well known to almost every gentleman in this House from New Brunswick, that he fills the office of registrar of deeds, of secretary-treasurer, and some other important offices. I do not know that he had any interest in sending a report which was not correct. The statement was one which surprised me, but the facts are that this Bill, if it passes, will disfranchise a very large number of persons in my own county. I called the attention of another gentleman from another county to these figures, and he said he was surprised that such was the case. I told him that he had better inquire in his own county, and he looked over the lists and he found that there were some 804 who would be disfranchised in York county. The hon. member for Sunbury found that over 400 voters would be disfranchised in his county, and I say it is unfair to attempt, by a Bill of this kind, to disfranchise the white people in New Brunswick and enfranchise the Indians, when no gentleman will claim that there is an Indian in New Brunswick who is qualified to vote. I move, in amendment to the amendment, to add, after the words "North-West Territories," the words "New Brunswick."

Mr. FOSTER. I want the House to understand clearly what the assertion is that the hon. member for Queen's makes. Does he make the assertion before this House, that actual information has been sent to this House from either York, or Sunbury, or Queen's, that under the operation of this Bill exactly so many persons will be disfranchised? Is that the statement he makes? Or, is this the statement he makes: that information has been sent from those three counties, that on looking over the assessors' lists so many were found who were assessed on property of the value of $100, but less than the value of $150? Now, which of those is true, for there is a great difference?

Mr. KING. I would like to answer the hon. gentleman. The statement he last made is the statement I made, that on the assessment list the secretary-treasurer of my own county informs me that he finds—I do not recollect the exact number, but 420 and some odd persons, who are assessed on real estate of a less value than $150, but exceeding $100.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will take the *Hansard* report of his remarks, he will find that the state-

ment he made a little while ago and the statement he makes now are not one and the same. He stated before that that many would be disfranchised.

Mr. DAVIES. So there are.

Mr. KING. That would be the effect of it. I understand that the hon. gentleman has stated that the assessed value of property is far below the actual value, but I do not believe the hon. gentleman will go before his municipal council at the next meeting and tell them that they are appointing men, sworn to make a true valuation of property, for assessment purposes, based on the actual cash value of the property, and that these men do not do their duty. That may be correct of the officers of his own county, but it is a charge which I would not have the hardihood to apply to the officers of my county. I believe, on the contrary, that on account of the large depreciation in the value of real estate which has been going on in many parts of New Brunswick, property is assessed too high rather than too low. The lists in many places have remained the same for ten years. I am voting on property, myself, which I would sell for half its assessed value, and the hon. member for Sunbury owns property in my county, and he is paying taxes on a valuation of $1,000 in excess of the value he puts upon it.

Mr. VAIL. When the First Minister made his short explanation with regard to this Bill, he gave us to understand that he intended to include the Indians in all the Provinces, but I did not suppose for a moment that he intended to give a vote to all those people living on the reserves, whether they were intelligent enough to understand their duties as voters or not. My idea was that he intended to give votes only to that class who were given votes by the Ontario Act, in which case I would have found no fault, because I think that all intelligent Indians, all Indians capable of exercising the franchise, and understanding fully the obligations and responsibilities of electors, should be entitled to vote. Shortly afterwards, however, in answer to my hon. friend from Bothwell, the right hon. gentleman stated that he intended to give the vote to the Indians of the North-West—to Poundmaker and Big Bear, and all the rest of them; and upon hearing that statement I made up my mind that the whole thing was a huge joke, and that he did not intend to enfranchise any of the Indians. A few days afterwards we heard whispers from the other side that the First Minister did intend to enfranchise some of the Indians, but that when he explained to whom he intended to give the vote they were sure hon. gentlemen on this side could not object. A little later on the First Minister stated that he intended, by an amendment, to confine the vote to a certain number of Indians, which would include those living on reserves who held and occupied land on which their improvements amounted to $150. When we heard that he intended to include all tribal Indians, while he kept the power in his own hands to say who should and who should not be entitled to vote, we made up our minds that, after all, our first impression was correct, that he intended to give the vote to all the Indians in the older Provinces that it was at all possible for him to enfranchise. Now, I do not know a great deal about the Indians of Ontario; but if the Indians we have in the Maritime Provinces at all compare with the Indians in Ontario, I cannot, for my life, see the justification for giving the franchise to any Indians who are on the reserves and who live as the Indians, generally speaking, do in the Maritime Provinces. In the county I represent there are some 200 or 300 Indians. A few of the younger men are employed in the spring of the year in driving logs and timber down the streams, and some few work in the mills; but with that exception they employ themselves in fishing and shooting, and their whole time in summer is spent off the reserve. They spend no time in improving their lands; they pay no taxes: they are not worthy of being called by the name of citizens, and they are not such people as should really be enfranchised. I notice that the appropriation made for the Indians in Nova Scotia is, in all, some $5,000, of which $1,400 or $1,500 is expended in paying agents, $1,200 or $1,300 in buying food and the necessaries of life, and some $1,300 or $1,400 in the purchase of seed grain, potatoes, and farming implements, in order to induce them, if possible, to cultivate the soil to some extent, in order to provide a living for their families through the winter. Now, if the Government find it necessary to expend over one-fifth of the whole grant for the 2,000 or 3,000 Indians in Nova Scotia, in food, to enable them to get through the winter, it is quite clear that they do not occupy sufficient land to entitle them to a vote under this Bill, nor cultivate their land to a sufficient extent to give us any hope that they will in the future become useful members of society, or convince us that it will be of any advantage to the State to endow them with the privilege of voting. I will just refer for a moment to the reports of the local agents in the county of Digby, to show that there is no such improvement going on among the Indians of Nova Scotia as to justify the Government in expecting anything in the future from them. (The hon. gentleman then read from the reports of 1877, 1878 and 1884.) We ought to be satisfied by this that there is no improvement going on among the Indians in the Province of Nova Scotia, at least in the western portion. I know nothing of the eastern portion, where, I believe, there are a few Indians of a little better class than those of the west. Our Indians spend the time hunting, fishing and shooting, principally porpoises, and do nothing else for their support; they take no interest in politics and know nothing of politics, except that Sir John is the Premier, and they look to him for the money they are to receive. With all due deference to what the feelings of the right hon. gentleman may be in regard to the Indians, he is not doing them any favor by granting them this privilege, and by doing so the whites will feel they are degraded to a great extent. In Ontario, where there is a large number of Indians, their votes, in many constituencies, will swamp the white vote, and one can easily understand with what a feeling of abhorrence the white citizens will regard a law which gives the vote to such a class as this. I cannot believe the right hon. gentleman would be so persistent in his determination to force this Bill through the House, at a great expense to the country, unless he was going to derive from it some political advantage over his opponents. To say that this country will be benefited by enfranchising the Indians is to state something no intelligent man should believe. If these men are intelligent enough to vote, why does the hon. gentleman keep their money in the treasury of the Dominion? Why does he not distribute it among them? If they are a people capable of properly using the franchise, they are capable of managing their own property and transmitting it to their descendants. I felt called upon to take part in this debate, because nothing has been said with regard to the public sentiment in Nova Scotia, and it might, therefore, be inferred that the Indians in that Province were fitted to exercise the franchise. That they are not, cannot be denied. Has any man from the Maritime Provinces asked for this Bill? True, the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) said that he thought the Indian ought to have the right to vote, but there is not a man in this House besides that hon. gentleman who holds that opinion. If the Indians are to be given a vote, let them be first put on the same footing as white men, and then I shall have no objection to allowing them to vote. This Bill will disfranchise many people who have hitherto voted on the personal qualification in Nova Scotia, while at the same time, it enfran-

chises those Indians who pay no taxes. It will therefore create a great deal of dissatisfaction. I admit that the income clause will cover a few of these men, but the papers in Nova Scotia, which were of a different opinion at first, are beginning to discover that many will be disfranchised who had votes under the personal property qualification.

Mr. PAINT. I am sure the hon. gentleman must be pleased at the attention with which the House has listened to his remarks. Let me present another picture. In the county of Richmond the Indians have a chapel which costs them $8,000, which they paid for out of their own money, and they have a comfortable glebe house. A large number of them can read and write; a number live in frame houses and some in log houses, and they have cattle. I can say the same for the county of Victoria, but I do not know so much about the other two counties in the island of Cape Breton. In the county of Inverness, however, they have a very valuable tract, that has not been much infringed upon so far. The timber upon it is nearly intact, apart from the damage by gales. The member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) can answer for that.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman referred to the county of Inverness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He did not.

Mr. VAIL. He said they were in as good a state as they were in his own county.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; he did not.

Mr. VAIL. I am not sure that they are not under the same agent.

Mr. PAINT. No.

Mr. VAIL. The local agent says:

"When not in real destitution, they seem always happy and contented, much more so than other people would be under similar circumstances."

That does not look to me as if they had chapels, and houses, and barns to make them happy and comfortable.

Mr. ALLEN. At the town of Owen Sound we had a band of about 300 Indians living for ten years. Our Indian experience has been neither profitable nor pleasant, and I believe the present course of the Government has a tendency to make Indians dishonest, dissatisfied, and worse citizens than they otherwise would be. If the Indians were treated as other people, if the Indians in the Saugeen peninsula, who receive annually from $12,000 to $18,000 in two bands, which number about 700, were to divide the property which they consider belongs to them, and if they were allowed to become citizens and to manage their own affairs, and to be responsible for their debts, and to sue and be sued, I believe they would be in a better position than they now are. We have found the Indians thriftless, drunkards, and unwilling to pay their just debts. We found them an intolerable nuisance in Owen Sound, and we experienced a very great relief when they were moved forty miles further down the bay. I was at home on Monday, and I know the feeling in that part of the country in reference to this clause of the Franchise Bill. Both Reformers and Conservatives, in the county of Bruce and in the county of Grey, say they will oppose the Government on this Bill; that it is giving an undue advantage, placing the Indians in a position they should not occupy as long as they are wards of the Government and treated as minors. I will support and vote for a measure putting the Indians on the same footing as white men, allowing them to transact their own business. In my part of the country many gentlemen of all shades of politics say openly that this Bill is not for the benefit of the Indian, but is intended for party purposes, and there are Conservatives in my constituency who are liberal enough to say they will not sanction any such measure. When the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) gets back to Wiarton, where those 28 Conservatives are who signed that petition which was presented the other day, and signed it principally for the reason that this Bill will enfranchise the Indians living a short distance from their place, he will have a hot and lively time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. PAINT. That is not to the point.

Mr. ALLEN. We are talking about the Indian franchise, and I am giving the reason why the gentlemen in North Bruce signed the petition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You are discussing the petitions, not the question before the committee.

Mr. ALLEN. The petition was a request to this House not to pass the Franchise Bill. They sent a petition because they believed the Indians should not have a vote while they are under the control of the Government.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman will keep close to the question.

Mr. ALLEN. I understand the question is the enfranchisement of the Indians.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No; it is the disqualification of the Indians.

Mr. ALLEN. I am giving reasons why they should not be enfranchised, namely, because they are wards of the Government, and because, while the Government controls their local affairs, and while the local agent is to be the party who is to recommend them to get the location ticket which will give them a right to vote, they cannot give a free and unbiassed vote. I was speaking to an Indian agent on Monday, and he is more bewildered, I think, than any man I have met, with reference to the qualification of Indians. He says he believes no Indian in the band which he controls will have a vote. He certainly does not understand this Bill. Nor do the leading Conservatives in my town who say no Indian in the North-West could vote; and when I showed them a statement made by the First Minister, that Big Bear and other Indians of the North-West could vote, they were almost incredulous, and said the *Hansard* I showed them was printed in the *Globe* office. The people in the country are not satisfied that Indians should be allowed to vote while they remain wards of the Government. Both Conservatives and Reformers in that part of the country condemn the measure, and you will find that those hon. members who will vote for it in this House will be left at home at the next election.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) has said that in his county the Indians were so well off that they had built for themselves a church worth $8,000, and a manse, for both of which they had paid. Now, if the Indians of Richmond county have done that, they have done more, I think, than the white people of Nova Scotia have done. In the county of Richmond there are 248 Indians, and to pay $8,000 it would require upwards of $30 per head for each man, woman and child, including the papooses; or, reckoning five individuals to a family, this church alone, to say nothing of the manse, cost $160 for each family. Now, I venture to say that there is no settlement of white people in the Dominion of Canada, I do not care how wealthy, who have done more than that towards building a church. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong in making that statement, as much so as some other hon. gentlemen who claim that the franchise is going to increase the number of voters in the Dominion. Whilst I am up I wish to read a short paragraph from the Halifax *Herald*, with reference to a statement made by myself in

this House on a former occasion. (The hon. gentleman read the article in question.) I do not know, and neither does the editor of the Halifax *Herald* know, that the Indians are enfranchised in Nova Scotia. I will promise the editor of the *Herald* a leather medal if he can point out to me one instance of an Indian ever having voted in the Province of Nova Scotia under the local law.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I know of one Indian in my own constituency who does, and he always has voted for me.

Mr. KIRK. If the hon. gentleman will satisfy me of one case he shall have the leather medal. I would like him to give the time, place and circumstances under which any Indian gave a vote. I know perfectly well that Indians who are in the same condition as white men can vote, but I say that the laws of the Province of Nova Scotia prevent the Indians from voting who receive aid from the Government as paupers, and I know that there is not one Indian in the whole Province of Nova Scotia who does not frequently receive such aid; and under the law of the Province, neither black, nor white, nor red man can vote who has received aid as a pauper from the Government, or from any source. In that way, although Indians may be enfranchised, they will not have votes. The Indians in that Province are an illiterate, ignorant class and, moreover, an improvident class. Under this Bill not more than twenty Indians will have votes in Nova Scotia, if the assessment roll were taken as a basis; but with the aid of a revising barrister a great many would be enfranchised. I was astonished when I heard the First Minister's statement as to the intelligent and educated condition of the Indians of the older Provinces. I thought that Nova Scotia was one of the older Provinces; and then I thought that perhaps he looked upon Nova Scotia as a new Province, or had forgotten altogether the condition of the Indians there, as described in his own report. The hon. member for Queen's stated that four-fifths of the Indians could neither read nor write. That is the case, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. There are only four Indian schools in the Province, three of which are in Cape Breton Island. In Nova Scotia, however, the Indians have a right to attend the public schools. In King's county I observe that only one is in attendance, and that is about the proportion throughout the Province. Special mention is made in the report of the Indian Department of the death of one Indian, who was the only self-supporting Indian in the county of Queen's. I can see no reason why the Indians should be enfranchised. There must have been some powerful reason for seeking to secure the Indian a vote. It cannot be in consequence of the number of Indians in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, because there are not many in these Provinces, but in consequence of the number in Ontario. I can fancy the Minister of Marine and Fisheries visiting the county of Colchester, where there are a good many Indians. He will call a public meeting in the town hall at Truro. He will attempt to make a speech to the free and independent electors there. Not many Indians will come to that meeting; so he will afterwards hold a special meeting in one of the Indian's wigwams. I fancy seeing the Minister addressing the Micmacs as the free and independent electors of the Dominion of Canada, and going round among the squaws, and kissing the papooses, in order to influence their husband's and pa's to vote. I am happy to say that, in my county, there are no Indians, and I therefore will not be troubled with anything of this kind. There are members on this side of the House whom they fear, and hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to get rid of them. In 1882 they tried the Gerrymander Act, but it failed to get rid of these men. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to be afraid to meet those on this side in fair, open and manly discussion, and so they adopt other means. They impose the franchise on the Indian, and try to get rid of these gentlemen by the tomahawk and the scalping knife.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is out of order to discuss the Gerrymander Bill, and besides it is contrary to the arrangement by which we were to get through this clause long ago.

Mr. PAINT. The hon. gentleman has doubted the accuracy of my statement. I say the chapel and glebe are good, substantial structures, erected by the Indians, and are worth $8,000. I was astonished to hear the hon. member for Digby accusing the Indians of poverty and misery, when the hon. gentleman should remember that the statement went through all the press of this Dominion that the maintaining of the pauper poor in his county had been sold at auction.

Mr. KIRK. What does the hon. gentleman say? That the people of my county have been sold by auction? There is not a word of truth in the statement. It is false.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman has referred to the people being put up at auction in my county. I merely state that the statement he has made has no foundation in fact.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister stated this evening that it was not intended that the Indian entitled to land, as tribal Indians, should qualify on the value of the land itself, if he happened to move off the reserve; and by the wording of the amendment, the land which is held by the Indian may be itself made the qualification, if he happens to move off the reserve. I think the intention of the Minister would be better expressed if the words "on the reserve" were struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The other clause says "in possession and occupation."

Mr. MULOCK. But it may not mean actual occupation. Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). As the Indians are to have the same privileges of white men, will liquors be allowed to be sold to them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That has nothing to do with the franchise.

Mr. PATERSON. But what will be the effect?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will not give that privilege.

Mr. PATERSON. At present, these newly made citizens are visited by agents, who are paid to report to Parliament what potatoes they grow, what children have been born, and so on. I want to know if the special privileges conferred on them will not be extended, and if we will not have agents appointed in the different counties to report to this Parliament how we are getting on.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that there are many of the Indians who do not speak English or French, and that there is no provision made for interpreting. It seems to me the hon. gentlemen will find it necessary to make such a provision in this Bill, or by an amendment in the Election Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If so, we would have to provide for the Germans, and the Poles, and the Mennonites, and people from the south and west of Ireland, who do not speak the English language.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all.

On section 10,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think this is quite a reasonable hour; I think we ought to have finished

a while ago. However, I do not complain; we have got through a very important portion of the Bill, and we have now entered upon another portion, which has received a great deal of discussion, and which, I must say, within reasonable grounds, called for discussion, though I think the bounds were immensely exceeded. However, I do not wish to press for anything more to-night, and I will move that the committee now rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:35 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I beg to move that the third report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates be adopted. I might say that last week, when the report was presented, the leader of the Opposition asked that a statement should be made as to the probable saving effected by the proposed changes, and that we should adjourn the debate so as to take up the question——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot take it up to-day.

Mr. WHITE. No; but I propose simply to make a statement as to the probable saving to be effected by the adoption of the report presented last week. I might say that in the present edition of *Hansard* there is 1,350 copies of what is called the daily edition—that is, the number sent around to members every day. Of the bound edition there are 1,100 copies of English and 350 French. Under the proposed arrangement we will have 600 copies of English and 180 of French, it being proposed that each member, instead of receiving five copies, shall receive but two, which will effect a saving in the number of copies of 670 altogether. The cost of the composition, that is, the mere typesetting, will not be materially changed by the new process, because there will be the same amount of matter to be set up, but a very considerable saving will be effected in binding, paper, and presswork, in the boxes in which these *Hansards* are sent to members, and in the express charges in sending them. The saving on these items is estimated in the aggregate at $4,000. That statement has been made up by Mr. Hartney, Mr. Brewer, and also Mr. Romaine, who made a very careful estimate of the probable saving. The amounts paid for salaries of reporters, translators, French proof-reader, English proof-reader—the gentleman who prepares the index—and the amanuenses, will be the same. The cost of *Hansard* last year, which we suppose may be regarded as a reasonable Session, was $38,114.84, but that did not include the increase in the salaries of the translators and the short-hand writers. The reporters, translators, proof-readers and amanuenses cost now, at the rate which was agreed to be given last Session, in the aggregate $26,696. The proposal made by the reporters themselves, and which forms part of this report, is a mere suggestion. Of course, the Debates Committee have no power to make an absolute recommendation on that question, and the offer is stated, that is, that the reporters, whose salaries are now annual salaries, and who are practically officers of the House, should be employed during the recess, where the Government require the use of short-hand writers, in connection with commissions, the court of claims about to be established, the Supreme Court, if necessary, departmental enquiries, or other work of that description. By returns which have been brought down this year I find that that the cost, during the last three years, of mere special reporting work, chiefly on commissions, amounted to about $4,000 a year; so that the saving in printing and from the use of the reporters in that way would be about $8,000 in the aggregate. I may say, however—if one may anticipate a report which will probably be shortly made from the Printing Committee—that if the printing of *Hansard* is included in the contract for the general printing of Parliament, the probability is that the cost of printing will be very much reduced. The contract for the printing of *Hansard* now is a special contract. It was made with the contractors for the printing of Parliament—in fact, no one else in the city was able to undertake it—and they charge 60 cents a thousand ems for composition. Looking at the matter with some practical experience, I think that will probably be reduced at least one-fourth, if the printing of *Hansard* is included in the general contract. So that, according to my estimate, the saving that would be effected by all these changes is about $10,000 a year. Hon. members will notice by the report presented, that the form of *Hansard* is proposed to be changed. Instead of having the large, bulky volume, in large type, the proposal is to make it an octavo volume, uniform with our Journals and Sessional Papers, and printed in smaller type; as, after all, it is a matter of record, and the question of larger type is of no possible value. In that way we make a large saving of presswork and paper, and also in binding. We pay, to-day, for the binding, 90 cents a volume. The estimate made as to what it will cost in the new form is 40 cents a volume, less than one-half; and I may say that the estimate I have made is on the basis of three volumes octavo, instead of two large quarto volumes. The whole saving, as I said, will amount to about $10,000 a year.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the hon. gentleman had arranged to give us the information as to the probable saving before he proposed to move the adoption of the report.

Mr. WHITE. I am going to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked twenty-four hours' notice. I may say, however, that the information the hon. gentleman has given requires to be supplemented by a division of the saving into two items. I think different considerations apply to the reduction in the number of copies and to the size of type, and we ought to know, before we are called upon to deal with the two propositions, what the effects of each, separately, would be.

Mr. WHITE. The reduction on the printing and paper and binding will be somewhere about one-half.

Mr. BLAKE. About $2,000 each.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; that is about the estimate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest that instead of the debate being adjourned the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman move it to-morrow.

Mr. WHITE. We will give twenty-four hours' notice.

Motion to concur in Report withdrawn.

IMPORTATIONS OF PRISON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. PLATT asked, Have any importations of manufactured goods, the product of prison labor, imported from the United States, been seized or detained by the Customs authorities of Canada? If so, who were the importers, and what disposition has been made of such goods?

Mr. BOWELL. Several importations of goods, in whole and in part the product of prison labor, have been detained by the Customs. In every case where it has been conclusively shown that the order for the goods was given prior to the passing of the resolutions, the importers have been permitted to re-export the goods. It is not deemed advisable to give the names of the importers.

GOVERNMENT QUARANTINE.

Mr. TASCHEREAU asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint, as has been already done, visiting physicians stationed at Father Point, who will visit and accompany, as far as the quarantine station at Grosse Isle, if there is reason, or Quebec, each steamship, whether carrying mails from beyond the sea or emigrants or passengers, and who will report on the sanitary condition of the steamship?

Mr. POPE. With respect to the first part of the question, it has been done already. At present, all the mail steamers that call at Rimouski are examined by a physician there; all other vessels and steamers are examined at Grosse Isle.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether it is true that the Militia Department deducted from the amount of pay due to Achille Blais, a private of the 9th Battalion, who died at Winnipeg while he was in the service of the country, the funeral expenses of the said Blais?

Mr. CARON. So far as the information the Department has obtained is concerned, it is not true. Every expense connected with the death of any of the volunteers has been met by the Government, so far as they could be ascertained by the Department.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether it is true, as stated by the special correspondent of the Toronto *Mail* at Clark's Crossing, on the 8th May, that soldiers pillaged the houses of half-breeds and destroyed a quantity of articles belonging to them; if it is true that they demolished Madame Tourand's house at Fish Bay, broke her furniture and broke up a sewing machine and a stove; if it is true that at Gabriel's Crossing they destroyed the windows of the residence of one Vandal, broke up the clock and bedsteads and strewed the floor with the remains of broken furniture, and then, next day, set the house on fire; if it is the intention of the Government to instruct commanding officers to take the necessary steps to prevent a repetition of such excesses and to punish those who have been guilty of them?

Mr. CARON. It is not true. Strict orders were given by General Middleton to the force not to enter any house or touch any property, under pain of severe punishment. Official despatches received mention nothing about Madame Tourand's furniture, sewing machine or stove. Some broken glass must be expected where guns are brought to bear upon a village; but no official account has been received as to the number broken on Mr. Vandal's residence—nor about his clock or his bedstead. The intention of the Government is to allow the commanding officer, who knows his duty as a soldier, to look after the troops under his command.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has received despaches not yet laid on the Table giving accounts of: 1. The Duck Lake fight; 2. The Fish Creek fight; 3. The fights at and near Batoche; 4. The fight with Poundmaker; 5. The evacuation of Carlton; 6. The affair at Frog Lake; 7. The affair at Fort Pitt; And from whom have such despatches been received, and when?

Mr. CARON. Telegrams were received, which I communicated, from time to time, to the House. Now, that the troubles are, I hope, very nearly finished, the Department expect to receive official reports of the different engagements which are mentioned in this question, which reports will be laid upon the Table.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has given any instructions to or communicated with General Middleton, as to the disposition of any of the insurgents who have surrendered?

Mr. CARON. No instructions were issued to General Middleton, except in so far as instructing him to send to Regina the persons whom he considered should be committed for trial.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the number of claims, so far, recognised by the half-breed commission now at work? What is the number of claims rejected by the commission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The commissioners have, up to date, reported the issue of 140 certificates for scrip to North-West half-breeds. There is no report from the commissioners, up to date, having reference to rejected claims.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the number of the North-West Police exceeds that authorized by law, and, if so, to what extent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. About 240 recruits have been engaged, in view of the proposed increase of the force. We hope to get a good many from the battalions now in the west when they are ordered home.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many claims preferred by Manitoba half-breed minors, remain, for want of proof, as yet unacknowledged by the Government? How many claims so preferred have been rejected?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report from the Department is that:—(1.) There are fifteen claims filed in the Department of the Interior preferred by Manitoba half-breed minors which require additional evidence before they can be recognised. (2.) The Department has no means of ascertaining how many of those which were preferred will be rejected, until the evidence in each case has been received.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is, how many have been rejected; none have been, I suppose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume not, from the answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government gave General Middleton any instructions or suggestions, or had any prior communication with him, or has received any despatch not brought down, from him, on the subject of: (1.) His message or proclamation to the insurgents after the Fish Creek fight? (2.) Or his message to Louis Riel at Batoche?

Mr. CARON. No instructions were issued about the first or second portion of this question. As to the question referring to the letter written by General Middleton, that letter

was read here by myself, when it was communicated to me by telegram.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government intends to propose to Parliament some increase of pay to the volunteers on active service in the North-West, so that their families may not be dependent on private contributions for subsistence during the absence of their bread-winners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole question of the treatment of the volunteers on active service, and of their families and also with respect to the families of those who have, unfortunately, fallen, and also with respect to the wounded, is under consideration of the Government, and the matter will be submitted to Parliament during the present Session.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Were the seven-pounder guns used in the fight with Poundmader, Mounted Police guns? If not, to what part of the force did they belong?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They belong to the Mounted Police.

PAYMENT OF CLERKS IN DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any of the clerks in any of the Departments have not received their pay at the ordinary times of payment? If so how many clerks, and in what Departments, for how long and for what reason? Whether the delay in despatching parties on the Geological Survey is attributable to there being no available appropriation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no clerks in the Department of the Interior who have not received their pay at the ordinary times of payment. The Director of the Geological Survey says: "No delay has, up to the present, occurred on that account. Two parties have been dispatched, one to Hudson Bay and one to Lake Mistassini. The other officers have been busy with the preparation of their maps. The lateness of the season also made it advisable not to take the field as early as usual, viz., the middle of May."

Mr. BOWELL. There has been no delay in my Department.

DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL FRANCHISES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the First Minister received from the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia the following despatch:—

HALIFAX, February 17th, 1885.

Right Honorable Sir John A. Macdonald, Ottawa.

In view of the intention of the Dominion and Provincial Governments to introduce Franchise Bills, it seems probable that there will be much confusion and inconvenience. It is very desirable, for the convenience of the public, that the Dominion and provincial franchise be the same. On behalf of the Nova Scotia Government I would suggest that action be deferred for the present, and that during the recess a conference be held between the Dominion Government and such of the Provincial Governments as may consent to participate, with a view to an agreement on a uniform franchise. Please let me know by wire whether you can entertain the proposal.

W. S. FIELDING.

Whether the said despatch has been acknowledged, and if so, when? Whether the said despatch has been answered, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A telegram from Mr. Fielding about the franchise has been received. I have searched for it and cannot lay hands upon it. I have no doubt I will find it; we are now looking for it, and the answer will be endorsed on its back. All I can say, however, is, that no action was taken.

DOMINION LANDS PATENTS—CHARGES OF FRAUD.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether besides Laing, the clerk at Ottawa, one Mathewman, a clerk at Winnipeg, is implicated in charges of fraud in connection with the procuring of patents of Dominion lands? Whether it has been ascertained that Mathewman has for a long time been taking bribes either in money or in scrip or land for the procuring and expediting of patents?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is not now and never was at any period, a clerk in the service of the Department of the Interior, either at Winnipeg or elsewhere, of the name of Mathewman, There is a brother-in-law of Mr. Laing, whose name is Mathewman, but he is a resident of Ottawa, although it is understood he has at various times made lengthened visits to Winnipeg. The whole subject covered by this enquiry is at present under investigation.

GOVERNMENT AGENTS IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—FEES FROM SETTLERS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has received any information that any of its agents in the North-West Territories have taken for their own use fees or money from settlers in connection with land cases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not received any information that any of the agents of the Department of the Interior have taken, for their own use, fees or money from settlers in land cases, but it has been made cause of complaint against some of the agents that in their capacity as justices of the peace, they have taken fees for affidavits, which were made before them for the convenience of settlers, and which, if made before other magistrates, would have been subject to the fee charged by the agents.

COLONISATION COMPANIES—TOWNSHIP SURVEYS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the dates of the surveys of the townships allotted to the Prince Albert Colonisation Company, and of the approval of those surveys? How many settlers were reported by the surveyors on the tract? How many settlers were reported by the inspector of colonisation companies on the tract prior to the commencement of settlement by the company. At what date or dates did the inspector report on this tract? How many reports did he make?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The following is the information asked for:—

PRINCE ALBERT COLONISATION COMPANY.

Tp. 45*a*,	R. 26,	w. 2nd Mer.,	surveyed season '83;	approved 18th Sept., '83
" 46*a*,	" 26,	"	" May, '83;	" 19th April, '84
" 45*a*,	" 27,	"	" season '83;	" 18th Sept., '83
" 45,	" 27,	"	" " '82;	" 22nd Dec., '82
" 44,	" 28,	"	" Feb. '83;	" 18th July, '83
" 45*a*,	" 28,	"	" March '83;	" 15th Nov, '83
" 43,	" 28,	"	" season '83;	not approved.

The surveyor reported five settlers on the tract. The inspector of colonisation societies reported ten settlers on the tract prior to the commencement of settlement by the company. Date of the report of the inspector, 19th November, 1884. The inspector made only one report on this company's tract. The total number of settlers on the tract at that time was twenty-nine, including the ten settlers who were on the land prior to the commencement of settlement by the company.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the dates of the surveys of the townships allotted to the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Colonisation Company, and of the approval of those surveys? How many settlers were reported by the surveyors on the tract? How many settlers were reported by the inspector of colonisation companies on the tract prior to the commencement of settlement by the company? At what date or dates did the inspector report on this tract? How many reports did he make?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The surveys were made and approved as follows:—

Tp. 53,	R. 23,	w. 4th	Mer.,	surveyed	season '82,	approved	22nd June, '83
" 54,	" 23,	"	"	"	'82,	"	22nd June, '83
" 55,	" 23,	"	"	"	'82,	"	22nd June, '83
" 53,	" 24,	"	"	"	'82,	"	25th June, '83
" 54,	" 24,	"	"	"	'82,	"	12th Feb, '83
" 55,	" 24,	"	"	"	'83,	"	2nd April, '83

The surveyor reported 14 settlers on the tract. The inspector of colonization societies reported 49 settlers on the tract prior to the commencement of settlement by the company. Date of the reports of the inspector, 30th August, 1884. The inspector made two reports, both on the same date; one upon townships 53 and 54 in ranges 23 and 24; and the other upon township 55 in ranges 23 and 24. The total number of settlers on the tract at that time was 115, including the 49 settlers who were on the land prior to the commencement of settlement by the company.

MANITOBA ROUNDHOUSE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When, and in whose name, did the patent for the roundhouse property in Manitoba issue? Is it one of the patents irregularly issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was incidentally ascertained about a year ago, that the roundhouse at Selkirk is probably upon a part of lot 72. This lot is shown, by evidence furnished to the Department in the usual way, to have been occupied at the time of the transfer by one George Johnstone, a half-breed, who sold to one Thomas Taylor, in the month of July, 1874; Taylor, in November of the same year, sold to one David Glass, barrister—now city solicitor—of Winnipeg, and at the time of the purchase, I am informed, a member of the firm of Sifton, Glass & Fleming, railway and telegraph contractors; Glass sold to one John S. Dennis, jr., of Winnipeg, Dominion Land Surveyor, on the 13th March, 1882; and shortly afterwards, the claim having been approved by the Department of Justice, patent issued to Dennis. If the Department of the Interior, at or before the date of issue of the patent, had had information that the roundhouse was upon this lot, the ground occupied by it would have been exempted from the operations of the patent.

FRENCH CANADIANS IN CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CATUDAL asked, What are the names of the two French Canadians employed in the inside branch of the Customs Department at Ottawa? What is the annual salary or monthly pay of each? When were they appointed?

Mr. BOWELL. The names are Charles Boivin and Alide Lacerte, they received, respectively, $600 and $500. The first was appointed 14th July, 1883, and the second, 1st June, 1882. These officers were appointed to the inside service on vacancies being created through the superanuation of Messrs. Hay and Peachy.

WATERPROOF BLANKETS.

Mr. CATUDAL. Has the Militia Department purchased a quantity of rubber or waterproof blankets for the use of the Volunteers in the North-West or elsewhere? If so, from whom were such blankets or covering purchased and what prices were paid?

Mr. CARON. The Department of Militia has bought 1,700 waterproof blankets from George May of Ottawa, at $1.40 each; 1,200 from the Gutta Percha and Rubber Manufacturing Company of Toronto, at $1.38 each, and 500 from the Goodyear Rubber Company of Montreal, at $1.25 each, making in all 3,400 waterproof blankets.

PETITIONS AGAINST THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. McNEILL. I desire to make a personal explanation. A short time ago I received a letter, which I hold here, from a gentleman in Wiarton. I am under rather embarrassing conditions in connection with this letter, for I have not yet received authority to read it, but, under the peculiar circumstances in which I stand, I am satisfied that my friend would allow me, in justification of my own character for veracity, to read this letter to the House. A day or two after the receipt of the letter—and I say this only to explain why I read it—I received a communication from the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), calling my attention to a petition which had been sent from Wiarton against the passage of the Franchise Bill, and which he informed me had been signed by 28 Conservatives. I replied to his letter immediately, thanking him for his communication, telling him I had heard of the petition already, and also something as to the means that had been employed to obtain signatures to it. Being in possession of the information I then had, I attached not the very smallest importance to the petition, so far as it was an exposition of the views of those who had signed it, but I considered it interesting as an evidence of the manner in which the signatures were obtained to that petition. I was in the Library on the subsequent day when the hon. gentleman made a reference to a paragraph which had appeared in one of the local papers, and as I was not present, my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), said that he thought that the hon. gentleman, under the circumstances, ought to have read the communication that I had sent to him. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), said that no doubt, if I were in my place, I would be able to say whether the names had been obtained improperly.

Mr. EDGAR. No, whether they were forgeries or not.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, I was informed that the hon. gentleman was speaking of whether they were obtained by misrepresentation or not; but, of course, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. Nevertheless, my hon. friend thought that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), being in possession of this document from me, might have communicated the contents of it to the House. My hon. friend who sits near me, from Cape Breton, had been shown by me the letter which I had received from the hon. member from West Ontario. He then got up in his place, and very kindly, in my absence, in order to justify the statement I had made in my letter to the hon. gentleman, said he was aware that I had received a letter from one of my constituents, stating that these signatures had been obtained by misrepresentation. Now, the House will excuse me for the length of time I have taken in respect to this matter, because I am desirous of explaining how the contents of this letter came before the House at all. When I received this letter, I had no intention of reading it, unless I had permission from the writer. But, under the circumstances, as I have said, I think it would be only right that I should communicate to the House the contents of the letter. It is dated the 14th May, and I received it two days before the hon. gentleman brought up the matter in the House. This is the letter:

"WIARTON, 14th May, 1885.

"ALEX. MCNEILL, Esq.

* * * * * * *

"I have no doubt you will be surprised when you see the number of Conservatives that have signed the petitions, as I was myself. But when you are acquainted with the means used to get signers you will not wonder at the number of names on it.

"Alex. Campbell, of Manlay's drug store, handled the petitions. As petitions are a common occurrence, and almost everybody signs them if the party operating them is liked, that has been the case in this instance. Few of those signing it took the trouble to read it, and simply took Campbell's word for the contents. Some say they signed it without knowing what it was. To others the petition (that is Conservatives) was read including the North-West Indians, etc. All kinds of deception was practised, as only Grits know how to practise it, and the Conservatives who signed the petition, when it is too late, are very angry at themselves for allowing any Grit to so far impose on them. I write on behalf of those Conservatives who have signed, showing how their signatures were obtained. These are facts that have come under my own observation when it was too late to remedy them."

I think hon. gentlemen will admit that when I was in possession of that information I was perfectly justified in making the statement I did. Of course I cannot read the name of my informant, but I may say that the person who wrote this letter to me is as honorable, and upright, and as thoroughly trustworthy a man as can be found anywhere, and I am just as certain as I can be of anything told me by any man, that the gentleman who wrote me this letter was requested by some of the signers of that petition to do so; and I am just as certain, also, that he believed when he wrote the letter that he was expressing the views of all those Conservatives who signed that document. I may also say that since then I have received a letter from another gentleman in reference to the petition, in which this passage occurs:

"A large number of names were got by fraud and misrepresentation, so far as I can learn."

Now, so far as the document presented by the hon. gentleman a day or two ago is concerned, I would just say that having looked it over since then I must in all candor confess that I see names upon that document of thoroughly intelligent men, who have always been considered, and who are, good Conservatives. It is only just and right that I should make that statement. But I may say at the same time that there are other names upon that document, which are purported to be signed only by Conservatives, of men who, I think I can say without doubt, voted against me at the last election; and I think I shall be able in a short time to give the House further information on this matter. I should just like to say that so far as I am concerned I think that the Conservatives who signed that petition are perfectly justified in signing it, are perfectly justified in signing any petition to this House which they believe to be a righteous petition. I am satisfied that hon. members on both sides of this House will agree with me when I say that I am not one of those who hold that the best friends of their party are those who, in ordinary parlance, "go it blind," or in other words, who put party before country; but I do say, and I repeat, that I am satisfied that many of those who signed this last document would not have signed it had they been in possession of all the facts in connection with the matter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have got a letter also from Wiarton which you will permit me to read, as it will assist my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to put those Conservatives who signed this petition in a proper light. I do not like to see it stated that intelligent Conservatives would sign a petition not knowing the nature of it. I think it is a reflection upon them which I would not allow, as I have a great many Conservative friends myself, and I could not allow the Conservative party to be so slandered without entering my protest against it.

Mr. MCNEILL. I am quite certain the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent what I said.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, I am not going to.

Mr. MCNEILL. I did not say that any gentleman who signed that petition did so without knowing the nature of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will read this letter, with your permission, which says:

"I am happy to inform you that 27 Wiarton Conservatives signed a petition against the Franchise Bill. Now, I see by the Tory papers that the Tory crowd claim a fraud. Such is not the case. Surely it does not reflect much credit upon Wiarton Conservatives to say they don't know what they sign, as well as to say they don't know which way to vote, and only go the way they are dragged by the nose."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 10,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a subject that has already been discussed at considerable length, that is to say, the mode of registration and the officer who is to be appointed to register the voters. I may say that with respect to the 10 and 11th clauses, which have excited most discussion with respect to the persons to be appointed, the revising officer, that several hon. members in speaking to the clause objected to the word "may" and desired it to be "shall." I do not think that is necessary under the ordinary mode of statutory construction; but the word "may" will be altered to "shall". The clause reads at present:

"A revising officer to be appointed under this Act may,"

I change that to:

"A revising officer to be appointed under this Act shall, in any Province, except Quebec."

I propose to except Quebec and British Columbia. The reason I make British Columbia an exception as well as Quebec from the general rule laid down as to the appointment is, that on the mainland, in the interior of British Columbia, there are no practicing barristers and there are some judges who may be appointed, but they may not all be available. With the exception of these two Provinces it is proposed that the revising officer shall be either a judge or a junior judge of any County or District Court (putting in the word "district") in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province. In the Province of Quebec he shall be either a judge of the Superior Court of Lower Canada, or an advocate or notary (it is proposed to insert "notary") of at least five years' standing. As the House knows, the notaries in the Province of Quebec are leading men, and are as much, if not more, acquainted with, and employed in, matters connected with real property than are advocates. With respect to the Province of British Columbia I propose that the following words be inserted:—

And in the Province of British Columbia the revising officer shall be either a judge of the Superior Court or of the County or District Courts, or a barrister of at least five years standing, or a stipendiary magistrate.

Stipendiary magistrates are men—at least some of them—who formerly performed judicial functions, they were Gold Commissioners and acted generally in a judicial capacity. The clause as I now propose to submit it to the committee will read as follows:—

Any revising officer to be appointed under this Act shall, in any Province except Quebec and British Columbia, be either a judge or junior judge of any County or District Court in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province. In the Province of Quebec he shall be either a judge of the Superior Court of Lower Canada or an advocate or notary of that Province of at least five years' standing.

There is a proviso added to the clause, which I propose to amend. It provides that the same returning officer may be appointed for and require to discharge the duties in respect to more than one electoral district. I also propose that he may be appointed for a portion of an electoral district. I add that clause because judicial districts, certainly in Ontario, and I believe it is the same in other Provinces, and electoral districts, are not the same. Take the case of an electoral district. A large portion of that district belongs to one electoral district. There may be a portion of it attached to another electoral district for electoral purposes. Then it will be more convenient to make the judge of the municipal and judicial district the revising barrister of that portion of his judicial district which belongs for electoral purposes to another district. Then, after the lengthy discussion which I have already mentioned, I propose that in all cases where the revising officer is not a judge himself, there shall be an appeal to the courts, and that shall be as well on fact as on law, and it shall not rest with the revising officer to grant it. Under an appeal made under the conditions specified in the Bill, the appeal shall go. These are the suggestions I make with respect to this branch of the subject. The first clause before us is merely authorising the appointment of the revising officer, the tenure of his office, and so on. I move the adoption of section 10.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposals which the hon. gentleman have laid before us are, I regret to hear, inadequate to the position of the case as it has been demonstrated in the discussions to which he has referred. The clause which we have before us, the hon. gentleman has thought, and rightly thought, involves, in order to its consideration, an explanation of his purposes with respect to dealing with the subject. But that clause in itself, even standing alone and without reference to the other clauses, deals with this subject in a manner which I think is entirely unsatisfactory, because it prescribes, in general terms, the duties of the functionary who is to be appointed by the Governor in Council. That duty is declared to be, not to revise but to prepare, revise and complete the list; and therefore, we are face to face in this clause, limiting ourselves to the four corners of it, and not extending our view as we may fairly do as we have been invited to do by the explanation of the hon. gentleman, with the two questions: The mode of the appointment of the revising officer; and a general description of the functions of that officer. I object to the duties assigned to the revising officer. I say that the name of that officer is, having regard to his duties, a misnomer. The hon. gentleman does not propose to make a revising officer; he proposes to make an officer who will make the lists, and having made them, revise them, and, having revised them, complete them; and therefore the primary function of this revising officer is to do something which he is afterwards to revise. Now, I say that that very statement of the case, shows that there is here a proposed combination of functions, which are certainly distinct; and, to a certain extent, as I think I shall demonstrate, incompatible functions. I say it is better that the person who is to revise the list, should revise the handiwork of another, rather than his own. We have had a good deal of revising going on the last two or three weeks in this Parliament, and one of the inconveniences has been the conjunction of the offices of maker and reviser of the document. The revision would have been better, the amendments more extensive, much more would have been struck out, and put in, had it not been that the reviser in chief of the document now under consideration, was also the maker of that document, and was obviously desirous that his handiwork should be confessed by him as little imperfect as possible. Now, practice shows the propriety and convenience of the separation of those offices, as well. Whence do we draw, whence does the hon. gentleman invite us frequently to draw, our inspiration in our legislation, except from the old land, and the practice in England ever since—so far as I know—they have had a system of registering and revising the lists, and certainly ever since the time of the passage of the great Reform Bill of 1832, has been in accordance with the argument I present to you, namely, that the functions of making and of revising the lists ought to be, as it is there, in wholly separate hands. There the lists are made by those who best know how to make the lists. The lists are made by the local authorities of the small sub-divisions, having that local and minute knowledge of the inhabitants in the sub-division, of their position, of their property, of their standing, which enables them to make a good list, and the list so made is revised by another and distinct officer, appointed by other persons, and in a different fashion. Then, Sir, we are not necessarily confined to our knowledge of the English practice as a guide—but we can refer as a guide to English practice which has worked satisfactorily. It is not simply because it has been written down in English Statute Books, but because it has been found to work so well—not without inconvenience and difficulty, I admit—but so well, so much better than any other scheme that can be devised and that, although attention is being directed to this subject continuously, although it forms a large part of the practical working of the election law, although the franchise has been extended several times, and although propositions for the extension of the franchise and the more perfect representation of the people in Parliament have been before the English people and the English House of Commons, off and on, for a great many years, you do not find any serious proposal to alter this arrangement by which the local authorities of the small sub-divisions, having the knowledge and experience to which I have referred, make the primary lists. We are not, however, confined to English statute law, or English experience; we can turn to our own. We find that in the different Provinces in which lists have been prepared, the system has ruled with us up to this time, of a local making of the lists. I do not speak of a provincial making of the lists, I do not use the word local in that sense, but with reference to the small sub-divisions of the electoral district, the municipal sub-divisions out of which the electoral district is composed, and when I speak of local authorities, I speak of that class of authorities which are created under—it may be the Provincial Legislature, it is true—but in which the men are appointed, as a rule, by the people of the locality themselves. I say, then, with us, in the old Provinces of Canada, before Canada was a Dominion; in the other Provinces, where there are lists, since Canada has been created a Dominion, the rule has been the preparation of these lists by local authorities. So that we can appeal to our own practice, to our own experience, as another reason why we should adopt this plan. I may go further, Sir. This, if it is not the first time, as I have said before, when the hon. gentleman has brought forward a Franchise Bill in this Parliament, and his Bills of the earlier years, the Bill of 1869 I think, the Bill of 1870 I am sure, contained different provisions from this. It contained the provision, objectionable as I conceive in the highest degree, that the Governor in Council should appoint the persons to make the lists, but it recognised the wisdom of the view that the persons to make the lists should not be the persons to revise it. For the hon. gentleman in that measure proposed a board of three persons for each electoral district, who should make the first list. He felt that a more minute local knowledge was necessary than could be obtained by the appointment of any one individual for an electoral district, and therefore he proposed more than one so that there might be an aggregation in the mind of the board, of the local knowledge which was essential, and he proposed a board to prepare the first list, and after that preparation of the first list, the revision of that list, and the framing of the voters'

list for the first year, was to be with the judiciary —with the County Court judges, with the District Court judges in Quebec. The Province of Nova Scotia had, at that time no County Courts, and in that Province on that ground, the hon. gentleman made special provision for the appointment of a revising barrister. But throughout the whole of the rest of the Dominion, where he could find county judges, or district or superior judges, as in Quebec, the hon. gentleman proposed a separate board for making the lists, and the subsequent operation—not for the first year only, but for all time thereafter—was put in the hands of the judiciary exclusively. The list which was revised first by the judge, was to be the basis of the list for every subsequent year, so that the Government nomination had nothing to do with any such proceeding. Now, the reason of the thing is in accordance with these views. I ask whether I do not establish a very strong *primâ facie* case for the adoption of these views, when I point to the legislation and the practice of England in like matters, to the legislation and the practice of the Provinces of old Canada and of the Provinces since Canada was confederated in like matters, when I point to the hon. gentleman's proposal in a like matter, in the years 1869 and 1870. But, Sir, one may ask why it is that there is this consensus of legislation and of practice. It is founded I believe on good sense, on the exigency of the case. What should be our object? Our object should be to obtain as good and full a primary list as possible. As little as possible ought to be required to be subject to an appeal, which is a source of trouble and expense and loss of time to the individual voter or to the party organisation—I say, as little should be left to an appeal as possible; and, in order that as little should be left to appeal or revision, in order that as little as possible should be left to the subsequent proceedings, requiring attendance of parties and the taking of evidence at a time to be fixed, it is necessary that the first list should be as full and complete as possible. in the effort to secure a proper representation of the people in Parliament we can deal with no more important topic than the machinery for the making of the lists; and it has been recognised in the discussions in the English Parliament as an object of primary and growing importance to secure that by a plan giving as little room for doubt and difficulty and omission and erroneous insertions as possible, so that the voter shall get on the list with as little trouble to himself as possible. If that is the view in England, where wealth abounds, where party organisations exist in every constituency which is at all equally divided, where it is a custom to have an attorney or several attorneys in the different parts of the riding engaged from year to year in making out and completing the lists, where a system almost perfect in its operation has prevailed for years, involving a very great expense—if that was important there, how much more important is it here. That difficulty has given rise to recent legislation in England with the view of reducing the expenses of elections—not the expense of the immediate canvass at the polls, but the constant drain of expenses, even upon wealthy candidates and wealthy party organisations, which were going on from year to year for a considerable time before the elections; and with the object of remedying this abuse which had grown up, it was pointed out that the list must be so made as to cause as little expense and inconvenience as possible to the voter in getting his name placed upon it. Now, how can that object be reached? It is assential to reaching that object that there should be minute local knowledge on the part of those who make the primary lists. It can be made effectively only by those who know a small area of the country, who know everybody in that area, where they live, how they live, and who have that general information that we usually have about our neighbor. That local knowledge on the part of certain individuals in order that they may discharge their duties to the municipality, is an essential element in the making of a good list. Talk to me about being able to make a list from the assessment roll without more knowledge; you cannot do it. There may be Provinces and there may be counties—I know there are counties in the Province of Ontario—in which by degrees the assessment has approximated to the real value of the property; but I know also that there are many instances in which the assessment furnishes no just basis on which you can calculate the value of a man's property; because it is rated at much under its real value. It was only yesterday that the hon. member for King's, N.B., (Mr. Foster) was complaining of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), because he had used an argument derived from the assessment roll as to the disfranchising operation of the Bill in his Province, and he said that was not a good argument, because you could not depend on the assessment roll, for, although 25 per cent of the present voters might be disfranchised if you did, they would not be disfranchised because their property was worth more, that appeared by the assessment roll. Upon that arose an issue of fact. My hon. friend said the roll represented the real value in the Province; and how had that been brought about? A few years ago the assessment had been an undervaluation, but the real value had depreciated while the roll had kept up, so that there was an approximation. That state of things exists in some cases; in all cases it does not exist; but even if you were to confine yourself to the roll, local knowledge is required to enable you to judge who should be on the list. But that is not all. Under this measure large numbers of persons are entitled to the vote who do not appear on any assessment roll at all, and therefore the qualification of these persons must be ascertained from other sources of information than the assessment roll. From what source? From the local knowledge of the individual within a small area within which a man's intimate local knowledge extends; he knows the people, he knows the property on which they live, he knows those who have incomes. He may not be able with the most complete knowledge to give an absolutely perfect list; but if he, with all the knowledge he has, can only give you an approximately accurate list, how accurate will be that which is made by one man for the whole district? It is clear that an essential element for the making of a complete list is the sub-division of the work among a number of persons in the different localities, with regard to which each has accurate and full knowledge. Now, Sir, the mode in which this is to be obtained is by taking as the makers of these lists those municipal functionaries, who, from their knowledge of the people, and from the general nature of the work they have to accomplish for the municipality, have the requisite information to enable them to give you a good list, and these persons being appointed by the people—in some cases through the medium of elections, in some cases indirectly through the medium of the councils whom the people themselves elect—are responsible directly to that small community whom they serve, in the midst of which they live, and of which they have knowledge; and in each one performing for that small portion of the community to which he is responsible, the function of making the primary list, you have the best guarantee you can have for its being well made. I am not saying that the system is perfect. Hon. gentlemen bandy charges across the floor of fraudulent assessments. There is no doubt there have been fraudulent lists made, and for political purposes; but if you search the records, and look at the number of cases in which there have been appeals, you will find that the number of cases in which there is serious ground for complaint is infinitesimally small compared with the whole number of cases in which the function is discharged by those officers.

I say that in the whole Province round, in the townships or villages or towns in which this function is discharged, the primary function of preparing that from which the list is ultimately to be made, ascertain the number of cases in which there are careful lists made, in which there is no serious ground of complaint. They go unheard of, unnoticed; nobody says anything about them. They are like God's blessings, air and water and sunlight; but there are cloudy days and rainy days, cold and wintry days, and those make a mark, and we grumble about them. So it is with the lists. There are municipality cases in which the officer does not rise to his duty, in which he has erred or, worse than erred, acted improperly, and those you must expect under any human machinery. Do you suppose you are making a perfect human machine? Do you suppose that any machinery you can make will be automatically perfect? Do you suppose that there will not be difficulties and inconveniences in this machinery? Of course there will; but we have had a practical experience of great value, of large extent, for a great number of years, in the making of lists, which, practically, has answered very well on the whole, and it has this immense advantage: That the people are accustomed to it, that the people have confidence in it, that the people know that their right to be put on the list is dependent upon a man living in their own small community, known to them, and who holds his office during their good will. I say, therefore, before you reject that plan and adopt another, you have carefully to consider, not whether there may be an occasional instance of an abuse of this power, but whether, upon the whole, this plan has worked well, and whether it does not give prospects for working at least as well as the one you propose. Is the one you propose likely to work better? If it is not, you had better leave things as they are; there is no use in changing except for the purpose of improvement. Now, this work has to go on in the different Provinces, and it has to go on practically by this class of officials. They have to keep on making lists for the purpose of ascertaining who the voters shall be, whether you pass this Bill or not, and there is another reason for not making a change unless there is some imperative necessity. Why should we make a double function? Why have two sets of men preparing lists practically of a majority of people, the same in each community? Why should we have one set of lists prepared by officials, not appointed by the Local Governments, if that is your abhorrence, but appointed by the people themselves, the electors themselves, through the medium of their councillors, as a rule, and then have another set prepared by some county judge or barrister? Why appoint some county judge or some barrister to do practically the same work for you? Of course, I do not say that the lists will be the same, because you have a divergent franchise; but we know that divergent franchise will to a very large extent, embrace a very large number of men who will be on both lists; and the question of the excess on the larger list is, after all, a question which is comparatively easy to settle if you have that local knowledge which is an essential element in a satisfactory settlement. This is, as I have said, the advantage of having the present plan, of having a plan which will be continued, whether you like it or not, as a means of preparing electoral lists for the provincial elections; and to impose upon the people the duty of looking to a double making of the lists is, it seems to me, a very serious thing. I say you impose that upon them when you propose that other functionaries shall make the lists. Any man who knows that under the least liberal of the two franchises he is entitled to vote, knows practically that he will be on the list, if he has confidence in the local authorities; but he will have now to make another enquiry as to a different mode of treatment by another functionary, who is a resident in a county town or in some large place in the county, with reference to a Dominion election. I maintain, therefore, that we ought to leave the making of the lists with those local officers who have the best means of knowing those things which are essential to the making of a good list, and it will not be denied that we can impose this duty upon them as we have heretofore imposed administrative, official and judicial duties, from time to time, upon any of the citizens of Canada, as well by virtue of their official titles as by virtue of their names. In Ontario, I should say that it would be better to authorise the local municipality itself to name the person who should make the lists—the municipal council or the representative of the municipal council in the locality. The worst plan of all is that which puts the making of the lists in the hands of the Government of the day. Now, let us consider what the proposal is. The proposal is that the revising officer, who may be, as the hon. gentleman hints to us he most often will be, a County Court judge or a district judge, shall make the primary lists. How is he going to make them? He, of course, has not that minute knowledge of the condition in life of all the people within his county, of the qualifications and position of the men, young and old, which each, in his own little area—the municipal authorities to whom I have referred—naturally, and as a part of his duty, possesses. He will have to rely upon information given. If he is going to make anything like a correct primary list, he will have to make a visitation of some kind, and to find out, here, there and the other, from this man and that, who ought to be on the list. He cannot make a domiciliar visitation. It is not intended he should go up and down the concession lines and find out who is entitled to vote and who is not; he has to take the assessment roll in a sense as a primary basis, but when we give him the assessment roll, and even with reference to the names on the assessment roll, there is much he is expected to attain by personal enquiry. I may say that is not the idea; the hon. gentleman has not pretended it is. If it were we know the County Court judge could not discharge the duty consistently with the proper performance of his other duties. It would be impossible for him to make such an inquisition as that; but the revising officer, whether he be barrister or County Court judge, will have to communicate with people here and there, possessing minute local knowledge, and try and find out from them who should be on the list. Is it not better to take those people themselves and make them responsible before the light of day, before the face of the people, for the making of the primary lists, than to allow Mr. Justice so and so, or Mr. Barrister so and so, the revising officer, to communicate with and obtain from them, irresponsible, without the sanction of an oath, without the discharge of official duty in this regard, that information without which he is helpless to prepare anything that may be called a primary list. He has to communicate with these people all over the county, get that loose information he will get in that way, instead of getting information upon their responsibility to the public, by their being persons warranted to discharge the duty, responsible under the law as regards those whom they wilfully put off the lists or wrongfully put on them, for neglect of duty to the local authorities. I therefore contend we are on this clause face to face with a great fundamental question, the practical operation of which is going very seriously to affect the representation of this people in Parliament. Had the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland carried it would not have accomplished all that some people expected from it. Because some people talk as if it would have saved entirely the expense involved in your system, but it would have accomplished much, because the test which was proposed—and it is only as a test, of course, that it could have been proposed; it is not the test I would myself propose, the payment of taxes—is one of very simple application, and it

would be a comparatively easy thing to make a perfect list according to that view. The task under this Bill, which contains so many different franchises, based upon so many different qualifications, requiring so much knowledge which can be obtained only by investigation, except from those who have that general knowledge of the people amongst whom they immediately live, is a task entirely different, and therefore, the more complicated your franchise, the greater your number of qualifications, the larger the sets of conditions under which people are admitted or excluded, the narrower the distinctions of value and otherwise upon which depends the right to be placed upon the list, the more important it is to consider whether the capacities of already acquired knowledge or the capacity of acquiring the knowledge satisfactorily by any one man, County Court judge or other, is going to be such as that this scheme shall carry satisfactorily, is going to be such as that the primary list shall be well and thoroughly and completely made. Now I turn next to the function of this officer. His only function under his name, the only function he can consistently perform is that of revision, the function of a revising officer. The hon. gentleman, not to day, but on former occasions, stated that this revising officer would be the judge in a great many cases, but he pointed out rather ominously, in one of the statements he made in the course of this debate, that we must not forget that in the Province of Ontario there were some forty counties, I think, while there were ninety-two constituencies, as much as to say that it could not be that always or in a good many cases the County Court judge would be called on to discharge the duty. At a subsequent period of the discussion, the hon. gentleman stated that more light had flowed in upon him since he spoke before, and that he had received communications from many County Court judges, indicating that they would make no difficulty, and that they thought the work could be well and thoroughly performed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Several County Court judges, not many.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—several only. I told him at that time, and I tell him now, that the proper function, the function that could be practically discharged, that of revision, the function which they are discharging now, he will find no difficulty whatever in obtaining their assistance to discharge, always supposing he gives them some remuneration for it; but, as to their undertaking to make the lists and do it satisfactorily, I do not think that is within the bounds of reason to expect. I maintain that, if it is to be the rule that the County Court judge shall be the officer, and, if it is only in those cases in which he declines, either from reluctance to undertake that task, which would be very rare, or from inability to discharge it coincidently with the discharge of his judicial functions, which will also be very rare, I say if, in these cases, the appointment of revising officer is to be made, this clause ought to be amended further, and the provision ought to be distinct and express that the County Court judge or junior judge, describing him properly, shall be the revising officer in all cases except when he declines to act. And I say that, in those cases in which he declines to act, he being bound to act unless he gives due notice of declination, in those cases, be they few or be they many, the Government should not appoint the revising officer who is to fill his place. I say that the revising officer who is to act under those circumstances should be appointed by some other authority than the Executive of the country. I maintain that, as to the judge, he should not owe his appointment in this regard to the good will or pleasure of the Executive, and I maintain *a fortiori* that, as to the revising officer, he should not owe his appointment to the good will and pleasure of the Executive. Do you want to make the judge suspected? Pass this Bill as it is, in which you know his appointment as revising officer is not dependent upon his judicial status, but upon the will and pleasure of the Government of the day, in which it may not be continued from year to year, except in so far as satisfactorily to them he discharges his duty; pass this Bill in the way you wish, if you want the revising officer to be suspected, if he is not a judge. It has been impudently stated, in a sheet supporting the Government from time to time, for years past, that I could not oppose this proposition because I once referred the hon. gentleman to the revising officer in England, because, when he was proposing a board of three persons to be named by himself, I pointed out that the English system of revising officers worked on a different line, and that the revising barrister was appointed not by the Executive, but by the judges of the land. Therefore, forsooth, because I am not in favor of the principle of this mode of appointment, because I objected then to what the hon. gentleman was proposing in this very regard, I am bound to favor it now. I am not inclined, I hope, to place on too low a position the political morality of our country, the political morality of parties, the standing of those who at one time or another may have the majority in this country, but I say that you have got to remember, whatever elevated view you may take with reference to our status, however far you may be disposed to go in the assertion that Canada will not depart from those principles of justice and fair play which must underlie parliamentary government and all other forms of government—and without it, your talk of self-government is a farce, and your talk of parliamentary government is worse than a farce—however much you may be disposed to affirm that no party when in power will use its power to aggrandise itself to the prejudice of the minority, to perpetuate its own power by unfair means, we cannot contend that we are less liable to misuse our strength, that we are less restrained by high considerations of the character to which I have refered, that we are less moved by those baser considerations to which I have refered than the English people, the English parties, the English Governments; and yet there no Government was bold enough to propose to the free Parliament of England that it should be entrusted with the nomination of the men to make or to revise the lists, no Parliament has been base enough to surrender to the Executive Government, in which it confided, that power. They felt that it was a power which ought not to be asked, and they did not ask it. They proposed a different mode of appointment. Why? Why is it that an English Government proposed to an English Parliament, and an English Parliament accepted and recorded upon the Statute Book, where it stands, amid all the vicissitudes of electoral laws, from that time to this, the proposition that the judges of the land should be the persons who should appoint the revising officers? It was because they felt that it was a power with which the Government of the day ought not to ask that it should be entrusted. It was because they felt that the appointment coming from that source was coming from a suspected and a painted source in the eyes of the people; it was because they felt that those engaged in the discharge of this duty could not do it with a fair chance of being considered impartial between the two great parties, if they were the nominees of the Government of the day; it was because they felt that the well working of the system depended upon the adoption of that special and peculiar provision which, in this case, and for those purposes, they used. Now, Sir, I have referred more than once, and I shall refer again, to the hon. gentleman's own statement on this subject. When he first introduced his Bill he told us the revising officer in England was appointed by the Lord Chancellor, who, we know, although a judge, is also a political officer, and a great member of his political party, a great member of the Administration; and the inference was naturally drawn that as we have not a political officer like the Lord Chan-

cellor here, that as there is no member of the Cabinet here who is Lord Chancellor, it was no great step, in fact it was following up the same lines, that what was done by that political officer in England, should be done by the Governor in Council here. I have called the hon. gentleman's attention more than once to the mistake in fact which he made when he made that statement, to the fact that he was inaccurate in declaring that a political officer had the appointment of revising barristers in England, to the fact that the revising barristers of the metropolitan county are appointed by the Lord Chief Justice, and the revising barristers of all the other counties are appointed by the senior judge of the Court of Assize, going on summer circuit, if I remember aright. There, in the county for which he is to make the appointment, on the bench of justice, that justice which he is called upon to dispense at the same moment to the people of the county, in public, before their faces, with the two great political parties represented, the judge, the non-political officer, is called upon to discharge, as one of his functions, this power, this office, of appointing the revising barristers. I say you cannot devise a better plan, so far as I know, in principle, however much you may vary in detail than that; I say you cannot find a stronger proof that the power which the hon. gentleman proposes to take to himself of appointing the person, whether he be judge or barrister, is a power which would not be asked in England, which would not be given in England, and if not asked and not given in England, I want to know why it should be asked and given here. I want to know on what ground the hon. gentleman sets himself so much higher than an English Prime Minister, having control of English and Imperial affairs, and controlling an English Parliament, that he should say that the appointment of such a man, surrounded by those checks and restraints by which he is surrounded in the exercise of his power, should be entrusted to him. I aver, therefore, that the revising officer, whatever his functions, in the rare cases the hon. gentleman says, in the cases, be they few or many, in which the holder of that office is unable to execute the duty, then his appointment ought to come from an unobjectionable source. What is to be this duty which is going to be discharged? It is the duty of making and revising the lists of the jury empanelled to try the Government of the day, which is to try the question between the Government and the Opposition. Why should those who are in the majority, who have all the advantage which place gives, which power gives, which patronage gives, which majority gives—why should they in addition have the power of naming the men who are to settle the lists of those who are to determine whether they shall continue to hold this power or not? I ask for answers to these arguments. We have not heard any answers yet. We have heard no reason given why the views taken in other countries, the views so obviously based upon reason and justice, should not be applied here. I maintain that those members of Parliament who will assent in silence to the passing of a law to surrender to the Government of the day the appointment of the men who are to make and revise the lists, are unworthy of sitting in a free Parliament, and those who feel, as my hon. friends near me feel, that this is a question vital to the reality of free representative institutions, are not merely at liberty, but are also bound, to struggle to the utmost of their ability against the incorporation of this vicious principle in the law of Canada. Sir, what has been one of the results of this discussion? Early on the second reading we herd the Secretary of State say that there was an appeal from the revising officer, as before. It was shown immediately afterwards that the Secretary of State was mistaken, that just as the leader was mistaken about the English law, so the Secretary of State was mistaken about the law which he was recommending to the House. Now we are told, after a long interval of time, that there is to be an amendment, that there is to be an appeal, first, as of right, and, secondly, in fact as well as in law. We are not told to whom that appeal is to be, as yet. We have not got the details of that appeal before us, but we are given a general principle of action. The hon. gentleman has confessed that his first proposition is indefensible as it stood; the hon. gentleman has confessed that it would not do to leave the revising officer power to say whether there should be an appeal, that it would not do to restrict the appeal to questions of law. The hon. gentleman has confessed that the powers, the final and conclusive powers, practically, that he was about to confer upon his nominees, the revising officers, were powers which he ought not so to confer, and he is about to amend the Bill and to render it in that regard less outrageous than it was when he first pressed it upon the attention of the House. Sir, that man would take but a very cursory, imperfect and superficial view of this matter, who would suppose that the amendment of the hon. gentleman removes the evil. The evil is at the source, the taint is at the source, the difficulty is at the source. It is the suspected and improper authority who is to appoint the officer, that makes the difficulty. Why, Sir, to say that our present system involves occasionally some injustice in the making of the lists to the one party or the other, that occasionally an over zealous and improper Conservative assessor or functionary, makes the lists wrongly, and occasionally an improper and over zealous Reform assessor does the same thing, and that that is a reason for this change—I do not say for a change but for this change—is absurd; because this change is one which puts the dead weight of a revising officer all the time on one side, which says it shall be the nominee of the Government in all cases who shall make the list, and the other party, the party of the minority, shall have the function of appeal. It is a very great blessing that it is able to appeal, but it is a very great misfortune that it should always have to appeal. And as a matter of fact many appeals will not take place, because the difficulty, the expense, the loss of time, the uncertainty, the trouble would prevent the appeals which ought to take place. But, as I said on the second reading of the Bill, the lists will be made right for the appointers of the revising officers. We are to have an appeal, and, though we are thankful for small mercies, though he gives us now at this late hour, the right to make an appeal, we insist, with all the force with which we can insist, that he has not the right to take to himself the power of appointing the maker of the lists of those who are to judge him. To these proposals of his, which are to combine the functions of making and revising the lists in one single man, who cannot be competent to do the thing, who cannot be competent to do it for the reasons I have stated, and to remove the making of the list from those best qualified by knowledge and experience, and the confidence of the people to perform that function, and hand over to the Government of the day the appointment of the maker and reviser, I, for my part, offer my humble, and earnest, and strenuous, and lasting, and persistent opposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not object at all to the line taken by the hon. gentleman in the argument he has just closed. On the contrary I would rather congratulate the committee on the fact that we are arriving at the last, even at the eleventh hour, at a legitimate discussion of the measure before us. It is a pleasing contrast between to-day and the discussion that has been going on for the last five weeks. And the reason of the difference is, that the hon. gentleman has, in an able argument, addressed himself to what he considers to be the defects of the measure and has pointed out in what respects the measure can be improved, instead of hon. members talking, evidently with his disapproval——

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Instead of hon. members evidently with his disapproval, discussing the matter, not with a view, even after the principle was adopted by the House, of improving and amending the measure, but of defeating it *fas aut nefas*. The hon. gentleman has divided his subject into two parts. First, he objects to the mode of the appointments. Second, he objects to the duties imposed on the revising officer. Although the hon. gentleman made that arrangement of the subject, he addressed himself to the latter head first. He objects to the duties that are imposed on the revising officer. He says that the name of the officer is a misnomer; that the revising officer prepares the lists. That, after the explanation that has been given, seems to be a mere technical objection hardly worthy of the hon. gentleman. The revising officer, according to the clause now immediately before the committee, is to prepare, revise and complete the list. That is true. That is the language of the section; but the Bill must be read as a whole, and it will be found that the Bill makes the revising officer really a revising officer in every respect, except in those particulars in which there are no means of having a revision, because there are no means under the present franchise of having any original list to revise. The Bill provides that the assessment roll, where there is an assessment roll, shall be taken as the evidence of the franchise. The hon. gentleman may say the language is indefinite. I am quite willing to hear suggestions, although all and any suggestions that have come from the other side I have endeavored to meet; I do not think they have been made in the spirit in which they have been received. But still that will not prevent me from receiving on the part of the minority, and receiving with respect, any suggestions made from any party in this committee, and of accepting them if they meet with my judgment. I have no fault to find in this matter. I desire to have a good measure. I desire to have a measure that will meet, as a whole, as I believe this measure will meet when it goes to the country, with the approbation of the country. I desire to make this a good and beneficial measure; I desire to make it as perfect a measure as discussion will make it, and I will not at any moment hesitate, if I think any suggestion is made that will improve the measure, to accept it. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Bill as first introduced in 1869 and 1870, and said that the propositions made in those Bills, I think in both of them, according to my present recollection, that the first list should be settled by a board of registration, and that there should be an appeal from such board. Those hon. gentlemen present who were sitting in Parliament when those measures were laid before it must remember that the most objectionable feature in the whole Bill, according to the mind of the House, was that same board of registration. It was opposed on the ground of the enormous expense it would involve. We hear much of the expense of the present system without such a board of registration, and how much more would have been the expense had that board been established with the subsequent appeal? So I have no hesitation in saying that the objection to that system was so great, as being uncalled for, costly and complicated, that it had of necessity to be excised, expunged and removed from any measure of this kind before it could meet the acceptance of either side of the House. The hon. gentleman says the revising officer has anterior duties. But this measure will try to deprive the revising officers of the necessity of having anterior duties, and it is only in those cases where there are no means of obtaining correct lists that the revising officer will be otherwise than a revising officer. The hon. gentleman draws a comparison between the system in England and that proposed here with respect to the appointment of those officers. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that I stated—and I was incorrect—that the revising officers were appointed by the Lord Chancellor, instead of in metropolitan counties by the Lord Chief Justice, and in other counties by the judges of assize. When a Minister prepares a Bill and lays it before Parliament he does so with the hope and expectation of its becoming law, and a Minister ought not to introduce a Bill without reasonable expectation of its meeting the views of the majority of the representatives of the people. A proposition of a similar nature to that in England would not, I have ascertained beyond a doubt, not only during this Session, but in many Sessions when this question came up, have met the expectations of Parliament. Why it is I do not say. Why there is a difference in the public mind in Canada and in England I do not know; I cannot quite fathom it; but I have an impression on my mind, and it is an impression amounting to a certainty, that any proposition that the appointment of the revising officers should be left to the judiciary in the different Provinces would not meet with the approbation of the majority of Parliament. I, therefore, took the next and best, because the best is the best possible mode of getting good, efficient, trustworthy officers, and officers beyond suspicion. In order to do that this clause which is now before the committee provides that these officers shall hold office during good behavior. They shall not be subject to removal at caprice, or at the pleasure of the Government of the day. I am quite well aware that this provision is open to the objection that as to the first appointments the Government of the day will have the appointment of these officers. It is true; and it is true that the Government of the day appoint all the judges, and with regard to them, the practice has been, as a general rule—I myself have not followed that rule with any great closeness, as perhaps is known to a good many hon. gentlemen in this House; but the general rule, when judicial appointments are made by any Government, whether Conservative or Liberal, other things being equal, political friends are chosen for elevation to the bench. But it is always understood and felt that the moment a man is made a judge, no matter what his political antecedents may have been, as he is appointed during good behavior and cannot be removed at the beck or will of the Government of the day, he at once gets a status and sufficient independence to act as an honest man. So by this Bill it is provided that the revising officer shall hold office during good behavior. It is true there is this distinction made between the tenure of a judge of the Superior Court and that of the revising officer, that in respect to the former, the judge can only be removed by the vote of both Houses, the Senate and the House of Commons. But it would be obviously improper to allow the Senate to have a voice in a matter affecting elections to Parliament. It is obvious that this House must retain that whole subject within its own grasp, its own supervision, and therefore, whereas a judge of the Superior Court is removable on a vote of both Houses, the revising officer under this Bill, is removable on a vote of this House. So that, if there is any reasonable ground for supposing that the revising officer has acted improperly, partially, or oppressively, or is a partisan, that matter being laid before this House, which is chiefly interested, he will be removed. And we all know, Sir, that, no matter what party is in, if a revising officer really performs his duty, if no wrongful act can be proved against the revising officer, no malversation of duty, no decided or distinct incapacity shown, no House of Assembly would assume the responsibility of removing him by a vote. It would set the whole country against the majority to do such a thing; the whole moral sense of the country would be opposed to the majority who would give a party vote to remove a revising officer, who has his tenure of office during good behavior, unless malversation were proved, unless his conduct proved that he deserved to be

removed. That, Sir, was the best and only course that could be taken, as I understand it, and as I know and feel, so as to meet the support of the majority of the representatives of the people in Parliament. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman objects to the revising officer preparing the lists. He says he should have nothing to do with it. Well, Mr. Chairman, we must have some person to do that, and in the majority of cases there can be no difficulty. Take Ontario, from which I am afraid the majority of the speakers on both sides have drawn their illustrations, because the majority of speakers have come from that Province; in the Province of Ontario what is the practice now? The assessor makes his lists, and he assesses all those who are ratable in any way, and that list is revised by the local municipality, by the Court of Revision. There is an appeal from the Court of Revision, both as to law and fact, to the County Court judge. Now, Sir, this measure means and designs to propose that the revising officer shall do the same acts, have the same powers and guidance as the county court judge has at this moment in Ontario, the only difference being—and you can quite understand it, the difference arises *ex necessitate*—that, whereas under the present system in Ontario, the local assessment list is finally revised and settled by the Courts of Revision, by the municipality, in effect the appeal to the county judge is only in individual cases of appeal. This system provides that the final assessment list shall as now, as finally settled by the Court of Revision, be the basis of the voters' list, the basis on which representation is founded; and instead of individual cases being appealed, in effect the whole list is appealed at once to the county judge or the revising officer. The hon. gentleman says that the most minute knowledge is required in order to form those lists. Well, the revising officer in England has not such a minute knowledge. He is appointed from the bar; the majority of the bar are assembled in London.

Mr. BLAKE. That is to revise the lists, not to make them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that. The majority of the bar are assembled in London; the young barrister, who gets his 100 guineas or his 200 guineas, goes to the county or riding and gets from the overseer of rates the list as primarily made to him, and he adds to it. That is the system the hon. gentleman wishes to have, but there is this distinction, that in England a revising barrister is a stranger altogether to the county, but here we hope, as much as possible, that the revising officers, whether they are judges or not, shall be men acquainted, or who ought to be acquainted, with the general circumstances of each individual constituency. The revising barrister in England comes from London, and the hon. gentleman praises that system. But if I remember aright—the hon. gentleman will correct me if I am wrong—there is no income franchise in England, and the voting is taken, even under the new Reform Bill, from the householder, combined or single, and there is no such franchise as there is given here. But I would ask the hon. gentleman, supposing there had been, as I dare say there will be, in England, as England has in many measures followed, in respect of time, the example of Canada——

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—in many cases, as I could prove. Supposing, now, that, following our example, there should be a wage-earners' vote in England, or an income vote, do you think they would alter the present system, which the hon. gentleman praises so highly? Do you think the revising barrister would not still be appointed, would not still come down from London, and be obliged then to pursue the course which this Bill proposes. He would have *quoad* householders, *quoad* ratepayers, the means before him in the list returned by the overseers; and he would have to assume the same responsibility, and the same initiatory process as we propose in this Bill. Under this Bill the names on the voters' list will be taken from the assessment roll. Those not on the assessment roll, I am satisfied, experience will show, will be a small minority in comparison with those who have established their right to vote upon the approved and revised assessment lists in the various Provinces; and it is only in a small degree that he will be obliged to use his own judgment upon the evidence before him as to those whom he will not find on the assessment rolls of the Provinces. Now, what is our system? In the first place I may say it will be the effort of the Government to obtain the services of men in judicial positions whenever they can be obtained; and it is only in cases where they find that that cannot be done, either from unwillingness, or incapacity, on account of ill health or old age or other causes on the part of the judge, that the Government will exercise the power given to them of appointing revising officers. The hon. gentleman says it should be obligatory—that there should be a clause in the Bill providing that only in case of declinature or refusal to act by the judge, another person should be appointed. But the hon. gentleman knows too well that there are judges who having once held their position, feel disinclined to give it up; he knows very well that too often

"Superfluous lags the veteran on the stage,"

and that although the judge, in the opinion of the suitor, and perhaps of the Government ought to have resigned, he cannot without a painful process be induced to resign. In such cases it must be that a person other than the judge shall be appointed; but the measure will provide that in such cases where a revising officer other than the judge is appointed, there shall be an appeal both as to law and fact. It is true, it may be inconvenient to have such an appeal; it may be expensive more or less, but it is expensive now, under the present system. All appeals are expensive, but appeals are the exceptions. If a revising officer acts fairly and is known to be an honest, straightforward man, the necessity for appeal will be small, and the only danger in allowing appeals is—as hon. gentlemen on both sides have seen—that it sometimes gives an advantage to a rich man who can afford to fight it out to the last, to keep out the poor man who has been elected, and has apparently got the votes of a majority of the people. But that is an incidental advantage that the rich man has that cannot be avoided. If there is to be an appeal at all, of course those who can afford to take advantage of the appeal will do so. Sometimes we have seen it taken improperly for the sake of delay, and for the sake, perhaps, of wearing out the unfortunate man whose means do not enable him to fight it out to the last. The hon. gentleman says he is so strongly opposed to this monstrous measure that he advises it being opposed in every way possible. Of course, Sir, I understand that; I understand the line the hon. gentleman has taken; I understand the line hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. I pay respect to their opinions; I am glad to hear them expressed when they are expressed for a genuine, legitimate purpose, and not for another and less parliamentary object. I shall not detain the committee any longer. I shall be glad to hear, and I have no doubt I shall hear, all arguments that can be offered both for and against the system proposed by this measure; and I can only assure the committee, as I have already stated, that any suggestion which is made with the evident desire of improving the measure, or removing any doubts, or making specific any uncertainties in it, will be received by me with every respect, and with an anxious desire to meet the wishes of both sides of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to answer the hon. gentleman's general argument; I have no doubt that will be done

by others; but he evidently misunderstood my statement. I stated that local knowledge was necessary to the making out of the lists. The hon. gentleman apprehended me to be guilty of a fallacy, because I was recommending the English plan of appointing revising officers, who, he said, came from London, and whose function was similar to the function of his revising officer. There he entirely misconceives the case. In England the lists are made up by the local officers, and the revising officer is simply a reviser. He comes down to the locality; objections are made that such a name that ought to be on the list is not on, and that such a name that is on ought to be taken off; he hears the evidence, and he deals with the case as an appeal against the list. He has nothing to do with the making of the original list, which is made by those persons in the locality having the local knowledge which I argued was essential to the making of the primary lists.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not misapprehend the hon. gentleman's argument at all; but my answer was that in effect our system is the same—that as the revising barrister in England takes the list prepared by the local officer, so in Canada, under this Bill, the revising officer will take the local assessment list, prepared by the local assessor and approved by the local municipality, and that in that regard the duties of the revising barrister in England and those of the revising officer under this Bill are identical. The only difference is—and that difference I stated plainly—that under the new franchises given by this Bill there are people given votes who do not appear on the original list; *ex necessitate* there is a difference in circumstances, and therefore there must be a difference in provision; but for the vast proportion of the voters whose names appear on the assessment list the duty of the revising officer in Canada and the duty of the revising barrister in England are the same. I could if I would provide that if there were any means the revising officer should only be a revising officer; but under the circumstances that cannot be.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, by throwing out the Bill and keeping the present system, that can be. But under the present system and under the present Bill, that cannot be avoided, and my argument was and my inference was, and I think the House will agree with me, that if it so happened to-morrow that in a new Reform Bill in England there was a vote given, such as we have given it to the wage-earner, or a vote given to the income payer who did not appear on the local rates, I will venture to predict, and I am sure no hon. gentleman will say it would not be so, that the same system of appointing a revising barrister would exist, and he would be obliged, from the stress of circumstances, to be as this Bill proposes he should be, the revising officer in all cases where the rate rolls showed that a vote existed, and that he would still act as the revising barrister under that name, although he must of necessity have the power conferred upon him to put on the lists *ab initio* those names that did not appear on those rolls, and he would still retain his mode of appointment and would still be appointed from a distance.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I deem it my duty to the profession to which I belong, more particularly in the Province of Ontario, to say a few words in answer to the substance of the complaint which the leader of the Opposition has made against this clause in the Bill. The objection which he has urged rests upon the theory that the members of the profession to which we both belong, will be found so neglectful of their duty, so blind to that sense of honor which we all claim is the distinguishing mark of our profession, that they will violate their duty, their oath of office, for partisan purposes, that they will dishonestly discharge their duty as revising barristers, should they be appointed to that office; and that from the ordinary members of the profession who may be appointed to fill that office, the same impartiality, the same administration of justice will not be obtained as will be obtained from the County Court judges. He insists that the appointment of judges should be made obligatory, unless in the case of declinature or other special reason of that character; and the reasons he advances for that position is that other men in the profession appointed to that particular position, men who are not judicial officers, cannot be relied upon to discharge their duty with impartiality. A charge of that kind is an insult to the profession to which he and I belong, and I regret that insult should have come from the recognised leader of the bar of Ontario, the Treasurer of the Law Society, who, himself, in conjunction with the Benchers of the Law Society, of whom I have the honor to be one, is responsible for calling men to the bar and confiding to them the obligations and duties of the profession to which we belong. On behalf of the bar of Ontario, from whom those revising officers are to be selected, I repudiate the charge. I say it is an insult to it, and that the last man in the world who ought to have made that charge or insinuation is the leader of the Opposition, the head of the bar in Ontario. I am quite sure, from what I know of the profession in Ontario, that no man will be appointed to this position of revising barrister who will not discharge his duty as fairly, as impartially, and as honestly as if he were a County Court judge, and a safeguard is provided by the Bill, as the leader of the Government has stated, should any delinquency occur, and I am quite sure none will occur, in any more frequent instances than those in which it has been found necessary to apply the power of the law to delinquencies on the part of County Court judges. I think I am only expressing the general opinion of the public in Ontario, the general opinion, I am sure, of the profession in Ontario, when I say that men can and will be found to discharge this duty where they are appointed in the place of County Court judges or instead of County Court judges, because county court judges are not to be found to discharge it, who will discharge it as fairly, honestly, and impartially as would any County Court judge or Superior Court judge. More over the duty is one that is to be discharged in the light of day; it is not to be discharged in a back room, without the knowledge of the public and the scrutiny of the public; it will be discharged in the presence of representative men of both political parties; and those administering this office will know that whatever they do will be scrutinised, will know if they depart from the line of rectitude, which ought to be followed be every one fufilling a judicial obligation, they will be subject to that obloquy and disgrace that always attends the breach of an obligation of honor on the part of any one committed with such obligation. I regret that the charge, or rather the insinuation, should have come from the hon. gentleman who has made it. I regret he is not in his place to hear my observations and to justify his conduct in making this insinuation, if he can do so, an insinuation that the profession in Ontario is so low in honor, so sunk in public esteem, so unworthy of reliance that it cannot be trusted to discharge that duty which this Bill proposes to entrust to it, and a duty, too, which is to be entrusted to it under the obligation of an oath, and which is to be performed in the presence of all parties, where every one has an opportunity of seeing what is done, of scrutinising what is done, and, if injustice be done, of making it public and appealing from the unjust decision. We know how these lists are revised, we know that the representatives of both political parties, active members of associations, both Reform and Conservative, attend these Courts of Revision which, it is provided by the Bill, shall be

held by every municipality, in order that the people interested may not have to travel far, may be present and see what is going on. We know the general interest that is taken, in these things, at any rate in Ontario, and that when any court of that kind is sitting there will be numerous representatives of both parties present, who understand all the circumstances; and we know that whatever the revising barrister does, will be done honestly, conscientiously and impartially, be he Conservative or Liberal. In fact, if my hon. friends opposite occupied the treasury benches to-day, I would be willing to see a provision of this kind put in the Bill, having every confidence in the honesty and integrity of the Liberal or Reform members of the profession in Ontario, who are almost as numerous, I presume, as the Conservative members, and who, I believe, if appointed, as they would be under a Liberal Government, to this office, would discharge their duty as honestly, impartially as Conservative members of the profession.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps you would like to see us make the appointments, now.

Mr. CAMERON. My hon. friend's observation is simply absurd, and he knows it. He knows, as an ex-member of the Government, that when he sat on this side he did not usually appoint members of the party to which he was opposed to office, and I think that the character of the appointments made by the Government of to day will compare favorably with those made by the Government of which he was a member. With reference to the general provisions of the Bill, I do not at the present moment intend to enter into a discussion of them, nor do I propose to discuss the details of this particular part of the Bill now before us. At a later period in the discussion, if necessary, I may have something to say on the subject, but at present I simply rose, at the first opportunity, in order to say a word in vindication of the profession to which I have the honor to belong, and to express my regret that the hon. gentleman, the recognised leader of the profession in Ontario, should so far forget himself as to make the insinuation against us he has made.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, in proposing this section of the Bill, has adopted toward the committee a tone wholly different from that which has characterised his observations in the earlier discussions that we have had upon this Bill. He has been complimentary to my hon. friend who leads this side of the House. He has spoken in high terms of the ability with which he has addressed himself to the consideration of this section of the Bill. There is nothing which the First Minister has said in reference to the able speech of the leader of the Opposition which would not be endorsed on this side of the House, but we regret beyond anything else that the Government and the majority in this House have not been led with the same efficiency, and that the hon. gentleman has not addressed himself with the same ability and care to the consideration of the measure as my hon. friend who addressed you from this side of the House. The First Minister proposed this measure, a measure of very great consequence, which is revolutionary in its character, which is making radical changes in our parliamentary system, if it should become law, in a speech of little more than eight minutes in length. I venture to say that no Minister of the Crown in England has ever introduced an important measure of this kind with such a speech as the leader of the Government introduced this to the consideration of the House or the speech in which he moved the second reading of the Bill. The hon. gentleman proposed important changes in our constitutional system, changes that had not been discussed on the hustings, that had not received the attention of the people, that had not been discussed in the press, and yet the hon. gentleman never for one momemt addressed himself to the effects that these changes were likely to have upon the electorate of Canada. When Mr. Gladstone introduced his recent measure, reforming the parliamentary representation of the United Kingdom, he went into minute details with regard to it. He told the House what the effect of those changes would be, he told the House what classes of the people would be admitted, the number in the different constituencies that would be admitted to the electoral franchise who had not enjoyed it before, and what would be the aggregate of electors that would be added to the electoral body throughout the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman gave us no information of this sort. To-day he addressed himself to a discussion of the particular clause before us, and he told us how anxious he was to receive suggestions from this side of the House, and how anxious he would be to adopt those suggestions if they met with his approval. Well, we have been rather unfortunate in obtaining the approval of the hon. gentleman to those changes which we have hitherto made, and, if the hon. gentleman is now disposed to give a little more attention and consideration to the suggestions made from this side of the House, I think it will be necessary that he should begin this Bill anew, that we should turn back to the first clause and go over it again. I remember reading an anecdote of a New York clergyman who had prepared his sermon with some care, and who was addressing a very large audience on a very warm day. He noticed that a large portion of his audience were asleep, and, when he had done, he said: I have taken a very great deal of care in the preparation of this discourse, I have given the subject a very great deal of consideration, and, observing that a large portion of my audience have not been listening to what I have had to say, and now, seeing they are waked up, I think I had better begin again. We are very much in that position. We have been obliged to give a very great deal of attention to the measure which the hon. gentleman has submitted to the House and which we are now considering in committee. Unfortunately the hon. gentleman has kept us here from very early hours to very early hours again, and he has not been here for the purpose of hearing those suggestions which we have from time to time made. He has been for a great portion of the time absent, and, if he is now disposed to listen with attention and care to what the Opposition have to say upon this Bill, I think he will be obliged to begin again and to remain in his place and listen to what we have to say, not merely with regard to this clause but with regard to those other clauses which have preceded it, and which have been adopted by the committee. The hon. gentleman, in replying to my hon. friend, said: Oh, the objections which you make to the functions of a revising officer are rather of a technical character. We say they are not of a technical character. The objections we make to the functions of the revising officer are of the essence of this particular proposition. We say that the duties imposed upon him are duties that a revising officer ought not to undertake, that the name is a misnomer. The revising officer ought to have nothing whatever to do with the preparation of the list. The hon. gentleman says there is no original list. No, there never can be an original list under the system he proposes, but there is an original list in England, which is prepared by the clerk of the municipality and by the overseers of the parish. That list is made as complete as possible. The work of revision is a work which sometimes, although it is always possible, is not found necessary, and it often happens that a revising officer, although appointed for the work of revision, finds there is no revision required. The list as originally prepared is the list that remains for the purpose of being used in the parliamentary elections. That is exactly the position of things in the Provinces at this moment. The list that is prepared, under the law as it now stands, by the clerk of the municipality and by the municipal courts of revision, is a list that is usually regarded, or accepted, as complete in itself, and the revising duties of the judge are not often called into oper-

ation. The hon. gentleman says that it is impossible to prepare a list independently of the revising officer, I say it is not impossible. I say there is no difficulty in pointing out to him how such a list may be prepared, There is no difficulty in obtaining persons with the necessary local knowledge to prepare that list, and unless we have a proper preparation of the list, with persons on the ground possessing the necessary local knowledge, it will be impossible that we can have a satisfactory list without a serious expense incurred every year. The hon. gentleman says he desires to make this a good measure. I do not think that is possible. We may make this part of the measure unobjectionable. It is possible to make this a very much better measure than it is now, but there are parts of this measure over which we have gone, against the improvement of which the hon. gentleman has set his face, which are of so serious a character as to render the measure radically defective, even though all the improvements required in this portion of the Bill should be effected. The hon. gentleman said: It is true I proposed a revising board in 1870, but that was objected to by my supporters and by the country, the proposition was regarded as monstrous, the expense would be so enormous that it would not be for a moment entertained. Well, this is a very extraordinary character for the hon. gentleman to give a proposition which he himself had made, and it does seem to me that if we are to have a voters' list independent of the provincial list, then it will be necessary to subordinate the question of expense to the question of the preparation of the list. If the hon. gentleman feels that it is impossible to incur the expense necessary to make a satisfactory list, one that will be accepted as a fair list to those who are to be placed upon it, then I say that he ought not to have undertaken the work at all. The question of the exercise of the electoral franchise is a matter too important to be allowed to remain in an unsatisfactory condition, simply because the hon. gentleman cannot afford the expense. But, Sir, I say that we can make it satisfactory, we can improve the machinery for preparing an independent list, without incurring any additional expense, and without exciting suspicion that is done for the purpose of promoting the interest of a party instead of being a means of securing the fair expression of opinion in the country. Now this Bill exhibits a disposition on the part of its promoter, from beginning to end, not to secure a complete and fair voters' list, but to get such a list as will secure to the Administration a party advantage.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. I will undertake to show that what I state is the fact; I will undertake to show that the Minister of Customs will not be quite satisfied with a fair list.

Mr. BOWELL. You have no right whatever to say that.

Mr. MILLS. I will undertake to show that this proposition submitted to us is not a fair proposition. Sir, the hon. gentleman says that the revising officer in England has no initiatory duties. Why has he no initiatory duties? Because the list is prepared by the municipal authorities, because the clerk of the municipality and the overseers of the parish prepare and complete the list? The hon. gentleman has referred to the class whose names are not upon the assessment roll, although qualified to exercise the elective franchise. Well, Sir, would the duty of putting them on the list fall upon the revising officer? Not unless the local authorities failed to discharge their duties. The work of putting them on the list would rest with those who are upon the ground, who know the facts, who know whether certain parties possess a rating which would entitle them to go upon the voters' list, and those parties, in a great majority of instances, would be put by the local authorities on the list, and the expense of amending the roll by revision would be reduced to a minimum. Now I find that all the wage-earners will not be found on the assessment roll. The assessment roll, then, is not an original preparation, is not such a preparation as will supersede the necessity of a properly prepared list as contra-distinguished from a revised list. Then there are the tenants. If the hon. gentleman had, in this Bill, adopted the rule of taking the assessed value of the property as a test of qualification of the tenant, then the assessment roll would enable the party in whose hands it was placed to see what tenants had a right to go upon the voters' lists. But the hon. gentleman has not done that. He has provided that the amount of rental paid shall determine the qualification of the tenant, and that being the case the assessment roll gives no indication of the right of the tenant to go upon the list, and the qualification of all tenants who are qualified to go upon the list, must be ascertained from other source than the assessment roll. Then there is the class of those who have a certain income. They may or may not be upon the assessment roll. I believe in the Province of Quebec there is no such thing as assessment for personal property, so that in the Province of Quebec there will be no such thing as a party on an assessment roll assessed for income, and those who are entitled to vote in consequence of the amount of income which they annually have, will not be found upon the assessment roll. Besides, there is the class of the fisherman. Now if you take these classes who are not likely to be found upon the assessment roll, two of which never can be found upon the assessment roll, you find that nearly 35 per cent of those who would be entitled to vote under the Bill, will not be found upon the assessment roll, and if they go upon the voters' lists they must either appear in person and show their right, or the fact that they are qualified must be ascertained from some other source. Why, Sir, if you take the parliamentary elections in this country at any time since the Union and make a change of 5 per cent from one side to the other, you will change the majority from one side to the other; and if that is the case, is it not a matter of immense consequence when you find that in the material that is placed in the hands of the revising officer for the purpose of preparing the voters' list, at least 30 per cent of those who are entitled to go upon the lists, are not upon it, and when only 5 per cent is sufficient to change a minority into a majority? I say this is a condition of things that ought to be avoided. What change is to be made in this proposition in order to get rid of that difficulty? Why, Sir, to avail ourselves of the local machinery, to say that the local officers who know the provincial law, who have the duty imposed upon them to prepare the voters' list, shall, under our law and by our authority, be called upon to prepare the voters' list for the election of members of the House of Commons. They reside in each township; they know, not only the farmers, the mechanics and merchants, but they know their sons, they know the wage-earners, they know who are steady in their habits, who earn a sufficient amount of wages to entitle them to go upon that list; they know who are the men of capital who have money loaned out to their neighbors, or who are possessed of other securities, and who have sufficient income to enable them to go upon the list. They are therefore prepared to utilise the assessment roll, so far as it can be used, and to make a list as complete as possible. We have, then the machinery already existing if we choose to utilise it. There is another point I wish to refer to. In the early part of this discussion I pointed out that in our contested elections we declared that the provincial courts should be the courts for the purpose of trying election petitions. Our right to do that was contested, and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England were called upon to decide the point. They held that, as we had absolute control over the subject of the trial of contested elections, we could designate a pro-

vincial court for the purpose of making the trial; and if we so designated and imposed the duty upon it, it was not optional to perform that duty. It became a Dominion court for the purpose of trying actions, just the same as if a court were created wholly independent of its having a local existence before. I say the same thing can be done with regard to the preparation of the voters' list. If we choose to say in this Bill, by a new clause, that the parties who are appointed by the local law to prepare the lists shall be officers of the Parliament of Canada for the purposes of this Act, they will have that duty imposed upon them, and will be called on to fulfil it, not as officers of the Local Legislature and as officers having derived authority from local laws, but as officers of this House, under the laws of this Parliament. There is no more difficulty in doing that than there was in saying that a provincial court should try contested elections for the House of Commons. It is a perfectly simple plan. We can attach to the due performance of the duties of those officers such penalties as we think the public interest may require, and we may give an appeal to a county judge. We shall be acting as is done in an analogous case in England with respect to the preparation of lists, and also in an analogous case under the Ontario and Quebec laws and in two at least of the three Maritime Provinces. There is no practical obstacle to having someone to prepare the list distinct from the party who is to revise it. If we adopt that system, we shall be in this position: We shall have men who know all the people who reside in the municipality and know who ought to go on the voters' list, and appeals would be confined to a few cases where the right to vote might be in dispute and where names might accidently have been overlooked. It, moreover, gives the advantage of enabling parties to enquire beforehand. Everyone knows that members of the municipal council, assessors and clerks, become acquainted with almost every instance of oversight; so that when the time of revision comes they are easily corrected, and the appeals taken before the revising officer are very few indeed. Suppose an opposite course is adopted. Here is a county with 40,000 or 50,000 people. The county judge or revising officer is called on to prepare the list. He has put into his hands copies of the various assessment rolls. He is told there is no difficulty, that he can accept those whose names are on the roll as owners and occupants. But there is the large class of tenants. There are wage-earners; there are those who have incomes, and are entitled on that account to go on the voters' list. All those parties must apply to have their names put on the list before the change can take place. I know of my own observation, as do other hon. members, that if you leave off any considerable number from the voters' list in any year, except that on which elections take place, the names practically remain off. Such is a condition of things we ought to avoid. It is not merely necessary that we should give facilities for having names placed on the list, but we should adopt such a system as will prevent any considerable number of names being left off. The great objection is that 25 or 30 per cent. of those whose names should be on the list will be omitted from the list as prepared. Measures will have to be taken to have the names put on, and evidence will have to be produced. Who is going to look after those lists? There is hardly a member from the rural districts who has not ten or twelve municipalities within his constituency. How is he to know whether the list is properly made up? How is he to know how many names have been left off? Even if a member resides in the constituency he represents, he cannot know more than 25 or 30 per cent of the residents. He will be obliged to go into every polling division and call a meeting of his friends, to go over the list, name by name. The next point is to see that the names of parties omitted are inserted; to see the party and ascertain whether he will attend at the Court of Revision and make application. The candidate or member must do that not in one division but in thirty, and must spend a month in meeting friends. The candidate must take means for the purpose of calling them together, for the purpose of having all names put on the list. Suppose there is not much political excitement prevailing at the time, difficulty will be found in getting the voters out. After all these measures are taken the list will be defective. Suppose that a wage-earner wants to get away to attend the court, his employer will not consent to his leaving, he finds it impossible for him to get away, he has something for him to do that particular day, especially if his political opinions differ from those of the wage-earner, and the result is that the wage-earner cannot get his name on the list. I say, if any gentleman will take the trouble of counting the time of calling meetings together in each polling division, of examining the list, of going over that list with the people of the division, of taking the necessary steps to secure their application for the correction of a list, and the time which is lost in attending the Court of Revision, he will find that the expense of a proper revision each year will be quite equal to the expense of an ordinary election. Now, I say frankly I would rather meet my constituents under an ordinary and fairly prepared voters' list under the present system, and incur the expense of an election each year, than incur the expense of correcting and revising the list under the system which the hon. gentleman proposes. I say we are called upon to take a practical view of this question, to look at it and see the features which it will present when it comes to be worked out. I have given you an idea of what it costs one man in time and labor. Consider the amount of time lost by the various parties, the time required in giving notice, the time required in visiting 30 different polling divisions and it will require 30 days at least to do that—and see how you are going to do all this and get that list revised, and if there is not some special favor on the other side, there is another party which will have just the same difficulty and expense to incur. This is not a matter that the community are going to meet together as a unit for the purpose of considering. We will meet together as parties; the Conservative party will look after the interest of the Conservative party, on the voters list, and the Reform party will do the same thing. There will therefore be double the amount of expense—there will be the same expense to both sides in many instances, as there would be in the case I have mentioned, to the one side. The hon. gentleman has told us that once these revising officers are appointed they will be such fair minded men that there will be no desire on the part of any party in this House to remove them. I wonder if the hon. gentleman remembers when there were officers of weights and measures appointed. How long were they allowed to hold office after the Government which made the appointment went out of power. I wonder if the hon. gentlemen remembers that not the Government, but Parliament itself, provided for the appointment of the returning officers; and named them in the Bill. The Government of the day did not ask that those returning officers should be appointed by the Governor in Council. They proposed that they should be certain responsible officers in the country, and they were named in the Bill as the parties who were to be returning officers in the election. How long were they allowed to retain their place after the late Administration was defeated? Why, Sir, we had the law changed, we had the appointment taken out of the hands of Parliament, we had the former Bill repealed, and we had the hon. gentleman carrying through this House a law taking the appointment of those officers into his own hands. For what purpose? Well, Sir, I know by practical experience the purpose for which that was done, and I daresay there are

other hon. gentlemen who have had an experience something like mine. Now, I say that these officers are not officers in whom the people of this country will have the utmost confidence. Let me take the case of the returning officer who returned a party for Muskoka, who Parliament believed had no right to sit here. He was summoned to this House for dereliction of duty under an Order of this House, to show cause why he made an improper return, and I am informed, and I believe the Public Accounts will show, that that gentleman, after being brought here, was paid by the Government whose interests he had served, and was sent back to his business, paid by the Government for making a trip to Ottawa and back, after having violated his duty in returning a party whom the people refused to elect. Yet, in the face of these violations of law, the hon. gentleman asks us to believe that the people of this country will have confidence in the man whom he, an interested party in the contest, names as the revising officer. Why, Sir, the proposition is monstrous. It is so utterly at variance with every principle of natural justice that a man should be made a judge between two contesting parties by one of them—such a proposition is so contrary to all our notions of natural justice that it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman could not have been serious when he declared that he had no doubt that Parliament and the country would have confidence in the appointments thus made. Sir, the hon. gentleman admits that this is not the English practice. In England, in the metropolitan county of Middlesex, and in the city of London, the revising officer is appointed by the Lord Chief Justice, and in other counties by the senior judge during the summer assize, and this is only for the purpose of revising. The work of preparing the list is in the hands of the municipal authorities. The hon. gentleman proposes to take from the municipal authorities the right to prepare the list. He proposes to give the preparation of the list to this creature of his own appointment, and he proposes that not only the preparation of the list shall be in his hands, but the revision of the list. Why, Sir, the very man who prepares the list, makes it with an imperfect knowledge, makes it imperfect possibly from partisanship, possibly from ignorance, a list which must necessarily be imperfect, is the man who is to have the revision of that list which he himself has prepared. Now, I say that in another feature we are not following the English practice. The hon. gentleman told the English people that he was the one man in this country who was disposed to follow the English precedents, to keep English precedents alive here, that the other party were constantly looking across the border and were inclined to be influenced by American opinion and precedents, and yet the hon. gentleman in an important matter, without any necessity, apart from political exigency, is proposing a radical departure from the system of preparing the list which prevails in the United Kingdom. He has proposed, Sir, what no Government in the United Kingdom has ever asked a Parliament, what no Parliament in the United Kingdom, since the fall of the Stuarts, would have ever entertained, and that proposition, is one which, in my opinion, will degrade Parliament, will prevent a fair expression of the country, will prevent the preponderating political sentiment of the country, prevailing in Parliament. This provision of the Bill is a provision calculated to prevent a proper expression of opinion, because it prevents a proper preparation of the voters' lists. Sir, a prominent supporter of the hon. gentleman, in the city of Toronto, in a communication he wrote to a newspaper, not long since, said he regarded the stuffing of the voters' list as being quite as objectionable as stuffing the ballot box. I think so too, and I believe the majority of the people of this country think so; and this proposition is one that must have the effect of stuffing the voters' lists, whether it is so in intention or not. The hon. gentleman says we want our revising officer to do what the revising officer now does in Ontario. If he does, let him provide the machinery for the preparation of the list, and let there be an appeal from the list so prepared to the county judge, and let that county judge not be appointed by the Governor in Council, but by Parliament; let Parliament say in the Act that wherever the county judge or the district judge, as the case may be, exists, he shall be the revising officer. Thus we shall take the appointment out of the hands of the Government, and make the judge independent of the Government for the purpose of revising the list; and we shall leave with the people themselves the work of preparing the list. Every law of this sort is only satisfactorily carried out when it is interpreted through the eyes of the public—when the people themselves understand what the law means. Let them prepare the voters' lists; let them say who are entitled by this law to be placed on the voters' list; and if they have done anybody a wrong, there is an appeal to the county judge. But this is a proposal to put the whole machinery, not merely for the revision but for the preparation of the list in the hands of the Prime Minister for the time being. It is proposed to give him some such power as the Roman centurion we read of in the Scriptures, who said, "to one man I say go and he goeth, to another man I say come and he cometh, to this man I say do this and he doeth it." We allow him to say that A or B shall be the revising officer, who shall receive such compensation as the Prime Minister provides, and who shall say who is and who is not to go on the voters' list. He interprets the law, from him there is no appeal, unless he is not a judge; but in the majority of cases he will be a judge, receiving his appointment, not from Parliament, but from the Government, from the Prime Minister; and while depending upon that Minister, he will be called upon to discharge the duties he imposes upon him. The hon. gentleman said that in England the revising officer has not such local knowledge as we claim for him. We do not say that here the revising officer should have it, if you confine him to the work of revision; in England, the list is prepared by the overseers of the parish and the clerk of the municipality. The hon. gentleman's reference to England is not in point, because he proposes to create an officer with functions wholly different from those performed by the revising officer in that country. The hon. gentleman said that in England they may follow one practice and give the wage-earners votes. They are not likely to follow our practice in England; there would be great deterioration if they did. In England, the political standard is higher than it is in our country. No Prime Minister of England could persuade his followers to entertain such a proposition as that now submitted to us. No Prime Minister of England has ever proposed to take the appointment of revising officers into his own hands and impose upon them not only the work of revision, but the work of preparing the voters' lists. I do not believe any Parliament in England since the period of the revolution has been so far lost to its sense of duty as the representative body of the nation, so wanting in public spirit as to entertain such a proposition if it had been made; and yet that is the proposition which the hon. gentleman makes to this House, and which he expects those who support him will vote to make law. In England, if wage-earners were given votes, it would be the duty of the overseers of the parish, and not of the revising officer, to put them on the list. Their work would be as complete as possible before the work of revision would be undertaken, and we know that there as here, under our municipal system the work of revision is reduced to a minimum. One hon. gentleman has said that my hon. friend who leads on this side of the House was casting a reflection upon his profession when he said it was an improper thing to put the work of preparing and revising the voters' lists in the hands of

men who were mere creatures of the Prime Minister. I have as much respect for the legal profession as that hon. gentleman; but I do not know that they are morally more trustworthy than any other class of the community. I believe the agriculturists, the merchants, the mechanics, the doctors, and the clergymen of the country are quite as upright, quite as honorable, quite as distinguished for their integrity, as those who belong to the legal profession. I do not care what profession these men may belong to, I do not care how honest in intention they may be; what I do care is that those who undertake this work shall be above suspicion, that they shall not be appointed by the leaders on one side or on the other, but that they shall derive their authority from some independent source, and that they shall not be suspected when they give a decision that they give it under the pressure of the Prime Minister for the time being, which it seems to me is the effect of the proposition submitted to the House. I do not think this proposition ought to be carried. I believe it is of the utmost consequence that this work of preparation should be kept distinct from the work of revision, that the work of preparing the lists should be left with the different municipalities, and the work of revision to the judiciary of the country. In that way both the preparation and the revision of the lists will be out of the hands of the Government and out of the hands of the opponents of the Government; but they will be in the hands of impartial persons. We know that in the various municipalities those who prepare the lists belong to both political parties. It is a rare thing to find a municipal body in which both parties are not represented, and even where there is, there is a law of compensation by which the parties who lose in one instance gain in another. But in this measure there is no such law; the dice are loaded, and they are to be cast always in the one way, in favor of the Administration, under the influence of the Administration. I have no objection to hon. gentlemen governing the country as long as public opinion is in their favor, but I object to a system that will retain them as rulers of the country when public opinion points in the opposite direction. And so I say, we wish to create an impartial voters' list, to leave the people free from the shackles which the First Minister wishes to impose upon them, to leave them free to express their own unbiased opinion. It is true the public occasionally err, but it is better they should go wrong freely than that they should go right under coercion from the Treasury benches. What we desire is that people may be allowed freedom to express their opinions at every general election, and that the preponderating political opinion of the country shall always be able to secure a majority to represent it on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. LANGELIER. Yesterday, in the course of the discussion on the amendment taking away the franchise from certain classes of Indians, a remark was made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that he was not afraid of the effect the giving of the franchise to the Indians would have in his own constituency. I was very much struck by the way in which that remark was taken by an hon. gentleman opposite. It was the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), I believe, who said at once, why then do you oppose it? Evidently, in his opinion, provided the one party had nothing to lose by a measure proposed, such measure should not be opposed by that party, even if it were ruinous to the country. If I were to take the same view the hon. member for North Perth seems to take, I should certainly not oppose this portion of the Bill, for if there is one thing which, in my opinion, will damage the Conservative and benefit the Liberal party, it is this. I propose however to oppose it, not because it will damage our party, but because I am sure it will injure the interests of this country. Those who have studied at all the political institutions in other countries, know that in all those countries which have acquired, in any degree, parliamentary institutions, the making of the voters' lists has always been entrusted to the local authorities. I shall not mention all the countries of Europe where the representative system is in existence; I may say however that in France, which has seen many kinds of Government, it never occurred, even under the second empire, to her political men to establish a system by which the Government would determine who should and who should not vote at parliamentary elections. What do we see in England? From the first moment that lists of parliamentary electors have been made, the making of those lists has been confided to the local authorities; it never occurred to any one to confide the making of them to parties appointed by the Government and under the dependence more or less of the Government. At this moment, the Imperial Parliament is about to pass one of the most important laws concerning elections ever enacted, and no one has thought of proposing to introduce such a system as the one sought to be forced through this Parliament, that of giving the making of the voters' lists to officers appointed by the Government. What is the reason given for this proposition? What is the reason given for taking away from the local authorities the making out of those lists? Is it because we have a new system of Government? We have the system of Confederation which has been in existence for nearly 18 years, and have no complaints under it against the present mode of deciding who shall have the right to vote. We have heard some hon. members bring very serious charges against the municipal officers in Ontario entrusted with the preparation of the lists, but I do not think any such charge could be supported by evidence. I am sure none such could be made as regards the Province of Quebec, on any just grounds. I think it was the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) who said that great injustices and frauds were committed by the municipal councils.

Mr. HESSON. What I said was that it was well known to all the members from Ontario that the elections, in the main, were carried very largely on political grounds, that the councillors were so elected in the first place, and that they appointed the assessors who made out the rolls, and that the courts of revision were appointed in a similar way. I also urged that the leader of the Opposition was responsible for bringing party politics in the election of the councillors, because he advised his friends to look after the voters' lists, and that consequently the object was to have the preparation of the voters' lists in partisan hands.

Mr. LANGELIER. That does not mean anything, if it is not intended to mean that the lists are not properly made. The First Minister did not give a single reason for the change proposed, but he said the majority of his friends in the House wanted the new system. I was much struck by that remark. He did not advance one argument to show why the system which has been in existence so long, has worked so well in the Province of Quebec, at least, and I think also in the Province of Ontario and the other Provinces, should be done away with, except the argument, if it can be called so, that the majority of his friends did not like that system. Why do they not like it? If it has given satisfaction to the whole country, why should it not give satisfaction to them? The reason is obvious, it is because that system gives justice to every one on both sides, and that is not what the hon. gentlemen opposite want. They want a system that will favor them. Like the dishonest gambler, they want to play with marked cards; or, like the cowardly duellist, they want to fight their adversary after they have destroyed his weapon of defence. That is the system they want to use against us. The system that is proposed to be introduced is not only new, is

not only a system in favor of which no good reason can be given, because I am sure that, if any good reason could be given, it would have been given by the Premier this afternoon when he explained the reason for introducing that system. The only reason he gave was that it was the wish of the majority of this House that the change should take place. It amounts to this that it is within the power of a majority of this House to say *stat pro ratione voluntas*. Whether there is a justification for introducing a system or not, whether that system is unjust or not, provided it pleases the majority, it is a good principle of legislation to introduce it.

I want to show first, that the new system proposed will be extraordinarily expensive. Figures have already been given in the course of the long discussion through which this Bill has passed, but I will mention facts which I am sure will not be controverted by those who know anything of the preparation of electoral lists in the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) the other day made the remark that, for several years, he had been secretary-treasurer of his municipality, and there may be several other hon. members who may be as well acquainted with the making of electoral lists as the hon. member for Bagot. I call upon them to controvert, if they can, the statements I am going to make. I think it is a very moderate estimate to say that the making of a list in a single municipality cannot take less than eight days. It takes at the very least a week to make a good list, under the present system, by the municipal officers, who also have the making of the valuation rolls. They know each man and each property. They are extremely familiar with all the details, the knowledge of which is necessary to the making of a good list. Still, it takes them a week at least to make a good list. There are, on an average, fifteen municipalities in every electoral division. I am not speaking of large cities, but of counties in the Province of Quebec. That makes fifteen times eight days for the preparation of the list. We may say, in round figures, that four months will be required by the revising officer, supposing him not to take more time than the local officers take now. It is self-evident that it must take much more time in the case of a man such as the revising officer will be, who will know nothing of the property in that municipality, who will be a perfect stranger, who will come there and will act only on the information he can get through the county. He will have to divide the municipality into polling sub-divisions. That is another very difficult duty. I can speak from personal knowledge of the difficulties that a revising officer of that kind will experience. I was carrying on an election last summer, and that election lasted nearly two months. It was in a county which was in a large measure new to me. I could not now undertake to make a list of the county. I drove through the county in every direction several times; still I would not take upon myself to make a proper polling division of that county, because it requires for a man to be very familiar with every locality, and with the citizens of every locality and the peculiar circumstances, to enable him to make a good polling division. What will it be then for a revising barrister who will arrive quite raw, quite new, in an electoral district to commence to make the lists in every municipality? He will have to act upon the information given to him. Do you think he will go to the heads of the Liberal party in every municipality to take information? What will he do? He will go to the wire-pullers of the Conservative party in that locality to get information. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) complained that the leader of the Opposition had insulted the Bar of Ontario by insinuating that these revising officers would not be impartial. I shall come to that in a few moments, but I must say now that, supposing the revising officer to be as impartial as it is possible to conceive, it will be impossible for him to act impartially, because, in making the electoral lists, he will have to take information from other parties who will not be under oath, he will have to take information, as I said, from the wire-pullers of his party. Of course they will tell him: Make the division in this way and in that other way. I am not making idle suppositions. I am only stating what we have already seen on several occasions, when returning officers have been obliged to make polling divisions because they had not been made by the municipal authorities. I have seen some of these divisions made in the best way to prevent a majority of the voters being able to cast their votes. We must not suppose that all those who give information to the revising officer will be angels, and will give only the most honest and the fairest information. It would be having a very high opinion of human nature to suppose that the revising barrister will take into his confidence the leaders of both parties in every municipality, in order to get impartial and fair information from them. One thing is sure, judging from the past and from the conduct of the officers in the past, that the officers will apply to the heads of the Conservative party in every place.

Coming again to the question of the great expenditure that this will entail, we should add to the four months, which, at the very least, will be required to make the list for each county, two months at least for the revision of those lists, especially the first list to be prepared under this Bill. There must be, first, a list made for each municipality, then the municipality must be divided into polling sub-divisions, and then there must be a second sub-division. If that does not take at least two months, I shall be very much mistaken. This makes six months that the revising officer will have to pass in the making of the list for each municipality. How much will he be paid? It will be impossible to get any decent lawyer to give up his profession or avocation for six months without giving him, at the very least, $1,000, and I am very much afraid, speaking for the Province of Quebec, that the Government will only get inferior, second or third-class lawyers, to give up their profession for six months for $1,000. That is a very moderate estimate of what the Government will have to pay. To that we must add the salary of a clerk, and it is making a very moderate estimate, also, to suppose that he will be paid $300 a year. I do not think it will be possible to get a clerk for $300 a year, but I am putting everything at the lowest figure possible. Then there must be a bailiff; that bailiff certainly will not get less than $200 for the large quantity of work he will have to do. That makes altogether $1,500 for each county. Then we have to add to this the travelling expenses of the revising officer, and of his clerk, of his bailiff, and the expenses of printing. Now, we have had some experience of the cost of printing when it is done at the expense of the Government. During this very Session, in the Public Accounts Committee, we have seen printers paid seventeen times the cost of ordinary composition for certain pamphlets. We may be quite sure that this printing will not be open to public competition, but will be given only to friends of the Government. Altogether, it is impossible that the expenditure under this Bill will be less than $2,000 for each electoral division, and as there are 211 electoral divisions in Canada, and we shall probably have more after the next census, the expenditure will reach very nearly half a million dollars—indeed, we may say with perfect certainty that the expense of making this list will reach half a million dollars. Well, as I have already said, if I were to consider this measure only from a party of point of view, I should rejoice at it. I have not forgotten the outcry raised in the Province of Quebec by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite from that Province, when the Supreme Court was created. A regular howl was raised against the Liberal party because it had, as was asserted put the country to an immense expenditure in order to give fat salaries to certain lawyers. I must admit that a good deal

of damage was done our party by that cry. But what does that court cost us now, against which such an outcry was raised? For the last fiscal year I see the expenditure in connection with it was $56,426, whereas the cost of these 211 supreme courts that are going to be created by this Bill, will be at least half a million dollars. I would like to see what defence hon. gentlemen opposite can make to this proposition. I see before me some of those who raised such a howl against the Supreme Court, on account of its cost and its affording fat salaries to a few lawyers, and I would like to know what they have to say in defence of a proposition to give salaries to 211 lawyers, at an expense of half a million dollars.

But not only will this system be very expensive, but it will be less efficient than the system now in existence. As I stated a few moments ago, it is a very difficult thing to make a good election list, so difficult that even when it is made by a local officer there are sure to be some mistakes. I do not think there ever was a list made by the secretary-treasurer which had not afterwards to be corrected by the municipal council, although it was made by a local officer, who knew every individual living in the municipality and the probable amount of property in his possession. I am now, of course, speaking of the Province of Quebec, with which I am specially acquainted, but I suppose the case is much the same in the other Provinces. Every man in a municipality knows what property his neighbors have, and the assessor cannot easily be deceived on this point. But when the list is to be prepared by a perfect stranger going into the county, knowing neither the individuals, nor the amount of their property, how is it possibls that he can make a correct list? For instance, take a lawyer going from the city of Quebec into the county of Gaspé, or the county of Bonaventure; what can he know of the electors or their means? What can he know of the wages earned by the laborers of that county? A great many of the electors are away from certain counties at certain seasons of the year, and how is this revising officer to get the information which will enable him to put them on the list or exclude them from it? Now, we have obtained a concession from the First Minister, that the valuation roll shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the value of property to qualify those who are to qualify on real estate. Several new franchises have been admitted, and very properly admitted. Farmers' sons, or proprietors' sons, are admitted, and wage-earners are admitted under the Bill as it now stands. Now, how would it be possible for a perfect stranger to go into a county and say how many sons a farmer has who would be qualified to vote? It is next to impossible. The consequence is, that that officer will have to act on second-class information, and of course he will take his information from the wire-pullers of his party.

But the worst feature of this Bill, after all, is its injustice and its want of impartiality. By the section now under discussion the appointment of the revising officer is to be left to the Governor in Council. (The hon. gentleman read section 10 of the Bill, concerning the appointment of revising officers.) Now, I desire to call the attention of the committee to a portion of the section I have just read. That portion of the section is the very best answer to the contention of the First Minister. He said, a few moments ago, that the system proposed is virtually the English system. It does not require a very strong argument to prove that this is not correct. It is only necessary to read the section to show that there is no comparison between the English system and the system proposed by this Bill. As was stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), under the English system lists are prepared by the local authorities, by the overseers of the county municipalities, and by the clerks of cities and towns. They are local officers, having local knowledge of individuals and of property. It is exactly our system, with the differences of detail which are inevitable on account of the difference of our municipal organisations. But taking into account the differences that exist between our municipal organisation and the municipal organisation in England, there cannot be more similarity than exists between the system now in force in England and the system in force in this country, up to this moment, and which it is proposed to abandon. Are those officers in England who prepare the lists those who revise them? Not at all. What are the duties of the revising officers in England? They are exactly the duties which are performed by the judges in this country in cases of appeal; I speak, at least, for the Province of Quebec, with the laws of which I am very familiar. I can state without fear of contradiction that the revising officer performs the same duties as are performed in Quebec by the judges when an appeal is taken from the revision of the municipal officers. It is impossible to have more precautions taken than are taken in Quebec to have correct lists. The list is prepared by the local officer, who knows everyone. It is submitted to the municipal council, to which every elector has a right to make complaint. Everyone can take cognisance of the list immediately after the municipal officer has prepared it; and he must swear to its correctness.

I heard a very strong remark made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) who stated that it was an insult to the legal profession of Ontario, at least, to insinuate that a lawyer, being under oath, could do anything but what was perfectly just and fair. I do not like the plan of opposing class to class. I belong to the legal profession myself, and there are very respectable people in that profession; but that profession is like every other, and I do not pretend that lawyers are above other men, as regards justice and impartiality. All classes in this country should be put on the same footing. It must be admitted that injustice and perjury have been committed. As soon as the list is prepared it must be sworn to by the officer who has prepared it. In Quebec we have more than an oath of office taken in advance. That was not found to be sufficient; so, after the local officer has prepared the list, he must take a special oath before a justice of the peace, swearing to the correctness and impartiality of the list. He must state under that special oath that, to the best of his knowledge, it is a correct list of persons entitled to vote, that he has knowingly ommitted no one and has not improperly inserted any name on the list. There is nothing of that kind provided to be done by the revising officer in the Bill now under discussion. He will only take the general oath of office. In answer to the hon. member for Victoria, I may say that the legal profession of Quebec occupies just as good a position as that of any other Province; but there is party spirit in the legal profession of Quebec as in the profession of every other Province. I do not say that lawyers of standing would perjure themselves, but it is very well known in Quebec, as in every other Province, there are in the profession kings and pigmies. There are kings, like the hon. member for Victoria, and he cannot judge all lawyers by himself. He, of course, would never lower himself by acting against his oath; but he cannot make himself responsible for every other lawyer. There are lawyers who may perjure themselves and be false to their oath; there are very few who would commit perjury and swear to statements that were not correct; but party spirit may lead men very great distances. It is a well known rule, and one followed in all countries, that a law should not place a man in such a position as to compel him to choose between his duty and his interest. What are we going to do under this this Bill if it passes the House? The revising officer will be a party man, because it is not expected, judging from the antecedents of the First Minister, that he will appoint men quite independent of

all party leanings. He will appoint party men, and perhaps very bitter party men. Is it desirable to appoint men who will be placed in the position of choosing between the interests of their party and their duty? It is against all principles of morality and of legislation. We can only judge of the future by the past. We have seen the effect of the interference of the Government in the past in election matters. It is very well to talk of respect paid to an oath; but we have seen, in Quebec and in other Provinces, returning officers, who are supposed to be officers occupying as high a position, if not higher, than that which will be occupied by the revising officer, commit improper acts. I am going to speak of occurrences within my own personal knowledge. In 1871 the law left the task to the Government of choosing any revising officer whom they wished. A certain revising officer was appointed for the election in Quebec Centre. He was a professional man, a notary, one of the profession from which it is proposed to select these officers. At that time the nominations were public. No precautions were taken to allow the free and independent electors to come near the hustings to propose a candidate. The hustings were surrounded by bullies, so much so, that any respectable person could not get near them, and one man could not get near the place, although he was one of the supporters of the party, because he had so respectable an appearance. The returning officer was deaf to all the voices proposing an Opposition candidate, though he heard the nomination of the Conservative candidate. The result was, that he declared the Conservative candidate elected by acclamation, although it was well known that another candidate was to be proposed. During the following Session an enquiry took place, and dozens of witnesses swore before the Committee on Privileges and Elections that they had proposed another candidate, that they had shouted his name very loudly, so that every one understood the name very well, the candidate being a gentleman who is now in the Senate. But although the returning officer was a professional man, although he had taken the oath of office, as the revising officers will do, he was deaf to all the cries of those who proposed the Liberal candidate, although his ear was very acute in hearing the name of the present Minister of Public Works, and he declared him elected by acclamation.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. LANGELIER. When the committee rose I was showing, in reply to the statement of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) that it would be an insult to the legal profession to suppose that revising barristers, sworn to do their duty, would act otherwise than in an impartial manner—I was giving instances in which professional men, appointed to still more important and responsible positions than those of revising officers, had acted in anything but a fair and impartial manner. In 1867 there were a great many of such cases, and one of them came before this House in 1868. I allude to the case of the returning officer for Kamouraska. How did he show his impartiality and fair dealing before the nomination came on. He commenced to show the strongest spirit of partisanship. He went so far as to tie up his dog's tail with a red ribbon in order to insult all the Liberal party in the county, and this was but a trifle compared with what he did when nomination came on. By his proclamation he disfranchised all the municipalities where it was generally known the Liberal party would have large majorities. He declared those municipalities should not vote; and this was not an isolated instance. We saw the same thing repeated in several counties, where they resorted to that shameful trick of preventing electors in the Liberal parishes from voting, and still these men were under oath. And in order not to perjure themselves they took the precaution of getting the opinion of a lawyer in favor of the course they were pursuing. The law at that time required the secretary-treasurers to send duplicates of the election list to the registrar. Under the pretext that copies instead of duplicates had been sent, whole municipalities were disfranchised; but it is a remarkable fact that copies had also been sent from several Conservative municipalities, and it was not considered that they should be disfranchised; one course was followed towards the Liberal municipalities and another course towards the Conservative municipalities. Still, that was the conduct of responsible men. This is an answer to the remark of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) this afternoon, to the effect that it was an insult to the legal profession to suppose that legal gentlemen should be anything but impartial under oath. Without going contrary to his oath, it would be very easy for the revising barrister to say he was acting on information, as he might be careful only to go to the Conservative party for information. So many abuses were committed by the returning officers to whom I have referred, that it was thought proper by our friends, as soon as they came into power, in 1874, to change the law. It had always been their contention, while out of power, that the officers connected with the election of members of the House of Commons should not be appointed by the Government, but should be entirely independent of the Government—should be public officers, in responsible positions, who should be *ex officio* returning officers; and as soon as they came into power they made good the promises they made in Opposition, by enacting that the registrars or sheriffs should be *ex officio* returning officers. In 1875, in order to put an end to similar abuses in the local elections, the Legislature of Quebec, directed at that time by a Conservative Government, enacted a similar law. All this shows the danger of the system now proposed, of putting into the hands of the Government the appointment of officers who are going to have so much to do with the election of members to the House of Commons. But it is stated that these officers shall be, as far as possible, taken from among the judges. Well, even in the Province of Ontario and in the other Provinces which have county judges, that will be impossible, in a great many cases. I understand that in the Province of Ontario there are only forty-two county judges, whereas there are ninety-two constituencies. If the county judges were to be *ex officio* revising barristers, the objections of the expensiveness and the inefficiency of the new system would remain; but there would not be that strongest of all objections founded upon the partiality of the lists. The county judges, being independent of political parties, are supposed to be free from partisanship, and to be likely to make fair lists. But in the Province of Quebec even that would be impossible, because we have no county judges, and it is entirely out of the question to expect the judges of the Superior Court to prepare the electoral lists. Their number is not large enough, and they have not too much time for the performance of their ordinary duties. What, then, will be the result? The result will be that in the Province of Quebec, at least, none but lawyers or notaries will be appointed to make the lists. I would call the special attention of hon. members from the Province of Quebec to the danger for that Province, in particular, of the system now proposed. I am going to quote a few lines from a book written by a Conservative writer; it is entituled: "*Le Canada sous l'Union*," by Mr. Turcotte. Speaking of the abuses committed in the first election under the Union, the writer shows the danger of entrusting to the Government the appointment of the officers who are to manage the elections. At that time the appointment of the returning

officers was put in the hands of the Government. The result was that the then Governor General, Lord Sydenham, succeeded in electing a majority of the members, although the majority of the electors were opposed to the Government he had formed. The following constituencies were practically disfranchised: Beauharnois, Vaudreuil, Rouville, Montreal, Chambly and Terrebonne. In these counties members were elected to whom the electors were opposed. One man, who afterwards occupied a prominent position in this country—I refer to Sir Louis H. Lafontaine—was defeated by the means used by the partisan returning officers, and here is what he said, speaking of his rejection in the county of Terrebonne, in a letter addressed to the electors:

"Un fait patent que personne ne peut nier, qui résulte des actes mêmes de lord Sydenham, c'est qu'il s'est identifié personnellement dans la lutte électorale de notre district, dont il a pris un soin particulier à changer les places de poll; et que, dans ces comtés, la lutte a été accompagnée de violence, de l'effusion de sang et de meurtres. En fixant pour votre comté le lieu de l'élection à New Glasgow, dans les bois, à l'extrémité des limites de ce comté, lord Sydenham a commis une injustice flagrante."

The same system might be resorted to by a partisan revising officer. The Bill provides that it shall be the duty of the revising barrister to divide each municipality into polling divisions. Every member of this House has had more or less to do with elections, and knows the influence that a certain division into polling districts may have in favor of the one party or the other. On the occasion to which I refer, instead of fixing the place of nomination at the real centre of the county, it was placed at New Glasgow, in the bush, at an immense distance from the central place. What was done on that occasion by the partisan returning officer might be more easily done by a revising officer. He might divide the municipality into polling divisions, in such a way as to make it almost impossible, in many places, for the Liberals to poll their vote, or make it exceedingly expensive for them to do so. I have seen that done on certain occasions by partisan returning officers. Every man knows, that under the present law, in the Province of Quebec, at least, when the municipal councillors have not divided a municipality into polling divisions, it is the duty of the returning officer to do it. In some cases, where the municipal councils neglected to do so, a partisan returning officer has divided the municipality in such a way as to practically disfranchise nearly the whole Liberal party in certain polling divisions, the polling houses being put in places where it was practically impossible for the Liberal party in the municipality to exercise their franchise.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say that is confined exclusively to Conservative returning officers?

Mr. LANGELIER. No; but the same thing can be done by the revising officers.

Mr. BOWELL. That was done in my own constituency—not in my election, but at the last local election, in the Liberal interest.

Mr. LANGELIER. What the hon. gentleman says is in support of my contention.

Mr. BOWELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to be contending that that would be done by the revising barrister; but that, under the present system, where the returning officers are confined to registrars and sheriffs, that cannot be done. In my county the returning officer did the same thing.

Mr. LANGELIER. When a municipal council neglects their duty, it is the duty of the returning officer to make the polling divisions. In a few cases the municipal council neglected their duty, and it was done by the returning officers in the way I have stated. Under this Bill, the divisions of a municipality by a Government officer will become the rule. Sir L. H. Lafontaine goes on to say:

"Il a voulu défranchiser virtuellement votre comté; et un fait important à constater, c'est que là, lui, lord Sydenham, est descendu dans l'arène pour combattre corps à corps avec un simple individu. C'est lui qui engageait la lutte avec moi; le Dr McCulloch n'était qu'un prête-nom. Il m'a vaincu; mais il y a de ces défaites qui sont plus honorables que la victoire, il faut marcher dans le sang de ses concitoyens amis ou ennemis."

Here are some instances of the frauds and injustices which have been committed, when a partisan officer had to do with the conduct of an election. Well, it is proposed by this Bill to put all the elections into the hands of a partisan revising barrister. This is a danger for every Province in the Confederation. It threatens this country with the overthrow of its representative institutions; but there is a special danger to be feared from it, as regards the Province of Quebec. The only guarantee we have of preserving our local institutions, our special institutions, which the promoters of Confederation were so careful to preserve, is the free and untrammelled exercise of the franchise by the electors of the Province of Quebec. I do not suppose we shall ever have a Governor General who will act in the same way as Lord Sydenham did; but it is easy to suppose that we may have a Prime Minister desirous of destroying the local institutions of Quebec, of invading the local rights of Quebec, and nothing would be easier for that Prime Minister than to secure the election of more tools in several counties, by appointing partisan revising barristers, who will put on the voters' lists only the electors prepared in advance to support the course proposed by the Government, or to have revising barristers who would practically disfranchise large portions of several constituencies, those portions which it was known in advance would be opposed to the policy of the Government. I repeat, if there is a Province in the Confederation which should be opposed specially to this portion of the Bill, it is certainly the Province of Quebec; and I am astonished to see hon. members, supporters of the Government from that Province, prepared to support that portion of the Bill. When I say they are prepared to support it, I must modify that statement; they do not seem to be prepared to support it very cordially. Not one of them has dared to stand up and say he is satisfied with the Bill which they are prepared to vote for, but I am sure, if the First Minister were to go to every one of them and ask him: Do you prefer this Bill should pass or not? I am sure each one would answer that he would prefer ten times over that it did not pass. They support it only for party purposes; and I must say this to the credit of the Conservative members of the Province of Quebec, that if they are prepared to vote for the Bill they have the decency, at least, not to say anything in its favor.

After each election which our adversaries have carried, we always hear a great deal of boasting from them of their immense success; we hear them say that the electors approve of their policy. Supposing, after this law is in force, an election is carried by hon. gentlemen opposite—I do not expect it will have that result—but suppose it will, will they be able to boast very much of the result? Will they be able to say it proves that public opinion is in their favor? It would only prove that the electors, selected by partisan officers, would be in their favor, but not at all that public opinion was in their favor. It has always been a great point in elections to secure fairness and impartiality. I remember hearing a very interesting remark made by the late Mr. Justice Willes, in an election case, when giving a reason why, in election cases, the wrongful acts of the agent go against the principal, which is not the case in civil cases. The reason he gave was, that an election should be carried only by fair means, and he compared it to a race, which, he said, if won by foul means, should not be considered as gained, but as lost to the party guilty of the fraud. Could an election carried under this Bill by electors selected by partisan officers be fairly considered as an election carried

on in a regular manner and showing the strength of public opinion? I say no. There is no man who will say that the election will show the public opinion of the country; it will only show the so-called public opinion formed by the revising barrister appointed by the Government.

I think I have proved that the system proposed will be extremely expensive, that it will be much more inefficient than the present system, that it is more dangerous, that it will bring partiality into the making of the election lists and will be dangerous for the whole country, and especially for the Province of Quebec.

Mr. VALIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the Opposition is very much afraid of the revising officers. We do not fear, because we are not accustomed to use the means which these hon. gentlemen most always use. It is true, the present system is very well liked by these gentlemen, because it leaves the door open for them to commit frauds and to cause the lists to be revised according to their own notions. I am speaking from personal experience in my own county. I shall speak of what has taken place during last election in my own county. The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Langelier) ought to know something about it. During that election people have taken the trouble to travel over every parish in the county with a notary, making out deeds, in order to increase the number of voters and in order to have the list revised and names struck out. The present Bill cannot give, especially in that part of the country, a great number of votes to these gentlemen, and this is easily understood; but if we give them the privilege of revising the lists we know what will happen. What has happened last year might happen again this year, and I have no doubt that that might be continued in the same manner for a long time to come. Deeds have been passed in all the parishes in my county, or nearly so, and as many as three different votes have been given on the same farm. Those who had so divided their lots were to annul the deeds immediately after votation, but there has been a case where the sons of a farmer declined to annul the deeds, and father and sons were left almost penniless. Well, what we wish to have to-day is revisers, who will be sufficiently independent from these gentlemen, revisers who will be under the control of the Government, and by this means I hope we may have justice. The present Government do not expect to remain in power for centuries; it may turn out some of these days that the hon. gentlemen opposite may come into power; and it is for that reason that, on our part, we should like to have the right of appeal. I suppose that that right will be used, and that everything that can be done will be done to have as many votes struck out as will be possible. It is not known who the revisers will be; I suppose that we are going to appoint Liberals, because we know very well that if the Liberals were in power they would appoint Conservatives. There is not the least doubt about that. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said about this Franchise Bill that our ears are full of it. I believe that the gentlemen who have said so much about this Bill are sick of it. I believe that their own seats must have heard more about it than hon. members on this side of the House, and that their voices must have resounded very often in their own ears. It is evident that if the present system was to continue these gentlemen would not find it necessary to make great contests; all that they would have to do would be to use the means which were employed in my county, and go round the country in that manner; it is well known that corruption would soon have changed the majority of the people. We know that we, the Conservatives, have not practised the same system as these gentlemen, so that we will probably have a considerable increase of votes in my county. This is the reason why, for my part, I am in favor of the present Bill; and I especially approve of that clause which will give us revisers appointed by the Government. We will have more chance to have justice when they will be appointed by the Government, than if their appointment was left in the hands of the present mayors. We know that the mayors who, in my county, are working in the interest of the Liberal party, are very apt to commit irregularities. I do not know who advises them in that way, but then, every year we have long lists, which give us a great deal of trouble to revise them; and if competent men are appointed by the Government it will do away with a great many difficulties with which we have to contend at the present time.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. gentleman practically agrees with me. He says that, in his county, some people in certain municipalities have been making electors by assigning portions of their property to their sons, or to some other relatives, in order to qualify them. The hon. gentleman cannot be ignorant of the fact that the law of Quebec provides for such a case. There is an express clause in that law, saying that, whenever it is proved before a municipal council that a property has been assigned or transferred or leased to a party for the only purpose of qualifying him as an elector, the council has the right to strike out the name of that party. If that is not done in the hon. gentleman's county it is his own fault or the fault of his friends. I know his county pretty well.

Mr. VALIN. You ought to know it.

Mr. LANGELIER. Yes; I know it pretty well. The hon. gentleman will not contradict me when I say that a large majority of the municipal councils in his county are Conservative. Why did they not correct these mistakes or frauds of which he speaks? I think he has no right to come here and make the complaint; this is not the proper place for it. I know that, on a certain occasion, he made a complaint against the valuation roll, which went as far as the Court of Appeal. That shows that there is a remedy for frauds, if frauds there are. The present system will not shut the door to such tricks as those he speaks of. I am not prepared to admit or to deny the statements he has made. I do not know anything of them, but I know that the law now proposed will not only not shut, but will open wide the door to the commisssion of the same acts of which he complains. What is there in the present law to prevent the making of electors by transferring or assigning property sufficient to qualify them? The only difference is, that when the property is assigned or transferred it is the revising officer who will have to decide whether the property is of sufficient value, instead of it being decided, as now, by the municipal council. But this will not prevent the evils of which he speaks. Now, there is a remedy. If the secretary-treasurer does not correct those abuses the municipal council may stop them; if the municipal council do not stop them a judge of the Superior Court, when appealed to, will correct those frauds or mistakes. Under the present Bill, instead of that, we shall have the revising barrister appointed by the Government, who will make the list. If such frauds are committed in the interest of the party, I can say, without much fear of being mistaken, that the officer in question will be very chary of striking off the names of parties put on the list in that way. He will be, first, the party to make the list; then he will revise it; then he will decide the appeal taken from his own revision. What can we expect? It is possible that the revising officer will correct his own work, and admit the mistake, but it will show a great deal of philosophy on the part of a revising barrister to admit that he has committed a fraud or made a great blunder; so, instead of the advantage we now have of correcting those frauds or mistakes, we shall have no correction, and the fraudulent lists will remain fraudulent.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have to consider the question of cost. I expected, when the First Minister addressed the

House this afternoon, that he would have given us some information as to the probable cost that will be involved in the inauguration of this system. It is a very important matter. If, by the operation of this Act, we are going to increase the annual expenditure, it is a very important consideration in connection with this Bill, and one which should be closely criticised. Several statements have been made on this side in regard to the probable cost, but we have had no such statement from the other side. The only suggestion the First Minister has made on the subject was when he stated that the county judges had been agitating for an increased salary, that some suggestions had been made in that direction, and that, by a sum being added to their salary, they possibly would perform the duties of revising officers in addition to their present duties. We do not know whether the amount added to their salaries will be the same amount as will be given to revising officers, who are not judges. Undoubtedly it is going to cost a considerable sum of money, and it is exceedingly desirable that we should have some more information upon this point before we can agree to pass this clause. Now, another objectionable feature connected with the revising barrister is that the Government is asking to be empowered to fix the salary by Order in Council. It has also been intimated that it will probably cost more the first year than it is likely to cost in subsequent years, because the revising officer and his assistants will have more work to perform the first year. Now, I do not believe that after the system has been put into operation, and the revising barristers have been granted an allowance for the first year, they will very willingly consent to a reduction, even supposing the work should be less in after years. I am quite sure it is not the Government's intention to reduce the judges' salary after it is once established, and consequently there is no probability that the amount granted to each revising officer the first year will be reduced, but it is more likely to be increased. Now, there is another point worthy of mention. It is going to be impossible to fix the same salary for each officer, because there are some constituencies in which there are 6,000 voters, while in others there are only 3,000. Where there is a large number of voters the revising barrister will expect a proportionately large allowance for discharging his duties. He will not be willing to perform the duty in a constituency of 6,000 voters for the same salary as he would in a constituency of only 3,000 voters, and the consequence will be that so many arguments will be used in favor of increasing the salary of the revising barristers that it will go on increasing from year to year. They will constantly be representing the work done by them as something very onerous, to which they would like to have a respectable salary attached. With regard to the appointment itself, I claim that it is an imprudent act on the part of the Government to ask that they should control the appointments in each constituency. They ought to endeavor to rid themselves of the odium, that will undoubtedly rest upon them, of appointing their own political friends in every constituency. It appears that it struck the First Minister as necessary in the interest of his party that he should not only ask power to make the appointment, but that he should make it in such a way that the revising officers will hold their office as long as they live, or until such time as some serious complaint is made against them. I hold that they should have adopted either the course that is pursued in England, and allow the judges of the Supreme Court, who go from circuit to circuit, to make the appointments, or else they should have sought in some other way to relieve themselves of the odium that will hang around the Government for taking power to make partisan appointments. Although the revising officer may, in some cases, desire to do his duty with some measure of fairness, there will always be a certain amount of dissatisfaction with him on account of the fact that he is a political partisan. We all know that in England, from which the Prime Minister is fond of quoting precedents, the judges make the appointment of the revising barristers, and we have courts here similar to those of England. When the hon. gentleman intended to follow so closely the English precedent he ought to have provided for the appointments of revising officers to be made by Superior Court judges. In the United States the appointments of supervisors or select men are made by the people themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. HESSON. I hope hon. gentlemen will keep a little more quiet. The hon. member has only spoken fifty-three times on this subject!

Mr. McMULLEN. I have not spoken more frequently than I considered it to be my duty to speak. I have a right to criticise every item. I am discharging my duty, and I will do it fearlessly, to the end. In the United States I have said those men are chosen by popular vote. No party in power, whether Democrat or Republican, has a right to select the men who shall fix the voters' lists. In some places there may be a majority of Democrats appointed, and in others a majority of Republicans; but the people are responsible for the result. In this connection we have a right to review the work to be performed by the revising officers. They will have to get copies of the assessment rolls in each municipality. Afterwards, they will have to make out duplicate copies of those rolls. They must post them up in several places, for the purpose of giving the electors an opportunity of seeing what names they contain. After a number of days the first revision will be held. It will be the privilege of any elector to attend and present his objections to any names on the list, or suggest that names be added. After the first revision the electoral lists will be prepared. Those will have to be posted up and remain posted for some time. Then will come the second revision of the list. As soon as the first revision is over several lists will have to be prepared and posted up. Afterwards the second revision will be held. It will have to be held in each municipality, of which there are from ten to fifteen in each electoral district. If the revising officer spends only one day in each municipality he will not get through the second revision in less than about fifteen days. I have been accustomed to municipal work for twenty years, and I am satisfied there will be considerable work for a revising officer to do, and more work during the first year than subsequently, due to curiosity on the part of the people. I have no doubt that the work will be larger than it would be after the system is in operation for several years. I claim that by this system the Government will shoulder the responsibility of endeavoring to cook the voters' list in every constituency, and in place of putting themselves in such a position, they should try to relieve themselves of a charge of that kind. If the Government were disposed to place their case fairly and honestly before the country they certainly would not seek, by a system of this kind, to control the voters' list in each constituency, and place themselves under the suspicion of putting some names on and taking others off. Whether that would be the case or not I cannot say; but of one thing I am certain, and that is, that there is a general suspicion that it will be done in some cases. If judges are appointed I have no doubt that the duties will be fairly and honestly performed in most cases, though there may be such a thing as even judges forgetting their high positions, and permitting their political feelings to bias them in the discharge of their duty. I hope, however, that such cases will be rare. The revising barristers, however, are like other men, and as we admit that there are partisans and men holding extreme views on all sides of politics, when the Government appoints a man of that stamp he will undoubtedly try to show

his willingness to discharge his duties, with an eye to the best interests of his party, and in such cases there will undoubtedly be great dissatisfaction, and possibly difficulties may arise of a very serious kind. We know that a law was passed some years ago by which the Government took into their hands the power of appointing returning officers in places where sheriffs and registrars could be got, but perhaps were not considered desirable men to appoint. I know that in my county we have a sheriff and two registrars, and that one of those registrars was permitted to stay at home, and a man was appointed in the centre riding who never had performed the duties of returning officer, and in many ways was completely ignorant of those duties. While there was no evidence of his acting in an improper way, possibly, if matters had come to as close a shave as in some other constituencies, he might have been willing to lend himself to acts which might have been questionable in themselves. We know that, by the action of one of these returning officers the hon. member for Bothwell was deprived of his seat for some time, and that another man represented the constituency in this House until the courts awarded the hon. gentleman his just rights; and if the First Minister should strike such a man as that, and appoint him a revising officer, no man would say that he would not be willing to do acts just as questionable as those which were done by that gentleman. The hon. member for Victoria was very indignant this afternoon at the leader of the Opposition, because he made some remarks which he thought were not complimentary to lawyers. I think the hon. gentleman exaggerated what the leader of the Opposition said; but, at any rate, though lawyers are a respectable class of men, they are like other people, and there are among them extreme partisans, men who would lend themselves to political acts of a very questionable kind if they had the opportunity. I believe there are barristers of five years' standing who, if they had, to-morrow, the opportunity of discharging the duties of a revising officer, would be willing to perform those duties in the best interest of their party, and I have no doubt, before we have had many years experience of this law, we will find, in sections where those men are appointed, just as great an outcry against the appointments which the hon. gentleman makes as we have heard with regard to his appointments of returning officers. I contend that there has been no evidence presented to this House in favor of this provision, and the fact that the present system has worked so admirably well shows that this change is not a desirable one, that it is, in fact, absolutely unnecessary. The only ground upon which any gentleman on that side can ask that this Bill should be put in operation is the ground of party exigency. I believe, if you obliterate the ill-feeling which exists between the First Minister and the Attorney-General of Ontario you would do away with the necessity of this law altogether, and it is too bad that the country, owing to this unfortunate state of things, should be asked to incur an annual expense of $300,000 or $400,000 for the operation of this law. The First Minister laughs when I mention these figures, but as we have not had the slightest intimation from him or from hon. members on that side as to what the estimated cost will be, we are justified in holding that our estimate is nearly correct. I hold that the system under which the municipal councils have in their hands the preparation of the lists has worked most admirably, and that they are the best judges and revisors. Though politics may rule in some few townships, as a general thing they do not, and the men elected discharge their duties with credit to themselves and advantage to the township. These men, from year to year, seek the honor of being elected to positions in the council, and they perceive the necessity of cultivating the the good feeling of the people and of seeing that every rightful elector in the municipality is placed on the voters' list. In the first place, the assessor has to put a fixed value on the entire assessable property of the municipality. Before he proceeds to perform that duty he has to make an affidavit, declaring that he will faithfully, truly and impartially discharge the duty of assessor. After that he makes his return to the municipality under oath. That return goes before the court of revision, every member of which has to take an oath and sign a declaration that he will faithfully, truly and impartially, to the best of his ability, discharge his duty as a member of the court of revision for that municipality. They then proceed to revise the voters' list; and every man being well acquainted with the section of the municipality which he represents—as the municipality is generally divided into wards—those whose names are improperly left off are generally put on the list at the court of revision, if there is any application. If there is not, and the court of revision omits any names, the parties, or their friends, can appeal to the county judge, who appoints a place where the appeal can be heard and witnesses examined, and he then proceeds to put on those names which he considers ought to be put on, and strikes off those he considers ought to be struck off. That is a convenient and cheap way of preparing the voters' lists at present, and it has worked admirably. Although, in some municipalities, we have had very keen political contests, the results obtained have been, on the whole, more satisfactory to the electors than those that will be obtained under this new Act. When you have a system in force that has worked so well as the present system it is unwise to discard it, and adopt another that is new to the country, and that will cause a considerable amount of expense and trouble to the people, and will end in a considerable amount of confusion. The next officer of importance is, the municipal clerk. He has to perform certain duties in connection with the revision of the list; he has to see that the list is forwarded to the different officials in the county; he has to post copies of the list up at different points, in order that the electors may have an opportunity of investigating it; and he has to make a declaration that he has performed his work; he has also to make a return of every man in the township who is liable to pay poll taxes or to perform statute labor. In this way he becomes familiarised with the names, and he gets so thorough a knowledge of every man in his municipality that he is able to judge at once whether a man is entitled to be put on the list or not. In a municipality in my own section of country, where there were some 900 ratepayers, where a by-law was submitted for a bonus to a railway, and where there was only one voting place, the clerk of the municipality was able to name every single ratepayer, without turning up the list, simply because he had occupied that position for fifteen years. That gives you an idea of the extensive knowledge the municipal clerk has of the residents of his municipality. I would like to know if such an extensive knowledge is not a decided advantage to any man called upon to make up the list. The revising officer will be possessed of no such information, because he will probably leave his clerk to prepare the list. If the hon. First Minister had embodied a clause in his Bill providing that the clerk of each municipality should be *ex officio* the clerk of the revising officer for the preparation of the list in that municipality, it would have been a great advantage. But I can easily conceive why he did not do that; all the clerks in the municipalities are not of the same political stripe, and the probability is that they would not just perform the work they would be asked to do. But it is not too late yet; and if the hon. First Minister would consider the question of utilising the municipal clerks, such a change in his Bill would facilitate the business of making up the lists. A very large amount of money would be saved by using the present lists. It is imprudent on our part to incur the expense of making out second lists. The Provinces of this

Dominion stand in the relation of partners; there are seven of us, and what is a saving to one is a saving to another; and if, through the co-operation of the Dominion Government with the Local Government, and the Local Government with the Dominion Government, money can be saved to the people, is it not desirable to save that money? If by the Dominion adopting the municipal and provincial machinery which is in force, and which has rendered acceptable service in the past, a saving is going to be effected to the Dominion, would it not be wise and prudent to continue to use that machinery? It looks like rivalry among the members of a family to inaugurate a system that is going to cost the country a large amount of money, simply because there are some Provinces with which the present Government are not on such terms as to enable them to accept those changes in the voters' list which the Provinces have made—not because they are not in the right direction, or because they do not extend the franchise to classes who ought not to have it, but simply from a pure spirit of spleen and bitterness. Now, the First Minister has told us that the municipal assessment rolls and lists are going to be utilised, but they are only to be utilised as a guide; and if the revising barrister chooses to value a man's property less than that put upon it in the assessment roll, he can do so, and he can do so while refusing to accept any evidence to the contrary. It is all very well to talk about appeals, but appeals are very expensive affairs; and the poor men, who are the class that will be left out, will not be inclined to consult a lawyer, and take all the expensive measures necessary to be placed on the list, so that the probability is, the majority of those struck off the list will remain disfranchised. As regards the cost of this new machinery, we have a right to feel disappointed that the First Minister has not ventured to give us any estimate. Figures have been submitted by hon. members on this side, which go to show that it will cost between $300,000 and $400,000 a year; but even supposing it cost only $1,000 for each constituency, which would be only $300 for each officer, a sum lower, I imagine, than even a third-class man can be got for, it will foot up to $211,000 a year. In our present position, I think this expenditure should be avoided, on the ground of economy alone, if on no other. It is unwise that we should open the door to an expenditure of so large a sum, and leave it solely at the disposition of the Governor in Council. The revising officer will undoubtedly be treated and recognised as an officer of the Government; he will seek to discharge his duties to the satisfaction of the Government, conscious that if he does that he may reasonably expect an increase of salary, or, at any rate, that his salary will be continued. Although we have the statement of the First Minister that, after the first year, the expenditure will, probably, be much less, I venture to predict it will be greater; I venture to predict that, in place of the revising barrister's salary being reduced, it will be increased. Before inaugurating this system we should carefully count the cost, and we should ask ourselves where are we going to find the money to pay for it. The people are beginning to feel seriously alarmed at our continued increase of expenditure, and we would be untrue to their best interests if we continued to add to their burdens without seriously considering whether the increase is absolutely necessary or not. In this case there can be no doubt that it is not necessary. The First Minister said this afternoon, he was willing to accept suggestions, if we were prepared to make them, that he was open to conviction on any point that might be raised, and be worthy of his consideration; but ever since the discussion has commenced we have been pressing reasons why changes should be made. The First Minister has been so much out of the House that we have had to state over and over again our objections to this Bill, in order, if possible, to reach his ear, and we shall have to continue to do that. I have made suggestions to-night myself as to utilising municipal clerks as clerks to the revising barristers, and I am satisfied that he did not hear what I said, so that some other man may have to repeat them, until they reach the ear of the First Minister. The revising barrister is given a great deal of power in exess even of the powers given to a county judge, whose duty it is to listen to complaints and hear evidence on both sides when it is presented. But the revising officer can hear evidence or not as he pleases. He is both judge and jury, and can put a name on the list or put it off. If he has reason to believe that a man is dead or has left the constituency he can strike the name off, whether the man is dead or has left or not. I am satisfied that when this Act becomes law a great deal more work will have to be performed by Reform candidates than ever before. In my constituency I stand in a more awkward position than most men in this House. I have a constituency where there are four county judges who have jurisdiction. There is a judge and there is a deputy judge in my county, and the two ends of my constituency belong to different counties. In 1882, whether as a matter of kindness to me or to the hon. member for North Perth, they attached a portion of his riding to mine, and the same in regard to the county of Dufferin. I suppose the county judge would perform the duty in the county of Wellington; then, when we come to revise the voters' list in the county of Perth, we will have to get the county judge of that county, and in the east part of the riding we will have to get the county judge of the county of Dufferin; so that we will have to get three judges to revise the voters' list for one constituency. There is another power which it is unwise to vest in the returning officer, and that is the power of arranging the wards. In most cases the wards in the several townships are conveniently laid out a present. In some cases, perhaps, they are not. But the revising officer is not supposed to accept the divisions as they are now, but, if he likes, can sub-divide any town or township. If there are more than 200 ratepayers in a sub-division, instead of putting off a concession or half a concession, to bring the number within 200, he may divide it again, and so make a good deal of confusion. As has already been stated by the hon. member from Quebec, he may seriously inconvenience one political party and accommodate the other. In one township in my constituency, the ward in the south end gives as large a Conservative majority as the ward in the north end gives a Reform majority. Now, if the revising officer should think it advantageous to his party, he might so divide the township as to make all the Reformers go from the north end to the south end, and some would have to travel twelve or fourteen miles to give their votes, while the Conservatives would have the poll at their own door. That would be an injustice. It may be said that no man would do such a thing, but our past experience leads us to believe that there are men in the world capable of doing almost everything, politically, and I believe that some of these revising officers will so divide the municipalities as to largely favor one party at the expense of the other. Mr. Chairman, I felt it my duty to my constituents to make these few remarks, and to give my reasons why I am opposed to the Government assuming the appointment of the revising officers who are to make up the voters' lists.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Before this clause is submitted to a vote I desire to say a few words as to the mode of preparing the voters' list. We have had a good many years' experience in Ontario of a system which has proved very satisfactory. We know that in Ontario, and some of the other Provinces, there are simple means provided, and the municipal machinery is set to work to secure a voters' list, and this system we might adopt in this Bill and at a small cost to this country. But instead of that, it is now proposed to appoint

revising barristers and adopt a machinery that is complicated in character and expensive in its details. We are asked now to sanction a system that will involve, for the salaries of the 211 officers, an expenditure of at least $211,000. The First Minister has not made any estimate as to what will be the probable cost of this measure to the country, but some hon. gentlemen on this side have made a very reasonable calculation, and their estimate is that it will cost something like half a million dollars a year. No hon. gentlemen opposite have yet challenged the correctness of these figures, except the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), who estimated that the measure might cost as high as $100,000 per annum. Let us take the experience of England, where this system has been at work for some time. We find, in the English Act, that the revising barrister is to be paid a sum not exceeding 200 guineas per annum, and in addition there are other expenses which necessarily belong to the working of the machinery provided; for instance, there is a provision by which, in populous constituencies, more than one revising officer can be appointed. Consequently, it is a fair deduction that in no constituency in this country can the revising officer be expected to perform his duties for less than $1,000 a year. Now, it has been alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite, whenever they deign to speak on the question, that this system will give us greater security in the preparation of the voters' list; but is there any gentleman opposite who will say that there is greater security in the existence of a revising barrister, nominated by a gentleman supporting the Government of the day, responsible, practically, only to them, than there is in the system that at present exists in the Provinces? Some hon. gentlemen have sought to throw contempt on the assessors and clerks of Ontario municipalities, and have charged them with being partisans. If it is, as these gentlemen allege, impossible, under a system having so many checks, to prevent fraud and the undue exercise of power, are these not much more likely to arise under a system by which the revising officers are practically independent of every elector of the county. The municipal officials are responsible to the municipal council, and in each municipality the official is only one of two men who has the arrangement of the list. There is a vast difference in regard to the preparation of lists under the present system and that proposed. Journals supporting hon. gentlemen opposite have not defended the Bill on its merits. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to point out a single Ministerial journal in Ontario which has discussed fairly the revising officer clause. No statement made in regard to that official has been made in good faith, but with the evident design of misrepresenting the position of the official. Moreover, the journals usually supporting hon. gentlemen opposite have misrepresented the position of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. They have attempted, in every way, to impute to us motives for the stand made by us in defence of the rights of the people, charges that were in every sense unbecoming. It is not necessary here to defend our position; it will only be necessary to do so when hon. gentlemen opposite make a more decided stand on this phase of the question than they have heretofore done. We have not heard from hon. gentlemen opposite at any length in defence of this particular clause of the Bill, which is one of the most pernicious and the most likely of all the clauses to deprive the free and independent electors of those rights that ought to be inalienably theirs. Under our system of government we have been constantly departing from that principle of administration that leaves it in the hands of the Government of the day to have any connection with the electoral machinery. Up to within very recent years this House had the privilege of administering the law in connection with election protests; but the consensus of opinion induced Parliament to abandon that system, and now allows such cases to be tried by judges. There are, now, no people in the Dominion who are in favor of changing the system from that which at present exists. In that and in many other respects we have attempted to separate the Executive from the electoral functions of the Government. It is a step backwards to admit the principle involved in the clause, and submit to the appointment of revising officers to prepare electoral lists and make appointments for the Government. Now, I strongly favor the system which has heretofore been in existence for the preparation of these lists. I believe that that system is such as to secure the preparation of the lists as nearly perfect as they can be, and as free from the suspicion of partisanship and favoritism which must attach to lists prepared under the system now proposed. I believe the municipal officers of the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, with which I am best acquainted, taking them all in all, are equal to any other class in the community. Besides the experience which they gain from engaging in municipal affairs, they have the local knowledge and acquaintance with each minor municipality which should be possessed by men occupying such positions, and would it not be better that these men should have the power of preparing the primary lists than the officials in whose hands the Bill proposes to place that power. I believe that under the Bill no perfect primary list can be prepared, and consequently no final revision, that does not comtemplate the engrafting of the municipal machinery and municipal officials in a Bill of this kind. Though one or two gentlemen have thrown doubt on the good faith of some of these assessors and clerks, they have toned down their expressions to such a degree that there is very little force in their remarks. But even if there were some complaints, does not the appeal to the judge offer the strongest incentive to these officers to perform their duties carefully, so that their municipalities should not be put to expense? And though there is an appeal under the Bill, when the judge is not the revising officer, it does not imply the same closeness of supervision that exists in the appeal from the present voters' lists. I desire also to point out that, while the assessor has to make a solemn declaration that he has done his work conscientiously and thoroughly, to the best of his belief, the revising officer is only required to subscribe his name to the list as being the list for that particular constituency. It has been said that the fact that the revising barrister has secured from the Law Society the privilege of practising his profession will be a security that he will conduct himself with propriety; but while I would not depreciate the character of the legal profession, I believe you will find that in all the public acts of the clerks and assessors throughout the Province of Ontario they have shown themselves equally competent, equally responsible, equally well-behaved, in proportion to their numbers, as the members of the legal profession of that Province. But that is not taken as a sufficient guarantee that these officers shall do their duty fairly, for other guards are thrown around them. Still, in the face of that fact, we are urged to accept the parchment which has been granted to the barrister as an ample guarantee of his moral responsibility, his legal knowledge, his good faith, and everything else involved in the responsibility which the Bill places on him. I say the best guarantee we can have is the security involved in a most stringent supervision; otherwise, we are throwing odium on every official in this Dominion on whom we place responsibility, because in proportion to their responsibility we take security for their good behavior. For instance, the Minister of Customs will not put a man in the position to handle the money passing through his Department without taking some kind of a security. He does not take the man's word, he takes his bond; and I would ask if any greater responsibility can be placed in the hands of any man than the preparation of the electoral list, on the proper arrangement of which depends the rightful discharge by each constituency

of its duty to the country. But we were told, some time ago, by the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), that if this is as bad a Bill as the Opposition contend, then let them appeal to the country upon it.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I did not say that. Read that, if you can find it.

Mr. CAMERON. I cannot find it at the moment.

Mr. LANDRY. No, nor to-morrow, either.

Mr. CAMERON. However, if the hon. gentleman disclaims it——

Mr. LANDRY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will tell him from memory what I did say. I stated that if hon. gentlemen opposite contended that the Bill was so atrocious in its character, the Conservative party would likely be defeated by it before the country, and that if that was the case, it was advantageous to them, and they ought to let it go, so that we might be defeated.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, if you place in the hands of partisans the preparation of the lists, and appeal to the country, you are not giving any fair opportunity of an appeal to the same electors who elected the hon. gentleman and myself. If there is any honesty or earnestness in the proposition of the hon. gentleman, the proper time to give us such an opportunity is before the Bill passes, and then the country will be able to say whether they approve of the measure or not. Now, I will read the hon. gentleman's remarks, which are to be found at page 1556 of the *Debates*:

"The country has put them in their present position, and they must be considered as representing the will of the country, and therefore are justified in pushing this measure through. If it be such a bad Bill as the Opposition contend, let them appeal to the country."

Now, I accept the hon. gentleman's proposition. Give us the opportunity to submit the Bill to the people, to say whether such a clause as we are now discussing should become the law of the land. But the hon. member for Kent has not been alone in his challenge. The leading organ of the Conservative party very recently used this language:

"We should advise a dissolution of the House. We should accept Mr. Edgar's insult to the loyalty of the people of Ontario as a challenge to a battle *à l'outrance*. We should force through all the necessary measures, sacrificing everything not essential to public business, and drag these Grit traitors and treason-mongers to the foot of the polls, which the people of Canada would speedily convert into a gallows. That would teach them a lesson in loyalty, as understsod by the people of Canada, and especially by the people of Ontario."

We have had these challenges hurled at us from inside the House and from outside the House; and yet where is the indication that hon. gentlemen propose to follow up the challenges they make? Is there the slightest intimation that they will suspend the operations of this Bill until the views of the people upon it are obtained? Is there any evidence whatever, except their disinclination to discuss the measure, that there is a single individual in the country, outside of the partisan press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, who is really anxious to see this measure pass? All the evidence that has been submitted goes to show the contrary. Wherever public feeling exists it is against the Bill, and particularly this clause of the Bill. That feeling exists, because there is manhood in the people of Canada—because there is, independent of political allegiance, the feeling that whatever party is dominant it should only be dominant as a result of the votes of a majority of the people; and the adoption of a clause of this kind, for placing the electoral vote practically in the hands of one man, really makes it possible, and is designed to make it possible, that the Government shall decide what members shall sit in this House. In this respect the Bill lacks the first element of fairness. It lacks all that is essential to freedom of choice by the electorate; and the country, on awakening to a full realisation of the purpose of the measure, will, in spite of the gagging that is attempted by this clause, in spite of the loading of the dice, in spite of marking of the cards, express their disapprobation of the measure, and particularly of this clause, on the first opportunity that will present itself. I only regret that the offer of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is not sufficiently endorsed by other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. We have been told by journals supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, that this is a transcript of the English law, so far as the revising officer is concerned. I think it has been already clearly established that there are very material differences between the two, especially in this respect: that here the revising officer is made the sole controller of the voters' list, while in England the revising officer merely acts as reviser of the list; but I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to produce an instance where any of the prominent daily journals supporting hon. gentlmen opposite have admitted that that distinction exists. On the contrary, they have invariably alleged a similarity between the provisions of the two Bills. If we have departed from the established English precedence, if we go against the experience that has justified England in continuing that provision since 1843, there must be some special reason for it. The First Minister tells us that the majority of Parliament are opposed to the English practice in this particular phase of the Bill, which left the local municipal officers to prepare the primary lists and left the revision solely in the hands of the revising officers. But if they are opposed to that phase of the Bill, why do they not express their opinion? Are they only to express it through the First Minister? It is beneath the dignity of hon. gentlemen opposite to occupy such a humiliating position. The First Minister, no doubt, was saying the truth, when he said he did not know why they should be opposed to the English practice. We also are destined to remain in ignorance, since they will not or are not allowed to give their reasons. The appointment of the revising barrister was defended by the First Minister on the plea that any partisan conduct on his part would ensure his dismissal by this House. We have had evidence of partisan conduct brought before this House in more instances than one, and my experience has been that the decision of the House depended largely on the fact as to whether the partisan conduct was in the interest of the majority or not. On that fact largely depended the disposition of the question raised as to the behavior of any particular officer of this Parliament. I do not think an Assembly of this kind should be entrusted with the decision of the case of a revising barrister, whose conduct is denounced. His position should be sufficiently independent of this House as not to involve the contingency that his conduct might come up here for revision; otherwise, it cannot be expected that his conduct will be of a character to entitle him to the confidence of every section of the community. It is alleged, besides, that the moral sense of the people will act as a controlling influence on the revising officer. The phrase is an admirable one, but it expresses an opinion which, in practice, we throw every day a doubt upon. Hon. gentlemen opposite indulged in the fallacy that the moral sense of the people would restrain the half-breeds and Indians of the North-West from rebellion. For two years and more they indulged in that fallacy, if we are to believe the public documents, but they eventually realised that the moral sense of the people did not restrain them from rebelling. We do not trust, by any means, to the moral sense of the people, or there would be less legislation of a prohibitory character enacted in the House. Would it be reasonable to dispense with those enactments on the ground that the moral sense of the people would be sufficient to restrain the people from wrong-doing; and is it to be expected that the moral sense of the revising barrister will be sufficient to restrain him, if he sees a judgeship or some other emolu-

ment in the distance, as the reward of his doing the bidding of the Government. In answer to the objection that the revising barrister will not have the local knowledge of the constituency possessed by the different municipal officers in the municipalities, the First Minister states that men will be appointed who will be acquainted with the circumstances of the constituencies. But in many rural constituencies it will be impossible to find a man sufficiently acquainted with every section to properly do this work. Let hon. gentlemen opposite refer to their own experiences, and ask themselves whether, in all cases, they have a thorough acquaintance with every section of their constituencies; and if they have not, as I think they will generally admit, how is it they have not? And is it possible that a man, who is only interested in making himself acquainted with the constituency for one particular purpose, will make that acquaintance which practically involves the knowledge, not only of every individual, but also as to the individual circumstances of each individual? It is alleged that the majority of the voters will be on the assessment roll. That may be the fact, and yet every objection which has been urged against the measure has as much force as if the reverse were the case. The right hon. gentleman knows how many there are on both sides of the House who hold their seats by a majority which, if one vote had been changed in every polling sub-division, would have been converted into a minority. How easy would it then be for a man who has the least predisposition to party instincts to put one vote off or put one on in every polling sub-division. How many constituencies would show a different result had that course been adopted at the last election? In England, they have recognised the local machinery and have made the municipal officers their officers, as far as the primary preparation of the lists is concerned, and the reasons for doing that in this country are all the stronger, because our municipal machinery is much the more perfect of the two. I assume that there is a purpose in this. There is no doubt that, practically nominated as they will be by the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, the revising officers will be the Conservative election agents for the preparation of the voters' lists in every constituency. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite fully realise the unfairness of the position which the revising officers will occupy under this Bill, which is so outrageous that I trust they will remove these men from the aspersions that must necessarily follow their acceptance of the position, if they are to be merely the election agents for the party in power for the time being. It cannot be expected that one party is to be dominant forever in this country, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are dealing with this matter, as between themselves and their consciences, to say whether this proposition is a just one. I say it is scandalously unfair to take the public money to the extent of half a million dollars a year and use it to further the ends of one political party. In the English Act ample provision is made for a notice to the party appealed against, but under this Bill the revising officer can practically disfranchise any man of his own will. A man's name may appear on the primary list, and that man may be satisfied that he will be an elector; but the revising officer, when he makes his final revision, can strike the name off, without any appeal being lodged and without stating any reasons for the removal of the name. Is it safe or prudent to leave the electoral lists in the hands of any man who has such powers as these? The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who has been willing to put himself in our place and to look at this matter from an honest and fair standpoint, said:

> "If hon. gentlemen opposite happened to come into power—and unlikelier things may happen—I would not like them to have the power in my constituency of nominating the man who shall say who ought to vote for me, and I think it unfair to press a measure of this kind, so objectionable as it is to so many hon. gentlemen, when a very much more simple remedy can be provided."

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

I am sure that the hon. gentleman would not have made such a statement if he did not conceive that a revising officer appointed under this clause was sure to develop into a partisan, and that this would be productive of pernicious results, to the prejudice of one or the other political party, as they might happen to be the ins or the outs for the time being. The Bill proposes to hand over the preparation of the voters' list and the disposal of the people's rights to a horde of partisan revising officers, whose first act, in the majority of cases, will be to favor the men from whom they secure their appointment. It is most unfair that such a course should be followed, and that, on the flimsy charges that have been submitted against the present system, a measure of such a drastic character should be proposed. Mr. Chairman, Addison, in one of his tales, tells of a man in his time who attended fairs to sell pills which were proof against earthquakes. I think this measure of a somewhat similar character. It is introduced to avert the earthquake that is evidently approaching, and is destined to create such a commotion among hon. gentlemen opposite as that they will scarcely realise their present existence. Now, we hear hon. gentlemen opposite and the Conservative press frequently dilate on the injustice that is done to the municipal councils and the municipal officers by the encroachments of the provincial Local Government of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, if that is the case, if hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in their contention that the Local Government is encroaching on the rights of municipalities, I call upon them now to stand up in defence of these municipalities and these municipal officers, from whom this Bill proposes to take away rights and privileges which they have long exercised, to the general satisfaction of the people. I say that the assessors and the clerks of the municipalities have proved to be capable men, and yet you propose, by this Bill, entirely to ignore them in providing machinery for the preparation of voters' lists. I repeat that to take away from these municipalities the power to control electoral lists, and appoint partisan revising officers, ignoring the machinery that already exists, is the most serious encroachment that has yet been attempted on the municipal powers. Since this discussion commenced no attempt has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite to defend this clause of the Bill. They believe this clause is worth a whole Session's talk. They realise that an advantage is to be gained by the passage of this clause; but that is not the position which their constituents expect them to occupy. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has invariably stood up in defence of the municipal authorities against the alleged encroachments by the Provincial Government. Why does he not stand up and make some defence of this clause, and give reasons why the municipal machinery should be no longer used and the municipal officers abandoned. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is always ready to make charges against the good faith of the Ontario Government in regard to the municipalities; yet, when the Administration have departed from one of the fundamental principles, which he has charged the Liberals of Ontario with abandoning, we do not hear a word from him in regard to this clause. They have entirely forgotten the charges made by them on the hustings, that the Provincial Government of Ontario are encroaching on the power of the municipalities. "A needy man's budget is full of schemes." That saying applies to the present Government and to this case. Independent of the National Policy, the Government felt the necessity, in 1882, of gerrymandering the constituencies, in order to secure a majority in this House. The same spirit is prompting them in respect to this clause, which is one that cannot be defended on its merits. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: We have a majority; we intend to take advantage of it; we will have the country gagged by the time the Opposition can appeal to them. If that is not the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite, as indicated by their silence, what is

their motive in not defending such an atrocious section? The same tactics adopted in the passage of the Gerrymander Act are being pursued to-day. Let hon. gentlemen opposite look at *Hansard*, and they will see whether any attempt was made to defend the Gerrymander Bill on its merits. There was no such attempt. They are willing, to-day, to push through this offensive measure, which is contrary to all that is fair, and manly, and honest, as between man and man; they are willing to remain silent, in order that the measure may become law. Their silence, and the misrepresentation of their organs are, however, having the effect of making many Conservatives feel that there must be something decidely wrong in this measure. I shall be, indeed, glad to find the details to which I have objected, altered. I should like the measure to have some reasonable appearance of honesty about it. I should like it, not in the interest of a political party, or in my own political interest, but in the interest of this country. Equally as I wish a greater element of fairness in this measure, do I protest with earnestness and fervor against the adoption of a clause that is fatal to fair play, on which the marks of unfairness are manifest everywhere, that is obviously intended to strike at one political party, while it is intended to buoy up hon. gentlemen opposite with advantages at the next general election.

Mr. FLEMING. Before this clause is adopted I would like to have the privilege of saying a few words with reference to it. The hon. the First Minister told us last night that this particular clause was one that was properly open to considerable discussion. He told us to-day that this power which the Government was attempting to take into their hands was one to which some reasonable objections might be taken, and therefore you will not be surprised if some of us desire to enter upon its discussion for a few moments. This provision is introduced into the election law of the country for the first time, after we have been getting along very well under the existing system since Confederation. There has been no voice from the public asking the old system to be changed. There has been no portion of the community finding fault with the existing system, and at this day, without there being such voice, there is a provision being introduced into this Bill that is not attempted to be defended in this House or out of this House—a provision that cannot be defended anywhere. The First Minister, himself, to-day, in moving the adoption of this clause, did not attempt to defend it. He said the power which is about to be taken into the hands of the Government is open to objection. He says it is not as fair a measure as that which exists in England. He says the reason he has not introduced the English system here is because it did not commend itself to the majority of the members of this House; that he had ascertained this Session, and previous Sessions, that the majority of this House would not adopt the English system. How did he ascertain that fact? Was it from the voices we heard in this House, from the expression of hon. members discussing the question in open Parliament? Where was it ascertained? It was ascertained in the caucus, where hon. gentlemen dispose of the affairs of the country. They have adopted this new system of governing a free country, by giving away their views in caucus and then coming in as a solid voting phalanx, for the purpose of carrying through every measure which cannot be defended in Parliament.

Mr. SMALL. That is business.

Mr. FLEMING. The Whip from Toronto says that is business; he supports that system; he calls that responsible government; he says that is representative institutions. Hon. gentlemen know that the very moment they give up their opinions in caucus and refuse to express them in open Parliament they abdicate their functions as representatives of the people altogether, and become the servants of the Ministry of the day. The hon. gentlemen have adopted this system of expressing their opinion in caucus and giving up what independence of thought they have there, and refusing in the House, in obedience to the resolutions in caucus, to express their views upon any public measure which comes before the House. This is the doctrine we are to have adopted here; this is the doctrine to be forced upon this country by those who are calling out for trampling feet to come in thousands and wipe out the Opposition; this is the doctrine adopted by a party which calls upon thousands of independent loyal electors of Ontario to come down to Ottawa and drive these nasty Opposition members out of their places altogether.

An hon. MEMBER. There are enough here to do it; come to the point.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman sees the point clearly. He sees the reason why they are not discussing the power which the Government are taking into their hands by this clause of the Bill. He sees the reason why they have thrown away the powers which were given them as the representatives of the people, of discussing on the floors of Parliament measures which are brought in for the consideration of the people's representatives. Hon. gentlemen know that they have not attempted to defend this proposition in the face of Parliament. They know why that to-day their First Minister, their leader, has not defended it. They know it is not defended by any independent journal in the country. They know that the only defence which has been attempted to be given to this Bill, and the powers which are secured to the Government by this particular clause, has been an attempt made by a subsidised press, that does not express the independent opinions of any section of this country. They know that that press, in order to induce the people to believe that the provision was harmless, has totally misrepresented the provisions of this Bill. They know that they have concealed its obnoxious provisions from their readers, and that they have misrepresented this Bill and absolutely told falsehoods with regard to this particular clause. They know that they have been instructed, I presume, to earn the subsidies given them from year to year by misrepresenting the measures which have been attempted to be rushed through Parliament in silence by hon. gentlemen opposite. The painful duty is, therefore, cast upon us, of discussing this Bill from day to day, in order that the people of the country may know its provisions. Where else are they to obtain their knowledge? They cannot obtain it from the expressions of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they do not express themselves. They cannot obtain it from the press supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, because, when they discuss it at all, they discuss it in a garbled and distorted form. They conceal its objectionable features and misrepresent almost every feature of the Bill. Therefore, it becomes our duty, as the representatives of the people, as the only ones who will give knowledge to the people of what is going on in Parliament, to discuss this Bill, and therefore, we are here discussing it. The hon. First Minister to-day declared that this provision was open to objection, because it gave the Government the power of appointing the makers and revisers of the lists, but that he could not secure the passage of a Bill similar to the law in England, where the judge of Assize in the different counties appoints the revising officer. He ascertained that fact, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small) tells us, in caucus. Why could he not pass such a Bill in this House? Simply because the necessities of hon. gentlemen opposite are so great that such a Bill would not answer their purpose. There can be no other reason. I dare any hon. gentleman to get up and state if there is any other reason. They dare not accept the challenge. Even the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who comes to the rescue of the Government when they are in a

tight place, on other occasions, fails to come to their rescue now. The hon. First Minister said to-day that this particular clause of the Bill was objectionable. Then, why introduce it at all? If he has not sufficient power over his supporters to pass a Bill that is a fair Bill, such as the English Act is, why introduce it at all? Is there any hon. gentleman who can answer? Not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House can do so because they dare not state the purpose for which it is introduced. They are silent. They know that there was no public necessity for this Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will the hon. gentleman please discuss the clause?

Mr. FLEMING. The clause is the kernel of the Bill. There is no public necessity why the Government should take into their hands the appointment of persons to make up the electoral lists throughout the country. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if there is a sentiment of honesty left in them, if there is a single constituency in the country that has expressed a desire to have a revising officer appointed by the Government for making up the list. Hon. gentlemen are silent again—because they cannot answer. There is no public necessity for this provision; then, why does the hon. First Minister introduce it, when he himself says that he would prefer the English system, if he could carry it through this House? If his supporters are not sufficiently enlightened to-day, let him wait until he has educated them up to that sense of fair play and honor that will enable him to secure their support for a fair and honorable Bill. The hon. gentleman says that the revising officer in England is very similar to the revising officer here. In England the revising officer revises the lists after the overseers of the parish have made them up; in Canada, under this Bill, the revising officer makes up the list from the very beginning—in the words of the Bill, he is to prepare, revise and complete the list. The whole electoral list is to be handed over to an officer appointed by the Government. We are not sufficiently verdant to believe that these officers will be appointed in any other way than on the nomination of the supporters of the hon. gentleman in the different constituencies; and in those constituencies which are represented by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House the nomination will be in the hands of the leading wire-pullers of the Tory party there. I can tell who, in my county, will be asked to nominate the revising officer; and everybody knows that the revising officer, notwithstanding that he is going to be a lawyer of five years' standing, will be a Tory; and when I have said that I have said enough. When I have said that, I do not require to say that he will be a partisan, or will be wanting in a sense of fair play, because I have only to refer to the conduct of the majority in this House, in pressing forward a Bill of this kind. We know that he will be appointed for the purposes of this Bill. His duty will be, according to his appointment and according to his political light—the light which an active Tory politician always possesses—to devise means to secure the election of the Tory candidate. That is his primary duty; that is the reason of his appointment; and he is removable by the majority of the members of the House of Commons, who are elected under his manipulation. But the hon. gentleman says that there are, by this Bill, votes secured to persons having incomes, and to wage-earners and others, that are not enfranchised in England, and that, therefore, it is necessary there should be some person to have control over the voters' lists from their beginning; and therefore it is necessary to confer additional powers upon these revising officers, powers which are not conferred upon any revising barrister in England. Why, the hon. gentleman must have forgotten himself. He must know that in Ontario, at all events, persons having incomes have votes; that under the Bill passed last Session wage earners have votes to a much larger extent than is provided in this Bill, and that the lists are made up by the local authorities, under the same system as that which has prevailed for years past, without any difficulty arising. The hon. gentleman desires to establish that there is only the smallest shade of difference, a difference that does not amount to anything, between this Bill and the English Bill. The English system is that the judges appoint the revising barristers; the electoral lists in England are prepared by the people themselves, through overseers; in England there is a sense of fair play. In the Empire of Germany, under Bismarck, there is a more liberal provision than is in this Bill; there the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities, subject to an appeal to the judiciary. In France they are prepared by the mayor, a delegate of the prefects, and a delegate of the municipal council. Are we going to be worse than France? Is this free country going to be worse than Germany? Are we going to place ourselves more in the hands of the Executive than Germany or France? There is not a country in Europe with representative institutions, in which the electorate is placed in the position ours is about to be put in. In Spain they have a freer way of making out voters' lists than the one proposed here. There the lists are prepared by a commission composed of the alcade and four persons appointed by the municipal council. Are we going to place in the hands of our Executive a power the Government of Spain does not exercise? In Italy the lists are prepared by a commission similar to our municipal council. In fact, in all the countries in Europe that have representative institutions the lists are prepared by the people themselves, and in all cases there is an appeal to the judiciary. Under the Bill, as introduced here, and which has secured the approbation of hon. gentlemen opposite in caucus, there was an attempt made to fasten upon this country a provision to appoint officers who could do what they liked with the lists, and whose decisions are not subject to appeal. From the time we have had representative institutions in Canada, the local authorities have prepared the lists. Are we now going back to a system which does not obtain in any country blessed with representative institutions, and which is not imagined in any free country in the world. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they will do this because they are in the majority, and Conservatives of the same stamp in the country talk in the same spirit. They say: You may fight against the Bill, but it will become law. That is the only reply they have to make; it is their only defence. In the words of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, "there ain't nothing more to it." Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of drawing their inspirations from British institutions. Filled with the fire of British institutions, flowing over with British valor, they make up their minds, silently, to tie the hands of the electorate of the country, to put shackles upon the free expression of the public will. By the Indian provision and the revising barrister provision they seek to exclude hon. members now in the House from their seats, and to secure the election of Government supporters in their place; and yet we hear them talking about drawing their inspirations from British institutions. Who ever heard of a Briton tying the hands of his opponent before striking him? Who ever heard of a Briton endeavoring to tie the hands of his opponent before entering into the fight? We will fight you at the polls, they say, but we will first tie the hands of those opposed to us. I admire the inspiration, I admire the effects of British inspiration upon hon. gentlemen opposite. It has a wonderful effect upon them. It makes them valorous. It is the essence of bravery to tell us that they intend to bind our hands and tie our feet before they will enter into the contest with us before the people of the country. And, if that is not sufficient, "the Opposition, at a

time like this, don't count." The subsidised newspapers of the country are brought in to bully the Opposition. Drag them to the foot of the polls, which will be a gallows to them. The rope is prepared. They are preparing the rope in this clause to-night. Hang them, because they are fit for nothing else. They are obstructing the business of the country. They are obstructing the Parliament of the country. They are obstructing us from passing a measure intended to perpetuate us in power forever. They are obstructing us from passing a measure which will bind the electors of the country, which will enable the officers of the Government, the Tory hacks throughout the country, to become the manipulators of the voters' lists. We are obstructing the passage of a magnanimous measure like that. Bring down the trampling feet of thousands of loyal Canadians, that will rise at the call of the First Minister and will ring with trampling feet around these grounds, to wipe out these fellows who are obstructing the passage of a measure so noble in its purposes. Bring down their thousands, place them in the square out there, commanded by the revising officers, the lieutenants in the great brigade, Lieut.-Col. Bunting at their head, Major Meek, Major Wilkinson, Mr. Stinson as commissary of the battalion; bring all these gentlemen down here, with their thousands, and Kirkland, the American, with his Gatling gun, the thousands of trampling feet, and what dismay will be cast upon the ranks of this small Opposition. They will fly at once, and enable the Government to pass this Bill, which is called for by every patriotic Canadian, without further debate or delay, this Bill which is intended to enfranchise so many that are not enfranchised now, which is intended to enable the Government to strike off all the naughty Grits throughout the country that may be objectionable to them. The spirit which dictates the bringing down of the trampling feet is the same spirit that will cut off so many of those voters who are objectionable to hon. gentlemen. The Opposition don't count in the House or the country. The Opposition don't count in a time like this. Let hon. gentlemen get up and defend this Bill. There is a place where they will have to defend it. No matter whether our hands are tied or not, no matter whether we are bound in the contest in which we are about to enter with hon. gentlemen opposite at the polls, or not, when that time comes they will find that no amount of trampling feet will deter us from doing our duty; that we are determined then to do our duty as we are determined to-day; that though the electoral lists may be in the hands of their partisans throughout the country, though they may strip off from the electoral lists those who have a right to be there, because they don't count, because their voices would be against them, and therefore they don't count, when they have done that, we will meet them on the hustings and on the platforms of the country, and we dare them here, or there, or elsewhere, or anywhere, to defend a proposition as subversive of public liberty as this is intended to be.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We are arrived at clause 10 of the Bill, I think, and I might say to you that I am not in favor of the clause. I do not agree with the principles of this Bill, and many of its details are very objectionable. This clause is perhaps one of the most objectionable in the whole Bill. The very first words that my eye catches are these: "That the Governor General in Council may." We have been told by the First Minister that the word "may" is equivalent in law to the word "shall." These words have reference to the appointment of a gentleman to prepare and revise and complete the lists of the voters who are to be allowed to exercise the franchise in this free country in the future. Now, this Governor General in Council is something that I suppose is necessary in our form of Government, under certain circumstances and conditions. We have, under certain circumstances and conditions, to give certain powers to the Governor in Council, but I do not know that there is anything to compel us, in a case of this kind, to place the power proposed to be placed here in the hands of the Governor in Council. It may be necessary, at times, that some things that cannot be done in detail by Parliament should be done by proclamations of the Governor General in Council, being authorised to do that by Parliament, but I cannot see that there is anything that would necessitate, if such an individual as this is to be appointed, that he should be appointed by the Governor General in Council; because, as has been brought before your notice, in England, where an individual is appointed to revise the list, who, hon. gentlemen and their press are pleased to tell us, is one performing the same duties as the one proposed to be appointed by this Bill, the appointment is not made by the Governor General in Council, because hon. gentlemen opposite—or rather, I think, they have not attempted to say so, but the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite have not scrupled to say we are following the English precedent in this case. It has a very bad look about it, to say nothing stronger, that the Government should take into their own hands the appointment of an individual irresponsible to the people who is to have the full control of the making, the revising and the completing of the list of individuals who will be permitted to vote for members of this House. And yet I am not astonished to find that clause in the Bill. The whole conduct of the Government and of their supporters, since this Bill has been introduced to the House, is in full keeping with the spirit of the first proposition here. I think I am not going too far when I say that they have apparently resorted to the Governor in Council, in appointing these officers, in order to rule the country through secret caucus, and not through parliamentary discussion in parliamentary halls. That has been their course in the whole matter. The Bill was introduced in a speech of eight minutes, and all the arguments that have been given in its favor have been given in a very few sentences by those empowered to speak. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Pruyn), early in the debate, gave us to understand that the provisions of this Bill had been determined upon, that its principles had been determined upon, that the Bill was to go through, that it did not matter what discussion took place upon it, and it was no use for the members of the Opposition to contend against this Bill, because the Conservative party in the House are a unit upon this question; and he gave us clearly to understand then that the whole matter was arranged upon in secret caucus. And it has come to this, that in Canada, where we supposed we had free and representative institutions, where laws were introduced and discussed fully by both parties, that practice has been departed from, and a party meet in secret caucus, where honor binds them to keep their mouths sealed as to what transpires in the caucus, when not even their own friends in the country are informed of what takes place; yet in that secret place is to be perfected and completed that which is to form one of the statute laws of this free country of ours. Sir, it is fitting that a measure which is conceived and carried through in that spirit should have, in one of its clauses, a provision that the Governor in Council may appoint an individual with the powers that are given him by this Bill. How are appointments made by the Governor in Council? At whose instance? At whose recommendation? The member for Victoria, a strong supporter of the Government, gave us to understand this afternoon, in language that was not very dubious, that the Government would appoint those who were friendly to them; and he might have gone further, and stated that the Governor in Council, in making these appointments to office, the First Minister, whose name really might be substituted in place of the Governor in Council, will be pressed by his supporters, each one in his own locality, and in the electoral districts that have sent repre-

sentatives here who do not support the First Minister at present, those who are the recognised heads of the party to which he belongs in the county represented by opponents here, will present the name of this barrister to the First Minister; and if the First Minister was to say that he did not approve of the nominee of the member supporting him, or the persons recommending it from other counties in which he has not a supporter in this House, what would be the pressure put upon the First Minister? What would be the argument that would be used by the individual presenting the claim? What would be the arguments used by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), for instance, when he makes his recommendation of the man he wants to be appointed to control and revise the list, and after that, of his own motion and in his own manner, to complete the list, if the First Minister was to say to him: I do not think the barrister that you are recommending will command the confidence of the country—what would be the reply of the member for Perth? Would it not be: Sir, he has been one of the most faithful members of the party that you have had in the whole county of Perth. For years and years that man's abilities and that man's means, perhaps, have been expended in furthering the interests of you, Sir John A. Macdonald, in securing the return of candidates to support you in this House, and it is poor recompense now for him to be passed by in favor of someone else. Sir, it will be almost inevitable that the man who will be appointed to this position will be a man strongly partisan in his feelings, and is it desirable that political partisans should have the manipulation, nay, more, the absolute creation and fixing of the list of men entitled to vote in this country? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes complained that through a political party being in a majority in a certain municipality the assessors, who were sworn to do their duty, appointed from year to year, responsible to the municipal councils, and the councils responsible to the people, and answerable to them once a year, that they have, through their strong partisan feeling, done an injustice to some electors of the county? Has not that been urged from the other side? And if that be true in their case, there is a remedy in the hands of the people. But here you have a man subject to like passions with these assessors, influenced by the same partisan feelings, who is to be appointed by the Governor in Council, and he is to hold his office during life. Sir, you can see it is objectionable to a freedom-loving people. The very first sentence of that clause must strike every man who values free institutions and who recognises the principle that the people are the governors and that the Ministers are but the servants. Here we have a subversion of that principle. We propose to exalt the servant over the master, and to prevent the master exercising his free will and giving directions as to how his servants shall conduct his affairs. It is an upsetting of the principle of constitutional liberty that ought to prevail in this country. It is taking from the people who ought to be the source of power that power which ought to be theirs, and giving it to those who are not the masters but the servants of the people. If the people were consenting parties, the objection might not be so strong. Are the people consenting parties? Is the Bill not so arranged as to prevent the people from exercising the power which is theirs; is it not an attempt to take the power from them before they have a chance to pronounce it? The next portion of the clause sets forth that the Governor General in Council shall appoint such an officer within three months after the coming in force of this Act. This is giving the Government power to take away the liberties the people have enjoyed since Confederation, and for years before, when they were distinct Provinces, without giving the people a chance to say whether they favor such a proposition or not. The Government think we should sit day after day and night after night to pass this measure; and when it has received the sanction of the Governor General and become law, within three months of that time the Governor in Council may appoint revising officers to enter upon their work of fixing the lists in such a manner as to prevent the free expression of the will of the people. If there was any desire on the part of the Government to do what is right, to restrain themselves within constitutional limits, they would alter the words "three months" to "three years," so that the people might have an opportunity, at the polls, of pronouncing as to whether they would allow the Act to come into force or not. Will they venture it? No. The Government and their supporters are unable, for if they were willing they would do so, to prevent the passage of a Bill brimfull of iniquities, which the Government are determined to have put through before the people can pronounce upon it; for they well know that if the people had an opportunity of pronouncing upon it the Bill never would be crystalised into one of the statutes of Canada. Do they think the liberty-loving people of this country want an Act placed on the Statute Book more infamous than any to be found on the Statute Books of Spain, Italy, or the countries that are least progressive on the continent? No. My suggestion to replace the words "three months" with "three years" is one of those practical suggestions which the First Minister called for this afternoon—a reasonable proposition, which hon. gentlemen opposite must admit; a proposition which is eminently right and proper. But the First Minister is not present to hear the suggestion and avail himself of it; but his able colleague is present, and I venture to recommend the suggestion to him. I do not object to the word "proper" in the clause. If you can find a proper person to carry out the provisions of the Bill I do not think I would have so much objection to his being appointed, or so much objection to the Bill itself. But if a proper person is to be understood in the limited sense, and in the sense designed to carry out the Act in the spirit in which it has been created, then I object to it. If he is to be a proper person to carry out the Act, which is to strangle one political party and strengthen another—if those are the characteristics of a proper officer, I am opposed to such an officer. And if a proper person, in the broad and full acceptation of the term, is to be appointed, tell me where you will find him. A man, to perform the duties of this officer, fully, faithfully and impartially, will be an individual whom, I think, you will not be able to find either within the ranks of the legal profession, the mercantile profession or the agricultural community. He would be required to be possessed almost of attributes higher than may be ascribed to man, in order to carry them out fully. Where can you find one individual who is fit to be the judge of the value of all the properties in an electoral district—a man of sufficient knowledge to know every man who should or should not be on the list? He is to be called a revising officer. Sir, I object to the name. It is not a proper name. It is a misleading name. To call a man who prepares the list and then looks over it, and strikes off or leaves on any name he pleases, and then completes the list to his own satisfaction, is hardly the proper term. Yet, Sir, if I were asked to do so, I do not think I could give him a designation which might not seem to be contemptuous, and that I do not wish to do, with regard to gentlemen who have not signified their acceptance of these positions. They are to be appointed for each or any of the electoral districts of Canada. We have 211 representatives in this House, and perhaps in the neighborhood of 200 electoral districts, so that you will have 200 of these gentlemen appointed; and if I were to mention simply the expense connected with the payment of those officers, I should mention a sum of money which ought to startle the people of Canada, in the present state of our finances. But if you take the clerks and bailiffs, who are to be associated

with them, you have an army of about 600 paid officials, whose salaries or remuneration are not fixed by this Bill, and as to which we have had no information from the leader of the Government, his colleagues or supporters, with the exception, I believe, of the member for West Toronto, who fixed the gross amount at something like $100,000. I hold that his estimate was an erroneous one—that it did not represent the full amount. Figures have been given on this side, estimating the cost from $300,000 to $500,000—about half a million has been pretty well agreed upon, on this side of the House, as the annual cost of these officers and their assistants throughout the country. Sir, Canada cannot stand that drain upon its resources at the present time, and in the present condition of our finances. If hon. gentlemen had any concern for the welfare of the country, or any proper appreciation of its financial condition, with our increased expenditures and diminished revenues, they would hesitate before attempting to saddle upon this country an additional burden of hundreds of thousands of dollars, in order to put into operation a law which, when it comes into effect, will not produce any beneficial results in this country, a law powerless to do that, but potent, if used in a wrong manner, to produce grave disaster and dire results; potent to produce enmity and ill-will between those who, common citizens of a common country, ought to be bound together by that tie which binds men together when they live in a free country, when, though differing in their views, they give expression to their views, but neither one attempting to take an unfair, an unmanly, an ungenerous or an unjust advantage of the other. Even under the most favorable circumstance you can imagine, with perfect men to carry out the machinery of this Bill, it will not be potent for any good, but there are within it elements which will tend to produce, if it is not worked aright and in a fair way, anything but that feeling of cordiality and good-will which it is desirable should exist among the citizens of a common country. I notice, next, that they shall hold office during good behavior. Well, I do not know if I should object so much to their holding office during good behavior, if that good behavior was to be understood in the full acceptation of the term; if it meant that they were to behave well, as we understand it. But here, again, I fear that the gentleman who drafted this Bill would be apt to judge a man's good or bad behavior by the manner in which he discharged his duties in accordance with the spirit of this Bill. And what is the spirit of this Bill? The spirit of this Bill is, that one political party shall have an undue advantage over another political party. Who will deny it? Will any hon. gentleman opposite, as they have been challenged time and again, rise and deny that that is the spirit of this Bill? Will any of them rise and say that, in their secret caucus, to which we were not admitted, and of which we know nothing, party advantage was not mentioned as flowing from the operation of this Bill? Dare they, with a love of truth in them, rise and deny that this has been talked over? In caucus, in secret among themselves, did they not design deliberately that this should be the scope and the purpose of the Bill?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, what is the object of the Bill?

Mr. SPROULE. That is your own question; answer it.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend ventured on thin ice, and when I ask him the question now that he ought to answer, what is the intent and the object of this Bill? he does not answer. Is it that half a million dollars may be added annually to the outlay of the country?

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it for the purpose of securing a fairer return of members of this House than has been secured hitherto?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. And how will the hon. gentleman accomplish that, by the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. SPROULE. Go on with your catechism.

Mr. PATERSON. I ask the hon. gentleman to say how this will accomplish it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want to take up too much time.

Mr. PATERSON. The gag might be removed for once to let the hon. gentleman speak; he is brimfull of a desire to speak; but I venture to say that if he rose, he could not lay his hand on his heart and say that it was not with a desire to get an advantage over another political party that this Bill was introduced.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I could.

Mr. PATERSON. I have often admired the amount of cheek the hon. gentleman is possessed of, but in no case did he display more than when he rose and denounced members on this side of the House for what he was pleased to term obstructing public business. The thing is too ridiculous—that the Opposition can obstruct the business of the House—those who have not control of the public business, those who cannot, from day to day, call up item 10, Bill 103, from the Order Paper; and that is done week after week by the leader of the Government. Look at the Order Paper, and see the measures that stand before this party measure—for it is a party measure; it is not public business. Therefore, who is responsible, if there is delay in attending to public business, but the gentleman who day, after day and week after week, passes by public business, that has priority on the Order Paper, and calls up this party measure? We, on this side, are anxious for public business to brought on; as patriots, we lament that gentlemen opposite should so far forget the responsibility they owe to the people as to neglect the public business; that they should, within thirty days of the time when millions of money will have to be borrowed to meet our obligations, let it be known on the other side of the ocean that the supplies have not yet been passed, that authority has not yet been given for the ways and means of raising money to meet the expenses of the country; we lament that the Government should, day after day, obstruct the public business by calling up this party measure out of its place, and putting the House into committee upon it. It is time the Government realised that the eyes of the country are upon them. The question is being asked, very anxiously, every day, when will the Government cease this obstruction and attend to the public business? The best interests of the country are being imperilled by their passing over public business and calling up a measure that is not designed in the interests of the country, and is not asked for by the country. Will they call a Bill in the public interest which they will not venture to say a man, from ocean to ocean, has asked for, but which thousands and ten of thousands of the people of this country are protesting against? Do you call that attending to public business? What more have we in this Bill? If the phrase "good behavior" is to be interpreted according to the spirit of this Bill, that one political party shall have an advantage over another, when will you remove a man for bad behavior when you have the Conservative party elected year after year through his carrying out the object and intent of this Bill? If that is to be the interpretation put upon the phrase "good behavior," then I say the gentleman is to be appointed for a long series of years, if indeed an indignant populace, an indignant electorate, tied though they may be by this Bill, as I believe it is designed they shall be tied, shall not rise superior even to the bonds that are sought to be placed upon them, and hurl from position and power those who are elected as their servants to do their will and to look after their interests, but

who have sought to dethrone their masters and reign themselves in their stead. If the phrase "good behavior" was to be interpreted in the full acceptation of the term, less could be said against it; but the hon. First Minister is not in his place to tell us whether we are to interpret it in a broad, general sense, or in the spirit in which this Bill is conceived and sought to be carried out. But if he should be wanting good behavior, it will be possible to remove him by an address of the House of Commons. If it were possible to conceive of such a thing happening as that this Government should appoint certain gentlemen who would disregard their oaths of office, and would, by putting on the names of one party and striking off the names of others, secure the return of a majority of members of this House to support the present Government, I suppose, in the broad acceptation of the term, that would be bad behavior; but the address is to be passed by a majority of the House of Commons, and would those gentlemen, elected under those circumstances, denounce the conduct of a gentleman who was the means of their election, good behavior or bad behavior? He has certain duties assigned to him. What are they? The duties of the gentleman to be so appointed by the Governor in Council are to be, "to prepare, to revise, and to complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the list of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act." Very extensive duties are given to those gentlemen; there can be no doubt about that. They are to prepare the lists; after they have prepared them, they are to revise them; and after they have revised them, they are to complete them, in the manner hereinafter provided. That leads us to the contemplation of the subsequent clauses of the Bill, in which the various duties of the revising officers are set forth; and, as I said before, it is not my desire to detain the committee by examining at length the other provisions of the other clauses of the Bill, which comprise the duties alluded to here; but you will observe the lists of persons entitled to vote are to be prepared by this gentleman, are to be revised by him and completed by him; and, as the Bill stands, after he has made his own list, revised his own list and completed his own list, there is to be no appeal from him on any matter of fact. But hon. gentlemen opposite may say the First Minister has announced he will make a change in that. Perhaps it was a mere oversight in his mind that he did not, in the first place, give an appeal on a matter of fact. Perhaps, as in the case of the Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia, whom he meant always to exclude from the Bill, but was so unfortunate as to word it that they were included, this appeal was excluded. It is peculiarly unfortunate, that with that idea in his mind, he should have taken care, expressly, in plain words, to say, that no appeal was to be allowed on a matter of fact. It may be that his original intention was to do as he proposed to do now. In case a barrister of five years' standing be appointed, he is graciously pleased to allow that there may be an appeal on a matter of fact; and, after being constrained thereto by the arguments, if not by the desire of hon. gentlemen on this side, he says it will be his sovereign will and pleasure to appoint county judges in some cases, but if a county judge is to be appointed there is to be no appeal from him at all. I have as high an opinion of the integrity and honesty of our judges and of their capacity in some matters as I have of any class of citizens in the country, and greater, I may say, than some. But there are other matters on which I do not consider a judge's opinion or his judgment is as good as the opinion and judgment of others, who may not even be in any of the professional ranks of life at all. It is part of the duties of this revising officer to determine the value of properties, and I do not believe that a judge on the bench, except he may have had some exceptional means of acquiring the knowledge, which will not be the case with many of them, is not and cannot be as good a judge of the value of property as local officials, who have been for years entrusted with the making up of valuations and whose judgment has been proved by the fact that when a judgment has been rendered and a property assessed at certain values on the assessment roll it stood there at that rate, all parties being satisfied with its fairness, so that scarcely any appeals have been made. Let him be a judge, and grant him all you can desire, duties are here devolving upon the revising officer that cannot be performed by a judge as well, if he wants to act conscientiously and honestly, as by the local officers who, for years, have been entrusted with the duty, and have done it for the interest of those who have entrusted them with it. From his judgment there s to be no appeal.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There is no appeal now.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for Hastings says there is no appeal now; but no one knows better than he, for I have just read the clause, that the commencement and the revision and the completion of the lists are in the hands of that judge, and in his hands alone, whereas it is now, first, in the hands of the local officers appointed by the municipality, sworn to do their duty, engaged, in many cases, for years, preparing the assessment roll; and from that assessment roll an appeal can be taken, if there is a difference in judgment between the man who has thus been assessed by them and the municipal council, that the people appoint, that the people vote for every year; so that if the least incapability is found one year, the council, responsible to the people, must see to it that a capable man is put in next year; and if the council neglect to do that, the people see that the council is replaced by another council. There is, first, then, the judgment and the action of the assessor, subject to the appeal to the municipal council or the court of revision, composed of members of that council, whose judgment is brought to bear upon it, a judgment quickened by the fact that the people have power over them, and that only twelve months can elapse before the people will have an opportunity of pronouncing upon them. After you have had the valuation of these two independent parties, responsible to the people, then the person who thinks an injustice has been done to him has an appeal to a judge, outside of these parties, who shall arbitrate as between him and them; and yet the hon. member for East Hastings would seek to infer, by his remark interjected here, that because after the list has gone through all these stages there is no appeal from the judge, it is the same thing that the judge himself should be the valuator of the property and of the many reasons why a man should be on and off, that he should be the judge in the incipient stage, in the revising stage, and the completing stage, and no appeal can be taken from him. I do not care who they may be, but, as a liberty-loving Canadian, I do not want a despot in this country, even though the despot be a good man. I do not want a man to be made the arbitrary ruler and governor of the electorate of this country, even if he is a good man; and no man who loves British institutions, and constitutional freedom, and liberty, ought to be found supporting such a proposition at all; and yet, that is what is contemplated in this clause, recited in this clause, and will become part of the statute law of Canada if this House sees fit to pass it, and it is endorsed by the other branch, and sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor General. Among the duties that are upon him are the duties of holding court for the revision of the rolls. The gentlemen opposite, I suppose, might tell us that you have that opportunity, and you have kept it out of sight—and I wish to be fair on this occasion—they will say: You can go before the judge, or before this revising officer, and can state your case, and you may appear before him. Yes, that is true; that can be done; but when you have gone there and stated your case, the whole matter is left with

him, and on his judgment, as a last resort; and he may not care what evidence you produce; he may not care how strong your case may be, if you have not convinced the judgment of that one man—I am speaking now of him as an honorable man, as a man wishing to do right—if you have not convinced him as to your contention as to values, that ends it; there is no appeal from him. Is there any such precedent in British history or in the history of any country? In this country, in any other matter, we go before the judges of the land and take our suits before them, and the judge gives his decision. We are bound to say that our judges endeavor to give decisions that are right and just, and yet are not the cases innumerable, almost, in which, with this judge endeavoring to do right, one of the parties is not satisfied with the decision, and appeals to a higher court, appeals to a number of judges sitting together, of higher rank than the judge before whom the case was tried, not because he thinks the judge was doing him an injustice designedly, but because he did not agree with his judgment. And he has the right, as a British subject should have, to appeal to a higher court, and the case may be taken from the jugment of the judge below and argued there. It may be that the judgment of the judge below may be confirmed by the judges of higher rank and grade, but is the appeal shut out from the Canadian, then, not on a point that involves the birthright, the dearest privilege of a Canadian citizen, the right to vote, but on a matter involving a few pounds of money, it may be? Is his right shut out then? No; he may appeal to a tribunal higher than that, a tribunal sitting in this city of Ottawa, the Supreme Court of Canada. He has his appeal there, and even then——

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Then he must stop.

Mr. PATERSON. He can, after that, or he can elect between that and going, if he chooses, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of England, in order that he may get what he thinks is his right.

Mr. WHITE. The case must cover over $2,000, then.

Mr. BERGIN. In the case of a vote, is that right given? Can you go beyond the county judge?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not speaking of the county judge. I have described that.

Mr. WHITE. You know that no one can appeal to the Privy Council unless the amount is over $2,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I said for a sum of money; let it be $2,000; and will anyone say, that if a man may have, for what would be a paltry sum of money to many of the inhabitants of Canada, $2,000, the right by law to appeal from the judgment of a judge to judges, and from judges to judges, and from judges to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, still, when the vote of a man, his right to say who shall make the list that shall govern him, is involved, in that case he shall have no appeal from the judgment of the judge, let him be determined to do right, not being that which is really right in itself; that there shall be no appeal from him, and that the right to vote, the dearest right of a free man, shall be taken from him, because of the judgment, the defective judgment, of that judge.

Mr. WHITE. It is the case now.

Mr. PATERSON. It is not the case now.

Mr. WHITE. It is the case now.

Mr. BERGIN. You cannot appeal from the decision of the county judge.

Mr. PATERSON. Have I not told the committee time and again that this is the last resort? Cannot the hon. gentleman see, does he not know the different stages it passes through and the judgment pronounced upon it before it reaches that judge at all? Does he not know—and this is the point I am making, and hon. gentlemen need have no difficulty in seeing it—that in the matter of a vote there is appeal, and appeal before the matter is decided under the present law, and that in the law they propose there is a decision rendered, and there is no appeal whatever to it allowed.

Mr. BERGIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question? Do you propose that, in the case of the decision of a revising barrister, an appeal should be granted from court to court, as you have been describing for the last fifteen minutes?

Mr. PATERSON. No; I made no proposition of the kind.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). You covertly said so.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not, if I may be allowed to contradict the hon. gentleman, and to contradict him flatly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I say again that you did.

Mr. PATERSON. I contradict him again, and flatly, because he has no right to——

Mr. FERGUSON. Your own statement will bear me out.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not so mean it, and you may accept that explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, of course I will, if you say you did not mean it.

Mr. PATERSON. I resent the imputation that I covertly did so.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not intend to say anything disagreeable, but I will leave it to the Chairman and to the House whether the House was not led to understand that.

Mr. McNEILL. He meant that that was implied; he did not mean to say anything disagreeable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, if you say you did not mean it, that is another thing.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman could not have followed my argument. I pointed out that in Ontario there was a process of preparing the electoral lists, that there was an appeal to the municipal council, and from the municipal council to the judge, and it stopped there; but that, under this Bill, the judge is to make the list, and there can be no appeal from his decision. I proposed then to point out that, in all the provisions of this Bill, there is no right of appeal. The hon. gentleman has mentioned the sum of $2,000. There is an appeal from a higher court to a higher court, and the appellant can go to the Appellate Court in England. I used that as an illustration of how keenly Canadians guard the right of appeal, in order that full justice may be secured to them. In that sense I used it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman allow me——

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I will allow you, presently. I used it as an illustration of my argument, and hon. gentlemen opposite should have understood it in that way, when I had gone through a description of the manner in which these matters were managed now. Now, my hon. friend from Brockville, who is a lawyer and ought to know, may be able to set me right on some point.

Mr. WOOD. The only point I desire to refer to is this: I do not think there is any appeal from the municipal council at all in regard to the voters' list. There is an appeal from the assessment roll to the court of revision, but if you wish to appeal to the county judge now, you appeal independently of any action of the municipal council.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman, being a lawyer, would know better than I; but he will see that it does not weaken my position. He may be correct, technically, but it does not affect my position, because, in making up the

voters' list they are guided absolutely by the values put upon it by the assessors.

Mr. WOOD. The clerk of the municipality cannot be guided by anything else; he has no option. If a name has been omitted from the voters' list, either by the clerk having omitted to see it on the assessment roll, or if the assessor himself has omitted to place it on the voters' list, then the person can appeal to the county judge, independently of the action of the assessor or of the clerk, and have it placed upon the list—which is exactly as under this law. The same person can appeal to the revising barrister.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This is not final. If a party wants to appeal, he goes to the judge, who fixes a day. The list is final when the judge sets a day to examine it; then, if there are any appeals, they are brought before him on a day fixed by the judge in each municipality.

Mr. PATERSON. It is as I stated. The only point the hon. member for Brockville made was that the clerk might, by error, omit a name; but he admits what I contended, namely, that the clerk has no option in the matter; the values are there for him, and he prepares the list therefrom; and although, technically, there may be that difference, virtually you have an appeal from the assessor to the court of revision, and from the court of revision to the judge. It cannot be otherwise. And can the hon. gentleman not see what a vast distinction there is between that and giving to this judge, who will not be as good a judge, probably, as the assessor, the absolute power to determine the value of that property, and, having determined it, notwithstanding any representations that are made to him, his judgment remaining the same, to refuse to alter it, making him absolute and sole judge as to the value of the property?

Mr. WHITE. He uses that very same list.

Mr. PATERSON. He is not bound to use that same list.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, yes, he is.

Mr. PATERSON. Is he bound to be controlled by that list? Is he bound to accept the values that are on that list?

Mr. WHITE. I say, in general, that the revising officer, or the judge, will take the list after it goes through these different processes you speak of.

Mr. PATERSON. I want the hon. gentleman to answer distinctly: Is he bound to accept the values that are on the list?

Mr. WHITE. In his own judgment.

Mr. PATERSON. Because, if the hon. gentleman had said yes, he would probably have had an opportunity of voting on an amendment making that clear and plain.

Mr. BERGIN. If the appeals suggested by this speech of the hon. gentleman are granted, may I ask when we may expect to have a voters' list confirmed in Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, if the appeals were to be granted, as I mentioned, the hon. gentleman could easily find out. The voters' list would be complete and finished in Ontario at the same time it is finished and completed now.

Mr. BERGIN. You would even have to go to the Privy Council.

Mr. PATERSON. No; we do not propose to take the vote to the Privy Council. We propose to take the vote through the course it goes through now in the different Provinces. The hon. gentleman cannot be so densely ignorant as not to understand my argument. My answer to him is, that the rolls will be finally completed and revised just at the date at which they are under the Ontario Act. I was endeavoring to point out, when the hon. gentleman broke in upon me, that a person being left off the list, or a person being put on that some one thought should not be on, would have his case brought before the revising officer. I was pointing out that although that may be done there is no other tribunal to which he can appeal against the judgment, if it be a party that wants to go on who is not on, and who is entitled to go on. I am not saying anything against the judge, but there is no way in which that party can appeal. There are dangers staring people in the face that will prevent them availing themselves of this opportunity of even laying their case before some of these revising barristers—I will not say before the judges—because I do believe that there will be such pressure brought to bear upon the First Minister in connection with the gentlemen that are to be appointed, that if I was to give him credit for every intention to do right he will make appointments so strongly partison in some cases that these officers will be unable so to clear their minds of prejudice as to do full justice in the matter.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman think that a stronger pressure will be brought to bear in the appointment of a revising officer than is brought to bear in the appointment of a county judge at present?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, I do. I do not think the First Minister would yield in all cases. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has regarded the appointment of judges as patronage to be exercised by members supporting him. I think the Government have been careful in that matter.

Mr. McNEILL. I think that the hon. gentleman will find that just as much care will be taken with reference to these appointments.

Mr. DAVIES. Judges will seek to get these appointments by doing political service within the appointment.

Mr. McNEILL. There will be an appeal to the judge, and that will show the impropriety of the conduct of the officer. It will all be done before the eyes of the public.

Mr. PATERSON. We will not argue that point; subsequent events will determine whether it is so or not, and I am sure members of the Opposition will heartily rejoice if they find the suggestion of the hon member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is correct. My objection applies all the same. I do not care how high a judge may be—I give him all honor and credit for a desire to do what is right—but I have an undying objection to let this right and this liberty, that involve the exercise of judgment in matters outside of judicial proceedings, to be placed in the hands of any one man, I do not care how high he may be.

Mr. McNEILL. That is the case at present.

Mr. PATERSON. Suppose a man brings his case before the revising officer. We will suppose that the revising officer is a partisan. What position does the applicant occupy? Clause 30 says:

"The revising officer may issue, at his own instance, or on the application of any person supporting or opposing any objection, claim or proposed amendment to a voters' list, at any of the courts or sittings for preliminary or final revision under this Act, a summons, in the form in the schedule to this Act contained, to any person to attend at such court or sittings, and (if required) to produce any books or papers in the possession or power of such person, and to give evidence thereat relating to any matter connected with such revision, and in the event of such person not attending after being served with such summons, the revising officer may punish such person as for a contempt of a court of record: Provided, however, that no such person shall be compelled to attend under any such summons unless the witness' fees and expenses allowed under the tariff of the Superior Court in the Province have first been paid or tendered to such person."

The next section but one provides as follows:—

"The parties to any application before any such court of preliminary or final revision may appear by solicitor or counsel, and the revising officer may, in any case, award the costs of any witnesses, and a sum "*en bloc*" for other costs, not to exceed , to be paid by any party to any other party to any application before him,

as he may direct, and the amount of such costs shall be certified by the revising officer, and may be recovered, on such certificate, as an ordinary debt due to the person to whom they are awarded by suit in any court of competent jurisdiction in civil cases in the Province."

I speak with some reluctance on this question, as I am not a lawyer; but I speak within the hearing of legal gentlemen who may correct me, such as the hon. member for Lincoln and the hon. member for Brockville. As I understand the operation of the clause—if you can suppose that a partisan revising officer may be appointed—it might be this: If a humble individual, whose name had been omitted from the list, desired to have it placed there, and came before the revising officer, that officer could, if I understand the interpretation of these clauses aright, of his own mere motion take such action that for all time to come this individual would never think of coming before him with any matter of complaint. The revising officer has the power, at his own instance, to summon, not only one witness, but any number of witnesses, to give testimony; he can bring them from a distance, if he pleases, at great expense, their time being paid for; in a word, he can make the costs so heavy as to make them unbearable for the individual; and according to the section I last read, the returning officer will have full power, not subject to any appeal, to decide who shall pay the costs and what the costs shall be. Can anything more monstrous be conceived. How could a poor man resist such an official? It may be that I am wrong, but in my opinion such power is conferred on the returning officer as will enable him to exclude hundreds of voters from the list, and deter them from appealing, by the power he possesses to summon witnesses and assess the costs upon any individual he thinks proper, even though the witnesses he may summon should bear testimony that would support the contention of the applicant. However it may be in the case of a judge, whom I cannot conceive would so act, such might occur in regard to a revising officer. The applicant would not be in a position to appeal to the county judge; he would have had enough of the matter. He would be apt to say: If, in this free country, I have to undergo legal penalties and disabilities in my endeavor to enforce my rights, and they have been refused to me, I cannot, in my straitened circumstances, or, even as another man might say, with my moderate means, having regard to my family, any longer protest against the wrongs that have been inflicted on me, wrongs that never would have been inflicted on me had the Parliament of Canada not wilfully departed from the path of justice that has been pursued for eighteen years, and devised the scheme whereby such a thing is possible as that under which I am suffering. I point out this one feature, in which even this opportunity that is afforded to the individual, of laying his case before the revising officer, may work to his injury to such an extent that he will be deterred from taking action by way of appeal. Do not such provisions act as stench in the nostril. Are there not good reasons why the Bill should be discussed, that hon. gentlemen opposite should not remain in silence and simply say they are ready to vote for the measure. That is not the position they ought to take. I trust it is not the position they will take; but we shall see, as we get further on in the various clauses in the Bill. To the part of the clause which provides that the officer shall take an oath, of course no exception can be taken. The last part of the clause provides that in the event of the death, resignation, removal, inability or refusal to act of any such revising officer, another may, in the same way, be appointed in his stead, who shall hold office under the same tenure and with the same duties and powers. There is no relief promised there, through the death of one of those officers, and that is something which no one will desire. But, if the system were found to work injuriously, the Governor in Council has power to appoint another, in the same manner, irresponsible to the people, to discharge the same duties and exercise the same powers. Sir, the clause before you is objectionable in almost every line of it, and that such a provision should be introduced into a Bill—to say nothing of the Bill itself—that it should have been conceived by a responsible Minister, in a free country, almost passes comprehension; and to suppose that a majority of a Parliament, elected by the people of a free country to guard the rights and liberties of the people, should so far forget the sacred trust reposed in their hands by the people, as deliberately, without the consent of the people, in opposition to the will of the people, to rob them of their rights and liberties, is something we are not even yet prepared to contemplate. They say we do not want the Bill; that we obstruct it, with a view to prevent its passing. Sir, let them proceed with the Bill. We do not take them by the throat, as some of them desire to say, nor do we make any attempt to do it, but we discuss this Bill; we want it understood. We say that principles dear to the heart of every man who loves freedom and liberty are subverted in that Bill, and that we would be worse than recreant to our duty and the trust reposed in us if we did not discuss it—viewing it as we do—fully, frankly and fairly. All we ask hon. gentlemen would be that, should they think it is their duty, they should allow the people to pronounce on this Bill, and to say, as between us, who is right and who is wrong—the party who are seeking to make it a part of the statute law of Canada, or the party who, in the name of the people of Canada, protest against this infringement of their rights and liberties. We have done this, and we propose to do it. As clause by clause is reached, if they contain provisions which we regard as iniquitous, the duty rests upon us of pointing them out. We have to regret that the whole people of this country have not yet had a full opportunity of understanding the nature of this measure. If all portions of the Canadian press would but print this Bill, which is sought to be made the law of the land, if, in their comments upon it, they would tell the truth and make known its provisions, then, Sir, I believe you would have had an agitation greater than that which you now see throughout the country; you would have still stronger appeals against its passing than those you have heard, and you would have petitions more numerously signed than those which have been presented to the House. Sir, the liberties of the people ought to be as dear to the Conservative portion of the country as to the Liberal portion of the country. True, they were not forward in securing those constitutional rights which they now enjoy in common with us. That is not in accordance with their traditions and their past history. Their history shows how they have warred against the liberties of the people of Canada, liberties which they now enjoy, and which where secured in spite of those who professed a like political faith with them in days gone by. And as the Reformers fought for and obtained those rights and liberties which were refused in times past by the Conservatives of those days, of whom those hon. gentlemen are the successors, is it not right that they should resist the attempts to have those rights and liberties wrenched away from them. I hold that the tenth clause of this Bill is intended and designed to wrench from the people of this country the rights and liberties which were contended for and secured to the people of this country in days gone by, and that the Liberals of to-day would be worse than recreant to their trust and to the traditions of their party, unworthy the name they bear, if they allowed this clause to go through, without resisting the attempt to wrench from the people the rights which were secured to them by the Liberal party in days which have long gone by.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will adjourn the House, as the hour at which we usually

adjourn will not afford me as much time as I should like to occupy in discussing an important measure of this kind.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). We will wait for you, doctor.

Mr. WILSON. Then, Sir, I woud say that appeal after appeal has been made from this side to hon. gentlemen opposite, to rise and explain the object of this clause; but we find that they sit in stubborn silence, and refuse to show any disposition to explain or modify this clause. Now, we are perfectly well aware, by the course they are pursuing, that they intend to force this measure through, whether we, on this side, will or not. They feel that they have satisfied themselves prior to the introduction of this Bill as to its effects; they have fully consulted each other in caucus as to the results which will flow from it, if it becomes law. The First Minister has announced to-day to a free Parliament that his followers would not allow him to introduce a certain measure, the measure to be found on the English Statute Book, and I ask him why would they not allow him to introduce that measure, or allow the revising officer here to represent the same position that the revising barrister does in England? Why was such a measure as that objectionable to his followers? I do not wish to impute motives, but would it be improper to say that the reason they did not desire to have a clause of that kind incorporated in this Bill was that they desired to obtain a substantial advantage for their party by this measure? We have, time and again, pointed out to this House that the introduction of such a measure as this by hon. gentlemen opposite does not indicate a disposition on their part to deal fairly and justly with the Opposition. I feel that, not only on this clause, but on every other clause of this Bill, we should offer strenuous opposition, and ask for explanations from those in charge of the Bill. It is necessary that they should explain to us why hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to consent to a Bill similar to the English Act. It is their duty to rise now and explain why they objected to the proposition of the First Minister; but we have found that appeals to them heretofore have failed, and we expect that this appeal will fail. To me, it would seem that they have weighed well the advantages likely to arise if they could get a revising officer who would prepare the voters' lists in their interests. But hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, these revising officers will be appointed for life, and they will be entirely free from Government influence; they will be elevated above the plane of partisanship, and will therefore be as independent as the judges on the bench. I deny such a proposition. They are appointed to do the bidding of those who appoint them, and they know full well that if they carry out the views of their masters they will be rewarded.

Mr. WHITE. I am very sorry you have so little confidence in the revising barristers of this country.

Mr. WILSON. I have just as much confidence in the revising barristers as I have in the Government of the day, and in hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I believe that when they can use their position to further the interests of their party they will do it. If hon. gentlemen opposite have, in the face of the desire of the First Minister, insisted on having revising barristers, who will be appointed by the Government of the day instead of by the judges, it is a strong indication to me that they wish to place this measure on the Statute Book for party purposes alone.

Mr. WHITE. Have you confidence in the judges?

Mr. WILSON. I have as much confidence in the judges as my hon. friend opposite. If the Superior Court judges had been selected to appoint the revising barristers I would have been better satisfied with this clause of the Bill than I am at present.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. WHITE. If the revising barrister does wrong there is an appeal to the judge.

Mr. WILSON. That sort of pleading will have no effect. What are we asked to do? We are asked to appoint a revising officer, not only to revise the lists, but to express his opinion as to the value of the property, and as to whether a man has a right to be placed on the list or not—in fact, to make the list. And yet, will hon. members opposite tell me that there is any comparison between this revising officer and the judge? Nothing of the kind. The object of hon. gentlemen opposite is a different one; their object is to gain a party advantage—to deprive the people of the country of the opportunity of going to the polls at the next general election to record their verdict against the Government of the day—to stifle the free expression of the electors at the coming election, and that is, no doubt, the reason we have such a clause as this.

Mr. BOWELL. You do not mean that.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman may have the habit of expressing what he does not mean, but I am not prone to do so. If I ever felt a sincere desire, I desire that this Bill should be made complete, that we should remove from it all the objectionable clauses and purify it of all the impurities it contains. Hon. gentlemen opposite must feel, if they will only lay aside their partisanship, that this is not a fair course that they are taking towards the Opposition—that this is a blow directed against us. Are they not, day in and day out, taunting us about our small number, and boasting that they have the confidence of the people? But when in a short time there will be an opportunity of appealing to the people, are they willing to appeal to the same jury to whom they appealed before, and who gave them the verdict? Are they willing to use the same voters' lists? Are they willing to use the same means of ascertaining whether they still possess the confidence of the country as they did before?

Mr. WHITE. We could not appeal to the same list, because Mr. Mowat changed the law, because he changed the list altogether, and the same thing has been done in Nova Scotia. The franchise has certainly been extended in Ontario and Nova Scotia far beyond what it was in the last election.

Mr. WILSON. We have heard a great deal with reference to the voters' list being so very different in the Province of Ontario from what it was before the last Act. My hon. friend knows well that the voters' list which will be in use at the next election, as prepared by the Province of Ontario, includes a larger number of people than the former list. My hon. friend says the Bill before us is enfranchising a larger number of people than the old Bill on which this Parliament was elected; therefore, why would they not appeal to a tribunal equally well prepared to record a verdict for or against the Government. Let us consider for a moment what will be the effect, if we adopt this clause as it is now presented to us. Every hon. member is aware that it will entail a very large expense. That I would not object to so much, were it absolutely necessary that the Bill should be passed. If it was necessary we should have a Dominion franchise I could understand there would be an excuse for this large expenditure. Various estimates have been made as to what this Bill will cost. We know well that whatever generosity there may be on the part of judges and lawyers, and it is from those the revising barristers will be appointed, they are not prone to do much work without being well compensated; and it is not likely the cost of having this Dominion franchise will be less than $400,000 or $500,000 a year. Are we prepared to incur that expenditure, merely that we may have a Dominion franchise and a less number of people enfranchised and a less well-prepared list, without any additional advantage

at all. Again, we have the objection that a vast amount of inconvenience and confusion will be created in the various municipalities in other sections of the Dominion. We have at present the means whereby the present voters' lists are prepared, means which are well understood. I would like to call your attention to the difference in the preparation of the voters' list under the Ontario law and that which will take place under this Bill. Under the Ontario law the assessors are sworn to faithfully perform their duty, and I believe we can with as much safety to the assessors doing their work well as we could to the revising officer. After the assessment roll is made those who may feel themselves aggrieved may appeal to the court of revision, which is held in every municipality. At this court of revision all parties are heard, without the necessity of having a lawyer, and without costs. I have every confidence in the municipal councillors who compose these courts of revision. If anyone feels aggrieved by the decision of the court of revision, he can appeal to the judge, and there the voters' list becomes a finality. The revising barrister, under this clause, accepts the assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence. That amounts to nothing. That concession on the part of the Minister of Customs amounted to nothing, and he knew it was no protection whatever.

Mr. BOWELL. Why did your party ask for it, then?

Mr. WILSON. It may be that we were trying to see if hon. gentlemen would make any concession, good, bad or indifferent. This being a bad one, was one which they consented to make. The revising officer can say whether he will or will not accept this assessment roll as sufficient evidence to place a man upon the voters' list. He takes this list, together with what other information he can receive. To whom will he go to get information? In East Hastings, to whom would he appeal for information as to who should and who should not be placed upon the voters' list? Is there one hon. member on that side who does not feel that the object of the revising barrister is to benefit the Conservative party.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman apply that observation to a judge?

Mr. WILSON. I will refer to the judges when I reach that point. It is more natural to expect that a man appointed by a certain political party, other things being equal, will show favors to the party from whom he receives his appointment.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman apply that to the judges?

Mr. WILSON. If the hon. gentleman comes to my county I will give him an opportunity of seeing that even a judge is not above being a partisan. Although, as a general rule, I have every confidence in the judges of the country, and in their acting impartially, if the hon. gentleman comes to my county and there finds a judge who deliberately gives a written decision on the bench, delaring that, in common law, a man is justified in castigating his wife, we may conclude that the judges sometimes are not more pure than the revising officers appointed by the Government of the day.

Mr. McNEILL. It is the duty of the hon. gentleman, in such a case, to impeach the judge.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So he has attempted to do.

Mr. WILSON. I was going on to point out the manner in which the revising officer would prepare the roll, and I think I was about to convince you that it could hardly be expected that he would be as competent to prepare the roll as the municipal officers are. I was also going to show that he would be called upon to act, not only as a revising officer, but as an assessor. Now, Sir, I think, if you are going to have a man able to perform the duties of an assessor he ought to be thoroughly acquainted with the various localities of the municipalities that he has to assess. As a rule, assessors are appointed by the municipality on account of their fitness and acquaintance with the values of property, but your revising barrister will not be possessed of that information, and therefore we cannot expect that the voters' list would be as efficiently prepared by a revising officer as it is by the municipalities. Now, some hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that the revising barrister, under this clause, is similar to the revising barrister under the English franchise law. To show how mistaken those hon. gentlemen are, and what a difference there is between the two officers, I will read you a few extracts from Brotherton on the franchise. (The hon. gentleman read sections 28, 29 and 31.) You find here that there is an opportunity for every individual who has a right to be placed on the voters' list to establish his claim. His petition is sent in to the revising officer by the overseer or the recorder of the municipalities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. WILSON. I wish you would keep order, Mr. Chairman. If you do not, I shall be compelled to go down nearer the reporter, where I can have myself heard. You will find here, Mr. Chairman, the course that is pursued in England to secure to every individual who is entitled to it the right to be placed upon the voters' list.

An hon. MEMBER. Trow! keep away from him, and let him go on.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. gentleman should have a right to go on speaking. He is paid by the hour; he is paid by subscription.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I never object to any man imputing motives or acts of which he is guilty himself; therefore, I do not object to an insinuation of that kind. I am satisfied that this Bill, appointing a revising officer, will not meet with the approval of the electorate and that when it is presented to the people, and when it is shown that it will deprive the electorate of an opportunity of their names being placed on the voters' list at the will or pleasure of the revising officer, it will produce a revulsion of feeling, adverse to the Government of the day and in favor of those who have fought valiantly for the rights and privileges of the whole people of the Dominion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire myself, and so do some other hon. members, to offer a few remarks on what the hon. gentleman acknowledged to-day to be the most important portion of the Bill; but at this hour I propose that the committee rise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not exactly state that this was the most important portion of the Bill, but one that would certainly, from what I had already heard, cause a good deal of discussion. But it occurs to me, from the little I have heard, that some of the discussion has been of the old stamp and not in the line meant by the leader of the Opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWWIGHT. I may say that the speech of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) was an exceedingly able and powerfully delivered speech, which I only regret was delivered to a small audience. I dare say some of the speeches the hon. gentleman would not have cared so much to hear; but I do not think there has been any attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen to unnecessarily delay the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to move a verbal amendment. That at line 32 the words, "for such purpose," be struck out, and the letter "a" inserted.

Mr. DAVIES. It is my intention to move an amendment to the clause.

Mr. CASEY. Is it the intention to allow amendments to be moved, apart from that amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. CASEY. There are several amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is irregular to proceed to discuss a clause without there being any amendment. We have been discussing a clause while there has really been no amendment before the committee, which I find, according to English precedents, is not according to rule. There ought to be an amendment before the committee while the clause was being discussed, and to make the proceedings more regular an amendment should be placed before the committee.

Mr. CASEY. I have never heard of any such understanding or rule in this Parliament. The question we have been discussing is as to whether we should have this clause or not. The discussion, in my opinion, is quite in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I point out that business will not be furthered by proceeding with the discussion now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this subject had not been fully discussed weeks before we came to the clause there might have been something in the hon. gentleman's request.

Mr. CASEY. It is simply absurd for the hon. gentleman to say that the clause has been sufficiently discussed, and to say, after the ordinary understanding we have had, after thirteen hours' work, that because the right hon. gentleman thinks so, this clause has been sufficiently discussed, is simply absurb. It is not in accordance with the understanding the hon. gentleman has been acting upon for some time past, and I am afraid it will not result in furthering the discussion on the Bill, simply because we cannot discuss it intelligently at this hour in the morning. We have shown our desire to discuss the Bill fairly and to the purpose, and the best proof of that fact is, that the right hon. gentleman has adopted a number of suggestions made on this side during the discussion, because they commended themselves to his reason. On the understanding I have mentioned, it was understood that we should sit at reasonable hours, and I am sure no one will say that to sit after this hour would be reasonable.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the hon. gentleman hardly wishes us to go into a discussion of this clause, which he will admit is a very important one, at this time of the morning. The hon. member for South Huron wishes to address the House, and I intended to speak, perhaps, for twenty minutes or half an hour. I think there has been no evidence of any intention of preventing discussion, or improperly delaying the proceedings, and as the hon. gentleman knows well this clause is one which must be more fully discussed, and amendments will be submitted in the proper time, but it is unreasonable to ask that we should go on at this hour of the morning.

Mr. HESSON. Hon. gentlemen should remember that the provision of this clause was very fully discussed along with the general principles of the Bill, and that no new light has been thrown upon it, as each speaker has repeated simply what the previous speaker said. I think, after all this repetition, they must themselves feel that they have debated fully a question which was very fully discussed before, unless they have something new to say upon it. I wonder that intelligent gentlemen should get up, one after the other, and simply repeat what was said by previous speakers. Surely they must admit that there are men intelligent enough on this side to know the purport and effect of the Bill, and who know its effect and its provisions as well as if they were to talk about it for a week. They have had an opportunity to move their amendments during the whole day, but they have not done so, and I do not think it is right that they should go on again, after coming fresh from the country, and repeat the same speeches over and over again, at this stage of the debate.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows that we have to meet here at half-past one to-morrow, and what condition will we be in if we continue at work for some hours longer. Human nature cannot stand it; and if we went on for three hours we would not be any further ahead. The desire to facilitate business is just as strong with some on this side as on the other, whatever charge they make against some of unduly protracting the debate. I do not think the speeches have been unduly protracted to-night, as only some five or six have been made on this clause. Hon. gentlemen may force us to go on for some hours, but it will not facilitate the passage of the Bill; and in what condition will we be to continue the discussion to-morrow.

Mr. McNEILL. The question is, what position will we be in to-morrow night, supposing we adjourn now?

Mr. HESSON. The leader of the Opposition so ably discussed the clause to day that I do not think hon. gentlemen can throw any further light upon it; and I think, if these hon. gentlemen on that side had come into the House and listened to the speech of their leader, they would have been content to sit silently, after hearing it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for West Elgin says there was an understanding. I am not aware of any understanding.

Mr. DAVIES. A tacit understanding.

Mr. EDGAR. Practice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not an understanding. The ground taken by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island is really trifling with the House. He said, a little while ago, that he had an amendment. Why does he not move it? I think the hon. member for West Elgin said there were several amendments, and here we have been discussing this measure all day, and not an amendment has been proposed. The amendment was spoken to by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) fully and ably, presenting all the arguments that could, by any possibility, be brought up against the clause, and the discussion has been a mere repetition of those arguments. There could not be any new suggestions with respect to that clause. And now they say they are going to commence with amendments. If the hon. gentleman was really in earnest he would have his amendment ready. However, I venture to say he has not it ready now, though he said he had.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman says: "I venture to say he has not his amendment ready now, although he said he had;" that is to say he was lying. When an hon. gentleman, even if he be a Premier, says that an hon. member utters a distinct untruth, he is out of order, and I must ask that that statement be modified or withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman puts words in my mouth. I did not say he was lying. That is an inference the hon. gentleman drew. I said, I ventured to say that he had not his amendment ready. He may have lost it or mislaid it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What will you bet?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said there were half a dozen amendments. I venture to say there were not half a dozen amendments.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that. I said I understood there were several amendments to be moved.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is trifling with the committee, and now he appeals for delay.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman believes I would have made the statement I did unless I was going to move an amendment. My amendment is not only ready but it is in my hands, and I have been here the whole afternoon waiting for an opportunity to move it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let us have it.

Mr. DAVIES. I hope the hon. gentleman will do me the justice to say that he did not wish to accuse me of that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not. I do not want to make any unpleasant charge against the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman said he had an amendment, and made a short speech, and I called on the hon. gentleman to move it.

Mr. DAVIES. I was just waiting to see how far the hon. gentleman would go, and I was about to rise, if the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) had not got up so hurriedly.

Mr. PATERSON. I want to call attention to the very irregular course pursued by the First Minister. He has allowed this clause to be discussed all day, and he comes, at two o'clock in the morning, to propose an amendment. Such an irregular course is a bad example to set to the other members of this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Perhaps it would be unfair to compel the Opposition to speak after two o'clock. They evidently have an object in detaining the House in session as long as possible. I read in the *Globe* of the 21st instant this paragraph:

"The letter of 'Ontario,' in another column is one that everybody should read. What the writer says is an evidence of the depth of the feeling prevailing in the Province. No doubt many are prepared to make the sacrifice he suggests."

When I read this paragraph a few days ago, I thought it was due to myself and to the great Dominion of Canada, to read the letter of "Ontario," and I find some paragraphs in it to this effect:

"Never was an Opposition in so favorable a position to stand a siege. The Administration of Sir John Macdonald is bleeding at every pore. The financial difficulties crowding upon the Government are sure sooner or later to be fatal, and these difficulties are all of their own creation. The North-West rebellion not merely increases these difficulties, but adds new and serious complications arising out of the capture of Riel—complications which will be harder to solve than were those resulting from the Red River rebellion in 1870—and these troubles, also, are of the Government's own creation. The Canadian Pacific 'Oliver Twist' is asking for more, and the French supporters of the Government are dictating their own terms. Every Province, not excepting Ontario, is in a state of dangerous discontent, and all that is necessary to rouse Ontario is a continuation of the gallant fight in the House of Commons against the infamous proposal to impose on the people the most odious tyranny, under the guise of constitutional forms, and to confer the parliamentary franchise on Indians who, as members of tribes, are still wards of the Government, and incapable of assuming the responsibilities of citizenship. Under these circumstances, a dozen resolute men could 'hold the fort' at Ottawa, and it will be a disgrace to the Liberal Opposition if it is surrendered now. Had the Gerrymander Bill of 1882 been dealt with in the way referred to it would never have been passed."—

So there appears to be an object in this delay; it is simply following the instructions of the organ of the party. But that is not all:

"But while the duty of the Opposition in the House of Commons is plain, the duty of those who are in sympathy with the stand they have taken is equally so. Every means should be resorted to for the purpose of making the public appreciate such self-sacrificing devotion to duty and principle, and one of the most effective would be the creation of a fund, with a view to adding to the sessional indemnity of the members."

The idea occurred to me, when I read this sentence, whether hon. gentlemen were paid by the acre which they placed in *Hansard*, or by the hour; probably by the acre. Then it is very unfair to ask them to remain here after two o'clock, because, certainly, they cannot cover as large an acreage after that hour as they could by daylight:

"That indemnity is calculated for an average of not more than three months, and already this Session has lasted almost four. As yet very little of the money required for the public service for the financial year commencing on the first of July next has been voted in committee, and not a dollar of the proposed appropriations has been voted by way of concurrence. Sir John, by bringing up his Franchise Bill day after day, has himself pointed out the way to his own discomfiture, and if the blockade which he has created is not raised by the 30th of June, the supplies will have come to an end and not a dollar will be available for the payment of salaries or for any other public purpose whatsoever. Nothing would do so much to strengthen the hands of those who are fighting the people's battle and to strike terror into the hearts of those who are seeking to fetter them, as the raising of a testimonial fund at once, as a mark of appreciation, and as a measure of substantial assistance.

"In order to be effective, however, the movement should be organised at once, and should be pushed with the utmost vigor. 'He gives twice who gives quickly.' A committee of members of Parliament should be formed to take charge of the fund, and those who feel disposed to give anything should not wait to be asked, but forward their contributions at once to headquarters. Or, those who prefer it, might send their contributions—anything from $1 to $100—care of *The Globe*, and they could be acknowledged in the columns of the paper, either over the real name or over a *nom de plume*. Such an opportunity of striking for freedom will never again occur in the lifetime of any of us, for never in the history of parliamentary institutions has such a retrogressive and indefensible measure as Sir John Macdonald's Franchise Bill been proposed in a legislature with British traditions to inform and inspire it.

"ONTARIO."

I think it is hardly fair, if my hon. friends opposite are to be paid by the hour, by the day, or even by the acreage on *Hansard*, that we should compel them to speak only till daylight.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After that, I cannot desire to rob my hon. friends opposite of another day's pay. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:40 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th May, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

Mr. ALLEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to make a few remarks of a personal nature. Prior to the 21st May, I presented a petition from the inhabitants of Meaford, praying that the Franchise Bill may not become law. On the 21st of the month the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) said, in his place:

"When the proper time comes, I intend to call the attention of the House to the gross breach of privilege on the part of hon. members in asking that these petitions be received and read, when they ought to have known, had they taken the trouble that parliamentary practice requires them to take, that the signatures to these petitions were in many cases in the same handwriting, and that, therefore, the petitions should not have been laid on the Table of the House."

He further said:

"I have looked over them, and have had an expert examine them, and the best authority that can be received in a court of justice in this matter, the authority of a competent expert, can be received before a committee of this House, to show that these petitions were signed by the same persons, and that the signatures are in the same handwriting."

Then he went on to name the parties who had signed the petition in St. Vincent, in the county of Grey:

"James Oliver and J. N. Oliver, Thos. Harris and Alb. T. Harris, A. Thompson and William A. Ellis, James Sparling and Chas. Collier, J. M. Smythe and Chas. Parkin, Amero Tait and Alex. Sauter."

He said, further:

"I have only referred to the signatures which it would be patent and clear to a boy ten years of age are in the same handwriting. In most of the soft pencil signatures the same man has put down signature after signature, and you cannot tell what the signatures are and what the names are. Not only the petition I have drawn attention to, but nearly all the petitions against the franchise presented to this House, have the same indelible mark."

Now, as soon as the inhabitants of Meaford saw that in the *Hansard*, they immediately went to work, and sent me the following statement:

"COUNTY OF GREY,
"TO WIT:

"I, James Drummond, of the town of Meaford, in the county of Grey' carpenter, do solemnly declare:

"1. That I have read the remarks in *Hansard* of 21st May, instant, made by the member for King's county, in the House of Commons, respecting the signatures on the petition against the electoral franchise Bill, from Meaford and St. Vincent.

"2. That I am one of two persons who circulated said petition, having secured nearly every name thereon.

"3. That the allegation that the names of James Oliver and J. N. Oliver, Thos Harris and Albert T. Harris, A. Thompson and William A. Ellis, Jas. Sparling and Charles Collier, J. M. Smythe and Thos. Parkin, Amero (should be Amos.) Tait and Alex. Sauter (should be Sunter) are 'all evidently written by the same hand,' is untrue, in fact.

"4. That J. N. Oliver and James Oliver are father and son, respectively, and that the son, James, signed his own name and also that of his father, who stood near, and instructed him so to do.

"5. That I am informed that Thos. Harris and Albert T. Harris are father and son, and that the father signed for both, but another person had the petition in charge at the time;

"6. That the names of A. Thompson and William A. Ellis are, I verily believe, the proper signatures of each of those parties; that I have this day seen the last named party, and was informed by him that he signed his own name, and did not sign that of A. Thompson to the said petition.

"7. That the names James Sparling and Chas. Collier are the proper signatures of the persons named, and that I was present and saw them sign, respectively.

"8. That the names of Amos Tait and Alex. Sunter (called in the *Hansard* Amero Tait and Alex. Sauter) are the proper signatures of the parties named, and I was present and saw them sign, respectively.

"9. That I verily believe not one signature was placed on said petition unless by the party purporting to be named thereon, or by his full authority, and that not one has signified a desire to withdraw his name, but, on the contrary, many electors regret that time will not permit petitions to be presented to them for their signatures.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously, believing the same to be true, and by virtue of an Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, intituled, 'An Act for the suppression of Voluntary and Extra Judicial Oaths.'

"Declared before me at the town Meaford, in the county of Grey, this 27th day of May, A.D. 1885. } "JAMES DRUMMOND.

"JAMES CLELAND, J.P., County of Grey, Ontario."

In addition to that, I have a letter from one of the same parties, speaking about his signature and about the statement of the hon. member for King's, in reference to the fraudulent entries. As to the expert, he says:

"The alleged expert had better serve his apprenticeship to the business over again, though I fear it would be a waste of time, for he evidently has not the natural capacity to tell a chicken path from the track of an elephant. I have read Mr. Woodworth's remarks in the *Hansard* to many of the signers of the petition, and they are not in an amiable mood, I can assure you, respecting the matter. J. N. Oliver, a Conservative, by the way, is hopping mad at having his name questioned. He says his signature is as good as that of Sir John A. Macdonald any day, and, as for Mr. Woodworth, he thinks he must be an ass."

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman ought not to read such an expression to the House. It is unparliamentary, and to read a letter reflecting upon an hon. member of the House is not correct.

Mr. ALLEN. I apologise, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the House will accept the apology.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY RETURNS.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the First Minister, whom I see in his place now, to the fact that about fifteen months have elapsed since an Order of this House was passed, directing the Government to lay before the House a copy of the list of the Grand Trunk stockholders.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thanks, gentlemen, very much. It is new that I have got any sympathy from that side of the House on this question till lately. I feel that the Government should be very severely censured for their neglect for allowing a whole year to pass over without giving effect to that Order. I took an opportunity, early this Session, certainly over three months ago, to lay before the House the desirability of getting another Order for a full statement, and that Order was also passed. I have several times endeavored to impress upon the Government that they should take means to procure a return to that Order of the House, but up to this time they have entirely neglected their duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of the Government's neglect of duty in a great many other things, but the instance that I refer to specially is their neglect to procure an answer to this Order—whether they are afraid of Mr. Hickson or of Sir Henry Tyler, I do not know. The excuse that the Government made, when I last called attention to this matter, was that they had to send to the other side of the Atlantic in order to get a return. I am told that the president of the company is now in this country, and I hope that at an early day the Government will be enabled to inform this House that they have at last, through the favor of the Grand Trunk Company, got their consent to lay on the Table of this House the statement of the shareholders of the company. At all events, I think, it is time the Government should have some little respect for their own dignity, that they should insist on the Order of this House being complied with, and insist on the respect that is due by a corporate company to the Parliament of Canada, and see that that return is laid before this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry we have not been able to procure the returns the hon. gentleman required. As I understand it, the Order of the House was sent home to England, where alone the list of shareholders could be made out; that return has not been made, and that is all I can say about it. I do not know when Sir Henry Tyler, the president, will be in this country; he is now in the United States; but when he comes here I shall ask him why it is not produced, and I shall read to him from *Hansard* the speech my hon. friend has made to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. All right. I hope he will comply with the request, and at once consent to give the return, and you can tell him that if he does not you will have him brought to the Bar of the House in order to assert the dignity of the House.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 10,

Mr. DAVIES. When the committee rose at a quarter to three o'clock this morning, I stated that it was my intention to move an amendment to this section, putting another section instead of it, and the First Minister very improperly, as I thought, and unjustifiably suggested that I had no amendment to propose at all, and he was very properly called to order by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I think before the House adjourned, however, he was satisfied that his statement was uncalled for, and that I had an amendment in my hand, and was prepared to move it—in fact I was ready to move it at the time. The amendment had been carefully prepared beforehand. I am

the more anxious to put myself straight before the committee, because I do not choose to submit to a charge of that kind by the First Minister, to the effect that I was merely trifling with the House. The 10th section proposes to vest in the Government for the time being the appointment of an officer who shall be the revising officer for each electoral district. He is not to be revising officer in the sense in which that term is understood in any other country of the world outside of Canada. His duties, in the first place, are not to revise at all, but to make up. He has no data on which to proceed. He has to take the best information he can get, to use the best material that comes to his hands. He has to prepare, in the first instance, a list, and, at a subsequent period he may himself revise it. Now, it has been very strongly objected—and no sufficient answer has been made to it that I have heard—that it is improper and unfair to vest in the Government for the time being the appointment of a person whose duties will be political, who will owe his position to political friends, and who will be practically appointed by the member who represents the district where he has to exercise his powers of making up and revising a list. It is very well to say that the appointment shall be made by the Governor in Council. That reads very well in the Bill, but, practically, we know that in the majority of instances he will be the nominee of the member now representing the county who supports the Government. Now, we know that is talked about openly. If you talk to hon. members in the corridor or on the streets, they will tell you: I intend to nominate so-and-so for my riding. He is a good man; he will not do anything that is wrong. In the sense that those hon. gentlemen mean he certainly will not do anything that is wrong as against them; but it does not follow that a gentleman, even although he may have been five years at the bar, if he owes his appointment entirely to political influences, and if the duties he has to discharge are to a large extent political as distinguished from judicial, it does not follow at all that he can be placed in the same category for impartiality as a judge. It has been argued here that we have no complaints to make against the judiciary of the land; they have been men of strong political feelings, but once they get upon the bench they leave those feelings behind them and discharge their judicial duties impartially. I am bound to say, Mr. Chairman, so far as I know, that is the case. Our judges do discharge their duties impartially, but why? Because, when they once get upon the bench, they are entirely removed from all political aspirations—or ought to be at any rate, and I believe to a large extent they are. They know that their conduct will be closely scrutinised by a body of intelligent and learned men who plead before them from year to year. They know, if they exhibit any partiality it must be in the face of the public; but they have no special motive for departing from a fair and honest discharge of the duties that belongs to their position. But how will it be with the revising barrister? He will be in the first instance recommended for this appointment by the member of the county. After appointment he will hold office during good behavior, that is, he will hold it as long as he does nothing which, in the opinion of the majority of the House of Commons, deserves censure at their hands. If, for instance, the hon. member for Carleton, who appoints the revising officer, places in his hands a list of those whom he alleges are entitled to be placed on the first list, the officer will not question the propriety of acting on the hon member's suggestion, and placing those names on the list. He will not see that is wrong. But where will be the Opposition candidate? Will the revising officer do the same thing for him? Practically it will amount to this: The names which the Conservative members wish to be placed on the list, will be placed on it in the first instance; while the names suggested by the Opposition candidates, will be placed on the list only on the individual application of the parties, and after a great deal of expense and trouble has been undergone. We have already in most of the Provinces of the Dominion, voters' lists prepared by municipal officers. With the exception of one or two hon. gentlemen opposite, no one has objected to the manner in which those lists are prepared by the municipal officers. The answer is, that those officers received their appointment direct from the people. If a charge of unfairness is proved against them, the officers are no doubt removed. If that system were continued, not only would it be a great advantage to have the experience gained by those officers, but great advantage would arise from saving in expense. The expense of the First Minister's system is placed at not less than half a million dollars. I have not heard any hon. gentlemen opposite submit a statement to show that the estimate is too large.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. member for Toronto submitted one.

Mr. DAVIES. I had not the advantage of hearing that estimate. That is a very serious amount, and if it can be reduced by adopting the existing system, it would be of great advantage. In Prince Edward Island, where there are no voters' list for the provincial elections, the amendment proposes that the lists be made out by the judge of each county. The scheme of the First Minister is one which has no precedent. The English system is entirely different; the American system is different, and the systems of Germany and Spain are entirely different. This system is unique; it has no precedent, no parallel. It vests in the First Minister, for the time being, power so great, that if he chooses to exercise it, he can return eight or ten members to this House. Personally, I should much prefer that a clause be inserted giving the right to the First Minister to return twelve members, because the public would then know what they were doing, and it would not be necessary to go through the farce of an election. I beg to move that the following be substituted for clause 10:—

The voters' lists shall be prepared by the municipal officer or officers who, under the laws of each Province, is or are required to prepare the voters' lists for elections to the General Assembly. In the Province of Prince Edward Island, where there are no voters' lists for provincial elections, the voters' list shall be prepared annually by the county judge in each respective electoral district. Every such officer shall, before he enters upon his duties, take an oath of office before a judge of the Superior Court or a court of record in the Province in which acts, in the form contained in the schedule, which he will hereafter cause to be deposited with the clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER The amendment of the hon. member for Queen's will practically retain in the hands of the local authorities the preparation of the voters' lists. By the adoption of that amendment one of the greatest blemishes in the Bill will be removed. The revising officer, although to a certain extent, performing the duties of a revisor is much more largely a maker of voters' lists, and attempting to fill this double capacity I do not think he can possibly do his duty fully and faithfully. I have heard supporters of the Goverment say outside of this Chamber, that this provision was an imitation of the English law with regard to revising barristers, and that it was unreasonable in this country, where we draw our inspiration so largely from English precedents, to object to the appointment of such officers here. Well, I think that is an erroneous statement of the case. It is true there are revising barristers in England, but those gentlemen do not make the lists, whereas, as I have pointed out, the revising officers under this Bill are not only to revise the lists, but to initiate the making of those lists—two functions which I believe are incompatible. I am pretty well acquainted with the method of preparing the voters' lists in my own Province, and the work, I find, is very well performed indeed, by the local officials to whom it is entrusted. These

officials live in the midst of the community with whose lists they have to deal, they know the names of the individuals, and they also know the property or the basis upon which those individuals seek to qualify. I heard, not long ago, a statement of the number of appeals from the original voters' list which were carried to the courts of Quebec last year, and I found that the number was ridiculously small, so small as to prove conclusively that the original voters' lists are very correctly prepared. The officials proposed in the right hon. gentleman's Bill will be charged with the duty of preparing the lists *ab initio*, and to perform that duty for the whole county he will not only have a great deal more labor cast on his shoulders than is now borne by the persons who prepare the lists in Quebec, but they will have to go around from one locality to another over the whole country, and make themselves acquainted with the conditions and circumstances of the various municipalities. He is obliged to hold a revision of the list, in every muncipality of which he has charge, and to do this in the larger counties will require a great deal of time. He will have to go considerable distances to hold what we may call, little courts here, there and everywhere in his county. All the work that is now done by the local authorities for the municipal and provincial elections, will still have to be performed, and in addition, there will be practically the same work to be gone over again by the revising officers. It is true, it will not be entirely the same work, because the voters' lists under the Dominion law, will be different from those for the local elections, but a large portion of the work will be merely a repetition of what is performed by the local officers. Some hon. gentleman, have objected here and elsewhere, that the local municipal authorities have been just as partisan as it is possible for the new appointees of the Government to be. The hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Valin) alluded to certain municipalities, in which he said, the local authorities had wrongfully taken some names off the lists and put others on that should not have appeared there. He seemed to have forgotten, however, that in every such case there was redress by appeal, while under this Bill there would be practically no redress. It is true that the right hon. gentleman has modified the Bill so as to allow appeals both in matters of fact and in matters of law, and I trust that that modification will take away some of the objections which we have heretofore urged against the Bill. Still, it does not remove the objection to which I now address myself. The hon. gentleman intimated that the new arrangement would not be any worse than the old, but I think it will, and for two or three reasons. The hon. gentleman pointed out some municipalities in which injustice had been done to certain Conservatives, but he failed to point out that in the same county, there are two or three Conservative municipalities, and I have reason to believe that some of those Conservatives did injustice to the Liberals of the county, and perhaps to as great an extent as in others the Liberals did injustice to the Conservatives. We find therefore, that under this municipal arrangement, although in some cases a little injustice may be done to one side, in other cases in the same county, the injustice may be on the other direction. We have there a balance of one evil against the other. I do not say that that is a good thing; I believe that in both cases a radical wrong was done to the electors who were themselves aggrieved by the partisan municipal councils; but the results to the country at large were not so injurious as they would be under this Bill, because, unfortunately, the revising officers will be of one political stripe through the length and breadth of the land. In my own county, where there is a municipal council opposed to me politically, some supporters of mine suffered an injustice; and I dare say that in other cases the same thing has occurred; but the likelihood of that occurring under the municipal arrangement is not so great as under a partisan political officer. Under the municipal arrangement there is the safeguard that it is in the hands of the people themselves; if they feel that they have been aggrieved by the wrongful act of their municipal officials, they can expel them at the next municipal elections and put new men into their places. But under this Bill the people have no recourse whatever; it is only the House of Commons itself that can have any recourse; and we are well aware that if these partisan officials do an injustice, it will be to people who will be represented on the floor of the House by the minority, not by the majority. One very great evil of the provisions of this Bill is that such injustices or such malpractice be committed by the revising officer, we may have brought into the arena of party strife, constant complaints in regard to elections and the election returns. Some years ago the trials of election disputes and the discussions relating thereto were removed from the arena of Parliament, and I believe that removal was a very great gain to the dignity of this House, and the progress of public business; but under this Bill we may have all the details connected with elections brought before the House of Commons, and that will be a great misfortune, both for the House itself and for the purity of elections in the country. There is another very strong objection to the arrangements under this Bill which would be obviated by the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). Under this Bill the revising officer has to undertake a very considerable labor, and for that labor he will have to receive a considerable salary. At present our voters' lists in the Province of Quebec are prepared absolutely free of expense. The municipal officials are obliged to prepare them without any additional charge over and above their ordinary salary. Should this House decide, as proposed by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, that these same officials should have the duty of preparing the voters' lists, I daresay some slight remuneration would have to be given to them for that work. I believe it is not legal for this Parliament to impose work on the municipal officials of the country without their consent and without reimbursing them for that work. But no one can suppose that such remuneration would be anything like as great as that to the revising officer. There is at present a sufficient expense entailed on this country without imposing upon us an additional burden that is unnecessary; and I contend that the necessity for the machinery provided by this Bill has never yet been shown by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. The hon. First Minister, in introducing the Bill, did not himself say it was a necessity. I understand, that yesterday afternoon, although I was not present, the hon. First Minister proposed an amendment to the effect that in the Province of Quebec notaries, as well as lawyers or barristers of five years' standing, should be eligible to act in this capacity. I suppose the notaries would also require to have five years' standing in their profession before they could act. I do not consider that that amendment is of any value whatever. In some of our counties, the notary who is best known in the county and who is likely to obtain this apointment may be a man of greater experience and higher social standing than the barrister or advocate who resides in the county; but I do not admit that the notarial profession as a rule stands higher than the profession of the law in our Province. The only advantage which could be urged in favor of the hon. gentleman's amendment is that it would give a greater choice of men. I do not wish to attribute any political motives for this proposal; but I think we shall find that in many cases in the Province of Quebec the notaries are just as likely to be strong political adherents of the party in power as the advocates; and the result of this amendment will be that where by any chance there is a lawyer or advocate in a county who is not an adherent of hon. gentlemen opposite,

and there should be a notary in the county who is, the notary will be chosen instead of the advocate; and no doubt the rule will work the other way. Yesterday afternoon the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) defended his profession from what he considered to be an aspersion cast on it by hon. gentlemen on this side. I do not know that anybody on this side has said a word against the profession as a body; we are well aware that it stands the highest of any profession in this country, and the hon. gentleman's defence of it was altogether needless. Under this Bill, however, the Government would have to appoint third or fourth rate lawyers, for it is not likely any lawyer who is in the enjoyment of a lucrative practice would be induced to give that up for the sake of manipulating the voters' lists in the constituency in which he happened to live. There is, however, a class of briefless lawyers and notaries who have very little to do and will be only too glad to accept this position and do their work in a partisan manner. Should the First Minister, however, intend to appoint men of good standing in the profession, he will certainly have to attach a larger salary to the office than any that has been imagined by hon. gentlemen on either side or indicated by himself; but should that be his intention the expenditure will be enormous. It is absurd that these revising officers should first make the lists and then revise them; it is contrary to all principles of justice and legal practice. Not only will the appellant have to establish the facts of his appeal but he will also have to remove the prejudices of the judge since he is compelled to appeal from the decision of the revising barrister in the first instance to the same revising barrister on the revision of the list. Allowing the same person who makes the list to revise them, is contrary to English practice. In England the local authorities—who correspond to our municipal authorities, to whom my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) wants to give the making of the first lists—make the lists, then the revising barrister, who is appointed, not by the Government, but by the judges, is appealed to in cases of dispute. This is as it should be, and were we to take that plan as our model, it would do away with a great deal of the objections raised. Believing that the amendment will throw a greater safeguard around this clause, I shall support it.

Mr. COOK. I have not attempted to address the House upon this subject, although the discussion has been prolonged for the last six weeks, and you have reached the 10th clause, and I suppose, if they receive the scrutiny that they deserve, the other clauses of the Bill will have to be discussed in the same ratio, and we may therefore expect that we will commence our fall ploughing before the Session is closed. I think, upon so important a matter as this, it is necessary that the representative of the people should look closely into a matter that is going to affect him in so large a degree, not alone in reference to the question of the expense that will be incurred by the passage of this Bill, but also as to the means that may be adopted and will likely be adopted if we take the past as a criterion for the future, as to what the result may be in election campaigns or in the fixing of the voters' lists. I remember, when a comparative boy, the speeches that were made by the Prime Minister, when he called upon his friends throughout the country to look closely after the voters' lists, when he called upon his Conservative friends to look closely after the municipal elections, to see that they carried the municipal elections, and that, by carrying the municipal elections, they got their officers elected, so that they could make the voters' list as nearly favorable to his party as possible. That was a common cry throughout the country. It was a cry that was hurled from one constituency to the other all over the old Upper and Lower Canada before the Dominion was confederated. The hon. gentleman finds now that his own friends in the different municipalities are acting fairly, and he begins to suspect them. He is afraid that they will not make the voters' lists in accordance with the views expressed by himself, and that the consequence may be disastrous to him at the next general election. I have had the honor of visiting some parts of the country while this discussion has been going on. I have had conversations with both political parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. COOK. I have met the respectable Conservatives, who do not murmur as some other gentlemen do over there, and many of them expressed their opinions in conversation. One gentleman said: Why, I do not know what this country is coming to. One gentleman said: I fear that our great Chieftain wants to become dictator, he wants to dictate to the people how the elections shall be carried in support of himself. This was but a mild supporter of the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very mild, I am afraid.

Mr. COOK. A mild supporter. I met another, and a most respectable Conservative, a legal gentleman in the city of Toronto, a very strong supporter of the hon. gentleman——

Mr. McCALLUM. Name.

Mr. COOK. I am not in the habit of naming private conversations, perhaps as the hon. gentleman does. He said: I fear the old man is losing his head. He will enfranchise the Indian, and he will drive two Conservatives away for every Indian vote that he makes. I hope that will be the case, and I verily believe it will be the case. I believe the people of this country are fair-minded after all. We saw that exemplified in some constituencies at the last general elections. We saw that exemplified in East York, in South Brant, in Bothwell, and I think that, if this Bill unfortunately becomes law, you will find that it will be exemplified in every constituency in the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, we are at the 10th clause, as I said. That provides for the revising barrister, that beautiful gentleman, who will lovingly approach the hon. the Premier with his arm about his neck, and will declare to him: I will do thy bidding, and I will do it well. Of course, I do not expect the hon. gentleman will appoint barristers in every constituency. I do not think he will appoint a revising barrister, for example, in West Ontario; I do not think he will appoint a revising barrister probably in South Simcoe; I do not think he will be guilty of appointing a revising barrister in a constituency that he knows is safe one way or the other, a constituency that is either Reform strongly or Conservative strongly; but it is the little ones between, where it is hinging just upon a few votes; then he will put his hands in his pockets and declare to the people upon the hustings: See how fairly I have dealt with them, see what I have done; here I have appointed a judge, and there I have appointed a judge, but we had no judge to appoint in this constituency—that is one which was a close constituency—we could not get a judge there; I am very sorry, very sorry indeed; it would be a very happy thing for me if I could appoint a judge in that case, but I could not and so I appointed a revising barrister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that I see how he would do it if he were on this side.

Mr. COOK. Then the hon. gentleman should not put weapons into the hands of his opponents by which he will be killed, for, just as certain as the sun rises and sets, he will be defeated at the next elections in this country. When he comes before the country again—and he dare not

do it to-day, although it is recorded that he threatened his supporters that, unless they came to his rescue and put this Bill through, he would dissolve Parliament and go to the country—he will be defeated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. There are some hon. gentlemen behind him who cheer, who know that their political existence depends upon the passage of this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. COOK. There is one hon. gentleman who sits behind him, laughing as he may laugh, trying to laugh, who may laugh on the other side of his mouth at the next election, even with the Indian at his back; and he knows that, with the Indian at his back, he will not have the opportunity of coming here again. Mr. Chairman, I know something about this thing. I remember that in the last local election for Algoma, an officer in the Indian Department was sent up there, and these poor Indians were trotted out to the polls to record their votes, and when they got there they found that the scrutineers on the Liberal side declared they had no vote, and they would not let them vote. Therefore we know that the hon. gentleman has had some experience already in this direction. He knows that he cannot lead them up to the polls and make them vote as he sees fit, and so he wants this Bill to enable him to do so.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I rise to a point of order. We are not discussing the Indian clause.

Mr. COOK. I know where the shoe pinches.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am following the hon. gentleman, and shall not allow the discussion to wander from the amendment.

Mr. COOK. I was intending to come to it in a round-about way. Now, the voters' lists in the Province of Ontario are made up by the municipal councils. I am perfectly satisfied with the way in which they are made up in my county, although I think about two-thirds of the municipalities in my county have Tory councils. I have more confidence in the Tories than the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) appears to have, because I heard him declare in this House that he would not believe the assessors, a great many of them, under oath.

Mr. HESSON. I rise to correct the hon. gentleman. He is entirely misrepresenting my statement again. I said nothing of the kind, and if the hon. gentleman had been present, he would not have dared to say so. I repeat again, that what I said was this: That the municipal elections in Ontario were generally held on political principles, and the councillors being so elected, the assessors were consequently so appointed, and the Courts of Revision were appointed upon the same principle, each side always endeavoring to obtain a majority of their own political friends, whether Grit or Conservative, as representing the county or town. That course, I said, was advised by the leader of the Reform party at Toronto, who told them to look after the voters' list. The voters' lists were therefore prepared in the manner I have described—first, by election of members of the council who were of a particular stripe, then by the appointment of an assessor of the same stripe, by the majority of the Court of Revision of the same stripe. If the hon. gentleman denies that, then he denies what no other gentleman in this House would deny, who has fought the municipal elections in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. COOK. I believe a great deal that the hon. gentleman has said. He said, as far as his knowledge goes, the municipal elections have been held on a partisan and political ground. I have no doubt about that, because I do not think the hon. gentleman knows anything beyond his own political party. I concur with what he says. I know the Conservative party have run their municipal elections on politics, and they have always had that advantage. But still I believe there are Conservative assessors in the country, who are sworn men, and who are capable men, and who will, under oath, do what is fair and right. They may err in judgment. One man may hold that a property is worth so much, and another man may hold that it is worth more or less; but I do not think because one man holds one opinion and another man holds a different opinion, that that is perjury. Men's opinions differ. My opinion differs from that of the hon. gentleman from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), for which I thank God. Now, Sir, the revising barrister is to take the place of the assessor. He is to be paid—by whom? The people already pay for the assessors, they already pay for the municipal machinery, and now you want to tax them to a greater extent, at a time when this country is laboring under one of the greatest financial depressions we have ever had, and when the national debt of this country is increasing at a rate that is appalling. Still, the hon. gentleman proposes to add to that national debt at least half a million dollars a year. Some hon. gentlemen say it will not cost as much as that, but I am satisfied the expense will be greater. When we remember the officials that have to be paid, and the expenses connected with their positions, and when we remember that men who are employed by the Government are not very careful about how they expend Government money, particularly if they are Tories, the expenses that will be incurred will be something enormous. Some hon. gentlemen have said half a million dollars, and I think that is far within the mark. I would much sooner say three-quarters of a million dollars. Some have said $800,000, and I think it will be as much as that. The greatest trouble will be that there will be two voters' lists, and people will not know which one to vote upon. A man may be enfranchised under the local law and disfranchised under this law, because there is no doubt that a very large number of people of the Province of Ontario will be disfranchised under this Bill. Why, Sir, in the shire town of my county, the town of Orillia, lying on Lake Couchiching—just opposite, on the other side of the lake, is an Indian village where every Indian will be enfranchised, while on the Orillia side white men who have been voting for years and years will be disfranchised. I know something of the facts of which I speak.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. COOK. Well, Sir, this revising barrister is a gentleman who will be appointed by the Government; he will be appointed by Sir John A. Macdonald—if I may make use of the name.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You say the Indian village will have votes on the opposite side of the lake, while the people on the other side will not have votes. Why?

Mr. COOK. Because they will be disfranchised under this Act. They have votes under the local law, but they will not have any under this law. I like these interruptions from my hon. friend from Hastings. I know he takes a great interest in the Indian question. We always see his face blooming when he talks about Indians, because he knows how many there are in his county who he expects will vote for him. Now, Sir, the mode of making the assessment roll in the Province of Ontario is a very convenient one. The people understand it. The assessors have the benefit of each other's judgment in reference to the value of land. As a rule an assessor is appointed from each political party—I know that it is the way in my county, and everything goes on beautifully and well—swimmingly in fact—no jars at all. We have had five elections under this law as it now stands, and why in the world could we not have five more elections under

the same law? Sir, the reason is not far to seek. The hon. gentleman knows the financial condition into which he has brought this country, and he is afraid to meet the people again. He knows the depths of degradation to which he has brought the people; he knows the difficulties in the North-West, the disturbance in the Lower Provinces——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. COOK. I am in order. Prince Edward Island is dissatisfied, New Brunswick is dissatisfied, Ontario depressed. It is well to let hon. gentlemen opposite know that something must be done. It would be well to let the right hon. gentleman appoint members to this House from the word go. He does it in the Senate. He appoints the senators; they are all good friends of his, and he might as well do the same thing here. And he is doing this under the guise of English precedent. Some people in the country yet fail to understand it. I suppose all members opposite do or they should do at all events; but some people in the country do not quite understand. They say: We are following English law; I do not object to that. But when you come to explain the matter to them, when the thing comes to be brought under their notice in the hideous shape in which it is before this House, they open their eyes with disgust. They say: We do not think it possible that the old chieftain, will attempt this thing at the close of his career; that he will stoop to such degradation as this in the closing portion of his political life. There has been a great deal said in this House about petitions. I will not transgress the rule, but I can talk about petitions, because they are directed mainly against the revising barristers. People say: If you take away the revising barrister and the Indian, Sir John will not want the Bill; it would be no use to him at elections. Therefore, the Indian must be in it, and the revising barrister must be in it. With respect to the petition that came from my constituency, I think I will take an opportunity, if necessary, to read a letter sent by the president of the Reform Association at Gravenhurst, Mr. Isaac Cockburn, brother of the member for North Ontario, in which he states that he could, if he had had time, have secured every single man in that village, but nine. There is a large Tory majority in the village. That fact shows there are a great many Conservatives who are prepared to sign the petitions. This petition that was presented by myself had 105 names, 18 of which were those of Conservatives. No doubt, it is a certainty, that those Conservatives will vote with the Liberals at the next election. They will make a difference of thirty-six votes, and give a Reform majority in the village. I do not make this statement from a political standpoint; we are not here to look after our political advantage, but to look after the interests of the country; to see that the people's rights are fully maintained; that popular Government is maintained; and we are here to check the Government in their endeavor to overthrow responsible government. Why what would we come to with the revising barrister? An oligarchy such as that we had forty years ago—the old family compact? No; it would be even ten times worse. We would then have an oligarchy all centred in one man. At that time there were twelve men and they all had something to say. Some people have called this a cowardly Bill. Some people have said it is the Bill of political cowards who hide themselves in their rifle pits and wait for the approach of the enemy, when they will have a full swing at their whole bodies.

Mr. RYKERT. How fine that is.

Mr. COOK. Yes, it is very fine. There are patriots, political patriots, personal patriots, public patriots. One of the great signs of the times is that you find patriotism leaking out of the very ends of men's toes; you find them always crying about patriotism. We have heard it. Some hon. gentlemen opposite cannot rise and make a speech unless they constantly repeat the word patriotism. Whenever you hear the cry of wolf look out that some one has not shorn a sheep. Look out, because I know something about that myself. Some people say if we are following the English precedents in this matter it is not so bad. But you find it is not English precedents; you find that the Premier is going to appoint a revising barrister, although the appointment is to be made in the name of the Council, and so forth, but we know what that means. I will be within my limit upon this clause if I refer to a few campaigns, because if we had had revising barristers then we would not have had to resort to other means. Probably we would not have had the Pacific scandal. I had to fight Sir Hugh Allan's money.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must discuss the question before the Committee.

Mr. COOK. If we had had revising barristers I would have been about $15,000 better off. As you, Mr. Chairman, have ruled, and I have great respect for the Chair, I do not wish to trouble your feelings or to go contrary to your instructions. Sir, I now have to desist from referring to some of the campaigns which have passed in the history of the country within my own recollection, though I should like to have given them some consideration, but I suppose I will have an opportunity of doing so at a later stage. Now, Mr. Chairman, we are at the revising barrister clause, and I am perfectly in accord with the amendment moved by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, that is, if the Bill is to become law. But I would rather not vote for it, because I do not want it. There is not a feature of the Bill which is worthy the consideration of this House. The whole thing is bad from beginning to end. I can tell my hon. friend, the Premier of this country, that he is making a great mistake pushing this Bill through at the sacrifice of the public business. We know how far we have gone in the Estimates, and we know the number of important Government Bills to be passed through this Session. We know that the Estimates must pass—and they always take a month or six weeks at least to get through with, and I know there are things to be unearthed; I know that a scrutiny should take place, and I give my hon. friend to understand that it shall take place, so far as I have anything to say about it. I say that although they press this Bill on from day to day, thinking perhaps that the other business will not receive due consideration, and that members of this House will want to get away—I say they are mistaken. I have not heard a grumble or a mutter from this side. They are all prepared to stay here till next year and they do not want an additional indemnity.

An hon. MEMBER. You will get it by subscription.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have to ask the hon. gentleman to confine his observations to the clause before the committee and the amendment which has been moved thereto. He is not discussing that now, and I hope he will not require me to call his attention to the matter again.

Mr. COOK. I was speaking of the length of the Session, and that if we discuss the revising barrister clause for the next three or four weeks—and there are sixty-three clauses in the Bill—there is not much chance of our getting through this year, and I want to get home before the fall ploughing, in order to get at my lumbering operations.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The sooner you begin discussing the clause the sooner you will get through.

Mr. COOK. We are now discussing the revising barrister clause, and these gentlemen will be appointed from cities, towns, and villages, for you do not find them in country places. These gentlemen are supposed to value the pro-

perty and make up the lists. How is he going to do it? The thing is simply poppycock. He will have to go to every farm and count the number of sheep that the man has in his field, the number of pigs, the number of hogs——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. And there are some old swine over there, too. He will have to count the number of cows.

An hon. MEMBER. And the calves.

Mr. COOK. He will have to pay particular attention to the sex, for he will have to put a value upon each. He will have to take the household furniture, and the children in the house, because he will have to find out how many of them are the age of 21 years in order to make up the list properly. He knows as much about a farm, probably, as he knows about the good time coming, or the heaven above him, and they say lawyers do not know much about that, and get there very gradually. How is he going to get this information? Is he going to go to the assessors? If he does, after what has been said of them by the hon. member for North Perth and others, they will say: If you do not believe the valuation we give on oath, we will give you no further information. They are not officers of the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government has nothing to do with them. I remember introducing a Bill into this House which required the assistance of the municipal authorities, but I was compelled to withdraw it because the House had no right to deal with such matters. You are passing a Bill, and you do not know how it will be carried out. These men will get two or three parties about them, and you may be sure it will not be their political opponents, and they will ask information from them. They will ask who is this fellow? He is a Grit—he is a blawsted fellow; and the man will say: We will not put him on. A great deal of this will be done if this Bill passes. I still have hopes that the Bill will not pass, but, if the Government are bound to put it through I hope they will amend it. If they are bound to impose the enormous expense of working this Bill upon the country, I hope they will make it workable. Under the Bill as it stands, some hon. gentleman on the other side, who is a barrister, or some one who is not a member, can be appointed a revising barrister, he can cook his county and make his list, and then resign and become a candidate. He will be elected of course without any difficulty by his own arrangement of the voters' list. I am sure that if such a Bill was proposed by a Liberal Government, and hon. gentlemen opposite were sitting on this side of the House, they would not allow this House to rise for a twelvemonth. It has been said that this was a sequence to the Gerrymander Bill. The Gerrymander Bill did a great deal of good to their friends, but it did not accomplish all that it was intended to accomplish, and the consequence is that they now propose to take this means to choke off and kill some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I said it would be difficult under any circumstances for the revising barrister to make out the list, even if he is an honest man. I would not believe much in the good faith of the revising barristers who would be appointed by the present Government, simply because I know that Government took to themselves the right of appointing returning officers on former occasions, and we know how they were appointed; we know the result of their appointment. I know that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was kept out of this House for nearly two Sessions by a partisan returning officer—one of the most shameful things that has ever been perpetrated in this country. I warn the hon. gentleman that this country is in a state of excitement at the present time. Thinking that the attention of the country was directed elsewhere, he has tried to shove through this House this infamous measure. Well, Sir, he may succeed; he may put this Bill through; but I assure the hon. gentleman that the revising barristers will be looked after just about as closely as that gang was that went into Middlesex on one occasion. I assure my hon. friend that the people of this country will not allow any man to go into a county to say who shall not be put on the list when they are entitled to be put on. If these revising barristers leave off men who are entitled to be put on the list, I warn the hon. gentleman that the consequences may be serious, because I know the feeling and temper of the people to day. One gentleman in the city of Toronto said to me, "Why, Sir, we have more cause for rebellion to-day than we had in '37." That is the feeling that exists in the country. I endeavored to calm his feeling; I told him that the Government were bad, but that we would try to bring them to a position where they would not be so far astray. The people of this country are beginning to understand this question; they are beginning to understand that the Government of this country want to perpetrate this outrage in order to perpetuate their power. But, Sir, there is a day of reckoning, there is a day of punishment and revenge coming. That punishment is near at hand; that revenge is about here. Hon. gentlemen will find it at the next election.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I propose making a few observations on this clause of the Bill. I think it will be admitted by both sides of the House that of all the clauses of this Bill, the clause we are now discussing is the most important, and requires a very full and free discussion. I was surprised that when the First Minister moved the adoption of this clause he did not condescend to give any explanation to the House why he thought it wise in the public interest that the appointment of the officer who creates and revises the voters' lists should be a nominee of the Crown. It appears to me that a proposition for so radical a change in our legislation requires at the hands of its introducer a full explanation; but the First Minister said absolutely nothing as to the reasons which suggested this change to his mind. It does seem to me to be an extraordinary power for the Government to assume—the appointment of an official, who is to be a supporter of the Government—a partisan; because we may rest assured that no one but a tried and warm supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite will be appointed to the position. Now, I venture to say that in no British colony, certainly in no colony on this continent, has any such proposition ever received the sanction of the Legislature. It is not the law in any land, so far as I have been able to discover, that the Administration of the day have assumed the unchecked, unrestrained, unlimited power of nominating the officials who are to prepare and revise the voters' lists, and to manufacture all the machinery necessary for the creation of the electoral body. It is the first attempt in the history of this country or in the history of any other country, to carry through Parliament a proposition of that kind. In a free country such as Canada is, with free institutions and responsible government, the voice of the people should find proper and legitimate expression at the polls and not be gagged or restrained by any legislation Parliament may see fit to pass. The effect of this Bill will be to place in the hands of irresponsible and practically irremovable officials the whole power of creating the voters' lists and the unlimited and absolute power of revising the voters' lists. True, the Bill allows an appeal to be taken from the decision of the revising officer on questions of law, and the First Minister stated the other day he now proposes to extend that right to question of fact as well; but we know there will be difficulty and great expense connected with the appeal. The evidence taken before the revising officer and the law points raised have to be submitted to the court of appeal, and as that cannot be done by an ordinary elector, he will have to employ some one learned in the law to prepare his case and argue it. The fact that there is an appeal in questions of fact and of

law, where the revising officer is not a County Court judge, is of little importance, because the expense will be so great that, unless the candidate sees fit to bear it, the appeals will be few and far between. The best way you can get the free expression of public opinion at the polls is to leave the creation and revision of the voters' lists entirely in the hands of the local authorities. It is nonsense to talk of this or any other Parliament representing the voice of the people, when at the outset we propose to take out of the hands of the people the power of creating and revising the voters' lists, and centre that power in the hands of an irresponsible, irremovable official appointed by the Government. You can, to a large extent, gag public opinion in many ways. We know that Parliament, by the rearrangement of constituencies, by the rearrangement of the boundaries of electoral districts in counties, can so arrange them that the voice of the majority of the people may be completely swamped by that of the minority; we know further that by appointing partisan returning officers, the expression of the public opinion may be checked. We have illustrations of this in this Parliament. I do not mean to say that every revising officer appointed under this Bill will be an improper officer. The First Minister will, in some cases, appoint County Court judges, but I fear very much he will appoint them where the revising officer can be of no service to either political party; but where the majority is limited, where the majority may be within a hundred on either side, the First Minister will find it his interest to appoint revising officers, perhaps men not of the most scrupulous character, who will do the bidding of the hon. gentleman with respect to the revision of the voters' lists. What I complain of is that this or any Government should have the power of creating any official who would have the power, under an Act of Parliament, to create or manufacture a voters' list, so that it would not represent the true, honest sentiment of the people. Legislation of this kind is not legislation that would proceed from honest statesmen. It is one-sided legislation, legislation solely in the interest of a political party. It may be the hon. gentleman's turn now to have a Bill of this kind, but supposing, in the whirligig of events, hon. gentlemen opposite should lose their seats on the Treasury benches, they would be the first to complain of the provisions of this Bill. It is not fair, it is not honest, it is not in the public interest, that any legislation should be sanctioned by this Parliament, the effect of which necessarily will be to place the control over the voters' lists, and thereby the control of the elections of the representatives in this Parliament, entirely in the hands of one man. Such legislation is worthy only of the days of the Walpole's, or the times of the Stuarts or the Georges. I can have no objection that whatever political party has the confidence of the people should hold the reins of power, but what I do object to is that if there is a majority of the electors opposed to a political party, the views of that majority should be prevented finding expression on the floor of Parliament. It may be the result of the Bill that although a majority of the electorate be opposed to the policy and the legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite, their opinion may not have effect, because the revising officer has it in his power by improper conduct to so gag and check public opinion that the voice of the people will not have legitimate expression in Parliament. A political triumph so acquired is no triumph at all. A victory obtained not by the free and independent voice of the people at the polls, but by the action of a revising officer, is not a victory that any hon. gentleman can feel proud of. Such legislation as this is unworthy of statesmen and unworthy of the people of Canada, and, if the Bill passes in its present shape, with the absolute and unlimited control given to one officer to tamper with and to cook the voters' list, I am satisfied that the people, when they have an opportunity of pronouncing upon the subject, will in no way sanction it. The first proposition is that the hon. gentleman shall himself have the power of appointing 211 revising officers. Some of these men may be judges who have already their parchment from the Government to discharge their judicial functions, but we have no assurance that there will be a single judge appointed. The hon. gentleman and some of his followers say the Government will appoint the County Court judges, but the First Minister is careful to provide that he shall not be bound to appoint any single County Court judge, or junior judge, or Superior Court judge in the Province of Quebec. He takes the absolute power of appointing either the County Court judge or the junior judge or the revising barrister; and when he is called upon to make the selection, I fear very much that there will be few counties in which he will find it in the interest of his party to select the judges. Although I am opposed to the principle of this Bill, and am opposed to this clause, it would not be so objectionable if the First Minister provided that he should appoint the judge or the junior judge of the County Court in every instance, and that, where he was unable to discharge the duties, the First Minister should take to himself the power of appointing a revising officer from the ranks of the profession. But the First Minister does not do that. He takes the power of appointing a revising officer. He selects those 211 men, if he sees fit, from his own followers, his own hangers-on, his own dependents, because we cannot expect, and we do not expect, that any revising officer will be selected from the ranks of the profession who belongs to the Liberal party. I have pointed out the inevitable results of that, and neither the First Minister nor any hon. gentleman on that side has made any answer to the statement that, by taking this power, they can practically send to Parliament whom they see fit. In subsequent clauses of this Bill the First Minister gives the revising officer extraordinary additional powers. The revising officer prepares the list and revises the list, and, when the list is revised, the revising officer is bound by section 26 to transmit that list to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and he advertises that list. There may at that very moment be a hundred appeals before the Superior Courts from the decision of the revising officer, but he is bound all the same to send the voters' list, when completed, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. These appeals may be pending, and a new election may be ordered and may take place while these appeals are pending, and yet, if it takes place then, the voters' list as transmitted, although it may be fraudulent, although names may be on it which ought not to be there and names may be left off which ought to be there, is final and conclusive; and, if any question subsequently arises as to the validity of that election, as to the frauds committed by the revising officer, as to his misconduct, as to his putting names on that he ought not to put or leaving names off that should be on, or tampering with the voters' list after it is finally completed, the 28th section of this Bill absolutely prohibits and restrains the judges of the Superior Courts from enquiring into the irregularity or misconduct of the revising officer. That is an outrage. What is the effect of it? Take a county with a majority in favor of either candidate, of 50. You get the revising officer to add 50 names to that roll that he ought not to add, 50 Liberals added to the roll that ought not to be added, and the result will be that the Conservative candidate will be defeated. On the other hand, by the revising officer adding the names of fifty Conservatives who ought not to be added, or leaving fifty names off, that ought not to be left off, the result will be that the wrong man is elected, the man who does not really represent the voice of the majority of the people; and, under the 28th clause, no matter how scandalous and outrageous the frauds may be, the Court has no power to rectify the wrong committed

by the revising officer. That is an improper power to be given, one that no Parliament ought to give to a revising officer, one that no Government ought to vest in any official, I do not care who that official is. It makes it the stronger when that official is irremovable except on an address from the House of Commons, when it is a permanent appointment, and he cannot be interfered with except for cause, and that upon an address of this Parliament. These are objections of the first possible consequence, that ought to have weight with reasonable and thinking men, and that ought to prevail against this clause. The hon. gentleman could avoid a great deal of the anticipated wrongs that may result from the enactment of the 10th clause by appointing the county judges or the junior judges. Nobody that I am aware of objects to the appiontment of these officials to discharge these duties. They have discharged them in the past, and have discharged them tolerably, fairly; they are the revising officers now, and what reason has the hon. gentleman and his followers for making the change which is now proposed, and appointing some one who is not clothed with the responsibility of a judge? Whatever we may think of some of the recent appointments to the judiciary, we pride ourselves as Canadians upon the fact that, as a general rule, when a member of the bar is appointed to the bench, he lays aside, as far as it is possible for frail humanity to lay aside, his political proclivities, his political inclinations, his political prejudices, and he goes on the bench free from all the party leanings he may have had when in active political life. We have, at all events, a guarantee in so far as the judges of the County Courts are concerned, that something like fair play will be dealt out to both political parties. It is of the first possible consequence to gentlemen upon both sides of the House that we should have a fair and honest voters' list. It is of the first consequence to the people of this country that we should have a fair and honest voters' list. What is the result if you have not such a list? Do you suppose that if the people of this country became satisfied in their own minds that a list made by a revising officer appointed not in the public interest, but in the party interest, acting unfairly, acting frauduently, acting contrary to the spirit and intent of the law—do you suppose that in a free country like this, where the people have been accustomed for so many years to manage their own affairs in this respect, that they would tolerate such an outrage? There would be dissatisfaction and discontent, and something more serious would ultimately be the outcome. Unless the people have a fair and honest list they will be dissatisfied and discontented, and unless they can get redress under the law, they will seek some other mode of working out their own political destiny. Now I say again, that no Minister of the Crown in any English colony, or in any other country—I make the statement boldly—has ever submitted a proposition of this kind to Parliament, that the Government who controls the maojrity of the representatives of the people for the time being, should take to itself absolute and unrestricted power to appoint an official to create a voters' list. Sir, the right to exercise the franchise is a sacred right, dearly cherished by our people, and the moment you interfere with that, you interfere with something they highly value. Now, Sir, there is no position that a man can aspire to that is more honorable, and perhaps more earnestly sought after, than that of the representative of a free people in a free country, but I say that if men are to occupy seats in Parliament, not by the free, uncontrolled, ungagged voice of the people, but if they are to be members of Parliament by Act of Parliament, through the intervention of a revising barrister appointed by the Executive of the day, all the dignity and all the attraction that cluster around the position of member of Parliament, are gone, and the member of Parliament simply becomes the creature of the Government and a member by Act of Parliament. Sir, the First Minister often tells us that he draws his inspiration from English sources; sometimes he has said he draws inspiration from our friends on the other side of the line. I do not care where he gets his inspirations if they are only honest inspiration. I do not care where he gets his models and precedents if they are acceptable to the people of this country. But in draughting this Bill, and forcing it through Parliament, I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point out a single country where they can show a precedent. You will not find it in England, or in any English colony, and you will not find it in any State of the United States. Now, we may very properly take a leaf out of the book of the experience of our neighbors to the south of us, and an experience that has extended over 100 years. I say that we would be fools—we would be worse, we would be madmen—if, when we find legislation on the other side of the line working satisfactorily, with the experience of a century to back it up, we did not adopt that legislation if we found it suitable to our circumstances. In the United States the creation of the voters' list is left practically in the hands of the people, who have the absolute and supreme control, both as to the creation and the revision of the voters' list. Now, we find that in the State of Maine the voters' list is created in the following way: The electors, at their annual meeting in the month of January, select either three, five or seven selectmen, as the locality may decide. The assessors of the municipalities are bound to send to these selectmen a list of the taxpayers and of those qualified to vote. These selectmen, from that list, prepare the voters' list, and upon a certain day, and at a certain place, both fixed by law, these selectmen meet and revise the list. Everything is thus left in the hands of the people, and neither the Federal nor the Local Legislature has a particle of control over the voters' lists. Most of the States of the Union have got different systems for the preparation of the voters' lists, but in none of them will you find a system that does not leave the matter in the hands of the people at large. In the State of Pennsylvania the electors, at their annual meeting, select three men, one of whom is called the judge, and the other two are called inspectors, and these three men form the board of election registrars. So in Pennsylvania, and in several other States, the law is careful to protect the right of a minority, to protect the rights of both political parties. Every elector has only got two votes. No elector in the State can vote for more than two of those judges, and thereby the minority in the State can at least have one of those three judges. Now, Sir, that looks to me to be a fair and reasonable proposition. Three men are appointed to prepare and revise the list. The absolute untrammelled power is left in the hands of the people, unchecked by any restraint so far as the Federal Parliament is concerned. In Rhode Island the town council are a board of canvassers. On the first Monday in January they meet at a place and time stated by law. They prepare the voters' list, and afterwards revise it. Taking these three illustrations I have given, they stand out in marked contrast with the course the hon. gentleman proposes to pursue in this Bill. In every one of those States, so careful are the authorities that the public interests shall be protected, that the interests of the respective political bodies shall be protected and guarded in the creation and revision of the voters' lists, that the task is placed entirely in the hands of the people themselves. In the United States, where politics run as high, probably higher than in Canada, you see how careful and cautious the majority are with respect to the rights of the minority. The same care, forethought and independence do not exist here. The First Minister in no particular intends to protect the rights of the minority. He places absolute, unlimited power in the hands of the revising officers, and he gives those officers so appointed unlimited power with respect to the voters' lists. In the United

States there is no Government interference, either by the Federal Parliament or by the State Legislatures. It rests with Canada, and it is the only instance, I believe, in the history of parliamentary government, to have the Government assume the power of dealing with the voters' lists in the way they propose in this case. Take some other States. Take the State of New Jersey. There the people elect, at the annual meeting, one person as a judge and two as inspectors of elections. These three persons constitute the board of registration. Every person who has a right to be put on the voters' list is placed on it. Every elector, at the election at which those three men are nominated and elected, has only two votes, so that in every instance the minority will at least have one member of the board representing their political opinions. In the State of New York the principle adopted is somewhat similar. In Minnesota, township supervisors are elected annually by the people, who also elect the election judges. The town clerk for each township is also clerk of the board of elections. They attend on a day and at a place fixed by law, are bound to attend and prepare the voters' list, and upon a day and at a place fixed by law, they attend for the purpose of revising the list. The basis on which the judges proceed is the voters' list of the preceding year. In that State, as in nearly all the States of the Union, the power of making and correcting the voters' list is left entirely in the hands of the people without any official control either by the Federal Government or State Legislatures. In the State of Michigan the aldermen of every incorporated city, the supervisor treasurer and clerk of every township shall constitute the board of registration. At a date and place appointed the board meets and revises the voters' list. They represent the people, and if they do wrong, violate the law, perpetrate a fraud, and do injury to either political party, the people have it in their own power to dismiss them at the next annual meeting, and they do dismiss them accordingly. They have a guarrantee of fair dealing in this board of revision, because if the board acts improperly it is in the hands of the people, and they have power to punish its members. Such are the modes adopted in several of the States of the Union, and I have only given these two or three instances in order to illustrate the policy pursued here. They leave the creation of the voters' list in the hands of the people. There is no revising barrister no enormous expense such as we are asked to incur by the proposition now before the committee. The local authorities are utilised in every instance; they create the voters' list and they revise it, and there is no appel from their judgment to the judgment of any court or higher authority. In a country like this, where we are a self-governing country, supposed to be free and independent, assumed to have intelligence enough to manage our own affairs in our own way, why should it not be a proper and fair thing as between man and man, as between the opposition and the Government, that the creation of the voters' lists should be left entirely in the hands of the people themselves? You will not find such a proposal as this in any British colony; and as the hon. gentleman says, he draws nearly all his inspiration from England and English sources, you would naturally imagine that the hon. gentleman would have sought in some English colony for some precedent for his action. He will seek in vain. He will find no English colony where a law such as the hon. gentleman proposes has ever been placed on the Statute Book. It is true that in Victoria, one of the Australian colonies, the Government appoint revising barristers. But the revising barrister has no such power, no such unlimited, unrestricted power as that officer will have under this clause of the present Bill. In that colony he has what are practically semi-judicial and semi-ministerial functions. His judgments are not final and conclusive in any sense. He is appointed by the Government, it is true, and is called an electoral registrar. In that colony the head of the department is charged with the administration of the laws respecting elections and he appoints officials. He sends the electoral registrar blank certificates as to the right to vote, and the clerk of every council, as he is bound by law to do, sends to this electoral registrar on a given day in each year, a list of every ratepayer whom this clerk supposes has a right to vote; and every ratepayer who goes to the electoral registrar obtains a certificate setting forth that he has a right to vote. Objection may be made at a given time to the list of electors as prepared by the electoral registrars in the colony. Those objections are transmitted by the electoral registrars to the clerk of the Court of Petty Sessions. This court hears objections made to the electoral list; in other words, this court reviews the judgment of the electoral registrar. The Court of Petty Sessions is composed of a judge learned in the law and of magistrates, and this court has power, as I have said, to review the judgment of the electoral registrar. More than that. The revising officer's judgment and even the judgment of the Court of Petty Sessions are not final and conclusive. There may be a protest against misconduct and fraud on the part of a revising officer or the electoral registrar or those charged with the preparation of the lists. Those allegations can be inquired into by the courts, which has full, unlimited, and unrestricted power, as they have here at the present time, unless this Bill becomes law. The hon. gentleman says he draws his inspiration from the mother country. Let us see what the mother country has done in this respect. Let us see if she has adopted such a law as this. England has not done so. Under the law of England there is no power to appoint a revising officer vested in the Executive. The revising officer is invested with certain judicial and Ministerial functions. He is appointed not by the Executive of the day, for so anxious and careful is the Imperial Government that even a shadow of a suspicion should not rest upon the character, the reputation, the integrity, the fair play, of these revising officers, that they have vested that power in the highest judges of the realm. What a marked contrast between what the First Minister proposes and the law which now prevails in England. In England, in the county of Middlesex, and the surrounding boroughs, they are appointed by the chief justice of the Court of Queen's Bench. In the outside counties they are appointed by the senior judge of assize, and for a term of only one year, so that, if at the end of the year it is found that the revising officer does not discharge his duties fairly and honestly, you may rest assured that his name is dropped from the list for the succeeding year. If the First Minister would only adopt that course, if he would leave the appointment of the revising officers in the hands of the chief justices of the Supreme Courts in the various Provinces, or the judges travelling on circuit, this clause of the Bill would be shorn of many of its objectionable features. But in its present form, this Bill will be not only objectionable to hon. gentlemen on this side, but I predict that the day will come when no more determined opponents of this clause will be found in the country, than hon. gentlemen sitting on that side. Hon. gentlemen must not suppose that they have got a lease of power in perpetuity. They must not suppose that times do not change, or that they are going to remain where they are for all time to come. The moment that the time will come, and come it will, when hon. gentlemen must sit on this side of the House, I say there will be no more fervent or determined opponents of the principle of this clause than hon. gentlemen who are now advocating it, in the hope of getting some petty, party, political triumph. I supposed that the day was past in the Parliament of Canada when, for the sake of a petty, political triumph, a great principle would be departed from, which has been recognised in the mother country and in the colonies, a principle which is fair, a principle which can be justified on every ground of reason and common sense, a principle which has

prevailed in the United Kingdom for years, without objection from either political party, and under both Liberal and Conservative Administrations. But the hon. gentleman does not propose to adopt that principle. He proposes to retain in his own hand the appointment of these officers. With a flourish of trumpets he announced some amendments yesterday afternoon, but what did they amount to? I suppose the *Mail* will declare to-night that the First Minister of his own motion had made some amendments which will do away with all objection to the Bill, that he has done what he has always intended to do, that he has made the County Court judges the revising barristers in every county where there is a County Court judge. What do these amendments amount to? He changes the word "may" into the word "shall," and he enables himself to appoint, in addition to a Supreme Court judge in Lower Canada, a notary public, and instead of some other official the stipendiary magistrates of the Province of British Columbia. Every objectionable feature of this clause remains in it as it was the first day that the hon. gentleman introduced the Bill. They are there still in all their hideous deformity, and nothing he can do will tone it down or improve it, except doing away with the clause altogether, or allowing the judges of the Supreme Courts in each Province to make these appointments. We are satisfied to leave these appointments, if we are bound to have revising officers, in the hands of the judiciary. We have some faith still left in them, although the First Minister has been making, of late, appointments to the bench of a questionable kind. Still we have some faith that that will not be swayed altogether by political influencies emanating from Ottawa. We have some faith that these judges will have a due regard for the public interest and the interest of both the political parties into which the people of this country are divided. We have some faith that their own sense of decency and propriety will, in some respects, compel them to appoint men fit for the discharge of these important functions. In the hands of the hon. gentleman himself, we have no confidence, no faith, and we have every reason to have no confidence and no faith in him. The hon. gentleman's course of conduct from the day he introduced this Bill down to this hour, has precluded the possibility of our cherishing the slightest confidence that he will make these appointments except to serve his own political purpose, and that being the object of the Bill, we know perfectly well that the First Minister intends to carry out to the end the object he had in view when he introduced the Bill. Now, I say that the course which has been followed in the two greatest and freest countries under the face of the sun, is well worth the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they would only listen to the voice of reason, if they would only look at the lessons taught us by the history of the past, if they would only take the examples spread out before us, in the legislation of the mother country and the United States, I would have some hopes that we could appeal to them with some measure of success, and ask them not to put the power of appointing these officers in the hands of the Executive, but permit the judges to make the appointments. There is another feature well worthy the consideration of this House, and one which to my mind presents objections that are almost unanswerable. Under the present system, as you well know, we have a cheap, economical, simple method, which costs you nothing when you are running your elections. It costs you nothing to get ten or twenty copies of the voters' lists and you know that you require these lists in canvassing every polling sub-division. You can get all this without the cost of one dollar; the revision of the voters' lists costs you but little; the preliminary revision costs you nothing, and if you have an appeal, the man to whom the appeal is made dwells at your door; you have free access to him; you can go to him and argue your own case. But it is not so under this Bill, If any other than the judge is appointed there is an appeal to the Court of Appeals at Toronto. Well, although you have a general knowledge of the law, I do not think you would care about appearing there before the eminent Queen's Counsel who would probably appear against you. The result would be that you, Mr. Chairman, would have to put your hand in your pocket, pay for the revision of the voters' list, and pay counsel a reasonably good fee in order to have the legal points that would necessarily arise under this Bill argued before the Court of Appeal. The enormous expenses of carrying out this Bill are almost past calculation. Has any hon. gentleman ventured a calculation of the cost of this Bill? The First Minister whose business it was when he asked Parliament to legislate in this direction, whose bounden duty it was to his own followers, before he committed them to the passage of this Bill, at the very first stage to submit to Parliament a reasonably fair detailed statement of the probable expenses connected with the administration of this Bill after it becomes law, never opened his mouth on the subject. Hon. gentlemen opposite are asked to take a leap in the dark. They are asked to vote for this Bill wholly ignorant of the enormos burden of expense it will necessarily impose on the people of this country when it becomes law. The First Minister has unbounded faith in his followers. He has reason to have faith in them, otherwise he would not submit a proposition of this kind to them and expect them to vote it through without further explanation than he has given. Now, I do not wish to trespass on the time of the House. If the First Minister desires that the members of this House shall honestly and fairly represent the public opinion of the country, he ought to leave the creation and the revision of the voters' lists in the hands of the people. It is in vain for the hon. gentleman to expect to get an honest expression of opinion—if he wants an honest expression of opinion from the people of this country—with a machinery so manufactured as the hon. gentleman proposes to manufacture it, under the powers vested in the revising barrister by this clause of the Bill. If he wants to get a free expression of opinion as to his acts and policy, let him leave the creation of the voters' lists in the hands of the local authorities; but if he will ignore the local authorities and will have a revising officer, then, in fairness to the people of this country, in fairness to the liberal element of this country, let him leave the appointment in the hands of the judges. No fair-minded statesman would take to himself the appointment of a revising officer who has the power of creating and revising the voters' list in the interest of the party from whom he derives his powers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have not spoken much on the merits of this Bill, but I wish to give expression to the opinion I entertain of the particular provisions contained in clauses 10 and 11. We have been told from the commencement of this discussion that in his own good time the First Minister proposed to make such important concessions and modifications as would very greatly remove the objections which even his own press and his own followers admitted, and which we on this side of the House, speaking not only for ourselves, but in the general public interest, alleged against the details of this measure. We have now, I suppose, had an opportunity of seeing what those concessions and modifications are likely to amount to. Yesterday the First Minister, in a very remarkable speech —a speech which deserves, perhaps, more attention than it has hitherto received—explained to us what his views were as to the modifications of these two clauses; and fearing lest I might misinterpret him I have waited until I had the report of his speech in my hands before discussing it. Now, I want to call the attention of this committee, and as far as I can, the attention of the country, to the very

remarkable admissions and confessions contained in the words of the First Minister yesterday. It is a very unusual thing indeed to find a First Minister, at this stage of a measure, coming down to us and using language which shows clearly that in his own mind he saw perfectly distinctly that this measure was indefensible on its merits; that is to say, as to the main and central proposition of this Bill, that the Government of the country, that is, the nominees of a particular party in this country, should take into their hands the absolute control of the electoral lists upon which the representatives of the people are elected. The hon. gentleman admitted candidly for once that so far as he could find out, it would be impossible for him to carry through this Parliament—a Parliament in which as everybody knows, he exercises a most extraordinary influence—a proposition to adopt the fair and equitable rule which is laid down in England, and which prevents either political party from exercising a control over the voters' lists. Now, Sir, I can only conclude that the hon. gentleman's intellectual part on this occasion got the better, to a certain extent, of his moral part. He saw, as he could not help but see, particularly after the argument of my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake), that such a proposition could not fail to strike the mind of every man in this House as being a most unreasonable and unfair one. Here are two parties who have been pitted against each other for many years. We are appealing, as two litigants, to a jury, and one litigant attempts to make it part of the law of this country that he should choose the jury by which he is to be tried; because that in practice is the result of the two clauses we are now considering. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that he had ascertained that a proposition of a similar nature to that in England would not meet the expectations of Parliament. He tells us he does not know why. It is quite evident that to his own mind the proposition commends itself as a just and reasonable proposition that the revising officers, the men who are to make these lists, should be chosen by some independent parties, who have no interests of their own to serve. Then he goes on to say:

"Why it is I do not say. Why there is a difference in the public mind in Canada and in England I do not know; I cannot quite fathom it; but I have an impression on my mind, and it is an impression amounting to a certainty, that any proposition that the appointment of the revising officer should be left to the judiciary in the different Provinces would not meet with the approbation of the majority of Parliament."

The hon. gentleman does not say that it would not meet with the approbation of a majority of the electors, or of a majority of the independent, honest, thinking men all through this country. What he says is this, and I call the attention of the House to it. He does not believe that he could carry this measure through Parliament, that he could control his own majority, unless he was able to give them some extraordinary inducement in the shape of the appointment of revising officers, who could make things pleasant for a great many of them in a great many doubtful constituencies. That, and nothing less than that, is the only deduction that can be drawn from the words used by the hon. gentleman yesterday, which I have now before me in the *Hansard;* and therefore it is, he said, because he, the First Minister, a man who undoubtedly exercises a perfectly unexampled influence over his followers, because he could not persuade his own followers to accept this Bill without holding out this inducement—I will not say this bribe—he has recourse to this most extraordinary step of appointing, by his own proper motion, men to decide who are to be the jury before whom his case is to be tried at the next election. No such confession was ever heard before, no such ground for a measure of this kind was ever advanced before, that I ever heard of or recollect, in any Parliament. Then he says, in another passage, that he did not know, when he introduced this Bill, the difference between his method and the English method, and he admits candidly he was incorrect in supposing the revising barristers were appointed by a member of the Government and not by the Lord Chief Justice and the judges of the assizes. That also is a most extraordinary confession to make. Here is a measure which the hon. gentleman has had in his hands, not for one or two, but for 16 or 17 years, and as to this fundamental feature of his own Bill the hon. gentleman did not know, when he introduced the Bill, whether it was in accord with the English system which he professes to desire to follow or not. I shall not stop here to point out the very serious inconsistency between that and his other statement, that he had ascertained beyond a doubt that a measure modeled on English lines would not meet the approval of the majority of Parliament. If he thought this measure was modelled on English lines, as he said he did, a few moments before, I do not see why it was he should be at the pains to ascertain that, if modelled on English lines, it would not meet the approval of the majority of his followers. This I leave for the hon. gentleman to explain at his leisure. What I desire to call attention to in connection with this clause is this: It is perfectly clear to everybody, it has been proven to demonstration, that in all other countries it has been the object and purpose of their Legislatures to keep the work of the preparation of the lists wholly apart and distinct from the work of the revising officer. That has been admitted; the hon. gentleman intimated that he would have liked to have done so, but the circumstances prevented him. I say that in itself is so grave an objection, that if he found that by no means he could conceive, he could keep them separate, that alone was a most excellent reason for not having introduced this measure until he could have devised some means by which the man who has to revise the lists should be a different person from the man who originally composed it. Nor can I see why he could not, as has been suggested so often, and as is suggested by the amendment in your hands, impose, as the House has undoubtedly the power to do, on these local authorities the duty of compiling the lists, even if he intended himself to keep the power of appointing the officers by whom they should be revised. Looking at the matter in a different light from that in which it may be viewed by a mere politician, looking at it as a statesman, the hon. gentleman ought to consider very seriously this fact. He knows, even if his followers do not, that the real strength of the two parties, particularly in the chief Province of Ontario, is very nearly the same. There is, probably, taking Canada all through, but a very small numerical difference between those men who support the Opposition and those men who support the Ministry. That being so, a wise and prudent statesman would be very careful indeed how he introduced a measure which he knew, whether rightly or wrongly, the Opposition must of necessity regard with great dissatisfaction and distrust. Here in Canada, our position is not so well secured, our future is not so well assured, that any man who really has the welfare of Confederation at heart should do anything he could help to exasperate and intensify the division which has already become too apparent between these two sections of our people. I do not know whether it has attracted the hon. gentleman's attention as much as it has mine, because his duties have been of a class which have compelled him to reside here very closely, and have prevented him, perhaps, from becoming as well acquainted as he was in former days with the undercurrents that affect the people's minds in other parts of the Dominion, but I have no doubt whatever in my own mind, that one, though by no means the only or perhaps the chief cause, of the great emigration which has been going on for a long period of time from various parts of Canada is this, that from various causes there is arising in the minds of a great many of our

people a profound distrust of the course of the Government, and I say that measures of this kind are calculated in a very great degree to increase that distrust. Take this measure. The hon. gentleman, as he said himself, felt and admitted that it was a measure which the Opposition might justly regard with distrust. He knows, we all know, perfectly well, what sort of persons are likely to be entrusted by one political party with the task of preparing the electoral lists, on the result of which the retention of office of the hon. gentleman depends. I do not mean to say that such a measure, if it had been introduced by a Government of another political stripe, would have been worked better by them than it will be by the First Minister. What I say is this: What he proposes to do is to entrust the present Government with a power no Government should possess, he proposes to put temptations in the way of himself and followers to which no politicians of any kind ought to be exposed, and to which they will inevitably succumb. The hon. gentleman says he cannot get this measure through the House, he cannot induce a majority of his followers to support it, without some such inducement as he holds out by giving them the power of appointing the revising barristers. Well, I think the hon. gentleman does not do justice to a very considerable portion, at any rate, of the gentlemen behind him. I do not believe, and the whole conduct of the debate tends to confirm me in that non-belief, that the great majority of the hon. gentleman's majority are at all in favor of this measure. Very few of them, indeed, have come to his rescue, or have endeavored to argue this question on its merits, and notably has that been true both of his colleagues and supporters from the great Province of Quebec. If the hon. gentleman's object was, as he stated, simply and solely to give us a uniform franchise, if he does not desire to obtain that under conditions which cannot prevent those consequences that I have alluded to, the hon. gentleman could very easily have done it by resorting to the English method of appointing these barristers. Now, he has given no reason (other than the simple affirmation that he could not induce his majority to accept it) based on a fair consideration of the circumstances, why that should not be done. He knows perfectly well that, if he had at an earlier stage declared that he would have met the wishes of the Opposition on that one point, that he would have permitted the revising barristers to be appointed by persons in whom they would have reasonable confidence, all this most prolonged and protracted discussion would probably have been avoided, and a very great injury to the business of this country would not have been incurred, and that he might long ere this have disposed of all the legitimate business which could come before us. If the hon. gentleman had a fair reason for that course, he was bound to give it. As he has given no reason for it, I am bound to suppose, as I have said, that the real reason can only be this: that his followers had no heart in this matter, that they did not desire this Act, that they could not be induced to support it unless some very strong inducement was held out to them whereby they might gain some political advantage which would be an equivalent to them for the unpopularity which they knew must attach to many of the provisions of this Act. I desire to say a few words with respect to the class of persons to whom this arduous and delicate duty is about to be entrusted. I entertain no prejudice myself against the legal profession. I believe that the legal profession contains within its ranks quite as large a percentage of honorable and able men as any other profession of equal numbers; but, on the other hand, I know and everybody knows perfectly well that the legal profession, besides containing its full percentage of honorable and able men, contains also its full percentage of exceedingly black sheep; and I cannot feel at all satisfied that the average five-year-old barristers, to whom almost of necessity these tasks will be entrusted,

are likely to belong to the class of honorable and capable men from whom judges are chosen, to whom most of us would like to see matters affecting our life or property referred. The whole thing is based on a false principle. It may be true that, when you take out of the legal profession men who have attained a high degree of eminence in it, when you place them in a position apart, in which they are at one and the same time removed as far as possible from all corrupt influences and subject to a very strict scrutiny, first on the part of the bar, and then on the part of the public at large, it may be true, and it is true, that, as a general rule, the tradition of the profession prevents those men from going astray and renders the public willing as a general thing to confide in their impartiality and honor. But all the conditions which go to make a judge a fair and impartial person suitable for the deciding of such a question as this are conspicuously absent in the case of the barristers whom the hon. gentleman proposes to appoint. We all know—all of us who have had any experience in election matters—that, of all men in the community, the class of needy and briefless barristers are the ones, on both sides, I admit, who, for very obvious reasons, take the keenest interest in politics. They are usually the bosom friends and sworn advisers of the political candidates in the region in which they reside; they are almost all of them aspiring to become candidates themselves; their training up to a certain point, the training of the earlier years of the profession, is not one calculated to foster a fair and impartial tone of mind. In the upper branches of the profession I believe it is so, but it certainly is not in the early years, when these gentlemen are anxious by any means whatever to obtain a reputation and an influential clientele. These men, being such as they are, are the persons to whom the hon. gentleman proposes, in a considerable number of cases, to entrust this very delicate duty. They are persons, in the first place, to whom it must be supposed that the stipend, whatever it may be that the hon. gentleman proposes to attach to this office, will be one of considerable importance. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman will not be able to secure the services of lawyers of high standing. I cannot tell exactly what the time would be that would be required to perform the duties imposed on revising barristers under this Act, but I should say that in all probability two or three months' time would be taken up at least. No lawyer in fair practice can afford to take this unless on one or two conditions—unless he has political aspirations of his own, or unless he is a man who is looking forward to judicial preferment, and willing to make certain sacrifices for the purpose of putting the party leaders under obligation to him. I have no doubt whatever that the better class of men the hon. gentleman may appoint will be that class of men who will be looking to their political friends for advancement, at a reasonable time, to some position on the bench, and the worser class will be men who will have probably fewer scruples, who will be subject to fewer restraints than any other class in the community. I say there can be, and there will be, no confidence whatever felt in these young lawyers, to whom, of necessity, this work will probably fall, because I believe that the sense of the House is with me when I say that you will not be able, except under very peculiar circumstances, to induce lawyers of good standing and high repute in their profession to accept this rather onerous and disagreeable duty. I am afraid that, in this, as in a good many other matters, the hon. gentleman has taken another downward step. I tell him this is neither in the interest of good statesmanship nor in accordance with the principles of the party which, at any rate, he once professed to maintain. I say there could be nothing done which I believe is more likely to recoil on himself, and at no very distant day, than this measure

which he now proposes to pass into law. The hon. gentleman would do well to remember, and his friends would do well to remember, that, when you commit a plain, manifest injustice for the benefit of one political party, you, as a general rule, instinctively excite a vastly more formidable opposition among the members of the party you design to oppress, and you rally round them a far greater number of the neutrals, who exist in considerable numbers in every country, than you would otherwise do. I recollect very well—I was not in Parliament at the time, but I took a tolerably keen interest in politics even then—what I must call another bit of sharp practice, when in 1858 the hon. gentleman succeeded in exposing his late antagonist, Mr. George Brown, to considerable humiliation and putting him to considerable expense and trouble, and I recollect what was the impression produced on some of the most valuable supporters the hon. gentleman then had; and I believe that, now this measure has come to be thoroughly understood, now that it has been discussed from one end of the country to the other, the hon. gentleman will find that he will lose a very considerable number of the staunchest and best of his supporters, when they come to understand, as they are beginning to understand pretty clearly, how thoroughly and radically the hon. gentleman has departed from all those traditions of honesty and fair play in the dealings between one great party and another that we used to make it our boast we had inherited from our English ancestry. There is another objection to this measure. I say this is another long stride towards the creation of a class of professional politicians. It is perfectly clear that not merely is this Bill going to inflict a very considerable additional expense upon this country, but it is going to inflict a considerable additional expense on most of the members of Parliament. They will be obliged to watch these lists, and, unless, as we contend, these officers who are appointed as revising barristers are openly and undisguisedly the partisans of one party alone, which in the case of the county judges I certainly do not believe they would be found to be, hon. members will find that they will have to pay a great deal more attention, and to undergo a very considerable deal of additional expense, for the purpose of keeping these lists correct or filled in their own favor. Now, all that means a considerable additional expense; it means probably a considerable additional central organisation. It means that these men who are engaged in political life shall sacrifice more and more of their ordinary avocations; and, as I said before, we are going on to make an additional stride towards the creation of that class of professional politicians who, as we know, exist in certain portions of the neighboring States, and whom almost all honest Americans regard as having been the source and original cause of great evils in American politics. That may be in part impossible to avert, but I say the hon. gentleman has incurred great responsibility, and is doing, in my judgment, very great injury to the welfare of both political parties in this country, by introducing a measure which makes the existence of these men even more of a necessity than has been the case heretofore. Then there is another consideration. Whatever faults the First Minister may have, he does, at any rate, possess intellect enough to know that there are serious defects for which no cure has yet been found, in our representative system. He knows that the two great parties in this country are not fairly represented, as a rule, on the floors of Parliament, that a very trifling alteration of the constituencies on either side, may produce an enormous alteration in the numbers of the parties confronting each other here. Now this mischievous tendency the Bill of the hon. gentleman is going to intensify. He has a great opportunity, to undertake the creation of a uniform franchise for this Dominion, an opportunity which will probably never occur again to himself or anybody else, under as favorable circumstances, in which he could have used his great experience and his undoubted ability in matters political, for the purpose of seeing whether he could not, to some extent, remedy that evil. Instead of that, the hon. gentleman has been teaching us by various lessons, first of all by his Bill of 1882, by the gerrymander he then introduced, and now by this attempt to gerrymander the voters' lists, what is very likely to come to pass under the operation of these various Acts, that a decided minority of the people may chance to return a majority of the representatives to Parliament. There is no doubt that that is an evil which is likely to occur under such institutions as these that are now growing up in Canada; and I can say this to hon. gentlemen, to my brother representatives in Parliament, that there is no one thing which ought to be more carefully avoided by statesmen than to bring about a state of things in which the majority of the people could feel, or could assert, that they were deprived of their fair representation on the floor of this Parliament. The basis on which Parliamentary institutions rest is this: They are supposed to represent the fair and unbiassed will of the people. Now all these Acts which the hon. gentleman has been placing on the Statute Book tend directly to prevent the will of the people from being fairly represented here. I say it tends directly to very corrupt practices, although it may possibly dispense with a certain amount of the corrupt expenditure which has so often been resorted to at elections. I say that the parties to whom the nomination of the revising barristers must of necessity be entrusted, will be under the greatest temptation to put those important duties in the hands of men who will be under their control, who will look to them, or the Government of the day, for preferment, and who will be known to them to be unscrupulous political partisans. The hon. gentleman is deliberately taking all the precautions he can to prevent any check being exercised upon the acts of these men. It would be bad enough if these lists were compiled by independent authorities, for we all know the immense power that an unscrupulous revising officer may exercise, even in such a case; but when these men are at the same time to compile the lists and then to preside over the revision, it is impossible to understand how any measure can be submitted to this Parliament which is more likely to tempt men to an improper abuse of their power, or which is more likely to inspire all the members of the Reform party throughout this country with a profound distrust of the motives and conduct of the Government of Canada. And as I believe, Sir, that that is a very serious misfortune, and is likely to work serious mischief to the country at large, I, for my part, shall oppose the introduction of the most pernicious principle which is now, for the first time, sought to be crystalised into law and placed on the Statute Book of Canada.

Mr. MULOCK. I think no portion of this Bill demands fuller consideration than the machinery for the preparation of the voters' lists. Last night the Premier made certain announcements to the House, and if the tenor of these announcements were incorporated in the Bill they would remove certain objections. The Premier stated last night that the revising officer would take the assessment rolls for his guide, and make up the list from them, and that he would be bound to place upon the list all those who, according to the certified assessment rolls, appeared to be entitled to be placed upon the list. If I understood him aright, he stated that the revising officer would be bound by their assessment rolls. Now, is there any way by which he is bound, or is it proposed to amend the Bill in such a way that the revising officer shall be bound by the list in the first instance? Because if that provision is to be inserted in the Bill, it will, to that extent, limit the discussion, and to that extent remove certain powers from

the revising officers. Is it intended to have a provision of that kind inserted in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Bill is quite right now.

Mr. MULOCK. Not quite. The next section provides that the revising officer shall procure certified copies of the last revised assessment rolls, and therefrom, and with such other information as he may obtain, shall make up the original list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It means from information that he can get from the assessment roll.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand it is necessary for him to go out of the assessment roll in order to procure the information. I understand, under this Bill, that perhaps there will be persons entitled to be placed on the list whose names do not appear on the assessment roll, and therefore they must first appear on the voters' list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot conceive, in the Province of Ontario, at least, that any person who has a right to vote will not be found on the roll. In the Provinces where there is no income qualification and wage-earning qualification, it may be otherwise; but so far as Ontario is concerned, certainly the whole of the electorate will be found on the assessment roll.

Mr. MULOCK. That being the case, in making up the original list, that is the list which is the foundation of the corrected list, the revising officer will find upon the assessment roll the names of all who should be on his list. Or, at all events, the names that appear on that roll ought *primâ facie* to be placed on his list, leaving the public to attack the list. It is in that direction that I am asking the hon. gentleman if he cannot insert an amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That does not arise on this clause.

Mr. MULOCK. I felt when the First Minister assured the committee yesterday that the revising officer would be bound in the first instance to accept the assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence, that if an amendment to that effect were made in the Bill, one of the objections to this clause would be removed, because it has been urged that it is competent for the revising officer to take the revised assessment roll, but ignore it and take other information. As the First Minister stated that the revising officer would be bound by that list, I inferred that an amendment would be submitted to carry out the hon. gentleman's statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have not come to that.

Mr. RYKERT. Section 12 provides for it.

Mr. MULOCK. It does not say that the revising officer has to adopt the assessment roll in the first instance.

Mr. RYKERT. There is an appeal in the event of parties being left off the list. Omissions occur every day in the clerks' list.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a common occurrence, I admit. I hope the First Minister will see his way to insert an amendment in the direction I have indicated. I am anxious to have the Bill satisfactory, which, of course, is the object of every member of the House. I can conceive of no subject that can be submitted to a free Parliament representing free institutions more important than the one we are now discussing. We have boasted that we enjoy representative institutions; that we have here an almost perfect form of government for the people by the people, and I presume it will be contrary to the genius of our institutions if we, in the slightest degree, endanger the hold of the people upon them, if we, in the slightest degree, weaken their power to withdraw confidence in the Government. Yesterday the First Minister, in dealing with the question of revising officers, stated that he felt it his duty, when introducing a measure into Parliament, to be reasonably sure that the measure would become law. He stated when he introduced this Bill that he did not deem it necessary at that stage to offer arguments in favor of its adoption, because, he said, it was built upon the same lines as Bills previously introduced, the principles of which he had then fully enunciated. If we turn to *Hansard* of past years we find that when the hon. gentleman introduced the previous Bill he said it was a Bill following closely the lines of the English Act—I suppose referring to 6 Victoria. The First Minister informed the House on this occasion that revising officers were appointed by the Lord Chancellor, who was one of the Administration of the day, and he gave us to understand that he was following that precedent in making the appointment of revising officers dependent upon the Government of the day, there being no official here occupying the same position as the Lord Chancellor of England. The hon. gentleman further stated in support of the measure that it was necessary we should pass a Bill of this kind; that it was an anomaly that the Canadian Parliament should not control its own franchise; that we represent British institutions on this continent and draw our inspiration in regard to the creation and management of them from the institutions of the mother land. He told us, in fact, that whatever precedent Great Britain supplied, that precedent it was the duty of this Government to follow. At the time the hon. gentleman framed the Bill and recommended it to Parliament he was under the impression that the revising officers in England were appointed in a certain way. Ever since the announcement was made on the floor of this House, the public have been educated, through his party's press, to believe that the Bill proposes to appoint revising officers in the same way as revising barristers are appointed in England. At last we have it admitted on all sides that the original announcement was a mistake; that the revising barristers were never appointed in the manner indicated, and that no such precedent as was stated exists. That being the case, is it not reasonable, now, that after the members of this House have been misinformed as to the nature of these precedents the measure should be recast, so as truly to carry out the spirit of the Premier as indicated in his remarks, when he said that we must draw our inspiration from British institutions and follow their example as closely as circumstances would permit. He told us last night that he would have difficulty in inducing his followers to consent to the power of the appointments in these cases being vested in the courts. But that does not furnish a reason why the Premier should ask Parliament to place power in the hands of the Government. What inference can we draw from his remark that his followers would not consent to these appointments being in the hands of the courts. Are we to draw the inference that the Premier, personally, is in favor of such a proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not say the hon. gentleman did, but I ask if we are to draw that inference—the inference that his followers and himself differ on this question, or are we to hold them all equally responsible and equally of the same opinion. If so, it will not do for the Premier to say: I decline to ask that the courts shall make appointments because my followers object to it. If the Premier objects let him say so with arguments; if his followers object let them do so, and give their reasons. But has any hon. gentleman supporting the measure, up to this time, told us why he objects to the courts of the land making these appointments? Until they do so, neither the House nor the Premier is justified in departing from the wholesome precedents furnished by British institutions, and the example which we are here invited to follow. As no hope has been held out to us that these appointments are

to be made by a non-political body, we must discuss this clause of the Bill as we find it, we must point out its imperfections, and I trust that the Premier will receive recommendations in that spirit in which he invited them, and will endeavor to remove those features of the Bill which are calculated, in the slightest degree, to endanger the liberties of the people. I object to the present proposal as to the appointment of the revising officers on the grounds advanced by the Premier himself, because he is not following British precedents, he is not taking his inspiration from British institutions. This clause involves the creation of a new tribunal; it is an original design, for which I believe there is no precedent in any country which enjoys free institutions to-day. We have in the mother land, whose example we are so proud to follow, a system which has been working for half a century, which has the confidence of the people there, and results in bringing to the Parliament of Great Britain the best men of that country, irrespective of politics. There is no possibility of the revising officer there unjustly interfering with the rights of the people, and surely we would not be doing an unwise thing in following such an example until, at all events, it has been proved wanting. As an admirer of the spirit of British institutions I would feel a sense of relief which passes expression if I could be sure that this crucial point of this Bill were to be placed beyond party considerations for all time. I would call the attention of the Premier to the fact that the adoption of a uniform franchise does not render it necessary to adopt Dominion machinery, such as is introduced into this Bill. The Bill itself tells us that. It declares that in certain cases the local authorities shall be officers of this House. The Bill imposes duties and obligations upon the municipal officers of the land, and it would be sufficient for this Parliament to create a Dominion Franchise and then relegate the working out of that scheme to the local authorities. There is a wide difference between Parliament declaring its own franchise and creating new machinery for working it out. The working out of that franchise can be effectually performed by existing machinery, all of which will be of great benefit to the country; and that being the case, I see no sound reason why we should, as a Parliament, create new tribunals for carrying out the law of this Parliament. Parliament has declared what is and what is not law, and it leaves the carrying out of those laws to the courts. True, a part of the officers of those courts are appointed here, but it is equally true that the executive officers of those courts are not appointed here. Take those branches of the law which are completely under the jurisdiction of this Parliament; this Parliament declares the law within its proper lines, but the construction of these laws may be vested in courts which are created by Local Parliaments. The Government of Canada alone appoints the judges, but every other official of the courts, so far as I remember, is appointed by the local authorities, and is under the jurisdiction of the local authorities as well as under the jurisdiction of the central authority. That being the case, why cannot the Government require the local authorities to carry out their measure, and thus have it carried out by a tribunal in no way biased or interested in the result? You will then have a system which will receive the confidence of the public. I can conceive of our being guilty of no greater crime against the State than to destroy the confidence of the public in our representative institutions; and if you transfer the power of making up to the rolls to officers appointed by the Government, in whom, even if they discharge their duty impartially and honestly, there is a want of confidence in the minds of the public; you weaken the trust of the people in the only institution that stands between them and their rights and liberties, and cause them, necessarily, to lose confidence in the laws which are passed by this House. Adopt this measure, and what are some of the minor consequences? In this House, and in the presence of this Government, I am perhaps justified in calling the question of expense a question of minor consequence, because the question of expense does not seem to enter into the consideration of public measures in this House at the present time. But it is our duty to carefully guard the public exchequer, and not add unnecessarily one dollar to the public expenditure; and can it be said that this is a necessary expenditure, when, as I have indicated, every dollar of expense that will be incurred under this system can be saved by adopting the local system? I would entreat, I would beg, the Government, in the interests of the country, to think more than once before they add unnecessarily to our financial burdens.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I propose now to call your attention briefly to another serious objection to the measure. I do not conceive that it is possible, by the machinery proposed in this section, to carry out effectively and in the best possible way the will of the people. This involves, necessarily, a comparison between the existing systems and the proposed system. This comparison I shall not make in detail, but briefly state that under the present system the preparation of the lists is entirely in the hands of the people. This Government is not responsible for any errors; it is entirely blameless if any occur, and the people have it in their power to correct the errors. The people are entirely responsible for the correctness of the lists on which the elections take place, so that if it should happen that by errors on the part of the present authorities the elections have not been such as they would have been had the lists been otherwise, still there is this satisfaction in connection with it, that the people themselves are to blame, for they had it in their power to make a perfect list, and if they did not do so it was their fault. But under the proposed scheme the people will not be in that position. A governmental officer, who will be considered the agent of the Government, will prepare the lists. It is true the Bill contains minute directions as to his duties, but there is a vast difference between the duties of this officer and his powers. His duties are one thing, his power another; and whilst it is true that there is or is intended to be some remedy provided in case he should neglect his duties, we all know the difficulty in the way of poor men getting justice in any courts. We are told that every court in the land is opened to the poorest as well as to the richest. That is a very good statement to make in theory, and no doubt the advantage under which a poor man labors cannot be avoided. The inequalities of conditions of men cannot be helped, but when we are now endeavoring to provide a scheme that will enable the poorest as well as the richest to enjoy the franchise which we give them in the earlier parts of the Bill, we are not justified in adopting any machinery which will injure the operation of the franchise of the Dominion, if better machinery can be adopted. Well, I submit that no case can be made out for disregarding the existing machinery of the country. That machinery has been tried for many years, and there is no man bold enough to stand up on the floor of Parliament and tell us, with proofs, that the present system is a failure. I am not going to claim more virtue for one class of the people than another. I am free to admit that at times the spirit of partisanship may warp and has warped the minds of those who have been entrusted with the powers and duties of preparing the lists; I do not admit that all the errors, either intentional or accidental, are on one side; but, on the contrary, I believe, if they could be analysed, and the one side set against the other, we

would find, throughout the whole Dominion, that the errors on the one would substantially balance those on the other. In proof of that, we have an assembly gathered here to-day who claim they represent the people. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House to-day who will venture to say he does not represent the voice of the people in his riding? Has there been a member of Parliament since Confederation who has been prepared to admit, and truthfully admit, that he enjoyed his seat in Parliament through the trickery or the chicanery of those who have to do with the lists. In 1882, when this Assembly was elected, we claimed it was a representative institution. Was there any imperfection then in the system? If there was, it existed in 1878. Why did not the Government, in 1878, with its immense majority, provide a true system of representation? On the contrary, they announced to the country that they were the chosen of the people, not the chosen of a defective system, but substantially the chosen of the people. Where, then, is the evil? It is idle for hon. gentlemen to refer, as hon. gentlemen on the other side have done, to the wrong-doing of a Grit assessor or a Grit council or a Grit court of revision. Those statements prove nothing. They simply are assertions; and even if such errors have occurred, the remedy is with the people, and the people are to blame if they permit those errors to remain uncorrected. But now it is proposed to change the system which is admitted throughout the whole country to be a fair one. What greater argument has been advanced against the Liberal party in the Province of Ontario than that it had a centralising policy? When the Ontario Government took upon themselves the power to appoint bailiffs to the courts we were told that they were wresting power from the people, and every attempt was made to discredit them with the people, on the ground that they were not trusting the people, and were setting themselves up as a little oligarchy. If that were a misdemeanor on their part, is not the same criticism applicable to the Government to-day, which proposes to do, on a wholesale scale, and directly for their benefit, what they condemned others for doing, although it was not done directly for their benefit? We are told that the revising officer is to be a professional man of standing, and that he is to be free from all control; that he is to hold his office during good behavior, which means for life, and is only to be removable on a vote of this House. Well, technically, he may enjoy that position; but, after all, to whom does he owe that position? He owes it, to begin with, to the Government of the day. Is the Government, in making that choice, going to choose from the profession, without regard to the political views of the profession? What is likely to be the action of the Government in that respect? On what principle do they proceed in making appointments to the judiciary? Is it not almost an invariable rule to fill up vacancies with those entertaining political views in harmony with the Government of the day? Are they likely to depart from that rule in the choice of revising officers? True, it may be said, as a blind to the people, that those officers are to be chosen by the Governor General in Council, but we all know what that means. The Governor General can do nothing. He is a constitutional Governor; if he does anything, he acts unconstitutionally; all he has to do is to assent. Now, I am not one of those who will say or think that the members of the profession chosen to discharge these duties will, as a rule, intentionally violate their obligations. I have a higher view of human nature than that, and if I had not, at all events I should endeavor to take that hopeful and better view of the case. Nevertheless, I cannot be blind to the consideration that when a partisan is chosen by the Government to discharge such duties as will devolve on a revising officer, when I remember that he will be of the same political stripe as the Government of the day, when I remember that he will feel he owes his appointment to his party, that his party is still in power, that he is not yet quietly shelved into some place on the bench, but is still fighting the battle of life, engaged in all the struggles, and has not yet given up political aspirations—when I bear in mind all these considerations I cannot but believe that however pure-minded may be these officers their actions will be influenced by the false position in which they are placed. For this reason alone we should avoid placing the choice of these judicial officers in the hands of those who are so directly interested in the manner in which these officers shall discharge these duties. I have shown that it is unnecessary, while the Government may wish to establish a Dominion franchise, that that franchise should be worked out by machinery, the creation of this House, but that the Government could use the existing machinery, that is not under their control. What have the municipal officers done that they should be set aside? Are all the past assessors and the prospective assessors of that character that they are not to be trusted? Has the action in the past of the courts of revision been such that they are not to be trusted? Will any member of the Government or of the House say that, in discharging their duties, they have been unfaithful stewards? If no one will make that charge against them as a class, on what ground are they deposed? The reason is, either that they have been unfaithful or faithful. The one answer cannot be established; the other would be a reason for continuing them in office; but here it is proposed to establish a scheme which does not commend itself to my mind as just or fair. In dealing with this question of franchise, probably the most important that is entrusted to the Government, it is their duty to so deal with it as a sacred trust that all their actions shall commend themselves to all classes of the people. Absolute fairness towards the people should be a binding obligation upon this House. Suppose that this vast power which is to be vested in these officers should be abused, and that constituency after constituency should be controlled by them, with the result that a Parliament would assemble here which did not represent the will of the people, then, truly, the prophecy of the First Minister would be verified, that free institutions in Canada were on their trial when this Bill was receiving the consideration of Parliament, and would be painfully verified when we found that free institutions had been destroyed. Why run that risk, when we have the experience of existing systems to our credit? Why bring all these troubles and complications on the people when it is not necessary? Why add this burden to the people's already overladen backs? For my part, representing a constituency where the municipal principle prevails, and where, if I remember correctly, as many municipalities are controlled by Conservatives as by Reformers, I have not the first word of compaint to offer against the system, or against any individual Grit or Tory who has been entrusted with the system. On the contrary, I say that they have loyally, faithfully and honestly done their duty, irrespective of party considerations; and I think my experience is the experience of all hon. gentlemen in this House. Therefore, in the name of my constituency, at least, I protest against the deposition of these officers; I protest against an army of lawyers being sent broadcast over the country to do the work which is now done at no cost to this country or to its Central Government; I protest against my people being saddled with the expense of maintaining this court—maintaining the lawyer, and his clerk, and his constable, paying his printing and advertising bills, his rents, his travelling expenses, and all the other etceteras incidental to the maintainance of such a court as this; I protest against this measure as unnecessary, as unwise, as calculated to produce no good result, but, on the contrary, to do grievous harm. I would wish that this proposition had never been broached in Parliament. The fact that to-day the people's representatives in Parliament could ven-

ture to make such a proposition to us shows that the people are somewhat careless about their rights. Is it not an ungrateful return to the people from this Government that, after they have placed them in power on two successive occasions by overwhelming majorities, after they have had confidence—and, unfortunately, too much confidence—reposed in them, they should now not only not be grateful, but should endeavor to take away from the people their control over Parliament. It would have been far better for this country if no statesman had shown himself so courageous or felt himself so firmly seated in power that he could make such a proposition to the free people of Canada, who, perhaps, are to be free no longer. Far better would it be if we could turn back the hand on the dial that has marked the flight of time, and return to the time before such a proposition was ever made to this institution.

Mr. MILLS. Before the amendment is put, I wish to move an amendment to it providing that—

The municipal or other officers who prepare the voters' lists shall divide the municipality into convenient polling divisions, but not so as to embrace more than 200 electors in any polling division, and the voters on such lists shall be arranged in alphabetical order for each of such polling divisions.

In case these propositions are not accepted, this will come up again, with regard to the functions of the revising officer, but the proposition made by my hon. friend is that the preparation of the list shall be put in the hands of local parties. If his proposition is accepted the municipal officers who prepare the voters' list under the law of the Province will be authorised to prepare the voters' list for this Parliament, not because they are provincial officers, but because we name them as the parties to perform that duty. Whatever powers they possess will be powers which we confer upon them, and will not be derived from any local authority. I have before referred to chapter 10 of the statutes of 1874, where provision is made for courts for the trial of controverted elections. You designate in that Act those courts which had an existence as provincial courts, and you confer certain powers upon them. The Privy Council has held that that court exist for the purpose of trying elections by virtue of the Act of this Parliament, and if the hon. gentleman accepts these amendments and says that the clerks of the municipalities, who, under the local law, have the power to prepare the local list, shall also have the power to prepare the list under this law, then they will be our officers for that purpose, and we can authorise them to divide the municipalities into polling divisions. They would do that better than the revising officers. They are on the spot, they know every concession line, and the best place for polling places and for establishing polling divisions. They can state where those polling divisions shall exist, and if they fail to do that there is already a provision in the law that the returning officer can do it. The hon. gentleman, in another section, provides for an alphabetical list, but it is to be a list for an entire division. Now, it is of great consequence that this alphabetical list should be a list for the polling divisions, and in that case it will be easily exempt, and each local party who would be authorised to prepare a list in the first instance would only have to examine that portion of the list in which he is specially interested. That would be of great advantage, and if the hon. gentleman wishes a fair list prepared, at little expense to candidates, he will secure it in this way, and will reduce the work of the revising officer to a minimum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am a good deal tempted to address the committee, but several considerations induce me not to enter into the discussion, especially as I think my hon. friend's amendment, as well as the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), had better be addressed to a subsequent clause. The clause now before the committee is simply empowering the Government to appoint a revising officer; it will certainly be his business to prepare a revised list, and in that regard the amendments are not irrelevant, I admit; but still they would come in more wholesomely, I think, in the next clause, where the whole subject will be discussed, and I am quite ready to discuss it with the hon. gentlemen.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see he provides that the revising officer shall prepare the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MILLS. Then, if we carry the clause declaring that he shall prepare the list, how are we going to provide afterwards that the list shall be prepared by somebody else? If the hon. gentleman will agree to let this clause stand over, then we can have the whole question open to consideration some other time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It says that he shall prepare and revise the list; then the mode of preparation is shown in the subsequent clause. For instance, he has to get copies of the assessment roll, and such other information as he can get. I think the ingenuity of the hon. gentleman will easily prepare an amendment to that clause, which would prevent us from having a long discussion on these two amendments and, as the hon. gentleman knows, there is a desire to avoid discussion, if possible, on this clause.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. member is prepared to consider the question as to who shall prepare the list, we might amend the existing clause by striking out the word "prepare" altogether in this clause, and at a subsequent stage consider who is to prepare it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I dare say, when the Speaker is in the Chair, with a full attendance, hon. gentlemen opposite will free their consciences and minds by moving resolutions and taking divisions, so as to put themselves on record, and then, I dare say, we shall have an opportunity of discussing all the points.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) to the amendment negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I propose to move an amendment to section 10 in pursuance of the observations I made this afternoon. I regret that the First Minister was not present and did not get the benefit of my observations, but he will see them in *Hansard*, and I still hope that he will accede to my proposition. The line of argument I adopted was that the Government should not have power to appoint these officials, but that the appointment should be in the hands of some independent body; that, in fact, the system pursued in England should be adopted here. I therefore move this amendment:

That all the words before "and," in the 29th line of section 10, page 9, be struck out, and the following substituted therefor: That within three months after the coming into force of this Act the Chief Justice of the highest court in any of the Provinces shall appoint a proper person, to be called a "revising officer," for each or any electoral district of Canada, who shall hold office during one year, and immediately before the expiration of any year the judge of any Assize for any county or counties in Canada, except in the Province of Quebec, where the Superior Court judge of the judicial district in an electoral district, or partly an electoral district, shall, at the sittings of each Assize or court, appoint a proper person as such revising officer for the judicial district for which he holds said Court of Assize, who shall hold office during one year, and such appointment shall be made by such judge from year to year, and the duties of such revising officer shall be to prepare, to revise and complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the list of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act in such judicial district.

Then I leave untouched all portions of section 10 to the word "and," and simply make provision for the appointment, declaring that it shall be made in the first instance by the Chief Justice, and subsequently by the judge of the Court of Assize. The officer so appointed will hold office during one year only. Substantially this amendment is the adoption of the English law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does not say one year only.

Mr. CAMERON. The officer is appointed for a year. I provide that before the expiration of the year a judge of Assize will appoint some one to succeed him, and so on from year to year. The same person may be re-appointed.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LANGELIER. I beg to move the following amendment:—

1. The secretary-treasurer or clerk of each municipality in the Province of Quebec shall, on or before the first judicial day in January in each year, make, in duplicate, a list, in alphabetical order, of all persons who, according to the valuation roll then in force in the municipality for local purposes, and as revised, if it has been revised, even for local purposes, appear to be electors by reason of the real estate possessed or occupied by them within the municipality, or by reason of their being sons of proprietors of real estate, or by reason of his revenue or earnings, as provided by this Act.

2. The secretary-treasurer or clerk, in drawing up the list of electors, shall distinguish the persons who appear to be qualified as owners, from those who appear to be qualified as tenants or occupants, or *owners' sons*, or as having a revenue or earnings, and shall specify the real estate of those who are qualified on real estate.

3. The secretary-treasurer shall omit from such list of electors every person who, under section 9, or any other legal provision of the Dominion, is not entitled to vote.

4. If any municipality is situated partly in one electoral district and partly in another, the secretary-treasurer or clerk shall prepare, in the same manner, for each of such electoral districts, an alphabetical list of the persons who are electors therein.

5. If the municipality has been divided into voting sub-divisions by the council of the municipality, the secretary-treasurer or clerk shall divide the list into as many parts as there are voting sub-divisions in the municipality. Each such part, the title whereof shall be the name, number or description of the voting sub-division to which it relates, shall only contain the alphabetical list of the electors of such voting sub-division.

6. If the municipality has not been divided into voting sub-divisions by the municipal council, then the secretary-treasurer or clerk shall make such division before making the list, in such a manner as there shall not be more than three hundred voters in any sub-division, nor less than two hundred, taking care that each sub-division is marked by well-defined boundaries, such as streets, roads, side lines, concession lines, rivers, or mountains; provided always, that when the electoral district does not contain 300 votes, or where the voters are scattered over a large extent of country, the same revising officer may, nevertheless, subdivide the electoral district into as many polling districts as he thinks advisable for the convenience of the voters, even though the number in each be less than 200.

7. If a person is an elector in one and the same municipality for more than one parcel of real estate, or for more than one title, his name shall, nevertheless, be entered on one list of the electors of the municipality, and if such person is an elector in a sub-division of his domicile his name shall be entered on the list of such sub-division.

8. The secretary-treasurer or clerk shall certify the correctness of each list of electors by him made, by the following oath taken before a justice of the peace:

I (name of the secretary-treasurer or clerk) swear, that to the best of my knowledge and belief the foregoing list of electors is correct, and that nothing has been inserted therein or omitted therefrom, unduly or by fraud: So help me God.

Each duplicate list must be attested separately under the foregoing oath.

9. One of the duplicates of the list so attested shall be kept in the office of the secretary-treasurer or clerk, at the disposal and for the information of all persons interested.

10. The secretary-treasurer or clerk, on the day upon which he shall take the oath required by sub-section 8, shall give and publish a notice, setting forth that the list of electors has been prepared according to law, and that a duplicate thereof has been lodged at his office, at the disposal and for the information of all persons interested. Such notice shall be given and published in the same manner as notices for municipal purposes in the municipality in which the list has been prepared.

11. If the secretary-treasurer or clerk has not made the list or lists of electors, or has not given or published the notice, as required as above, on the first judicial day of January, then the judge of the Superior Court for the district, or, in his absence, of a neighboring district, on summary petition from any person entitled to be entered as an elector in the municipality, shall appoint a clerk *ad hoc* to prepare the list of electors.

12. The secretary-treasurer or clerk shall be personally liable for the costs incurred on such petition and for those incurred in drawing up the lists by the clerk *ad hoc*, unless the said judge, for special reasons, deems it advisable to order otherwise. The secretary-treasurer or clerk may, however, draw up and prepare the list, so long as the clerk *ad hoc* shall not have been appointed.

13. The clerk *ad hoc* shall proceed, within fifteen days after notice of his appointment, to the preparation of the lists of electors, and he shall have the same powers and the same duties as the secretary-treasurer or clerk of the municipality, and the mayor and the officers of the council in charge of them shall be bound to deliver to the clerk *ad hoc*, on his demand, the valuation roll which is to avail as the basis of the list of electors.

14. The list or lists of electors may be examined and corrected by the council of the municipality in the thirty days next after the publication of the notice given under sub-section 1, upon complaint in writing, as hereinafter mentioned, and not otherwise.

15. Any person who deems that the name of any person inserted should not have been inserted in such list or lists, may, either by himself or through his agent or attorney, file a complaint in writing, within the fifteen days next after the publication of the above notice, asking the correction of such list or lists.

16. The council, before proceeding to the hearing of such complaints, shall cause to be given, by the secretary-treasurer or clerk or other person, public notice of the day and hour at which such hearing shall take place. He shall also, previous to hearing the said complaints, cause a special notice to be given to every person, the insertion or the omission of whose name upon the list is demanded. The public notice and special notice required as above shall be of five days' duration; and they shall be given, and published or served in the same manner as notices for municipal purposes in the municipality within which the list or lists have been prepared.

17. The council shall hear all persons interested in the complaints made before it, and by its decision may confirm or correct each of the duplicates of the list or lists.

18. If, upon a complaint in writing, as aforesaid, and proof, the council is of opinion that a property has been leased, or assigned, or made over, under any title whatsoever, with the sole object of giving to a person the right of having his name entered on the list of electors, it shall strike the name of such person from the said list.

19. Every insertion, erasure or correction, whatsoever, of the list, in virtue of this Act, shall be authenticated by the initials of the presiding officer of the council.

20. The list of electors shall come into force at the expiration of the 30 days following the notice given in virtue of sub-section 10 as it then exists, and shall remain in force until a new list is made and put into force under the authority of this Act. If there is an appeal from said list, as hereinafter provided, the list shall remain in force pending such appeal until the decision of the appeal.

21. Every list so put in force shall, during the period in which it remains in force, be deemed the only true list of parliamentary electors within the territorial division to which it relates, even although the valuation roll which has served as a basis of such lists shall have been quashed or set aside.

22. It shall be the duty of the secretary-treasurer or clerk, as soon as the list of electors has come into force, to insert at the end of the same a certificate that it has or has not been examined by the council, as the case may be, and to transmit, by registered letter, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, one of the duplicates, within eight days from such coming into force of said list. The other duplicate shall remain of record in the archives of the municipality.

23. Any elector of the electoral district may, within 12 days of the decision of a council, appeal from such decision by petition to a judge of the Superior Court; or, in case a council does not take into consideration, within the prescribed time, a complaint, the same appeal may be taken within 12 days from the expiration of the delay given to the council for taking the complaint into consideration.

Amendment negatived.

On section 11,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this section the word "may" is changed to "shall." In the section as drawn it applies to every Province but Quebec, in regard to which there are special provisions. British Columbia is now added, because on the mainland there are no judges available and no barristers; but there are stipendary magistrates and gold commissioners, who possess civil and I think criminal jurisdiction; those are experienced men and will perform the duty in a very satisfactory manner. With regard to Quebec, the word "notary" is inserted, because notaries form a branch of the local profession and are specially acquainted with the conveyance of real estate and are fully as qualified, and perhaps in some respects better qualified, than many advocates, to discharge the duty of revising officers. I provide, also, that a revising officer may be appointed for and be required to discharge the duties of more than one electorial district. I find that county judges, or, at all events several of them—a good many of them now, from whom we have had communications—are not at all afraid of the duties, and have expressed their perfect willingness to undertake more than one electoral district. I also provide that a revising officer may be appointed for a portion of an electorial district, so that if a county judge of a judicial district has lost, for electoral purposes, certain townships of his county, and they have passed to another county, it may be more convenient that he should have charge, as revising officer, of the whole

judicial district, although a portion of it may belong to another electoral district. These are the amendments I propose to the clause.

Mr. MILLS. In the Province of Ontario there are something like forty judicial districts, and if the hon. gentleman were to allow the judge to act for his own judicial district it would be of no consequence to any candidate, or any member, whether the portion of the district for which the judge acts is embraced under the judge of one county or another. In that way every electoral district would be embraced under the jurisdiction of some judge or other, but what the hon. gentleman proposes now is to confine the judge to the electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is just the other way.

Mr. MILLS. Which other way?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object is that the county judge, when it possibly can be done, shall be the revising officer for the whole of his judicial district, but I must make this provision, because a revising officer must be provided for the electoral district. I may say that the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B., who is not in his place, wished to insert the Surrogate judge, that is, for New Brunswick, but I am not exactly prepared to accept that.

Mr. DAVIES. The amendment simply amounts to this, that it leaves the discretion in the Government to appoint either a county court judge or a barrister of five years' standing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. That is the main objection, as we understand, that has been urged on this side during the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Mr. DAVIES. I need not repeat the arguments against that objection, but propose to submit an amendment, which is pretty much in the line of the hon. gentleman's amendment, but omitting this objectionable portion, which permits the Government to select in any particular district, a barrister of five years' standing instead of a county court judge. I need not repeat the arguments which were advanced so forcibly this afternoon. The hon. gentleman remembers that it was urged by the opponents of this provision that it left the power in the hands of the First Minister, for the time being, to appoint, in those districts which were closely contested, not a county court judge, but a barrister, and in that case, *ex necessitate*, from the condition of politics in this country, the appointments would be made on the recommendation of the member for the county, or the chief political wire-puller in the county. The First Minister would not, of course, be bound to accept every recommendation, but practically that is what it comes to. Well, we have had experience of that, and the hon. gentleman, though he shakes his head, will acknowledge that while he may exercise firm control and keep a firm hand on the reins in the guidance of his party generally, still, in making appointments in particular districts he has to give way, largely, to the member representing those districts, or the main politicians in those districts. Now, whatever virulence or bitterness there may exist in districts where there are large majorities on one side or on the other, we know that that virulence and bitterness are intensified in counties where the majority is very small, and we know that the temptation to pass over the county judge and appoint a partisan barrister would be ten times as great in a county where the majority is 5, 10, 20 or 30, as in the county where there are 200 or 300 on one side or the other. In point of fact, in those counties in which the majorities range from 100 to 500 there would be little objection to appointing a barrister of five years' standing; and why? Because his power for doing evil would be minimised by the existence of the enormous majority, and little objection could be taken to his appointment. He could not do a great deal of harm, even if he desired; but I put it to hon. gentlemen who want the Bill framed in such a way as to do even-handed justice, can it be defended that in 8, 10 or 15 counties, where the majorities range from 5 to 20—is it fair to place in the hands of the political party in power the right to appoint the man who shall make up the lists and revise them? We know what it means, and if we were to debate it for ten hours more we could not make it clearer. It is patent to the minds of every one. I only want to put the fact on record, and as it is not contradicted I assume it may be stated as a fact, admitted by both sides, that in counties where the majorities are from 5 to 20, the appointment of the revising barrister, if vested in the Prime Minister for the time being, means the control of the county. There is no question about that; it is not denied, and therefore I say the First Minister is retaining in this clause the most objectionable feature in the Bill, next to the Indian clause, and that is the right to appoint, in those counties, not the county court judge, not a stipendiary magistrate or notary, but a barrister of five years' standing. It has been argued, and argued well to-night—argued irresistibly, to my mind—that you do not appoint first-class men for revising barristers. It has been urged that first-class barristers were men of high character. We know that the men occupying the first positions at the bar are men of high character. They would not be there if they were not, and if these men were appointed we would have some guarantee that justice would be done. But we know that the men who will accept these appointments will not be such men; they will be political hacks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; yes, yes.

Mr. DAVIES. We all know that, from personal experience. Take the great Province of Ontario: is there an hon. gentleman in this House who imagines that any one of the first ten or twenty barristers of that Province would accept these positions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Mr. DAVIES. And, therefore, it is the gentlemen who are not holding briefs, who are just coming to the bar, who, perhaps, have strong political aspirations, strong political leanings or feelings, who have not practised—they are the men who will be prepared to accept these appointments and will use all the means in their power to get them. So in the Maritime Provinces. It is not supposed that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) or any one occupying his position, would take such a position, even if it were offered to him. An hon. friend says he would not get it, but even if he could get it he would not take it. Who will take these positions, then? The juniors, the young men beginning life, and who hope to make positions for themselves, politically. Not the man who is striving to make advancement in his profession, purely as a professional man, not the man who hopes to reach the top of his profession by proving himself to be a lawyer of high attainments, because he knows that by confining himself to legitimate practice he will soon reach a proper place in his profession. But it is the man who has not got these hopes and attainments, but who hopes for political preferment, who will seek for and obtain these appointments. Now, I think that is highly undesirable; I do not think hon. members on either side should desire it; I think it would meet with general acceptance on the part of the majority of this House if the Prime Minister for the time being—I do not care whether he is Liberal or Conservative—was obliged to appoint a judicial officer, who is removed from political feelings and leanings altogether, and in whom the public have confidence, and in case of the inability of that officer

to discharge the duties of revising officer, then to vest the appointment in the Chief Justice of the particular Province where the vacancy arises. The Chief Justices of the Provinces do not belong to any one political party. Whatever they may have been, nowadays they are not partisans at all. Holding the positions they do they are removed from party politics.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Speak for your own Province.

Mr. DAVIES. I will speak for my own Province, and I will do more, for I have the honor of the acquaintance of the Chief Justices of more than one Province. I think I am speaking for the judiciary of the Dominion of Canada when I say that those who have attained to the positions of Chief Justices of the respective Provinces have left their party politics behind them, and are impartial, and fair and just; and I do not think the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) will dare to stand up on the floor of this House and assert that on the part of any of the Chief Justices there has been any partisanship. I know the venerable Chief Justice of the Province of New Brunswick, and a gentleman more respected and impartial does not exist in any part of the Dominion of Canada, and I am sure he is held in high respect by the hon. gentleman himself, and by the Conservatives of New Brunswick as well as by the Liberals. In fact, I do not know what party in politics he belongs to, because he has been for twenty years removed from the political arena.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DAVIES. Why, I am speaking right to the kernel of the question; I am advocating that in cases where a county court judge cannot, from any cause, discharge the duties of revising officer, the place shall be filled by the Chief Justice of the particular Province. This amendment cannot be said to be prompted by political feelings, because I believe that if you go back to the political leanings of the Chief Justices of the several Provinces you will find that more of them were Conservatives than Liberals. However, my experience of the bar has gone over fifteen or sixteen years, and I think I am in unison with all the members of the bar, on this side of the House, at any rate, when I say that none of us have found in the Chief Justices of any of the Provinces any political feelings to prejudice or mar their judgments. I move, in amendment, the following :—

The county court judge in each county where there is such judge shall be the revising officer for the electoral district or districts, or parts of an electoral district, within such county, and in the Province of Quebec the Superior Court judge of the judicial district in each electoral district or part of an electoral district, shall be the revising officer for such district or part of a district. In any case where a judge, who is a revising officer under the Act, shall be unable to discharge the duties of revising officer for his entire county, or for any part thereof, he shall forthwith signify such his inability to the Chief Justice of the highest court of his Province, and if his inability extends only to a part of his county, he shall specify particularly which part, and such Chief Justice shall thereupon forthwith appoint another county judge or a barrister of at least five years' standing as revising officer in the place of the judge so signifying his inability to act for the county or part of the county, as the case may be, and the person so appointed shall have all the powers conferred upon a county judge acting as a revising officer under this Act.

This provides, in the first place, that the county judge shall be the revising officer, and in case of his inability to act, the Chief Justice of the Province shall appoint another judge or a barrister to act in his place. If he appoints a barrister, the presumption is that he will appoint a man who will be impartial, while if that appointment is made by the Premier, the presumption is that it will be political.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It may bring rather cheap popularity on the part of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to declaim so loudly in favor of the Chief Justices of the different Provinces of the Dominion. All I said to the hon. gentleman was, that he had not such an acquaintance with the Chief Justices of the other Provinces as to be able to speak so positively as he has done. I did not mean thereby to imply that any of them were partisans in politics. I do not believe he knows the Chief Justice of New Brunswick sufficiently to be able to speak as positively as he has done. That does not lead me to state, on the hon. gentleman's challenge, that he is a political partisan; but I say this, that, speaking for New Brunswick, I would prefer not to have this duty imposed on the Chief Justice of that Province—not casting any imputation upon him, but because I think the Chief Justice should be entirely free from the suspicion of being a partisan. How would it be if the Chief Justice appointed the revising barrister? As party politics go, there are very few lawyers who do not adhere to one side of politics or the other. I do not mean to say that they would not do their duty impartially on that account; but what position would the Chief Justice be placed in? He would have to choose, in each of the 14 or 15 counties, a partisan on one side or the other, and by so doing he would probably leave it open to some partisan to say: He is a partisan himself; he has chosen a Grit here or a Conservative there; and he has taken the advice of so-and-so to do it—for he would necessarily have to take the advice of some one, and I am free to admit that he would be quite as ready to take the advice of our opponents as of our friends.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has not evidently heard the amendment. I do not propose that all the appointments shall be in the hands of the Chief Justice. I propose that the county judges shall be revising officers, and it is only in case of their inability to act that I propose to vest the appointment, not in the Premier of the Dominion, who must necessarily be a partisan, but in the Chief Justice of the Province, who is necessarily removed from party influence; and I would ask my hon. friend, who belongs to the party which boasts that it derives its inspiration from England, whether the judges who appoint revising officers there are considered by the people of England to be partisans, or to necessarily appoint partisans.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The circumstances of the two countries are entirely different. In England, you have a very large population and a very large bar, a great portion of whom are not partisans, on one side or the other. In this country, and more particularly in the Provinces, there is a small bar, a small number of men qualified to accept the position, and the appointments would necessarily, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Kent (M. Landry), be open to the imputation of partisanship, to which, in the case of England, they are not. The appointments are vested in the judges of Assizes in England, because on their various circuits there is a large attendance of briefless barristers, who go on circuit as soon as they are called, and who have no decided political convictions on one side or the other, so that there is a field of selection there which we have not in this country; and I quite agree with the observations of my hon. friend from Kent, that it would be very undesirable to introduce further Chief Justices, or other judges of this country into the arena of politics. I do not think their introduction into politics, so far as they have been introduced, by giving them the trial of election cases, has been beneficial to the estimation in which they are held by the public for impartiality. We have seen, in our Province, judges accused, most unjustly and disgracefully, of partisanship, to which charge they were in no respect open. We have seen one of our judges so basely and unjustly accused of partisanship that not only he but several of his brother judges have deemed it necessary, from the bench, in their charges to the jury, to refer to those accusations and to condemn them; and we would find the same accusations repeated in reference to the appointment of revising barristers by a Chief Justice or by a judge, if that system were introduced here. That system would be still further intro-

ducing the bench into politics, out of which, undoubtedly the bench had better be kept.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) thinks it would not do to call upon a judge or a Chief Justice to appoint these officers, because he would be suspected by the people of acting in a partisan manner if he made the appointment, and that would be, of course, bad for the judge, and it would be bad for the revising officer. It would be bad for the revising officer, because he would hold his appointment from a tainted and suspected source, and his decisions would hardly be received with that respect with which they would be received if he were appointed by a person who was not a partisan. That is very plain; the very function which the revising officer is called upon to discharge would be rendered more difficult to discharge.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I have not said that.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the hon. gentleman did not say that, but it is the inevitable inference from what he did say. It is the conclusion that inevitably follows from his argument. If the people suspected the judge to be partisan because he made the appointment, they would suspect the person appointed to be a partisan. But how strong a position is that revising officer to occupy when he is appointed, not by a judge, whose ordinary business is to dispense justice, who, I believe, has the respect of the population—and particularly the Chief Justices, who, as a rule, for a long time, have left the struggles of the bar and of political life and have become more inured than the puisne judges to the routine and calm of judicial life, and that serener atmosphere which is said there to prevail—but by the First Minister If he is to be suspected to be appointed improperly when appointed by a judge, if that suspicion is to arise and to be made a substantial difficulty in that case, in what light is he to be regarded when he holds his appointment from the head of a political party which has the majority for the time being? It is quite clear his position must be much weaker than that of the revising officer appointed by the judge. The hon. gentleman says we must keep the judges free from the suspicion of being partisans, and in order to keep them free from the suspicion of partisanship, which would follow from their being given this particular appointment, to be discharged by them as a high function connected with the administration of justice to the people, for the right to be a voter is a part of the common justice of the country—in order to prevent them from being suspected of partisanship in the administration of this function we are to refuse to entrust them with the duty with which the English judges are entrusted, and we are to hand over to the First Minister of the day that duty, although the English people say that they would not trust the First Minister of the day with it. The English people say: We will trust our judges; we will not trust the First Minister of the day. The hon. gentleman says the Canadian people are not to say: We will not trust the judges, but we will trust the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, the difference between the appointments in England and the appointments that are to be made in this Bill are very remarkable, in one instance. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, these young barristers will be briefless barristers. They will have no buisness; men leading the profession will not accept the appointment. Who are appointed in England but young barristers, who get a hundred guineas, or thereabouts, by the judges? They are young; they have political aspirations. An hon. gentleman said last night, if they do not get large pecuniary remuneration they will look to political advantages. That same argument is applicable in England as it is here, with this marked difference, that here the majority of the revising barristers will be judges, whereas in England they are all young men. Then, I have heard it said, *ad nauseam*, that, drawing inspirations from English laws and English institutions, this legislation is unheard of, that it could not be possible to happen in England. Well, in the Imperial statutes of 1884—I am not going to mistake the Chancellor for the Chief Justice this time—47-48 Victoria, chapter 35, passed last July, with respect to the county of Dublin, where the revising barrister was a judge, the Recorder of Dublin, that position is taken away from him: "It shall be lawful for the Lord Lieutenant or other Chief Governor or Governors of Ireland for the time being, from time to time to appoint a barrister-at-law, who shall have actually practised for ten years at least in the Superior Courts of Dublin and shall not, at the time of his appointment, have ceased to practice, to discharge all the duties in regard to the registration of voters and the revision of the lists of jurors in the county of Dublin, which were capable of being discharged by the Recorder of Dublin." Thus, only last year, under this Act, the office of revising barrister was taken away from the Recorder of Dublin and handed over to Lord Spencer, who has got constitutional advisers, and we did not find, from Mr. Parnell or any of those who serve under him, and are continually denouncing the tyranny, oppression and unconstitutional action of the Castle, the barbarous oppression that has been practised in Ireland by the Castle authorities, one single objection raised to the Lord Lieutenant appointing a revising barrister for the county of Dublin.

Mr. BLAKE. There is such a thing as the exception proving the rule, and out of 600 or 700 constituencies of Great Britain and Ireland, the hon. gentleman has found a statute passed, I do not remember under what circumstances, or whether Mr. Parnell objected to it or not—probably the hon. gentleman has looked at *Hansard* and found he did not. It is very surprising that he did not; I think he could not have been there, or else he would—we do not know whatp articular reasons there wereto justify this particular case, but certainly it was not the rule.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the commencement of my system.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the thin end of the wedge, and they put it in in Dublin city. My impression is there was some strong reason given for that, and the proof is that the provision which makes him a political officer also gives him the duty of revising the lists of jurors as well.

Mr. BERGIN. Is not that a political thing in Ireland?

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know. I do not know what side the hon. gentleman now takes upon that very large question he now puts to me. I remember when he took one side; I do not know whether he now takes that or the other side on these Irish questions. The argument on this question from hon. gentlemen opposite is a little inconsistent. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) told us a little while ago that the case in England was quite different from what it was here. There, he said, there were a great number of barristers, a wealth of barristers, in every place, who were not partisans, who were not politicians at all, who were entirely neutral, and that there was ample room to choose men who were perfectly independent and in whom the people would have confidence, and that there would be no difficulty, therefore, of the judges making a selection, without being obnoxious to those charges of partisanship which are given as a reason why they should not appoint these officers here. The First Minister does not say the same thing. He says it is the young, briefless barrister, who is looking for preferment, whom they appoint.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what you said yesterday.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I never used the words "young, briefless barrister" at all. The hon. gentleman therefore differs from his supporter, the hon. member for Victoria, as to the

situation of affairs. I do not remember any instances of the appointees being revising barristers except one, and certainly, though he was not a gentleman in very large practice, he was not, in the sense of the hon. gentleman, a young, briefless barrister. I only remember his name because the Lord Chief Justice of England, who had appointed him successively for years, in the end declined to renew his appointment—I refer to Edmond Beales. He had been appointed for several years by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, and though he had not a very large practice he was a man of considerable knowledge and of considerable eminence—a marked person. The Lord Chief Justice had occasion to deal with the question whether Mr. Beales should be reappointed, and Mr. Beales had taken a very active part in a particular political party agitation, at the time, and the Lord Chief Justice declared that he thought it inexpedient to reappoint Mr. Beales, and Mr. Beales applied to know the reason, inasmuch as it was, in a sense, a stigma on him not to be reappointed, and the Lord Chief Justice wrote a public letter, in which he explained his views, not that he condemned Mr. Beales or thought that it was at all certain that he would be influenced, but he thought the public confidence would be, to a certain extent, impaired by the continued appointment of a person who had felt it to be his duty—as no doubt it was his duty, as a free citizen, entertaining those feelings—to take an active part in a particular agitation at the moment, to take part in the revision of those lists. That was the view of such a high judicial functionary as Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, who, as a politician, when he was a politician, belonged to the same party as Mr. Beales. He, therefore, might be supposed to sympathise, if he had any sympathies, with that style of view which Mr. Beales adopted. Can we expect that from the Minister of the day, who is to make the appointment here. We cannot expect such a line of action. I say there is no ground whatever for our deciding that our judges are less worthy of confidence than the judges in England, and that our First Ministers are more worthy of confidence than the First Ministers in England; and yet, that is the proposition of hon. gentlemen who sustain the proposition of the Government and decline ours.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The hon. gentleman has shown, it seems to me, his usual ability, in getting a meaning out of what is said by another entirely different from the ordinary meaning attached to the words used. If the language I have used could imply in any way what the hon. gentleman has said, I was very unfortunate in my choice of language; that is, that because a revising barrister was named by the Chief Justice, the public would look upon him with suspicion, because the source which appointed him was stained, politically. I have never used any language which would give that meaning, and yet the hon. gentleman deduced from the position I took that that was the case. What I meant to say was, that while the judge might make as impartial a choice as could be made, as politics stood in this Dominion now, he could not, under any circumstances, name any one who was not a political partisan, in the sense of being on one side of politics or the other. He would name a barrister this year; the barrister would fulfil his duties; he would give dissatisfaction to somebody, to one side or the other, I care not which; he might lay himself open to being discussed on the public hustings and in the public press, to have his name heralded all over the country, and the next year the same Chief Justice would have to make the choice again. He would have to decide upon the opinions put forth in the public press as to whether he had made a good choice or not the first time, and in doing so he must necessarily decide for the contention of one party against the contention of the other, he would have to say: I have weighed the pros and cons, what has been said against this officer and what has been said in his favor, and I must make the choice, and decide for one side of politics or the other in making the choice for the next year. There is an immense difference between the Government making the nomination and the Chief Justice making it, because the Chief Justice must hold himself entirely aloof from politics, he must do nothing which would appear a choice between the parties; and if he does not do that the first year, he must necessarily do it the next year, when sides have been taken for and against his nominee of the first year. There is a very great difference. If there should be political differences among the people as to the choice made by the Chief Justice, how are they going to visit it upon him in any way, except by being suspicious of him? They have no recourse against him. They have against the Prime Minister, if he makes a poor choice. If the Government make a poor nomination, if the nominee shows himself a violent partisan, and does injustice to one party or the other, by the decisions he may give or the lists he may prepare, the country can condemn the officer and can condemn the Government, and put them out of power. How can they reach the Chief Justice? Only by mutterings, or by throwing suspicion upon his character as a judge, and in that way sapping the very foundation of justice. With the Prime Minister it is different. They have a right to approve or disapprove of his actions, and to try to get the dominant party in the Dominion to oust him from his power if he makes a bad choice. One is a man who has a right to be a political partisan, I do not mean to the extent of doing an injustice to any one, but to the extent of upholding his party honestly, and making the choice, all other things being equal, between his opponents and his friends. It is the duty of any Government, not to do injustice to anyone, but to choose their friends instead of their opponents, when other things are equal. But the Chief Justice has no such right, and would leave himself open to suspicion in such a case, without remedy or redress on the part of the public.

Mr. BLAKE. Then this is too delicate a task for an independent man to perform. It is so delicate a task that an independent man, occupying an independent position, ought not to be asked to undertake a task of such delicacy and difficulty, but it is to be left to one of the parties to choose the arbitrator between it and the other party.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak under correction, because it is many years since I resided in Dublin, but my recollection is that the Recorder used to be an officer of the corporation in Dublin.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very likely.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that is the case. We know only too well, however, and we must regret it, that the relations between the corporation of Dublin and the Government of England have been strained to the last degree, and most undoubtedly, as between the two, it may have become necessary for the Government of England to take the matter into their own hands, knowing that, if the Recorder was an officer, as I think he is, of the corporation of Dublin, empowered to choose the jury list, it would be a very questionable thing to obtain a conviction of any offender under a jury list made by an officer of that corporation. I am sorry to have to say it, but it is the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true. The Recorder is appointed by the corporation, and he might be a very proper person, when political feeling is runing high and political trials are going on, to select the jurors. But here the selection of the jurors is taken away from him, and the power is given to the Lord Lieutenant and not to the Chief Justice, in Ireland, or to any Chief Justice, to appoint

the revising officer. It is given expressly to the Lord Lieutenant. In case of the absence of the revising barrister, if the Lord Chancellor, or Keeper, or Commissioner of the Great Seal for Ireland, for the time being, are satisfied the revising officer for the county of Dublin is unable, from unavoidable absence, to discharge his duty, it shall be lawful for the Lord Chancellor or Keeper of the Great Seal to appoint some other person. He is sworn of the Privy Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid it is like a good deal of English legislation for Ireland, *experimentum incorpore vili.*

Mr. MILLS. This subject is one of far greater importance than hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think. We must remember that we are taking, in this matter, a retrogressive step; we are going back upon the policy of the Government for the last fifteen years. Formerly we had controverted elections tried by this House, and we took the matter out of the hands of the House of Commons and entrusted it to the ordinary tribunals of the country. Now, one hon. gentleman opposite this evening has regretted this step. He says it has been a disadvantage to the courts. But anxious as the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government is to adopt a policy of retrogression and to incorporate ancient abuses in the legislation of the country, he has not ventured to propose a return to the ancient system of trying controverted elections in this House. But it does seem to me that it is quite as important to secure a proper voters' list and to prevent political parties tampering with that list, as it is to secure a proper trial of controverted elections. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) says that if the First Minister makes bad appointments he will still be responsible to the House, and who, he asks, is to hold the judge responsible? I say the judge is far more responsible than the First Minister, for he can be attacked by Parliament if he fails to discharge his duty properly. This proposition provides that Parliament shall exercise the power of appointment, and that the judges shall be appointed for the purpose of trying controverted elections; and it is only in case a judge intimates his inability to do that that the Chief Justice of the Province shall make the appointment; and if a judge should abuse his powers in this matter, which is extremely unlikely, the number of cases would be so few that it would not, in all probability, seriously affect the representation in Parliament. But the hon. gentleman proposes to put into the hands of one man not merely a few isolated cases, but the appointment of revising officers, who make up the voters' lists, over the entire Dominion.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Not one man.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; it is in the hands of the Prime Minister for the time being. The hon. gentleman says that if the Prime Minister acts improperly the public will hold him responsible. But I say, if Parliament itself is corrupted, if the men returned to Parliament are returned upon a corrupt list, how are you to obtain redress from a Parliament so constituted? How are you to punish the Prime Minister for improper action, in a Parliament where a majority of the members have been elected by means of that improper action? Are they going to sit in condemnation of an act by means of which they succeeded in getting into Parliament? Sir, we have, for some time, been trying, by slow degrees, to secure reform. We have succeeded in securing a fixed period for elections all over the country. We remember the election of 1867, and again in 1872, when some took place in the month of July, some in August, and some late in September. That abuse has now been corrected by legislation. Then we proposed that certain responsible officers should be returning officers. But the hon. gentleman has repealed that law by the majority that supported him in Parliament. He has taken the appointment of returning officers into his own hands. He names whom he pleases, and some of those gentlemen, at the last election, whom he named, committed gross abuses. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I tell him it is a fact. I say that, in my case, in my constituency, the returning officer whom he named was a perjured man; I say he opened the ballot boxes, contrary to his oath, that he took papers out of those ballot boxes, and that he tampered with the ballots.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I am in order. I am stating facts. I am stating what has grown up under the law, as the hon. gentleman has made it. Now, he proposes to take another step and to interfere with the purity of the election by corrupting the voters' lists, by stuffing voters' lists, instead of stuffing the ballot box. He will not consent that Parliament shall state who are to be the parties who shall make these lists. He is not willing that the judges of certain courts shall do, in this country, what the judges of certain courts have power to do in England; he proposes to take into his own hands the appointment of revising officers. If judges are appointed, it is because he chooses to name them, and we know what the result will be. The hon. gentleman's conduct as Administrator in this country is sufficiently well known. We can judge as to the future by what has been done in the past. In the ninety-two electoral districts of Ontario judges may be appointed in forty or fifty. To do what? To prepare voters' lists where a majority of the voters is known to be unalterably Tory or unalterably Reform. But were the parties are nearly equally divided, revising barristers, who have sympathy with the hon. gentleman, and who will seek to secure his good opinion, and promotion at his hands, will be the most available officers; and they may alter the voters' list in such a way, by altering the valuation of the property on which the party qualifies, so as to affect the results of the elections. In every general election since Confederation 5 per cent. of the votes taken off one side and added to the other would change the political complexion of the Government. If that be so, it is easy to see what an immense power revising officers will have. The hon. gentleman has said that $150 will be the qualification. The revising officer may decide that a certain property is not worth that amount, and that the person in question cannot go on the list. Another party has a property of a certain amount, and although the assessor holds that it is not of the required amount his name will be put on the list. So, the results of elections may be determined, not at the polls, but at the time the revising officers prepare the voters' lists. We wish to have a fair and proper list made, and we cannot have such so long as the appointment of the revising officer is in the hands of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for Simcoe this afternoon made a charge against the returning officer at the late Bothwell election, which I did not think it necessary to notice at that time, because the hon. gentleman knows nothing about it, except what he has read in the *Globe.* But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) just now repeated that charge, and he knows all about it.

Mr. MILLS. I do.

Mr. CAMERON. And I know all about it, also; and I think it necessary I should answer the hon. gentleman's statement and do justice to a public official who has been most unjustly accused. That returning officer was acquitted by the judge who tried the case of any legal wrong and of any moral wrong. He was held to have honestly and faithfully discharged his duty at that election, and the secret of the hon. gentleman's attack upon him now is, that the judge was so confident that the charge was unjust and unfounded

that he ordered the hon. gentleman to pay the returning officer's costs.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to say——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. MILLS. I think, after the hon. gentleman's statement, I may be allowed to make a somewhat more specific statement.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to address himself to the clause under discussion.

Mr. DAVIES. I have a remark to offer with regard to the precedent which the First Minister has cited in support of his proposition. I have not had an opportunity of looking at *Hansard*, and I suppose the hon. gentleman has.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Parnell made no opposition to the proposal. Whether the hon. gentleman is wright or wrong, we will ascertain afterwards. I submit this to the committee: In the Empire of Great Britain appointments are made to the position of revising barrister by the judges who go on Assize; but there is one exception, and I give the hon. gentleman credit for having ferretted it out. He has found an exception, and where is that exception? We have heard, year after year, and we know it as a matter of history, that Ireland has been in a state of quasi-rebellion, that it has been exceptionally governed, governed almost as a Crown colony; that the *Habeas Corpus* Act has been suspended; that the Crimes Act is in force; that there are measures adopted in regard to Ireland which would not be justified in any other part of the British Dominions, and which even the Prime Minister of Canada could not justify, if he attempted to apply them to the Dominion. In order to justify this provision, the First Minister has had to go to Ireland, to that misgoverned country; and he has extracted from it the one single precedent, to justify the adoption of this clause here; and therefore hon. gentlemen who sit behind him approve his conduct, and disapprove of the general policy of the British law; they approve the particular, exceptional legislation, applicable to the exceptional circumstances of Ireland alone.

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Committee rose and reported progress.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that the Senate had passed the Canada Temperance Act Amendment Bill, from this House, with certain amendments.

Mr. JAMIESON. I should like to ask the leader of the Government whether an early day could not be fixed for the consideration of these amendments.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not know what they are.

Mr. JAMIESON. I believe important amendments have been made, and I think every facility should be given for their consideration.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. BOWELL presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General submits to the House of Commons the expediency of granting $1,000,000 for the purpose of meeting the expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories, this sum being in addition to the amount submitted by His Excellency, under date the 11th of April last.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 22nd May, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Message be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BOWELL. If the House consents, it is absolutely necessary that the Government should be furnished with an additional sum to that which has already been voted by the House a short time ago—$700,000—to meet the expenses which have been incurred in the unfortunate troubles in the North-West, and I would ask permission to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply on His Excellency's Message, and the estimate of $1,000,000, to meet the expenses in connection with the North-West troubles.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that all that is necessary is to call the order. The Message has been referred to Supply. There is an order to go into Committee of Supply, and if you call that order it is sufficient.

Mr. BOWELL. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I followed precisely the practice which was pursued when my hon. friend the Minister of Militia moved the House into Committee of Supply, when he asked for the vote of $700,000. If that practice was wrong, I am wrong; but I took the resolution, word for word, from the proceedings of the House.

Mr. CARON. On a previous occasion, it will be remembered that it was my duty, as Minister of Militia, to appeal to the patriotism of this honorable House to consent that the rules should be suspended, and that the House should go into committee and pass the vote that I asked, to meet the first expenses occasioned by the outbreak in the North-West. The appeal which I made was received as I expected it would be, and I met with the response which I anticipated from the hon. members of this House. The vote which I then asked for was at the very outbreak of the disturbances in the North-West. To-day I have to make the same appeal to the House and to ask for a further sum of $1,000,000 to meet the expenses in connection with those disturbances. But to-day, I am glad to say, that the appeal which I make is made under more favorable circumstances than the one which was last made. Through the pluck of our volunteers, through the management of the Major-General Commanding, and his officers and staff, the troubles which at one time appeared possible might last longer than we can now see they will last, are now pretty well ended. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that up to the present time the Department have been very anxious, indeed, as will be readily understood by hon. members of this House, that the pay of the men should be met punctually and without any possible delay. The sum of money which was entrusted to the Department of Militia, the sum of $700,000, has now been expended, and it becomes necessary to provide for the pay of our volunteers who are still at the front. I may say that we calculate that the pay and subsistence of about 6,000 men, composing the present force, comes to about half a million per month; the expense incurred, so far as transport is concerned, and forage for about 700 horses, which compose the force comprising the artillery and the mounted force, are very heavy, and I now ask and hope that the House will follow the example of what it has already done, and will consent to the rules being suspended, and to the vote being agreed to and concurred in to-night.

Mr. BLAKE. On the former occasion the notice of the vote was on the Table for a great many days, and the Message having been delivered to the House it was competent for the hon. gentleman to have moved the House

into committee, in accordance with the regular rules, to have taken the regular stages, which are proper for money resolutions, which are prescribed as the proper stages of deliberation in such important matters. The hon. gentleman on that occasion did not take that course; although he had brought down the Message, although it had been laid on the Table, although he had placed himself in a position to go through the regular course of procedure, he abstained from taking that course, until on one evening, when he informed us that the Treasury was absolutely empty, so far as his appropriation was concerned, and he called upon us to suspend all the rules, in order that he might be able at once to carry out those financial arrangements which his own neglect to proceed earlier had rendered it impossible to proceed with regularly. Upon that occasion I expressed my regret that the hon. gentleman, having known that he had a war on his hands, having known that he would want an extra vote, had not applied earlier, and when he did take the initiatory stage of bringing down the Message, had not acted upon it earlier, so that the regular course might have been followed; but I said that under the circumstances, and on the statement which the hon. gentleman made, I should not, for my part, interpose any obstacle to the suspension of the rules upon that occasion. I certainly did not expect that the hon. gentleman would propose to repeat the same policy. I make no objection, although I think it an unreasonable thing that the hon. gentleman should bring the Message down at ten o'clock at night and propose to take a vote in Committee of Supply upon it at the instant. Still, that is the rule of the House. I believe he is entitled, according to the rule of Parliament, having brought this Message down, having procured the reference to Committee of Supply, the order for Supply being on the Paper, to go into Supply. But, Sir, the Message you read is dated the 22nd of May. It is dated one week ago, and for a week the hon. gentleman has been carrying the Message about in his pocket, and he lays it on the Table at ten o'clock Friday night, and he says, not merely do I wish to go into committee, but to obtain concurrence in the vote. Now, what excuse is there for that? More than a week ago the hon. gentleman had found that he wanted a million. On the 22nd of May he gets a Message, but he does not bring it down on the 22nd, or in any one of the intervening six lawful days; but he brings it down now, and he says: I must ask you to suspend all rules? Why? Because, I have neglected my duty, because I have not brought down the Message earlier; because, knowing that I wanted the money, I procured that authority to get the money, but I kept that authority in my pocket, instead of presenting it to Parliament. I make no objection to going into Supply, but when we get out it will be time to consider when the report shall be received.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to enquire from the Minister of Militia whether this $1,700,000—that is to say, this sum and the sum we voted before—will, as far as he knows, clear what may be called the military expenses of the expedition. I presume it is for military purposes alone that he requires it, and can he give us any rough estimate—of course, I cannot expect a detailed estimate—of what more expenses may be incurred? I should imagine, from what he stated, that this would about close his expenditure up to date, not more.

Mr. CARON. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the expenditure exceeds the vote which I am now taking. Hon. gentlemen will understand how extremely difficult it has been for the Department to get the vouchers—indeed, to get accounts, from the more remote portions of the North-West Territories. I have endeavored to get in the accounts as rapidly as possible, and within a very short time now I hope to be able to lay before the House an approximate estimate, much more exact than anything I could give to-night, of what the expenditure will be.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has given us an estimate of the pay of a certain number of men for two months, for transport, and for some other necessaries. Is this estimate for the same classes of expenditure, or does it include expenditure for munitions of war?

Mr. CARON. No munitions of war at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Men's pay and transport?

Mr. CARON. Subsistence, transport and forage.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it include the purchase of animals?

Mr. CARON. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Have there been any horses purchased?

Mr. CARON. No. Not out of the amount granted.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman not give us some character of estimate as he gave us at the time of his initiatory vote?

Mr. CARON. The only estimate I could give is the one the hon. gentleman has himself given. It would be quite impossible for me to give any more information than I have given to-night. It would be useless for me to attempt to give any information which would not be exact, and it is impossible for me to be any more precise until I have received the information which I have just referred to as being expected to come into the Department within a few days. The amount of money now asked for is for the purpose of meeting the expenses incurred by the pay of about 6,000 men, and I calculate about 700 horses; but even that is only approximate. The transport has been, as we all know, very heavy, and we have had to purchase supplies—which had to be sent at very large expense, from the fact that no delay could be allowed—to meet the wants of the troops who were fighting our battles. That is about the only information I can give the hon. gentleman in explanation of the vote I am now asking from the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say I think it would not have been impossible for the hon. gentleman to have given us some more information. We do not know whether this $1,000,000, with the $700,000, covers, as far as he can calculate, his whole expenditure up to this period for the different classes of expenses which he has enumerated, namely, pay, subsistence of men and horses, and transport. Of course, if his present estimate covers the transport of the men home it would not be difficult to make an estimate what that would be; but if it covers the transport of the men up to this time, I think the hon. gentleman might, very much better than he was able to do a number of weeks ago, give us a calculation of what the cost of transport has been. He says he estimates that there are 6,000 men, at $500,000 a month. The great bulk of the men having been under pay for at least two months, you would have $1,000,000 for the pay of the volunteers; then the $700,000 would be divisible into transport, subsistence and forage.

Mr. CARON. And supplies—hospital supplies and clothing.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman not give us any idea of how this $700,000 is made up—whether it covers the whole or part of the expenditure up to this time for these classes of expenditures. I may add that I am quite prepared to make very great allowances for the necessarily enhanced cost of an emergency such as this. It would be grossly unfair to those in authority to deal with this question in any other spirit than that. When things have to be done in a very great hurry, on a very large scale, at a very great distance, no man, having the smallest feeling of fair

play, would be disposed to exact such a very strict and accurate inspection of the procedure which was being taken with the view to economical results as under ordinary, normal conditions. But while I state that as my present feeling, and the feeling with which I shall be quite disposed to criticise the details of this expenditure, I must say that I have been alarmed by statements I myself have received as to the character of some of the management in the North-West, with reference to the transport of the expedition thither. My particular information has been with reference to the transport of some supplies from the front into the interior. I do not make or imply any charge against the Minister of Militia, directly, for that. I have no grounds upon which I could make or imply any such charge against him, because I do not know what has reached his ears, or whether it reached his ears in time to mend the abuses, for so they seem to me, from the information I have received, that have grown up in those remote districts. I am afraid it will be found that some of the hon. gentleman's officers—and I once again say he was obliged, in a hurry, to find men to do the duty, a duty to which they were unaccustomed, and therefore I am not surprised that there were mistakes—made contracts of a most extravagant character, and that there was a waste of force and energy, and an expenditure on a scale and with a profusion which it is extremely difficult to understand. That being the state of the case, as stated to me, I am anxious to know what, from the hon. gentleman's information, this estimate divides itself into, in the general sense in which I have put it, and whether it covers the whole cost of this branch of expenditure.

Mr. CARON. I can state to the hon. gentleman that when it became necessary for the Department of Militia to send in, at a moment's notice, some 5,000 men, to meet the immediate necessity, I felt, as ever hon. gentleman will understand, the full responsibility which devolved upon me. I felt it was imperative for the Department of Militia, that it was due to the country and to the volunteers who are sacrificing their business to fight the battles of their country, to make every provision so that these volunteers would suffer as little as possible in the campaign that was then opening. I am perfectly prepared to say that at that moment, when it became the duty of the Department of Militia to organise the commissariat, it was impossible for the Department to make anything like a bargain. We had to take advantage of everything we could lay our hands upon, so as to convey these supplies as rapidly as possible to the front. From that period we have been greatly reducing the cost of transport, and every other branch of the service. We have been reducing it to a system; we have been cancelling contracts where we considered the transport was too extravagant or too high, and when that transport which, according to our views, was more expensive than it should be, could be replaced by a cheaper transport, provided it would not interfere with the operations of the troops at the front. Our troops depended absolutely on the transport; the season was most inclement; the roads were impassable; moreover, the teamsters were very reluctant to undertake the service, from the fact that at the time the cry had gone over the country that the dangers of war were really very much greater than they turned out to be; and it became almost impossible for us to organise anything like a transport system. I question whether, if it had not been for the help that was given to the Department by the Hudson Bay Company, and the valuable assistance given us by Mr. Wrigley, the gentleman who is in charge of the Hudson Bay Company at Winnipeg, it would not have been impossible to achieve what we have achieved. The great difficulty was, at a moment's notice, to organise all these different branches of the service, and hon. gentlemen will understand that we had no time to spare. It had to be done at a moment's notice; consequently, the expense was greater than if we had had five or six months before us, and could use our own men and organise under the supervision of our own staff. We had to depend upon strangers. The hon. gentleman, in his opening remarks, referred to what he called my neglect in not bringing down the first Message before the time I did. When the Message came down I explained that I had been using the money that had been voted by Parliament for the purpose of meeting the immediate expense that occurred in despatching troops to the front; the $700,000 that was granted at the time has all been expended. The expenditure has been for the payment of men and for the large quantities of supplies we had to get. We had to provide blankets, rubber blankets, socks, shirts, boots, shoes, almost every article that was required in that campaign, and naturally most of those articles were paid for out of the money which was given me. I do not wish to mislead the House by making statements here to-night that later might be considered statements made at haphazard. I say that the amount of money which is now asked for, is for the purpose of meeting $500,000 for the pay and subsistence of about 6,000 men per month. Besides that we have 700 horses, the cost connected with which it is next to impossible for me to say. We have very little information about the column which is under the command of Major-General Strange. Hon. gentlemen know that the lines were all down for a long period of time; we had to use couriers, at a heavy expense, and hon. gentlemen will be surprised when they come to consider what that service, which was indespensible, cost. The general and other officers commanding columns had to be kept in daily communications with headquarters, so that their wants might be attended to, and we paid an immense amount of money in keeping up a system of couriers, who kept the different commanding officers and the Department in daily communication. When the accounts are brought down hon. gentlemen will see that, under the circumstances, every possible precaution was taken by the Department to secure as much economy as possible; but I felt the responsibility of my position, and I felt I would not be deserving of the position I occupied, if I had hesitated one moment, for any consideration of expense, to do all that lay in my power to make a success of the campaign which is now very nearly terminated and which might have lasted very much longer. I do not wish to keep back information, but I do not wish to go into details before I can get information in so precise and exact a form that it may be of use and value to the House. Hon. gentlemen will see that every precaution was taken to meet the immediate wants of the troops, to meet the requirements of a great emergency, and to do so as economically as possible, under the circumstances.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would call the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to some information which I have got, and which I think is reliable information. I understand that, in several places where corps of volunteers are stationed, supply officers have been appointed. Instead of appointing some of the officers, who would be quite able to perform the duty, some people have been appointed, taken from all parts of the country; in fact, political partisans.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LANGELIER. This seems to surprise hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. If it is desired, I can give names. I may mention one case. I will not give the name, unless it is insisted on. At Calgary, a broken up grocer from Montreal has been appointed supply officer, and I am told that, in almost every place where volunteers are stationed, the same thing has been done. I do not say it has been by the orders of the Department of Militia. I do not know anything of the way in which it was done, but the system followed appears to consist in

appointing people from several parts of the country, who have no particular experience in purchasing supplies, who have, at all events, much less experience than the officers in command of the corps stationed in these places. I am told that these supply officers receive very high pay. I do not object to that, but I think it would be advisable to give those positions to the volunteers themselves. They are giving their time for almost nothing for this country, and I think if there is any advantage to be given, it should be given to them, rather than to political hacks.

Mr. CARON. Under the emergency, I used the officers to command the troops, and I used the grocers to look after the groceries. I believe I am not open to the charge of any political partisanship so far as the management of this campaign is concerned. The hon. gentleman's information, I already perceive, is not always very correct, and I think that, when the time comes to discuss these matters, which it is impossible to discuss to-day, because we have not got the information, I shall be prepared to meet any charge brought by the hon. gentleman, or any other hon. gentleman, and to explain the line of conduct which I have adopted and carried out, and which, so far as we know, has been successfully carried out.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not yet answered either of my questions. He has not given me any apportionment. He says that about $1,000,000 of the $1,700,000 is for pay, but he cannot give any apportionment of the other $700,000. That is an answer, but he has not answered the other part of the question, whether this $1,700,000 represents his approximate estimate of the expense under those heads up to this date, or, if not, up to what date?

Mr. CARON. The $700,000 is all expended. The $1,000,000 I am now asking for will represent the expenditure for one month, under the different heads I have mentioned, which the Department will be called upon to pay.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the $1,700,000—the $700,000 already voted and the $1,000,000 now asked for—will leave us at least $300,000 behind?

Mr. CARON. It is impossible for me to say.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says the $1,000,000 represents the total expenses for one month.

Mr. CARON. As far as I have been able to give the hon. gentleman the information. Of course, I do not want to be tied down to any statement I may make, because it is impossible for me to give any reliable imformation now.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite understand that the hon. gentleman cannot give as exact an estimate on this subject as he could give under ordinary circumstances, with reference to ordinary estimates, nor do I ask as much. I quite understood, when he came to us, a good while ago, that his statement was necessarily of the vaguest possible character, and I did not ask any questions about it at all. It was accepted in the sense which he intended. I do not intend to hold him to the division which he then stated. I do not make any comment upon the fact that the amount to be paid is very much larger, because it was impossible for him to know how much the forces would be increased which it was his duty to call into the field; and if he had to get more men, of course he would have to give more pay. But, of course, it is possible to come nearer the thing now than it was then, because then he was dealing almost entirely with the future, and now, as he tells us, he is dealing almost entirely with the past, though not yet with the recorded past. Now, he says that $1,000,000 is a rough estimate of a month's expenditure for all those heads. So my remark was that, as this has lasted about two months, that would be $2,000,000, and that would leave us $300,000 behind, or about that.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that the expenditure has been increasing every day. When I asked for the $700,000 we had a very few battalions called out. They were going to the front; but the great expenditure which was incurred when they left the line of railway to go into the interior, increased our expenditure enormously. The hon. gentleman cannot have the least idea of how rapidly the expenditure increased as soon as our troops left the line of railway. The different services, as I have tried to explain, had to be organised immediately, and the expenditure for transport was very large indeed. I have given the hon. gentleman every information which I possess; and I do not believe that it is possible, or could have been possible, to make it any more explicit than I have done, because I have not the information which will permit me to make an estimate, and tell the House exactly how the expenditure is divided.

Committee rose and reported the resolution.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolution reported from Committee of Supply.

That a sum not exceeding $1,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty, for the purpose of meeting the expenses incurred during the year ending the 30th June, 1885, in connection with the troubles of the North-West Territories; this sum being in addition to the amount of $700,000 voted in Committee of Supply on Thursday, the 23rd of April, last.

Mr. CARON moved the first reading of the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has heard the statement which I made with reference to his proposal a little while ago, that this report should be received now. I pointed out that, on the first occasion when a vote of credit for the operations of the war was asked, a Message was brought down, submitted to the House, and left on the Table for many days before any action was taken upon it, and then we were called upon to act upon the score of a public emergency, which caused the hon. gentleman to invite us to suspend all the rules and proceed immediately to a concurrence in the resolution, in order that he might get money which he required at that instant. I pointed out at that time the inconvenience of that course, and that I did not perceive how the hon. gentleman could justify those delays which had resulted in the emergency at that moment. Notwithstanding, I yielded, since he stated that the emergency existed. I did not expect a recurrence of the same procedure, and on this occasion the hon. gentleman has had ample opportunity, from week to week and from month to month, to know when his resources were getting low, and when he would want more money, and when it would be necessary to bring down a Message asking for more money. At least a week ago he decided that he would want $1,000,000 more, and he obtained the assent of the Council to that Message on the 22nd of May. He retained that Message from the 22nd May to the night of the 29th, and then he says: The emergency is so pressing that I must ask you to suspend all the rules and give me the money in ten minutes, instead of adopting the ordinary, the wise, the salutary, the constitutional practice of the House in regard to votes of money. Now, the hon. gentleman has not answered that observation. Before I can give my consent to the suspension of the rule, I think it is fitting we should have some explanation of the circumstance to which I have alluded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The circumstances have materially altered since then. The fortunate results of the action of our little army have been such that we hope they are nearly approaching to the suppression of the rebellion and the restoration of peace. At one time it looked as if we were threatened with a long war, and we might have had to ask for a larger sum. As regards my hon. friend asking for an explanation just now, I am going to follow

this motion with another, that when this House adjourns it stands adjourned until Monday at half-past one o'clock, as my hon. friend, I think, would like to have concurrence in this resolution, so that he may utilise it on Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. I am unable to observe the validity of the hon. gentleman's explanation. On the 22nd of May the Government decided that they wanted a million for the war, and they obtained His Excellency's assent to a Message to this House asking for a million. The hon. gentleman says he waited from day to day to know whether he would not be wanting some more money, and that was the reason he did not submit that Message. He knew he wanted that much, at any rate, and he thought he might want some more. But now that the war is going to finish, and he will want less money, he asks for the million at once. The emergency has got greater, the pressure has got more extreme, just as the necessities of the Government got less. There is really no excuse, when, on the 22nd of May, that million was wanted, why the ordinary form of procedure should not have been observed. I wish to emphasise that proposition, because you will observe how rapidly bad habits grow. I suppose, if it had not been for my hon. friend's generous assent the last time when the Government was asking $700,000, the hon. gentleman, instead of keeping that Message in his pocket, would have put it on the Table, and we would have had reasonable notice of what the demands of the Government were, and would have been in a reasonable position to have accumulated such information as we could from the outside, since the hon. gentleman does not choose to impart any to us. But when I was so willing formerly to permit the rules to be infringed, in consequence of the hon. gentleman's demand, he trusts to that, perhaps mistaken generosity, and he goes farther the next time; for, instead of bringing down the Message, as he did the last time, he keeps the Message in his pocket and fires it off at us as if it was a Gatling gun, with a million shots in it. I therefore feel it necessary to emphasise the circumstance, in order that it may be understood, if it be the unanimous pleasure of the House upon this occasion once again to depart from the salutary rule, that it is not done without remonstrance, without protest, without objection and without a formal statement, which I beg now to make, that except for cause which indicates an emergency not capable of being guarded against by earlier action on the part of the Government, I shall be extremely indisposed, on any future occasion, as one humble member of this House, to permit a violation of its wholesome rules, nor should I do it now, except for one thing—it is not the Government that would be punished, but the volunteers, and as the volunteers are to be punished for the sins of the Government if this report is not now received, I do not propose that to their hardships should be added another hardship; therefore I shall give my consent.

Resolution read and concurred in.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose this is treated as the former one, as a vote of credit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. O, yes. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the resolution adopted this day, that when the House adjourns it stand adjourned until to-morrow, be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. What business does the hon. gentleman propose to take up on Monday?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A new measure altogether—the Franchise Bill.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 10:40, p.m.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 1st June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

GOVERNMENT RIGHTS TO THE BEACH AND DEEP WATER LOTS OF CERTAIN RIVERS.

Mr. VANASSE asked, Whether the Dominion Government is the proprietor of the beach and deep water lots on the banks of the rivers Yamaska, St. Francis and Nicolet?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say, after consulting with the Minister of Justice, that he is not in a position to give a positive reply on this point. Everything depends on the land grants on the shores of the river. In some instances grants have been made down to the water, and in other cases they have been made as far as the middle of the river, and then those grants have their effect. If, on the contrary, the grants have not been made as far as the shore of the river, then arises the question to which authority, the federal or local, is entrusted the control of the bed of the rivers. From a decision given by a high court of justice, and from an Order in Council passed some twelve or fifteen years ago, it seems that the control of the rivers belongs to the Crown, as represented by the local authority. However, if the part of the river mentioned in the enquiry of the hon. member is part of a harbor, then its control belongs to the Federal Government.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have signified to the Government their willingness and ability, under the resolutions on the Table, to acomplish the several points proposed by the president to be acomplished, in case the Government acceded to the terms of his letter of the 18th March last, viz.: 1. To complete the road; its equipment, fixed and rolling, improvements and terminals, between Montreal and Coal Harbor, on English Bay, including snowsheds, &c., and Quebec terminal facilities and telegraph system; 2. To extend the Manitoba South-Western Railway; 3. To complete the line to Sault Ste. Marie; 4. To secure a connection with the city and harbor of Quebec; 5. With reasonable aid from the Government, to extend the Canadian Pacific Railway system to the ocean ports of the Maritime Provinces; 6. To aid indirectly in securing the early completion of the Ontario division to the Detroit river; 7. To remove forever all necessity for any further applications to the Government for assistance on the part of the company.

Mr. POPE. I am not aware of any correspondence having taken place since the resolutions were laid on the Table.

SALE OF TICKETS ON THE CHATHAM BRANCH OF THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Is it true, as stated in the Miramichi *Advance*, of the 21st May, that the Government refuse to allow Intercolonial Railway tickets to be sold at Chatham station, of the Chatham branch road? If so, why so? Is it true, as stated in the same paper, that the Intercolonial Railway issues return tickets from Newcattle to St. John, good for eight days, while the return tickets from Chatham Junction to St. John are good for four days only? If so, why so?

Mr. POPE. The Chatham branch is on exactly the same basis as other branches, as regards the sale of tickets over the Intercolonial Railway, namely, to sell tickets over the Intercolonial Railway to St. John, Moncton and a few other places. The manager of the Chatham branch, although it appears he had tickets printed, has never offered them for sale, and refuses to sell beyond the limits of the Chatham branch. The Intercolonial Railway has a ticket agent, on commission, in Chatham, who sells through tickets to all points on the Intercolonial. Return tickets between Chatham and St. John, and also Newcastle and St. John, have been good for eight days. Chatham Junction being in the middle of a swamp, and no settlements near, remained, until recently, good for four days only. The manager of the Chatham branch, however, only sells tickets to Chatham Junction; hence return tickets from Chatham Junction to St. John were found to be necessary, in consequence of the action of the manager of the Chatham branch, and they were then made the same as those to Chatham and Newcastle. Since the question was put upon the Table I have received the following letter:

"I am in receipt of your favor of the 21st instant. I find now that the tickets from St. John to Chatham are in order, being issued on the same terms as to Newcastle. The difference in the return tickets occurred at Chatham Junction. I have learned, since writing you, that this matter has been rectified also."

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LOCATION.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the plan and profile of the proposed change in the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway, near the Illecillawaet Creek, B.C., have yet been laid before the Government? If so, when? Whether such plan and profile have been approved? If so, when?

Mr. POPE. It has not been laid before the Government Does that answer the whole question?

Mr. EDGAR. Yes.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CURVES, TANGENTS AND GRADES.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government engineers have prepared, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, tables of curves, tangents and grades, in sections similar to those laid before Parliament in the report of the surveyors of the Yellow Head Pass, and similar to those laid before Parliament this Session in respect of the surveys of the proposed Short Line Railway? Whether the company has submitted to the Government such tables? Whether the the Government engineers or the company have been requested to prepare and submit such tables? If not, why not?

Mr. POPE. In answer to the first part of the question—they are in course of preperation; to the next part—no such thing has been submitted to the Government; the answer to the third part—the Government engineers are preparing such tables.

SAWDUST IN LA HAVE RIVER, N.S.

Mr. FORBES asked, Does the Department of Marine and Fisheries intend to put the sawdust law into operation in relation to the La Have river, in the county of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, during the present summer?

Mr. McLELAN. It is the intention of the Department to do so.

FISH LADDERS IN THE LA HAVE RIVER, N.S.

Mr. FORBES asked, Is it the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, through its proper officer, to remove the present fish ladders from the dams of mill owners in the La Have river, Lunenburgh county, and replace the same with Danison's natural fish-ways as recommended by himself?

Mr. McLELAN. It is the intention of the Department to place fish-ways in the dams for fish, and the enquiry is now being made as to the best means of doing so.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CONNECTION WITH QUEBEC.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government has yet completed plans to be submitted to Parliament for the Canadian Pacific Railway connection with Quebec?

Mr. POPE. No, it has not.

SHORT LINE TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government has yet completed plans to be submitted to Parliament for the construction of the short line between the Province of Quebec and the ocean ports of the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. POPE. Only such as the hon. gentleman has seen before the House.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government has yet completed plans to be submited to Parliament for the construction of the Cape Breton Railway?

Mr. POPE. No; they are considering the question.

PRIVILEGE—TIMBER REGULATIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. GORDON. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I rise to a question of privilege. My notice has been drawn to an article in the Ottawa *Free Press*, of Friday last, reflecting somewhat upon members from British Columbia—at least, severely reflecting upon two of them. I will read the article, and then explain the charges:

"Mr. Reid, M.P., for Cariboo, B. C., left for home a week ago on the pretence that he did not care to support the Franchise Bill any longer, but the true cause of his sudden disappearance has now come to light. He had always been a steadfast supporter of the Government, but before his departure he received a telegram from his leading constituents, telling him that he was at perfect liberty to oppose the Government if they did not immediately modify the obnoxious Dominion timber regulations. Mr. Reid therefore left for home on account of the threatening aspect of affairs in his Province. British Columbians here are receiving telegrams of an alarming nature from that Province.

"Mr. Blake will, to-morrow, formally ask the Government whether it is aware of the rumors of dissatisfaction in British Columbia on account of the Dominion timber limit regulations, and if it has taken steps to remove that dissatisfaction by the modification of the regulations.

"This morning Mr. Gordon, M.P., was approached by an inquisitive Liberal member of the Parliament, who desired to know what truth there was in the rumors coming from the Pacific Province.

"'It would be wise for our people,' said Mr. Gordon, M.P., 'not to take extreme steps, but to present their grievances formally, and then they will be redressed.'

"'But what were you British Columbian members doing,' replied the Liberal M.P., 'when these objectionable timber regulations were passed? You were here at the time.'

"'Oh, we were not consulted,' replied Mr. Gordon.

"'Not consulted,' replied the Liberal M.P., with astonishment, 'why, what kind of Government supporters are you, that the Government does not consult you respecting matters concerning your own Province?'

"Mr. Gordon then left."

Bearing upon the same subject, I will read a similar article in the St. John *Telegraph*, being a special, dated at Ottawa, May 27:

"The threatening state of public affairs in British Columbia causes alarm here. Last week Mr. Reid, M.P. for Westminster district, was telegraphed to that if the Government did not immediately modify the

new regulations enforced upon the holders of timber limits in the railway belt of British Columbia, he was to oppose the Government, which he has hitherto supported. Mr. Reid immediately left for the Pacific coast to see what was the matter. British Columbia papers received here to-night openly talk of armed rebellion and secession from the Confederation if justice be not done. It is the North-West trouble in a new form."

Now, Sir, from my long acquaintance with Mr. Reid, and and from a thorough knowledge of his character, I felt that the article with reference to him was false in every respect, but in order to make sure, before bringing the matter before the House, I sent him this telegram:

"*Free Press* says you left on pretence that you did not care to support the Franchise Bill any longer, but that the real cause was that you had received a telegram from your leading constituents, telling you that you were at liberty to oppose the Government if they did not immediately modify their obnoxious timber regulations. Is the statement true or false? Answer.

"D. W. GORDON."

To which I received the following reply:

"VICTORIA, B.C., 30th May.

"*Free Press* statements are both decidedly untrue. Please correct same.

"JAS. REID."

Now, Sir, with reference to that portion of the article referring to myself, I have this to say: That since I have been a member of Parliament I have never intruded my society upon any member, so far as I am aware of. I have always met in a friendly spirit members from both sides of the House, and have always regarded conversations held with them as of such a character that I should consider it not only unwarrantable but dishonorable to go and peddle those conversations to the newspapers of either party, with a view of making any political or party capital out of the same. With regard to the conversation that is said to have occurred between myself and the "inquisitive" member on the other side, I do not know that I can call to mind which member is alluded to. I have had conversations with several of them, and also with a number of citizens, who were enquiring as to the state of affairs in British Columbia. I did not guard my remarks, as I felt that I was talking to honorable men, I have always felt, in conversation with members on both sides of the House, that I was talking with honorable men. I do remember saying, as reported, that I thought it would be better for our people not to take extreme measures, and that the grievances, if any, would be removed. I am astonished to think that the inquisitive member even put that into the report. With regard to stating that the British Columbia members were not consulted—I am perfectly satisfied, if I have any recollection of what occurred, that it is entirely untrue. The question was asked me (and there was a gentleman present who called my attention to it afterwards) and I turned away without making any answer to that question. I had reasons of my own for not answering such a question. The conversation extended to many minor details as to the timber regulations, which I do not think it necessary to repeat, and which I will not repeat. But the most significant part of the whole matter is the fact that dove-tailed in between these calumnies on Mr. Ried and myself we find a notice of that interesting question, that one of the Minister's has just asked, shall be allowed to stand over until the First Minister is in his place, viz.:

"That Mr. Blake will, to-morrow, formally ask the Government whether it is aware of the rumors of dissatisfaction in British Columbia on account of the Dominion timber limit regulations, and if it has taken steps to remove that dissatisfaction by the modification of those regulations."

I am sure Mr. Reid does not, and I am sure we do not wish to become scapegoats for carrying any such questions on Mr. Blake's part into British Columbia. The distortion of a conversation between members is totally unworthy of any hon. member, and if the hon. member who is responsible for it will rise in his place it will release all other hon. members on that side of the House from being, as it were, regarded as the inquisitive member.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I happened to be present at the time the conversation referred to took place. The hon. member called my attention to it when he saw the article the following morning. I remember the discussion that took place in regard to the timber dues in the North-West and in British Columbia, and I can say that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, used no language or said anything from which the inference could be drawn that is contained in that article. I remember distinctly, when the question was asked to which reference has been made—I was somewhat curious to ascertain whether the hon. gentleman had been consulted by the Government, and being so curious on the point, I remember most distinctly that he made no reply to the question asked. I think it is a pity that the sanctity of private and confidential conversation—not confidential, but private—in the smoking room and in the corridors of the House should be thus violated and made use of by hon. members and published, even if they were true. I am free in conversing as to political affairs and as to matters before the House, and I do not think any hon. member should make use of such conversations for party or other purposes. I think it is a pity if such is done, and I hope the present case will act as a reproof to members, or will, at least, put Conservative members upon their guard in using language in conversations on matters of this kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The statement made by the hon. gentleman is quite correct. It is not creditable that private conversations of members outside of the Chamber, and made in confidence between members, should be retailed. But the hon. gentleman must recollect that this is not the first time this thing has occurred. We have had in the House more than one hon. member stating that private conversation between himself and another hon. member had been used for party purposes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the Minister of Customs made that statement himself.

Mr. BOWELL. You ought to be prepared to sustain that assertion.

ST. CLAIR RANCHE COMPANY.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, How much rent has been paid by the St. Clair Ranche Company? How much rent is due by that company? How much stock has been placed on its range by the company? Has the company complied with the terms of its lease? Is the Government aware that the lease is an obstacle to settlement, and is being held on speculation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One thousand dollars has been paid. There is no rent due by the company. So far, the company has not placed any cattle on the ranche. In fact, the lease is not yet executed. The lease will not prove an obstacle to settlement, and is not being held on speculation.

DOMINION LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—TIMBER DUES.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government has recently largely increased the timber dues on Dominion lands in British Columbia over the rates heretofore imposed by the authorities? Whether the Government has established any limitation as to the area of British Columbia timber limits to be conceded to an individual? Whether the Government has been informed that the sawmilling industry in British Columbia is very much depressed, that the increase of dues is materially affecting

it, and that great discontent has been produced by the regulation? Whether it is intended to modify the regulation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Since the opening up of the country and the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway the timber in the railway belt of British Columbia has been greatly enhanced in value; and on the 25th April regulations were passed by the Governor in in Council, by which an increase in the duties imposed under the regulations with respect to British Columbia was made. The area of the Dominion timber limits in the railway belt is fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council. Representations have been received from prominent members of Parliament from British Columbia that the timber industry is depressed, and the matter is now receiving consideration at the hands of the Government. That is the answer sent to me by the Department. Personally, I have received representations on the subject, stating that the timber industry is depressed, and asking for a reduction of dues on timber in the railway belt.

COLONISATION COMPANIES.

Mr. EDGAR (for Mr. BLAKE) asked, Whether the Government have yet settled their plans for modifying the agreements with colonisation companies? Whether the proposals of the Government on this subject will be laid before Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The proposal of the Government will be laid before Parliament. It is not quite settled, but it will be laid before Parliament.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 12,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to observe that the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), is present. I have remodelled the clause to a considerable extent, and if hon. gentlemen will look at it they will see how it is proposed to amend it:

"The returning officer who prepares the first list of voters of any electoral district under this Act shall, as soon as possible after taking the oath of office, obtain a certified copy or certified copies of the last revised assessment roll or rolls, if any there be in the electoral district for which he is appointed, and also a certified copy or certified copies of the last revised list or lists of voters of such electoral districts, prepared under the statute of the Province relating to the assessment and voters' lists respectively, for elections for the Provincial Legislature."

I put in an amendment, because I find there is neither an assessment roll nor a voters' list in the Province of Prince Edward Island; and so I insert, that where there is no such list a certified copy of the poll book or poll books at the last election, in each electoral district, shall be obtained. Then the next line is struck out—about the non-payment of taxes on income:

"And he shall proceed, as speedily as possible, with the aid thereof, and of such other information as he can obtain, to ascertain and prepare a"——

Now, I insert some words providing that the revising officer shall prepare a preliminary list for the electoral district and publish it. I insert here:

"Shall ascertain and prepare a separate list for each municipality in the electoral district, and wherever there is not a municipality, a separate list for each township, parish, polling district or other known division of the electoral district."

The clause then proceeds:

"Of the several persons who, according to the provisions of this Act, are entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote under this Act at any election for such electoral district, which list shall contain the names of such persons in alphabetical order, and shall be in the form contained in schedule "D" to this Act, indicating in the proper column thereof whether such persons respectively are qualified in respect of real property, as owners, tenants, occupants, purchasers in occupation under the Crown, or otherwise, stating the numbers of the lots, portions of lots, and concessions, streets or other most available description of the real property in respect of which they are so qualified, and their post office addresses, as nearly as can be ascertained by the said officer, or as farmers' sons, or the sons of owners of real property other than farmers, stating the numbers of the lots, portions of lots, concessions or streets, or other available description of the real property of their fathers or mothers, in respect of which they are qualified as farmers' or other owners' sons, as hereinbefore provided, or whether they are qualified in respect of income; and as to sons of farmers or of other owners as aforesaid, and voters on income, stating also in the said list, in the proper columns thereof, the residences and post office addresses of such persons, as nearly as can be ascertained by him; and after having so prepared the said list the revising officer shall sign the same as such."

Then I add a proviso to the following effect:—

"Provided, that such assessment list shall be taken by the revising officer as *primâ facie* evidence of value, and such voters' list or polling books, as the case may be, as *primâ facie* evidence of the qualification to vote."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it a very unreasonable proposition on the part of the First Minister to expect the committee to discuss intelligently the amendments which he proposes to make, having sprung them on the House on the very spur of the moment. Now, on this occasion the First Minister proposes four or five amendments. They are intertwined and interlarded with the clause in such a way that it is utterly impossible, for me, at all events, to understand their true meaning. I think the least the Government could do in such cases would be to give notice of these amendments, at least a day in advance, so that we may understand how far they materially change the clause which is under discussion. Now, I do not think that any person in the House, except the First Minister and the hon. member for North York—and I do not suppose that they are the only members of this House—can understand clearly the effect of these amendments. As I understand this clause, it provides the mode in which the revising officer shall procure the necessary evidence upon which he is to base his first voters' list. Under the Bill as it was first introduced the revising officer was bound to prepare his list in a certain way, by obtaining a certified copy of the assessment roll from the local municipality. Of course, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, that is all satisfactory, so far as it goes, but I understand in some of the Provinces they have no such thing as an assessment roll at all, and there, of course, it would be useless to attempt to obtain it. He is also authorised to obtain a certified copy of the last revised voters' list, prepared by the proper officer, of voters on income who are in default.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is all struck out.

Mr. CAMERON. So I understand. Does the hon. First Minister intend that it shall be a condition precedent to a man's right of registration that he shall have paid the taxes imposed upon him by the local municipality, or can he vote if he is assessed on income, whether he has paid the taxes or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. There is no restriction whatever?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No restriction. It is similar in that respect to the last Ontario Act, which does not provide that a person qualified on income must have paid his taxes.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman has made another amendment in this section, the nature of which I do not exactly understand, as the information on which the revising officer shall base his first list. So far there are just two sources of information—the assessment roll and the voters' list. I understand that the hon. gentleman also proposes that the revising officer shall get a certified

copy of the voters' list used at the last election, and, where they have not a voters' list, a copy of the poll book used at the last election. That comes back to the old proposition we have been arguing for all along. The hon. gentleman proposes to authorise the revising officers to utilise to a large extent the local machinery. He goes to the assessor or municipal clerk and gets from him the last revised assessment roll; or he gets a certified copy of the voters' list used at the last election, or a certified copy of the poll book used at the last election, and from these three sources he is authorised to make up his voters' list. The hon. gentleman having utilised the local machinery so far, it would be infinitely better if he utilised it for the preparation of the voters' lists in the first instance. The local officials have every information and material at their hand, and they can make out the list at very little cost to the country a large. The hon. gentleman knows that the revising officer cannot get certified copies of the assessment roll or of the provincial voters' list, or of the poll book, without paying for them. Who has to pay for them? The revising officer in the first instance, and then the country. If the hon. gentleman, instead of authorising the revising officer to utilise the local machinery, would himself utilise it, and authorise the men who now prepare the voters' lists for the Province, to prepare them for the Dominion, the lists so prepared would, I think, be satisfactory to all parties. We know that the local officers are not all of one political stripe; some are Liberals, though the majority, I am sorry to say, are Conservatives; but they are responsible to the people. If they are guilty of any frauds or wrongs, they are liable to be turned out of office at the municipal election which comes around every year; so that there is some guarantee that justice and right would be done if the matter was left in the hands of the local authorities. Can the hon. First Minister assign any substantial reason, why, having gone so far, he does not go the whole distance? He cannot say that he has no authority or control over the municipal officers, and cannot make them Dominion officers for the preparation of the list, because that is just what he does. He authorises the revising officer to get from them the necessary information, and if he cannot force them to give it, this proposition is wholly useless. There are reasons why the preparation of the voters' list should be left with the local authorities. The revising officer is entirely dependent on the information he gets from them. The local officer—the assessor, or the clerk of the township, who prepares a list under the local law—has full knowledge of every individual in the municipality. He has perhaps lived there all his life time. I do not suppose that in the Province of Ontario, there is a township clerk who has been four or five years performing his duty, who is not as thoroughly conversant with every individual in the municipality as the hon. gentleman is with his followers; he knows every man, and his qualifications, and if he does not know every particular about him, it is the easiest matter in the world for him to get the information to enable him to prepare a correct voters' list. That being so, why should not the hon. gentleman get direct from the local authorities what he authorises the revising officer to get from them at second hand? The hon. gentleman knows that the system of utilising the local machinery for the preparation of the voters' lists has worked satisfactorily where ever it has been tried. It has worked satisfactorily in the Provinces hitherto; I venture to say that he has never had a complaint about it. That system prevails in the United States; the judges and inspectors who may be appointed, according to the different laws in the different States, have full power to prepare the voters' lists in the first instance. So in England, the hon. gentleman knows, that the local authorities are utilised for the preparation of the voters' lists, and the revising officer's powers are limited solely to the revision of the voters' lists prepared, in the first instance, by the local authorities.

Mr. IVES. I rise to a question of order. By adopting the tenth section, this committee has settled the principles that the first list shall be made and prepared by the revising officer. The hon. gentleman is now going over the same ground, arguing that the lists should be prepared by the local authorities.

Mr. CAMERON. That question was up when we were discussing the 11th sub-section; and it was quite understood we would have full liberty to discuss, as the First Minister himself said, the mode in which the first list should be prepared, and that is the point I am now discussing. This section defines, to a certain extent, the duties of a revising officer; and I am now discussing, not the propriety of the appointment of the revising officer, for that has passed beyond the region of discussion to a large extent, but the question how the lists should be prepared. In that I am clearly in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the question as to the appointment of the revising officer, but the manner in which he performs his duties can be treated under this clause.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman wants the lists to be made by the local authorities and not by the revising officers. I say that is out of order.

Mr. CAMERON. I say it is not. The revising officer may be appointed only to revise the lists prepared by the local authorities. Parliament has decided there shall be a revising officer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. He is appointed by the previous clause to prepare the lists.

Mr. CAMERON. I am pointing out how he can procure the lists. He can procure them from the local authorities more economically and much better than by making them himself. Is that in order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. IVES. The 10th section says his duty shall be to prepare the lists.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to that, and he has to direct his argument to the question how the revising officer is to prepare the lists.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister on Friday evening said:

"It will certainly be his business to prepare a revised list, and in that regard the amendments are not irrelevant, I admit; but still they could come in more wholesomely, I think, in the next clause, where the whole subject will be discussed."

According to that, the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I at all meant to alter in any way the clause that was passed, which says the duty of the revising officer shall be to prepare and revise the lists. That is settled by the committee as far as it can be settled, but, I take it, the hon. gentleman is going on to argue that he might prepare the lists on the lists previously prepared by the local officers. That is shaving it pretty close, but I dare say it is within the clause.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think I am shaving it close at all. I am arguing that the revising officer instead of doing the work himself should have it done by the local authorities. That would be much less expensive and much more convenient to the parties interested, and it would place the work in the hands of men thoroughly conversant with every fact and circumstance necessary to be known in order to prepare an honest and satisfactory voters' list.

That has been done in the United States, it is done to-day in England and in the Australian colonies. In England there is a revising officer as here, but he does not directly go to the locality and prepare the voters' list. He utilises the local machinery in every borough and parish, and he revises the lists so prepared by the local authorities. What will be done under this clause? The revising officer will remain at one locality and send around to all the different localities for the purpose of getting information to aid him in the preparation of the lists. He can compel every one who desires to see whether his name is on the register or not, to travel to where the revising officer is, for the purpose of ascertaining that information. Take the county in which I live: Should the county judge be made the revising officer, he will, of course, remain in the county town, which is 50 miles distant from the other end of the county, and every elector who lives at the extreme limit will, if he wants to make sure that his name is on the list, have to travel all the way from that extreme limit to interview that officer. If the revising officer were to utilise the local machinery, the local authorities, all this work would be done in the locality in which it ought to be done, and done to the knowledge of everybody directly concerned. I move in amendment to this section:

That the following words be added after the word "Legislature," in the 7th line, 10th page: Also a list of the persons entitled to be registered as voters under this Act, to be prepared and furnished by the officer whose duty it is to prepare the voters' lists for the elections to the Provincial Legislature in each Province.

That is an amendment which should meet with the approval of anyone who desires that the voters' list should be fairly prepared.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I disagree altogether with the amendment which has been proposed. The hon. gentleman says it is very unreasonable that we should press this section, amended as I propose, without giving time to discuss it. It has been discussed at full length, and all the various subjects to which the amendment refer have been laid before the committee at full length. I do not think the clause required the amendment which I have moved, requiring the assessment roll to be taken as *primâ facie* evidence. I think that is the necessary meaning of the clause as it is; but, as it has been so strongly pressed, in order to prevent the possibility of a doubt, I have proposed that the assessment roll, so revised, shall be held to be *primâ facie* evidence of value, and that the voters' list, or the polling-book, where there is no voters' list, shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the right to vote. I think there cannot be any doubt of the meaning of the clause now. The hon. gentleman says: Why should we not have got the local officers to prepare the lists? The whole aim of this Act is to remove the great evil, especially in the Province of Ontario, of the local assessment system in Ontario, and, I believe, in some degree in the Province of Quebec, the assessment roll is prepared in a common sense way for the purpose of assessment of property, for the purpose of paying the taxes, but it has been found, as everyone knows, as the hon. gentleman knows, that there has been—I do not say on the part of one party alone—in Ontario and in Quebec, a struggle to get assessors appointed of a particular stripe. There is a political element in the selection of assessors who are to prepare the voters' list and there is a great temptation on the part of the predominant party in the municipality to introduce that political element. It is true that the assessors are sworn, but they consider that they perform their sworn duty if they do not diminish the revenues of the municipality, so that in accordance with that view, one man may be left just outside the limits of the franchise and another may be brought just within them. It is only human nature, but it is a fact, and, if anyone said he did not know that this took place, I should say that he was singularly ignorant of the facts. We want to get a pure list.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen may jeer, but the fact is that we want a pure list, a list which is not the selection of an assessor or a Court of Revision, but one which we want a judge to settle; and he is to take the assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence. We are discussing the voters' list for the first year, for the basis, the fundamental voters' list, under which the new system starts. The judge has the assessment roll before him, he sees what the assessor says is the value, and, unless there is any dispute, unless in fact there is an appeal, he gets the value in that way. That can be impugned. Anyone interested can impugn it, can say he is assessed too high or too low. As regards the *personnel* of the list, he is obliged to take the name of the party on the voters' list as being *primâ facie* evidence of his qualification to vote. The assessment roll cannot be *primâ facie* evidence of the right to vote, because it merely shows the amount of assessment, and the party may be an alien or a minor. Therefore the assessment roll cannot be *primâ facie* evidence of the right to vote; it is only evidence of the value of the property. But the judge sees that the property is assessed at that amount, and that certain persons were on the last voters' list. There is *primâ facie* evidence that those persons have the right to vote. You have the assessment roll to show what is the value of the property, and the county judge or revising barrister will have to assume that such a party has a right to vote and that the property is of the value described, unless the statement is rebutted. It is in the interest of having a thorough, a full and a complete voters' list to carry out this system, and I think hon. gentlemen will see it. I admit that they are opposed to the introduction of the new system, I admit that they would prefer that the Provinces should continue to have the right to fix the franchise for this House, but that is settled as far as this committee is concerned. This committee has decided that we should have a new system, and for that purpose it is necessary to have a correct voters' list, and I do not think the ingenuity of man can settle a more complete system of checks in preparing that list than that which is proposed. The judge will be sworn as the assessors have been sworn, and he will have to decide in the light of day, having the *primâ facie* evidence before him, and there will have to be evidence in rebuttal of that before he can act or before any name can be struck off. I think I have gone so far as I could go. I must adhere to the clause as I have proposed to amend it, and I am very much disappointed to find that it has not been accepted more readily than it has been apparently by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. I quite admit that in agreeing to the second part and adopting the clause we have already adopted, we have committed ourselves to the principle of a voters' list, independent of the list of the Provinces; but we are free now as we were before to take into consideration the machinery which we shall employ for the purpose of preparing that list. It is a well known rule of statutory interpretation that when one clause is inconsistent with another clause, the subsequent one shall override that which precedes it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. I say yes; and I say further, that it is quite open to us to go on and amend the provisions of this section, and to provide here for the preparation of a voter's list quite inconsistent with the provision of the section proceeding; and that fact coming to the attention of the committee, it will be for us to say whether we will adopt that provision or not. The hon. gentleman recognised this rule on Friday evening, when he had this subject under conside-

ration; his attention was called to the fact that it would be more convenient to keep open the subject as to the preparation of the list, and he admitted that we could deal with the whole subject again upon this clause that is now before us. The amendment of my hon. friend from Huron proposes that the revising officer, in addition to the assessment roll, shall avail himself of the information which may be furnished by the various parties who are connected with the ascertainment of the value of property, and whose local knowledge enables them to know who is entitled to be placed upon the list. The hon. gentleman says that the revising officer is to avail himself of the assessment roll, but at the same moment he attacks the honesty of the assessors. He says that, although gentlemen are sworn, it is notorious that the value they put upon property is not its actual cash value. Now, I do not admit that the hon. gentleman is correct. I believe they place the value, in many instances, below that which the party who holds the property would be disposed to take for his property, but I say that in almost every case the value is put quite as high as the property is likely to sell for at a cash sale. And supposing that is the case, is that any reason why the hon. gentleman should throw away the machinery which is thus furnished for the purpose of preparing expeditiously a proper voters' list? All the committee need do is to keep that fact in view, namely, that the property is assessed below its real value, and then to fix a lower standard for the qualification of the voter, so long as a monetary standard is retained, then that which would be fixed if the actual value of the property was in every instance had—that is all that is necessary. The hon. gentleman knows that if property is assessed at $150 that is worth $300, all he need do is to lower his standard of qualification, and he thus accomplishes the same object that he would accomplish by increasing the valuation of the property. But the hon. gentleman overlooks what is far more important, that is, the making up of a voters' list. He knows that he has not, under this Bill as it stands, the necessary machinery for the purpose of making a proper voters' list in the first instance. He has taken the rental value of property held by tenants. Now under the law of Ontario, and of most of the Provinces, he has no means of ascertaining what the rental value is. What is he going to do? Is he going to put tenants upon the voters' list from the assessment roll after having that information which he says here is to determine whether they are to go upon the voters' list? The hon. gentleman has not informed us upon this point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did inform the committee; I read the amendment to the committee which I proposed to lay before it, and the matter was postponed until we returned to it. It was simply this: That in any case where it appeared on the assessment roll that the property was valued at $150, that was to be *primâ facie* evidence that the tenant paid sufficient rent. I read the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. This is the first time I have heard it, and my hon. friends beside me say the same thing. Supposing that to be the case, then how is it with regard to tenants who are assessed below $150, and who are paying more than $20 a year rental?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will have to prove it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman admits, then, so far as they are concerned, that he begins with an imperfect list, and the hon. gentleman should have got rid of that difficulty from the very start. Then take another case. The hon. gentleman here proposes to give the vote to wage-earners. Now, how is the class of wage-earners to be ascertained? The hon. gentleman has not informed us. He knows that so far as Ontario is concerned——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will look at the income clause as it passed the committee, he will see it provides for every possible mode of income by earning, as well as by the receipt of money, and therefore what is called a wage-earner franchise in the Ontario Bill is an income franchise in this Bill—precisely the same. If a voter is put on the list of the Ontario assessment roll as a wage-earner, he must, of course, come in under income here.

Mr. MILLS. That is quite beside the question. The question is: How are these persons' names to be got upon the voters' lists? Now the Ontario law has provided for that, but it does not come into operation immediately, and the hon. gentleman's list will be made up before he has even that information, so far as Ontario is concerned. Then, how is it with regard to the other Provinces where no such provision is made? If the Government of Ontario does not choose to provide that parties who are wage-earners and who have a certain income are to be taxed upon their wages or their income, there would be no reason why their names should go upon the assessment roll, but there is a reason for putting them upon the voters' list. But the hon. gentleman knows that in the Province of Ontario, even though those parties have not their names upon the assessment roll, they would, through local agencies, be known to the municipal officers and to the clerk, and there would be no difficulty, even without any formal application on their part, to ascertain, in a great majority of cases, who they are, and to put their names upon the voters' list. But how is the revising officer to know who the parties are and whose names should be upon the list. Their names will not be on any assessment roll in the first instance. If the First Minister appoints a judge, he may possess some local knowledge, but how many will he know out of the 40,000 or 50,000 people, and how many of the wage-earners and people of moderate income? We have statements here showing that the tenants and wage-earners will constitute 30 per cent. of the electors, and the bulk of those will not be on the assessment roll in such a form that it may be transferred to the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman might appoint the present officers to constitute a court of revision to prepare a list for the use of the revising officer, giving it only such value as it may have as a means of enabling the revising officer to make up his list. At all events the First Minister should furnish facilities for the preparation of a fair and full voters' list in the first instance. He is, however, furnishing a plan under which 25 per cent. of the voters will not be placed on the voters' list, and yet the hon. gentleman refuses to adopt the only efficient measure by which such a fair and complete list can be obtained in the first instance. There is no other country in the world having such a voters' list as is proposed. The hon. gentleman says there is a struggle constantly going on in the different municipalities between the two parties respecting the appointments of assessors. I deny it. Is any such struggle going on in every municipality?

Mr. FARROW. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I ask the hon. gentleman whether there is a party contest in every municipality on this point?

Mr. FARROW. In every one.

Mr. MILLS. As to who shall be assessor?

Mr. FARROW. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit it. I know many municipalities where the Reform party has an overwhelming majority, and where the reeve, clerk and assessor are on the opposite side of politics.

An hon. MEMBER. Give the name.

Mr. MILLS. Take the township of Orford, which gave myself, when it was part of Bothwell, a majority of 240. John Mason, a Tory, was reeve of that township for five or six years; the clerk was a Mr. Gesner, a political opponent of mine for more than twenty years. Yet the First Minister comes here and makes statements that are not borne out by the facts. Let him produce statements showing the political opinions of municipal officers, and show that where his own friends are in the majority they have endeavored to appoint municipal officers of their own political party. The hon. gentleman proposes to take the machinery for the preparation of the voters' lists out of the hands of the people; and he, in effect, declares they are not fit to be trusted with the initiatory stage respecting the preparation of such lists. We know what a cry was raised against the little tyrant Mowat, because the Ontario Government appointed certain license officers for the purpose of carrying into effect the License Act. Yet the First Minister has taken control of the returning officers, and he now proposes to take control of the revising officers and all the machinery for the preparation of the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman undertakes to purify the moral and political atmosphere and to raise the moral standard of public affairs. That localities and municipalities are not altogether governed by party considerations is shown by the fact that a Reform mayor in this city had a majority of 700, while the city itself is Conservative and sends supporters of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is not justified in the course taken by him at the present time. We all know why it is being pursued. It is not for the purpose of getting rid of political bias in the preparation of the voters lists, or in order to give the people a fairer list, or to prevent sharp practice on the part of the Conservative party and Conservative assessors. But it is in order that that very condition of things may be brought about. We know the class of men who will be appointed revising officers and that the voters' lists will be manipulated. We ask that the municipal officers shall be utilised for the purpose of giving the necessary information to the revising officer. The assessment roll will furnish very inadequate information, and we ask the hon. gentleman to amend this clause so that those parties which have special information will be called upon to give to the revising officer that special information. But if the section is carried out as the hon. gentleman proposes, he will have at least 30 per cent. of the names left off, and those parties, in order to get their names on the list, will be obliged to make special application, or they will be disqualified from voting. I say that is not the way in which the voters list should be made up in the first instance. It is our duty to protect the voter, to secure to him his right with as little trouble to him as possible, and in order to do that it is necessary that the amendment of my hon. friend from Huron should be adopted, and that his correction should be made. The hon. gentleman has proposed an amendment providing for a separate list in each municipality. Take Toronto, which is a municipality, and the hon. gentleman will have 15,000 or 20,000 voters for the whole city, and the names will be arranged alphabetically under the amendment as proposed. I ask how is such an alphabetical list going to serve any practical purpose? The names might as well not be arranged alphabetically at all. What we require is an alphabetical list for each polling division, in order that the people in each locality may have facilities afforded them to see whether any names are left off or put on. It will be easy to detect omissions where you have an alphabetical list for a polling division, but it would be almost impossible in a list for an entire municipality as large as many of our city and town municipalities are. I think the amendment is a reasonable one, and that it should be sustained by the committee.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the statement made by the hon. gentleman must be satisfactory to the committee in one respect at any rate. During the long discussion on this measure, it has been described as a disfranchising Bill, as a Bill which is going to take votes from those who had votes under the law existing in Ontario. Now we find that the chief objection which the hon. gentleman has to this mode of preparing the lists, is that there will be on the voters' lists at least 30 per cent. of the persons entitled to vote who are not on the assessment roll at all. Now, inasmuch as the assessment roll is the basis of the list in Ontario, where the franchise is wider than in any of the Provinces except Prince Edward Island, we at least have some satisfaction in knowing that the hon. gentleman has come to the conclusion that this is not a disfranchising Bill, whatever else it may be. It is a Bill which will give us according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, 30 per cent. more voters than are to be found on the assessment roll in the Province of Ontario, for, as I understand, he speaks of the Province of Ontario, which is——

Mr. MILLS. I did not speak of Ontario, specially. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman's provision would only apply to Ontario after the new Act came in force, and the list would be required to be made up under the law as it now is—and that it did not apply to any other Province.

Mr. WHITE. It is satisfactory to know, at any rate in regard to Ontario, that the lists provided for by this Bill will give us 30 per cent. more voters than are on the present lists. I certainly understood the hon. gentleman to be speaking of Ontario; but of course we are bound to accept his statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not mean it at all.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is another thing in which I think the hon. gentleman is not quite fair, and that is in saying that we, on this side of the House, object to the municipal officers who prepare the lists—that we object to the assessors. As a matter of fact, the assessors have little or nothing to do with the preparation of the lists. The assessors go round and make their assessment for the purpose of taxation—that is all they have to do. Then the assessment roll comes up before the Court of Revision, which is the municipal council. The Court of Revision hear complaints that the assessment is too high or too low, or that some persons have been left off the roll altogether. They complete their work in that way, and make what may be called a revised assessment roll, and then from that revised assessment roll the clerk of the municipality prepares his voters' list, which, after all, is a mere copy of the roll, in so far as that roll indicates the persons qualified to vote. And then, Mr. Chairman, after that there is an appeal from that voters' list—which is to be published and put up so that the people can look at it—there is an appeal to the county judge, who in this case sits as a final court of review over the voters' lists, and from whose decision no appeal can be had. Under this Bill we do not make any attack on the assessors; they will still be the same officers, appointed in the same way, for the preparation of the roll. That roll will go before the Court of Revision in exactly the same way as it does now; the members of that court will sit as revisors on that roll, they will will hear complaints with regard to it, they will finally revise it, and everything occurring up to that stage will be precisely the same after the Bill passes as before. There is no suggestion of impropriety on the part of the assessor—no reflection on him or on the municipal council at all. There is no attempt at assuming the functions, or interfering in any way with the functions, either of the assessor or the municipal council in so far as that council acts as a revisor of the roll. But what is proposed? It is proposed that that assessment roll, thus made, thus revised, shall be taken as *primâ facie* evidence

of the right to vote. We have heard during this discussion, so far as the Province of Ontario was concerned at all events—and I think from the manner in which it has been discussed, it has been largely discussed from the standpoint of the experience in Ontario—we have heard all through the debate that under the law as it exists in Ontario, we have had a very much larger number of voters than we will have when the Act passes. In fact, I think hon. gentlemen have undertaken to prove that even under the existing law in Ontario, this can scarcely be said to be an enlargement of the franchise. Well, the revising officer, whether a county judge or a barrister of five years' standing, is instructed to take that assessment roll, which is precisely what the clerk of the council would be compelled to do if it were in his hands, he is to prepare a copy from that roll, of the names of persons who by it and by its terms appear to be entitled to vote under the qualification fixed by this Act of Parliament. When that is done it is published just like the original copy of the voters' list, and then he sits just as he would sit in review on the township clerk's copy —he sits in precisely the same way to hear any person coming before him to complain either of being left off or that persons have been improperly put on the roll. So that the only difference in the matter is simply whether the township clerk shall do the clerical work of copying that roll, taking that assessment roll as a basis of making the voters' list, or whether the revising barrister shall do it. Now, we are told by hon. gentlemen that the work had better be done by the municipal clerk, because he has the local knowledge which enables him to do it. Well, with all respect to the township clerks, who are undoubtedly as a general thing intelligent, and as men go as much disposed to do right as people generally will be, we must remember that that local knowledge of which so much is made, may actually become the very reason why he will not always get the finest kind of voters' list. The local knowledge may be the knowledge of the party interest in a particular township. The township clerk may be, and often is, a very active politician on one side of politics or the other. He may know very thoroughly what persons had better be put on, and what persons had better be left off, and with the best possible desire to do just exactly what is right, that very local knowledge may possibly be the means—I do not say it would be, but the danger is certainly greater than it would be under the revising officer—it may actually be the means of leaving off votes or putting on votes, which are not the result of a mere transcript of the assessment roll. In so far as they are a transcript of the assessment roll, there is no difficulty either way, for it is merely clerical work in either case. The revising officer makes up his list first from the assessment roll; he has to assist him in that, the last revised voters' list, so that if the revising officer was found leaving off the roll persons who were there and who *prima facie* had a right to be on, in consequence of the amount for which they were assessed, or in consequence of the fact that they were on the voters' list before under qualifications similar to those we have, he would, by that very fact, establish an accusation against himself of having been guilty of partiality unless he could prove that the thing was done by oversight or accident, which is not likely to occur. So that the whole question is simply whether the township clerk—not the assessor - shall make the preliminary copy or whether the revising officer shall make it. Whether the township clerk makes it or the revising officer makes it, it is to be hung up; it is to be open to the supervision of every elector who is interested in seeing that there is a good, proper and honest assessment roll—open to the supervision of every man on either side of politics who may desire to see that his own friends are on the roll and that none of his opponents are on who ought to be off; then it comes before the revising officer, just as to-day it comes before the judge sitting as final revising officer of the voters' list. It does seem to me that the attempt to make out that this is a means to get an improper list must utterly fail, seeing that the final revised list is to be made by the very officer who at present makes it, the county judge, and in the next place because the work of the local officials is taken as *primâ facie* evidence of the right of the parties whose names are on the roll to vote. I think we had better adopt the clause amended as the First Minister proposes, and reject the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. TROW. The reasoning of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is not logical if he says that a total stranger to a municipality, not acquainted with the circumstances of the case, and perhaps not knowing a single individual there, is better qualified to make up the voters' list than the assessor and clerk, who may have been a resident in the municipality for a quarter of a century, and has a character to sustain in the neighborhood. In regard to the remarks of the hon. First Minister to the effect that the assessors are partisans, I deny that entirely. In the county of Perth, which I can best speak for, the assessors are the best men to prepare the preliminary list for the revising officer; and notwithstanding what the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) and the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) says about their being political partisans, I deny it; any of them that I am acquainted with are just and honorable men. In one particular township in my own riding, where I had 150 majority, all of the officials are Conservatives, which proves that the Reformers of that township are not anxious for office. The hon. member for North Perth will not get great credit from the municipalities in that county for stating that the officials are placed in their positions as political partisans for a particular purpose. The rolls I have seen in the different municipalities are generally honestly made up, and I think the hon. First Minister should certainly utilise the officials who prepare the rolls now, who are familiar with the work, and who could do it better and more cheaply in every respect than a stranger.

Mr. HESSON. I must rise for about the fifth time to correct the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I made a statement, which I think is patent to every gentleman who has canvassed a municipality in Ontario, either for township or for county purposes, that elections are carried on political grounds. I am sure my hon. friend should not be the gentleman to complain of that or to suggest that it is not the case, for he had the pleasure of representing one township as reeve for 21 years; no Conservative dare oppose him, because there was a Grit majority of 300 in the township. I ask him whether during 21 years they had a Conservative reeve in that township, a Conservative assessor, or a Conservative collector. Why, Sir, even to the fence viewers and the road masters, the officials were Grits. On the other hand, to show the liberality of the Conservative party, in the city of Stratford, where my hon. friend and myself reside, we have to-day a Grit mayor, and we have allowed Grits every year to have seats in the council without attempting to oppose them, although my hon. friend knows that we have carried every ward in that city except one for years when we choose to contest them. But I rose to correct again, for the fifth or sixth time, what my hon. friend charges me with—that I charged the assessors with doing what was unfair, and with doing it in a fraudulent way. The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) charged me in this way:

"I think it was the hon. member for North Perth who said that great injustice and frauds were committed by the municipal councils."

Now, I never made use of such a word as frauds, or said that great injustice was done. I pointed out the fact that the elections were contested in the townships and towns and cities of Canada on political principles, that the asses-

sors were appointed on political principles, and that the courts of revision were appointed from majorities obtained according to their political principles, and that if this Bill were all that hon. gentlemen opposite said it was and simply brought into this House for a political purpose, it was not worse than the old state of things. That was the nature of my remarks. What I said in reply to the hon. gentleman was this:

"It was well known to all the members from Ontario that the elections in the main were carried very largely upon political grounds, and that the councillors were so elected in the first place, and that they appointed the assessors who made out the rolls, and that the courts of revision were appointed in a similar way. I also urged that the leader of the Opposition was responsible for bringing party politics in the election of the councillors, because he advised his friends to look after the voters' lists, and that consequently the object was to have the preparation of the voters' lists in partisan hands."

I have to correct a misrepresentation of my remarks again. I would like hon. gentlemen to cease misrepresenting me and quote my exact words, when they do quote me at all; they have no right to suppose that I will be here on every occasion to correct them when they attribute to me the remarks I never made. I would not notice this were it not due to myself and to a class of citizens before whom I wish to stand right, especially the Conservatives who act honestly in politics; I cannot say so much of both sides. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) said:

"I have more confidence in the Tories than the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) appears to have, because I heard him declare in this House that he would not believe the assessors, a great many of them, under oath."

I never said anything of the kind. I defy any gentleman to look up *Hansard*, I defy any hon. gentleman who was in this House when I made a few remarks on this question, to say that I ever used such words. The hon. gentleman misquoted me, and, as I happened by mere accident to be in my seat at the time, I immediately rose and set him right in the following words:

"I rise to correct the hon. gentleman. He is entirely misrepresenting my statement again. I said nothing of the kind, and if the hon gentleman had been present he would not have dared to say so. I repeat again, that what I said was this: That the municipal elections in Ontario were generally held on political principles, and the councillors being so elected, the assessors were consequently so appointed, and the Courts of Revision were appointed upon the same principle, each side always endeavoring to obtain a majority of their own political friends, whether Grit or Conservative, as representing the county or town. That course, I said, was advised by the leader of the Reform party at Toronto, who told them to look after the voters' list. The voters' lists were therefore prepared in the manner I have described—first, by election of members of the council who were of a particular stripe, then by the appointment of an assessor of the same stripe, by the majority of the Court of Revision of the same stripe. If the hon. gentleman denies that, then he denies what no other gentleman in the House would deny who has fought the municipal elections in the Province of Ontario."

I say that the elections in the townships, towns and cities of Ontario, and the hon. gentleman knows it well are so conducted, and if this Bill had the effect simply of carrying on the same state of things, matters will be no worse than they are.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman, wincing under the castigation he is receiving from the corporations in his ridings for having charged those municipal bodies with being partisans——

Mr. HESSON. Quote my words.

Mr. TROW. To satisfy the hon. gentleman I will read what he said:

"The hon. gentleman says that persons should be elected for the purpose of preparing voters' lists. Now, we elect a council for the very purpose of appointing the assessors, and the hon. gentleman knows, and every member of this House knows, that not only are the councils elected on political principles, but the assessors are appointed on political principles. My hon. friend knows it perfectly well. He knows that the great struggle has been between the parties on that point for years. I give him my own county as an instance; I do not think there is a single township in which the assessors have not been elected on that principle for years. In the city in which I have lived for the last forty years that battle has been fought out from year to year between the two great parties. My hon. friend will not be in any better position if the council are taken, in the first place, upon the principle, and they choose their assessors. What better would it be if this suggestion is carried out? I think it would be very much better, and we will get rid of some portions of these partisan struggles, and it will be in the interests of the country if we could have gentlemen appointed by the Government for this purpose, gentlemen who have reputations, and who are responsible to this House. I do not think any gentleman would value his position so low that he would be willing to place it in the hands of his party, and say: I will sacrifice my reputation for the paltry pittance you give me as a salary to discharge that work. I think it is asking too much of the members of this House to believe that we should get rid of the political principle by still leaving the appointment in the hands of the electors. My hon. friend must know that has been the trouble in the past."

Mr. HESSON. Does my hon. friend find the word "fraud" there, or that I would not believe the assessors on oath?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think it would be well if the right hon. gentleman would define to the committee what part the revised assessment roll and the voters' lists, as finally revised, are going to play in preparing the lists under this Act. In the amendment he has placed before the committee, he stated that the assessment roll is to be taken as *primâ facie* evidence of a man's right to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of the value of property.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Of the value of property. But I find that the amendment says that is only a part of the evidence, that he is to take such other evidence as he thinks right in making up the voters' lists. If the assessment roll, as finally revised, were to be taken as the absolute basis of the voters list, and then additions made to it or names struck off, at the final revision of the revising officer, a great part of the difficulty would be obviated. There would then simply remain the question of expense, which is a question for the Government to take hold of; this side of the House is not responsible for it. But if, as the Act at present provides, the revising officer is only to take the assessment roll as as evidence of valuation, and may of his own will and motion reject such names or put on such names as he may see fit, the same difficulty exists; we will have still a person appointed for a partisan purpose, who may enter only such names as suits himself and then shall have the final revision of the voters' lists. I was sorry to hear the remarks made to-day and on a former occasion regarding the assessors and municipal clerks. It has been stated again and again that the reason for taking this matter out of their hands is because, as a general rule, they are partisans. I submit that if there is any force at all in that objection, it applies much more forcibly to this Bill; because in the case of the assessors there is a remedy provided, sure, quick and decisive, should they act in a partisan manner, whereas under this Bill there is no remedy. So far as the assessor is concerned, he performs his duty under oath.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will he not still take the same oath as before?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is an insult to any assessor to insinuate that he will perjure himself or violate his oath. But it does not rest there. There is an appeal from the assessor to the Court of Revision.

Mr. McCALLUM. What is the appeal for?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is against under-valuation or over-valuation. It is free to every man who thinks he is wrongly kept off the assessors roll, or who thinks his property valued too low or too high. Each one of the five gentlemen who compose the revision court takes a solemn oath before commencing his duties, and I believe that justice is, as a rule, done both to the Reformers and Conservatives. A great point is tried to be made out of the complexion of the council. I have only to say that in the township in which I live, which gives 400 of a Reform majority, in which I myself, running for reeve, have had 700 of a majority, I have never known, in my experience, of a council altogether

Reform. There have always been Conservatives in it; we have even had a Conservative reeve, and once gave a Conservative warden to the county. But the matter does not end there. If any man feels aggrieved with the decision of the Court of Revision, he has an appeal to the county judge, and, so far as I know, those appeals have always been fairly dealt with in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. McCALLUM. Would not that be the same under this Act?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This Act, in effect, declares that the assessor is not to be trusted, that the Court of Revision is not to be trusted, that the clerk of the township is not to be trusted, and finally that the county judge is not to be trusted.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McCALLUM. I only desire to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot allow interruptions, unless the hon. gentleman who is speaking permits them.

Mr. McCALLUM. I stated——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The right hon. gentleman who proposes this Bill declares that the voters' list, prepared in the manner I have described, is not a pure list, and that the object of this Bill is to produce a pure list. He, in effect, says that the eight men who are now engaged in getting up and revising the lists, and who do their work under oath, are not able to get up a pure list; and he proposes that the whole thing shall be left to the judgment of one of them, the county judge or of some one else whom he may appoint, and that all the others who now have anything to do with the preparation of the voters' list are not to be trusted. It will be an intolerable hardship if the alphabetical list is to be made for the whole municipality, instead of for each polling sub-division, because I know townships where there are from 2,000 to 2,500 voters, and it will entail an enormous amount of labor to separate these, while it is a simple matter in a polling sub-division where there are not more than 200 voters. In the one case it will be very difficult to watch the list, while now it is quite easy, and under the new system it will almost be impossible to say that the roll is correctly made.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding what has been said by the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), there is a great deal in the contention that the assessment roll is not an evidence of the correct value of the property. No doubt, the assessors endeavor to do their duty, but it is evident that they do not always succeed in that. In my county, there are every five years county valuators sent round to rectify the assessment of the township, or reassess the whole county, and I think that the last time such county assessment was made there was a difference of about $2,000,000 in the amount as assessed by the local assessors and the county valuators. I know of cases where land of equal value on different sides of a township line is very differently assessed. I believe the township assessors endeavor to do their duty fairly, as they are sworn to do; still, they have different views as to the value of property. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) contended that we have power to compel municipal officers to make up those lists. If they are appointed for that purpose and paid for it, I think we have, but not otherwise for they receive their instructions from the municipal governments. It was also contended that the officers entrusted with this duty under this Act could not get a copy of the voters' list. My experience is that these voters' lists are on sale in every township or county for a price ranging from 10 cents to 20 cents, so that it would be very easy for the revising officer to get a copy. The hon. member for Bothwell contends that 25 or 30 per cent. of those entitled to vote under this Bill would not be found on the voters' list of the Province. That is an amusing contention in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman the other day alleged that the Ontario franchise gave votes to a large number who would not be entitled to vote under this Bill. That is in keeping with most of what the hon. gentleman says in this House. Now, there was another argument something like this: That the clerk of the municipality would be the best party to prepare the voters' list, because he was acquainted with the people and had this duty to perform every year. He has nothing of the kind to do. He can only copy the list after it has been revised by the assessor and municipal council of the municipality, and he has no more to do than the clerk who will be employed by the judge to copy the revised voters' list from the assessment roll which he receives from the clerk of the municipality. He has only to keep what is given to him by the municipal council after the assessment has been made, and after the municipal officers have revised that list. There is a great deal of force in the contention of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) that the very knowledge the township clerk possesses ought to unfit him for the discharge of that duty. And why would the judge be more likely to do it impartially than the clerk? For the reason that he is not acquainted with the political leanings of the voters in the township; he is not interested in knowing whether a man is a Conservative or a Reformer when there is an application made to him to put that name on or strike it off. He has an entirely different duty to perform, and the less he knows about the people of the township the better. The only thing he needs to know, after he accepts the revised assessment roll as *primâ facie* evidence of the value of the property upon which a party shall be entitled to vote, is the value of that property; he does not want to know anything about that person's politics, and that is the reason why he is likely to do his duty impartially.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) and some other members, in considering the wording of this clause, seem to forget that in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion there are districts with numerous settlers where there are no voters' lists at all, and where there is no township laid off and no assessment roll or anything of that kind. In these cases there ought to be some provision made whereby it may be ascertained what people are living there and what property they are possessed of that would entitle them to vote. In my district with its 55,000 people there are some places where the polling stations are 100 miles apart; that district is 900 miles from east to west, and 300 miles from north to south. It is not like those little constituencies that you can drive around in a day and make up the assessment rolls. I think these unorganised districts should be taken into account as well as these organised districts where you have assessment rolls, and I think this provision very fair and very ample for that purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. When the First Minister addressed the committee on Thursday last, he stated that the revising officer would be bound by the assessment roll, and that he was anxious to have the power and duties of the revising officer correspond as nearly as possible, *mutatis mutandis*, with the powers of the revising officer in England, and I presume that we are proceeding now with that object in view. Now, if the English statute is to be our guide at all, we find by it that the revising officer has very different duties to perform from those which it is proposed to assign to the revising officer here; and the remarks I made on Friday night, which resulted in the First Minister recommending the proviso to the 12th section, were with a view to following

out the line that he indicated and to harmonise this measure with the English Act. Now if we look at the English Act 41-42 Vic., cap., 26, we find that the lists are prepared by the overseers who are municipal officers, and then they are dealt with by the revising officers, the revising officers have nothing to do with the original preparation of the lists; and I am anxious, if possible, that this Bill should provide that the assessment lists shall be binding upon the revising officer in the first place. Now, I see a great distinction between the proposition now made by the First Minister and the position which I think should be taken. I suggest that the assessmant rolls should be, in the first instance, binding on the revising officer to this extent: That he should examine them and that the name of every person appearing by the assessment roll to be that of a duly qualified elector, should be transferred, without any discretion on the part of the revising officer to this preliminary list. If, however, you simply say, as the proviso offered says, that the revising officer shall take the assessment roll and voters' list as *primâ facie* evidence, it still leaves him judicial powers before he has prepared his preliminary list. He can judicially hold that he has reason to discredit the assessment rolls, and he can ignore them entirely in the first instance. Now, it appears to me that after a person, claiming to be an elector, has had his qualification approved by the assessor, after the Court of Revision has sat to correct mistakes, there is a fair presumption that all mistakes have been corrected; there is a fair presumption that all persons whose names appear on that revised assessment roll, and who by that roll appear to possess the necessary property qualification, are entitled to vote. At that stage it ought not, I submit, to be in the power of the revising officer, on any unauthentic information he may obtain *ex parte*, to ignore the revised assessment rolls. Therefore the distinction between the amendment which I placed in your hands and the proviso is this: That in dealing with the names of the class of people to which I have referred the revising officer shall simply have ministerial duties, and that it shall be his duty to transfer from the assessment roll to his primary list—called by the First Minister the fundamental list—all names which appear on the revised assessment roll. It does not deprive him of any power later on to correct mistakes occasioned by mistakes in the assessment roll, if they are brought to his notice. The English Act states that the revising officer shall only have such power as would follow if the committee were to adopt the suggestion I have made. He simply can correct. I do not find there is any provision whereby a revising officer can overrule the overseer's estimate of value. His powers and functions are set forth in section 28 of the English Act. With respect to the illustration furnished by the First Minister, namely, that persons might be placed on the assessment roll who were aliens and therefore not entitled to vote, I do not see that is any reason for discrediting the assessment roll. It is true that names of persons may appear on such roll who are not able to vote. The revision of such names is the sort of work the revising officer is to do, unless it is still left to be done by the machinery of the Election Act. Under the English Act, sub-section 7, the revising officer has to deal with that class of cases. When the primary list is made up the court is held, and if there is such an objection as has been suggested, that for example a certain person is an alien or is civilly dead in any way so that he cannot enjoy civil rights, then the revising officer, on evidence being adduced, can strike the name off the list. That appears to be the right time to strike it off. The presumption of the law is that all persons placed on the roll enjoy all civil rights. All I ask is that this presumption shall be allowed to stand good until the revising officer has held his court, when legal evidence must be given in order to adjust the rights of parties. For these reasons I think the provision proposed does not go far enough; I recognise the intention of the First Minister, and I still hope the hon. gentleman will meet the objection I have made. What I ask is, that so far as regards the assessment roll and the voters' list, the revising officer shall, in the first instance, be obliged to transfer the names from the assessment roll to the primary list, instead of at that stage giving any judicial decision.

Mr. VAIL. The great objection I have to the proposal is that it will be quite impossible to prepare a satisfactory and correct list without a large expenditure of public money. Our present mode in Nova Scotia is for the municipalities to appoint assessors. They are obliged to furnish revisers with a copy of the assessment list. The revisers revise the lists, and they are obliged to furnish the clerk of the peace with copies, and from that list the sheriff makes up the list of voters. It is a simple and inexpensive method. Let us suppose that a revising officer has been appointed, and he proceeds to commence work. He calls upon the clerk of the peace to furnish him with the assessment roll. It will be found that the roll does not contain a number of names of parties who will be entitled to vote under this Bill. It will contain a number of names, in the case of Nova Scotia, who will not be entitled to vote under this Bill; and it will be quite impossible for the revising officer to use that roll as anything more than simply a guide. It will be necessary for that officer, after he gets the list, to go into every polling district of the county and make a perfect examination of the lists, and compare the names with the people of the district, before he can ascertain who will be entitled to vote. Take the county I represent (Digby). The shire town is placed at one end of it. Three roads run parallel through the county, each having a length of 50 miles. The county judge and all the barristers, with one exception, live in the shire town. How can the judge, or revising barrister, be sufficiently acquainted with the persons living in the county to prepare a correct list unless he personally visits every part of the county? He must do that, and go over those three roads, having a united length of 150 miles, which, counting there and back, will give a distance of 300 miles. When he has done that he will only have his first list. It is necessary that list should be revised, then he goes over the district the second time so as to give people an opportunity of saying whether names have been improperly omitted or whether names should be struck off. In his final revision it is necessary to make the same journey. It is, therefore, quite impossible for a revising officer to perform the duties satisfactorily which have been discharged by municipal officers in regard to the preparation of the voters' lists. Those officers do not reside in one locality but in different parts of it, and they know the men whose names should be on the list, and in that way they obtain a very correct list. Under the proposed system it will be quite impossible to get a reliable list except at very great expense. That is the greatest objection I have to the proposed mode of appointment. The present method in Nova Scotia has worked satisfactorily. It sometimes happens that a partisan may be appointed, either as assessor or as reviser; but it is not the rule, and very few appointments are made because the individuals belong to one political party. The people select the very best men who have an interest in the county, men of property and intelligence, who understand all about the different districts and are quite competent to make up a list that will be fair and just between the different parties. I know the Province of Nova Scotia and I do not think politics has, as a general rule, anything to do with the preparation of those lists in the Province. I know that in Halifax they sometimes take off and put on a good many names, at the Court of Revision there, but outside of

Halifax, I do not believe that half a dozen names are put on or taken off. If the Premier would only adopt that system, so far as obliging the revising officer to take the local lists to base his list upon, it would be more satisfactory in every way. The preparation of the list will cost very little, as the revising officer will have all the information necessary to enable him to arrive at a correct conclusion. Even although the committee has decided to adopt the revising barrister clause, I think we should do the best we can to assist him in arriving at the best method of obtaining information on which to base the voters' list.

Mr. TUPPER. The innocence of the hon. gentleman with regard to one matter in the Province from which we both come, is extraordinary. He stated that he could not call to mind any county in Nova Scotia in which political feeling was much involved in connection with the preparation of the assessment rolls and the revision of electoral lists. This is an astonishing statement after the debate which has taken place in the Local House upon a Franchise Bill which his friends introduced. No doubt the hon. member for Digby has seen that Bill, and no doubt he has read the debate.

Mr. VAIL. No; I have not.

Mr. TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman should have done so before attempting to make such a statement as the one to which I have referred; for in that debate it was admitted all round, it was not contradicted by a single member of the Local House, that the grossest partisanship existed in connection with the preparation of the electoral lists in Nova Scotia. His own friend, Mr. Longley, in introducing the Bill, said the great object of the Bill was to do away with the partisan abuses in connection with the making up and preparation of the electoral lists. I have before me a report of the debates when that Bill was before the Local House. The leader of the Government in Nova Scotia, Mr. Fielding, another friend of the hon. gentleman, took the same ground in connection with one clause, the clause enfranchising farmers' sons. The leader of the Government said the reason the Government had thought proper to bring down that measure, was that all over the Province the law as it stood before the Bill was introduced, was so evaded that farmers' sons went on the list without qualifications, and that the feeling of the country was so strong, the evasion of the law was so general, that he felt it necessary to bring in a law legalising a custom which these voters had followed without legal sanction. The leader of the Opposition also made a remark which was not challenged, to this effect:

"The strength of political parties in each locality depends somewhat upon the acts of the assessors and revisors, and the consequence is that the control of the appointment of assessors and revisors, becomes a matter of the greatest political consequence."

That is in a Province where, according to the hon. gentleman, they do not mix up municipal matters with politics. A member of the Government also said:

"Reference has been made to the undesirable mode of making up the electoral lists under the existing laws."

Those are the laws which the hon. gentlemen have admired so much during this discussion.

Mr. VAIL. From whom are you quoting?

Mr. TUPPER. From Mr. Longley. I suppose you will acknowledge him an authority upon matters with which his Government is called upon to deal.

Mr. VAIL. Certainly.

Mr. TUPPER. He went on to say:

"The other object of the Bill is to remedy, as far as practicable, those evils. Under this measure introduced to-day, it is not hereafter to be in the hands of partisan assessors and revisors, to decide who are to be electors. We make it law under a penalty that the assessors are bound to send up the names of parties to be put on the lists."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear," and therefore I take it that he will be surprised to find out that the Bill as passed, is, so far as this point is concerned, simply the old Bill which existed before, and under which all parties admitted that partisan acts were committed, and with the simple change that a stringent oath was framed, which is to be taken by the assessor. Mr. Longley continued:

"Those names must go on the list. This is the greatest purpose of the Bill. We do not propose widely extending the franchise, because any one looking at the Bill for a moment will see that; but we believe that, by the agency of this measure, we shall do away, to a great degree, with the evils of partisan assessors and revisers' boards."

Now, I take it that that statement was accurate because it was not challenged, and I could go on to read extracts from members after members who gave instances in their own counties where the grossest abuses arose in connection with the preparation of the lists. After such statements by members of the Executive Government it ill becomes any member from the Province of Nova Scotia to assert that politics have not entered into the prepartion of the voters' lists in Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL. If the hon. gentleman was surprised at my innocence, I am much surprised at his ignorance, because he does not understand the law which has been passed in Nova Scotia, nor the old law which was on the Statute Book for 10 or 15 years, although he is a lawyer. As to what these members of the Local House may say, it may be that they were referring to the county represented by my hon. friend, but at any rate, it makes little difference to me what they say. I think I know as much about Nova Scotia, take it all in all, as any man in the Local House, or in this House, and I do not know that there is a place in Canada where politics enter less into the preparation of the lists than in Nova Scotia, the hon. gentleman to the contrary, notwithstanding. The hon. gentleman has referred to the law recently passed in Nova Scotia, but does it provide a new system of making up the electoral lists? As the hon. gentleman evidently does not know much about the old law, I will read him one clause of the old law, under which we have been running elections for the past 20 years:

"If the assessors neglect to make up or deliver the list, or wilfully deliver an incorrect list, or if the revisers neglect to revise the list so delivered, or wilfully transmit an incorrect list, for every neglect or wilful delivery or transmission of an incorrect list, every assessor or reviser so contravening this Act shall pay a penalty of $100, which any person may recover with costs, and each day a list is delayed shall be a separate offence."

Mr. TUPPER. Did I deny that.

Mr. VAIL. If they put a penalty clause in the Act, is it an improvement on the law which has been in force for the last 20 years? The hon. gentleman does not understand the law. The hon. gentleman says he could prove that in my own county politics have been allowed to enter into the preparation of the lists. I deny it. I have represented that county since 1867, except for a short period; we have had the same revisers since that time that we had for 10 or 15 years before, and I do not think there have been two names added to the list or two struck off in any one year since I have represented the county. I have so much confidence in those men who were appointed before I was in politics and who have done their duty so faithfully that I do not look at the lists except just before an election to see if any alterations are necessary. Having held an office in Nova Scotia for eight years which brought me into communication with these men, I think I know as much about this matter as any man in Nova Scotia or in this House.

Mr. TUPPER. I think I must add to the charge of innocence against the hon. gentleman the fact that he does not understand the language of his own friends. He must

not take me to task because the Government, while introducing a Bill which they said was to wipe out the great abuses that existed under the present system, and adding a stringent oath to the Bill, neglected to carry out that provision. The former extracts were too long for the hon. gentleman to follow. Here is a short one:

"It will be remembered that when it was brought before the Legislature before the hon. Provincial Secretary it was not brought forward in a vaunting spirit as a great reform, but was introduced particularly with the purpose of doing away with a great deal of illegality and partisanship now existing in making up the electoral lists."

is that not enough to satisfy the hon. gentleman? I do not quarrel with him for misunderstanding me, but I do not see why he should misunderstand or villify his absent friends.

Mr. VAIL. Whom are you quoting from?

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Longley, a member of the executive council.

Mr. VAIL. I am not responsible for that. Mr. Longley lives in Halifax, and he may have been referring to the partisanship that existed there. I expressly exempted that city, and said it was customary for a great many names to be put on or struck off there.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) whether any of his friends in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia admitted serious abuses to exist, and proposed, in order to correct those abuses, that the preparation of the voters' lists should be taken out of the hands of the local authorities, and placed in the hands of the revising officers appointed by the Government of the Province for the time being.

Mr. TUPPER. Perhaps my hon. friend will not be surprised to learn that my friends in Opposition in Nova Scotia have borrowed a leaf from hon. gentlemen opposite. They have not propounded any policy on that subject.

Mr. VAIL. Yes, they have proposed manhood suffrage.

Mr. BURPEE. By the adoption of the 10th section, the committee has decided in favor of the revising barrister, but the manner in which he shall carry out his duties is prescribed in the section now before us. I think the leader of the Opposition has very well characterised the title of revising officer as a misnomer, for certainly his duties relate more to the making up than to the revising of the lists. The revising officer, we are told, is to be a judge or lawyer of five years' standing. I say nothing of the judges; but I do say that there are many lawyers of five years' standing who are violent partisans and who should not be entrusted with the making up of the list. It has been said that the assessors are partisans, and that we should take the duty of making the lists out of their hands; it is said that there is a political struggle over the appointment of assessors. In the Province from which I come I have never seen any such struggle; but we propose to end this struggle by appointing a purely partisan revising barrister. We intensify the evil by providing for the appointment by a partisan Government of a man who is clearly a partisan. The fact is the revising barrister with the duties and powers as defined by this Bill, is not to be found in any other British colony. No British colony would trust the Ministry of the day with the appointment of a revising barrister to make up the lists by which the members of the House of Commons are to be elected to support or condemn the Ministry. This clause in fact provides for the making of a jury by an officer appointed by the party to by tried, to try that party. That is extremely unfair. In England, it has been well said the revising officer is very different from what he is under this Bill, and I wish to correct an impression that is sought to be conveyed by organs of the Government. Only a few days ago, the organ of the Government in the Province of New Brunswick made this statement:

"The machinery provided in this Bill is that which has been in operation in Great Britain for years. Why then should the free trade Liberals of this Province complain?"

The writer assumes that the machinery in this Bill is the same as that which has been in use in England for years. I deny that statement. It is well known that in England the lists are made up by the municipal officers, the overseers and parish clerks, and not by the revising officers, and then the revising officer, instead of being appointed by the Government, is appointed by the judges. Thus it will be seen the two systems are entirely different. I am glad to see the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), in his place, because I wish to refer to a proposition he put forward in this debate, namely, that this provision of the Bill is similar to a provision in the Bill introduced in New Brunswick last Session, but which did not become law. He intimated that the revising barrister under the New Brunswick Bill had the same duties to perform as he has under this.

Mr. LANDRY. Did the hon. gentleman take that from what I said, or from the St. John *Globe*?

Mr. BURPEE. I took it from the hon. gentleman's speech in the *Hansard* which I have in my hand, and will read, if allowed to do so:

"If this same measure had come from the leader of the Government of New Brunswick there would not have been a word said against it. Look at the Bill as it passed the Lower House in New Brunswick. It would not only change the franchise for the election of members to the Legislature of New Brunswick, but the franchise for the election of members to this House also; yet these hon. gentlemen did not say a word against it."

The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

"The revising barrister is, there, not to be removed by another party but the party that appointed him. Now, if a Bill of this kind passed in this House can be used for a party purpose, surely a similar measure passed by another House can be used for a party purpose in the same way. Therefore, my hon. friends from the Province of New Brunswick would not have made that objection against the Bill if it had been proposed by some one else, but he simply does so because it was proposed on this side of the House."

The hon. gentleman here intimated distinctly that the Bill now before the House is similar to the one which was passed in the New Brunswick House, but which did not become law.

Mr. LANDRY. No I did not.

Mr. BURPEE. In confirmation of that, I have letters in my possession from different parties who give that construction to his language.

Mr. LANDRY. The St. John *Globe* said I stated so, and that is no doubt where the people to which the hon. gentleman alludes got their information.

Mr. BURPEE. I do not know what the St. John *Globe* said. I do not know that I have read it, but I know the construction put upon the hon. gentleman's remarks by the people. Under the present law of New Brunswick, we have revisers; we have no revising barristers, there are no legal gentlemen upon the board, the assessor is sworn to do, is duty and is enjoined to put a valuation on the property, which would be the value it might be considered to bear if it formed part of an estate after a man's death. The system in New Brunswick is very strictly guarded. There is not only the assessor, but, as a check upon the assessors, valuators are appointed every three years whose duty it is to value the property in the whole county, and they are appointed by the municipality. These valuators take the whole electoral district and consult the assessors in the different districts, and make out as nearly as may be a perfect statement of the value of the property. The revisers in New Brunswick are two councillors elected by each parish,

with the third appointed by the municipal council. They are not revising barristers. They are practical men who know all about the different localities. They have no power to put anyone on the list in the first instance, but are compelled to take the names from the assessors. They submit their list to the public for a certain time, and every person has the privilege of going before them and producing evidence. From the revisers' list there is no appeal. It was proposed in the Bill which did not become law that there should be an appeal to a revising barrister, but he was to have no right to interfere with the assessors' list or with the revisers' list, except on appeal. Whether that was a judicious measure or not, I think does not matter, but I have heard very few complaints in regard to the present mode of making up the list, and I think there is hardly any necessity for anything further in that Province. I think that, to take the power of making up the list out of the hands of the municipal authorities is injudicious. Gentlemen on the other side say that the revising barrister will be impartial because he may be a judge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is not the question.

Mr. BURPEE. Cannot I consider the possible or probable action of the officer who will be appointed to carry out the provisions before you? If we are to take the action of the present Government or of any other Government preceding it, we must come to the conclusion that no person will be appointed to carry out these provisions unless he belongs to their own political party. I do not believe they will go to the Reform party to get a revising officer. But to put power into the hands of a political partisan to make up a list of voters for the election of a member who is to support or condemn the party appointing this gentleman, is certainly, in my opinion, a most outrageous act. If I could characterise it in milder terms I would do so, but I think it deserves very much stronger terms. I do say that when a man has power to select his own jury to try his own case, he will be very likely to get a verdict in his favor. Then there is the question of expense. It has been proved beyond doubt that this Bill will entail a cost of $1,000 or $1,500 for every average electoral district, and the people of that district will indirectly have to pay it. In my opinion this is one of the strongest arguments against this section of the Bill, namely, that it will entail a heavy expense on the Dominion at a time when we are ill able to bear it. For these reasons I shall support the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. BAIN. I had hoped, when the First Minister referred to the amendment which was proposed when the House opened with respect to this clause, that the section respecting the position of tenants upon the assessment rolls of the various Provinces where the qualification is not entered in the form of rental, would have received some attention at his hands: and I hope yet that he will carry out the partial promise he made to the House a few days ago and enable the revising officer, when making up his roll, to place upon it all tenants who may appear as occupants of property to the value of $150, which would qualify the proprietor, without compelling these tenants to appeal to the revising barrister afterward to have their names placed upon the lists. I conceive it would facilitate matters very much, because, if these parties, from any accidental cause, should happen to pay a rental below the property qualification, those few exceptional names could then be struck off in the second revision, and it would be made a correct list in future. But I think it should be a matter of instruction to the revising barristers that these parties, where there is not a rental qualification upon the face of the assessment roll, should be entered upon that roll as *bonâ fide* tenants of property, fairly qualified, when the property is shown to be valued at $150. Respecting the mode of making up the first list, I confess, from my municipal experience, I have a strong leaning towards employing in some way the municipal officers. I do not propose that they should be made independent of authority; they may be employed under the supervision of the revising barrister. Notwithstanding all that has been said about the partisan action of municipal officers, I think that they will be found to be, on the average, of as good a material as the revising officer can summon before him, for the purpose of obtaining any other information with respect to the qualification of voters. There may be extreme cases in which the assessor allows his feelings to get the better of his judgment; but I must say this, with respect to the township clerks who would be the parties under the amendment of my hon. friend to make up this first list, that so far as my personal experience goes, in referring to my own riding, that if partisanship is the first qualification for a revising barrister to discharge this duty, I would be no worse off than I am with the township clerks. In my own riding it happens that all the municipal clerks who now make up the voters' lists belong to my political opponents, with exception of one, and he is under the control of a Conservative council, and I suppose under these circumstances he will be looked after in the discharge of his duty. But aside from that, the making up of this list by the municipal officer is largely a question of clerical work. He is not authorised to put a man on or to put a man off; he simply makes up the voters' lists from the assessment roll as completed by the court of revision. We propose, to a certain extent, to make those rules the *primâ facie* basis on which the revising officer can make up his list. I wish to impress upon the First Minister that by employing those municipal officers, who now have the custody of those rolls, to prepare and make up the voters' lists, with such additional evidence as may be put in their hands with reference to parties who may not appear upon this list, they have an advantage in the matter of cost, which will be a considerable item if all the assessment rolls of all the municipalities of the whole Dominion are to be copied for the purpose of placing them in the office of the revising barristers. I venture to say that on an average, over the various ridings of the Domidion, the municipalities will vary from four to ten in number, and it will be a small municipality where the copying of the assessment roll would not cost at least $10, and perhaps $15, in the large municipalities. Now, if it costs, on an average, $50 to $100 to copy these rolls for the revising officer, I think it is plain that a very large saving would be effected if the first duty could be imposed upon the municipal officers in preparing the first list, whether they are known as township clerks or secretary treasurers, or whatever other name they may bear in the various Provinces. They will have the subsequent advantage that they are the custodians of these rolls; and I understood the First Minister to say that we should have a subsequent court of revision held by the revising officer or the judge in each of these municipalities, so that the municipal clerk could still discharge the duties of clerk to the revising officer or judge before whom he could produce the rolls for the purpose of settling any question of value that might occur with the additional advantage of his familiarity with the subject he would make a much more efficient assistant to the revising officer in the subsequent revision of the list than would a new officer who would not possess that particular knowledge. It cannot be that the clerk appointed to assist the revising officer will have duties of such a nature as to fully occupy his time. In my municipal experience I am not aware of any charge of fraud having been sustained against the officers in making up the voters' list from the assessment roll. Any difficulties that may arise with respect to improper or unfair valuations by the assessor would be perfectly open to revision and correction by the revising officer on the second revision of the list. But it will be much simpler if in the first instance the duty

is left to be discharged by the various municipal officers now charged with the work. This is also true as regards expense. It is well worthy of consideration whether it is not desirable to effect the very material saving that would be effected by adopting this plan, without involving additional duties upon the revising officer upon the second revision, when the voters' lists will be completed. There necessarily must be more or less difficulty in transferring voters' lists made upon a different basis and from assessment rolls that do not cover all classes of persons entitled to vote under this Bill. These difficulties will obtain in a greater degree, if you place the working out of the first lists in the hands of men who have had no experience in that direction. It is important that every man who has apparently a fair and equitable right to be placed upon the first list should be placed there; but, unless some modification of this clause is adopted, it will be found that a large number of names will be left off when it is printed and in the hands of the public for review. I suggest whether it would be possible first to effect a division into polling divisions, which becomes a subsequent part of the revising officer's duty, and have the list printed in alphabetical order in subdivisions, which would enable voters of different districts to more easily check the names.

Mr. WELDON. The discussion seems not to have been confined to the amendment merely but also to cover the clause generally. One of the great objections to this Bill is that it is entirely framed with respect to the Province of Ontario and entirely ignores the positions of the other Provinces. First, there is a reference to a revised assessment roll. We, in New Brunswick have an assessment roll, but it is not revised. Another point is as to a revised list in an electoral district. Now it is only defined what the rolls should be in an electoral district, but I think it should also be defined as to cities, towns, parishes and polling districts, and that it should be arranged so that there may be no technical advantage taken which might materially affect the preparation of the lists. I have also noticed that this clause is in other respects, with regard to obtaining certified copies of the list, applicable only to Ontario and not generally applicable to the Provinces. With regard to the amendment, I would point out that as in the Province of New Brunswick each county is a municipality, instead of a township or village as in Ontario, there should be some change so as to give the Province of New Brunswick the advantage of a separate list for each town, parish, or polling district, according to the intention of the Bill. As it has been pointed out that the assessment roll ought to be the basis upon which the revising barrister shall form his list, I may say that in New Brunswick the assessors prepare the list, not so much with regard to voting as to the collection of the local and county taxes. Provision is also made for a valuation every 5 years of all the lands, and also by persons being compelled to furnish certain particulars to the assessors. By these means, the roll is made practically correct, and I am happy to say that I have never in all my experience, heard the charge of partisanship made against our assessors in New Brunswick or any suspicion attached to them in that respect. Formerly the assessors were chosen by the people, but since the introduction of municipal institutions, they are appointed by the county councils. Up to 1882 the revisors could add or take off names from the roll, and they did so, acting upon the advice of the late Judge Fisher who introduced the Bill in the Legislature; but just before the last election, it was held by friends of the right hon. gentleman that the law was improperly construed in that respect, and the revisors were shorn of a great deal of their power, and it was largely in consequence of that fact that the franchise law of that Province was sought to be changed. I am sorry to say that some of the newspapers of New Brunswick have misrepresented this Bill. They have stated that its provisions were practically the same as those of the English law, when, as we all know, it is an entirely different measure. It was charged in one of these organs that I had stated in this House that in my opinion we had no power to pass such a Bill. Anyone who knows what I said, or who knows me as a lawyer, knows that I could not have made such a statement. What I did speak of was as to the true meaning of the 41st section of the British North America Act and the policy of passing such a measure as this. The words revising barrister, as applied to the officer provided for in this Bill, are a misnomer, because, so far from his duties being merely to revise, he has the whole machinery in his own hands, and he is to prepare the lists at his own discretion from such information as he can obtain, no matter where or how he gets it. Some hon. gentlemen have charged the assessors with partisanship, but the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) disfavors that idea, and the general feeling, as shown by the tenor of the debate, has been that both in Ontario and Quebec the assessors, as a general rule, have honestly and fairly done their duty. The assessment list is not made simply for voting purposes; that is not its primary object- A man's name is put upon the assessment roll by virtue of the claim the municipality has upon him to contribute his share to its revenues. And by virtue of that claim he becomes entitled to vote. The very object of this clause, as the hon. First Minister proposes to amend it, is to take the assessment roll in the first instance as the basis of the voters' list. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) provides that the assessor should make up a list of the persons entitled to vote, not an absolute list, but for the use of the revising officer. What objection is there to that? The assessor knows everybody entitled to vote in his locality, and in making up the list he could have no partisan object in view, and if he had, he would be checked by the subsequent machinery of the Bill. Take a large district, like the county of Northumberland in our Province; it would be impossible for a county court judge or a revising officer to go through that county and ascertain the different persons entitled to vote; he would have to rely on local information in the long run. Take my own county or the county of York, it would be utterly impossible for one of these officials to ascertain who are entitled to vote in either of these counties without obtaining local information. He has to take the assessment roll as his guide or to seek information from persons who understand the locality. At present, tenants or occupants and farmers' sons have no right to vote, and their names do not appear on the assessment roll. How is the revising officer going to obtain the necessary information regarding their qualification without going to the district himself or taking the *ipse dixit* of any one who comes before him? If the assessors were required to make up, in addition to the assessment roll, a list of persons entitled to vote under this Act, the revising officer would have something to guide him, and he could verify it with very little trouble. He would not be bound by it; but it would be official information for him in the first instance, and would be obtained at very little expense; otherwise, the revising officer would have to make a personal inspection of the county and is paid by the day, or he would compel the people to come where he held his court, and great expense would be incurred, which might be saved by the adoption of my hon. friend's amendment. I do not think the amendment at all interferes with the principle laid down by the right hon. gentleman. It is merely for the purpose of getting the aid of the local machinery so as to reduce the expense and get at the information in a manner by which justice would be done to all. With regard to the extension of the franchise, it is entirely new as regards our Province, and, being entirely new, it will have to be ascertained very carefully, and I know of no

persons better able to carry out, in the first instance, the divisions with regard to the extended franchise than the assessors who are bound by the valuations made by valuators appointed every five years, and whose work is done very carefully. I cannot urge too frequently upon the committee that the valuation is made, in the first instance, for the purpose of ascertaining the taxation of property and those who have a right to be taxed, and the right to vote follows merely as a consequence; so that the assessors are far less open to the charge of partisanship than the revising barristers appointed by a political party will be. If the judges had been given the power of appointing the revising officers, there might be an argument for taking the preparation of the lists out of the hands of the assessors, and placing it in the hands of men whose appointment was not partizan. Had this power been given into the hands of the Chief Justice of the Province of New Brunswick, there would not, in regard to that Province, be a word of complaint. I am sure the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), in his remarks, had no intention of imputing anything improper to the Chief Justice, or of inferring that this charge, if confided to him, would be abused in any way. Having presided 20 years over the New Brunswick court, very ably and to the general satisfaction of the public, we may fairly conclude that in this instance also he would do his duty fairly. Had the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) been adopted, there would therefore have been less chance of partisanship; but by adopting this provision now under discussion, I am afraid will be dropping from the frying pan into the fire.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CASEY. On Friday last, we passed a clause which provided that an individual to be called a revising officer should be appointed by the Government for each electoral division. The clause we are now considering describes the duties of that individual, and compels us to come to the conclusion that the name itself is a misnomer. The person who is appointed to perform the duties described in this clause, is not a revising officer at all. He is an officer to make lists, not to revise them, at least primarily. His principal duty is to make lists. The late lamented William Shakespeare—I do not refer to any member of this House—said "What's in a name?" but that Mr. Shakespeare to whom I now refer evidently knew nothing of the Franchise Bill. Had he read this Bill, he would have known there is a great deal in a name, that in fact, in the words of another immortal author, "There's millions in it." If we were to call this individual, whom the Bill calls a revising officer, by any of the other aliases which would more properly describe his duties and functions, it would be easily seen that there is a great deal in a name. If we were to call him the list maker, the vote maker, the chief cook of the voters' lists; if we explained that he was an oracle, a person inspired, not exactly by the divine afflatus of the Gods, but by the afflatus of the right hon. the leader of the Government, a person intended to speak the words of that right hon. gentleman, to do his work, and to further his interests in every way; if we were to give him a name that would carry that idea with it, it is easily conceivable that the people would look with greater suspicion upon his appointment than when we call him by the simple and unpretentious name of revising officer. A revising officer is a person who corrects lists made by some bodyelse; this revising officer is to make lists on his own, and then go through the form of revising them afterwards. His powers are very much like those which were attributed by a poor negro, in my part of the country, to the school trustees in the section to which he belonged. "It was," he said, "most lemoncholly that poor, weak, human nature should have such supernatural powers." It is very lemoncholly that poor weak human nature should have such supernatural powers as this creation of the brain of the right hon. gentleman is endowed with by this Bill. He is in a special sense the child of the right hon. gentleman; the conception is his alone, the conception is worthy of him, the conception is one that I believe could have originated in the mind of no other Canadian statesman. I will go further and say that the conception is one that could have originated in the mind of no statesman of Great Britain or of the United States, as far as I can judge by the past actions of the inferior politicians of those countries. The idea is grand and comprehensive and thorough. The idea of appointing a political agent of the Government, a personal nominee of the Conservative candidate in each riding throughout the Dominion to form the lists upon which the election shall be held could only have emanated from the brain of the right hon. gentleman himself. It is one with which his name will be linked to all posterity, and which will be looked upon as the fitting crown and culmination of his political career. Some of us have heard and have believed that the *vox populi* and the *vox dei* are the same thing, but the hon. gentleman has gone further, he has created the *vox populi*, and he is going to make the *vox populi* himself. He has adopted a means to enable him to nominate the *vox populi* in each electoral district, to nominate a person who shall say who shall utter the *vox populi*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CASEY. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. PAINT. How many times will *vox populi* be pronounced?

Mr. CASEY. I think it will be pronounced about 211 times in the next general election, and I do not know whether the hon. member for Richmond will like the way in which the *vox populi* will be pronounced in his own county, or if he will regard it as a joke, as he seems to do now. The leader of the Government has tried to bring that voice into accord with his own, to tone it and to tune it, and to make it sound such soft and sweet melodies for his followers as they could desire. The country would have been startled if the officer referred to in this discussion had been given a name to express his powers, but the right hon. gentleman has been careful to take the name from the political system of a country foreign to us, Great Britain, where it does express the powers of the officer concerned. For a time, no doubt, the people as well as the members of this House were inclined to think there was something comparable in the duties of these two officers, but their eyes are being opened, and I intend to show in a little detail how very different the duties are. The right hon. gentleman has apparently gone some distance to meet our views by declaring that the assessment rolls and voters' lists and poll-books shall be *primâ facie* evidence. He has gone far enough to prove that the views which we have urged are sound, but he has not gone far enough to carry the doctrine, whose soundness he admits, into effect. He empowers his *protégé* to get such other information as he may think fit in order to fill up the gaps left by these lists. What does this mean? Is the officer to drive from concession to concession as the assessor does, in order to find out how many people have an income of $300 a year and how many pay $20 a year rent? Of course not; neither he, nor his clerk, nor his bailiff, nor any other of his official family will do that. He will go to the friends of the man who appointed him, to the organisation of the party candidate who made him revising officer, to the Conservative association and branch associations of the riding. The result

of the intentional looseness in this clause will be that the Conservative voters of the classes not shown on the assessment rolls or old voters' lists will be put on at the expense of the country, while the Liberal electors will only be put on at the expense of the Liberals themselves. Why does not the hon. gentleman strike out the words "and all such other information as he can obtain," and leave the revising officer bound by the names found upon the assessment rolls, old voters' lists and poll-books? Undoubtedly large classes would be left off in that way, and would have to appeal, but they would be divided between the two parties; a proportionate number of Reformers and Conservatives would be left off, and all those who were not found on these lists would have to appeal. In fact, they would be in the same position as the income voter in England. I find it stated in Rogers' Election Law that the names of income voters are not put upon the rough draft of the voters' list in England at all, and only go on the list by subsequent application to the revising barristers. Whig, Tory and Radical—all the income voters, and, I think, all the lodger voters, too—go upon the list only by appeal made through the overseers to the revising barrister. What is the object of that? Simply because the income and lodger qualifications are of a nature that is not easily shown by documentary evidence, and do not appear on the assessment rolls of the parish. It is but fair and right that persons asking to be qualified under these franchises should not be put upon the list except on sworn evidence, put in in open court before the revising barrister; and the same thing that is fair there is fair here. Our income and tenant franchises are of such a nature that it will not be improper to require sworn evidence of qualification before applicants under those franchises are put upon the list. I say, then, that if this clause is to operate fairly between the two parties, nobody should be put upon the first rough draft of a list made by the revising officer except those whose qualifications are shown by the assessment roll, the voters' lists and the old poll books. I do not think, indeed, that the revising officer should be the maker of that first rough draft at all; I think with my hon. friend who has moved the amendment, that the municipal officers alone should be entitled to prepare that. Of course, there are a number of persons not at present included upon the assessment rolls whom they would have to include in this first draft; and what is to hinder us from asking them to include those persons? What is to hinder us from directing that the clerk or assessor of every township should prepare a primary rough list, including not only those persons now included upon the assessment rolls, but also other classes whom this Bill gives the franchise to? Have we not power over these officers? Undoubtedly we have. By this Bill we direct the assessor to provide a copy of his assessment roll for the revising officer. And if we can do that we could direct him to make a separate list of persons not included on that roll. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not want the assessor to have anything to do with the voters' list. Why? Because he is apt to be partisan. Well, Sir, in the first place, he is not at all certain to be partisan. Men who seek to hold office under successive municipal councils, are very apt to become neutral so as to keep in favor with successive councils who may differ in politics. But suppose all the assessors were partisan. To whom do we appeal from the assessors—who will be Grit or Tory about in proportion as the population of the Dominion is Grit or Tory? We are to appeal to officers who will be invariably partisan. Each one is sure to be on one side or the other in politics. When a Conservative Government is in power, they will be Conservatives, and when a Reform Government is in they will be Reformers. We are to get men who will be always partisan instead of men who may be partisan. But we are told we shall have the security of the oath of the revising officer. Well, I think we may fairly put the oath of the assessor against the oath of the revising officer. It is certainly no degradation to the legal profession in Canada to say that the oath of the average honest farmer, such a man as is apt to be chosen for assessor, is as good as the oath of any lawyer, as good as the oath of any barrister of five years' standing, as good as the oath of any county judge, or of any other judge, that he will fairly discharge the duties of his office. But under the present system we have not only the oath of the assessor, we have five councillors sworn to do their duty, who revise the work of the assessor, we have the oath of the municipal clerk, and we have the judge sworn to do his duty, who revises the work of the other seven—we have eight oaths under the existing system against one under the system that is now proposed, and if these eight oaths, including the oath of the county judge in Ontario, are not as good as the oath of one barrister of five years' standing, then I say the race of five-year old barristers is becoming something of an altogether supernatural excellence. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Cameron) said that the insinuation that the revising barrister will be partisan was an insult to the whole bar of the Dominion. He considered that the profession to which he belongs inculcated such ideas of honor and uprightness that it was monstrous to suppose that any member of that profession could so far forget himself as to be guilty of the slightest partiality when acting under oath as the political agent of the Premier of the day. I think the hon. gentleman is too charitable. He is judging other barristers of Canada by his own high standing. He knows quite well he would not for a moment allow his party leanings to sway his opinions upon the most doubtful point of qualification. He believes that the other barristers of Canada of five years' standing have reached the same superhuman standard. I do not think, Sir, they have; I am sure the people do not believe it is so. They believe that the barristers of Canada, without exception, are subject to the same temptations and the same weaknesses as a member of Parliament; and if we find ourselves occasionally acting from partisan motives in the House, is it reasonable to suppose that the five-year old barrister, to whom we propose to entrust our political destinies and our political life, will not act from partisan motives occasionally? I think I could name, without any disrespect to the bar of Ontario, a few barristers of five years' standing in that Province who would be apt to act on partisan principles in this office, no matter how many oaths they took. I do not mean to say these men would consciously perjure themselves, but I mean to say that they are so subject to partisanship and their moral vision is so oblique in respect to political matters that things which are unfair, unreasonable and unjust in themselves, would seem to them fair, reasonable and just. Of course, they would consider that they were acting upon the highest and most patriotic motives; but I am prepared to assert that not only some of them, but the great bulk of them—nay, all of them, would do that which would seem to the rest of the community unfair, unjust and iniquitous, by whatever high patriotic and lawful motives they were actuated. I am going very far when I say this, and take it for granted that the officer will act from such motives I have stated, for I cannot help knowing from experience of such officials appointed by this Government how they act. It is the most charitable thing to assume obliquity of moral vision instead of bad intention. But suppose we take the most able and clear-sighted lawyer that can be named on the Conservative side and make him revising officer. No one would expect that he would act fairly. Whatever party was injured by his decision would feel that it was the act of a partisan. It is a downright insult to any self-respecting and reputable lawyer in Ontario, or any where else, to offer him such a position, to ask him to put himself in a position where he

would be looked upon by both friends and foes as a party tool, placed there to do dirty work, an officer who is to give all his decisions from partisan motives.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking of the revising officers' duties.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is discussing rather the question of the revising barristers.

Mr. CASEY. I am discussing their duties. I repeat that it is an insult to ask any self-respecting barrister of Canada to accept that position and discharge those duties which will place him in a hopelessly invidious position, a position which will heap disgrace on him in the eyes of a great many of his fellow-citizens. The hon. member for Victoria said the duties would be discharged in the light of day. The hon. gentleman has overlooked part of the duties of the revising officer. In section 55, which must be read with this section, he is distinctly directed, "of his own motion," to make certain changes in the list without notice being given. That is not discharging duties in the light of day. I desire to point out some reasons why it is far preferable that the primary voters' list should be made by municipal officers and not by the revising officer. The manner of his appointment casts a strong suspicion on his motives and fitness for the task. The nature of his duties raises a stronger suspicion. The duties discharged by revising officers in England are quite as large and wide as should be entrusted to revising officers here. What are the duties of such an officer in England? He is to take the list made by the overseers of each parish—as to the manner of making which the House has some information. These overseers are elected by the ratepayers. What shall he do with that list? Rogers, on elections, says that a revising barrister is empowered, first, to correct any mistakes on the list; and he goes on to say what mistakes may be corrected. The revising barrister may correct figures made in error—a name of a township erroneously put at the head of a list, and so on. When a christian name of a voter or a wrong description is inserted he may make the necessary correction. He may expunge the name of any person whose qualification is insufficient, in law, to confer a vote. "But this does not authorise him to strike off the name of a voter who is not objected to, although the Court of Common Pleas had decided that the voter could not have sufficient qualification"—even although the revising barrister knew the alleged voter could not have sufficient qualification. Under the English law he cannot expunge any name from the list, of his own mere motion. Look at the difference betwen the powers of the officials in England and here. One is superlegal, independent of the law, does not take evidence; the other is strictly limited by the law. The English official is not to make any changes, except such as are called for by the electors themselves. He can neither expunge a name nor insert a name unless objection is taken. Those objections must be lodged with the board of overseers, with a body corresponding to our township court of revision. With that body objections are lodged; from it they go before the revising barrister, and on the case thus presented the claim either stands or falls. The barrister is purely judicial and has no ministerial duty; he does nothing of his own mere motion, and nothing at all except upon evidence laid before him in the light of day, and given upon oath. The English revising barrister has also "power to expunge the names of persons who are dead, or have been proved guilty of bribery, treating, or using undue influence, or against whom judgment in any penal action has been obtained." That would be a very beneficial provision to insert in the Bill we are now considering. The revising officer in England is called upon to insert the name of any such persons, whether on the register or only claimants for registration, in a separate list, to be headed, "List of persons disqualified for bribing, treating, or using undue influences." Now, Sir, by section 38 of 6 Victoria, chapter 13, it will be seen that there is a very striking difference—I think the greatest difference—between the two officials. There is a great deal of difference in the method of appointment. That has been dealt with. In the one case he is appointed by an impartial judge; in the other he is appointed by the person most interested. The English officer is a judicial officer; he has only to decide on claims which are laid before him. The Canadian officer is to be a ministerial officer; he is to act of his own motion, in the interest of his own friends, if he chooses to take action. He is not to wait to be called upon by any of the voters of the electoral division, either as to striking off names or putting on new names. The two things go together—his supra-legal powers and his supra-constitutional appointment. One is the complement to the other—carries out the purpose of the other. He is appointed for a purpose, and his duties are so arranged as to carry out that purpose. What the purpose is is so evident that I need not explain it further. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman himself, the father of this Bill, told us the other day that his amendment making the assessment rolls the *primâ facie* evidence of the primary voters' list made the duties of the so-called revising officer similar to those of the real revising officer in England. He said that in one case the voters' list was appealed from to the revising barrister in individual cases, whereas, in the other, the whole list was appealed *en masse*. Taking his own statement, it does not appear that the duties of the two officers are similar, as there is something different in appealing a voters' list *en masse* from allowing appeals in individual cases. One opens up the whole case; it puts the whole list at the mercy of the revising officer, while in the other he is only allowed to decide individual cases. But the right hon. gentleman did not state the case correctly, as the duties of the two officers are not similar, even to that extent. The English revising officer makes no list at all. He simply corrects the errors in the list made by the parish overseers, when the correction is demanded by some one who is interested in each case. The other official has to take the assessment rolls, and has to make from those rolls, or "from such other information as he can obtain," a list to satisfy himself, and then, and then only, does an appeal come in. There is no appeal from the assessment to the revising officer, but from the last voters' list of the revising officer there is an appeal from the revising officer to himself. He is himself called upon to say whether he has acted unfairly, partially, or blunderingly, and if we know anything of the average opinion of their own conduct, possessed by the five-years' old barristers of Canada, we can easily come to the conclusion that they will be very unlikely to decide against the course they have themselves pursued. There is not the ghost of similarity between the two cases, and the right hon. gentleman's attempt to draw a parallel between them is wholly misleading, or, at all events, it goes in the direction of misleading, and looks as if it were intended to mislead. I do not think it can mislead any person who is familiar in the slightest degree with the duties of the two officers. I do not think that any person who has read even once what are the duties of the English revising barrister could be led for a moment to suppose that the duty of the proposed officer under this Bill will be similar to his duties. But the making of the right hon. gentleman's remarks could have no effect at all if not to mislead somebody in this respect. Now, the hon. member for East Grey does appear to have been misled by those remarks, for he said that the revising officer had only to take the assessment list as made up by the municipal officer, have it copied out, and then revise it. He said that the

revising officer did not need to know anything of the neighborhood, of the people, or of their politics, and that it would be better for him not to know anything of them, in order that he might be more impartial. This shows that he, at all events, has been misled by the explanations of his leader. That is not the state of the case at all. The revising officer does not take the assessment roll and simply copy it, and revise it, but he takes the roll, as far as it goes, adds as much as he chooses of his own motion—and then it may be appealed from to himself! The hon. gentleman says he does not need to know the neighborhood, or the people, or their politics, but I would ask how is he to fill the gaps in the old voters' list or in the poll books unless he knows the people of the locality? He cannot do it himself; he must get the information somewhere; and we all know where he will get it. He will have the assistance of a clerk, and we all know who he is likely to be. He will have the assistance of a bailiff, and we know what sort of a person he is likely to be, and what sort of information the triumvirate is likely to obtain, and we know what the result is likely to be on the list. Now, the Premier argued something in the same strain a little before my hon. friend from Grey, and therefore cannot be suspected of plagiarising from that hon. gentleman. He said that in England the revising barrister was sent down from London, that he did not know anything of the people or the neighborhood, and had none of the local knowledge which we said was necessary to the person who made the list. Well, Sir, the revising barrister in England does answer to the description which my hon. friend from Grey, in his darkness of mind, applied to the so-called revising officer in Canada. The revising barrister in England does not need to know anything of the neighborhood. He is all the better for not having the local knowledge, all the more likely to be impartial, because he does not know the politics of the people who come before him on appeals, and why? Because he is a judicial officer; he has merely to decide on points of law and fact brought before him, just as a judge of Assize does in travelling about on circuit. But the Canadian revising officer has to do more than that; he has to fill up gaps; he has to act on information obtained, not judicially, not on sworn evidence, but obtained any how, from the sources to which he is most likely to go for it. I am told that he will probably have some local information, because he will probably be a resident of the electoral district. Very likely he will. Some nice young Conservative lawyer in the county town will be very apt to be the revising barrister where a judge is not appointed. There is one class of local information that he is quite certain to have. He is quite certain to have that kind of knowledge which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said he should not have, the knowledge of the politics of the individual.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely misrepresenting me. In answer to the arguments, I think, of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), that the lists should be prepared by the municipal officers, because they would be more likely to act impartially, I asked if it was not more likely that a person who was a stranger to the people would act impartially.

Mr. CASEY. That was exactly the remark on which I was basing my argument. That is just the kind of information the revising officer is sure to get. He is not going through those districts without a guide, philosopher, and friend, in the shape of the secretary of the Conservative Association—at all events, he will not, in East Grey; he will have some kind friend at his shoulder to tell him what the politics of the people are; he will get just the sort of information he should not have, to be impartial.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the same remark would apply to the English revising officer.

Mr. CASEY. There my hon. friend shows his utter blindness to what the English revising officer does. He does not put any one on or off the list, except in open court and upon sworn testimony. He does not make the list; he can only insert or strike off a name on application; he only decides judicially on those cases which are brought before him; but this man is a list maker. Now, it has been urged that the voters' list should be made up by polling sub divisions instead of by municipalities. I think the arguments in favor of that view are unanswerable. A thorough canvass would be almost impossible if all the electors of a municipality were to be put upon one list. We have been accustomed, in almost every part of Canada where we have voters' lists, to have them arranged by polling sub-divisions, and I do not see why they should not be so arranged under this Bill. I do not think the hon. First Minister has any particular objection to that; it has only escaped his notice, and I have no doubt he will, as he has done already, take this further step towards improving the Bill in its working. Then there is the clause about tenants. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has simply, through oversight, forgotten to do what he said on the 22nd of this month he would do, and which I think should be done here. He said:

"It was argued last night, with a great deal of force, that in Ontario the assessment roll, for instance, says: John Jones, lot No. 1, value $150, as the assessed value. Then he is marked as tenant, but that does not show what rent he pays at all. But I would make a proviso that if that property is assessed at $150, which gives the franchise to the owner, that shall be *primâ facie* evidence that the tenant has a right to be registered. If it is proved afterwards, on objection, that he does not pay $20 a year, the *primâ facie* evidence is rebutted."

I am sure it is entirely through oversight that the right hon. gentleman has neglected to make provision to that effect in this clause, namely, to make such an arrangement as would make the assessment roll to a great extent *primâ facie* evidence of the qualifications of tenants. It would take a long time to discuss the provisions of this clause in detail. It is very clumsily put together; it is put together as if it had grown by accretion rather than by organisation—as if bit had been added to bit, without organic union in the section. I admit that some parts of it are not as clear as they ought to be to me, although I have given it a good deal of consideration; I am sure it will not be clear to those electors who will give it much less consideration than I have done; but it is only of a piece with the whole Bill in that respect. The whole Bill is undoubtedly of the same nature as the section in that respect. It is hard to understand; it is a bungle and a blunder. This clause alone, the conferring of such duties as are by it conferred upon a Government official, a party tool, a nominee who holds office virtually at the pleasure of the Government, is an insult to the whole community; it is an insult to the public intelligence and the public independence of the country to ask this community to submit to a dictation that no country which has representative institutions at all would submit to. Even Russia is not an instance; Russia is a pure autocracy; there is no disguise about it; the Czar rules by his own will, and not through a revising officer. We are told that in France a great deal of power is put into the hands of the Government, but never was any power so absolute as this thought of in France. In England there was never anything to compare to it, nor in the United States. In no free country has anybody dared to propose anything like this; in no free country has anybody ventured to think that the people would tamely submit to a usurpation of their constitutional rights and privileges such as this. This one section contains the venom of the whole Bill. Give the right hon. gentleman this section and the 10th section, and he cares not

what the qualifications are, whether there is uniformity or variety in the electorate. The Conservatives themselves are awakening to the iniquity of these clauses. When we find a lifelong Conservative like Mr. D. B. Read, of Toronto, giving voice, in his letter to the *Globe*, to language stronger than any which any Liberal, or Grit, or Radical, has put his name to in the press; when we find him declaring that he has seen smaller causes than this produce a revolution, we must believe that there are Conservatives who believe that they are being insulted and wronged by this Bill. When we find a Conservative expressing his views, as the one did whose letter was read here by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) the other day, we must believe that the Conservatives are waking up. We believe that the country is patriotic and sound to the heart, and that the soundness of its heart will be evident by its actions the next time the country is heard from; we believe that Conservatives and Reformers throughout the Dominion are waking up and showing the indignation such a measure must cause in the heart of every free man. Conservatives are co-operating with us. I do not say they will become Grits in other respects, but I know they are co-operating with us in opposition to the Bill, and will give effect to their indignation at the next general election; and I believe the moral atmosphere of the country will be all the clearer for the storm this Bill is producing. There is no use in hon. gentleman opposite trying to deny that it is raising a storm. Had we not the North-West troubles and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other vital matters to occupy the public attention at this time as well, the storm would make itself heard in such a manner that not even the most bigoted Conservative, the Conservative most entrenched in his party egotism, could fail to be aware of it. The time has come when the patriotic men of both parties will go to the polls and declare their opinions on the questions of the day, without regard to party lines, but having regard solely to their conscientious opinions. I am glad this much good has come out of what otherwise would seem an incurable evil. I believe that good will flow unintentionally out of this proposition and out of the operation of this Bill, a good that may outweigh the evil; I believe the patriotic people of both parties will be fused and hammered into one by the attempt of the Government to usurp power, by the attempt of the Government to sweep out of existence those whom they are pleased to consider the representatives of an insignificant minority of the people.

Mr. McCALLUM (Monck). I am sorry to see hon. gentlemen opposite still keeping on their course of obstructing the business of the country. I can tell them that if they console themselves with the feeling that there is any movement in their favor among the Conservatives of the country they are very much mistaken. There may be a few disappointed Conservatives, such as the gentleman from Toronto, by the name of Read, but we have had such gentlemen before, and we have had one, in particular, of whom hon. gentlemen opposite made one of their leaders; but as to any movement in the most distant way approaching anything like agitation against this measure amongst Conservatives, hon. gentlemen opposite need not lay that flattering unction to their soul. Speaking of the assessors, we would fancy, to hear them, that this officer had to make out the voters' lists. What he makes out is a roll, not for the purpose of making voters' lists, but for the purpose of raising revenue for the municipality and for the administration of justice, to be a charge upon the property of the municipality. Of course, from that roll the clerk makes out the voters' list, and where is the difference if the revising officer makes it out or the clerk? I do not see any difference, whether the revising officers' clerk or the clerk of the municipality copies the roll for the voters' list. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) speaks of the barristers being party tools in the hands of the Government. Why, in that he insinuates that the judges of this country, who will have the final revising of the lists, will be party tools. Under this Bill the judges are to be the final revising officers in the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman insinuates they will be tools, and hon. gentlemen opposite find great fault with the Bill because the revising officer makes out the voters' list in the first instance and then appeals from the list to himself. Any revising officer, whether he be a barrister of five years' standing or a judge, will be very glad to correct any omission or mistake he has made, in the same way that he does now. If these gentlemen are bound to continue this obstruction, with their arguments repeated over and over and over again, the people of this country, not the Conservatives alone, but the Reformers of this country, will hold them responsible for the waste of money they are causing. I only got up to protest on behalf of the people of this country. Are a few Grits in this House going to control the majority; are a few gentlemen here, who are discontented, who are looking for power, to run the people? I simply rose to protest against this course, and I will say no more.

Mr. GILLMOR. If the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) had occupied the short time he was on the floor in speaking to this amendment he would not have obstructed the business of the country. He has not undertaken to show why this amendment should not be adopted. He has talked about obstruction. I think the mover of this Bill asked the members of the Opposition to help him to perfect this measure, but it is very evident that anything which will affect the material ingredients of this Bill will not be adopted. Hon. gentlemen are very grateful for any amendment which will remove the poision out of this measure, but when any amendment is suggested which will interfere in that way, that is obstruction. Some very objectionable clauses have been already adopted. The Government have taken power to appoint their own nominee as the revising officer. The mover of this Bill gives as a reason for this, that the municipal officers are corrupt, that they are influenced by party feeling, and therefore cannot be trusted. That is why he wants this perfect measure, and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) says the necessity for this extraordinary measure is that the municipal authorities and the people cannot be trusted, and we should have a measure free from party influence. Admitting, for argument's sake, that they are correct, that is an evil, but it is not a universal evil. If one county does anything objectionable, some other county is an offset to it. Is not the Prime Minister a party man? Is he more free from party prejudices and preferences than the electorate of this Dominion? It is a mere absurdity to pretend to state that the electoral system is going to be rid of party preferences by this measure. We have not to go very far back in the history of this country to see where the leader of the Government and his supporters resorted to extraordinary means to strengthen their party. I have never heard of the evils referred to existing in the Province of New Brunswick. In the county I represent it is impossible for one revising officer to perform the duty imposed upon him by this Bill. We have a population of a little over 26,000, and to do this duty it requires about eighty-four officials. There are three assessors and three revisors in every parish, and there are fourteen parishes in the county, and these officials do the whole of this work more thoroughly than it can be done by any revising officer, and at very little cost. In the parish in which I live, the assessors know every man and his household, and I have never heard of any objection to their action. It is so perfect that, for twenty years, during all

of which time I have been in politics, I have never heard any objection made. They are not all supporters of mine, but we never think of their politics. I never look over the list, except about the time of an election, and sometimes you find one name off which should be on; but, of course, that cannot be remedied then until the next election. How is it possible for a revising officer to go all over the county of Charlotte, or the county of Kent, or the county of Westmoreland, which is a large and populous county, and make up this list? It is quite impossible. The mover of the Bill has admitted the principle of this amendment already, because he has agreed to take the assessors' list and the poll book as a basis. He will have, of course, a large number of voters on the list upon which we have been elected, but he has got a large number to add to his list; he has got to add every farmer's son, all the tenants, all the property-holders' sons; he has got to add fishermen who qualify on real and personal property. How upon earth can any revising barrister ascertain that fact? The hon. gentleman might as well abandon the assessors' list as to continue that as a basis, and let the revising barrister go over the whole county to find out who is to be added. Therefore I think he has admitted the whole principle when he takes the assessors' list as a basis to start upon. I do not see what objection there can be to it. It is impossible, I say, for any revising barrister to do this duty properly. It would take him a year to get up one list, and then he could not do it as well as it is being done now. The hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry) is a lawyer, and he ought to understand how impossible it is for the revising barrister to know as well as the municipal officers who now make up our voters' lists. You cannot find any one man who can do it over the whole county, unless he works for months and months. I could not do it in my county. I would not know whether a farmer had one son or two sons, or whether he had any sons at all. I would have to ascertain from some disinterested source, at any rate, to satisfy myself. But the men now who make up the list know all about it. They know how many sons a farmer has, they know the qualification, they know every tenant. How can the revising officer find out every tenant in a city, or town, or incorporated village? If the right hon. gentleman and his friends want to make the Bill less objectionable let them adopt this amendment, and they will still have advantage enough. They have still got the revising barristers, of their own appointment, of their own political stripe; I do not wish to attribute motives to them, but of course they will put in political friends. Now, I think it is an insult to the people of this country, after so many years' experience, after the present system has worked without friction for so long a time, when nobody has found fault with it, when it has grown up after years of effort and of trial—I say it is an insult to the people to come down with this cumbersome measure and take away from the people the management of their own affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they want a fair and honest system, that shall be freed from all party bias, thereby accusing municipal officers of being dishonest. I do not want to accuse hon. gentlemen opposite, but I say it is behind the age for any civilised country, on a pretence of getting free from political influence, to introduce such an infamous measure as this, and attempt to justify it. Mr. Chairman, I believe all these smiles and all these offers of concessions by the Government are a mere sham and a mere pretence. They are willing to pay tithes of mint and cummin and annise, but the weightier matters of the law the Premier and his followers do not pretend to amend. They are going to keep the Indian and the revising barrister, no matter what follows. Why should they have a revising barrister at all? It is nonsense to call him a revising barrister. But he would be, if you allowed the local authorities to make up the list, and then allow him to revise it. The local authorities have to assess all the properties for their own purposes, and these are the men, above all others, who know who are qualified. I say it is quite impossible for any stranger or any individual in the country to do this work. He has got to go all through the municipalities, and how is he going to get his information? Perhaps he might come down to Charlotte county and ask me to go with him, and I might get into his waggon and drive around with him. If he wanted to see a man himself, or see the property on which he is qualified, he has either got to go on to the place, or take somebody's opinion. Well, he might come to me. I might be influenced by party feeling, and I might not give him correct information. He might go to my opponent, and he might be influenced by party feeling, and where is this revising barrister to get his information? I tell you this revising barrister cannot do the work satisfactorily. He may be as honest as it is possible for a man to be, but the work is more than he can do. Now, the county I live in has about 26,000 people in it, and we have eighty-four men, revisers and assessors, in all the various localities, who are familiar with the men who go on the assessors' list, who make the voters' list, and they are just as familiar with the voters as the Prime Minister is with his colleague who sits beside him. They live in the locality. There are twenty-eight councillors, some forty-two assessors and forty-two revisers; they are in every corner of the county; they know every man who is qualified to vote. There has never been any difficulty; the system is a perfect system. These men never enquire whether a municipal council is composed of Conservatives or Liberals. The system works so harmoniously that I think it is a pity to give it up; and, apart from all desire that the Bill may not pass, I do feel sad—yes, I do—that we are going back to introduce such an expensive, and such a difficult, and such an intricate system, to supersede one so simple, so based upon common sense, and upon common justice and fair play to all parties. I do hope that the hon. Premier will see that is almost impossible—I say quite impossible—for this revising barrister to do this work fairly and properly. He has got to go all over the county and see everybody. He might as well not have the assessors' list as the basis at all. I think the Prime Minister cannot realise the difficulties this revising barrister will have to do his work. I would like to have my hon. friends from New Brunswick explain how it is possible that, in a county of 25,000 or 30,000 inhabitants, scattered over a large area, for any man to ascertain just who is qualified to vote, and put them on the voters' list. He has to see all the parties and the property in order to ascertain the facts, because he cannot know them himself, and cannot possibly obtain them otherwise. I do not see that the First Minister is sacrificing any principle by accepting this amendment. He has already adopted the assessors' list, and said that the poll books may be made a basis on which to form a list, and afterward the revising officer can add or omit names; but I would again urge that if the officer has to do this work himself it is a moral impossibility that he can accomplish it. I should like to convince hon. gentlemen opposite on this point, so as to lead them to accept the amendment. They have enough advantage in this Bill at present. They say they have no advantage. We would think we had a great advantage if we had the naming of the revising officers. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to make the Bill less objectionable they should adopt this amendment, and let the revisors' list be the basis on which the revising officer should make up and complete his list. The First Minister has adopted the principle by taking the assessors' list; but it is quite impossible for the revising officer to find out all tenants who pay $2 a month rent, all the farmers' sons, all the fishermen's sons and the wage-earning class—it is a needless and impossible undertaking.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has ventured again to use an oft-repeated

expression, that the Opposition are obstructing public business by discussing the clause and amendments. We can afford to smile at such a term. The country is not so ignorant as not to know in whose hands the conduct of public business is; that the First Minister is the sole guide as to the public business that is to come before the House, and day after day and week after week he has passed by twelve items to bring on Bill No. 103. It is rather amusing, when such is the actual state of affairs, for an hon. gentleman opposite to endeavor to charge the Opposition with obstruction tactics. We will not, however, be deterred from expressing the reasons that induce us to support the amendments to the various sections of the Bill. The present amendment is one which will effect as much good as any minor amendment that will be submitted. The necessity of adopting the amendment is practically justified by the fact that no hon. gentleman opposite, from the First Minister down, has attempted to show that this is not a real amendment, designed in the interests of the country. That justifies all the pleas that can be urged by us for its adoption. In the discussion of any measure it is the bounden duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to accept amendments, when good reasons are assigned for their adoption, and when they themselves are unable to show why the amendments should not be adopted. No hon. gentleman dare attempt to do so in this case, because it would be an impossible task to accomplish, and they do not care to attempt a task beyond their strength. The amendment is designed to save the people a vast amount of money. That is an argument which should have considerable weight. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not take the ground that it is designed to have an imperfect list. If not, the machinery proposed by the amendment would secure a perfect list at much less cost than it is possible to secure it under the machinery of this Bill. If any hon. gentleman opposite desires to controvert this position, I will be most happy to hear him.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I believe it will cost a good deal more.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give his reasons.

Mr. LANDRY. The hon. gentleman has told us that hon. gentlemen opposite are perfectly justified in having a long discussion on the one section, and reiterating the same arguments, one getting up and using an argument, and the next member rising up and using the same argument, because on this side of the House we have not tried to answer those arguments, and therefore they think they are justified in going on for ever. Then the hon. gentleman has challenged us to say that the amendment would not save a vast amount of money if it were adopted. I accept that challenge. I do not know what the hon. gentleman may have in his mind; but with respect to the amendment before the House, he cannot read it and assert that the adoption of it will be a saving in the expense. I will read it, and see if I cannot change his mind by the simple reading of it. I do not care to accuse the hon. gentleman of being ignorant of what is before the House, as some hon. gentlemen opposite declared I was ignorant of the business before the House the other day, because we are all apt to be mistaken. Now, this amendment does not propose to strike out one word from the motion of the First Minister. I start out with that proposition. The same machinery will remain there; the same duties are left to the revising officers; they will have the same work to do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LANDRY. Then I have not read the amendment aright. I will read it. It is in the following terms. (The hon. gentleman read the amendment.) This amendment does not propose to take out anything from the original amendment as proposed by the First Minister. It will add additional expense. Take New Brunswick; in the county I represent, it will add from 24 to 30 additional officers, all of whom will have to be paid, as they will not work for nothing. This may not apply to Ontario—I do not think it would—but I speak for New Brunswick. In the county I represent it will, I say, cause the appointment of from 24 to 30 additional officers, to do what duty? It will give them the duty of preparing just such a list as the revising officer is authorised by this Act to prepare. It does not say how these additional officers shall do it at all, but they are bound by this clause to prepare a thorough list. How are they going to do it? Are we to have thirty men going all over the county getting the information? If so, instead of the one carriage, mentioned by the hon. gentleman, we will have thirty carriages going through the county getting the information—thirty persons preparing that list, and what for? To put in the hands of the revising barrister the list prepared by them. It may be useful as information, of course; but is that the best way? And it does not say that it is to be taken by the revising officer as *primâ facie* evidence. These thirty gentlemen in my county are, by this amendment, authorised to prepare the list and put it in the hands of the revising officer for the purpose of additional information.

An hon. MEMBER. Each in his own parish.

Mr. LANDRY. It does not say so, as I find it here. But even if it were, there are thirty in the same county, three in each parish, if you will. These gentlemen will come in and hand their list to the revising officer, and for what purpose? Simply as additional information. It may be useful information, but it is information which he can get by gentlemen who are interested. Will not those men who are interested in getting on the voters' list, farmers or farmers' sons, or tenants, or whatever they may be—are they not capable of sending a letter to the revising officer, saying that they are authorised to vote, although they are not on the assessment roll, or on the voters' list of last year, because it was more restricted than the measure before us now—cannot they say, for this reason, their names are not on the list, and that therefore they write to the revising officer. I say that they can, and that that information is just as useful to the revising barrister as the other, and just as authentic. There is no provision for its being done under oath, and if hon. gentlemen can get over that, and say that it will not be an additional expense, I fail to see it, for I think there will be a great deal of additional expense. If it were said that those thirty men were to prepare the list in the same manner as for the Local Legislature, and then if the revising barrister was bound to take that as the list to revise, there might be some argument in it. But he is not bound to take that list; he is bound to procure all the information as pointed out by the hon. Premier's proposition just the same, though he is to have the additional information which is provided for by this sub-amendment. While on my feet, I may say that I would not have been tempted to speak only for the challenges which hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of throwing out to this side. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), whose speeches I admire, whose speeches I like to listen to—I must say that he has that way of throwing out challenges to hon. gentlemen, and he calls them cowards; he says that they dare not get up on their feet, when perhaps their reason is that they do not propose to give hon. gentlemen opposite a text which will last them for three weeks, as happened in my own case, when I addressed the House on this subject. I only gave some of my views very briefly, but they have done my humble effort the honor of quoting me frequently, and have sometimes misrepresented me, though I know that they do not do it intentionally—I know that I speak very fast, and perhaps I am not interpreted quite as I intend, but, at any rate, they have

done me the honor of citing my remarks. Perhaps these hon. gentlemen wish that I may do the same thing again, and furnish them with a text; perhaps they have run out of material, and therefore they have challenged me to address the House again. Well, it is a pleasure to give them the opportunity, but I hope that they will not avail themselves of it as a text which will last them for three weeks. I think I have been misrepresented by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), not intentionally, for I give him credit for sincerity, as I do every hon. gentleman, or, at any rate, those coming from New Brunswick, for I think we should stand by one another in that respect at least. We must support one another as coming from the same Province, letting others from the other Provinces deal with their colleagues as they choose. I may say that I never intended to convey, nor do I think the language I used conveys, the idea that everything in this Bill, as regards the revising barrister, was similar to the one passed by the Lower House of the Local Legislature of New Brunswick. The hon. gentleman said that the people down there so understood me, and I venture to say, if they did, it was because two of the papers representing the opposite side have been kind enough to say that I declared in so many words that it was a similar Bill. What I said on that occasion was, in effect, that the point of similarity in the two Bills was that the revising barrister was the court of last resort, in the one case as he was in this case, before the right of appeal was given, as is now proposed. In that particular, I said that there was a resemblance. I said if this can be used for the purpose of making a partisan list, the other can; because, if you went to the revising barrister under the New Brunswick Bill with a long list of 200, 300, or 400 names which had been rejected by the revisers—if you went to the revising barrister appointed by the Local Government with that list, and he was a partial man, one who intended to prepare a partisan list, he could put every one of them on, because he was the court of last resort, and he had as much power to favor the Local Government as it is claimed the revising barrister would have under this Bill to favor the Dominion Government. I did say that if this Bill had been proposed by the Local Government of New Brunswick I thought my hon. friends from New Brunswick would not have opposed it. I made that remark, however, in this connection: I was speaking of the New Brunswick members of the other side of the House who had contended all along and had reiterated that they should go to the country on the same list—to the same electorate that sent them here—and I said that that was impossible if the Bill in the Local Legislature had become law, because, by that Bill they did not merely wish to change the electors for the Local Legislature, but the electors for this House as well, and therefore hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick did not raise their voices against it when they saw the Local Legislature changing the electorate who sent us here. But when this Government proposed to do so it was an outrage, it was something which should not have been done, and that we should go back to the same electorate who sent us here. That is the sense in which I made that remark. I did recognise—and I think you will find it in my speech—that this was not the same Bill, with the same machinery, or in the same terms, but as to the revising barrister being the court of last resort, it was the same. These are all the observations I intended to make, and I think my hon. friend from Brant will be satisfied that this proposition will add materially to the cost of the Bill, unless these thirty men in one county are all willing to work for nothing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is this proposition involved in the hon. gentleman's argument, that he must suppose that the time of the judge or the revising barrister—whose main business in life, I suppose, will not be the revision of the rolls—will not be worth more to him than the time the municipal officer may have in spare hours to prepare these lists. If his argument is to be good, he must expect that the judge or the revising barrister will do the mere clerical work for the same price as the municipal clerk in the same township, city, or town.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). He still has to do the clerical work.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, if the hon. gentleman is willing to rest his case on that, I am willing to allow it to rest there, as such a statement answers itself The list of voters must be prepared by some one. It is ridiculous to suppose that the judges and the revising officers will do that mere clerical work at the same rate as municipal clerks, who could do it with so much greater ease, being accustomed to that kind of work.

Mr. WHITE. The judge has still to do the work, under this amendment.

Mr. PATERSON. No; the hon. gentleman is all wrong; the judge will not have the work to do. The hon. member for Kent has evidently fallen into the same mistake. Will these hon. gentlemen seriously argue that if the amendment is engrafted as part of this section the judge or the barrister will only have to sit down and copy off name after name from the list? Nothing of the kind. The revising officer would have the list furnished to him by these disinterested parties—a complete list of persons entitled to vote at elections for this House; and his duty would then be purely a judicial one, to sit and hear appeals from the list so furnished. That is the position the amendment would put him in.

Mr. WHITE. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. If hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that my proposition would be less expensive, I suppose it could easily be arranged. If they succeed in showing that this amendment will not accomplish what is intended I suppose there would be no objection on this side of the House to let them word a resolution that would accomplish it. We say it does accomplish it, and all we want hon. gentlemen opposite to do is to commit themselves to the principle that the gentlemen who prepare the lists for the Provincial Legislatures shall prepare the lists for the House of Commons. Will the hon. member for Cardwell agree to that proposition?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The point for argument is simply what the cost of this amendment is going to be. If the hon. gentleman will take the clause and the amendment together, he will find that if this amendment were inserted the revising officer would still have to get the assessment roll and the revised list of voters. He would then have to get this particular list of voters proposed to be made; and from these he would have to make up his own list of voters, and that would necessarily cost more by the extra cost of this additional list.

Mr. PATERSON. No; the effect would be that this list would be made up for him. The hon. gentleman thinks that this amendment should be read with the words "also a certified copy of the last list of voters," struck out. If he is prepared for the amendment that can easily be done. If the amendment prevails, the hon. gentleman knows that in the very list of voters proposed he would have what he contends for. It is above all things, matter of cost and everything else, indispensible that you have an absolutely correct list. You have no right to play on the electors in the matter of their votes; every man entitled to be on the rolls should be on, and a man who is not entitled should not be on. I say again, advisedly, to get a complete and proper list, and at very much less expense, the means proposed in this amendment are entirely preferable to the machinery provided in the Bill. It will not be difficult for hon. gentlemen opposite to ascertain that for themselves, by entering into

communication with any municipal clerk or officer, and ascertain from him for what amount they could get such a list from him. Everybody knows that a judge or a barrister will not do mere clerical work as cheaply as it can be done by those whose duty it is to do such work; besides, it will not be likely to be as correct; and, as absolute correctness is required, the judge or barrister, or a clerk who might be engaged for the purpose, would be obliged to travel to different parts of the county to make himself acquainted with the electors in the different municipalities, and their circumstances, in order to gain such information as is already possessed by the municipal officers. On that ground alone the amendment should commend itself to hon. gentlemen opposite; but there are other grounds for it. It will retain to the people, in a measure, powers that have been theirs since we have been confederated—powers which, I believe, they are jealous of - that is, to have their own officers perform this initial work. Then, if you will have the revising officer, his duties will be, as his name indicates, of a judicial character—to hear appeals from the work of those municipal officers. What can be said against engaging the municipal officers to do this necessary work? There have been no statements made, but insinuations have been thrown out, that you cannot get a fair and impartial list from them, because political partisanship dwelling in the breasts of these officers would bias their judgment. When it was charged home to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) that he had more than insinuated—that he had made the broad charge—that assessors and others might be charged with this, he attempts to deny and explain it; and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) intimates that a person altogether unacquainted with the municipality would be more likely to do the duty fairly and impartially than the municipal clerks who prepare the voters' lists in Ontario. What is embraced in that statement? That the municipal clerks of Ontario, in their positions, are political partisans. Does the hon. member for Cardwell believe that? Is there any hon. gentleman from Ontario who believes that? Do the hon. gentlemen not know that the municipal clerks of the various municipalities of the Province of Ontario hold office year after year, and many for a score of years? Do they not know that they act as returning officers for the council that presides over the municipality year after year. Do they not know that they are in such a position that if there was any class of men who would be supposed to naturally free themselves from political bias and partisanship in office it is these same municipal clerks, who act as returning officers at the elections for the various councils. Any attempt to be partisan in their dealings would at once injure their position, as councillors and a mayor may be returned to-day who may be Conservatives, and the next year they may return a mayor and councillors who may be Reform. I hold that men of that class, even if they were not actuated by principle, would desire, to retain their position, to act independently; and it is against such a class as these that the statement of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) were levelled this afternoon, as men who would be not as likely to do what is right and fair, not as likely to be free from political partisanship, as men appointed by the First Minister, who, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) told us would be, as every one knows they will be, supporters of the right hon. gentleman. Each one of them will be a Tory, at any rate, if not a Tory of the Tories. In the very construction of this section, in the very voting down of this amendment, there is an implied insult to all the municipal officers in the Province of Ontario, because that amendment can only be voted down on the principle laid down by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), that their political views will not enable them to do their duty as honestly, as faithfully and as conscientiously as political persons appointed by the head of the Government, who is himself the leader of one of the great political parties of the day. The proposition is one, I think, that will not bring much strength to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is one that may not find an echo in the breasts of the Conservatives of this country, to say nothing of the Reformers. It is doubting the impartiality, the good faith of the Conservative municipal clerks as well as the Reform clerks, in leaving this duty in the hands of the municipal clerks, many of whom have done it for years, and whose conduct, as far as I am aware of, has never been impugned. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if there have been any charges made against any municipal clerk for violating his office, when he has been sitting and acting as returning officer for the return of a mayor for a city or town, or a reeve in a township, but we have had cases mentioned to us, in the course of this very debate, of returning officers appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite for elections to this House who have violated that which is honorable and fair. I do not think any charge of that kind can be brought against the municipal clerks of Ontario, and yet, forsooth, the proposition that the preparation of the lists should be left in their hands cannot be entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite. No; because there is danger of these gentlemen, who have sworn to do their whole duty, who have ever done their whole duty, are not to be trusted with it, but it will be safe to leave it in the hands of partisans appointed by the leader of a political party, or if not in his hands altogether, part of it to be in the hands of a clerk appointed by this revising barrister, and responsible to the revising barrister alone. Does any body believe that the revising barrister's clerk will be one of any higher character, one more likely to act impartially and do his duty faithfully, than the clerks of municipalities, many of whom have been in their position for years? No, Sir, they will not. More than that; you have the assurance and the guarantee that those municipal clerks are responsible to the council. The council is responsible to the people, and any variation from the strict line of impartiality or fair dealings would be visited with the merited displeasure of the electors, who could reach the council, and that council could reach the clerk. You may have that list prepared by the clerk nominated by the revising barrister, and he will be above the people; he will, in preparing the voters' list, go over the country, discharging the duty as he thinks fit; he is not responsible to the people; he may add names or take them off, and he has to answer alone to the revising officer; and besides, he is unsworn, as far as I can make out by the Act. The revising officer may then shield himself behind the list prepared and handed to him by his appointee, and he may say: This is the only means of information I had; I trusted the clerk; I supposed he would have done right, and I accepted his list; if any harm has been done, it is a great pity you did not come before me and let matters be known. Thus, the people will be subjected, if they would remedy any injustice, to all the expense that is entailed in applying to these revising barristers for relief. I hold the amendment ought to be accepted by the Government, if they desire to secure, in a degree, a measure of impartiality and fairness. It is a reasonable amendment, and pressing it upon the attention of the committee is warranted by the fact that there has been no information given from the other side of the House that they are prepared to accept it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not attempted to show, until the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) rose, that by this being adopted—and I will do him the justice to say that he did not argue that was the reason the machinery of the clause was adopted—but he argued that, as adopted, the machinery would cost less. I believe that, on the grounds of economy, the amendment ought to commend itself; and I believe, further, that it leaves to the people, in a measure, the rights they are jealous of, and which ought to remain

in their hands. I urge it on the ground that it will be more likely to secure a more impartial list. Whether it will be adopted or not I do not know, but we have done our duty in pressing strongly and at length our reasons for adopting this amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I was indeed gratified to find that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) did raise their voices in favor of economy in the construction of the measure now being discussed. I demur, however, to the position they take as to the construction of this amendment. I think that the intention is quite evident, and if not sufficiently explicit to satisfy the hon. gentlemen opposite, it is quite open to them to admit the principle and alter the phraseology to suit. I rise to support the proposition that is involved in moving that the primary construction of these lists be left to the municipal authorities throughout the country. If there is any doubt as to the intention of the amendment I am sure the mover will be glad to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite. The placing of the lists in the hands of revising officers is an evidence of a lack of trust in the people, and proves that hon. gentlemen opposite consider that their future existence as the dominant party lies altogether in their being able to manipulate the voters' lists. This amendment practically says that the lists shall be primarily prepared, as heretofore, by the officers of the municipal bodies. These are of all shades of politics; they are not elected on account of their political proclivities. The performance of this work is one of the incidents of their position as municipal officers. The same consideration applies to municipal councillors, and consequently we have in the municipal bodies and their officials men who can prepare these lists without any suspicion of partisanship. They are closely watched; any action in which they display party bias is scrutinised, and if the partisanship is continued these officials are punished. For these men it is proposed to substitute men who are the appointees of one political party only and who, while operating in different parts of the Dominion, will not be so careful in the performance of their duty, because their master will be here, at Ottawa, instead of being, as in the case of municipal officials, close at hand. We are assured that the revising officer will be absolutely impartial; that he, of all men, will be absolutely pure in his inclinations and perfect in his aspirations; that he, of all others, is to be at once capable of preparing an absolutely correct list, and disposed to do so. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite not only charge the present machinery with being imperfect, but impugn the impartiality of the assessor, the clerk, the council, and even the judge of the county. Sir, a great deal has been said impugning the good faith of the municipal assessors in the different Provinces, particularly in the Province of Ontario, and detracting them for the manner in which they have discharged the duties they have heretofore performed in connection with the voters' lists. I cannot speak from a lengthened experience, but the experience I have tells me that in the locality in which I reside the municipal assessor and the municipal clerk have been appointed and have held their position entirely independent of the political complexion of the municipal councils under whom they serve. In the west riding of the county of Middlesex more than one-half the municipal clerks are Conservatives, and yet a majority of the councils are of a different stripe of politics, and the majority of the municipalities give, in the greater number of instances, political majorities of a different kind. Now, Sir, it cannot be the case but that these men must have discharged their duties honestly or the party in the majority would have demanded that they should be removed from their position. I can say the same thing of the municipalities where the Conservative party is in the majority in my own constituency. There are municipalities where the Conservative party has received majorities of over one hundred, and yet the municipal clerk in one of these municipalities has been of a different political complexion. These facts furnish the best evidence that can be produced of the satisfactory working of our municipal system, as regards the preparation of the voters' lists. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not scrupled to throw discredit upon municipal officers—not, I believe, because they felt that they were really worthy of blame, but because they felt that some defence was necessary for the proposition contained in this clause, and felt it necessary even to go the length of attacking the good faith and the honest discharge of duty by some of their supporters in order to justify the introduction of a measure and the pressing of a clause that, under no other circumstances, they could find a defence for. The proposition is unfair and unjust, and it has not the manly characteristics about it that ought to belong to a proposition coming from the majority in Parliament. The proposition raises a doubt in many minds as to whether hon. gentlemen opposite are confident that they can retain their boasted majority of 1882, and whether they do not believe that if they were now obliged to go to the country a different result would follow. A peculiarity of the proposition involved in this clause is that the revising officer will have the privilege of making an appeal from himself to himself. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) held that some such machinery as was provided in the Bill was necessary, because this Parliament could not compel municipal officers to discharge any duties under this Act. If this be the case, how are we going to carry out sections 13 and 15, which involve the employment of municipal officers? Suppose a municipal officer should refuse to act under this Bill, what recourse is provided? It must be assumed, from the position taken by the First Minister, and from the sections to which I have referred, that he will be able to control municipal officers for the purposes of this Act. Then if the municipal machinery is utilised, as I suggest, we shall be able to prepare the voters' lists by a simple means, instead of by the expensive and complicated means contemplated by this Bill. The First Minister has asserted that the assessors considered their oath did not bind them further than that they consider their sworn duty performed, if they do not diminish the revenues of the municipality, when they had completed work for the municipality. Even if it were assumed that their obligation goes no further—and that would be assuming a great deal, and doing them a very great injustice—it would still become a question whether they have done their work honestly, because every ratepayer is interested to know that his neighbor is not assessed too low as well as himself too high, and it would be a satisfaction for people to know that they were assessed equally with their neighbors. There is no better security than that under which men would, on fair and just grounds, obtain the right to vote. The people know the value of having their neighbors' property equally assessed with their own, because on that fact will depend whether they pay more than their share of taxation or not, and in that way we have the assurance that the lists will be fair and proper, as the law contemplates. The First Minister argued this afternoon that the lists, under this proposed system, will be free from all the taint or suspicion which may attach to voters' lists prepared under existing systems, and yet, Sir, the lists under this system are to be prepared by an official whose very recommendation to his position is the fact that he is a partisan. Our municipal officers are primarily appointed on account of their fitness for the position, and the fact that succeeding councils may change politically is a strong restraint on their conduct; whereas the revising barrister will feel that he will have the best recommendation for reappointment or

continuance in office if he discharges his duty to his party as he is expected to do. The submission of this Bill shows that hon. gentlemen opposite, although they invariably attempt to conceal it, are afraid of public opinion, and have a contempt for public sentiment. When our municipal system was first introduced a Tory nobleman of that time made the remark that they were sucking Republics. Nevertheless, our municipal system has answered its purpose admirably in all the Provinces where it has been adopted. These institutions have brought home to the people a knowledge of their power, a knowledge of the fact that the money they contribute is their own, and they are consequently induced to watch its expenditure very closely. It has educated them in self-reliance, in self-government, in fair play towards one another, and it has furnished our legislative halls with many men who have done those institutions credit. That being the case, it is a retrogressive step, a step in accord with Tory instincts, that we should forsake those old land marks and adopt a system such as that proposed in the Bill. I would ask hon. gentlemen, if the municipal authorities of this country are amenable to all the charges of partisanship and dishonesty which have been alleged against them, how does it happen that these hon. gentlemen have a majority in this House. If they say it is in spite of the system, I say it is nothing of the kind, because it is a fact that their friends as well as their opponents have an equal share in the preparation of the voters' list; and the close supervision which is exercised over this local machinery is the best guarantee that no gross scandals or departures from what is fair and honest will take place, because, if they did, those who are independent of political leanings would demand that the wrong should be righted. I have almost invariably found, in my intercourse with these officials, that they are disposed to do what is right between the political parties. Whether that disposition was induced by the knowledge that they were closely watched, or by an instinct to do what is right, under all circumstances, I am not prepared to say. But in what position do we find some hon. gentlemen opposite, who come here, the representatives of constituencies where all the municipal officials are Conservatives, and who allege that the municipal officials throughout the country are dishonest and unfair, on account of their political partisanship? The city of Toronto and the city of London, for instance, have invariably, I think, had Conservative majorities in their councils and Conservative assessors; and yet hon. gentlemen hear those assessors maligned equally with others of a different political stripe, in order to find a justification for a measure that ought never to have been submitted to this House. I say it is unfair to the municipal officials of the Province of Ontario, independent of their political predilections; and, as between them and the officials likely to be appointed under this Bill, I believe the people of Ontario, by a very large majority, would prefer the existing machinery. Besides the very grave doubts that will be cast on the good faith of any officer appointed as proposed by this Bill, the less expensiveness of the municipal machinery ought to be an argument for its adoption. I think the municipal officers throughout the country could be induced to do the clerical work involved in the primary preparation of these lists at a fraction of the cost at which the revising officers could do it. The difference between the duties of the revising officer here and those of the revising officer in England is so great that even the clerk provided under this Bill will have much more to do in a constituency of the same kind than the revising officer in England. If that is the case, it is fair to assume that the cost is going to be the very utmost farthing of what has been estimated by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Not only would the municipal officials do the work at much less cost, but their appointment would give much greater confidence to the people of both political parties. Then, leaving the appeal to the county judge, as it exists in the Province of Ontario now, we have all the precaution that any fair minded-man can ask; and I think that the comparatively few appeals that have been made to the judges have been due largely to the fact that an appeal lay to the judge. That was present to the minds of the municipal officials when making up the lists, and it is a much stronger deterrent than anything by which the revising officer can be bound. I cannot conceive how hon. gentleman opposite can, by any possible system of argument, arrive at the conclusion that this five-year old barrister can exercise the functions imposed upon him under this law with the same honesty and fair play to the political parties as the municipal assessors and clerks. If it is the case that the municipal officials can discharge this duty more thoroughly, it is reasonable to suppose that there is an ulterior motive in the intention to appoint these revising barrister with the powers to be conferred upon him by this provision; it is reasonable to suppose that the design of hon. gentlemen opposite is to thwart the free expression of the public will and to secure a position at the polls which public opinion will not justify. It is precisly as if one of two litigants insisted on having his own jury appointed. It has been represented that the struggles in the municipal elections is in order to get political assessors of a political stripe appointed. Well, if the assessor were to occupy a position towards the municipality that the revising officer, under this clause, will hold towards this country, I could understand the object of making a fight over the appointments of the assessors. But it has been shown, over and over again, that their position is entirely different. If hon. gentlemen opposite, however, are prepared to view the assessors in that light, how much more strongly does it apply to the position they take in trying to secure the appointment of revising barristers, with power to make the lists to suit themselves. I believe that by accepting this amendment these lists will be prepared in a way that will give satisfaction to both parties, in a way that would prevent any doubt being thrown on the good faith of any of the parties concerned, and I am therefore of the opinion that it should be accepted, rather than the clause as it appears.

Mr. LISTER. As I understand the matter, the Government has determined that the revising officer, so called, shall be the person who shall prepare the voters' lists and also revise them. The preliminary list which is to be prepared by the revising officer will be the basis for all future lists, and it is therefore pre-eminently important that the first list should be made as correct as possible. It has been stated, over and over again, that the name "revising officer" is a misnomer, as he is to be a person to prepare the list instead of to revise it. No matter how zealous the officer appointed may be in the discharge of his duty, it will be impossible for him to prepare the voters' list required under this Act. Many people are not thoroughly conversant with the law, and will not take the trouble to see that their names are upon the list, and the revising officer, while he may be acquainted with the town in which he lives, will not have the requisite knowledge in regard to the remote parts of the country for which he has to prepare the voters' list. But the local officers have this knowledge. The assessors are acquainted with the circumstances of every family in the municipality, and the preparation of the list could be entrusted to no persons more capable than the assessors and the clerks of the municipalities. The latter have generally held office for many years, no matter what the political complexion of the council may have been, and if the preparation of the lists were left to them they would be as nearly correct as it is possible to get them. It has been stated that we are following the English system in passing the present law. I give that a flat con-

tradiction. We are adopting the name used in England, but on every page of this Bill fraud is written, and there is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government to control the electorate of the country. In adopting the name of revising officer you are misleading the people to believing that we are adopting a system which has been in existence in England for many years. According to Rogers on Elections, page 115, the overseers of every parish and township in the county are the persons who prepare the list. The overseers of those parishes occupy positions similar to our municipal officers throughout this country. The list having been prepared and posted up, and appeals being put in against it, the revising officer merely goes there as a judge. He has nothing whatever to do with the preparation of the list; he never sees it, in fact, until he opens his court and is called upon to adjudicate upon the claims made, either to have names struck off or to have others put on; so that, as far as this Bill is concerned, it bears no similarity whatever to the English Act. I deplore that the Government should have felt it necessary to put the country to the enormous expense which this Bill must necessarily involve, in view of the fact that in every Province of the Dominion we have had a system which has worked admirably, a system which has cost the Government absolutely nothing. I believe that when the people have an opportunity of pronouncing upon this measure they will resent the action of the Government in taking away from them the rights they have always enjoyed of preparing their own lists. I believe that if it is not a revolutionary measure it strongly tends in that direction. Though these appointees may exercise their power honestly, still the Government are putting into their hands a power which, in the hands of unscrupulous men, might imperil the very commonwealth itself. I regret very much that hon. gentlemen opposite, in defending this measure, should have attempted to discredit the municipal officers of this country. I say that if there is any class of men in the country who are intelligent and honorable it is the municipal officers, in the Province of Ontario, at all events. When hon. gentlemen charge these officers with partisanship they do them a grievous wrong. These men have occupied their positions ever since municipal institutions were introduced into Canada, and from my own experience I can say that, so far as I know, these men have always discharged their duties honestly and honorably. It may be that in some isolated cases a man may have acted in a partisan manner, but we must remember that the municipal councils always have these men under their control, and can censure or remove them if they do wrong. I trust the Government will see its way clear to adopt the proposition contained in the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron).

Mr. WILSON. If the Government are determined to push this measure through it is our duty to do all we can to render the vicious clauses of the Bill as little objectionable as possible. There is not a more important provision in this Bill than that of the revising barrister, and his duties. We all feel that every man who is enfranchised or is entitled to have his name placed upon the voters' list ought to have every facility granted; every opportunity should be allowed him, and he should have no difficulty in having his name placed upon the voters' list, that he may have an opportunity of recording his vote for the man of his choice when election takes place. Even if a county judge were appointed he could not be expected to know people in different parts of the riding. Therefore, it cannot reasonably be expected that he would be able to prepare a list as do the various assessors and other municipal officers. The revising officer will, under this Bill, have power to remove names from the list. The people will not have an opportunity of knowing whether their names are on the list or not, and therefore the revising barrister would not be able to form a list from the assessment roll. I say, let every man who is on the voters' list be accepted, unless he is appealed against, and unless you do so, I do not see how you can have an efficient list. The revising barrister or judge cannot devote much time to his work, and therefore he will have to depend on his clerk, who cannot have the same knowledge of the constituency as the municipal clerks; and what means will the clerk or the bailiff have of obtaining information? Unless, therefore, it is made obligatory on the revising barrister to accept the voters' list, inconveniences will be constantly cropping up. The argument that the list prepared by the municipal officers is partisan, is one of the weakest that could be presented to the House. These men are sometimes the very best men in municipalities; many of them have had long experience; they have been sworn to do their duty impartially, and they are liable to penalties if they act contrary to their duty; and it is absurd to say that they would not act more fairly than the revising barrister. Our municipal system, wherever it has been tried, has worked well, which would not have been the case if these officials were guilty of the partisan conduct ascribed to them by hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that they have performed their duties well, and as to the revising barrister, even if a judge is appointed, his clerk will have to do the greater part of the work in connection with the initial list, and that clerk is certain to be a partisan. Supposing a Reformer were selected as a clerk for the first election, representations would be immediately made to the Government requesting the removal of such clerk of the revising barrister. The object of this Bill is, no doubt, to further the interests of the party in power. If the revising officer be a county judge he may not be a partisan, but if he be a lawyer of five years' standing he will be a partisan, and I have no more confidence in lawyers than I have in other people. He has a motive in being a partisan. If he acts faithfully in his first calling it will be an inducement to the Government to promote him to a judgship or to some other higher position. If it is your wish to get as perfect a voters' list as possible your duty is to accept the list as prepared by the municipalities under the provincial Act. Again, if you adopt this revising barrister clause, it may recoil on your own heads. You have no certainty of remaining in office longer than the present Parliament, and if you dread the partisanship of the municipal officers on account of their being under the control of the Local Legislature, how will it be when you change places with us on this side of the House? Should not this be a warning to you against taking an undue advantage of us at present? I believe, judging from the expressions that have come from every part of the Dominion, that this very revising barrister clause will be the cause of your downfall; the people have endured many acts on the part of the present Administration; they have shown great patience; but a very patient community, once aroused, will rise with all its might and drive those who have been oppressing it from the position they occupy. People say, and say truly, that the Administration of the day have so administered the affairs of the country that they know they ought to be removed from power; but in order to keep themselves in the position they occupy they are adopting a method of stuffing the ballot boxes, to prevent a free and independent expression of public opinion upon their acts. I say this is a dangerous experiment, and I believe it will be the very means of removing you from the position you hold. This is an iniquitous clause. It is intended to prevent that free expression of sentiment which you ought to court. If you had been acting in a manner in which you ought to act as stewards of the people, you would not be afraid to appeal to them on fair and equal ground; but you have not been doing so, and therefore you ask to have the power of appointing revising barristers to prepare the voters' lists so

that you may be able to say who shall be elected and who shall not. Looking at the Bill from first to last, if I could have my way, I would strike out every clause, and think I would improve the Bill by so doing. Consider the course you are now pursuing. Ask this House whether it is in the interest of the general commonwealth that this measure should pass. It may be that your love of office is greater than your patriotism, but I would ask you for a moment to allow patriotism to have sway, and let the love of office give way on this occasion, by striking out the clause and allowing the motion of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to prevail. Entertaining those views, I will have much pleasure in voting for that amendment, and I hope the Government will see the necessity for incorporating it in the Bill.

Mr. KING. To judge from the protestations of hon. gentlemen, one would think this measure only concerned the Province of Ontario. I claim, however, that in the clause before us the people of New Brunswick are as interested as any others. I thought, at the second reading of the Bill, that when in committee the Government would be prepared to make some important changes. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) told us that the principle of the Bill, was to be adopted, but that in committee amendments to it would be necessary, and I expected that hon. gentlemen to suggest some amendment or, at any rate, to acquiesce in some of those proposed. He has, however, failed to come to time, and I take it for granted he was prepared to accept the Bill as it came down. As the hon. member for Brant pointed out, the amendment of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) would, if adopted, affect a large saving in the matter of expense. That statement was challenged by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), who said he believed the amendment would be more costly, for, instead of one person seeking for information, the revising barrister, it would require some thirty. True, under the system that prevails in New Brunswick some thirty persons would be required to get the same information, but they would reside in the different parishes, and be possessed of local knowledge, and thus have no difficulty in getting the information required. In fact, if the Government are determined to have men specially appointed by themselves, for the purpose of preparing the first list, it would be much cheaper for the Government to select three men in each parish to prepare them for revision by the revising officer, and the lists would be much more carefully made out. The hon. member for Kent says the revising officer could get all the information by letter that he required, without being obliged to make a personal visitation. I believe he could; but that is just one of the means I do not approve of, and the gentlemen selected by the council would not have to resort to any such means, because they would have all the local knowledge necessary themselves. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), according to his remarks, though he has attempted to give another construction to them since, endeavored to make out that the revising barrister, under the Bill introduced in the New Brunswick Legislature last year, had the same powers as the one under this Bill. I can easily show that that is not the case as he was not the maker of the list. Mr. Macleod and Mr. Hannington, both Conservative members of the Local Legislature of New Brunswick, expressed the view that the revising officers that were proposed to be appointed under the Bill introduced in that House would, of necessity, be partisans, and objected to it on that ground. I have already pointed out that 427 persons who are assessed on real property in my county would be left off this list, and I do not expect that the revising officer appointed by this Government would take the trouble to put any on who were not of the right political stripe, while a very heavy cost would be necessary for the Liberal party to bring before him those cases which they thought should be put on. I believe the county court judges will discharge their duties faithfully and honestly, but we have no guarantee that they will live forever, and the chances are that in future the appointments to that position will be made with regard to the special fitness of the judge for performing the work of the revising barrister rather than in regard to his fitness for any other duties he is called on to discharge.

Mr. WELDON moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion negatived.

Mr. KING. I believe the object of this Bill is to benefit the Tory party in Canada. I have lately been through the Province of New Brunswick, and I find the opinion prevailing among all classes of the people, is that the Government are pushing this measure through Parliament solely with the view of gaining a party advantage at the next election. If the question were submitted to the people of my Province you would not find a corporal's guard of honest men to support this Bill. For the last thirty years our local system has worked well, and has given satisfaction to everybody, and we see no reason for a change. Nobody is more opposed to this Bill than the honest Conservatives of New Brunswick, and if it becomes law they will resent it at the next opportunity.

Mr. MILLS. In speaking on this clause this afternoon, I observed that nearly 30 per cent. of the parties who would be entitled to vote under this Bill would not be upon the assessment roll, and that it would not be in the power of a stranger to place their names at once upon the lists. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) inferred from these observations that by this Bill there would be a considerable extension of the franchise. That did not at all follow. It did not follow, because we could not put the names of wage-earners, and tenants who were qualified to vote from rental, and the farmers' sons, and the sons of other property holders, in all the other Provinces except Ontario—I say it did not follow because these parties would not have their names upon the assessment roll that there was necessarily an extension of the franchise. Why, Sir, in the Province of Prince Edward Island the names of those parties would not be upon any assessment roll, and yet in that Province there would be a limitation and not an extension of the franchise. The Prime Minister and his supporters have informed us that this measure was intended to mitigate the rancour of party feeling, that the assessment roll was improperly made up, that we must have some fairer voters' list, and therefore the Government must take the appointment of revising officers into its own hands. Now, I would like to ask the hon. member for London (Mr. Carling), who is a member of the Administration, whether the assessors and municipal officers in London have been so far influenced by party bias that he thinks they have disregarded their oaths and have prepared unfair voters' lists?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I observe that Mr. Taylor is seeking to disturb the proceedings of the committee, and I wish specially to call your attention to the fact. If necessary, I will name other gentlemen on that side, and will call the attention of the press and the country to their conduct. I know hon. gentlemen opposite have held that the Local Government, in taking control of certain appointments, have unfairly influenced local elections. But this is a much more serious matter. It is the appointment of a large body of men throughout the Dominion who are to prepare the voters' lists which will be the very basis of the elections. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether there has been such a condition of things in this country as to justify the taking of

appointments out of the hands of the people and placing them in the hands of the Administration. It has been observed in this discussion that we do not propose, by the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron, to prepare a voters' list. That is true. We proposed it on Friday night. We proposed that the municipal officers shall assist the revising officer in preparing a voters' list, and shall furnish him with the material from which to make the list. Now, we can limit the power of an officer as much as we please. We can say to him: You shall not have any discretion in the matter, so far as the original preparation of the list is concerned; you shall take the valuation of the property which you find upon the assessment roll; and with regard to tenants, wage-earners, and those who qualify on income, you shall take the list that is prepared for you by the municipal officers mentioned in this amendment. It is perfectly competent for us to take that course. We can say that the revising officer shall prepare the voters' lists from materials we here designate. I have pointed out that a large number of names necessarily will not be found on the assessment roll, the names of wage earners, farmers' sons, tenants, and other classes. It requires local knowledge to put those names on the roll without very serious trouble and great expense. One hon. gentleman has stated that to obtain the services of thirty officials will cost more than the machinery proposed. I say they will not. The returning officer, being a stranger in nine-tenths of the constituencies, must summon parties to appear before him and produce the necessary evidence; that must involve great expense and much waste of time. The municipal officers referred to will have no travelling expenses to pay, no enquiries to make; they will act on personal knowledge. The work could be carried out by those officials at much less expense, and the revising in each case would be confined to the work of revision. The amendment proposed by the First Minister suggests a means of getting over the difficulty we have pointed out, by using the last election roll in those portions of the Dominion where there are not properly prepared voters' lists. Take the case of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, and see what the effect would be. All the names of those who, under manhood suffrage, voted at the Dominion election in 1882, would go on the voters' list, whether they possess any proper qualification or not. Not less than 25 per cent. of the voters in those Provinces placed on the list would not be entitled to vote. It will be absolutely necessary for the revising officer to see, not only that names are added, but that very many names are struck off. That is an extraordinary condition of things. A large number of people will thus be placed on the voters' list whom everyone knows will not be entitled to vote, and it is certain to lead to a contest as to who should vote. Suppose no revision is held before an election: those 25 per cent. would remain voters, and from contests that might arise elections might be voided. The committee has been told that judges are to be appointed revising officers in Ontario. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) told us that, but the First Minister did not do so.

Mr. RYKERT. That is not the question now before the committee.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman should have called "question" when the hon. member for Monck was making his statement. The hon. member for Monck, in addressing the House, told us that the judges were to be made revising officers, and I say that is apart from the question. I did not call the hon. gentleman to order, because the extent of the power which you leave with the revising officer may, to some extent, depend on who the revising officers may be. If you are to have the judges as revising officers, then you would only have the question of inconvenience.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has no faith in the judges; so he told us the other day.

Mr. MILLS. I told you nothing of the sort, nor did I tell the committee, nor anyone else.

Mr. HESSON. I refer to the hon. gentleman's own statement in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS. I refer to the fact that I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. HESSON. I tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Victoria called you to order, and spoke very sharply, and now the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MILLS. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order; the hon. gentleman has the floor.

Mr. HESSON. I am in order; I simply wish to correct his statement.

Mr. MILLS. The statement of the hon. gentleman is as inaccurate as his charge about the assessors. I say we have had no assurance from the Prime Minister of the appointment of judges as revising officers, as stated by the hon. member for Monck. I say that we are obliged to keep in view the fact that these officers are not judicial officers, that their functions will be, in a great measure, ministerial, and that being the case, it is part of our duty to limit their discretion and power, and to see that they are rendered capable of doing as little mischief as possible. I have given the reasons why I think the revising officer should make up his list in the first instance, from the voters' list, with the additional information afforded by the assessors' roll. In that case the voters' list would be much more complete, in the first instance, and we would have much less difficulty in the work of revision at the subsequent stage. I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen who give this measure such an energetic support will find it will be quite as costly and inconvenient to some of them as it will be and as it is intended to be, to hon. gentlemen of this side.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am so much opposed to the system proposed in this Bill, as compared with the present system, that I would not feel justified in allowing the clause to pass without stating my objections to it. The people of my Province hold very dear the present system, which allows the people themselves to prepare the lists at the least possible expense. It is a system which commends itself to members of this side, at least, who have endeavored to keep down the expenses of the Government, and who are opposed *in toto* to the principle of adding unnecessary burdens upon the people. We cannot have as correct lists by the proposed system as by the one now extant, as no stranger, without going to vast expense, can prepare the lists as correctly or as fairly as they are now prepared by the local officers. I oppose the system because it is a scheme of centralisation; it is taking away from the people those rights which they hold dear, under our municipal institutions, of which we feel justly proud. They are controlled by the people of this country, and they cause the people to feel that they have an interest in the government of the country. By taking away that system you vote non-confidence in the people, you give them to feel that they are slighted, that they have been acting unfairly and unjustly, and that they are not to be trusted longer with the preparation of those lists which have hitherto given such general

satisfaction. Under the present system every safe-guard is provided to obtain a correct expression of the popular will. Under the proposed system there are no such safeguards against omissions and injustice of every kind, as there are under the present system. Judging by the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, one would suppose that the assessors are not to be trusted to do what is fair and honest on account of their party bias; but in the riding I have the honor to represent, although many of the assessors are opposed to me in politics, I have never heard any complaint of them. Sometimes omissions occur in the list, but mistakes of that kind can be rectified, and I cannot understand how a revising officer, who may possibly be a stranger in the locality, can prepare a satisfactory list. I think the insinuations made by hon. gentlemen opposite against the assessors and clerks of this country will be met with just indignation by all of those men who are elected by the people. I protest with all the force I can command against this Bill, because it is a direct insult to every municipal councillor in this country, to the assessors and to all who are engaged in the preparation of the lists, which have hitherto given uch general satisfaction. I protest against this measure because I believe that a Government which will pass a measure for the purpose of bolstering itself up and keeping itself in power is exceeding what is justifiable in party rule. Every right-thinking man, who is not bound down by party ties, and will bring an unbiased judgment to bear on the question, cannot fail to be convinced that the system which has been in vogue for eighteen years in Canada is the best, the safest, the fairest, and above all, the cheapest system we can have. That is something the people want. They do not want to be saddled with enormous debt. The expenditure of this country is $12,000,000 more than it was a few years ago; it is increasing at a rate that the people view with the gravest alarm. Almost $2,000,000 have been voted to restore peace and order in the North-West; we do not know how much more is to be voted; half a million more is proposed by this measure.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see you are shaking your head, Mr. Chairman. I quite agree that the contemplation of such a vast expenditure makes many more than yourself shake their heads. I am glad to see that even now you begin to realise the perilous step this country is taking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please confine himself to the clause, and leave the question of debt.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think everything connected with the preparation of the lists is involved in the discussion of this clause. I am anxious to preserve the rules of debate, and I hope they do not prevent me dealing with the question of the vast cost to this country which is proposed by this Bill, in connection with the preparation of the lists. The Government may pass this Bill, but it is well that the people should know what it entails upon them. We do not get uniformity by this Act; we have several franchises under it; then, the idea is, that the revising officer can be an assessor, a county clerk, a council and a judge. I think it is rather derogatory to those officers to suppose that one revising barrister is equal to them all. The expense that this new system will cost, over that proposed by the amendment, which leaves the making of the first lists in the hands of the municipal officers, is a question which, in our present depressed state of affairs, ought to receive pressing attention. We are adding expense to expense, without any particular benefit to be derived therefrom. I oppose this Bill because I consider it is an invasion of the rights of the people and will add vastly to the expense of the people at the time when they can ill afford it. I hope the Government will look into this measure, and will allow the provincial system to remain in operation under this Bill.

Mr. DAWSON. I am always an attentive listener, but it gets a little wearisome when the same thing is spoken over and over again, and I have heard the same ideas expressed to-night that were spoken a fortnight ago. Hon. gentlemen repudiate the idea that they are talking against time, but it certainly looks very much like it. One hon. gentleman said that the provincial franchise had worked admirably for eighteen years. What franchise? The provincial franchise is not a fixed thing, and the Ontario franchise, which is now to come into force, is as different from any we have had before as this Dominion franchise is. It is a new and experimental thing, and it is assuming what is not the case, to say that it has worked well for eighteen years. Another gentleman referred to the petitions which have been sent in against this Bill. One came from Port Arthur, which has a population of about 6,000, and there were only 55 signatures; and though I thought I knew everyone there, though I have resided there, and have seen the place grow up, there were many of those signatures that I did not know. These rolls which have been so much discussed will be at the disposal of the revising officer, as well as any other person, and there are vast areas where there are no assessment rolls or voters' lists. In the district I represent there are wide areas without any assessment roll. Household suffrage obtained there, and assessment rolls were not necessary, and when this new Ontario law goes into operation the household suffrage will still to some extent obtain there. This Act provides that where there are no assessment rolls, the last list of voters shall be taken as the basis for making up the roll. I think that is a very good basis. Every hon. member speaks from the particular circumstances of of his own district, but there are other districts in Ontario, besides those for which the hon. gentlemen have spoken. It is stated that the revising officers will always be partisans. Is it not assuming too much to believe that barristers of five years' standing and judges will be mere partisans, to suppose that they will not be men of honor, as capable of exercising an independent judgment as men in similar positions are now. If anything could justify the music which sometimes rises in this House, it is the extreme bitterness with which some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side express themselves. I was very much surprised to-night to hear my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), whom I had always considered the mildest mannered man in this world, express him self in such a strain of positive bitterness.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it not the member for West Elgin that you mean?

Mr. DAWSON. There must have been something to disturb the equanimity of my hon. friend from East Elgin. Then, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) was also a little strong in his expressions. I remember one night during this discussion hearing that hon. gentleman say something to the effect that his language could not keep pace with his ideas; to-night I think the case was reversed, for his language appeared to outrun his ideas; his language ranged over the whole continent, while his ideas seemed to be entangled and stumbling far behind.

Mr. WATSON. I believe the municipal voters' lists should be used in making the preliminary list of the revising barrister. In a county such as the one I have the honor to represent, which is 150 miles long by 120 wide, it will be very awkward to have only the revising barrister to make up the list in the first place; it will be very awkward for the revising barrister to find out who has a right to be on the list in the remote parts of the county. I think that taking the preparation of the lists out of the hands of the local officers is, to a certain extent, an insult to those officers. In my county I have never heard any complaints made against them; I have seldom heard of their making any mistakes, or that anybody was aggrieved at their action.

So far as the county of Marquette is concerned, the voters' lists have been prepared with the utmost accuracy; the officials, in all cases, have done their duty well, and there has been nothing like what some hon. gentlemen opposite have referred to as existing in Ontario, where elections are run on party lines and where officials are appointed for the purpose of fixing up the lists for a particular party. I believe that the true mode of preparing the list is that at present adopted by the local municipalities. It should be prepared by the people and for the people. The local officials are far better qualified for that purpose, and they know who has a right to vote and what has not, better than any revising officer would know. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) finds fault with the statement that the provincial franchise has worked well for eighteen years. It has worked well for eighteen years, and no hon. gentleman opposite has yet pointed out any single instance where it has not worked well. It seems to me that it makes no difference who has the preparation of the list, so long as it is correct; it matters little what mode the Provincial Legislature adopts for making a franchise, so long as a majority of the qualified electors are able to elect the candidate of their choice. I do not see why the First Minister should object to having the preliminary list based on the list prepared by the local officers. Those lists can be revised again, and the revising officer might be allowed to revise them. If this gentleman is to be a revising barrister, what is he to revise? Is he to revise a list prepared by himself? This Bill, now forced upon Parliament, has never been asked for by the people. From the petitions that have been presented to this House, it appears that it has roused up, not only Reformers but Conservatives. It is my opinion that not only the officials of the council, but the councils themselves, will look upon this Bill as a sort of insult to the municipal officers. There is no doubt that the present mode of preparing the list is very satisfactory to the people. It has involved very little expense, and in Manitoba, at least, the municipal officers who prepare the list receive no extra pay for such work. If any names are left off the list parties can appeal, first to the court of revision, composed of the municipal council, and after the list is revised by the council, they can appeal to the county judge. This has given entire satisfaction, and no doubt it will do so in future, better than the Bill now before the House. Under this Bill the revising officer has to be a lawyer. The First Minister has so framed the franchise that a lawyer will be necessary to interpret the meaning of the measure. My feeling is well expressed by the words of a Conservative gentleman, Mr. D. B. Read, of Toronto, who says: "I think no such power should be given to political saints, much less to political sinners. I believe the intention of this Bill is evil, and not good, to the electors.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg to move an amendment, that the following words be added after "district," in line 16, page 10:—

And shall, in the form of the schedule to this Act contained, divide every city, town, ward, parish, township or other municipality or division in the electoral districts, or, in default of such municipality or division, every tract of land therein having, according to said list, more than 300 voters therein, by well-defined boundaries, such as streams, side lines, concession lines or the like, into districts, in such manner that the number of voters in said polling districts shall be nearly equal as may be, and not in any case exceed 200.

And also that the following words be added after "order," on line 17, page 10:—

For each of such polling districts.

Section 18 provides that before the final revision the revising officer shall make this sub-division. In the interest of the public, I think it might as well be made early as late. One of the suggestions of the First Minister was that the sub-divisions should be into municipalities, but they will be very large. The sub-division should be made before the first revision.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I have very great encouragement in acceding to amendments offered by hon. gentlemen opposite. Whenever I make an amendment in accordance with the views of those hon. gentlemen, or which has even the appearance of meeting their views, it is a signal for renewed opposition and renewed obstruction. We cannot disguise the fact that the debate to-night has been one of obstruction—of decided obstruction. Everybody must admit it has been so. I had intended, perhaps, to have gone some way to meet the views of the hon. member for St. John, who spoke in a manner which would not justify me in calling his remarks obstruction—but his was a singular exception to the speeches which have been made to-night. Of course, I cannot move the amendment, but perhaps it will be supposed that the hon. Minister of Public Works moves an amendment on the 4th line.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but is my amendment voted down, or does the hon. gentleman propose now to amend my amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it is voted down.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, there is another which I wish to move.

Mr. DAVIES. I had one in my hand on the same subject and I think it is on the point that the right hon. gentleman refers to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. First, I wish to meet the views of the hon. member for St. John, by inserting the words "the last revised assessment roll or rolls."

Mr. DAVIES. In Prince Edward Island the counties are divided into school districts, and each school district has a roll, and perhaps the First Minister would have no objection to add, after the word "appointed," the words "or any city or town, or any parish, or any school district therein."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that would not do. I have inserted an amendment, providing for a certified copy of the poll-books where there are no assessment rolls.

Mr. DAVIES. I would point out that these rolls of the school districts contain the names of every property owner within them, and, collectively, the names of all the property owners in the county, and this would be simply placing us in the same position in this respect as in the organised municipalities.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we had better hold that over for the present. There is another suggestion of the hon. member for St. John which struck me. He said that in New Brunswick the whole electoral district or county was a municipality. I propose to provide for such cases, by saying that where the electoral district is a municipality, a separate list shall be made for each township, parish, etc.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the First Minister if it is intended that a municipality is a municipality for the election of councillors, or for members of the Local House?

Sir JOHN. A. MACDONALD. You have not a municipality for electoral purposes; you have counties and districts for that purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. I wish to make a remark or two, in moving my amendment. The First Minister says he has not been met in a proper spirit, and therefore he allows the amendments to be voted down. I want the First Minister and the committee to understand that I am not moving amendments in the interest of myself or of my party, and

that they are matters of as little concern to me, individually, as to any hon. gentleman opposite. I think I put my case very fairly. I deny any attempt to take up the time of this committee. I deny having said anything that I did not feel called upon to say, with reference to the amendment which I offered before. I did not feel that it was necessary to continue an apology to the committee for offering the remarks I did.

Mr. RYKERT. Eleven hours on a section.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not responsible for that. I have a right to speak on behalf of my constituents. There was a motion before this committee that warranted me in saying all I said, and would have warranted me in saying double what I said. My amendment was one that ought to have commended itself to the committee. Was it not in the interest of everyone?

Mr. RYKERT. No; it was not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was an absurd amendment.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the hon. gentleman proposed an absurd clause in his Bill, for the amendment is, word for word, taken from his Bill, only in the Bill the division is to be at the final revision instead of the first. Is it not better for the revising officer to make his division on the first list, when the people have have a chance to see it? We can look through a list as well as the hon. gentleman can; but unless he thinks it is convenient to have 2,000 names to look through, when he might have had 200, I say my amendment was in the interest of the people, and it was voted down. I make these remarks in reference to what was said by the First Minister. I think his remarks were dicourteous; he undertook to deliver a lecture to me, and he insinuated, not that my amendment was an improper one, but because he had made amendments in other directions, which had not been received in the proper spirit, it was not even worth while to put this amendment, although, when I moved it, I said only a few words, willing to let the good sense of the amendment speak for itself, and that was the spirit in which it was received. I am not going to find any more fault. The hon. gentleman has a right to speak, I suppose, as much as I; I want to recognise his position as leader of the House, but I do think he was not justified, even in the position he occupies, from anything I said or did, in delivering a lecture which I, not being one of his good boys, and well trained, was not willing to submit patiently to. That having been voted down, I ask the attention of the committee to this resolution which I propose:

That the following words be added after the word "order," in line 17, page 10:—For each of the polling districts, as set out for use at the then last election of a member of the House of Commons.

We will take it for granted that the revising officer could not make his division at the first list; and fully impressed with the idea I sought to carry out in the last amendment, I seek now to have it done by proposing this amendment. It simply proposes that the revising officer, after he has made his first list, shall have it printed. It will be as easy for him to have it published then as after the final revision. I say no more; it will so obviously commend itself to the good sense of the committee that I leave it in your hands.

Mr. MILLS. This is a proposition to take the polling divisions as they existed at the elections of 1882. I think it would have been more convenient to have adopted the other amendment, but that failing, this is better than nothing. I do not admit at all the observation of the First Minister addressed to this side of the House. I think the remark was uncalled for, that the amendment was absurd. There is no more difficulty in making the division into polling divisions in the first instance than there is in the last; and though this amendment will not be quite as satisfactory as the other would have been, it will certainly be better than the proposition the First Minister makes. He proposes that each municipality should be arranged alphabetically. If the list contains several thousand names it would be almost impossible to tell whether names have been improperly left off or improperly put on. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman has not accepted the amendments proposed from this side of the House in the spirit in which they have been proposed. We have been sincerely anxious to propose amendments, but every amendment has been voted down in dogged silence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say that that is too barefaced a remark for the hon. gentleman to make. The hon. gentleman vowed, when this discussion in committee commenced, that the only way of pleasing him was to withdraw the Bill. That was his statement, and his whole course has been to force the Government to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said so, and everybody heard him say so.

Mr. MILLS. It is not true. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The statement that amendments were not received in the right spirit does not come properly from him. Other gentlemen who have proposed amendments and have discussed them might have made such a remark, but under no circumstances could it properly come from an hon. gentleman who made up his mind that he should weary out the majority, and the hon. gentleman cannot, in candor, say that that was not his intention.

Mr. MILLS. An hon. gentleman opposite, I think it was the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), suggested a number of changes that might promote the business of the House, and when he was mentioning them I mentioned the withdrawal of the Bill as one of them. My observation does not admit of the interpretation the hon. gentleman has put upon it, and he knows it does not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, in his speech, said this Bill was so obnoxious from beginning to end that no man would have a right to obey it. The hon. gentleman said it would be disgraceful that this measure should be passed.

Mr. MILLS. I say so still, and that statement is perfectly consistent with what I said. I say the hon. gentleman knows as well as any hon. gentleman that the measure is a discreditable measure, calculated not only to discredit Parliament but to discredit the country as well.

Mr. CASEY. The proposition that if an hon. member declares a Bill to be obnoxious, discreditable, unconstitutional, no attempt should be made to improve that Bill, to render it less vexatious, less unconstitutional, can be regarded as only absurd, as a proposition one would never expect to hear, even from the Prime Minister. I did not think the right hon. gentleman would have lead us off into this digression, after we had been discussing this particular section of the Bill all evening. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen who have done nothing but howl and bark and growl to repeat those noises now, but our discussion has had the effect of causing the hon. gentleman to amend this Bill in some respects. It is nonense to talk about obstruction; if the Bill has been amended at all it is in consequence of our so-called obstruction.

There is one point to which I called attention this afternoon, and which I wish to bring to the hon. gentleman's notice now. He promised, on the 22nd of last month, to introduce a clause providing that when a tenant was assessed for $150 —we were dealing with cities and towns—that would be accepted as *primâ facie* assumption that they pay $20 rental. This is the place to introduce that amendment, and I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he intends to move it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. The amendment the right hon gentleman has suggested, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, does not meet the circumstances of the case. His amendment is, that copies of the poll book should be submitted to the revising officer, and put in his possession, to be accepted by him, as the assessment rolls are in the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman is only making confusion worse confounded. The last voting lists are based on manhood suffrage, and they contain a thousand votes which cannot be put on the list now. If a copy of the poll books is to be accepted as *primâ facie* evidence that every man named there has a right to vote, the consequence will be that you will give the right to vote to a thousand men, in direct violation of the law, men who have not the qualifications required by this Bill. If the revising officer has to accept the poll books as *primâ facie* evidence, the onus is thrown on the candidate to have every bad vote removed. The revising officer, if he puts on or off votes, as he pleases, will throw the onus on somebody, of going in and having names put off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is right.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says it is right that 1,000 votes not qualified under the law should go on, in direct violence of the law. Men who have admittedly not all the qualifications will be on the voters' lists, and then you say let somebody knock them off. But that somebody may knock off some 500 or 600 votes which he knows will be against him, and may leave on 500 of those who are in his favor, though both equally unqualified. If the hon. gentleman would adopt my amendment, to return to the revising officer the assessment rolls in each of the school districts, the revising officer would have the same data as is furnished by the assessment rolls in the other Provinces, and then the farmers' sons and the sons of land owners and the others who would be left out would claim their right to be added. You are making the poll book containing the names of hundreds who have no votes, *primâ facie* evidence of their right to be on the voters' list, and I must therefore bring rebuttal evidence to strike off these names. I say it is an unjust and iniquitous provision. The school district assessment rolls show every man who has an acre of land on the island, and if you take those, any man who wishes to come in under any other provision can apply for that purpose, as he must elsewhere. You put on 1,000 men who have no right to vote, and you throw the duty upon the candidate to show that they should not be there. It will create tremendous trouble, unless both parties agree to leave them all on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These school assessments show only the names of proprietors of land. What is to become of the income voters and the tenants? The argument of the hon. gentleman is a justification for the expression, "and such other information as he can get." There is nothing to prevent the revising officer, after taking the last polling list as *primâ facie* evidence of the right to vote, sending for the sch ol assessment rolls; but they must be very imperfect and cannot be of much real assistance to the revising officer, because the real property voters must be a very small proportion, especially in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman says he is in favor of manhood suffrage. Why does he not allow the last polling list to stand? He does not like to put in any objection, because he might object to the wrong man; he might object to a man who might say: I would have voted for you if you had not put me off. I do not think we can accept this amendment.

Mr. DAVIES. By the use of the school assessments we should be precisely in the same position as Ontario. You have no income tax in the municipalities in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. You have not in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an income franchise in New Brunswick.

Mr. DAVIES. There is none in Nova Scotia. In the cities and towns in Prince Edward Island we have the income tax as well, and the assessment roll gives the name of everyone who pays that tax. The hon. gentleman makes the assessment rolls *primâ facie* evidence in Ontario. Do they show the farmers' sons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. They do not, in the Maritime Provinces, at any rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You have only to ask the man if he has any property.

Mr. DAVIES. The man would not be there. He would be on the list, and I should have to bring evidence if I wanted to strike his vote off. That will cause tremendous expense. Somebody will do it, and the other will suffer. The man who has the most money will go in and strike off his opponents. We are legislating deliberately to put on a lot of men who have no votes. There is such a thing as justice and fair play, and we are not getting it. It is a most iniquitous thing.

Mr. MILLS. The right hon. gentleman's explanation was untenable. If he takes the last polling book he will put on the name of all parties who had votes at the previous election. They are not voters, but he provides that they shall go on the list. Sir, we are informed that the hon. gentleman has promised the members for Prince Edward Island, or certain of them, that they shall have manhood suffrage; that this Bill shall be altered in the other Chamber, and when it comes down here the hon. gentleman will support it with this change. He is so much devoted to the principle of uniformity that he will not consent to make the amendment here. It would be a disagreeable business to give Prince Edward Island manhood suffrage and withhold it from other portions of the Dominion.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). In Prince Edward Island, in 1882, every person 21 years of age, who was a British subject, was allowed to vote. Does my hon. friend suppose that they are going to be 21 years of age forever?

Mr. DAVIES. If my hon. friend had run an election in Prince Edward Island he would learn that there are hundreds and hundreds who vote upon manhood suffrage qualification at every election, and these young men who voted at the last election possess that qualification now. I would like the hon. gentleman to consider the words a little lower down, and strike out the words that the poll books shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the right of every man there to vote. That is what I object to. Every man in that book, whether he has the qualification or not, is to be put on, and to knock him off you must bring counter evidence to show that he has no vote, which will cost, perhaps, $10 for every vote. Why, it will cost thousands of dollars to run an election under those circumstances.

Mr. RYKERT. It puts money into circulation.

Mr. DAVIES. If that is the principle upon which hon. gentlemen are going, it justifies a good many epithets that are used against the Bill. It is most unjust and most arbitrary, and calculated to impose a fine upon every man who seeks to get elected. What can he do, with 7,000 voters in the county, and with 1,500 or 2,000 of whom have voted on manhood suffrage? You would have to go through the county and bring evidence to show that these could not vote. It is something I would not relish, but if it cost a thousand, or two thousand dollars, I would be obliged to do it, in self-defence, and my opponent would have to do it, too. I would like to put 500 votes in the county of the hon. member for Inverness, particularly if they were opposed to him, and see if he would like that.

Mr. CAMERON. I could spare 500, and I would have 350 majority afterwards.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not fair to make the polling book *primâ facie* evidence of a right to vote, when you know that that polling book contains the names of thousands of voters who have no vote under the Act. I would move that the words, "or polling books," be struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the most unpatriotic speech I ever heard delivered in the House of Commons. He is in favor of manhood suffrage. He says that every man, a British subject, coming to twenty-one years of age, has a right to vote; yet he says that he will willingly spend his money, a thousand or perhaps two thousand dollars, for the purpose of depriving a large body of men of the right to vote, who ought to have the right to vote, because he thinks they don't look upon political subjects the same way he does. Why, Mr. Chairman, if we want to hold up the hon. gentleman to his constituents as being an unpatriotic man, a mere blind partisan, not caring whether he deprives one hundred or five hundred men of their votes, and, at the same time, believing that every one of them ought to have a vote—if that won't ruin him among his constituents it will be just about as bad as it was with the Hon. David Laird some years ago.

Mr. DAVIES. This is the style of argument we have heard all through this Bill. The hon. gentleman deliberately passes a law to deprive these men of the right to vote, and when I move an amendment to continue to them that right he votes the amendment down. Then he comes in afterwards and says: We will put a thousand votes on the list that have not the right to vote, and you must take the chance of letting them vote you out of a seat. After this Parliament has declared that these men shall have no right to exercise the franchise, the hon. gentleman still allows them to send a man to represent them here. I am told it is unpatriotic. What nonsense that is! I do not wonder at his own supporters behind him smiling in derision. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the candidate will be obliged, in self-defence, to take that course. His opponent will take it. Do you suppose, when there are 500 men who have not got the right to vote, on the list, that you are going to let them remain there? In self-defence you will be obliged to do it After I have aserted, by my voice and vote, the right of these young men to vote, and after the right hon. gentleman has deliberately, by law, taken the right away from them, for him then to say it is unpatriotic to prevent them going on the list is the height of absurdity.

Mr. CASEY. The remarks of the right hon. gentleman do not deserve to be called a reply. If they were delivered outside this House they would be designated as the most wretched twaddle. To hear such remarks from the gentleman who is *de facto* leader of this country, in answer to a serious speech, is saddening. It has sobered us up from the jollity in which we were disporting. The demand made by Prince Edward Island, that the polling books should be adopted as the basis of the voters' lists, is simple justice and common sense. The hon. gentleman refused manhood suffrage to Prince Edward Island, and insisted on a property qualification, and now he declines to take the only means of carrying his plan out. The hon. gentleman's action is only capable of two explanations: Either he does not see the drift of the suggestion, or he does not wish to see it. Probably the hon. gentleman wants to retain manhood suffrage by a side wind. If manhood suffrage is retained in Prince Edward Island we want it retained by law and not by a side wind. I have voted for it, and I will vote for it again, but I want it retained by regular means. The First Minister distinctly stated that he would make provisions by which the assessment rolls should become *primâ facie* evidence as to tenants. In the discussion on 22nd May the hon. gentleman promised to introduce a clause which would enable the revising officer to make certain use of the assessment rolls in regard to tenants. He has paid no attention to that matter. I will quote the words he used on that occasion. He said:

"That in case any assessment roll shows a party to be a tenant, but does not show the rent he pays, I propose to add a proviso which, although it does not go as far as the hon. gentleman wishes, goes a considerable step towards it, and I propose to provide that the fact that the property in respect to which he pays a rent is assessed at $150 shall be accepted as *primâ facie* evidence that the tenant has a right to be on the register."

The hon. gentleman promised to insert a provision of that kind in the Bill, and this is where it should be inserted. I call his attention to the desirability of making the change now.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has not answered the point I put to him, so we will give him an opportunity of voting whether he will carry out the arrangement he proposed or not. As he proposed to carry out the arrangement, no amendment has been prepared by this side of the House, reliance being placed on the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) stated that he did not see any difference between the powers exercised by the clerk of a municipality in Ontario and the powers proposed to be conferred on the revising officer.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say that. I said this: That I did not see what difference it made, whether the clerk of a municipality copied the assessment roll or whether the revising barrister did it.

Mr. MULOCK. It is the same idea. It makes no difference who copies the roll. The hon. gentleman was expressing satisfaction with the Ontario system, and pointed out that our rolls were made up by clerks copying from the assessment rolls. He saw no difference, in substance, between the present system in Ontario and the one which would obtain under this Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman made that statement.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say that; the hon. gentleman is wrong again.

Mr. MULOCK. Whatever was the drift of the hon. gentleman's observations, I drew this inference: He was quite satisfied with the way the lists were made up in Ontario to-day, and by illustration, he pointed to the fact that the clerks copied simply from the rolls, and he would wish us to believe that he thought the revising officer would be the same in that respect. The duties of the clerk are

simply to copy. The Revised Statutes of Ontario, chapter 9, entitled "The Voters' List Act," section 2, defines the matter. (The hon. gentleman read the section.)

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There is not a member from Ontario but knows that as well as you do. Do you think we are a pack of fools ?

Mr. MULOCK. I read the statute to show that the clerk in the Province of Ontario is obliged to transfer to the voters' list the names of all persons who appear to be entitled to vote according to the assessment roll, and my suggestion should apply to the revising officer in preparing his original list. The First Minister stated that it was desirable to minimise the duties of the revising officer anterior to the period of revision, and if we can, to a certain extent, control his power in making out the lists, we are carrying out the policy of the First Minister, and carrying out a sound policy. We should not unnecessarily delegate power to any person, and we should restrict the discretion of the revising officer as much as possible. The First Minister thinks my amendment is covered by his proviso, but I favor my amendment, because it provides that the alphabetical list shall include all who appear to be entitled to the franchise by the revised assessment roll, so that it would leave the revising officer no discretion. He could be compelled by mandamus to transfer them, whereas, under the proviso, he is left with judicial powers. At the stage when he is gathering material to make his list, he is to consider the rolls as *primâ facie* evidence, which implies that he may have other evidence. If he is bound by the rolls at that stage, they should be conclusive evidence, instead of *primâ facie* evidence, as the words *primâ facie* evidence imply the power of weighing evidence at that stage. After the voter has had his name placed on the list, after the assessor has used his own knowledge to place him on the list, and that name is left on the list, then the only kind of evidence that the revising officer would have would be hearsay evidence. He cannot have, at that stage, as good evidence as the assessor has had.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the amendment I have moved fully meets the object of the hon. gentleman. He says that *primâ facie* evidence should be conclusive evidence. Well, it is conclusive evidence if it cannot be rebutted at any subsequent stage. To give an illustration : The revising officer, in preparing his list, is in the situation of a grand jury, who judge upon the *primâ facie* evidence, but when he comes to settle the rolls finally, he sits as a judge and jury, and he will be bound to hold to the *primâ facie* evidence unless it is rebutted afterwards. That is the opinion which I have come to, and with every respect for the hon. gentleman's argument, which I quite appreciate, I cannot see my way to a change.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do, and better, that the grand juries do not receive rebutting evidence at all, and the revising officer may. If he thinks the word "conclusive" would not answer, he might get over the difficulty by saying "conclusive for the purpose of the preliminary roll."

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. I would move that the words "or polling books" be struck out. The revising officer could then take such means as he liked to ascertain who were tenants or occupants, income voters, or farmers' sons.

Mr. MILLS. We have, in this amendment, as we have had in many others this evening, an evidence of the anxious desire of the hon. gentleman to receive suggestions from this side of the House. He assured us, a few days ago, how sincerely anxious he was to receive suggestions from this side of the House, and we see, from the spirit in which every proposition from this side has been met, what his anxiety amounts to.

Amendment to amendment negatived, and amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On section 13,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose some amendments to this clause. It has been suggested to me that it would be as well to send copies of the list to the unsuccessful candidate at the last election. That is done under the Ontario Act.

Mr. MILLS. That is not only done, but there are a good many things done which are not done in the provisions of this Bill. The hon. gentleman proposes that two copies should be sent to each candidate for the House of Commons. In Ontario there are ten copies sent, the intention being to enable a candidate to place a sufficient number of copies in the hands of his friends in the different polling divisions. The hon. gentleman will see that that is a matter of very great convenience. There are not often more then or eight polling divisions in a township. With two copies it is impossible that that can be done. There are other provisions in this section which are in the highest degree unsatisfactory, apart from the provisions in the beginning, which I shall not mention, as my hon. friend has an amendment to it, which will require a great deal of consideration. The hon. gentleman provides, also, that copies of the list shall be furnished at a price proportionately sufficient to cover the price paid for them. The hon. gentleman might put the lists into the hands of a few of the friends of the Government, and the proportionate price might be very exorbitant. Under the Ontario law these lists are furnished at a mere trifle, and under the English law at 6d. per hundred names. Here, that would be 10 cents per hundred names, but in this Bill you charge 6 cents for ten names, nearly ten times the charge in England. In Ontario a very much smaller sum is charged, excepting the furnishing the special names after the lists have been revised by the judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks about the number in Ontario. The numbers sent here to the members of the different parties are the voters' lists finally revised. This is merely the preliminary list, which will be posted up in the post office, and elsewhere, so that the people may see them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. gentleman will not expect us to go on with amendments ; if so, I propose to discuss the motion to adjourn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not wish to press hon. gentlemen unduly, but I think if there are really any amendments prepared they should be laid on the Table, so that we may know what they are. In England that would be compulsory.

Mr. PATERSON. In that matter the hon. gentleman himself has set us a bad example. He came down with important amendments to this clause under discussion, of which he gave no notice, and which altered some of the amendments we proposed to make. I think the hon. gentleman should also lay any amendments he intends to make on the Table.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Bill is a very good Bill, as it is, and perhaps I will go on with it as it stands. I did not suppose any hon. gentleman opposite came to fight out this one clause until 3 o'clock in the morning. We have discussed this clause 11 or 12 hours.

Mr. PATERSON. You did not accept our amendments.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 3.20 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 2nd June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

Mr. RYKERT. On the 26th May a petition was presented from certain electors of the town of Niagara, praying that the Franchise Bill may not become law. I beg leave to present a petition, signed by a large number of the said ratepayers, representing that their names were obtained by false and fraudulent representations, and that, having ascertained the particulars of the said Bill, they are anxious that the Bill should be passed for the public benefit, and to prevent the interference of designing and unscrupulous men in the Local Legislature, and further, they desire to prevent an unscrupulous Opposition in this House from wasting the time of Parliament. This petition is signed by nine out of the twelve who signed the other petition.

Mr. EDGAR. I think a question of privilege has arisen in connection with the remarks made by the hon. member for Lincoln. I would like to read two letters which I have received to-day upon that subject, because it is alleged that gentlemen on this side of the House have presented petitions, the signatures to which were obtained by misrepresentation. A letter which I received to-day from St. Catharines states:

"I understand that Mr. J. C. Rykert is endeavoring, through one of his hacks, Thomas Beatty, Inspector of Weights and Measures"——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I do not think that this is a matter of privilege. When the petition comes up on the motion to read and receive it, that will be the time, if any, to discuss it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Allusion was made to the fact that these names had been obtained by fraudulent pretences. I think, under those circumstances, an explanation is in order, and ought to be permitted. It having been said by the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), in presenting the petition, that these names had been obtained by fraudulent pretences, no objection can be made to the course of my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that the petition states that.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member alleged it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that that is an allegation of the petition.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman was stating the allegations contained in the petition. The question may be, whether the petition is to be received or not—I do not know yet; I think the proper time would be when the motion is made for reading and receiving that petition.

MEDALS FOR THE VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia the question of which I gave him private notice. Is it the intention of the Government to have a medal struck for presentation to those volunteers who have been called out for active service in the North-West, as a token of how highly the people of the Dominion appreciate the patriotism, courage and devotion with which, without warning, they have responded, in the hour of danger, to the call of duty.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that the matter to which he has referred has not yet been considered by the Government.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Before the amendment of which the First Minister has given notice is proposed, I desire to move an amendment to the first part of this clause, the object of which is to furnish means for providing printed copies of the primary voters' lists. For some years we have had printed voters' lists in some of the Provinces, and the advantage has been so apparent that I think it very desirable the same facilities should be continued. It is true that there is an optional provision in this clause for printing the lists, but the purpose of my amendment is to make it an absolute necessity on the part of the revising officer that these lists shall be printed. In the Province of Ontario it was held as a decided boon when the Legislature changed the law in the direction of requiring the lists to be published. Municipal bodies have furnished these lists at their expense, but the expense has been so small, comparatively, that no one has been found to take exception to the course that has been since followed. The municipalities get them printed cheaply, and they are furnished in sufficient number to supply every one who desires to secure a copy. I am satisfied that the departure proposed in section 13 will be extremely unsatisfactorily, and I trust the First Minister will consent to such an amendment as will make it not merely optional with the revising officer, but one of his duties, to secure the printing of these lists, in order that they may be supplied in such numbers as that all may procure a copy who desire. It is provided in a subsequent part of this clause that one copy of the list shall be posted up in the office of the clerk or the corresponding officer of each municipal and parochial division, and that it shall be open to inspection by any person, free of charge. I assume that it is intended to furnish conveniences whereby any elector may ascertain whether his name is on the list, and if he finds it omitted, that he may have an opportunity of entering his protest. If the lists are not printed, the only opportunity the majority of the electors will have to ascertain whether their names are on the lists or not, or whether names are on the list that ought not to be there, is the written list that is in the possession of the municipal officers; if that list is printed in sufficient numbers, it will evidently be a great convenience to the electors. That is an additional reason why the amendment should prevail. There is a further reason why printed lists should be adopted under this clause. Hon. gentlemen opposite have more than once alleged that the municipal clerks cannot, under any legislation passed by this Parliament, be compelled to carry out any requirements of this Legislature. Supposing that to be the case, and knowing the refusal of Parliament to recognise their position in the preparation of the list, as we have done by adopting the clause and rejecting the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), proposing that the municipal clerks should prepare the primary list, they can with perfect impunity throw that list out of doors. There is no provision in the

Bill for attempting to control these municipal officers. There is no provision in this Bill for a return of the courtesy extended to members of the Dominion House by having copies of the voters' list, which are sent to them, furnished to the Local Legislature. There is no recognition of their claims in this Bill, but no doubt that ommission will be remedied. It is important that the voters' lists should be printed instead of "made," as provided for in this Bill. When we compare the cost of voters' lists in England with the proposed charge here, we see the extravagant amount proposed in this Bill. Under the English Act a ratepayer is entitled to receive a copy of the voters' list, if the names do not exceed 1,000 for 1s.; if they exceed 1,000 and not 3,000, for 2s. 6d., and so on; the amount charged for a list over 9,000 names being 10s. Under this clause, for a list with 1,000 names, ratepayers in Canada will have to pay $6, or twenty-five times as much as the English ratepayer. If the number of names on the list exceeds 3,000 the charge will be $18, or twenty-nine times as much. Experience in Ontario has conclusively shown the advantages that result from having a printed list, and that well circulated; and a similar practice should be followed here. In order to carry out these view I beg to move:

That the words "make or," on the 39th line of paragraph 10, be struck out; also that the word "make," on the 40th line of paragraph 10 be struck out, and the word "printed" be inserted therefor in each case.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust the First Minister will make some reply with regard to the amendment of my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Cameron), as he may thereby shorten the discussion on this clause. The question involved in this clause is a very important one to the whole Dominion, as a question of expense, and also to the candidate who may be engaged in a contest. As, however, the First Minister does not appear disposed to express any opinion on the question just now, I shall, in a few words, explain my views on this question. At present the clause does not compel the revising officer to print a single copy of the preliminary list, as he will comply with the provisions of the clause by simply writing out a certain number of copies. One copy is to be sent to the clerk of the municipality——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend will allow me, I would say that here is one instance where it would have been well if the hon. gentleman had moved his amendment last night, so that we might have considered it. On looking at it for the first time, I may say that I shall accept the amendment.

Mr. CAMERON. It would have been well for the First Minister if, instead of putting my hon. friend to the trouble of framing his motion and making his observations upon it, he had framed this Bill in the first instance so as to cover this case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; never satisfied.

Mr. CAMERON. Hon. gentlemen opposite are perfectly satisfied with any proposition that may be submitted. We may go on day after day discussing a proposition of this kind, and then the First Minister comes down and makes an amendment. If he had framed his Bill, in the first instance, with the care and the deliberation which he should have given to a Bill of this magnitude and importance, it would save a considerable amount of discussion. Although the amendment of my hon. friend is a proper one, so far as it goes, the First Minister must see at a glance that it does not go far enough. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to make any additional amendment with respect to this clause?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Let us dispose of this first.

Mr. CAMERON. I propose to discuss the whole clause. All that is required by this amendment is that the revising officer shall print some fifteen or twenty copies of the electoral list, which are distributed among certain persons. But we all know that each candidate in a contest requires a very large number of copies in order to conduct his campaign with reasonable satisfaction. Where is he to get these copies, unless the First Minister will provide that, as in the English Act, a certain number shall be printed, in order to satisfy all reasonable demands for them, by candidates and others who may require them, and at a reasonable expense. By the Bill they can only be obtained from the revising officer, by paying 6 cents for every ten names. A candidate would require to have at least four copies for each electoral polling sub-division; and as there are an average of seven in each electoral district, there would be required at least twenty-eight for each candidate, or fifty-six for the candidates alone. I know that, in my own constituency, while engaged in a contest, I never have less than from twenty to twenty-five copies of the voters' list, and every candidate will require to have at least that number. The opposite candidate would require to have the same number. How are you going to get these voters' lists? Under the Bill, as now framed, all that the revising officer requires to get printed is something like twenty copies, and if you require any additional copies you will have to pay him a sum not exceeding 6 cents for every ten names. Take my own constituency as an illustration of the hardships this provision imposes on the candidate. In that constituency there are seven municipalities and thirty-five polling sub-divisions. You require for each municipality at least four copies; so that, at the very least, each candidate will require twenty-eight copies. He gets two copies, under the Bill, so that he requires to purchase at least twenty-six copies, in order that he may be able to get the constituency canvassed in each sub-division. There are nearly 5,000 names on the voters' list of the electoral district of West Huron; but assuming that there are 4,000—multiply 26 by 4,000, and it makes 104,000 names; which, at the rate of 6 cents for every 10 names, amounts to $624. It is a monstrous outrage; no official of the Government should be allowed to take 6 cents for every ten names; and without this expense it is utterly impossible for the candidate to obtain the requisite number of voters' lists, in order to examine thoroughly into the condition of the electorate in the particular constituency. Therefore, the hon. gentleman ought to adopt the English law, and compel the revising officer to publish a sufficient number and to sell them at a reasonable figure, so that candidates and others who require the voters' lists will not be imposed on by the officials entrusted with the administration of this portion of the Bill. Under the Ontario law each candidate, the defeated as well as the successful, gets ten copies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of the voters' lists?

Mr. CAMERON. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not the voters' list.

Mr. CAMERON. It is much more important that the political party should have a sufficient number of copies of the preliminary list, because there is only a limited time allowed to prepare objections to the list. The candidate has to send a copy of the preliminary voters' list to each polling sub-division, and find out from the residents there whether any parties entitled to vote have been left off improperly, or whether any parties are on who ought not to be on; and with the limited time allowed for objections to be put in, it becomes absolutely necessary that we should have more copies of the voters' list than the law provides we should have. An enormous sum would have to be paid for voters' lists in my county, and the same remark will apply to other districts; whereas, if the voters' lists were printed

in sufficient number to supply all demands, and the revising officer were only to charge the reasonable cost of printing, the objections to this clause would be removed. By the English law the local authorities are compelled to publish the voters' list in sufficient numbers to satisfy all demands, and there is a schedule which limits the charges to 10s. for any number of names exceeding 9,000; 7s. 6d. for any number between 6,000 and 9,000; 5s. for any number between 3,000 and 6,000; 2s. 6d. for any number between 1,000 and 3,000; and 1s. for any number up to 1,000. No one could object to those charges. In my county, I would have to pay, under the English law, 5s. for a copy of the list, or $20 for twenty copies, whereas, under this Bill, the charges I would have to pay would be enormous. This is a matter that will work both ways, for I apprehend that hon. gentlemen opposite will require copies of the voters' list for their canvass just as well as Liberal candidates, and unless they can get them from the revising officer without pay they will have to pay the same charges. Apart from the question of cost, there is another extraordinary provision in this clause which I think the First Minister ought to amend. The voters' list, in order to be of the slightest utility or advantage to the public, will require to be published somewhere. To send them to the officials mentioned here is of some consequence, but not very much. Those copies will never reach the hands of the persons who really take an active interest in the political affairs of the constituency. There ought to be some additional mode by which the public at large will be enabled to see how the register, for the time being, has been made up. The hon. gentleman proposes that there shall be a publication of the list. What publication does the hon. gentleman propose by the Bill? He directs that a copy of the voters' list, the preliminary voters' list, shall be transmitted to the clerk of the municipality; and he directs that the clerk shall post up the list. Now, on clause 14 there is another direction, that two copies of the preliminary list shall be transmitted to every postmaster in the electoral district, and that the postmaster shall, in a public and conspicuous place in his post office, post up the list. We know that in Ontario, at all events, these lists are with the clerk of the municipality, and certain other officials, and we know where to go and when to go in order to examine the lists. That official is compelled to post them up and keep them posted up. Under this Bill the only persons compelled to post their lists up in a public and conspicuous place, are the postmasters of electoral districts. In some electoral districts there are municipalities where there are no postmasters. I have in my mind one municipality in a riding in the west where there is no post office, and in that case the only public notice of the publication of the electoral lists would be the notice published by the county clerk. How is he compelled to publish them? This clause says he shall post them up, but does not say how long. He may post the list up at noon, and it may be torn down five minutes later, and he is not compelled to post it up again. During the whole time that elapses between the publication of the list and the revision, the list may not be posted up for two consecutive minutes in the office of the clerk of the municipality. That is unreasonable. Those who are not in the inner circle, who have not the ear of the revising officer and his clerk, and his constable, may know nothing about the revision of the voters' list. The letter, and even the spirit of this provision of the law, may be complied with, and yet there may be no publication whatever for five consecutive minutes in any municipality. The hon. gentleman ought to provide that the local officials, such as the clerk of the township, the sheriff of the electoral district or the county, the treasurer, the clerk of the county, and the other public officials should be compelled, not only to post up, but to keep posted up the voters' lists during the whole

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

space of time between the day of publication and the date fixed for the preliminary revision. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the English electoral law he will find, in section 23, how the publication is arranged for there. Why he should not compel any person except the township clerk or the clerk of the municipality to post up these voters' lists and then not compel them to keep them posted up for a given time, the interval between the days of publication and preliminary revision, is to me incomprehensible. Why he should not compel the local officials, the sheriff and the county treasurer, and the county clerk, to post up and keep posted in their offices, in conspicuous places, these lists is to me equally incomprehensible. Had the hon. gentleman referred to the English Act, he would have found there express provisions that certain public officials are bound to post up the voters' lists in a conspicuous and public place and keep them posted up. Section 23 of the English Act provides as follows:—

"Every notice, every list registered, or other document herein required to be published, shall be published, except where some other mode or place of publication is herein expressly provided, by being affixed in some public and conspicuous situation, on the outside of the door or outer wall near the door of the buildings hereinafter named for that purpose."

What would be the effect of a strict compliance with this clause, in so far as the county clerk is concerned? We know that in Ontario the township clerks, as a rule, keep no public office; their office is in their own home. All this Bill requires of the clerk is to post up the list; it does not say in a public, conspicuous place, or to keep it posted up. He may, in strict compliance with this law, post it up behind his door, under his desk, in any place not conspicuous, where it cannot be seen at all, and he may keep it posted up for only five minutes in strict compliance with the law. Surely that is not the kind of publication the hon. gentleman contemplates, or which ought to be given to documents of this kind. In England it is not published in the office but on the door or in some conspicuous place near the door, so that if the elector cannot attend during the official hours he can still see the list, or the notice of its revision, or any other notice required to be given under the English electoral law. In order that the people may have the fullest possible information, the English law requires that every church and public chapel in every parish or township, every place of public worship that belongs to the Established Church or any dissenting body shall be utilised as places where these notices of revision and of the voters' lists shall be published, and they are required to be posted up at certain other places as well; and in another clause publication is provided for in a newspaper in each county. If the hon. gentleman desires the kind of publication that the people have fairly a right to demand at his hands, now that he is inaugurating a new system for the preparation and the revision of the voters' lists, he should provide that not only the clerk of the municipality should post up and keep posted up the notices in a public and conspicuous place on or near the door of his office, but he ought to provide also that a copy of the list should be sent to every teacher in the electoral district and every church in the electoral district, so that the lists might be posted up at the church doors and the school-house doors——

Mr. BOWELL. And the pulpit.

Mr. CAMERON. That might not do the hon. gentleman much good. He, perhaps, does not go near the pulpit very often.

Mr. BOWELL. You never should judge others by yourself.

Mr. CAMERON. I am arguing this matter in a sensible way, and not as a joke.

Mr. BOWELL. Has there ever been any difficulty in regard to the point the hon. gentleman is now discussing, in Ontario?

Mr. CAMERON. No; but it is very different.

Mr. BOWELL. This is not half so expensive.

Mr. CAMERON. I say it is very different, and the hon. gentleman does not know anything about the Bill if he says it is not. Under this law, the only publication required is by the clerks of the municipality and the postmasters in the electoral districts, but the clerk of the township is not bound to keep it posted for five minutes. The hon. gentleman's remark in reference to putting it up in the pulpits is a small joke which is not worthy of discussion.

Mr. BOWELL. You are turning the whole thing into ridicule, for the sake of your audience.

Mr. CAMERON. If the Government desire to have a proper publication, let them adopt the English law on the subject, or let them send these documents to the public officials who are recognised, especially in Ontario, and let these documents be posted where the public can have access to them at all hours of the day. Hon. gentlemen have adopted a system which will work admirably in the interests of the party, but it is not a fair system. Under the English law, these documents must be posted in a conspicuous and public place, and must be kept so published, and, if they are mutilated or torn down, maliciously or otherwise, the official charged with the duty of posting them, is bound to post them up again, and, if any one improperly removes them, he is liable to a penalty. This Bill provides no such guarantees or protection for the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always the Conservative committee to look after their interest. They have the revising barrister, who is the nominee of the Crown, and they have the constable and the clerk, who will be party men. These three men are always there, charged with looking after the interests of the Conservative party. Those opposed to the Government have no safety or protection, and any amount of fraud can be perpetrated under the Bill as it stands. The list may be revised without the public knowing anything about it, for it is not necessary to post it up more than a few minutes. The leader of the Government invited amendments and suggestions in reference to the Bill, and yet, when amendments of the first possible consequence to the purity of elections and to the public at large are suggested, the hon. gentleman will not pay the slightest attention to them. From beginning to end he has made no amendment designed to protect the public interest, but simply those in favor of his own party. I have been surprised at the way in which he has treated amendments coming from this side, while professing a desire to deal fairly by his political opponents. The hon. gentleman ought to utilise the local machinery for publishing the lists as well as in other particulars. There is no difficulty in calling upon the township clerk, the sheriff, the county warden, every official who derives his authority from the Local Government, to give the necessary publication to these documents. The hon. gentleman pretended that these local officers were partisans, and were elected on political lines, therefore it was not safe to entrust the publication of these lists with the local officers. But how did the hon. gentleman undertake to remove the partisan character of these officials with respect to their dealings with the voters' lists? By the First Minister himself appointing a revising officer, who everybody knows will be of one political stripe, and by permitting him to appoint a clerk and constable who will be of the same political stripe. I daresay that in some localities the local officers may be partisans, but there is always a check upon them. Even in the discharge of so small a duty as this, they are amenable to the people, because they are appointed by the local authorities who derive their authority directly from the people, to whom, every year, they have to give an account of their stewardship. But we have no such guarantee for the impartial conduct of the revising officer. The official that is appointed under this Bill is not removable except by an address of the House of Commons. He is responsible only to the First Minister, he holds his office during life, and, worst of all, he is a partisan, and likely to be a partisan of the worst kind. Therefore, to tell us that it is not safe to trust the publication of the voters' lists the duties that are imposed upon revising officers, to the local authorities, is an insult to the people of this country that I trust they will not submit to. We were told, also, that complaints were made of the partisan conduct of the local authorities, and that in one Province the law was changed because the local officers, charged with the administration of these duties, were partisans, and the public interest was not safe in their hands. Sir, when that proposition was submitted to Parliament, did the Conservative members propose that you remedy that evil by charging the Administration of the country with the appointment of officials to prepare the voters' lists and in whom certain other powers and authorities are vested by Parliament? Sir, nobody ever proposed such a thing. In the Province of Ontario, where a new electoral law was passed during the last Session of the Local Legislature, did the Conservative party insist upon the Government assuming the power of appointing these officers? No one ever suggested such a thing as that. No man, up to the present time, has ever suggested that the local officers were so partisan in their character that it was unsafe to leave the preparation of the voters' lists and the publication of the notices in their hands; and it is only after eighteen years that the hon. gentleman has suddenly aroused himself to a sense of his duty to the people, and that, on account of the partisan character of these officials, he must take their appointment into his own hands. I have pointed out that under the first clause of this section, even with the amendment of my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron), the hon. gentleman still leaves it in the hands of this revising officer to exact from any candidate who is running for Parliament, an exorbitant sum of money for the necessary number of voters' lists to serve his purpose in canvassing the constituency. The revising officer, moreover, is not bound to give any notice at all of the publication of the list. If he posts it up, and it is torn down five minutes afterwards, he is not bound to put it up again, and there is no penalty imposed for not keeping it up. If the hon. gentleman desires the public interest, if he desires fair play to be meted out to both parties, he ought to accept the amendment providing still further that a sufficient number of these lists shall be published, and that the officials shall not only stick them up in public places, but shall keep them stuck up during the whole period between the first publication and the day fixed for the preliminary revision of the voters' lists.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to that I suggest that there ought to be a limitation as to the number of copies, say not less than 200 should be printed. I think there is a difficulty with regard to the list that is to be posted up by the revising officer. The clause says that it shall be posted up in the office of the clerk or other corresponding officer of each municipal or parochial division in the electoral district. Now, in New Brunswick we have no officers corresponding to that. We have, it is true, a nominated parish clerk, but he has no office, and the question arises,

where is the list to be posted up. It is provided by the 15th section that where you object to a person's name you have got a right to write opposite to the copy posted up in the office, the words "objected to"; that in addition, you have not merely to give notice, but you have to sustain your objection by inserting opposite the party's name, the word "objected," on the list, which is in the office of the clerk. Now, this is a very important matter. In our own Province we have no individual who occupies such an office as is here contemplated; there is no public office within the parish where such a list could be posted up. Then again, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) has pointed out that the parish clerk or revising officer is not bound to maintain that list, or be under obligation to let parties go there to make objection. It seems to me that there ought to be some such mode as we have at present in New Brunswick, that the list should be posted in three public places in the parish where persons could have an opportunity of seeing the names that are on it. Under this Bill, the list is to remain in the office of an individual who is not amenable to the people. He is subject to no penalty if he neglects his duty. Then, with regard to copies, we ought to have a provision that a sufficient number shall be printed. It is all important that full information should be given, and that it should be furnished to the different parties by the most suitable officers. The First Minister suggests that the clerk of the municipality or town should be the officer. We, in New Brunswick, have corresponding officers in the parish clerks. The great difficulty is, that those persons are merely nominal officers and take no interest in such matters. I would suggest, that in our Province, the commissioner of civil courts, who exercises jurisdiction over civil cases within the parish, should act. He would be more accessible to the public, and there would be greater facility for obtaining information from him than from parish clerks. The number of copies proposed is entirely too small. The sheriff of a large district is only to receive two copies. In some parishes there are more than three polling districts. There should be at least a sufficient number for each polling district. With respect to the notice: there is no provision made to prevent the notice being pulled down half an hour after it has been posted up. This might be done by either accident or design, and names that should have been struck off might thereby be retained. The officer appointed should be responsible for seeing that the notice is kept posted during the proper time. Copies of the primary list should be distributed to parties applying. The expense will be comparatively small compared with other expenses, and the proposed arrangement, about 6 cents, is really a tax upon the electors and the parties interested.

Mr. MILLS. It is important to consider what the list is that it is proposed to print and publish in the manner described in this section as amended. It is stated in the Bill that this will be found in a schedule. I turn to a schedule and find a form given, which provides for ascertaining the nature of the qualification, the municipality or place where the qualification is situated, and so on. All this is given on page 29 in the schedule attached to this Act. If this voters' list is printed according to the schedule, why does not the First Minister provide that the list shall be divided, instead of being allowed to remain in municipalities, which in Ontario may mean a city, town or village. How is the party who wishes to inspect the list, who is desirous of seeing whether the parties entitled to vote have their names on the list or not, in the case of a large electoral district like Ottawa or Toronto, if the whole district is included in one list? Surely, if the revising officer is required to put down the property on which each party resides, he can put them in the particular local municipality in which they reside, in which case there would be no difficulty or inconvenience. The greater number of names comprehended in the list, the more difficulty there will be in determining whether the list is complete or not; but if the list were segregated into proper divisions, there would be no difficulty in determining whether the names of parties with whom you are acquainted in particular localities, and whose names ought to be put on the voters' list, were really on the list or not. It seems to me it should be provided that the voters' list should be put up for each separate town, township or village in the different municipalities, and in the case of cities, in each electoral sub division, in order that there may be no difficulty in inspecting it. The list is for the purpose of enabling the various parties to see whether it is complete or not, and if there are defects to correct them with facility, and anything which makes that process easy, it is desirable to adopt. I trust the hon. gentleman will see his way to an amendment in this direction, in order that we may not defeat the whole object of the publication, by embracing the whole municipality on one list, when it may include three or four electoral divisions, as in the case of the city of Toronto, where, unless such a change is made, it will be necessary to go through several thousand names for the purpose of seeing whose names have been improperly put on or left off. I say it is not a desirable thing, and certainly, while the hon. gentleman may protract the discussion upon the Bill, he can gain nothing by keeping it imperfect in that particular.

Mr. VAIL. It seems to me that the provision is not at all suited to the Province of Nova Scotia. In several of the counties of Nova Scotia we have not more than two municipalities, and if the list is only to be posted in the office of the clerk of the peace, those in the more remote polling districts would have to come at least fifty miles to inspect it, in order to see whether their names are on the list, and to attend at the proper time to have them put on if they are omitted. In Digby, we have two municipalities, and the shire town is in one end of the county, and one polling district is at least fifty miles away. The difficulty would be met very easily by the revising officer being obliged to post up the list in each polling district the same as is done with regard to Prince Edward Island. Take, for instance, the county of Halifax, which, outside of the city, is one municipality. The clerk of the municipality resides in Halifax, and if I am not mistaken, it is from seventy-five to ninety miles from Halifax to the county line. Surely it could hardly be expected that men would go that distance to find out whether names have been improperly put on or left off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Move.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). My hon. friend from Digby is very much mistaken with regard to the publication of the lists provided for by the Bill. It is much more extensive than the publication of the preliminary list as provided by the law of Nova Scotia. By the 13th section of this Act, copies of the list are to be sent, not only to the clerk of the municipality, but to the sheriff, the warden, the mayor, the clerk of the peace and other officers, and section 14 provides that two copies shall be sent to each postmaster in the municipality. By the provisions of these two sections the publication would be much more extensive than that provided by the law of Nova Scotia. In the electoral district in which I reside there would be no less than fourteen copies posted up, while the law of Nova Scotia only provides for three. The great objection urged against this Bill up to this time has been its expensiveness; but I observe that my hon. friends opposite are determined to make it as expensive as possible. The publication of the preliminary lists is certainly as extensive as any reasonable person should desire, but they are insisting on having such a publication as would make it very expensive to the Dominion, and they com-

plain with very little reason that they themselves will be put to a great deal of expense. In the Province of Nova Scotia there is no provision made for lists being provided to either the representatives in Parliament or their opponents. At any time he requires a list for the purpose of having it properly revised by the revising officer, I have never heard of any gentleman complain that he had to pay the usual compensation for having the list made up for him. I do hope my hon. friends opposite will be satisfied with the publicity given by this Bill. At any rate, I think every representative from Nova Scotia should be satisfied.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would say to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that the position he describes is totally different from the existing state of things in the Province of Ontario. Our only security against the very extraordinary and extravagant powers which are given to certain Government nominees under this Bill is that full publicity should be obtained. I believe the county judges will act with reasonable fairness and justice; but in the revising barristers I have no confidence whatever; I look upon them as being likely to act in the most partisan manner; I have not the faintest belief that they will be anything but the most unscrupulous partisans; and we are bound to insure the only possible check that can be put upon them, that is, that the utmost publicity is given to the lists. In Ontario—I do not know what is the case in the other Provinces—whenever the lists are completed, not only are 10 copies sent to members of Parliament, but every candidate at any election to the House of Commons receives 10 copies also, and each township and each sub-division is clearly defined; so that every opportunity is given for the detection of any omission or of any person being improperly put on. The publicity would give us at least one facility for detecting the improper addition or omission of names. In addition to the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) that the revising officer should be compelled to print at least 200 copies, I think we should do very well to imitate the example of the Ontario law, and insist that a larger number of copies than two—ten is little enough—should be sent to all the candidates as well as to members of Parliament, and besides that the list should be divided into sub-divisions. There is very great force in the objection made by my hon. friend behind me that the rate of six cents for ten names is outrageous. The English rate, as pointed out, is a great deal less, and the very highest rate I think that ought to be allowed to be charged, if any is charged, would be ten cents per 100 names.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon).

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Weldon) agreed to.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron (Middlesex) agreed to.

Mr. INNES. As the hon. First Minister has accepted the amendment of the hon. member for West Middlesex, as well as that of the hon. member for St. John, perhaps he will accept the one I propose to move with reference to the distribution of the voters' lists. The clause provides that, in addition to the sheriff and warden, the mayor, the clerk of the peace, and other municipal officers, two copies should be furnished to each member of the House of Commons. As several hon. gentlemen have pointed out, that number is practically useless. I propose to recommend that ten copies at least should be furnished not only to each member of the House of Commons but to each member of the Local Legislature and to each candidate for whom votes were cast at the last election, The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has pointed out how expensive it would be to pay for copies. Even the number that I have proposed we should receive, ten copies each, is too small, but still it would mitigate the evil. I would also propose that, for the purpose of a wider distribution, copies of the list should be placed in the schools of every school section. This is also a clause that is in force in the Ontario Act and which has answered the purpose admirably. We know that there is a school in every school section, and that no voter is far from these schools, so that he will have every opportunity of examining the lists if he chooses, with very little inconvenience and loss of time. I would therefore move:

That the words "registered letters" be added after the word "mailing," line 47, page 10; and that the following words be added after the word "district" in line 49, page 10: And the member or members of the Provincial Legislature for the said electoral district or any part thereof, and to every candidate to whom votes were given at the last election of members for the House of Commons for said electoral district and at the last elections of members of the Provincial Legislature of said electoral district or any part thereof, and to the reeve or other chief officer of such municipality, 10 copies each; and that the following words be added after the word "district," in line 55 page 10: And to every justice of the peace in the electoral district, and the head master or masters of every public and separate school in said electoral district, and to the aldermen and councillors of each municipality.

This will tend to the wider distribution of the lists, and be a great convenience, not only to members of both sides, but also to electors generally.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. HICKEY. I think that the amendment I have in my hand will add to the distribution already provided for in the Bill and make it sufficiently extensive. I propose that clause 13 be amended by adding the words "aldermen or councillors" after the word "mayor," in the 48th line, and the word "councillors" after the word "reeve" in the 52nd line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I accept that.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the First Minister to have made an amendment that not less than 200 copies should be printed. Of course if they are printed, they may as well be distributed, and I was wondering whether the hon. gentleman had gone into his calculation as to whether the distribution he had provided for would consume these 200.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Copies of the list may be procured by any person on application to the revising officer, so that he must keep a certain number on hand. This is of course only a preliminary list, and has no analogy to the voters' list distributed in Ontario, which are the revised lists.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the copies to be obtained from the revising barrister be charged for at the rate of 6 cents per ten names, the rate fixed in the 16th section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The section says: "If printed, they will be furnished at the cost of printing." There will be 200 printed at least, but I left the clause in to meet the very improbable contingency of the 200 running out, in which case of course the applicants will have to pay for the additional copies at that rate.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman provides the same number of copies for an entire riding that the Ontario Act provides for a single township. As the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) remarked it is of the utmost importance that publicity should be given to these voters' lists. Though this Bill seems to be treated in the House as a measure which primarily should advance the interests of a party, nevertheless the Bill is one that affects the interests of the people. We should give the utmost publicity to the lists and everything pertaining to their preparation. It has been pro-

vided that these lists shall be printed. That involves the cost of composition, no matter how many are printed. The cost of the composition is assumed by the Government, and the multiplication of the lists afterwards is a very small matter, simply involving the press work and the cost of the paper. It is just as well to print 1,000 or 2,000 copies as to print 200. In my riding there are six municipalities, and 1,200 copies are printed under the Ontario Act—200 for each municipality. The hon. gentleman provides for printing not less than 200 copies. The cost of multiplying them would not be more than 25 cents per copy. Under the English Act, 6 and 7 Victoria, chapter 18, copies of the alphabetical list were to be delivered to anyone who applied on payment of a certain fee, which at that time, 1843, was 1s. for 1,000 names, 2s. 6d. up to 3,000, 5s. up to 6,000, 7s. 6d. up to 9,000, and 10s. above that number. By 41 and 42 Victoria, chapter 26, more efficient provision was made in regard to the posting of these lists. They were to be posted and kept posted in some conspicuous position in the post offices and telegraph offices, as well as in the municipal or parochial offices. This Bill does not provide that these notices shall be kept posted, but only that they shall be posted. The Voters' List Act of Ontario is much more liberal than this Bill. It provides that at least 200 copies shall be printed, one of which shall be kept posted, and two copies of which shall be sent to every municipal councillor, the treasurer of the municipality, the sheriff, clerk of the peace, every postmaster, and every master or mistress of a separate school, and ten of which shall be sent to the member for the constituency and every candidate at the last election, and the reeve; and provision is made that each of these persons shall keep these lists posted. Thus the utmost pains are taken to secure publicity, but this Act is deficient in this respect. If we are to incur the expense of having separate voters' lists for Dominion elections, and the expense of revising barristers, bailiffs, clerks and constables, we should at least be liberal in the matter of furnishing the public with the means of ascertaining whose names are upon the the voters' lists. We should not save at the spigot and waste at the bunghole. The voters' list should be published for each separate municipality, for the confusion which this Bill will create in any case will be added to if these lists embrace the whole of an electoral division. We should afford the utmost facilities for the examination of these lists, and I believe we ought to publish at least as many as are provided for under the Ontario law. This is a matter of such importance that I ask the First Minister to give it his candid consideration. The Bill is objectionable in itself, but, if we are to have such a measure, let us make it as little objectionable in its details as possible.

Mr. TROW. I think the First Minister should be a little more liberal in the printing and distribution of these lists. According to the amendment of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) each municipal councillor shall receive two copies, that will be at least ten for each municipality; two for the clerk of the Crown; supposing there are only two candidates, that will be 28. On an average there are seven municipalities in each riding, which would require seven times that number or over 200, to say nothing of the sheriffs or other officials, or of a distribution to other parties who may require to use them. I think the First Minister should increase the number by 50 or 100. The expense of printing this additional number would be very trifling indeed.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure that 200 lists will not be sufficient to supply many of the electoral divisions. The hon. gentleman will see that at least 200 lists will be required for the villages, towns and townships, and this will mean 140 or 150 lists for each electoral division. These lists, although they may embrace the whole of the electors within the municipality, will have to circulate over the entire municipality, whereas those for the township, apart from the candidates, would only apply to the officers residing within the limits of the township.

Amendment (Mr. Hickey) agreed to.

Mr. VAIL. I desire to propose an amendment that the list shall be posted in as many places as possible, and in places where the voters will be sure to have an opportunity of examining them. I move in amendment to the amendment:

That after the word "parochial," in the 46th line, the words: In one or more of what the revising officer considers the most public place or places of each township, parish or polling district, or other known territorial division of such electoral district.

This is the same as is proposed for Prince Edward Island.

Mr. DAVIES. The effect of the amendment will be to make about the same number of publications in districts where there are municipal divisions, as is provided for in districts where there are no municipal divisions. It puts them both on a par.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose an amendment —as I have no right to do it myself, I will suppose that my hon. friend makes it—that the 45th line shall read: "corresponding officer of each municipal, parochial or other known division."

Mr. DAVIES. The difficulty is that there are no officials of these sub-divisions. There is no division of the county smaller than a municipality, which has an officer corresponding to the clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are to be two copies sent to each postmaster.

Mr. DAVIES. When the hon. gentleman provides for those counties where there are no municipal divisions, he makes the identical provision that the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) suggests with reference to counties where there are municipal divisions.

Mr. VAIL. We have only two townships in the county of Digby; therefore the only territorial lines would be the township lines. The hon. gentleman will see at once that it is necessary to be more definite. It is quite true that the 14th clause meets the case to a certain extent, where the revising officer is to send these lists to the postmaster, but they may be torn down the next day, and there is no provision for keeping them up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will read in the 14th clause:

"Two copies of the said list, certified as aforesaid, shall be mailed to each of the postmasters in the electoral district, who shall forthwith, after receiving them, post up one of them in a conspicuous place in his post office, where the said list shall remain."

I think that will meet the case.

Amendment (Mr. Vail) negatived.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The amendment I have to propose is for the purpose of facilitating access on the part of candidates and others interested to the voters' lists at a reasonable rate. I draw the attention of the House to the position in which interested parties will be placed under the provisions now before us. The clause immediately preceding this provides that the revising officer shall make up the voters' list alphabetically for each municipality. The effect of this is that the first list, under which the first revision will be made, will be for the whole municipality. In practice no doubt the first list will be the one most closely scrutinised by those interested in seeing that proper parties are on it. The effect of having those large lists for each municipality, will be that each one desiring to become acquainted with the votes in a particular sub-division will be obliged to obtain a copy of the voters' list for the whole

municipality. That will cause an unneccessary addition to the number of names required to be printed; and if the names were printed by sub-divisions the voters' lists would go four or five times as far as they will under the present arrangement. I hope the First Minister will reconsider this point. The post office distribution will not cover so wide a field as the First Minister anticipates. In some townships and municipalities, from local circumstances, two-thirds of the post offices are outside the boundaries and in adjoining townships. Municipal boundaries do not in any way regulate post office matters, and although the lists are posted up in the various post offices, still there will be a large number of persons who will not see them. Every facility should be provided for enabling the public to see those lists, as many of those who are most desirable to have on the list will have least opportunity of seeing and inspecting the names. With respect to the price of the list: I really think that although it is fair that the revising officer, or the public treasury, should be protected against loss in supplying the lists, it is hardly sufficient protection to the parties requiring copies of them, to enable him to charge at this rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is only if it is written.

Mr. BAIN. Still he is left free to charge for them at whatever rates may be involved in the question of printing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be the cost price

Mr. BAIN. As a matter of fact, the cost of the lists will fall upon the candidates, and I understood the hon. member for East Grey to say last night that the lists for the Legislative Assembly were now procurable at all times in his riding by the payment of not more than 20 cents per copy. In England they cost 1s. per 1,000 names, which is a still lower rate. In my own riding, which may be considered as an average one, there are 3,500 names on the list, and one whole copy under the provisions of this Bill will cost $21, while in England it would be less than $1, being but 3s. 6d. I would propose that these printed lists should not cost more than 10 cents per 100 names, which would be about $3.50 for a complete list for a riding, a price of which no one could complain. We know as a matter of fact that when the type is set up and 200 copies are struck off, the mere printing of 100 extra copies would involve but a small extra cost, and I think it is in the public interest that they should be furnished at as reasonable a cost as possible.

Amendment (Mr. Bain) negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I notice that, while postmasters are required to post the lists they receive in a public and conspicuous place, no such provision applies to clerks. I think that they should be required also to post them in a place where the public could have access to them. I think also that the First Minister should adopt the English system by providing that in case the list is torn down, accidentally or otherwise, the official should be compelled to replace it and keep it up the prescribed time.

Mr. SPROULE. It does say that the clerk shall keep it posted up.

Mr. CAMERON. It does not say in a public or a conspicuous place.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no official place mentioned where the list would be accessible to the ordinary voter, and where it would be protected from being destroyed or torn down. The law, I think, would be complied with even if it were posted outside of a building or on a fence. I would therefore move that after the word "district," in the 14th line, the following words be inserted: "The office of each clerk and assistant clerk of the county court in each district." We have no officers corresponding with those in Provinces where there are municipalities; but there are seven of these clerks of circuits in each electoral district, and their offices are open to the public for certain hours, and documents are accustomed to be posted there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is clear enough as it is. The revising officer will attend to that.

Mr. DAVIES. Still it is entirely in his discretion, and I cannot see what possible objection there can be to requiring him to do it. The hon. gentleman has accepted other reasonable amendments, and I think he will not deny that this is a reasonable one. He does not know these localities to which I refer as well as I do, and I should think that he would be willing to accept practical suggestions from those who do know the circumstances of the locality. I do not think there would be anything wrong in requiring the revising officer to publish them in this place. It is what was done under the local law.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire what the hon. First Minister means by "a price proportionately sufficient to cover the price paid for printing the same." It appears to me that this would impose an unnecessary expense on the candidate. No one would object that a reasonable sum to defray the cost of printing and paper should be charged, but the word "proportionately" hardly means that. It means that if an additional number of copies were obtained, the cost would be divided over the whole number of copies charged for, while the hon. gentleman knows that the cost of printing the first hundred is a great deal more than the cost of the second or third hundred. This is particularly important, because the rate of 6 cents for 10 names, if the list is not printed, is very high. We shall probably have an average list under this Bill of 4,000 or 5,000 names, which at that rate would cost $24 or $30. Six cents for 10 names is a very extravagant rate, judging by the average price paid for the direction of printed matter here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Six cents for 10 names are only charged when the list is in manuscript; but there is no chance of its being in manuscript if there are a sufficient number printed. The hon. gentleman knows that the list is not a mere list of names; it contains also a description of the property and the vote; there are half a dozen columns to be filled up. As regards the printing, this phase means that anybody can get the list at cost price.

Mr. MILLS. "A price proportionately sufficient to cover the price paid for printing" may be a very variable sum; it may be five times as much in one locality as in another. That is not the rule adopted in the English law; there a fixed sum is provided, and the party knows what he must pay. If the charge made for printing the voters' list were like the charges made for some other Government printing which has come under the notice of the Public Accounts Committee, it might be ten times what it is worth. The hon. gentleman may pooh-pooh the statement, but we have had information on subjects similar to this. It is of some consequence that there should be a fixed sum charged, so that every candidate and every citizen in any part of the country could obtain a copy of the voters' list on precisely the same terms. Under the clause, the matter is left to some local printer to whom the revising officer may have given the contract at very unreasonable rates. That is not a fair condition of things; all the people of the country should in this respect stand upon a footing of exact equality. There should be no more paid at Vancouver than at Toronto. Under existing facilities it would be possible for the Government to provide that the printing should be done by stereotype plates; that could be done here for the whole

Dominion, and there would be no trouble in printing additional copies when they were required. A price proportionately sufficient to cover the price paid for printing is altogether too indefinite an expression. There should be a fixed sum.

Mr. DAVIES. The remark of the hon. First Minister that the list contained a description of the title as well as the name might be a good answer for raising the fixed price per hundred names suggested by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), but it was no answer to the proposition that a fixed price of some kind should be established. I do not suppose that in the central districts there would be a great deal of inconvenience felt from the wording of this section, because printing is so cheap and competition so great that a revising officer can hardly go astray if he goes to any of the leading printing establishments; but the hon. First Minister will know, if he consults his supporters from outlying districts, that the prices they are compelled to pay for printing of this kind is often something enormous, and unless there is some restriction imposed, the wording of the clause as it stands will place candidates in outlying districts in a very unfair position. I would suggest that after the word "same" in the eighth line on page 11, the words should be added, "but not in any case to exceed 12 cents per hundred names." It is of no use to pass by this section cavalierly, because the expense is going to be very serious. If 12 cents is not enough, make it 14 or 15 cents, or whatever is enough; but it should not be left for a printer to charge what he likes. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see that the list is their list as well as ours; it is not a party matter; there should be some fixed sum.

Mr. CHARLTON. The charge made in this Bill for a copy of a portion of the list, I would point out to the First Minister, is just five times greater than the cost in England. The charge is at the rate of 1s. sterling for 200 names or 6d. sterling for 100 names, just five times less than the charge proposed in this Bill of 6 cents for 10 names. This is an extravagant and outrageous charge. With regard to the printed lists, the principal cost is the cost of composition; after that the cost of obtaining copies is a mere trifle. We can obtain printed copies of speeches in this House, from 25 to 36 pages, at 1 cent a copy. This Bill provides for the distribution of from 150 to 175 copies in an entire riding, while the Ontario Act provides 200 copies for each township or about 1,200 copies for the riding. I urge upon the consideration of the Minister that the cost of increasing the number of copies of the voters' list after composition is so small as to render it almost not worth discussion whether there be 200 or 2,000 for each municipality. The cost will not exceed 2 or 3 cents at the outside. It is of the highest degree of importance that the greatest publicity should be given to these lists, and a reserve supply should be provided sufficient to furnish every man who desires a list with one at a small charge, say 10 cents a copy, which would more than compensate for the cost of printing.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member from Prince Edward Island labored under a mistake when he said no party consideration was involved in this matter. The reasons for objecting to any amendment to this clause, as regards distribution and the cost of furnishing copies, are distinctly party reasons. There is not a constituency in the Dominion where there are not two or three little organs of the Government, some slightly prosperous and others near the brink of starvation, and the Government think it desirable to allow the revising officer to give the printing to whom he chooses, at what price he chooses. Of course, under these circumstances, the right hon. gentleman cannot be expected to change this provision even though public opinion demands a change.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose it will not be disputed that what is desired is publicity in this matter, so that everybody may have an opportunity of seeing the list before the final revision. The Government have refused to adopt the Ontario system of a free distribution of a sufficient number of those lists among a large number of persons. In England the system is adopted of distributing copies to be posted up at the doors of churches and chapels and other public places for distribution, and of furnishing copies to those who desire them at an extremely cheap rate. There are in England two classes of lists quite distinct. The one is the general register of names which is changed every year, and the other is a smaller list, what they call the list of claimants, which is made up before the revision by the overseer of the parish for the revising barrister. That list is printed. These are made out by the overseers, showing the names of all who claim to be added to the register, and all names on the register which are objected to, and those which the overseer himself thinks ought to be objected to, or added, or marked dead. These smaller lists are furnished for a price of 6d. for a hundred names. The register itself, which is more analogous to these lists which we are considering, is furnished at a mere nominal price—1s. for 1,000 names, 2s. 6d. up to 3,000, 5s. up to 6,000, 7s. 6d. up to 9,000 and 10s. for 9,000 and upwards. Under the provisions of this Bill, there is a great uncertainty as to the price to be charged, because the revising barrister will not know how much to charge the first applicant, as all the other copies may be left on his hands and he is to charge sufficient to cover the cost. There should be some provision for a specific sum per copy or per hundred copies.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) negatived.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to move in amendment that, after the word "same" in the 8th line, the following be added:

But not to exceed 50 cents for each copy of any voters' list for any electoral district.

That will be more than the ordinary cost of a voters' list. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Weldon) has a list containing 5,000 names for his own constituency which only cost 25 cents a copy. This would be a maximum price which would certainly exceed the cost of printing the list in any ordinary constituency. If the hon. gentleman desires to give some protection against improper conduct or jobbery on the part of the returning officer in connection with a local printer, these words should be added.

Mr. WELDON. In reference to the amendment of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), it is very important that a price should be fixed, because, as the Bill stands at present, the revising officer can charge what he pleases, and I do not know if it is intended that the charge should cover the cost of the copies which he is bound to deliver to different parties. Our lists in New Brunswick are printed in broad sheets, and we have to get them in pamphlet form at our own expense. I have a pamphlet here, containing nearly 6,000 names, which costs only 25 cents a copy. It contains 68 pages, and the price is $25 per 100. The candidates arrange among themselves how many copies they shall have printed, and we get them at a very low figure. These lists could be printed also at a very low figure, and it should not be left to the revising officer to decide on the price. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) will know that after the first hundred is printed the rest of the price is merely nominal—not much more than the expense of the paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept the proposition; we will make it "not to exceed fifty cents per copy."

Mr. VAIL. I think we ought to define that to mean for each electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is only one list to be prepared. There can be no doubt.

Mr. DAVIES. There will be a doubt raised, because, where you have to make up an alphabetical list for each township, it will be argued that this means fifty cents for each township.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, put it for each electoral district.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know whether it would be desirable to give instructions to the revising officer in the sense of an amendment I have prepared, namely, to add to the end of the clause that "the said printed list should have sufficient margin opposite each name thereon to permit a person objecting to any name thereon to fulfil the requirement mentioned in the last two lines of section 15." A person has to write "objected to," and his name, address and occupation, opposite the name of the party to whom he objects, and that will take considerable margin. If the revising officer, in having the list printed, should not leave sufficient margin to enable a person to fulfil the requirements of section 15, objection might be taken to it.

Mr. SPROULE. You are cutting your amendments down to a fine thing now.

Mr. PATERSON. The requirement is absolute in section 15 that the person is to write opposite to the name of the party objected to, besides the words "objected to," his own name, address and occupation. On some of the electoral lists that I have seen it would be impossible to write these words.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have got seven electoral lists, one for every one of my townships, and in not one of them is there place sufficient for these words to be inserted opposite that of the party objected to. As this marginal note is to form the basis of an appeal, it is very important that there should be sufficient margin to write the words as required in section 15.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I presume in printing those lists that ordinary common sense will govern the action of the revising officer. The first list is the preliminary list. It is, in fact, of the character of the original assessment roll before it goes through the Court of Revision, and in that case the proper course for the revising officer would be to print those lists, to be used afterwards, in galley form, the effect of which would be to save largely the cost of making up, folding and stitching, which is, perhaps, the heaviest part of the cost of printing an ordinary pamphlet.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman does not see my point. It is provided as one of the requirements that the name and address shall be written opposite each name that is objected to; and if owing to the lack of margin there is not sufficient room to thus enter the words this objection would be held to invalidate the claim.

Mr. CASEY. There is no provision for sending copies to parties entitled to receive them, beyond first copies. The remedy, however, I think is to be found in amending section 15. In Ontario the judge makes the corrections on one of the rough lists, as does the revising barrister in England.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). If hon. members will read section 15 they will find it contains no reference to printed voters' lists. (The hon. gentleman read the section.)

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken is in error. If any person objects to the name of another person on the published list he must write his objection and sign his name, address and occupation as the person objecting opposite the name objected to, so that the party shall not be taken unaware.

Mr. HESSON. I have several copies of voters' lists here, and there is not a page on which I could not write everything required by this Bill.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that this is a statutory power, and in such a case the orders must be strictly followed. I think it would be better that this amendment should be held over until we discuss the 15th section, as its construction will largely depend on that section. It is provided that not only the name shall be written in the margin, but the occupation, address, and so on, which will require a considerable space, and besides, it will have to be put directly off or else questions may arise on the appeal. We should remember that when statutory conditions of this kind are not complied with, the appeal falls to the ground as the courts would have no discretion.

Mr. McCALLUM. It seems to me that there is a good deal of hair splitting in such a discussion. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that if the revising barrister or judge made a mistake of this kind, he is going to take advantage of his own neglect?

Mr. WELDON. It is not the revising barrister; it is the person objecting.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is absurd to say that the revising barrister will not leave room, or that he will take any technical advantage of that kind, to prevent people exercising the privilege which the law confers. It may be a nice question of hair splitting for lawyers, but I am satisfied that nothing of the kind will occur. No man who is fit to act as revising barrister would be guilty of such neglect.

Mr. LISTER. There is no hair splitting about the question, for the wording of the statute is imperative, and if it were not complied with, the appeal would be rejected and necessarily.

Mr. McCALLUM. Who makes the voters' list in the first place.

Mr. LISTER. The revising officer, of course.

Mr. McCALLUM. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. Is it not wise and prudent to provide by the statute that there shall be sufficient margin rather than to run any risks by leaving it to anybody's discretion? The hon. member for Cardwell conceded that a margin was necessary, and if so, why not place the matter beyond controversy, so that the provisions of the Act may be fully carried out. If a sufficient margin is not provided, the person appealing would have to paste a piece of paper to the list upon which to write his name and the other particulars. I think such a provision is exceedingly important, because the revising barrister may not have that great fund of common sense which is possessed by the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. member for Monck, and they may overlook the matter and thereby prevent the right of appeal from being exercised. This preliminary list is very important, as it is a complete record of the appeals, and upon it everything should be found that is necessary to entitle a person to appeal. If this provision is made it will be part of the duty of the revising officer to see that the printer carries out the Act by leaving a proper margin. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) certainly has not given this matter consideration, or he would not have ventured the statement he made to the House to-day. It is physically impossible for the hon. gentleman or anyone else to write what is required by this statute in the margin of the voters' list. There may be half a dozen appeals against half a dozen consecutive names, and each appeal must be opposite the name; so that the margin must be sufficiently wide to enable the person appealing to state the ground

of his appeal directly opposite the name of the person appealed against. All that is required is that the paper on which the list posted up is printed should have a wider margin than the other lists. The proposition is so reasonable that I cannot understand why the hon. First Minister resists it. If we are to have a Bill of this kind, it should be made as workable as possible, so as to afford as many facilities to the local authorities and to persons who take part in elections, and to throw as few difficulties in their way, as possible. Now, I desire to call the attention of the hon. First Minister to the provision which is made for the posting up of the list in the office of the clerk or corresponding officer in each municipality or parochial division; but no provision is made for the event of that list being carried away or destroyed before the revision takes place. If that occurred, how would it be possible for a person desiring to appeal to enter his appeal. The Bill should provide that as soon as that list is destroyed and removed, so that the elector cannot have access to it, it should be the duty of the officer to immediately post up another. The hon. gentleman may say that that is something not likely to happen, but they did not think so while passing the English law, because we find that it makes provision for such cases. That such a provision ought to be contained in our Act is evident from the fact that the English Legislature found it necessary to make it part of the law there; and a penalty not exceeding 40s. nor less than 10s. was provided, to be imposed on any person who destroyed, mutilated, effaced or removed the list. I hope the House will see its way to adopt these provisions, which are so essential to the proper revision of the lists.

Mr. McCALLUM. When hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the revising barristers, or the officers to be appointed to administer this law, if they do not say in direct language, they insinuate that they will be dishonest. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if he were a revising barrister under this Act, and had the ordering of the printing of these voters' lists, and if he failed, either from neglect or on purpose, to leave margin enough, does he mean to say that he would take advantage of his own fault to defeat the law? I do not believe he would; but he gets up and insinuates that the judges of the land would do that. Whether you provide for a margin or not, I am satisfied that the men who have to prepare these lists will see that there is sufficient margin left, so that men can appeal and the law can be carried out in every particular. I hope the hon. gentleman will offer something more tangible than this, because I am sure the revising officer, whoever he may be, will make provision so that he will not take advantage of his neglect or fraud.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman knows that the power given here is a statutory power, and consequently every condition of it must be strictly adhered to. The hon. gentleman says the revising officer will be careful to have a sufficient margin on the printed voters' list to enable him to insert the words "objected to," with the objector's name and address. He may do so, but he is not bound to do so.

Mr. McCALLUM. He is bound to administer the law.

Mr. CAMERON. The law should compel the revising officer to do what he ought to do. It should compel him to leave a certain margin. The hon. gentleman says if he does not do so, he cannot take advantage of his wrong doing. But the question is not one between the claimant and the revising officer, but between the complainant and the public at large. All the court of appeal will enquire into is whether every term and condition required by the law to entitle a party to appeal has been complied with, and if it has not, whether through the fault of the revising officer or not, the appeal will not be allowed. "Rogers, on Elections," lays down this point very clearly. So strict is the law, that if a single condition has not been complied with, whether intentionally or not, the appeal absolutely falls to the ground. Even should the respondent not appear at all, the appelant must satisfy the court that he has complied in every respect with the provisions of the law. What has the revising officer to decide? He has to decide whether or not the man whose name is on the list is entitled to be there, or whether one who has been omitted should be put on; and he is bound to see, before he is seized with the appeal, that every condition of the law is complied with.

Mr. McCALLUM. It is the revising barrister who puts the name there in the first place, and he must provide a margin so that a man may object according to law. If he did not he would not be honest. The hon. gentleman is suggesting that the revising barrister will not be honest.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am afraid it is impossible to teach the hon. gentleman law. When I have finished with it I will send him over "Rogers Election Law." I was going on to observe, when for the fifth time interrupted, that it is not a question between the complainant and the revising officer, but between the complainant and the public at large. There is this further difficulty that the appellant is compelled to write the words "objected to" opposite the name of the person who is objected to on the voters' list, as well as the name, address and occupation of the appellant.

Committee rose, and, it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). On another clause, I endeavored without effect to induce the hon. gentleman to adopt the provisions of the English law in reference to the posting up of another voters' list in case of the mutilation or destruction of the one originally put up. Now, supposing that, when the complainant comes to the clerk's office, where he is compelled to mark his objection in the margin of the voters' list, he finds there is no voters' list, he will be unable to comply with the law. This clause will compel him to do something which it is impossible for him to do. In the schedule the words are as follows:—

"Such person so objecting shall also, at the time of giving such notice, write opposite to the name of such person so objected to in the copy of said list posted up in a public office nearest to the residence of the person objected to, in the electoral district, the words 'objected to' and sign his own name."

In the enacting clause of the statute the appellant is bound to write the words "objected to" opposite the name of the person to whom he objects, on the list posted in the clerk's office. Now which is the appellant to comply with? Is he to comply with the clause of the statute that compels him to write the words "objected to" on the voters' list in the clerk's office, or is he to comply with the notice given by the revising officer that he is to write those words on the voter's list nearest to the place of residence of the person complained against. It is clear there is room here for doubt and difficulty. Electors are not all lawyers, and it will not be easy for them to understand something that even a lawyer cannot understand. The section ought to be amended or the schedule ought to be amended. Now, the law further on says that the complainant or appellant shall write his name, that is, his own name, opposite the name objected to on the list. He cannot comply with the law unless he writes his own name. Supposing a person cannot write at all, then it is clear he cannot comply with the law. That is clearly laid down at page 158, "Rogers on Elections" (the hon. gentleman read therefrom). The effect of this clause, as it stands, is simply to puzzle, to harrass and make it most difficult for electors, or complainants,

or objectors to comply with the strict letter of the law. What is the object of putting that clause in the law at all? It is not in the English law. There is no necessity for it. In England it is not so—at least, so far as I can gather from "Rogers on Elections." All that is required is that notice shall be given to the overseer of the parish, where it is a county election, and the town clerk, where it is a borough election and to the revising officer. The objector in that case must serve the notice upon the clerk and upon the revising officer. So far as I have been able to ascertain, in England it is not necessary that any such words as are required by the law here should be written opposite the name of the person objected to. If it is not necessary in England why should it be necessary in Canada? I say the words ought to be struck out altogether, and then my hon. friend's amendment would not be required.

Mr. MILLS. If we knew the Minister's intention with respect to section 15 it would be easier to deal with this particular amendment. If the latter part were dispensed with, this amendment would be dispensed with at the same time, and some other means adopted of giving notice of the intention to question the right of the party to have his name on the voters' list If hon. members will look at the latter part of section 15, it does not appear that objection could be taken on every voters' list, but only on those posted up in the office of the clerk of the township or parish. The whole plan of taking objection, as proposed, is not a good one. A better plan would be to allow that, when a name was questioned, a written notice should be sent to the clerk of the municipality, and it might be his duty to mark opposite the name on the voters' list that the name was questioned. There are many ways in which provision might be made that would obviate the necessity of this amendment, and would render the power of appeal easier and much less open to question than by the provision in this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought the hon. gentleman moved the amendment rather in jest than in earnest, and therefore I said nothing about it. If we had been allowed to go on to section 15 it was my intention to strike that out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister has given an answer to himself as to whether this is a proper motion, for he states that he proposes to strike out the last lines of section 15, which does away with the necessity of my amendment. But the fact of that clause remaining in the Bill, and that no intimation had been given as to changing it, is ample justification of my having moved that amendment. The discussion has led the hon. gentleman to say that the words in the last few lines of section 15 should be removed. If I had not proposed this motion it would have been taken for granted that the words were required and the question would not have been raised. The question was a very pertinent one. The statement of the First Minister now proves it. I at first thought it would only be necessary to call the attention of the First Minister to the point; and it was only when he did not seem inclined to listen to the suggestion that I proposed the amendment. I did so without confering with anyone. I used my own common sense, and looked forward to some of the clauses ahead. I moved the amendment at this particular stage because exception might be taken when we came to section 15, that section 13 should have been amended at the proper time. My position has been supported by the positive declarations of legal gentlemen on this side of the House, which have not been controverted by hon. gentlemen opposite. They stated that the omission of the words in question, being a statutory declaration, might invalidate an appeal. That was not an unreasonable view when we consider the whole spirit of the Bill, and the spirit manifested in trying to force it through the House. There will not be many known supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite who will be left off the primary list; and it is the bounden duty of the Opposition in the public interest to see that no one can shelter himself behind technicalities. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has stated that revising officers being the persons charged with making up the voters' list would be men of character, and they never would take avantage of technicalities; and the hon. gentleman asked if judges would do so. It must be remembered that part of this work will be done by clerks to revising officers, who will not be responsible to this House. Yet I am told in view of these facts, and without any intimation having been given that the hon. gentleman intended to strike out part of clause 15—for the hon. gentleman said last night it was a good Bill and did not need amendment—that my motion was unnecessary. But the amendment will not remove the difficulty unless the hon. gentleman consents to strike out the last line of the schedule as well.

Amendment (Mr. Paterson) negatived.

On section 14,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister will find it convenient, on looking at the way this will work out, to alter either this or the preceding section, so as to provide that the list to be put up at each post office shall be the list of the municipality and not of the whole electoral district. He will see that if you are going to put up a list say of 6,000 names with the description and other particulars, they will require a most enormous placard unless it be printed in excruciatingly small type. Such a list would occupy on a rough guess, some 30 superficial feet, which would be very inconvenient for the purpose of examination in the first place, and it would be exceedingly inconvenient in many of these post offices to find a proper place to put up such a thing; whereas if the lists were sub-divided among the various municipalities, the thing would be brought within a reasonable compass, and would be much more convenient.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had that in mind in connection with my amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would suggest instead of the words "said list" being used, it should be "said list relating to a certain municipality." Before recess the hon. First Minister held that the list referred to was the list for the entire constituency. If that is the case, the language of the clause would not convey the same meaning unless the list for the entire constituency were posted up in each post office, while as proposed to be amended, it refers to the list relating to each municipality, so there would be a conflict of terms. I suggest that it read "of that part of the said list."

Amendment (Mr. Cameron) agreed to.

Mr. KING. Section 14 provides that two copies of the list shall be furnished to each postmaster, and that it shall be his duty to post one of them up in his office. That is, in my opinion, good so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The 13th section provides that two copies shall be furnished to the sheriff, warden, mayor, clerk of the peace and treasurer, or officers corresponding thereto, in each electoral district, but there is no provision made for compelling these officials to post either of the lists furnished to them. It is important that the utmost publicity should be given to the list. If all the precautions provided by this Bill were taken to publish the list, they would not prove as effective as the means adopted at present under the law of the Province of New Brunswick. In that Province the day for the final revision of the list is fixed by Act of Parliament, and is known to every elector in the Province—in fact, it is as well known as Christmas. But under this it simply rests in the discretion of the revising officer to fix a

day to suit his own convenience, and not a day to suit the convenience of the electors. I therefore beg to move:

That the word "who" in the 20th line on page 11 be struck out and the following words be inserted in place thereof: And each of the said postmasters, and the sheriff, warden, clerks of the peace, and treasurers, and parish court commissioners or other officers to whom two copies of the said list are to be mailed under this Act; and that the word "post" be struck out of the 22nd line and the 23th line on page 11.

Mr. MULOCK. This amendment I think is a very reasonable one. What it provides will cost nothing to speak of and will help to give publicity to the lists. In view of the territorial size of some of the municipal constituencies in this Dominion, we ought to avail ourselves of all public officials in order to make the lists as accessible to the electors as possible. In Manitoba, I am told, there are ridings 150 miles in length, and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) told us last night that his riding was 900 miles long by 300 miles wide; and no doubt when we come to give representation to the North-West Territories, we shall find there ridings of immense proportions. This proposal is to place the lists in the hands of various municipal officers to post them up in their offices where they may be seen by the public.

Mr. RYKERT. It is already provided in the previous section.

Mr. MULOCK. They are not bound to post them up. The amendment secures greater publicity for the lists, and I can see no possible objection to it. There are not enough offices in the North-West at present in which to post these lists where they will be seen by the public, and no doubt in many parts of the older Provinces the same difficulty exists. I think it is in the right direction, as it will tend to enable the public, without expense and unnecessary trouble, to ascertain how far the lists are correct and how far they are not.

Mr. LISTER. Unless we make it imperative on the officials mentioned in section 13 to post up those lists in their offices, there will be very little use in sending them. Of what possible advantage will it be to the public if those officers receive the lists and they are not compelled to post them up.

Mr. CHARLTON. In order to make the Bill acceptable it is necessary to give the public such opportunities for information as they may desire with regard to the working of the Bill. The circulation of a few extra copies is a matter of very small moment as regards expense. By the English Act, the lists are required to be published much more widely than they are by the provisions of this Bill. After they are published by the overseers, they have to be affixed in some public and conspicuous position in every post office and telegraph office and in every municipal and parochial office. Surely the hon. gentleman will not object to giving our lists the same publicity.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 13th clause provides that the revising officer shall publish the said list by causing one copy thereof to be posted up in the office of the clerk or other corresponding officer of each municipal or parochial division, and by mailing to the member or members of the House of Commons for such electoral district, to the sheriff, warden, mayor, clerk of the peace, etc., under whatever official name they are known. I take it, it is a matter of necessary inference that if the revising officer sends these by mail to these official parties, it must be for the purpose of their posting them up and not that they may throw them into the fire.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not a necessary inference that they will post them up in their offices. The hon. gentleman did not think so, or he would not require the postmasters, to whom he also sends the lists, to post them up. One class of officials he requires to post them up, the other class he does not. Therefore the inference is irresistible that the other class are not to do what they are not told to do. The amendment only carries out the view of the First Minister, by not leaving it open to any official to refrain from posting up the list if he chooses. It does not require any additional copies, but only that the copies provided to be sent, in the 13th section, shall all be posted up.

Mr. MULOCK. The First Minister will see that under section 13 the clerk of the municipality is directed to post up in his office the copies sent to him. If the inference is that every officer who receives a copy will, without instructions post it up, why provide that the clerk of the municipalities shall post them up? There are other classes under this clause who receive these copies but certainly are not expected to post them up. For instance, members of Parliament are entitled to receive them, but they cannot be expected to post them up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They can post themselves about it.

Mr. MULOCK. Our ridings are very much more extensive than those in England. For instance, the riding of my hon. friend from Algoma would be about as large as the whole of England. I hope that the First Minister will see that this is a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. WELDON. This is only carrying out the object of the 13th section. These lists are to be sent to two classes of persons—to members of Parliament and unsuccessful candidates, and to the sheriff, mayor, warden and other officials on behalf of the public. The latter are to receive them because the public come in contact with them, and therefore publicity is given to them. The section points out what postmasters are to do with the lists, and the natural inference is that the others, who are not so directed, are not to do the same thing. I think the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's is only carrying out the object of giving publicity to these lists.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will accept the amendment, pressed as it is by my hon. friend from St. John.

Amendment (Mr. King) agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The English law provides for a continuous posting of these lists, and for the punishment of anyone who mutilates or destroys them. I move that the following words be added to clause 14:

And, in case the said list so to be published as aforesaid shall be destroyed, mutilated, defaced or removed before the expiration of the time required for such publication, the said parties hereinbefore required to publish the same as aforesaid shall, as soon as conveniently may be, publish in like manner in its place another list in some public and conspicuous place in or near their said offices; and any person who shall unlawfully destroy, mutilate, efface or remove any such list so affixed as aforesaid shall for every such offence forfeit a sum not exceeding $20, to be recovered in a summary manner before any justice of the peace.

We know that mischievous people are in the habit of pulling these things down without any cause. Any person so guilty, especially in regard to a list which it is of the first consequence to make public, ought to be punished. This is an exact copy of the English law.

Mr. LISTER. Without the list referred to, the revising officer would have no material upon which to proceed in the revision of the list. I think the Bill would be imperfect if provision were not made for keeping the voters' list continuously in the office of the clerk of the municipality. We find that in England such a law is now in force; that the lists required to be posted up in the places mentioned in the Act, if they are mutilated, destroyed or removed, a similar list is to be re posted. The English law also provides a penalty for any party taking down or mutilating the list,

and I think there should be some such provision in our own law.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the old adage is true, that whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing well, I think provision ought to be made for the continuous posting of these lists, if they are to be posted at all. If no provision is made to secure the continuous posting of these lists, or to secure their being put up again if they are torn down or mutilated, then it seems to me that the provision in regard to that posting is simply a farce. Moreover, it is certainly proper that any person who wantonly removes, or effaces, or destroys these lists, should be punished. In our laws it is made an offence to take down an ordinary advertisement posted upon trees or public places; the rights of individuals are protected in this way, and surely the rights of the public should be protected in the matter of these lists that are to be posted up for public convenience. I think the amendment ought to receive the support of every member of the House.

Mr. WILSON. If the right hon. gentleman desires to meet the public convenience he ought to take means to have this list kept continuously posted up. In some sections that list may have been made very favorable to one party, and those that were upon upon the primary list would have a desire to keep from the other party any information in connection with the lists and the names upon it. If there be no penalty and no obligation to keep the list posted up, a designing person might destroy the list and by that means withhold information from those parties who would have an interest in looking after it, I think the First Minister ought to allow this amendment to pass and to that extent protect those who ought to be placed upon the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think experience has shown that there has been any pulling down or destruction of lists in Ontario or elsewhere. No such provision has hitherto been found necessary in England or Canada, and I do not think it is well to crowd the Act with penalties.

Mr. MILLS. There is some difference between the list proposed by this Bill and the list that formerly existed in Ontario. In the Province of Ontario the assessment roll formed the basis for making a complete list. The hon. gentleman will see that a large number of persons must have their names put upon that list about whose right to be there, a great deal of doubt may exist, and it is therefore clear that it is important the list should be preserved and kept public in order that it may be inspected. Now, in Prince Edward Island, he proposes to take the last poll-book as the basis for the preparation of the list, and he is going to establish a property qualification in place of manhood suffrage. There must necessarily, therefore, be a large number of persons whose names will be upon the list in the first instance, that ought not to be there. It is clear, therefore, the public have great interest that this list should be kept open for inspection. The list proposed by the hon. gentleman does not stand in the position of the old list in Ontario. It is open in a very much greater degree to objection, especially the first list prepared, and if the hon. gentleman is anxious to give due protection it is necessary some step should be taken such as is proposed. Such a list as that proposed is open to fraud in regard to some of the persons put upon it, wage earners, tenants paying an amount of rental bringing them just within the qualification. Protection can only be afforded by making persons destroying the lists liable to punishment.

Mr. CHARLTON. I call attention to the provisions of the English Act, 6 and 7 Vic., cap. 18, sections 23, 24 and 25 (the hon. gentleman read the sections). The English law makers considered that it was proper and necessary that a list should be published, it was necessary to make provision for its efficient publication, providing in what manner it should be posted, and that it was the duty of the officer who posted it to keep it posted. Furthermore, English law-makers decided that it was proper and necessary to provide for the punishment of individuals who removed such lists, the punishment being by fine after a trial before justices. I hold that if it is necessary under this Bill to provide for the publication, it must be done so as to protect the public interest and ensure to the public that the list will be kept posted. It is therefore necessary that proper punishment should be inflicted on such as wantonly remove those lists; and for the Government not to provide punishment for parties who wantonly remove the lists, is to take a step backwards and to come short of the requirements of the Bill, and to leave the public without an assurance that the Bill will be carried out efficiently and satisfactorily.

Mr. MULOCK. If the provisions of the Bill ordered that officers shall do certain acts and it is not provided that they shall be punished for non-compliance, it is a mere blind. Nothing is more important than to keep these lists posted. The time is already too limited within which objection can be made, and it will even be necessary to consider whether more time should not be granted, especially in view of our sparse population. To state in this Bill that lists are to be put up by certain officers, and yet fail to insert a clause to punish them for allowing them to be removed, is an illusory and not a substantial publication of the list. What we aim at is a substantial publication during the period provided. Anything less than that will not be satisfactory to the public. If the officer does wrong, neither the Government nor Parliament will be blamed, if Parliament has adopted all reasonable precautions in order to enforce compliance with the law. But if Parliament does not provide the requisite machinery and that wrong-doing shall be punished, Parliament will be charged with negligence and carelessness. There is a clause which says that if the municipal officer who has control of the assessment rolls does not furnish a certified list to the revising officer, that officer will be liable to certain money penalties. Why, then, are not penalties inserted in this case? The object of the Government must be to continue publication, and that means that the list shall be kept continually posted.

Mr. DAVIES. The only suggestion made by the First Minister was that it did not appear likely that any one would be found to wilfully destroy and take down the lists. While it is not wise to impose unnecessary penalties, the imposition of those which are necessary may be a good thing, and the sole question here is, would it be at all probable that these lists would be mutilated or destroyed. If the list were mutilated or torn down, those in the immediate locality would have the only means taken away from them of discovering whether names were improperly put on or struck off, and this would be particularly the case in Prince Edward Island, where there will be a large number of names which will not be entitled to a place on the list. There will therefore be motives for people to pull down or destroy these lists, not merely for the love of mischief, but with a view of destroying the record of names which may be improperly on the list. A man may go into the post-office and pull down the list before the face of the post master, and there will be nothing to prevent him from doing so. I think we would not be going far wrong in following the experience in England, by providing for the punishment of those who wilfully destroy or mutilate those sources of information.

Amendment negatived. Yeas, 36; nays, 47.

On section 15,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen will see that clauses 15 and 16 should be transposed, and I move accordingly.

Mr. DAVIES. Is not the wording of this clause wrong in the first two lines?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The previous clause provided that the list shall be published in a certain manner, that the notice of the holding of the sitting shall also be published in one or more newspapers, and that same notice states not only that the list has been published in the manner prescribed, but that the specified sitting shall be held. In the 2nd line of the clause, after the word sitting, I insert the words "mentioned in such notice." This gives notice that the publication has been made in the manner prescribed by the Act, and that the sitting will be held.

Mr. WELDON. It strikes me that one publication in a newspaper really amounts to nothing at all. As at least four weeks and possibly five weeks will elapse between the time of the first publication and the time of the holding of the court by the revising officer, more notice should be given. Therefore I would move:

That the words, "at least one" in the second line on page 12 be struck out and the words "three weeks" be inserted in place thereof.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that notice ought also to be given in all the newspapers published in the electoral district. As a rule there are at least two newspapers in each district, certainly in the Province of Ontario. They are usually of opposite politics, and each person as a rule takes the newspaper which represents his own side of politics, and does not very often take the other. Of course, if but one receives the notice, we must presume that the one supporting the hon. gentleman will be the one selected. I think very little additional expense would be incurred by publishing the notice in all the newspapers, and it would certainly give more publicity.

Mr. CHARLTON. If my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) will permit a suggestion from me, I would suggest that the amendment be as follows:—

That the word "one" in the 2nd line and the words "one or more newspapers" in the 3rd line be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "Every newspaper."

The Bill as it stands would be liable to this objection in addition to many others, that it would furnish the right hon. leader of the Government with additional patronage for his organs. All are interested in having the greatest possible publicity given to this notice; it should be published in every newspaper in the riding, in the organs of the Opposition as well as in those of the Government; we should act impartially towards all the journals published in the riding.

Mr. VAIL. There are some districts where there are no papers, and I would suggest that in such the notice be published in the local *Royal Gazette*.

Mr. MILLS. I think a more efficient means of publication than the *Royal Gazette* could be devised. We know that the returning officer at the time of an election publishes proclamations everywhere, and the revising officer, besides putting an advertisement in the newspapers, might put up posters of some sort which would give general notice to the electors. As there is no time fixed when the enquiry shall take place, it is desirable, if there is to be an efficient revision of the voters' list, that there should be publicity given of the time and place of holding the court of revision. The hon. gentleman could easily correct his clause so as to meet the difficulty. There are new districts in Muskoka and Algoma as well as in the more sparsely settled portions of the old Provinces, where newspapers are not published, and where notice of some sort ought to be given to the electors.

Mr. VAIL. In this Bill, it is put in the power of the revising officer to appoint a time for the revision of the lists. In the law of our Province, a regular date is fixed for revising the lists, so that the people of the different localities are always prepared for it; but when you leave the matter in the hands of the revising officer, the utmost publicity as to the date should be given, so that there may be no doubt about it.

Mr. CASEY. The required publicity can only be effected by inserting this notice in all the newspapers published in the riding. A notice published either in the Conservative or Liberal newspapers would only reach approximately half the people of the district. In the cities, a notice in a couple of papers on each side would probably be sufficient, but in the country districts there is no way of securing the required publicity except by publishing the notice in every paper in the electoral district. In my riding, there are three papers, and those only reach a comparatively small proportion of the people because they are purely local and circulate only within a small circuit of where they are published, but there are two papers published in the county town of St. Thomas, just outside of the riding, which reach, if anything, a larger number of people in the riding than the small local papers published within its borders. The notices should be published, not only in the papers in the riding, but also in one paper in the county town of the county in which the electoral district is situated, whether it is in the riding, or not, and where there are no newspapers in the riding, proclamations should be posted up. I will however leave the hon. gentleman to deal with the newspapers, and move the following amendment:—

That the following words be added:—And if no newspaper is published in the electoral district, then by printed proclamation posted in conspicuous places throughout the electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no pleasing hon. gentlemen opposite. In discussing clause 14, we had a series of amendments, and one especially from the hon. member for King's N.B. In the first place the notice has to be posted in the post office, then in the office of the warden, reeve, mayor and clerk and everybody else, and it was argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that that was absolutely requisite in order to give sufficient notice. Then the clause that is now before us is almost a work of supererogation. It has been argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that, if clause 15 were adopted with the amendments, there would be ample and sufficient notice to the public; but this goes further, and says that, if there be a newspaper, the revising officer shall give one insertion in one such newspaper. That is more notice than hon. gentlemen opposite have already declared is sufficient. The hon. gentleman says the revising officer will take a partisan paper. The clause says the notice shall be inserted once in one or more newspapers. It is clear that the revising officer will, like everyone else, try to make matters pleasant, and, of course, if there are two leading newspapers, newspapers worthy of the name, he will insert his notice in them both, in the same way as returning officers do, and as all public officials do, except sheriffs in Ontario. If it were required that this notice should be published in all the newspapers in every electoral district or in every municipality, it would entail a very large expense without any corresponding benefit.

Mr. CASEY. I am not aware of any agreement on this side that the notice given under section 14 was sufficient. In any case, the right hon. gentleman has expressed his own opinion that it is not sufficient by moving section 16 which provides for giving further notice. I agree that, as it stands, it is a work of supererogation, for it will give very little additional information to anybody. It is a pretence.

Mr. HESSON. Not at all.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend from Perth says it is not even a pretence of giving publicity.

Mr. HESSON. I did not say anything of the kind. If you give the article to one newspaper all the other newspapers will refer to it.

Mr. CASEY. In my opinion it is merely a pretence of giving publicity. If the notice is published at all, it should be published so as to reach everybody. In Ontario we have been accustomed to have the notices, in regard to these lists, published very fully. The right hon. gentleman says the revising officer will see that due notice is given. We cannot judge as to what the revising officer will do, because there is no officer of that peculiar breed now in existence. He is a new and original conception of the right hon. gentleman, and we have nothing to compare him with. The probabilities are that, unless we insert this amendment, he will only publish the notices in the papers of his own party. It is useless to pretend that the publicity given by posting lists in post offices and similar places is sufficient. I have known such notices to be posted without anyone paying any attention to them. I would be prepared to see the newspaper clause done away with altogether, if the hon. gentleman would accept the plan of proclamations posted as fully and widely as proclamations calling an election, but that I think would be more expensive than the publication in newspapers.

Mr. VAIL. There are two separate notices. One is the list itself, but this refers only to the fact that the list is posted, so that parties who are interested may themselves examine it.

Mr. DAVIES. I shared in the view of the First Minister on the first reading, because I thought the notices required under section 16 were additional notices of the lists, but my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) points out that it is a different notice which is to be given under this section, a notice that the lists have been published and that the parties must go to the places named to see them. I do not find the schedule to which the First Minister refers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is schedule D.

Mr. WELDON. It seems to me that this notice is quite different from the notice which is put on the list. It is to give information that these lists are published and that the officer will hold a sitting at such a day. I do not think there is any need of a newspaper at all. The object of the newspaper is to call attention to the fact that the list has been published, and if the voter wants information to see whether his name is on it, that directs him where to go to find a list; but if he wants to see if an individual is on who has no right to be on, he goes to that list and finds at the bottom of it directions as to what course to pursue. Therefore, it is not necessary that it should be published in a newspaper, and I would suggest that a period of three weeks prior to the revision, would give sufficient notice.

Mr. EDGAR. The publication by merely one insertion might give no notice whatever, because, in the absence of saying when that one insertion shall be, it might be too late to give notice of application; it might be within a week, or a day, before the sitting, and the notice will be too late to inform the public that the list was posted or that the court is being held.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman will see that we are copying at a humble distance the law of the Province of Ontario, which provides that the voters' list shall be published in some newspaper in the municipality, if there be a paper in it, and, if not, it is to be published in the neighboring municipality, and there is only one insertion. The object of publishing that is to give notice that the list has been revised, so that the public may have an opportunity of appealing to the county judge. In the same way here we provide for giving full notice to all officials, and for the notice being posted up in the offices of those officials. We provide, besides, that there shall be one insertion in the newspaper of the electoral district. I think that is amply sufficient; at all events, being in an economical mood, I shall not agree to publish it more than once, nor yet shall I agree to publish it in all the papers. I think we might leave it to the revising officer.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the revising officer will use his discretion in a beneficial way in the right hon. gentleman's interest. In my own riding there are three papers. The smallest paper in the riding has no politics at all, and has about 500 or 600 subscribers. A notice published in that paper would meet the requirements of the law, but it would be seen by only 500 to 600 people, whereas there are over 5,000 voters in my riding who have a right to know when the list is published, and when the revision of it is to be made. It is just such cases as this that the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk is intended to prevent. In its present shape the clause appears to be intended to give every facility for holding the sittings without the necessary publicity being given.

Mr. VAIL. In Nova Scotia there are four or five counties where there is no local newspaper, though the county I represent has a newspaper. In the case of those counties with no newspapers, I think, at all events, the notice ought to be published in the adjoining municipality.

Mr. DAVIES. In the county of King's, P.E.I., no newspaper is published at all. The newspapers are published in Queen's, from whence they circulate throughout the Province.

Mr. BAIN. You will find that difficulty in closely settled counties that are near large centres of population. In the south riding of my own county there was no newspaper published in the towns of that riding in former days, and I think there is none yet. The municipal notices for South Wentworth and North Brant are published in the Hamilton papers; and this plan should be adopted in the present case.

Mr. AUGER. In Bagot, which is a very large county, there are no newspapers.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In many of the rural constituencies of Ontario no newspapers are published. Such is the case in East Middlesex and South Middlesex. The clause should be amended so as to allow the revising officer to publish the notices in one or more newspapers published in any constituency adjacent to the constituency in question. I suggest that the clause be amended so as to require advertisements to be published in three newspapers, if there are that number published in any constituency, and if there is no newspaper published in a constituency, the returning officer shall be required to publish the notices in one newspaper or more in the adjoining constituency. As this is a radical change of system, the people will require considerable education before being posted in the details. The lists are now to be published in January instead of July, August, or early in September, as at present, and in view of such a change I hope the First Minister will consent to such a publication as will practically secure the end aimed at.

Mr. CHARLTON. The leader of the Government informs us that we are very unreasonable in demanding a further publication, after declaring that the publication made by the posting of a notice is sufficient. If the hon. gentleman had proposed to drop this provision with regard to the publication in the newspapers, he would have been logical, but he assumes himself that it is necessary to have further publicity. We claim that there should be the greatest possible publicity, and that if the notice is published in the newspapers at all, it should be published in a fair and efficient manner, and that there should be no partiality in the selection of the journals in which the notice is to be inserted. The First Minister informs us that the revising

barrister will select the papers without reference to politics. Well, we shall be somewhat curious to see what the result will be in the light of his prediction. I hazard the prediction that his selection will invariably be made with reference to politics, and that under this section, where there is one Conservative journal, it will be selected, and where there are more than one in a district, the notice will be published in them all. This looks like the purport of this section, and I have no doubt that in this matter, as in other cases where the Government has advertising patronage to bestow, it will select its own friends.

Mr. HESSON. No doubt of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman has more honesty than discretion, because his declaration is directly opposed to the assertion of his leader. I have no doubt that he is right, and that the journals will be selected only with reference to their political standing. What we contend is that as this is a notice affecting all classes and both parties, such a degree of decency should be observed as would require the selection of journals of both parties. The adoption of such a provision, and the insertion of the notice three times instead of once, will not largely increase the expense. In Toronto, Montreal, and a few other places, the expense might be beyond the limit of propriety, but in most ridings you will find only two or three, or at the most, four journals.

Mr. HESSON. In Perth there are twelve.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is, six for each riding, and in most cases the expense would be inconsiderable, and would be richly repaid by the reputation the Government would have for acting with impartiality, and without reference to political bias. This section as it stands would empower the revising barrister to select merely the journals of his own party, and to select them all even if there are twenty, and as the hon. member for South Perth says, he will do so. While we believe that the principles of this measure are radically wrong, we are called upon to make its details as workable as possible.

The amendment (Mr. Casey) was then put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. White, Cardwell). In my opinion the nays have it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amendment has been voted upon.

Mr. CASEY. The Chairman had not declared it lost when I rose to my feet.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The motion was put.

Mr. CASEY. The motion was put while I was on my feet, addressing you, Sir.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CASEY. The arguments on this motion have been all on one side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to argue that point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I declare the hon. gentleman out of order.

Mr. CASEY. I am speaking to the point of order, and therefore I cannot be out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman will gain nothing at all by this conduct. I say it is scandalous on the part of the right hon. gentleman to try to force down discussion which must come. He will gain nothing by it; he will make nothing by insisting on your ruling. He makes nothing whatever by insisting on getting a ruling from the Chair. I was rising to address you, Sir, when you put the motion, and I am sure you would not have put the motion if you had heard me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I waited for some time after the hon. gentleman sat down before putting the motion. I then put the motion, and declared that the nays had it. It was after that the hon. gentleman rose.

Mr. CASEY. If you declare that you did not hear me address you, I call for a division.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) negatived. Yeas, 43; nays, 60.

Mr. CASEY. I will have to say now what I could have said in half the time we have been debating the point of order; so nothing was gained by the insistance of the right hon. gentleman on the point of order. I say that the argument on this question has been all on one side. The hon. gentleman has not seen fit to argue the propriety of these proposed amendments at all; he has simply poohpoohed them, although he must know that they are important. Unless he gives reasons for objecting to the publicity we ask for, we must come to the conclusion that what he objects to is the publicity itself. He has created an officer who, by virtue of his duties, is a suspicious character, who will never be anything but a suspicious character, and whom the community will desire to watch with the utmost carefulness; and he has, obstinately and wilfully, and without reason given, declared that he will not allow us to secure for the public that opportunity of watching him which we are anxious to obtain. When the right hon. gentleman, with an attempt at jocularity about his being in an economical vein, which we do not see evidences of in any other direction, refuses to go to the trifling expense of inserting a short advertisement in two or three more newspapers than he proposes, and a few more times than he proposes, we can come to no other conclusion than that he does not want the public to know the facts that should be brought before them by this notice, but that he wishes his tool, his party agent, to have an opportunity of doing his work under the shade. It is rather startling to us to find a question of this importance received as it has been by hon. gentlemen opposite—to find an attempt to hiss and hoot and bark down the discussion; and I would call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that dogs are not supposed to be in this Chamber without their masters. We hear now and have heard during the last few nights barking in this House which could only proceed from a dog. I am sure no hon. member of this House would so disgrace himself as to imitate that quadruped, and can only assume that some members has smuggled a dog under his desk, and I would ask you to call one of the pages to turn him out. We have shown the importance of this matter, and the only answer we get is a hoot, a hiss, or a bark. It is, of course, impossible, in the face of the obstinate resistance, the unargumentative resistance of the hon. gentleman and his followers, to carry what we desire, but we are determined that our views shall be fully put on record. The hon. gentleman has refused to allow the notice to be inserted in more than one paper; then let it be inserted several times in that paper. The English law in this respect is preferable. It provides that the notice shall be inserted in "one or more papers circulating in the county;" while this clause provides that it shall be inserted in a paper in the county, but makes no provision if there is no paper published in the county. I hope, with the reverence he professes for English practice, and with his professed intention of following English practice in this Bill, he will see his way to assimilate it in this respect with his professed model.

Amendment (Mr. Weldon) negatived.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That ought to be carried. In North Brant, owing to the particular boundary given by the Gerrymandering Act, they happen to be without a newspaper.

Mr. KING. In the two counties adjoining Queen's, King's and Sunbury, there are no newspapers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are Provinces where there are no municipalities, and I would suggest an amendment which the hon. gentleman may move if he chooses: "And in case no newspaper is published therein, then in some newspaper published in a neighboring district."

Mr. CASEY. The wording of the English Act is preferable. A newspaper may be published in an adjoining district and not circulated at all in the one in question. By saying, in a newspaper circulated in the district, it does not matter where it is published.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The county which I represent will give a fair idea of the difficulty that may arise. My riding is composed of a part of Oxford, Brant, and Wentworth, and the papers that circulate in one part of the riding do not circulate in the others, and there is no newspaper published in the riding; so that if the notice be published in a newspaper in the adjoining riding it will only reach the electors in one part of North Brant. To reach the whole of that riding it should be published in newspapers circulated in both ends and in the centre. I do not suppose that my county is the only one of this description to be found in the Dominion, and in such counties it is necessary the publication should be made in papers published in several of the adjoining municipalities.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for Queen's N.B. (Mr. King), said that the counties on both sides of his, Sunbury and King's, had no newspapers. I believe there is a small newspaper published in the latter, but it is entirely devoted to chemical fertilisers, and my hon. friend from King's.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) moved that the words "one or more" be erased and "newspapers" be substituted, and the following added:—"if there is that number, and if not, in the newspapers circulated in such district." This will meet the objection of the hon. member for Brant to some extent, and it will also meet the case of the county which I have the honor to represent, as well as that of many others. There is difficulty in framing any one clause that will meet the different circumstances mentioned here; but, if we determine to publish these notices in three newspapers, if there be that number in a constituency, that will meet the case, to a great extent; and if there be no newspapers published in the constituency, as in the case of Brant, the notice should be inserted in newspapers published in three different points, at some distance apart, each paper having a circulation in a portion of the constituency.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the following words be added after the words electoral district:—"and in case no newspaper is published therein, in one or more newspapers published in a neighboring electoral district."

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The amendment, as it stands, will be of no use in my riding, which is 65 miles long, and embraces part of three counties. I suggest that the word "districts" be substituted for the word "district," because the papers published in the district adjoining one end of my riding would not reach the other end.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would only give the revising officer the option of using newspapers published in more than one adjoining district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I agree.

Amendment agreed to, with the addition of the words "or districts."

Mr. MULOCK. We ought to have the time limited within which this advertisement should be published. It might be published at the last moment, before the sitting of the court.

Mr. WELDON. It says "immediately."

Mr. MULOCK. What is "immediately?" There should be a limitation. Immediately is a relative term. Would there be any objection to enacting that the first insertion should take place at least three weeks before the final revision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman does not like the word "immediately," I have no objection to take the word in the Ontario Act, which is "forthwith."

Mr. MULOCK. We are not legislating for Ontario altogether; we are legislating for the whole Dominion. The Ontario Act provides that the same practice shall be followed as is required in the case of appeal to the court of revision, so you must go to the Assessment Act to find out what the requirements of the law are, and that Act provides that the publication must take place at least ten days before the sitting of the court. If the First Minister desires to follow the Ontario Act let him follow it in that respect, but in view of the size of some of our constituencies, I think ten days is not sufficient, and I, therefore, move that the first publication shall be at least three weeks before the sitting of the court. The public are entitled to reasonable time in which to obtain whatever advantage this Act gives them, in order to control the attendance of unwilling witnesses, and also to make their own arrangements; because this Bill provides that there shall elapse at least an interval of four weeks between putting up this notice and the sitting of the court, and I think the publication of the notice in the papers should take place at least three weeks before the sitting of the court. That gives the revising officer a margin of one week.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On section 15,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that in the 34th line the word "nor" and subsequent words be struck out. There is no necessity, I think, for having "nor more than five weeks." Then, in the 40th line, after the word "form," I propose to insert "form E," and I will strike out the words for that purpose. Then, in the 47th line, after the word "address," to strike out all to the end of the clause. That was understood a little while ago.

Mr. DAVIES. The draughtsman who drew up this clause evidently intended there should be one list of voters for every electoral district, and that there should be one preliminary revision of that list made. But the First Minister has altered the scheme of the Bill in that respect, and the Bill, as it now stands, down to section 14, provides for lists for every municipality and other sub-divisions of the electoral districts, so that, in some districts, there will be five, six, seven or more lists. It is apparent that it will be impossible to revise these lists at one place, or with one preliminary revision. I look upon the preliminary revision as the most important revision which will be held. The right hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I have studied the Bill pretty thoroughly, and I know that in the ridings with which I am best acquainted the preliminary revision will be the most important, and the subsequent revisions will not amount to a great deal. There will be a few legal objections made to certain names, and a few appeals; but the practical work of revision, the striking off and adding on, will, I am satisfied, be done at the first preliminary

revision. Now, take Prince Edward Island, in which the hon. gentleman made an alteration last night. He has placed upon the list of voters there every man who voted at the last general election; he has made the poll book *primâ facie* evidence of the right to be placed on the new voters' list. Well, we know, as matter of fact, that there will be a good many hundred names placed upon this new voters' list that will not have the legal right to vote. Their right to remain on that list will be questioned, and must be questioned, at the first preliminary revision. In the county of Queen's, which I have the honor to represent, the shire town is situated in the centre of the county, and from the south end to the north end of the county is a distance of 60 or 70 miles. Now, it is perfectly absurd, it is out of the question, to say that the revising officer could hold the sitting in Charlottetown to revise 7,000 voters' names, and ask men to come there a distance of 60 or 70 miles. It would not only be ruinous to the people themselves to come such a distance and remain while the revision is going on, but it would be impossible to induce the hundreds of people whose evidence will be necessary to remain for the necessary length of time. The scheme, as it has been remodelled, provides for an alphabetical list being made out in the subdivisions of the county. When we had a voters' list prepared for Prince Edward Island the county court judge held a court for preliminary revision in each circuit of the county. That riding has six county court circuits, and the people are accustomed to go to those circuits. So far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, I think the preliminary revision should be held in each of the county court circuits; that would be six places in the riding. It would be very much easier for the county court judge, or the revising barrister, to travel to five or six different places in the county than it would be for hundreds of people to flock in from all parts of the county to one central place. I propose, in amendment:

That after the word "place," in the 33rd line of the 11th paragraph, there be added the following words: "or places in each municipality or parish, or, in Prince Edward Island, in each county court circuit in the electoral districts, as he shall deem most convenient for such purpose.

Take Charlottetown: it has 2,000 voters, and the revision will take several days. It will be perfectly impossible for people far out in the county to attend. The cost will be so expensive that they would prefer to abandon the matter. I assume that it is intended to amend the section in accordance with the preceding amendments, so that the scheme of the Bill shall be thoroughly carried out. The scheme I propose will not be inconvenient to revising officers. There are county court houses in each district where the sitting can be held. It will be much easier for one man to go there than for 500 people to attend at some other point. There is no party object to be gained by this amendment, it being as much in favor of one party as another. We are all anxious not to throw too many obstacles in the way of the people getting on the list, or to names being struck off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The alteration in the Bill to which the hon. gentleman has referred is that of having several lists instead of one list; but it in no way alters the balance of the Bill. It was made for the purpose of meeting the objection that it would cause confusion, perhaps expense, in having a long list of all the voters in a constituency put up in such municipality or other division of the constituency, and therefore, according to the Bill, as amended, instead of there being one list for each municipality there will be several and distinct lists for the different polling divisions. And the lists which interests particular sections of constituencies will be made up and put up. The plan of the Bill remains as it is now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) says this preliminary revision is a most important portion of the Bill. It is comparatively unimportant, and the only doubt I have is as to whether this clause should be in the Bill at all. This clause is only

put in for the first settlement of the voters' lists under this Act. In the subsequent annual revision it is not provided that there shall be a preliminary revision. In the second year, the voters' list having been once settled, the officer will take the voters' list of the year before, and will visit each municipality or other well-known division, and with that list in his hand he will add new voters, and strike off dead voters, or those absent, or those who have lost the franchise, and he will settle the list at once. But, in order to have a good list to start with, it was thought well this system should be adopted. Let me shortly go over it. In the first place, the revising officer takes the revised assessment roll, or the poll books, or the voters' list, as the case may be. He takes those books as *primâ facie* evidence. He makes out his list, showing every name that the assessment roll shows to have a vote. He takes other such information as he can obtain, in order to add other names. He publishes that list. It goes to every municipality. He says: There are the parties who, on an examination of the assessment roll, have a right to vote. Then he announces that he will hold a court—if a county judge, in his own office, and if a revising officer, in some other place; and he will receive all papers sent in, applications that may be made to be placed on the roll by mail or otherwise, and all objections made to the names appearing on that roll. It is not required that anyone should be present. The practical working of the plan will be this: The political associations of the two parties that govern the country will send in their lists, I have no doubt. Individuals who are interested will send in names or their objections. They need not attend at all. But the revising officer will get all those applications, and all the objections. In the next clause, the 17th clause, it is provided, however, that parties may attend the preliminary revision if they please; but there is no necessity, those documents being sent in being sufficient for the purpose. He takes the applications; he reads them and adds them to his list. He makes the objections to them on his list; and after that list is completed, that is the preliminary list, the original list of applications—the applications with the objections noted—the revising officer, with the complete list, goes and visits every municipality, holds his court there and settles the list finally. That is the important portion of it. It may be, indeed, as has been pressed on me, that there is no necessity for going to this trouble to get this information, even for the settlement of the first list. But I think it will be well, and I think the plan will commend itself to the judgment of the committee, that we should take this additional trouble. Although the revising officer will have the assessment roll, the voters' list and the poll book, still he will be ready to receive all applications made to him from any source to put names on the list, and that additional list showing every possible applicant and name, including wage-earners, tenants, occupants and so on; and then with that very full list the officer will go and visit every municipality; and then, at the solemn sitting in each municipality, he will settle the list. That is the scheme. In subsequent annual revisions of the list by the revising officer there will be no necessity to continue this preliminary business. All the officer will have to do will be to annually go round, at a time announced, and well known to the municipality, to receive applications and objections, and so settle the list. In England this work occupies a very short time. So it will be here, when we get a good and satisfactory list. It will be done with very little trouble, time and expense. This preliminary revision will cost us some money, but it will be well worth the money, in order to start with a full, thorough list; and I believe such is the political activity in the minds of our people that every elector worthy of having a vote, and the various political parties, will take the highest and deepest interest in making a good start and getting up a full list;

and it is for the purpose of giving them an opportunity of doing so that this clause has been put in.

Mr. MILLS. I think if the hon. gentleman really holds to the views he is enunciating, it is an argument against the existence of this clause altogether. He must remember that he has furnished, under the provisions of this Bill, very imperfect material to the revising officer, out of which to prepare the voters' lists. The new law in the Province of Ontario will not be in operation, and the assessment roll will not be prepared with reference to that law, so that there will be a great many serious defects in the assessment roll, as a means of information to the revising officer, even in the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman seems also to forget that the wage-earners, a large class of tenants and income voters, will not be upon the roll at all, and how does he propose the revising officer shall get the information in the first instance? The hon. gentleman has objected to the importance of having local aid and knowledge in the collection of information for the revising officer, and now he proposes, with imperfect material, to deny to the revising officer the opportunity of acquiring such further informa'ion as will enable him to make a more perfect list in the first instance. Take my riding as an instance. It is made up of townships from two different counties; the people of the counties are seldom together, and the county towns are outside. The most central part of the county is the town of Dresden, from which the people of Sombra, on the river St. Clair, are 35 miles distant. Sarnia is their county town, and they are not in Dresden once in one year or in two years. Bothwell is 24 miles eastward, and how will those voters, whose names will, necessarily, be off in the first instance, attend these meetings? The revising officer will require a longer time to deal with these lists than would be required for a judge to hold an ordinary assize court for the county, and if the candidate has to bear the expense of the attendance it will cost more than running an ordinary election. If he takes the wage-earners alone, he will have at least 100 people, in an ordinary township, who will be entitled to go upon this list. They will not be upon the list unless they attend personally for the purpose, and unless the judge or the revising officer holds his court in the municipality they will not have an opportunity of getting there at all. I say that this procedure ought not to be had at all, unless the court is held in every municipality. If the hon. gentleman intends that the electors shall not have an opportunity of having a proper list, if his object is to put obstacles in the way of preparing a list in the first instance, then the course he is pursuing is perfectly intelligible to us all, and it will serve its purpose, but it will not serve the purpose of preparing a proper list. In an ordinary constituency it is no exaggeration to hold that out of 4,000 or 5,000 electors from 500 to 1,500 will be off the roll, after the revising officer has used all the materials that he may have at his disposal. There will be, at the very least, 25 per cent. of the names to be put on the voters' list, by actual attendance and evidence, either in this case or at a later period, at the final revision. It will be utterly impossible to make the list perfect unless the revising officer meets the electors in their own immediate vicinity; he must go to them, for they will not come to him. Electors are only induced to attend under the pressure of the excitement of a general election. When that takes place they may go a few miles for the purpose of recording their votes, but they are not going to travel thirty or forty miles to have their names put on the list, when they may be obliged to wait four or five days, or even a week, before the revising officer can reach their particular applications. Some of us remember the period in the political history of Upper Canada when the electors were all required to go to the county town in order to record their votes; and one of the advantages of the introduction of our municipal system was, that along with it we succeeded in securing the polling of votes in each local municipality in the first instance, and ultimately in polling sub-divisions in each municipality. This is a proposition to go back to the old condition of things; the old inconveniences and expenses are revived in another form; the hon. gentleman wishes to re-establish, under the guise of a Franchise Bill, those abuses which we supposed were corrected in the days of our fathers. I say this is a monstrous provision, and I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that if they undertake to carry this into practical effect days will have to be spent in the perfection of the list, and they will require to bring voters thirty or forty or fifty miles, and keep them for an indefinite period of time at the place where the preliminary revision is taking place in order to make a comparatively correct list in the first instance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MILLS. Hon. gentlemen take exception to that; but every hon. gentleman knows the assessment roll will not give the revising officer the information necessary to enable him to prepare the list. The hon. gentleman refused last evening to take the assessment roll in Prince Edward Island, which would give a large amount of the information required. He will take the poll books of 1882, which record the vote of every British subject over twenty-one years of age, and at least 25 per cent. of the persons whose names are in the poll books will not be entitled to vote under this Bill. How does he propose to get them off this preliminary list? The revising officer will have to bring some of them 70 miles.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HESSON. You have just been told that there is no necessity for it.

Mr. MILLS. I say there is. Does the hon. gentleman deny that the hon. First Minister proposes to take the poll books of Prince Edward Island for 1882, that he proposes to transfer the names on those books to the new voters' list, that there are many men without property who voted then, and that some procedure is necessary to get their names off the list? We are told that in the county in which the city of Charlottetown is situated, from the county town to the extreme borders is a distance of 70 miles, and those parties must all be brought to one place for the purpose of giving evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. I say, yes. I want to know how the revising officer is going to make his revision without subpœneing those parties to give evidence; he has to pay their expenses for the time they are kept there, and my hon. friend beside me says there are upwards of 2,000 in his county whose names must be taken off at some time or other, either at this preliminary revision or at the final revision. If it is an unnecessary provision it should not be there; if it is necessary, the hon. gentleman should furnish facilities to carry it out fairly and honestly, and it cannot be carried out fairly and honestly under this Bill. Where is the revising officer or the judge to sit in Algoma? At Port Arthur? Are all the voters of Manitoulin Island to be taken to Port Arthur, a distance of 200 miles? The hon. gentleman knows that this is a proposition to put obstacles in the way of properly correcting and revising the list. If he is willing to have a fair and honest revision of the list made it is necessary that the revising officer should meet the electors in the municipality where they belong, that he should there revise the list, in the presence of those who are capable of giving him the information he requires, and where he will have an oppor-

tunity of examining and cross-examining the parties on the property on which they propose to qualify. Therefore, if the hon. gentleman wishes to obtain a fair list, let him accept the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). If he wishes to put obstacles in the way of a fair list, if he wishes that the list shall be a sham and a delusion, and will not represent those honestly entitled to vote under the law, it is only necessary to adhere to the Bill as we have it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are none so blind as those who will not see. I thought, after my explanation, that the system was plain, and that instead of offering obstacles it facilitated the formation of a good and perfect list. The hon. gentleman says this clause is not wanted at all.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that. I said that if the First Minister's line of argument was correct the clause was not wanted at all, and he ought to have struck it out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says this clause puts obstacles in the way, and that it will require people to be brought seventy miles, and all that sort of thing. It has no such intention, and the hon. gentleman has not read the clause or he would not say so. He says the revising officer should visit each municipality and make himself thoroughly acquainted with the people. That is provided for in the Bill. This is simply an additional means of information. The people need not go a mile; they need only go to the nearest post office and mail a letter, stating they apply to be put on the list or to get some one taken off the list. The political parties may send in lists, saying how many owners, tenants, occupants, farmers, fishermen, have been left off by the revising barrister; and the revising officer, instead of sitting in secret in his office, will sit in open court. The representative of a political party may go and hand that list to him, or he may mail it, if he likes. The revising officer has prepared these lists on the assessment roll and books, and on this preliminary sitting he receives all applications made to him to be put on the list, and adds the names of the applicants. He then goes round and visits every municipality, after giving full notice of his intention. He takes up a new name, not on the original list, say John Jones, wage-earner, and asks if there is any objection to the name, and if there is any objection the person objected to has to prove his right to vote, in the same way as in the case of an appeal from the court of revision to the county judge. This is simply an additional means for completing the lists. No man need leave the plough or the work bench, but can send in his name and have it put on. Instead of being an obstacle, this provision is an additional convenience. The hon. gentleman has attacked the system. I do not suppose I can convince him it is a good system; but supposing he is right and I am wrong, the majority of the committee have declared that this system should be adopted, and there is no use harping back, and saying it is a bad system. The only thing for us to do is to work it out as well as we can. I declare this clause was put in by myself for the purpose of making the preliminary list as full as possible, so that every person having a shadow of a claim shall appear on it; and after the revising officer goes round, as the hon. gentleman says he ought to, he will be able to separate the chaff from the wheat; the real voter will be left on the list, and those who have been weighed in the balance and found wanting will be set aside.

Mr. VAIL. The more I hear the several clauses discussed the more I am convinced we never should have attempted to meddle with the election law. It is evident that the framers knew nothing whatever about the effect of some of the provisions. I am quite sure the representatives of Nova Scotia could not have read the Bill, or they would have seen that the provision that the revising officer shall sit in the shire town of the county and revise the list, and that there shall be only one sitting, is not at all suited to the Province of Nova Scotia. The counties in Nova Scotia are long and narrow, and in some of our counties the shire town is at almost the extreme end; in others, they are within four or five miles of the county line one way, and 60 or 70 miles from the other. Take Hants county: the revising officer holds his court in Windsor, 70 miles from some of the outlying districts. Take Halifax county: some of the districts are 70 to 80 miles from both of the shire towns, Halifax and Dartmouth, so that people will have to travel 70 or 80 miles in order to see whether their names are on the list. Take the county of Digby: the people in one part of the county would have to travel 40 or 50 miles to the shire town to see if ther names are on the list. In no way can this be arranged satisfactorily, except by compelling the revising officer to hold his court in several places in the electoral district. In Digby, for instance, an arm of the sea runs right through the county, so that there are actually two counties. Digby neck is divided off, and there are two islands at the lower end, Long Island and Brier Island, inhabited by fishermen. How will any of these men at Westport or Brier Island, 50 miles away, be expected to leave their fishing and go to Digby, to see whether their names are inserted or not; and it is impossible for the officer to know how many fishermen in that particular locality are to be put on the list. The fishermen themselves will not know, for they are not in a position to study the law, and the consequence will be that a great many of them will be left off, unless some provision is made, obliging the revising officer to hold his court in two or three places in the electoral district.

Mr. FISHER. The right hon. gentleman said, at first, that he did not suppose this clause was necessary, but a few minutes ago he stated that this preliminary revision of the lists was really the most important.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not; I said the reverse.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; he said the making of the first lists was really the most important part of the whole Bill, because the first lists will form the basis for future lists. It is therefore very important that every possible precaution should be taken in the preparation of the first lists, to see that the right people, and only the right people, are put upon them. He says it is not necessary for the people to come to the revision, as they can apply by letter to the revising officer, and he can act upon that application. In that case there is no necessity for the revising officer to sit at all. He can do all that in his own office, without taking any evidence, except these letters. If a public sitting is to be held it must be for the purpose of taking evidence and obtaining information. Under the 17th section it is provided that evidence will be taken from those who may then be present, so that the hon. gentleman expects that the people will come before the revising barrister, and will not only communicate with him by letters. If the people near at hand can attend this preliminary revision, the same right should be given to people far away, and that can only be done by the revision taking place in different sections of the larger counties.

Mr. HESSON. Look at clause 21.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to see that the hon. member for North Perth is waking up to the necessity of advancing some arguments, although he may be the only one on that side who is, and although his arguments may not be very strong ones. The clause to which the hon. gentleman refers has reference to the final revision, to which I am not alluding. I think the right hon. gentleman is quite correct in introducing this preliminary revision as a necessary prelude to the final revision, but it should be an effective pre-

lude, and in order to be that it must take place in different parts of the counties. The week's notice provided for is not sufficient to enable persons to communicate in writing with the revising officer, and if arguments have to be advanced and replied to it is impossible to carry them on by letter in the time specified. I have known two whole days to be occupied in my county by the revision of the voters' list of one small municipality, and I believe the revision of the list for the whole county will take, at least, a week. I know my people, and I know that they will be present themselves to watch the action of the revising barrister. It is absolutely necessary that the preliminary as well as the final revision should take place in every municipality. In the Province of Quebec, if I object to a name on the voters' list, I have to send in my objection to the secretary-treasurer of the municipality, and that officer has himself to give notice to the person whose name is objected to. I think that is a much better proceeding than the one proposed by the First Minister. It is also throwing the work on the person to whom that work belongs, I mean the secretary of the revising officer. The precautions in the Bill with regard to sending a letter, I think, are very insufficient. If notice is to be sent to a person whose name is objected to, it certainly ought to be sent by registered letter, and not by mailed letter, so that it may be sure that the person gets it. The hon. gentleman might object that we are asking something that will greatly increase the work. But he must remember that the chief portion of the work must be done in making the first list, after this new Bill comes into operation, and I do not think it would be asking too much to ask that the revising officer should take the trouble to go to the people, instead of asking the people to come to him.

Mr. HESSON. I think my hon. friend must have overlooked the fact that the revising officer is to prepare his list from the evidence furnished him by the assessment rolls in the first instance, and by the voters' lists in the second instance, from which sources of information he ought to be able to place all properly qualified electors on the list. When the notices are so widely distributed, as has been conceded by the Bill, all parties who are not on those lists, as prepared in the first instance by the revising officer, would have an opportunity of appealing when he held his court under clause 15. It is a matter of little importance where that court will be held, or what point he may consider his headquarters, where parties may write to him or appear before him, in person or by proxy. It is only those who are left off the original list, after they have been duly notified, who will have to appear before him in person or by letter. If objection is made it may be made in writing, and the party objected to must be notified. Then he will appear, or some person on his behalf, though he is not bound to appear. Then it is only when the party appears in that particular electoral division, not in the riding, but in the particular part of the riding where the vote may be cast; and when the revising officer appears there, the party concerned goes before him. The proposition of my hon. friend is simply to involve an unnecessarily large amount of cost, to require the revising officer to pass through the whole of the district for the purpose of receiving what might be conveyed to him by letter. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said a great deal about the cost of working this Bill, but every proposition they have made to-day has been in the direction of multiplying difficulties and increasing the cost to the country. They have asked that the notices should be published in all the newspapers. In my own county there are at least twelve newspapers, and it would cost a good deal to publish the list in all these papers.

Mr. WATSON. I would remind the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were, from the first, opposed to this Bill, on account of its cost and its injustice to the electorate, but since the House has decided that we are to have a Dominion voters' list it is our duty to make it as perfect as possible. If it is going to cost a few dollars more we must not disfranchise people. Now, in the county I have the honor to represent there are twenty-nine municipalities. From the principal town in that county, Portage la Prairie, it is 175 miles to the municipality of Shell River. I do not think it is fair to compel the people to travel 175 miles to Portage la Prairie to have their names put on the voters' list. Besides, hon. gentlemen must remember that in some electoral districts we have not got regular mails; in some municipalities in my county we have only one mail a week. Now, if a man applied to have his name put on the list it would take him two weeks to get an answer, and before he could be notified of the day of revision it might be too late for him to furnish his evidence. There are a good many reasons why I think it preferable that the revising barrister should visit all the municipalities in preparing his list. It might be a little more costly, but it would be much more convenient for the electors. The idea of having the revising barrister sit in one particular part of the county is a mistake. I think there will be more difficulty in preparing the first list than in revising it afterwards, and if the list is made right in the first place it can only be done by the revising barrister visiting each municipality. There are a great many people who will not understand this new franchise, and unless the revising barrister goes amongst them, to give them an opportunity of being entered on the list, a great many names will not be entered at all. The great object in preparing the list will be to have the names placed on the preliminary list. Then, any person who objects will have the privilege of looking at the list and making objections. Action can be subsequently taken, and evidence adduced to have the name struck off. There is no doubt that a great number of persons may apply to have their names put on who will not be entitled to vote. If that is the case, the revising officer will have it in his discretion to say whether he will allow those names to be put on or not. In the final revision names may be struck off and others inserted. If it is necessary to have this Bill passed it is necessary that precautions should be taken with respect to the first list. It will not be so necessary in subsequent years, because there will be few changes. The revising officer should visit each municipality for the purpose of preparing the preliminary list. It will be a great hardship to persons in counties such as I represent to have to travel long distances at a large expense in order to have their names placed on the first list. The hon. Minister states that both political parties are very active, and that the names will be placed on the first list. I do not think it should be necessary for a man to be constantly watching the voters' list to know whether his name is on it or not. In my county I do not know, personally, one-third of the electors.

Mr. HESSON. You have the assessment roll.

Mr. WATSON. There will be 200 or 300 persons left off that list who should be on it, and it will be difficult to ascertain these facts without incurring much expense. The revising officer should be compelled to visit each municipality in order to make up his primary list.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman seems entirely to ignore the fact that county court judges, at the present time, go wherever they hold courts of revision and hold a final revision. If any parties desire to appeal they do so at that time and place. Take the county of Perth; there are three places where the judge holds division courts; he attends there on a certain day, and if the people raise objections, evidence is taken, the matter is disposed of, and there is a final revision. Under this Bill the revising

officer will have to visit each county independently, and that brings him much closer to individual electors than the present mode.

Mr. WATSON. That explanation will do very well for people who are near the centres of population, but it will not apply to persons far away from centres, and who take but little interest in political affairs. Suppose I were to attempt to look after the voters' names in Marquette, there might be a hundred men qualified to be placed on the list, and I not know it. People may be very intelligent, but they do not care to put themselves to much trouble about having their names on the voters' list.

Mr. HESSON. What advantage will it be to an elector to be placed on the primary list and not on the list finally revised?

Mr. WATSON. If he is on the primary list and is entitled to vote, his name cannot be struck off. Every possible facility should be given to the people to have their names placed on the voters' lists. If Judge Ryan were appointed returning officer in my constituency he would probably sit at Portage la Prairie, from which it is 175 miles to the municipality of Shell River, and there is railway communication for only about 70 miles. At Shell River the mail does not arrive more than once a week, and in other parts once in two weeks. The same difficulties to which I have alluded will prevail in Algoma and Selkirk.

Mr. AUGER. Few of the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be willing to take the First Minister's word about anything; but I am willing to take it, so far as it goes. The returning officer, it is said, will be an independent officer, and will follow out the law. What is the law? It is provided in section 12 that the revising officer shall prepare the lists of persons who are entitled to be registered as voters; that is the first step. The next step is set forth in clause 15, which points out that notice must be given to the parties against whom objections are raised. If they want a name entered on the list, or taken off, they must notify him. By clause 17, after he has initialed these cases they are decided—they are final. There is no appeal, because it would simply be an appeal to the revising officer himself, and that is not provided for. By clause 25 provision is made both as to the preliminary and final revision, as to the examining of witnesses, the production of books and documents, just as in any court of record.

An hon. MEMBER. That is for the final examination.

Mr. AUGER. No; that is for the preliminary as well as for the final.

An hon. MEMBER. No; it is for the final.

Mr. AUGER. Well, if the hon. gentleman cannot understand plain English it is not my fault, and if the hon. gentleman will study the law he will see that it is as I have stated. If he cannot make it clear, let him consult some of the lawyers on his own side, and he will find that this is for the preliminary as well as for the final revision. This shows that the work will actually be done at the preliminary revision. It will be at that revision that names will be added and taken off, and therefore I say that that revision should take place in each municipality, and the final revision in the county, where any errors may be corrected which may have been overlooked in the first revision. Perhaps that was the intention of the framer of the law, but he may have got the thing turned around, as in the case of clauses 15 and 16, where he got the wrong clause first. In my own county, for instance, there are fourteen muncipalities, and some of the people live at a great distance from the centre. Both parties would have to bring witnesses, and if one party was not present the others would practically settle the matter, the list would be initialed and the others would have no remedy. But if the work were distributed over the municipalities it could be attended to properly and at much less expense, and it must be remembered that most of the expense will fall on the candidates, or leaders of the party, as a great many of the electors do not take much interest in matters of this kind, and therefore the question is one of equal interest to hon. members on both sides of this House. Perhaps hon. gentlemen opposite do not care much about the expense, and especially the First Minister, so long as it carries out his own political ends. I hope the amendment will be adopted, especially as it would involve no more cost to the Government, and no more trouble to the revising officer, while it would save thousands of dollars to the candidates, or to the electors. In my own county it would take at least three or four weeks if the preliminary revision was made in one place whereas, if it were carried on in each municipality it would require very much less time and expense.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I think it is very important that this section of the Bill should be amended in the way proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). It is a mistaken idea that hon. gentlemen opposite are laboring under, that the Opposition are trying to prevent the perfecting of this measure or to increase the cost of operating it. I think we ought to have a common interest in this matter, now that the majority have decided that we shall have this Bill; and therefore it is in the interest of both parties that we should make the Bill as perfect in all its details as possible. It will be admitted that in the Province of Ontario, at least, we have now facilities for the preparation, revision, and final revision of the voters' list which we shall not possess under this Bill. We all know that we have our local courts of revision, where the electors who live in the municipalities can readily be present, and we do not want to put the electors throughout the Dominion to any greater trouble than they are now compelled to undergo in order to perfect their lists. I think it is just as much in the interest of hon. gentlemen supporting the Government that this alteration should be made in the Bill as it is in the interest of hon. gentlemen on this side. Under the present system the electors are not required to send notices or letters to any persons residing at a distance, and it must also be borne in mind that there are a large number of electors in the different constituencies of the Dominion who are not regular and constant readers of newspapers, and who may not have an opportunity of learning the provisions of this Bill. In introducing a new law of this kind, we must take into account the difficulties a great many of the electors will have to contend with under it. Although we have been discussing this Bill for a long time, it appears to me that there are some gentlemen in this House who do not yet fully understand it; and if that is the case with intelligent representatives of the people, how can you expect those electors who have no such opportunities to become acquainted with its provisions. Therefore, it would be in the interest of gentlemen opposite, as well as in our interest, on this side, that every facility should be afforded to the electors in the preparation of the first list. Even supposing that the expense for the preparation of the first list will be made greater than at present by the amendment, it will be a justifiable expense; but I do not admit that the expense will be greater. The amount of money saved to the country at large will be much greater than the increased wages paid to the revising barristers for these various visitations. This is a matter that not only affects the electors; it affects, also, the time and expense incurred by gentlemen who hold seats in this House, and who will have an interest in seeing that the lists are properly prepared and revised. It is plain, to my mind, that the interpretation that should be put upon this first revision of the voters' list is not the interpretation put upon it by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). The 12th clause provides the way in which these lists are

to be prepared; it provides that the revising officer shall obtain his information from the provincial lists and the assessment rolls, and by any other means that he may be able to avail himself of. The next section provides he shall publish the list, and that afterwards he shall hold a court; and I contend that the court he holds for the preliminary revision of the list is as much a court as the final court he holds. I agree entirely with the remarks of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). In the Ontario system it is not required that the elector should go to the trouble of notifying parties against whom he objects or whom he wishes to be put on the list. That duty should be given to the revising officer. If I desire to have a number of electors struck off, because I believe they are not entitled to be on the list, I do not think I should be required to discharge the duty of an officer of the law, and notify these parties. I do not see how it can be denied that this is a court. It is as much a court as the final court of revision, as will be seen by referring to the 25th section. If it is not intended that the revising officer shall sit in court, but that he shall merely receive his applications by letter, without examining witnesses, why is it stated that he is to be governed by all the rules of a court of record, and that he is to sit in judgment on the evidence? I do not see what objection there can be to passing the amendment. Not only to save ourselves expense and trouble, but in the interests of the electors, it should be adopted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fail to see what earthly objection there can be in allowing the revising officer to go to the municipalities. As matters stand in Ontario, the people there have the convenience that the lists are made up and the court of revision held in each municipality, a court which holds a position closely analogous to that occupied by the revising barrister at this preliminary investigation; and then when an appeal lies to the county court judge he goes round to each municipality and holds his court there. The First Minister has shown himself disposed to accept suggestions to-night. This is a case in which he ought to continue showing that good disposition. There is no doubt whatever that to compel men to travel thirty or forty miles to the revising barrister is a great tax on them, and with the probability, then, that they will have to wait for several days together before each particular case can be taken up. The right hon. gentleman said that the representatives of each party would take the matter in hand, that they would make application to have men put on or off, in a wholesale manner, 300 or 400 at a time. If it goes, as the First Minister appears to think it will go, into the hands of the associations, or of persons employed by them, these things will be argued, especially in the first instance, at very considerable length. It is quite likely that very nearly as long a time will be taken up in considering these various cases, especially in the preliminary organisation, as would ordinarily be occupied in the disposal of an assize, and the First Minister knows—no one better—that that may take seven, eight, nine or ten days, or possibly a fortnight. It would not so much matter if the thing were thoroughly understood, but I repeat that it is not understood. A number of curious objections are likely to be taken in the first instance, where you are applying a new statute, every word of which is going to be litigated, in all probability, by the parties employed by the respective political parties. It is quite clear that the First Minister, or whoever drafted this Bill, expected that these people would be present, as the next clause shows. It would be a very great and unnecessary hardship to insist on all these persons coming to one particular point in an electoral district, and I think the First Minister should either concede this or reserve the point for further consideration and discussion. These matters often come up unexpectedly, and it is not to be supposed that the hon. gentleman can decide them at once. He has conceded some other points, and I think he would do well to take this into his consideration, also.

Mr. WELDON. No doubt the principle has been affirmed by the committee, but there are many salient points which require careful consideration. This preliminary revision is important, because the list then made will be the basis of the lists to be used hereafter. It was originally proposed that a complete list should be made out of the whole electoral district, but that has been departed from, and I think the First Minister has wisely conceded the point, that before any preliminary revision, the alphabetical list should be made out for each municipal or parochial division. The preliminary list will be the list on which future lists will be based, and to some extent the powers of revising barristers are restricted in regard to the final list. The Bill provides that the revising barrister shall hold a sitting at such place in the constituency as he may deem necessary. The right of the franchise belongs to every one who is qualified under the law, and he should have that right with as little expense as possible. The expense, if any, should be borne by the country and not by the individual; but the revising officer having power to hold his sitting in any part of the electoral division, those who desire to appear before him must go there at their own expense. It is true that the Prime Minister says they need not go at all; but, especially in regard to the preliminary list, a man will want to see whether he is there or not, whether he is to remain there, and, more particularly, whether any objection has been made to his name. He will want to attend in person. Otherwise, the county judge or the revising barrister will act as we know the judges act, *ex necessitate rei*, when the parties fail to attend. This is to be a court of record, with the power to bring witnesses. In New Brunswick you are creating an entirely new tenure, and how is the revising officer, sitting in the centre of a county, such as Westmoreland, Northumberland or York, very large counties, ranging over 100 miles, from one end to the other, to ascertain the different classes of persons entitled to vote, who are not shown on the assessment rolls, or in any other way, unless the revising barrister receives the information by letter. If the revising officer holds his court in the locality he has the party there on the spot who can give him information, but who would not be present if the court was held 50 miles from his home. No person is going to attend this court of the revising barrister in the centre of the county unless he has some particular object. Take, for instance, a district which the revising barrister never visited. How is he going to ascertain whether the electors have a right to be on the list? He knows nothing about them, and the result is, the list will be imperfect. The whole scheme of the Bill was placed upon the principle of their being one list; that having now been altered, it seems to me we should at once provide that the revising officer shall hold his court in each locality, in order that he may see the people, and hear objections, and obtain information upon which to frame his preliminary list. This preliminary revision is particularly important, because it is to be the basis of the final revision; and, practically, it will be the basis of every future registration, from year to year. It may increase the expense a little for the revising barrister to visit the different municipalities, but it will save expense to the people, who, otherwise, might have to travel 50 or 60 miles from home, or else make up their minds to remain off the list. As the revising barrister is paid by salary, the only additional expense will be in his travelling expenses. It seems to me that to do justice to all the electors, to have a thorough investigation of the different franchises, to get all those upon the list who are entitled to go on, and to get rid of those who are not

entitled, it is absolutely necessary to make such a preliminary list in the different parishes or municipalities, where parties can attend and be heard, and where the revising officer shall have the opportunity, not only of hearing the parties, but, if necessary, of obtaining information as to the relative position of the voters, as to the tenants, farmers' sons, and others qualified under the different franchises. I contend it would be utterly impossible for him, at a distance, to give a fair valuation. Either he will be biassed by some particular individual from whom he obtains information or he will not be able to get the information at all The only additional expense involved would be the travelling expenses of the judges. On the other hand, great expense would be saved to the people interested. Take the case of the county of St. John: If the revision were held at the city of St. John it would take parties at the eastern end of the county three or four days to reach there, involving great expense and loss of time. If, however, the revision were held at the village of St. Martin's, the parties would be put to little expense.

Mr. DAWSON. The big district I represent has been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite as furnishing an instance where the provisions of this Bill would not apply. I merely rise to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the district—although very large, as an electoral district—is divided into two judicial districts, with two judges, who have the esteem and respect of the whole community, and who will, no doubt, make excellent revising officers.

Mr. MILLS. There can only be one of them appointed.

Mr. DAWSON. Either of them would make a good officer. The district has now a population of about 55,000, and yet I do not see any great difficulty in working this clause, except in one instance, at Moose Factory, where there are about 250 white settlers, who should have the franchise. Where there is a will there is always a way of getting over these difficulties. I am exceedingly pleased to see hon. gentleman opposite taking such an interest in the district I represent, and always bringing it forward as an example of something good. I must, however, say that very early in the Session I had to answer an enquiry of a very distinguished member of the Opposition as to where it is; he positively did not know where Algoma is. Although it is coming into notice now, and notwithstanding that hon. members from the Maritime Provinces tell us so much about their great districts and the vast interests they represent, the whole of the Maritime Provinces, with Newfoundland added, might be put down in Algoma, and yet there would be plenty of space left. I merely rose to say that notwithstanding the great size of my district the Act can be worked in it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It must be a source of gratification that while the hon. member for Algoma had to give us a mild lecture last night about hon. members talking of their own ridings, yet to-night he has drawn attention to his own district. It has furnished one of the many instances of how the Act will work. We need not, however, take so extreme a case as the hon. gentleman's riding, for this clause is objectionable in the riding of any hon. gentleman opposite, except in the case of an electoral district comprised within the boundaries of a city. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) is one that ought to be pressed on the First Minister until he gives some intimation that he will be prepared to consider it. It has been charged by an hon. member that the adoption of the amendment would very much increase the cost; and the charge was made that it was the desire of the Opposition to make the Bill as expensive as possible. That charge will not lie, because the Opposition have strenuously opposed the passage of the Bill. It might, however, be argued that since the principle was adopted we had tried to make it more expensive. That would be a fair statement to make; but it would require to be proved that the changes proposed would add to the cost. That would be a difficult task to undertake. If you might suppose that it would add to the cost of the revising barristers if they held sittings in different places instead of in one place, the expense has been located by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), who has pointed out that the expense would only be augmented by the amount of the travelling expenses of the revising officer. But the expense connected with this Bill is not to be fully comprehended by the expense attending the revising officer. The revising officer and many of the electors have to be brought together, and in getting them together there must be more or less expense involved. If you take the revising officer to the individual he will have to incur expense. If you have to bring individuals to the revising barrister the expense will have to be incurred and defrayed by the individuals; but if it might appear to be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue, it would still remain a fact that under the operation of the Bill the cost to the country would be much less, for it is a simple proposition, that in taking the greater numbers to the less, there must be a larger expense. Then, Sir, looking at it in that light, if the Bill is put in operation is it not fair to charge on the revenues of the Dominion of Canada, the expense attendant upon it being put in operation? I think no one will care to controvert that proposition; and, therefore, having adopted a Dominion franchise, the fundamental requisite is that all who are entitled to be registered as voters, should be on the list, and that those who are ineligible shall not be allowed to remain thereon. That being established, the question of expense becomes a secondary question. The principle must be maintained that justice must be done, no matter what the expense may be; and having decreed that we shall bring the Bill into operation, we are bound to see that justice is done to all, even if some expense may attend it. There is still another reason, and that is, that people of this country have been accustomed to have every facility for rectifying errors in connection with the lists, such as they will have under the operation of the amendment now proposed. In the Province of Ontario, with which I am best acquainted, they have every facility of that kind, and that being the case, they are entitled to demand, at the hands of this House, in passing a Franchise Bill, that they shall not be called upon to go to any more expense or trouble in a preliminary revision of the voters' list than under the existing system. Just imagine the state of affairs if the clause, in its present shape, is adopted. I will not take an extreme case, but an ordinary electoral district. A court will be held for the preliminary revision of the list, and the inhabitants will be required to repair to this one place. My impression is, that the errors which will have to be rectified on this list, considering the manner in which it is prepared, will run up to the hundreds, or, at any rate, to the scores, and the court may, therefore, have to go on from day to day, and these persons will be at the expense of remaining at this place during the court, or else paying their railway fares, or taking long drives to get to their homes, at a great expense of time and money. Let me call attention to the cost which may be put on the individual so summoned to attend this court at the mere whim of the revising barrister. (The hon. gentleman here quoted sections 38 and 39 of the Bill). This revising officer, sitting at a central place, in a large electoral district, upon a person making application to him to have an error in the list rectified, may say that he wants to hear a little more about this case, and, at his own instance, summon men from distant parts of the county to come there and produce books and records, and give evidence as to the case before him. When this large number of witnesses

arrives he may be proceeding with another case on the roll, and the court may have to adjourn over the night. All the witnesses have to remain; another day's court may be held, and after all these expenses have been incurred the revising officer, as sole arbiter and dictator, can turn around and say: I assess you who have made application to have your name placed on the list for all the costs and expenses of these witnesses whom I have summoned, and having heard their testimony, I find, after all, that you are not entitled to be placed on the list. That is possible—shall I say, not improbable?—under this Bill. Does the hon. gentleman say that there is no danger of the court holding its sittings day after day, but that the cases will be quickly disposed of? The schedule of the Act with respect to the summoning of witnesses, says that the witnesses are summoned to appear before the revising officer, "and so on, from day to day." You can see that if this clause were maintained as it is, it would be an absolute impossibility, in many cases, for parties to have simple justice done to them; and I hold that above all things the foundation principle ought to be that justice shall be done, and the matter of expense must come in after. On principles of equity, if expense is to be incurred it ought to be borne out of the revenues of the Parliament which is making this one of the statutes of the land, and ought not to be placed on the shoulders of an innocent person seeking to vindicate his rights. Every consideration points in the direction of the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I venture to say that no defense worthy of the name can be offered for this clause, as it stands in the Bill, and I hope that representations so strong and so persistent shall be made on this side of the House, that the hon. First Minister will be led to give an intimation that it is his intention to accept the very reasonable and proper amendment that has been offered.

Mr. FLEMING. The clause now under consideration provides that one week before the sitting of the court, any person having any objection to any of the names on the list may give notice to the revising officer, and to the person objected to, that he entertains such objection. Any person desiring——

Mr. VAIL. It appears to me, seeing that we met at half past one to-day and that it is now two o'clock, that the First Minister should consent to an adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must get through before Christmas.

Mr. FLEMING. Subsequently, the Bill provides that a court shall be held for the purpose of hearing the objections. Surely the observations of the First Minister do not apply to this court, when he says it is not necessary that the parties shall attend. Surely it is asking too much that the parties who apply to the revising officer to have their names inserted on the rolls shall all assemble in one place in the electoral district to answer those objections. It may be that a person living at the extreme end of the county is objected to. He must appear to substantiate his right, or be removed from the roll. It is true, he may make application afterwards to be put on the roll at the final revision; but no elector ought to be deprived of that right; it should not be something that he has to go and seek, at his own inconvenience and expense, but it should be freely accorded to him. Surely the hon. First Minister can see his way to providing that the court shall sit at different localities throughout the district, in order that the applications and the objections may be made and determined by the best evidence that can be adduced, the evidence of the parties interested. Such evidence cannot be adduced before him at one particular place in the electoral district. I differ with the First Minister as to the construction of this clause and the subsequent clause. If I was acting as a revising officer under this Bill I would feel that I had no power under this provision to make any changes in the list, except on the notice that is provided in this section. It is a court of record, and a court of record will only receive such evidence as, in courts of record, can be regarded as evidence. Under clause 17 the revising officer must publicly proceed to the preliminary revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and statements before him, and of the persons who may be present. He has no power to put on names suggested to him by letter. Is the revising officer to accept the lists sent to him by a political agent, and add the names, or take names off, without evidence whatever? The whole frame of the Bill regards the revising officer in this investigation as a court intended solemnly to deal with the rights of parties. There are so many serious objections to this clause that I shall not attempt to point them all out. The matter is so outrageous that it cannot be possible the committee will adopt this clause without amendment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved that the committe rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not; we have discussed this clause for several hours already.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have scarcely discussed it an hour; it was only put about one o'clock. It is a clause to which hon. members do not attach, in the slightest degree, an obstructive sense; it does not, in the slightest degree affect the principle of the Bill, but it is in the highest degree important that this matter should be made one of convenience. We sat until four o'clock yesterday morning; and to be compelled to sit after two o'clock this morning is too great a strain.

Mr. HESSON. Merely to allow hon. gentlemen to talk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is altogether wrong; this Bill is crudely drawn, and every argument that has been made shows that important alterations have to be made. Some were of very considerable importance, affecting the practical working of the Bill, to a great extent. This particular amendment is one that certainly deserves some consideration. I cannot conceive why any objection should be made to it. It seems to me a thing which might be very fairly conceded, even if there was a little undue pressure on this side. It does not add, to any material extent, to the expense; it is an obvious convenience to the public; and, at any rate, it ought to be considered at a reasonable time in the day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not our fault that this comes so late. We have been seven weeks on this Bill, and though this clause may not have been specially discussed more than an hour or two, as the hon. gentleman says, nevertheless the principles involved in this clause have been discussed for weeks. This was foreseen, and was discussed and rediscussed for weeks, day and night. It is true, we were sitting here till half-past three yesterday morning, and it is half-past two now; but the hon. gentleman must see that if we want to finish the business of the House this year we must sit it out; we cannot get along unless we sit it out. If hon. gentlemen want to discuss, we must discuss, but we must show to the public and our constituents that if hon. gentlemen have such a great desire to discuss this measure, on the other hand, we must do our duty to the country, by preventing the House sitting for three or four months more. We have been in session over four months, and hon. gentlemen have taken nearly two

months to discuss this measure, and we are at the 15th clause out of 63.

Mr. MILLS. There are three features in this Bill which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House feel are very objectionable. Two of these have been already disposed of, the Indian question and the revising barrister; and the third is the clause we have now before us. We have discussed the other two objectionable features at such length as to give to the people an opportunity of learning not only the character of the clauses but our views in regard to them. Whether our views are right or wrong, they are honestly entertained and they have been fully expressed. This is another clause to which strong objection is felt on this side. We only commenced to discuss it after midnight, and we ask the opportunity to discuss it when the gentlemen who represent the press are in the gallery, and when there is time to give it fuller consideration. As the Government yielded nothing of a practical character on the other points, we hoped they would have met what we believed to be the wishes and convenience of the country on this question, and we ask the opportunity of discussing it at a reasonable hour. My hon. friend, a few evenings ago, came to an understanding, that a certain division should be taken at a reasonable hour, and I heard the Prime Minister ask whether it was a reasonable hour after 11 o'clock. Yet he has us here from one o'clock till after two in the morning, maintaining that two is a reasonable hour. It is after two now, and we want an opportunity of a fuller discussion on this clause.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. I say it honestly, and this is not a reasonable hour for that full and frank discussion which it should receive.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We have disposed of three very important clauses, to-day and this clause involves considerations of the first possible consequence. It is rather hard that we should be asked to discuss this question at this hour in the morning, after sitting till nearly four o'clock yesterday morning. Several gentlemen on this side desire to discuss the clause. I desire to say something on it myself, but at this hour it is not fair for the Government to ask us to proceed. I do not think anything will be lost or gained by an adjournment now, except that we will have a night's rest and will preserve our health. The First Minster has asked us to make suggestions, but we cannot do that in an intelligent way at this hour.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I have shown that whenever any amendment was proposed or suggestion made from the other side that fairly met my judgment, I tried to meet it, and even in cases where I thought there was no necessity for an amendment, yet it was pressed so strongly, either that the clause was not specific enough or that it might be made more apt, that I yielded my own opinions in order to meet the views of the gentlemen opposite. But in this case I must say that I am satisfied that the clause is a good one, and that the mode of getting this preliminary revision prescribed by the Act is the best one; and it occurs to me, either that the clause must be dropped and we must have the final revision without this preliminary meeting, or we must insist upon it as it is. I cannot at all entertain the proposition which was made from the other side, that we are to have two expensive circuits, by which the revising barrister is twice to go round every section of the constituency, in order to make the list. I think that one is quite sufficient. It would be a criminal waste of money; it would do no good in the world; it would greatly occupy the time of the revising barrister, and therefore greatly increase expense. Moreover, it would greatly disincline the judges, whom I desire to have as revising barristers, to accept office, if they were, in one year, obliged to make two circuits, withdrawing them from their ordinary avocations. In my opinion, there is not the slightest necessity for it. This preliminary meeting is so valuable that I do not wish to see it wiped out of the Act. It is inexpensive; it will enable the judge to prepare a preliminary list, which can afterwards, in circuit, be fully gone into. I cannot, therefore, hold out any hope that any arguments used by the hon. gentleman will induce me to concede to any of the amendments made to the clause. I think it is a good clause in itself, and any alteration of it, by extending the circuit, would be a mistake, for the reasons I have given. I can assure the hon. gentleman that, so far as I am able to judge, when this clause is voted upon it will be voted upon as it stands. It may be right, or it may be wrong, but I am satisfied it will be carried as it stands. The hon. gentlemen, as it seems to me, have done their duty in making their protest, and I have no doubt, with the Speaker in the Chair, this and the other important clauses will hereafter be fully discussed. Therefore, I do not think hon. gentlemen should press a further discussion in committee, but allow us to go on; let this be carried, and afterwards it can be discussed fully, when the hon. gentlemen, in the face of day, can vindicate their objections to the clause as it now stands.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The result of the hon. gentleman's course is this; that those of us who have not expressed our opinion on this question will be deprived of the opportunity. I know there are several gentlemen who desire to discuss it on its merits, but at this hour of the morning it will be utterly useless to attempt it. It serves no purpose to discuss it at this hour. The discussions will not be reported in the newspapers, and we know that even in *Hansard*, at this late hour of the morning, discussions generally do not receive that attention they otherwise would.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Discuss it on concurrence and on the third reading.

Mr. CAMERON. But if we discuss it now we do not require to discuss it on the third reading.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would remind the hon. gentleman that there is a motion before the House for adjournment, which I think will receive the support of both sides of the House. I heartily support the motion to adjourn.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Three clauses have been passed to-day, which is greater progress than has been made on any occasion since this Bill has been under discussion. There would have been no difficulty whatever, if hon. members on this side had been so disposed, in protracting the discussion on the first clause.

Mr. MULOCK. The motion that the committee rise is a most reasonable one. Considerable progress has been made. We are now on a peace footing. If we are now told, at a quarter to three o'clock, that there shall be no cessation of labor, I cannot accept that determination except as an intimation of a desire to terminate existing relations and to declare war. I dare say the minds of those who have expressed themselves against the clause are also pretty determined, but it may be that after a pleasant sleep and meeting again at the proper hour we will be able to see the matter in a different light. It may be that we can find some common meeting ground in this matter, and if so, an end of the issue on this point having been reached, we will

proceed to the next clause, knowing that nothing has occurred to mar the relations which now prevail. Speaking in all sincerity, I believe it will be for the interests of the majority to be reasonable, under the circumstances, and to carry this motion.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That motion being disposed of, I would say now, that in the hope of making greater progress than one clause a day, and that we will be met in the spirit promised by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that we will make substantial progress, I move that the committee now rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:45 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—CORPUS CHRISTI.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it will stand adjourned until Friday at 1.30, and that when it adjourns on Friday it will stand adjourned until Saturday, at 1.30, and that Government measures will have precedence, on that day, after routine.

Motion agreed to.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 15,

Mr. LANDERKIN. I hope the amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island will be carried, for, if the clause passes as it stands, and only one court of revision is held in each riding, it will cause great inconvenience and expense. It would practically mean that there would be no revision at all, because the expense of bringing witnesses so far will be too great to bear. For instance, in my own riding, if the court was held in the centre of the riding, we would have to bring people some forty or fifty miles, and that is a thing altogether impracticable. I think we should hold a court at least in each municipality, in accordance with the system now in force in the Province of Ontario, a system which gives very general satisfaction. I think it would be even better if we could have a court in every electoral sub-division, as it would be a great convenience to the people and would lessen the cost of appeal. In many of the ridings the people would probably have to go twice as far as in my own, and it would be impossible for the candidates to bear the expense of bringing the witnesses so far. I think the amendment is one which should commend itself to the judgment of the Government, if they wish to consult the convenience of the people, the convenience of the candidates, and the expense to which they will be put.

Mr. DAVIES. I must say that I was extremely disappointed in the explanation the Prime Minister gave of his understanding of the meaning of this section, and of the duties the revising officer would have to discharge at the preliminary revision.

Mr. McCALLUM. Question.

Mr. DAVIES. We are going to talk to the question, and I ask the attention of the hon. member for Monck for a few moments, while we carefully discuss it.

Mr. McCALLUM. Well, talk about it then; but you are simply standing still.

Mr. DAVIES. We cannot hope to convince the hon. gentleman if he will turn away and not try to understand the section.

Mr. McCALLUM. Let the hon. gentleman go on, and not stand there saying nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is most unreasonable. If he will listen to me a moment, he will see that from the standpoint from which we view this section it is absolutely essential that the amendment should be accepted; for if I were a revising officer, acting as a judicial officer, I certainly would not put the construction on this section that the Prime Minister intimates he would put upon it. Now, the First Minister's explanation of the preliminary revision is simply this: Instead of being a revision in the legal sense of the term, where a preliminary list is taken and alterations made, in accordance with legal evidence and with legal rules, which would do justice to both sides and ensure an impartial list, it is simply a preliminary making up of names. Let us see what antecedent work is to be done before you come to this revision. The revising officer has to obtain a certified copy of the revised list of voters. He then obtains a certified copy of the assessment roll, and from those two sources of information he is supposed to gather sufficient information to enable him to make up a proper voters' list. But inasmuch as he has not local knowledge, the First Minister says that the officer must look about and get some additional information. After he has gained all possible information from the assessment roll, the voters' list, and from private letters sent to him by those who wish to add to or subtract from the list, and all information from any source to which he has applied, he then takes the list and prints it. He is directed to furnish a copy of that printed list—a list made up after he has exhausted all sources of information—to every official in the county. More than that. It must be made up according to electoral subdivisions, to ensure that those who possess local knowledge will be able to examine it, and see if fair play has been done. Then, if you object to any names, you have to give notice a week before the revision to the revising officer that you object to a certain name or names; or if you wish to place a name on the list, you have to give a similar notice. Then the court is held in a public place in the county, and it must be intended that such shall a public court in the sense in which that term is generally understood, where there is a presiding judge, who will decide on the conflicting evidence given by both sides. Take my own county. A revision is to be held at Charlottetown. Say I object to 100 names of men who live about eighty miles away in one part of the county, and in he same way to a number of names of persons who live at the other end of the county. If those 200 men do not come to the court on the day named, what will be the result? The First Minister tells us that this is not going to be a public court—that the men need not come in. What, then, is the meaning of all the notices to be given a week beforehand, the publishing of the list in every electoral sub-division, notice to the returning officer,

that I am going to object to John Smith's name, if, when the court is opened, the returning officer is able to say: I have received a private note from John Smith, and I will put him on or off the list as I please? That is not going to be a revision, when a partisan returning officer can add or strike off names without hearing evidence. Let the First Minister strike these sections out of the Bill—the whole thing is worse than a farce, because you impose on those who want the list to be correct a heavy expenditure for travelling 80 or 100 miles to see whether the objection is going to be sustained or not, and then the revising officer can say, following the language of the First Minister: This is not a revision; I have letters before me in regard to these cases, you can come up again on the final revision." This scheme, as outlined by the First Minister, is one that will work serious injustice, if there is a particle of partisanship in the returning officer. At the final revision the parties will again have to incur a like expense. Either strike out the preliminary revision altogether, or strike out from the Bill all provisions which *primâ facie* would lead any reasonable man to imagine that there was to be a real revision of some kind. This, I say, will be worse than a farce; because, instead of taking evidence he will decide questions on private letters. The draughtsman of the Bill must have intended this to be a real revision, and in order to have such the revision officer must go to the locality. It is monstrous—it is an injustice of the worst kind to drag men 50, 60 or 80 miles to sustain applications to add names, or to refute objections. The First Minister has deliberately placed on the list in my county 800 or 900 names, well knowing that not one of the men will be entitled to vote. He compels the revising officer to put them on the list, because he says the poll book must govern you as to making up the first list. In order to have those names struck out I shall have to procure evidence from many quarters. It is going to cost an enormous amount of money to bring such evidence into court, and even then the judge may tell me: I have a private letter from your opponent, and I am not going to strike the names off. I appeal to the common sense and honesty of the committee to say whether they approve of such a scheme. It is very well for the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) to sit there and laugh.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman makes a man of straw and then knocks him down. He always does so.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the straw? Is it that the revision is not intended to be a real revision, but that the returning officer will take letters of private information furnished, not publicly, but privately; not given on oath, but in some other way, and decide the matter sitting in his private office and not in a court. The seventeenth section provides that the revising officer shall publicly proceed to the preliminary revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and statements before him, and so on. It is no doubt on the word "statements," that the First Minister bases his explanation. In large constituencies where there are 6,000 or 7,000 voters, the expense involved in producing evidence will be so large that no man of moderate means will be able to bear it unless he is supplied with money by some association. It opens the door by which a returning officer can do wrong without laying himself open to punishment or impeachment. It is a scheme by which an unjust revising officer can make up the lists so that they will all be in favor of one party. It will not be a just revision, but one which may contain the names of those only on one side. No doubt, some judges would pay very little attention to the statements of the First Minister with respect to the scheme, and would decide cases on evidence submitted. I submit that the preliminary revision is the main revision, especially in this case, when you are making up the voters' list for the first time. It is not going to be repeated every year, and therefore the cry of expense is not a just cry. The list made in the first year is to be the basis for all future years. It must, therefore, be fought out then; and it is essential that it be fought out justly and fairly to both sides, and fought out in the locality where the voters live. The system which centralises the preliminary revision, 70 or 80 miles from where the voters live, is an unjust system, and will be worked to the advantage of one party if the revising officer allows himself to be made a partisan, which I am afraid he will do in some cases—I do not say in all. I hope this matter will not be treated in the spirit of levity that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) displays towards it; it is too serious a matter to be so treated. If there is a clause in this Bill that requires exhaustive and thorough discussion, this is the clause. I believe the whole Bill hinges upon it. In its present shape I look upon it as worse than the revising barrister or the Indian clause. The putting on the list of 100 or 200 Indians is not so bad as the clause that enables the revising officer, in my constituency, for instance, to put 600 or 700 persons on the list who he thinks should have votes, and does not give me an opportunity to have the list revised in the locality where the men live, and where I could bring evidence to show that they did not own property and had not the right to vote. I trust the matter will receive greater consideration than it has yet received, and that hon. members will not treat it lightly, because I look upon this clause as one of the most serious in the Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. The committee adjourned last night in the hope, I think, that a night's reflection would enable us to find some fair solution to this problem. The Bill, in providing for a court of revision, contemplates both parties being able to be present, but it is quite clear that at the court of revision proposed it will be practically impossible for the public to be present. I think there is a fair middle course which, if adopted, would be productive of no harm, and would, perhaps, accomplish the main object of the mover of the Bill. It is idle to go through the form of offering to the electorate a court unless they can take advantage of that court. The map of the Dominion, especially of the Province of Ontario, furnishes sufficient proof that the public will not be able to attend the court. Some of the ridings in the Province of Ontario are of extraordinary shapes and proportions. Take, for example, the riding of North Ontario, which is, I believe, over 100 miles in length, and in some places only eight or ten miles in width. It is idle to offer to the electorate of that riding the advantages of a court which is to sit in but one part of the riding, because it must, on the average, be nearly fifty miles distant from the homes of the electorate. An objection may be made against a name upon the list, and the judge is obliged to adjudicate upon that objection at this preliminary court of revision according to the evidence then before him. The person who makes the objection may be the only person present to give evidence upon it; the man whose name is objected to may be at home fifty miles or more distant; therefore, the revising officer will be entitled to decide on the *ex parte* statement of the objector, and so the matter will go by default against the respondent. It is quite clear then that the names of many persons may be got off the list by any one deciding to take advantage of their difficulties, or their distance from the place where the court is held. I endorse the suggestion made at the close of the sitting last night by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), that the powers of the revising officer at this preliminary sitting shall be limited to the adding of names to the list, and that he shall not have power to strike off. I think that would to some extent overcome the objections now offered to the clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The clause under discussion is one of the most important clauses in the whole Bill. Its

importance cannot be thoroughly appreciated without careful consideration, not only of clause 15, but of clauses 13, 14, 17, 25 and 39, all of which are intimately connected with it. The importance of this Bill is not sufficiently appreciated by hon. gentlemen opposite, because they take their views from the hon. the First Minister, who, last night, declared that he attached no importance to this clause, and had even some doubts whether it ought not to be dropped altogether. Now I could understand the proposition of the First Minister if it were a proposition that the revising barrister, in the first instance, should have the power himself of creating a voters' list on the basis of the information he is authorised to get under the 12th clause of the Bill. Under that clause, he is authorised by law to procure from the local authorities a certified copy of the assessment roll and a certified copy of the last revised list of voters. He is also authorised by the amendment of the First Minister to procure from the local authorities a certified copy of the voters' lists for the last local election; and in Prince Edward Island he is authorised to procure a certified copy of the poll book at the last election. If from this material the revising officer were authorised to prepare the voters' lists in the first instance, I could understand that proposition, and there should be a final revision held in open court in the several municipalities at which applications can be made to have names put on and off the list. I could understand that proceeding, but I cannot understand the necessity of this preliminary court of revision for the revision of the voters' lists prepared by the revising officer from the data supplied to him by the local authorities. You will find, by reference to the Bill, that from this data the revising officer is authorised himself to prepare the list. After he has prepared the list, he is compelled to procure a sufficient number of copies to be printed and circulated among the local officials. By section 13, copies have to be posted up in the offices of the clerks of the municipality and others, and by clause 14, as amended, two copies are to be sent to every postmaster in the electoral district, who shall post them up and keep them posted up from the time of the first publication to the time of the sitting of the court of revision. I could understand these several clauses if the power of the revising officer stopped there, until it became necessary to make the final revision of the voters' lists. So far he is empowered by this Bill to obtain from the local authorities the material from which he will be enabled to make up the voters' list. He is compelled to publish the list, and if his duties were then limited to a final revision by him of the voters' list so circulated and distributed, giving all parties opportunities of being heard, I could understand this provision. But he is compelled by section 15 to do more than that. On the publication of the list, any person who sees fit to complain of any names upon it is authorised to give notice to the revising officer and to the person complained against of his objection, and by section 15, after the time fixed for the giving of such notice, one week before the day fixed for such preliminary revision, the revising officer is compelled to hold court. Why? What is the object? Who are bound to attend? The revising officer, under section 15, is bound to hold this court, an open court, a court of record, a court having all the power and authorities vested in it that an ordinary court of record has—he is bound to consider all the complaints made against the voters' lists as prepared by himself. Section 25, you will find, defines what his authorities and powers are to be. He is to have all the power of any court of record in the Province, as to compelling the attendance of witnesses, the production of books and documents, and the taking of evidence under oath, and generally all the power necessary to enable him to carry out all the purposes of the Act. It is nonsense to say that this preliminary court is of no consequence, that it is a court at which no evidence is necessary. The revising barrister is bound by all the rules with respect to the acceptance and rejection of evidence and the mode of trial, as fully as if he were a judge of any county court. Section 39 depicts the powers and authorities with which this court is invested. The revising officer shall have the power to summon witnesses and obtain necessary information to perfect his list, and has power to punish persons summoned, who neglect to attend, as for a contempt of court. Reading sections 25 and 39 in connection with section 15, the hon. gentleman will see that this preliminary court for the revision of voters' lists is a court charged with the authority and power that is vested in a superior court of record in any Province. Any power which can be vested in a superior court of record is vested in this court for the preliminary investigation of the voters' lists. The First Minister wants the House to believe that the revising officer can act upon any letter sent to him by any elector or non-elector. I deny that. If the Bill passes in its present shape, the revising officer is a judge, with the same power and rights possessed by a judge, and he can only act according to the rules of evidence in the Province in which the court is held. The 17th section points out the duties the revising officer is to discharge. He has to proceed, after public notice, in a public way to investigate this voters' list, and the evidence must be given in the same way as in an ordinary court. The First Minister wants us to understand that it is not necessary that anyone should attend, that it would be perfect folly for anyone to attend in person, because the power of the revising officer is a purely ministerial power. He is simply to put on the names of any persons who ought to be put on the voters' list. If the First Minister's interpretation is correct, what is the meaning of clause 15, which compels persons to give a notice to the revising officer of those whom they may object to? That indicates that there is some issue to be tried. The only way in which that can be tried is the way the law prescribes, and that is laid down in section 17. Clause 15 presupposes that there will be a court for the trial; otherwise the notice required to be given would be an absurdity. If the revising officer is only bound to hold one court in an electoral district, with a population of perhaps 30,000 individuals, the inevitable result will be that one man in the district can compel everyone else to attend that court under the penalty of having his name struck off. The revising officer is not bound to take evidence as to a man's right to be put on, not even the assessment roll and the voters' list. He can act upon other testimony, and can put names on without any evidence whatever. If you object to their being on and give the necessary notice, the persons objected to must attend this court or the names will be struck off. The effect of this clause is most serious, and I am satisfied that neither the First Minister nor his supporters have realised the gravity of the situation, and the inevitable result which will follow if this clause is carried in its integrity. Now, it is perfectly clear that you can compel the attendance of an elector if you see fit, under penalty of putting his name off the list. He has to travel to the county town, perhaps 30, 50, or 70 miles, in some cases; and if he does not attend, or employs some professional man to attend for him, his name is liable to be struck off the voters' list. There is no provision, even that he can attend by proxy or by attorney. I apprehend that under clause 17, if he wishes his name to remain he must attend himself, and satisfy the revising officer that he has a right to have his name on the voters' list. Now, look at the consequence of that, the trouble, the annoyance, the expense to which the electors of any particular constituency will be put by reason of this preliminary revision. Then there is another point of great consequence. Under this clause 15, and the court that is authorised to be held under it, and under clauses 17, 25 and 39, this court for the preliminary investigation

of the preliminary list, is a court of record. It has all the powers of a court of record; it tries the case upon the merits; it investigates the right of a man to be on the voters' list. Now every lawyer knows perfectly well that when a case is tried upon the merits the court cannot try that case again; it has passed beyond the region of discussion unless upon appeal. But we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a court for the preliminary investigation, and that there is another appeal from the judgment of the revising officer who revises the list under the preliminary court of revision. I doubt that. I am strongly of opinion that if complaint is made to the revising officer at the court held for the preliminary revision, and if the case is tried and evidence is gone into on both sides, and judgment given, that concludes any further investigation as to the right to vote or not with respect to that voters' list. Now, if that is so, the effect will be that if a person does not attend at the first court, believing that he has a right to have his name put on at the second court, then if my interpretation of the clause is correct, in that case the man is deprived of his vote altogether; otherwise he has got to attend the preliminary court and the court for the final revision of the voters' list. But even supposing the interpretation of the First Minister is correct, and that he has a right to attend or not, as he likes, at the preliminary court for the investigation of the voters' list in the first instance; and suppose he is correct that the man has a right by law to attend at the second court and to have his right then fully adjudicated, look at the trouble, the expense, and the annoyance to which the electors of the country are likely to be put by being called to attend at two courts when one is quite sufficient. If the First Minister's interpretation is correct, it is clear that every elector in every electoral district in the whole Dominion can be compelled to attend the first court for the preliminary investigation, and again be called upon to attend at the final revision. The revising officer, of his own mere motion, may issue an order and compel them to attend in both cases. I have been unable to discover upon what principle the First Minister can justify the holding of two courts for the revision of the voters' list, even in the first year. What does the clause mean, if my interpretation is not correct? I challenge the First Minister to tell me what other meaning it can have. What are the duties of the revising officer at this first court? The First Minister tells us that all he has got to do is to receive a letter or some communication, and sit in his private office and prepare the voters' list from them. Look at the hon. gentleman's Bill. Is that what this Bill calls for? It calls for a great deal more than that. If the hon. gentleman's view is the view that he wants to prevail with respect to this revision, then let him so mould and modify this clause as to carry out that view. If he leaves this Bill as it stands, then his view cannot be carried out under this clause of the Bill. Now I have said that I could understand the hon. gentleman's proposition if it had been that from the data which the revising officer is to proceed upon under clause 12, namely, a certified copy of the assessment roll, a certified copy of the voters' list, and a certified copy of the old poll book, with such other evidence as the revising officer could gather, that he could prepare a voter's list upon this data in the first instance, and that that list should be the list upon which the final revisions should take place. I can see the simplicity and the inexpensiveness of that, although this puts extraordinary powers into the hands of the revising officers, although those who see fit to complain have a remedy at the court of revision. But then, what is the necessity for this double machinery, for this double-barrelled gun that shoots one way? What is the necessity of complicating the machinery in the mode the hon. gentleman proposes? There can be but one purpose. Sir, we know perfectly well who this revising officer will be; we know perfectly well who the clerk of the revising officer will be, and who his constable will be. We know that in every municipality these officials, appointed by this Government, the creatures of the Government, the hangers-on of this Government, will be canvassing agents for this Government in every municipality, aided and assisted as they will be by the local Conservative association in every one of these contests; and rest assured that no Conservative whose right is in question, or whose right is unquestioned, will be left off that list. They will not require to go to the expense of appealing, but the gentlemen upon that board, when the preparation takes place, will take care that the Liberals who are not represented within that board will be left off, and they will be called upon to incur all this expense, and worry and annoyance, simply to gratify the hon. gentleman's desire to throw impediments and obstacles in the way of the Liberal electoral body getting upon this voters' list. Sir, if the hon. gentleman wanted to act fairly in this matter, and wanted to allow the electors of this country to go upon the voters' list upon the most economical, in the least expensive and least troublesome way, there is a way by which it can be done. If we are bound to have a Dominion franchise, let the revising officer, vested with unlimited power, prepare the voters' list and give an appeal. That is all we want. We want plenty of time to file an appeal from the adjudication of the revising officer in order that our rights may be conserved. But if we are going to have a revision, there is only one thing to do: It is in the interests of the people to compel the revising officer to attend in the local municipality, instead of compelling large constituencies, with perhaps 5,000 voters, to dance attendance at the office of the revising officer, perhaps 50 or 60 miles away—it is to compel the revising officer, to whom we propose to pay a handsome salary, to attend in the local municipality where the voters' list is to be prepared, and so that the people may not be obliged to incur enormous expense in making appeals. In the colony of Australia there is an electoral registrar. His powers are not those vested in this revising officer. The head of the office, charged with the administration of that particular branch of the service, sends blank certificates of the right to vote to the different electoral registrars. Any individual who wants his name placed on the list can either go or send to the registrar, satisfy him as to his qualification, and then he has a right to obtain a certificate. In some of the colonies the electoral registrar is bound to leave a blank certificate at the residence of, or send it by mail, post paid, to every individual in the constituency; and that individual fills up the blank, sends it to the revising officer and his name is put on the list, and subsequently upon proper notice being given the revising officer proceeds to revise the list in the manner prescribed by law. If the First Minister would adopt that simple, cheap, convenient system, it is one which would meet with the approbation of the electors. The hon. gentleman if he wants to do right as between the people and the Government must modify this Bill. He must compel the revising officer to hold his court in the municipality in question. The hon. gentleman tells us, why go there; look at the expense and trouble. But if the hon. gentleman is bound to enter upon the dangerous experiment of creating a Dominion voters' list, if he is bound at the end of 18 years to enter upon this experiment, he must enter upon it with true sense of all the consequences that must inevitably follow such an experiment. One of the results is that a large additional expense will be entailed upon the country and upon the candidates of both political parties in order to have the voters' list properly prepared. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman is bound to enter upon an experiment of such a doubtful and dangerous character he should not allow a few thousand dollars to stand between the rights of the people and the hopes of the Government. What does it matter for a few thousand dollars if a few

thousand individuals are to be disfranchised, as they certainly will be under this Bill. It is a bagatelle: hon. gentlemen opposite ought not to consider it for a moment. If the First Minister is bound to have the revising officer prepare a preliminary list, he should compel that officer, although it may cost some additional thousands of dollars, to attend in the local municipalities and revise the list where he will be in possession of local information and will be able to prepare a correct list. Although our appeals have not had much effect on the First Minister, I still hope the hon. gentleman's better judgment will prevail. Hon. gentlemen remind me that the First Minister is not present to hear the suggestion. That is the difficulty, that has been the difficulty throughout this discussion. We discuss these questions on fair and business-like principles; yet the man in charge of the Bill—and there is no member opposite who knows anything about it, if the hon. gentleman knows anything about it himself is almost persistently absenting himself from the floor of the House. How does he know whether reasonable suggestions are made or not? He comes in the House and tells us, after the matter has been discussed for hours: "I cannot receive any suggestions from hon. gentlemen opposite; my Bill is perfect as it is." The hon. gentleman claims that he can keep out of the House while important suggestions are under discussion and still understand the discussion. He trusts to the hon. member for North Perth, who thinks these clauses do not require discussion. That hon. gentleman is prepared to accept the provisions, however disgraceful they may be. In fact, hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to swallow the Bill holus-bolus. They cheer the First Minister when he moves a clause of this bill—they would equally cheer the First Minister if he were to introduce a Bill to disfranchise the Liberal party of Ontario. The hon. member for North Perth would cheer that proposition. I say it is unfair that the responsible head of the Government should be absent from his place in Parliament while grave and important questions are being discussed, and I hope the people, when they have the opportunity of pronouncing on his conduct, and I hope they will have that opportunity soon, will deal out to the hon. gentleman and his friends the punishment they deserve.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has referred to the temporary absence of the leader of the Government. The hon. gentleman, if he considered the time the First Minister spent in this House listening to the debates that take place here, chiefly by hon. gentlemen opposite, would not have made such an insinuation. Hon. gentlemen have discussed this clause until they have tired themselves, and until the House and the country are tired of listening to them. The hon. gentleman has quite forgotten that the leader of his own party is constantly absent; he has quite overlooked the fact that we are obliged to listen to second and third-class individuals. Members on the back benches have come forward and taken up positions on the front benches. No wonder the First Minister is sometimes absent when the leader of the Opposition, who is responsible for this delay, does not think it worth while to remain in the House and listen to the speeches of those who have come to the front and displaced the usual occupants of those benches.

Mr. EDGAR. I am glad we have been entertained by hearing a second or third-class speech from the other side. The hon. gentleman who last spoke complained because the leader of the Opposition was not making a speech every day. The leader of the Opposition, the hon. gentleman knows very well, has made important speeches on the most important clauses of this Bill, and not one of those speeches has been answered yet. The only objection which I heard offered by the First Minister to the amendment of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), tending towards making the Bill more fair and more workable, was this: That the preliminary list which we are now considering is a very trifling matter; and is not a list of any importance whatever, and therefore the Prime Minister says it is right that the revising officer should hold one meeting in only one place in the whole electoral district. I think I can show the committee that the list provided for by this Bill is not only an important one, but that the hearing at which the list is made is altogether the most important provided for under the Act. How is it made? Take a riding where we have not a judge but a revising officer appointed by the Government, which will be the case in a large number of the electoral districts in Ontario, and a still larger number in Quebec and other Provinces. We will assume that the revising officer is a partisan, that he is desirous to help his party, perhaps honestly and perhaps not honestly, that he is at any rate prejudiced in favor of his party, and is much more willing to accept statements, as he has to accept them under this Bill, and to receive information as he is allowed to do under this Bill, from his political friends, than from any one else as to who shall or who shall not be put on the list. We find him approaching the settlement of the subject in that frame of mind. He has before him the draft list which has been prepared under section 12, and surely under that section the First Minister gave him plenty of discretionary and arbitrary power, without giving him any further such power where he holds the meeting for preliminary revision of the list. At this meeting he has power to correct the list by adding on or striking off names, and on what material? He has evidence for one thing, and then he has "statements" which may be made to him, and he can even do his work on "information." He takes the old list with which he has already dealt, and he finds that he has not had material, when he made that first list, to find out the names of very large classes of voters who under this Act will be entitled to vote. For instance, in Ontario, he had no means of finding out the tenants entitled to vote on rental; because, although the First Minister has made a change in the direction of allowing tenants who appear to be qualified in respect of property valued on the roll at $150, still he has made it absolutely impossible to find out from the assessment roll, or any other official information, who are the tenants which are entitled to be put on the list, irrespective of the value of the property. Then he cannot find from the assessment roll whether income voters have been residents for a year before the first of January previously, and he cannot put them on until he comes to the preliminary revision. He cannot find out who are the wage-earners who are qualified by income in kind as well as in money, and as to this very large class of voters he can only get his information for the first time at the preliminary revision. He will not find out the name of the landowners' sons whom he has enfranchised, following the example of the Ontario Act, until he holds this preliminary meeting. Then there is another franchise, and a very good one, that of the fishermen who are qualified partly in respect of realty and partly in respect of personalty. He cannot add this class of voters from the assessment roll or the provincial voters' list, so they will have to be dealt with at the preliminary revision, and yet the hon. gentleman says that this meeting is a very unimportant one. On consideration, it seems perfectly clear that this is altogether the most important sitting which will be held in connection with these lists, because surely when that sitting is held, the revising officer is not going to leave all these classes for the final revision. Surely after taking all the trouble in preparing this list, he will not leave all this work for the final revision. Surely he will not hold the preliminary revision for nothing. By section 25 of this Bill, the revising officer at the preliminary revision will have all the powers of a court of record. I assume that he will exercise those powers, that he will receive evidence in a legal and proper way, which will prevent fraud and false-

hood, and allow the true facts to be brought out. I could not have believed it possible that anyone could have thought of placing such an interpretation as the First Minister has put upon that clause, because by section 25 the revising officer is clothed with the power of a court of record for the purpose of the preliminary revision as well as of the final revision; but still the First Minister has explained that mere statements of fact may be received and acted upon by him—mere letters and memoranda I suppose; and if he receives a letter from his political friends and acquaintances, he will naturally attach more weight to it than he will to anything he receives from some one he does not know or from a political opponent. Then is it not an extraordinary thing to suppose that a good vote which may be put on this list from the assessment roll, may be struck off and destroyed by the revising officer on a mere letter or an *ex parte* statement without the party complained against being present, not being able to come? The onus is thrown on the voter who is thus treated of going to the trouble and expense of appearing before the final court of revision. But the case is worse than that; not only may the revising officer act on statements, but on information. A statement we might assume to be written, but mere information may be gossip, rumor, or verbal allegation. The fact that these extraordinary and arbitrary powers are in the estimation of the First Minister given to this officer at that preliminary meeting renders it all the more important that the fullest publicity should be given of his proceedings; that his proceedings should not take place at one end of a large county, it may be, but in the midst of the people, where they can have their eyes upon him, and check him, and exercise moral pressure to prevent any impropriety or outrage of that kind. If any person goes to that court and makes a statement or puts in a letter asserting that my vote is bad, because the valuation of my property is not sufficient, the onus is thrown upon me of going to work and obtaining actual evidence at my own expense to contradict that charge. Now, should I, if I live at one end of a county, be called upon to go miles and miles to the other end to do that? Surely if that outrage is to be committed upon me, it should be done at my own door, where I have the opportunity at the least possible expense to rectify it. Now, the first list is made by the revising officer in private, and upon his own information. We have objected, and still strenuously object, to entrusting an officer with powers of that kind at all. Surely that is bad enough. But this revision is set out in the Act to be a public revision. It would be really public in a city or town; the electoral districts which happen to be composed of cities and towns will not suffer. It is only the rural districts that will suffer from the defeat of this amendment; and surely it cannot be that the Government desire to discriminate against the rural districts in favor of cities and towns —to give cities and towns, where Conservative majorities generally prevail, easy opportunities of attending this court, and to make it almost impossible in rural constituencies, where the reverse is generally the case, to get mistakes rectified. What are these notices for, which are so elaborately provided in this Act? What is the use of the distribution of the lists to members, and to sheriffs, wardens, mayors, clerks of the peace and treasurers, or other corresponding officers, if it is not to give publicity? And how can we get publicity if you hold the court in one particular part of the electoral district? The result is briefly this: That a Conservative vote, by this machinery, can be got on the list with the greatest possible ease, and a Reform vote can be got off with the greatest possible ease, upon statements or information, and any wrongs can only be set right at great expense to the parties, either at the preliminary revision or the final revision. The objections we have to the first secret list made by the revising officer still remain. That clause is passed; but here we have a chance, by passing this amendment, to prevent the evil being doubled and intensified by allowing this preliminary revision to be held in a hole-and-corner way in one corner of the electoral district.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. leader of the Government last night informed us that this preliminary revision was important, in that it was to be the basis of the list, and it was desirable to make it the basis of a good list. Then it should be held with due regard to public convenience and in such a manner as to enable the revising officer to do his work properly, and it cannot be said that the mode provided in the Bill of holding the preliminary court of revision will produce the results that the right hon. gentleman professes to be anxious to obtain. But he stultifies himself later on by saying that it is doubtful whether it is worth while to hold this preliminary revision at all—that he had been advised by his friends that it was not necessary to do so, and that he himself had serious doubts whether it was proper that this preliminary revision should be held.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a mistake; I did not say so.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not refuse to accept the statement of the First Minister; I have, perhaps, misunderstood his remarks. With regard to the preliminary revision, whether the First Minister stated it was a matter of importance or not, it is a very important matter. By section 17 the revising officer shall, on the day and at the time and place appointed, publicly proceed to the revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and statements before him and the evidence of the persons who may then be present to give information in support of, or in opposition to, the objection. By clause 25, it is provided that the revising officer shall, for the purpose of the preliminary revision of the first general list of voters, have all the powers of a court of record in the Province. By clause 39, he may summon witnesses to attend and to produce if necessary books, papers or other information, and punish persons for contempt, who, on being subpœnaed, refuse to attend. It is claimed by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), and it is to be regretted the First Minister was not in his seat to take notice of the objections used against this clause, that the questions treated in this preliminary court of revision were questions that could not or need not necessarily be raised again. Whatever action was taken by the revising officer on the case of any individual was an action that need not be revised, and the individual aggrieved could not secure a revision afterwards. This being the case, the courts should be held at such times and places as will suit the convenience of the population. One preliminary court of revision in an entire riding will not be at all effectual. It will be held in a place remote from the homes of many of the people, who may be required to attend it, and the result will be a very small minority of the electorate will take enough interest in the matter to incur the expense and be subject to the inconvenience of attending the court. If there is no general attendance of the public, the work of the revising barrister will be imperfectly performed, and the people will be dissatisfied. These preliminary courts of revision should be held at such places as will meet the convenience of the public, and secure an efficient performance of the work. Take such a riding as my own, which the right hon. gentleman has made 50 miles in length and 4¾ wide in one place, composed of parts of two counties, no part of which has a county seat, and one portion of which has never been associated in municipal affairs with the other portion. It is absurd to expect the inhabitants to cross from one part of the county to the other to attend this court. Take the county of North Brant which is 65 or 70 miles long and in one place a few rods in

width, and which comprises portions of three counties. It is absurd to suppose the inhabitants of North Brant will assemble at one common centre at the same day, as notified by the revising officer, for the purpose of attending the preliminary revision of the voters' list in that riding. The hon. gentleman said he adopted the scheme to coax the people to send in their claims by letter, but the Bill provides that the claims must be drawn in a legal manner and couched in legal phraseology. Is there one elector in every hundred who will feel himself competent to draw up his application in the form prescribed in this Bill? Under the non-resident provision in the Ontario Act, it is difficult to get people to give notice to the township clerk to have their names put on the list, although no special form is required; how much more difficult then will it be to get people to send in their applications under this clause? The hon. gentleman objects to the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) on the score of increased expense and of loss of time to the revising officer. He fears that if these courts are held in the different municipalities it will be impossible, on account of the increased amount of time required to appoint county judges as revising barristers. I do not see that it will take much more time to hold courts in the various municipalities than to have the labor performed at a central court. The only additional time involved would be the time consumed in travelling from one point to another. The work itself will take as much time at one point as it would if the court were held at different points, as convenient. If it is proper there should be a court of revision, the work should be done efficiently, and if that work can be done more efficiently by holding courts in several municipalities the hon. gentleman should provide to have them held in the different municipalities. He objects to this motion on the ground of increased expense. Of all men, he is the last who would be supposed to raise an abjection on the ground of expense. The objection we have urged against the whole measure, from the beginning, is that it involves unnecessary expense, but if the Bill is to be worked at all it ought to be worked properly. If the expense necessary for working the Bill is to be incurred at all, let it be made as perfect as possible. Having determined to incur the large amount necessary to work the Bill, we should not halt with a view to save $3,000 or $4,000 and so to impair the efficiency of the measure.

Every development in the discussion of this Bill shows the utter folly on the part of the right hon. gentleman in tinkering with the provincial franchises. There has not been a successful attempt to show that this Bill was a necessity.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman is not going to discuss the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am discussing the point raised as to the expense, and in connection with that I am pointing out that the Bill is an utter piece of folly, because it entails unnecessary expense in substituting this for the provincial franchises. This Bill is promoted by one man, or perhaps by two men, the First Minister and the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). It is a measure that was not asked by the country or by any portion of this House. It may be supported, but it is not urged or supported in debate by any considerable portion of this House. If we make an appeal with regard to any feature of the Bill, to whom do we appeal? Do we appeal to the majority of this House? No, we appeal to Cæsar, we appeal to the leader of this House, who devised the Bill, who drafted it, who introduced it, who urges it, who promotes it. It is not the country's Bill, it is not the Bill of the party on the other side even. Scarcely a man stands up to advocate it. There is no one empowered to allow any modification of the Bill. The right hon. gentleman is the Cæsar to whom it is all left, and when he is absent, as he very often is, we are talking to empty air, we are talking, it is true, to a solid majority, but it is also a stolid majority, and none of them seems to have any power in reference to the matter. It is a one-man Bill. It will be a monument to the man who promotes it. It is a monument that will not last long. The right hon. gentleman may outlive the monument he has erected. It will be changed, but in any case it will be a monument of folly which will not redound to the credit of the right hon. gentleman.

It is wise for us to be guided by the lamp of experience, for us to profit by the experience and example of others. I do not suppose, wise as hon. gentlemen on the other side are, that human wisdom will die with them, or that human wisdom commenced with them. Some of the terms used in this Bill are copied from the English Act, and I call attention to the fact that the preliminary revision of the voters' list in the parent country is conducted in a different manner from that which is proposed in this Bill. The revision of the preliminary voters' lists in England is conducted by officers of the people. The overseers of the poor make the lists, and afterwards the revising officer decides upon appeal from those lists. He is not even appointed until after the preliminary list is arranged. I will read the provision of the English Act.

Mr. McCALLUM. Point it out to the reporter.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think, in the interests of hon. gentleman opposite, this discussion requires that we should give them line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, and, when we have done that, I am afraid very little impression is made upon those hon. gentlemen.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Dispense; taken as read.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am aware that hon. gentleman do not take very much interest in this Bill. They are quite willing to believe that the hon. gentleman who has charge of it knows all about it; they are willing to take his judgment; but we are not, and it is our duty to appeal to the reason of hon. gentlemen opposite, though it seems difficult to reach it. The 12th section of the English Act provides that the overseers of every parish or township shall make up the list of voters between the hours of 10 and 4 o'clock.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is reading clauses that relate to the preparation of the lists instead of the revision.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are quite relevant to the preliminary revision. One thing is related to the other.

Mr. McCALLUM. Let him go on; he must put in the time.

Mr. CHARLTON. Throughout this discussion upon a measure which changes the constitutional foundation of this Government, throughout this discussion of a measure of infinitely greater importance than any that has ever engaged the attention of this Parliament, a measure which every member of this House should consider with a sincere desire to do what is in the interest of this country and what his duty to his constituents requires—I say that throughout this discussion which the Opposition have engaged in, not, surely, from any motive of gain, because they are staying here at their own expense——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, they are not.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, they are; and I can warn hon. gentlemen opposite that any attempt to increase our sessional allowance on account of this matter will be resisted by the Opposition—I say, remaining here at our own expense, and determined to resist any attempt to increase the sessional allowance in consequence of remaining here a longer time—throughout the whole discussion which we

have carried on, without any expectation of gain or reward, we have been constantly taunted with an assertion similar to that made a few moments ago, that we are talking against time. Sir, I do not believe that we can point to the record of any parliamentary body in christendom in this century, where any great measure such as this has been discussed, where the discussion has been less irrelevant than the discussion upon this measure has been; and, Sir, in future ages, when the student of history refers to the *Hansard* of Canada at this time, and reads the discussion upon this great constitutional question which may yet shape the destinies of this Dominion, that student, I venture to say, will look with admiration upon the full and exhaustive discussion of every point at issue in this Bill; and whether hon. gentlemen believe that or not, they are not warranted in taunting the members of the Opposition with speaking against time. We have no such desire, we have no such intention. Whether we succeed in discussing this question pertinently or not, whether our speeches are relevant or not, whether we present our arguments concisely or not, we are laboring to present those arguments and to conduct this discussion in such a way as to influence the opinion of this House and the opinion of this country; and, whether we are succeeding with this House or not, Sir, we are succeeding with this country, and if the hon. gentleman does not believe it I defy him to dissolve this Parliament and appeal to the country; and, great as his majority is to-day, he will come back here with that majority reversed; and if he does not believe it let him try it. Sir, we have no fears of an appeal to the people, but he has. He has a fear of going back to the people; even with his Gerrymander Act, even with the dice loaded as they were in 1882, he dare not appeal to that same constituency again, and so he is now engaged in perfecting the most infamous measure that ever disgraced the Statute Book of this country.

Now, with regard to this preliminary revision. Section 14 reads (the hon. gentleman read section 11). Without troubling the House further with regard to this Act, these overseers of the poor go on to revise the list, to take off and put on the names, according to the evidence furnished to them; and this revised list, this list revised by the overseers of the poor, the officers of the people, this list under the English Act, which should form the model for our Act, this list made by the officers of the people and revised by the officers of the people, in a preliminary sense, is the list that is submitted to the revising barristers appointed, not by the Government of the day, but by the courts of the land, and appointed from year to year under restrictions that prevent them from running for any office within eighteen months of the day they were appointed. I say the list prepared in this manner and revised by the officers of the people, is the list that is submitted for final revision, not to an appointee of the Crown, but to an appointee of the judges of the land.

Now, Sir, I wish to refer to the case of one English colony; and I will say in connection with this matter that you can find no colony of the British Empire, you can find no commonwealth that derives its existence from the British Empire, that has a measure such as this upon its Statute Book. You can find no colony or state where the preparation and preliminary revision of the voters' lists, and their final revision, are entrusted to an appointee of the Crown, or an appointee of the Government—not one of all the states and commonwealths at the present time that derive their existence from England. The colony I wish to refer to as an example is New Zealand. By the Statutes of 1866 the preparation of the list in this colony is entrusted to an officer who is appointed by the Governor, but the revision of the list is not entrusted to an appointee of the Government but to an officer or revising barrister appointed by the courts. The Statute of 1875 takes from the Governor even the

power of appointing an officer who shall prepare the list, although the revision of the list was not in the hands of the Governor. It provides that the list shall be formed by the clerks of the municipality, countersigned by the mayor or presiding officer, and revised as before provided by an officer of the court. I repeat that there is no colony found in the British Empire in which such a provision as that contained in this Bill obtains; that in no colony in the British Empire, nor in Great Britain itself, are the rights of the people so trampled upon and tampered with as they are under the provisions of this Bill; that there is no colony in the Empire, except Canada, where the rights of the people are not respected, and where the officers connected with the preparation of the lists are not elected by the people and where they have not a share in the formation of the voters' list, in the mode of registering the voters, and in the control of the election machinery. It is only here in Canada that the Government is so lost to a sense of duty to the people, is so lost to a sense of the duty that devolves upon it as to attempt to take into its hands the entire election machinery by providing that its own officers shall make the list, its own officers shall preside at the preliminary revision of the list, its own officers shall preside at the final revision of the lists, and that the people through their own officers, elected by themselves, shall have no part whatever either in preparing the preliminary list or the final revision of the list. I had other references to turn to, but I will not delay the House with them. This Bill is unique in its provisions. It is a Bill that will place Canada at the lowest point in the scale of the colonies. It is a Bill that will give us the unenviable distinction of being the only British commonwealth that tramples on the rights of the people systematically and with malice prepense, for through the action of the Government it takes the election machinery into its own hands and seeks to secure, through fraud and chicanery, a decision which the honest will of the people would not give. I have nothing more to say. I presume this little amendment, this little boon, requiring that the revision court shall be held in the municipality, in order to facilitate the proper performance of the duty of the revisers, will be denied us by the Cæsar to whom we appeal, and that he will insist on retaining the provision of the Bill, which requires that the people of an entire riding, thousands, perhaps, in number, shall go to one common centre, like the Jews of old to Jerusalem on the Feast of Pentecost, tabernacled and boothed for days before they can get their business attended to.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentlemen has stated that he has been misunderstood as regards the language used by him in respect of this clause. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) quoted the hon. gentlemen as having said that he considered this clause unimportant and he doubted whether it should be in the Bill at all. That is what the hon. gentleman now says he did not state. I have *Hansard* here, and I will read the hon. gentleman's remarks, and will leave it to the committee to say whether our understanding of the words was not justified by the words he actually used. Whether he intended to say something else or not is another question. The hon. gentleman said:

> "This is comparatively unimportant and the only doubt I have is as to whether the clause should be in the Bill at all."

I ask the Committee whether any other meaning can be placed on the words used by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. The hon. gentleman further said:

> "This clause is only intended for the first settlement of the voters' list under this Act. In the subsequent annual revision it is not provided that there shall be a preliminary revision."

According to the hon. gentleman's own words he considers this section unimportant. I differ from him entirely. This

is one of the most important clauses in the whole Bill. The proceedings to be conducted under this section are termed a preliminary revision of the voters' list. They are in no sense a revision of the list, whether preliminary or final. They are simply the completion of the making up of the list, and not the revision of one. A glance at the wording of the section itself, and at the explanations given by the right hon. gentleman, shows that he intends it to be a completion of the making of the list, and not a revision at all. The right hon. gentleman says:

"In the first place, the revising officer takes the revised assessment roll, or the poll books, or the voters' list, as the case may be. He takes those books as *primâ facie* evidence. He makes out his list, showing every name that the assessment roll shows to have a vote. He takes other such information as he can obtain, in order to add other names. He publishes that list. It goes to every municipality. He says: There are the parties who, on an examination of the assessment roll, have a right to vote. Then he announces that he will hold a court—if a county judge, in his own office, and if a revising officer, in some other place; and he will receive all papers sent in, applications that may be made to be placed on the roll by mail or otherwise, and all objections made to the names appearing on that roll. It is not required that anyone should be present. The practical working of the plan will be this: The political associations of the two parties that govern the country will send in their lists, I have no doubt. Individuals who are interested will send in names or their objections. They need not attend at all. But the revising officer will get all those applications, and all the objections. In the next clause, the 17th clause, it is provided, however, that parties may attend the preliminary revision if they please; but there is no necessity, those documents being sent in being sufficient for the purpose. He takes the applications; he reads them and adds them to his list."

This is what the right hon. gentleman intends to be done at this proceeding, which is mistakably called a preliminary revision. These are exactly the duties which are performed by the Board of Overseers in England, and a part of the original preparation of the lists. The revising officers are not sitting to revise, but to make up the list, according to the explanation of the right hon. gentleman. Whether he correctly interprets the Bill which he is supposed to have drafted, is another question. I do not think he does. I think the wording of the Act has a different meaning from what he intends. Section 15 evidently contemplates that he shall hold a real court of revision. The hon. gentleman says he does not intend that he should do so, but that he is merely to take a mass of applications and statements made by individuals and make up a list roughly from those. But by section 25, he is given all the powers, duties, responsibilities and dignities of a court. By section 55, the revising officer may correct the list on his own knowledge when there have been no objections or complaints. Now, Sir, it appears that the wording of the Act makes this sitting a solemn proceeding, the session of a court. The revising officer may put on or strike off names of his own motion, and the right hon. gentleman says it is not necessary for any person to be present. Now, Sir, it would no doubt be very convenient for the right hon. gentleman and his friends if this House and the public should accept his explanation of this clause, and allow the revising officer in the absence of everybody, to perform his work. The right hon. gentleman evidently intends the public to understand that they need not be present, and he tells us so in so many words. The revising officer will be present though, armed with all the powers conferred on him by the Act, to do what the right hon. gentleman says he will do, to do practically what he likes, in the absence of the persons interested. I am astonished that the right hon. gentleman should have made a statement which would lead the House and the country to suppose that he did not want them to understand what the powers and the duties of the revising officer would be under this section, that he wanted the people to absent themselves and leave his paid agent alone at the concoction of the list. It is said that there is no reason for holding these sittings in several places for the reasons we have urged, because nobody need be there. I have shown you that everybody does need to be there, that this is the occasion on which the lists are really made, that this is the time to get names put on or taken off, when the voters' lists are in actual process of concoction, when they are plastic and can be moulded—that this is the very time, of all others, when the people should be present to see that their interests are protected. There has been no argument against the claim that the sittings should be held in every municipality, if they were to be real courts of revision. That has been granted. The only argument brought forward has been misleading, incorrect and untrue—that the sitting is not important—for that argument is disposed of by the very words of the Act, and therefore our argument remains unanswerable, that the sittings should be held in so many places as to be convenient of access to everybody in the electoral district. Now, where is the sitting to be held? "If it is held by a county judge, he will hold it in his own office," says the right hon. Premier. If the county judge is appointed in my own constituency, where will the meeting be held? My constituency consists of parts of Elgin and Kent. Which judge will it be? Will my constituents be compelled to go to Chatham, some 50 or 60 miles distant, to look after their rights at this preliminary concoction of the list, or will the people from the extreme west of my riding be compelled to come 50 miles to St. Thomas? My riding, as may be understood from its being part of the work of the Gerrymander Bill, is a rather disconnected affair in its municipal relations, although it is sufficiently compact in shape. The two extreme western townships have not much communication with the others, and the middle township has not much intercourse with the townships on either sides. There is a moderate sized place on the railway where the court might be held, but it is not a place to which people are accustomed to come. The court will probably be held at one end of the riding or the other; but even if it is held in the middle, people will have to come 25 miles at least to look after their rights. How will it be with North Brant, which contains part of three counties? Will the judge of one county revise the list for the whole of North Brant? Will the judge of one county, either of Kent or Elgin, revise the list for the whole of West Elgin, and where will the court be held? These are questions which I do not think the right hon. gentleman can answer; I do not think he has thought about the complications or the inconveniences that will arise under this clause. Then, after saying that there is no reason why this preliminary revision should be held in the different municipalities, he goes on to show why it should. He says that on the occasion of the preparation of the first list, the revising officer will not go around—it will not be necessary. Yet he says:

"This preliminary revision will cost us some money, but it will be well worth the money in order to start with a full, thorough list."

Yet he says the revising officer need not go around to the municipalities; it will be quite sufficient for him to sit in one place and take all the applications made to him; but in the second year, when the preliminary revision is not required, what will the revising officer do?

"In the second year, the voters' list having been once settled, the officer will take the voters' list of the year before, and will visit each municipality or other well-known division, and with that list in his hand he will add new voters, and strike off dead voters, or those absent, or those who have lost the franchise, and he will settle the list at once."

The hon. gentleman gives away the whole case; if the revising officer is to go around in order to make a rough preliminary revision of the second list, it is infinitely more necessary that he should go around to each municipality in order to make a rough preliminary revision of the first list. He says again:

"All the officer will have to do will be to annually go round, at a time announced and well known to the municipality, to receive applications and objections, and so settle the list."

Why will the hon. gentleman not let him do that now? Because it would be too convenient to the people of the country. "In England," he says, "this work occupies a very

short time." In England this work is not done at all by the revising officer. The right hon. gentleman should surely have looked to the English law, where he would find that the revising officer in England does not go around to the municipality to receive applications and objections, as this officer will do. He only sits as a judge to decide on cases, which are not put in to him personally, but to the municipal officers—the overseers. He has nothing to do with trotting around and making up the list. It is simply incorrect to say that this work occupies a short time in England, because this work is not done there at all. Again, as to the necessity of people being present, and as to the notice, I find that clause 15 provides that notice shall be given by the objector or applicant "at least one week before the day fixed for the preliminary revision," and that notice may be given either by depositing it with the revising officer or by mailing it to him; and the same course is to be followed with regard to the person whose name is objected to. How much notice does this provide for? The revising officer may live a long way from the scene of his labors; the revising officer for my constituency may live in Toronto or Halifax so far as the provisions of this Bill are concerned, although of course it is not probable that he will live so far away. Still a letter may take a day or two to reach him, and it may be mailed at a post office where there is only a tri-weekly or a bi-weekly mail. There are scores of voters in my riding who live outside, and these it is proposed to retain,—some at Detroit, some at Toronto, some at various other places. If a notice is addressed to these from an out-of-the-way post office in my riding, it will certainly take three days to reach him; so he will have four days out of the week in which to arrange his business and leave to look after his vote, or empower someone else to look after it for him. In spite of the hon. gentleman's statement that he need not go there in person, I say he need, or his vote will be at the mercy of a partisan official. It is not fair that such short notice should be given to parties at a distance. It should be provided that the notice should be mailed in time for the person to receive it a week before the revision. A week's notice is the shortest notice that a person ought to receive that his vote is going to be appealed against. Suppose on the other hand that one person put in 500 appeals against persons living at a distance, and he should be present at the preliminary cooking of the list with evidence and statements to show that these persons were not qualified to vote; what position would they be in? The revising officer would be acting quite within the statute if he simply said: It is all very well, gentlemen; you are offering me evidence, and statements, and deeds, and mortgages, to show that these people are not qualified. I have statements from trustworthy persons that they know these people are qualified, and therefore I will not strike off their names. He is allowed to take, not only evidence, but statements, and the statements are given the same value as the evidence. He may take the statement of anybody he chooses, if he considers him trustworthy, in rebuttal of all the evidence. If those 50 parties are opposed to him, and he had notice of objection against them, he might, on the unsupported statement of anybody he chose to consider trustworthy, knock the whole 50 names off on revision, no matter what evidence might be brought forward as to their qualifications. It is very clear that if there is any necessity for the revising officer to go into the separate municipalities at all, it is on this preliminary revision. It would be fairer, if the preliminary revision were held in each municipality, and the final revision in one place. The former is the important one; it is then easy and cheap to get the list corrected; no lawyer is required, and when the final revision comes on, the people will be prepared for it. No arguments have been advanced against this contention. The hon. gentleman treats the House to so little consideration as to insist upon this provision being passed, no matter what arguments are brought against it, and without attempting to contradict those arguments. What we are asking is simply that every elector should have within reasonable reach a means of seeing that his name is not improperly struck off the list or another or others improperly put on. If you purposely place in the hands of an individual, who is to hold the great power of deciding whether a name should be on a list or not, the right to decide of his own motion, on the mere uncorroborated statement of any person who may happen to be present, whether it should be on or off, the Government will stand convicted in the mind of every fair person in the country, not only of affording facilities but of arranging these facilities with the object of allowing a partisan revising officer to cook the list in the interests of his party.

Mr. WELDON. After the remarks of the right hon. gentleman in regard to this clause, I have carefully looked over the Act, and must confess that this preliminary revision appears to me to be in some respects more important than the final revision. The officer has at this preliminary revision all the powers he has at the final revision, but from the final revision there is the right to appeal. By contrasting the 17th with the 25th section, you will find that this power of adding or striking off names is greater in the preliminary than in the final examination. If we contrast the 15th with the 30th section, we will find that the preliminary revision is simply where the revising barrister corrects the list of the preceding year, and then publishes a notice for the final revision. Great difficulties, unless the amendment of my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) is adopted, will arise. If the section relating to the final revision is adopted, the officer will have to go to each parish and investigate, whereas it is more important that he should do so in the preliminary revision. The powers of a court of record are given under the construction of the Bill, whether the Bill distinctly creates the court a court of record or not. I take it that the construction would be that it would only have the powers of a court of record. The notice required is the same in the preliminary as in the final revision. The whole scope of the Act shows that the list is to be published in the case of the preliminary revision as in the case of the final revision. If anyone objects to my name, if I do not attend, my name is struck off; but, if I am obliged to attend, I may have witnesses there, and the party objecting may not choose to attend, and the judge may award costs, but, if it is true, as the First Minister says, that the party need not attend, I may write a letter, but the opposite party may attend with witnesses, and the name may be struck off, and the costs may be awarded against me. It will be far better to prevent objections being taken at all at the preliminary revision. If the preliminary revision is held to be conclusive, a difficulty might arise under this Act as to whether an appeal could lie from that revision at all. The taxed costs would, in any case, not probably be equal to the amount of costs to which the party was put, and certainly would not compensate him for the trouble and expense he would be put to. Then an objection may be made in just the same way at the final revision, and the party has to go through the same ordeal again. In one case it will be less expensive, because the judge will hold the investigation in the man's own neighborhood, while the preliminary revision may be held at any place in the riding which the revising officer sees fit to select. No man who wishes to retain his position on the voters' list could treat with contempt or pass over in silence, a notice served upon him. If he absents himself from the court the party objecting to him may appear with his witnesses, and the revising

officer may at once take judgment by default and strike his name off the list. If the man has been there himself he could at once have had evidence to meet the *primâ facie* case that his objector may have made out against him. But he is not there, and the result is that judgment is given against him, and not only does he lose his vote under that clause but the revising officer has a right to saddle him with the expense of the unvestigation. Then he has to go to the expense of putting his name on again, and has got to give notice to the revising barrister to that effect. Or put it in the other way; if the objection fails at the preliminary examination, and an objection again made, the result will be that the party has been put to a great deal of needless trouble—because we know that sometimes parties are not actuated by the best of motives in endeavoring to get a man's name off the list, and it may be done by malice. We find again that after he has been three or four days away from home at the preliminary revision, no sooner does he get home than he finds another notice that he is objected to on the final revision. Now, under these circumstances, I think it may be fairly urged that this preliminary revision is of equal importance to the final revision. The revising officer is clothed with the same power—in fact, according to the construction put upon the 17th section by the Premier, the revising barrister has more power with regard to the questions of evidence and questions of fact at the first revision, than he has on a final decision, because the 25th section will show that he must be bound by evidence on the final decision. We find that even in this preliminary revision according to the 40th section, it would almost seem necessary that a man would have to attend in order to see that no objection was made to his name, because we find that the revising barristers may dispense with notice at the preliminary revision. A man may come up and say that he objects to John Jones or Thomas Smith being upon the register, and the revising barrister has power to dispense with a notice of that objection, and strikes their names off, and the men are put to all the expense of going before the court of revision in order to get their names put on again. Now if the court were held in their immediate locality it would be a difficult thing to get these men's names put off the list without their knowing something about it. They could attend without any expense or trouble and look after their own names; but if the court is held 50 or 60 miles away from them, and the revising barrister has the power that is given to him in the 40th section, every man's name might be struck off without his knowing anything about it until he saw the list and found it was not on. The first thing they know when they see the preliminary list is that their names are not on it, and these men have got to go to the trouble of employing a lawyer—because I think no man would be safe under this Act unless he employed a lawyer—to get him to give notice and attend at the final court of revision to have their names put on. Now, I say this opens facilities for fraud and injustice which we ought to prevent if possible. After looking carefully at the several sections of this Bill and seeing the powers given to the revising barrister on this preliminary revision, it seems to me that the principle adopted with regard to the final revision ought rather to be adopted at the preliminary revision, the preliminary revision being the most important. I think the revising barrister ought to visit each municipality in order to hold this preliminary revision, and the travelling expenses would not be great. I think that we are bound to give every man entitled to the franchise an opportunity of having his name put on the list, and we ought not to throw obstacles in the way of his exercising that right; therefore, in order to secure justice and fairness, and to prevent expense and loss of time on the part of the electors, it is quite right that the general revenue should bear what additional expense there may be incurred to secure these ends. Now, this is not attacking the principle of the Bill. It is a matter of machinery, and the question is this: is it not more in the interest of the people, more in the interest of the individual voter, more in the interest of the public at large, that at this preliminary examination, even if it does put the general revenue of the country to a little more expense, should be held in the various localities, and that the revising officer should visit these localities in order to afford the electors greater facilities for having their names put on the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I always listen to the arguments of the hon. gentleman with pleasure, because he addresses himself directly and candidly to the question immediately before the committee, and therein, perhaps, there is a contrast between his course and that of some other hon. members on this measure. With respect to this amendment, I cannot at all accede to it, inasmuch as it would greatly increase expense. It duplicates the expense without securing any corresponding advantage. The hon. gentleman said I was the last man to talk about expense, because this measure was introduced regardless of expense, and therefore the hon. gentleman very logically said, if the Bill is going to be expensive, the expense shall be increased. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman, and like a good many of his other arguments, surrounded though they may be by scriptural quotations—and a great many people can quote scripture for their own purposes—I do not think the argument was strengthened thereby. The object, as I explained last night, of having this preliminary sitting is to make the list as full as possible, to receive from every source and quarter, by every means possible, the names of any persons who by any possibility can claim to have a vote, and at the same time receive any objections as to claims to votes which are decidedly bad. Then the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) quoted from my speech last night, and said I stated that the clau e is unimportant. My opinion was, and I attempted to explain it, that it was comparatively unimportant in relation to the final revision; the revision when the lists are settled finally must be the more important of the two. There is something, perhaps a good deal, in the arguments used by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken in regard to the next clause, that the same objections might be taken twice, and a person might be summoned from a distance by the revising barrister to the place where the central court was held, whereas the objection might as well be tried in the polling district where eventually the final revision will take place. I propose to amend the 17th clause in that direction, so as to prevent the possibility of the objection taken by the hon. gentleman and by others weighing adversely to the interest, pecuniarily or otherwise, of the claimants to votes or to persons urging objections. The great fault it seems to me of the whole line of argument with respect to this Bill, if I may for a moment go out of the the clause is this: That hon. gentlemen opposite hold that of necessity the county judge or revising officer must be a scoundrel; he is going to be a partisan, an unscrupulous partisan; he is going to be false to his oath, which he is compelled under this Bill to take; he can by no possibility do right; and they must treat him as a scoundrel from begining to the end. I think that is a very faulty style of argument. When it was ventured to be hinted in the course of the discussion that there was such a thing as a partisan assessor and a partisan court of revision we heard denunciations that this was an insult to every assessor and every court of revision. Yet hon. gentleman opposite do not hesitate to offer insults to every county judge who may be appointed as revising officer and to any member of the legal profession who may accept such positions. The revising officer will be sworn, as well as is the assessor, and he

will commit a great moral sin and a crime as well if he acts as a partisan. However, I will propose, a little in anticipation of the clause before us, the following clause :—

At the day and time and place appointed the revising officer shall proceed to hold the primary revision of the list, and he shall add to such list the names of all claiming the right to be placed on it as voters, and he shall note on the same all objections, either proposed amendments or corrections, and he shall then and there sign the said list so made up by him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That will mean that the officer will not strike out anyone until the final revision of the list?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. He will receive all objections and all claims. He will add all names offered to the roll, and he will note every objection offered, and those lists with those additions will be signed by him; and those are the lists that will go to the different polling divisions where the battle, as to the right to be placed on the register, will be finally fought out.

Mr. WELDON. Do I understand that the revising officer will merely note the objections, and that they will not be taken up till the final revision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will note the objections.

Mr. WELDON. Does that preclude any person from making further objections?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will settle that when we come to another clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What then is the object of giving notice to the revising officer, unless the revising officer will deal with the matter at the primary revision? At the final revision the party will have to give the officer notice over again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. We shall have to alter the form of the notice in the schedule, that is all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the list for the first revision as proposed include a municipality or electoral district, or is it in polling sub-divisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is provided for in the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. In this case, there is no sense in requiring notice to be given of these objections at the preliminary point, because they have to be taken on the final revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of this preliminary meeting is to get as many names on the list as possible, and as early as possible, and also if there are any objections sent in that they should be known as early as possible. A party gives notice of objection, it is put on the margin of the list, he marks after the name "objected" and there will be a notice to the party opposite to whose name the word is written, that his right to vote is going to be tested at the final revision. There will be no necessity for the other notice of course, even if he gets this one because he will be informed at once that his vote is to be objected to.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there will be two separate opportunities of objecting—one at the preliminary revision and one at the final. The result of his objecting at the preliminary revision will be simply that his objection is noted and that he will not be required to give any further notice for the final revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. BLAKE. Whereas if he omits objecting at first, he will not give a similar class of notice in order to be able to object at the final revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is my proposition by the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is, as there is to be a personal notice, whether the notice will not be likely to be more really useful if it is not given with reference to the court at which the objection is to be tried. I think that it would be better that the notice should be given with reference to that court, and at a short period before the court, than it should be given with reference to a court where it is not to be tried, and at a considerable period before that court.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The notice in the schedule will of course have to be altered, and instead of that form, the notice will be given that it is intended to object to the vote at the final revision in the polling district. If that objection is sent in, and I think it would be well to have it as early as possible, the objection will be noted and the revising officer will know approximately the number of objections and the class of objections.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so, and for this reason, that as I understand this first list will be a very defective one, because the revising officer will not have the machinery to make anything like a full list at the start. It is most probably with reference to the very names added at the preliminary revision, that there will be most dispute at the final revision, and therefore I think it is hardly likely that he will get a reasonable approximation of the number or class of cases he will have to try, by the notice given of the preliminary revision. The class of names put on at the first revision, though numerically large, are probably amongst those as to whom there will be the least question or dispute. Of course the hon. gentleman's statement that the notice which is to be given at this early stage will be distinctly a notice that the vote will be objected to at the final stage, will be a reasonable prevention of misunderstanding, but still it strikes me that the notice had better be given with reference to the stage at which the great proportion of the cases will be tried.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events let us try this.

Mr. DAVIES. This section was drawn making the filing of the objections peremptory, and now it is proposed to make it permissive, the word "may" should be inserted instead of "shall."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is right.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no occasion, with the recasting of the sections, to require the revising officer to sit in different localities at all, in view of what the hon. gentleman says, I will withdraw that amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Davies) withdrawn.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that this preliminary revision shall simply be for proposals? It might be worth while to consider whether it would not be reasonable to give some greater degree of latitude with reference to objections. I conceive of a case, for instance, in which, within the week for giving notice, an objection might occur to a man's vote, and it seems to me it would be rather an advantage to permit that objection to be stated and noted at this preliminary revision, although the notice may not have been given. In that case, of course, the regular notice would have to be given before the final revision. There would be on the public list the fact stated that this name had been objected to, and that would give to the opposite party and to the individual himself notice of the objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That, I think, is the great object of retaining this clause. If any objection was sent in, as a matter of course there would be an entry made on the roll opposite the name objected to. That would be a notice and an early notice.

Mr. BLAKE. My desire was in that sense, to give perhaps some greater facilities for bringing objections than would appear to be given as the clause was originally cast.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How do you propose to give that facility?

Mr. BLAKE. The clause provides that you must give a week's notice that you are going to object to a certain vote. I do not see any object in that. I do not see why, even while attending the court itself, the agent of a party or an individual who chooses to take advantage of this procedure, might not be allowed to object to a string of names. That string of names would be marked, and the only result of attending at the court would be that that string of names would be marked as objected to. That makes as wide as possible the area of those objected to.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. There is a good deal in that, but I do not think there should be verbal objections allowed, because an unscrupulous agent might go before the court and say, I object to all these names.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask whether it is the idea of the First Minister that under these two clauses the revising officer should put on every person who claimed to be put on, or would he have to make a preliminary examination of the claims; in other words, would he have to try the claims in advance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have provided in the clause to put on all the claims.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He then decides on them at the final revision—that I understand to be his meaning.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to make it read "May at any time before the day fixed for such preliminary revision deposit with or mail to the revising officer," etc. That precludes objecting on the day the court sits for the preliminary revision.

Mr. BLAKE. That quite answers my view with reference to that portion of the revision which involves noting objections to names on the list; but as the hon. gentleman has proposed it, it applies to a clause not merely providing for objections but also for additions, and my opinion is that you should not add without a much longer notice. As I understand it, what the hon. gentleman proposes to do is to add names positively, when the proposal is to add them on the primary revision, but with reference to proposals to strike off names he is simply to write opposite them "objected to." I suggest with respect to the proposal to strike off, that as it is not to be disposed of in any shape at this time, there is no reason why there should be any length of notice, and the hon. gentleman agrees with that. But, the act to be performed with reference to additions is entirely different. In the case of additions, it will be necessary to appeal to strike them off, and it is advisable a week's notice should be given, otherwise the day before the revision, a political agent might put on the list 300 names and they might go on at once, and would have to be appealed against in order to strike them off.

Mr. DAVIES. The action of the revising officer will not be in any sense an official action, when he is bound to put on names on application being given. Under the Bill as originally drafted, there was to be a week's notice to be given; but if there is not to be a judicial decision to be given upon the application, but a mere ministerial act, I do not see the necessity of a notice.

Mr. BLAKE. If the proposal of the First Minister is this, that when a representation is made to the revising officer that certain names should be inserted, the officer is simply to put them on the list, without evidence, that would be objectionable to the last degree. I do not propose that at this preliminary revision he is to add the names. If he does so, he will do it on the theory of the 13th clause, namely, on receiving such information as will convince him that they should be put on, and the notice I refer to is to be given by any person with reference to another person or persons to be put on the list. A political agent may send a long list of persons who he claims ought to go on, but surely there must be some sort of evidence that can satisfy the mind of man that there was a *primâ facie* case established, or he would not consent to the application.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the First Minister means to make this a list of claims, something like that provided for in the English Act. That Act provides that the overseers of the poor in parishes shall make out alphabetical lists of all the persons who have claims to be put on the register, and if there is reasonable doubt with regard to any of those, the words "objected to" will be written opposite their names. That would be the duty in this case of the revising officer.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, of course, if the only result of the proposed addition to this clause was the announcement of a claim, one would not see the necessity of the week's notice. If the effect of a claim at a preliminary revision is that you simply see the old list, not enlarged or diminished, but the words "objected to" are to be marked against the name that is objected to, I should agree that the week's notice would not be necessary for the claim to be put on any more than in the case of a claim that a name should be put off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must do one of two things. We must either have the original plan by which the revising officer shall have judicial powers under the 17th clause, or he must merely hold his court to receive openly, and to state that he has received by mail or otherwise, claims and objections. There is a good deal to be said, even if the revising officer is merely to have the function of adding the names of claimants and making a note of objections, in favor of giving a week's notice of claims, in order to prevent persons at the last moment handing in all kinds of names on the chance of having them put on the list, right or wrong.

Mr. EDGAR. The notice in the English Act is from the 20th June to the 1st July.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the word "shall" in the 45th line ought to be "may." If you leave it imperative, and the man does not give the notice, it might be held that he could not bring it up on the final revision at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman has not answered the question of the member for West Durham as to whether the functions of the revising officer are purely ministerial.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Purely ministerial, according to my view.

Mr. CAMERON. Then, no matter how many names are sent in, he would have to put them on without any *primâ facie* case being made out. I am afraid that would cause a great deal of difficulty, because one political party might ask to have any number of names put on, and the other might not go to the expense of having them struck off. I think the revising officer should, at all events, see that a *primâ facie* case is made out. He should have some little discretion. The hon. gentleman will see that, otherwise, those names may have to be all removed again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole argument of hon. gentlemen opposite was that, under this clause, the revising officer should not exercise any judicial functions, that he would be a partisan officer, and therefore ought not to be entrusted with those functions. I think there can be

no trouble in having the list as full as possible. When the revising officer visits the different polling districts afterwards, objection will be taken to all parties who have not the right to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended, according to the hon. gentleman's present plan, that, although the claim may not be made by the voter himself, but may be made by anyone at all on behalf of a large number of persons, all those names are to be put on?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The claim may be made by himself or by anyone on his behalf.

Mr. BLAKE. For instance, John Smith writes a letter to a revising officer claiming that a long list of names shall be put on, not even furnishing his own statement as to his knowledge that they should be added, or giving a statement of their qualification. Upon that, it is to be the imperative duty of the revising officer to add all those persons to the list. You see how different is the position between the second stage and the first stage. In the first stage, you require the revising officer to get information, to satisfy his own mind at any rate, before he puts anyone on, but now you propose that he shall be bound to add anybody that any person says ought to go on. Some one says: I claim that John Smith, Thomas Jones, and so forth, ought to be added to this list, and you say the revising officer shall be bound to add them. It seems to me that he should have, at least, as much information as that which was required in the making of the primary list. You turn him into a strictly ministerial officer to act upon the warning of anybody at this second stage. I do not see the sense of that. The hon. gentleman says that we object to the revising officer as a partisan officer. Of course he may be a partisan at the beginning and at the end, and the hon. gentleman gives him latitude to be a partisan at those two stages, but he says: You are precluded from suggesting that he should have any such power in the middle stage, because you object to his having it at the other two stages.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It amounts to this. I have been trying to please everybody, and now I ought to return to the clause as it was originally.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that is a mistake. I think we achieved a very great improvement in the clause when the hon. gentleman dealt with the objections as he proposes to deal with them. All we are proposing is, that the revising officer should act at this stage upon the same measure of evidence which the hon. gentleman thought twenty minutes ago he should have. Let him add the names upon the same evidence upon which he called it right that he should add the names a while ago; but with reference to objections, let him only note them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion. I am very glad to think that the revising officer can safely be trusted.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he will allow me to suggest, we will adopt this clause as amended, and then the question now raised can be taken up on the next clause.

Mr. MULOCK. I think this clause requires that the same notice should be given to the person whose name is objected to as to the revising officer. It says that notice shall be given at the same time to the person as to the revising officer. Now it is not possible to comply literally with that direction; it is impossible to deliver the same notice to the revising officer, who may be in one part of the county, and to the person whose name is objected to, who may be in another part of the county at the same time. I suggest that the notice should be given to the person whose name is objected to within seven days, at least, before the sitting of the court. Would it not be better to strike out the words "at the same time" and say, "within at least seven days?"

Mr. WELDON. Put it this way: "Within the same time and in the like form."

Amendment agreed to.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

On section 17,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had a very interesting discussion on this clause before recess, and I have considered well what has been said on that clause. The amendment I first read made the office of revising barrister, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) pointed that out clearly. So I have prepared a clause in substitution for this clause, which I shall read to the committee:

On the day and at the time and place appointed, the revising officer shall publicly proceed to the preliminary revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and information before him in support of any claims for additions to the voters' list, or of any proposed amendments or corrections, but not including any objection to any vote, which he shall merely note on the list opposite the name objected to; and he shall then and there correct the lists on the said basis to the best, of his judgment and ability, upon such information and evidence, and shall note every objection on the said list as aforesaid.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a suggestion to make to the hon. gentleman. I pointed out that the office of the revising officer was ministerial, and I objected to its being ministerial in the sense in which he made it so. As to the addition, he was bound to do without evidence; as to the objection, he was bound not to do more than mark the objections. My opinion of a purely ministerial office would be that while, with reference to objections, he marked the objections, with reference to additions he marked them as claims for additions. Now, I have this suggestion to make to the hon. gentleman—speaking for myself alone—that it would be a considerable improvement to this clause if we were to provide that in the cases of claims for addition which the revising officer does not think warranted by sufficient evidence, he should have a supplementary list of those persons as claimants for addition, and having dealt with the claims it should then become public that they were claims for addition upon the final revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept that; I think it is a very good suggestion.

Mr. EDGAR. What is the reason for omitting the words "attesting with his initials claims for additions?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is needed now. The list is to be signed.

Mr. EDGAR. There are erasures of additions to be put in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The original idea was one general list, and that he should make corrections on that general list and put his initials opposite. But we have altered the Bill now, and there will be separate and distinct lists.

Mr. EDGAR. I should think it would be a great safeguard when the list is gone over. Whenever there is an erasure or interlineation it is always initialed.

Mr. DAVIES. I was going to suggest if he put the names under the heading of "claims to be added," whether it would not be necessary or advisable that the claimant should state the particular qualification on which he bases his claim.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not propose that any man should be marked as a claimant to be added which would not su ffi-

ciently state the character of his qualification. It is evidence in support of that claim.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revision is to be based upon evidence and information in support of any claim before him. I amend the clause by inserting the words:

He shall also attest by his initials any additions or changes therein.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire to bring up the question with respect to getting the names of the Indian voters correctly. Owing to the peculiar circumstances of the Indians there will have to be some provision made with respect to them. There are no assessment rolls on the reserves. There are maps showing the separate holdings, in some cases. The First Minister certainly does not contemplate placing in the hands of the Indian agent the power to hand in a list of Indian voters, who are wards of the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We shall deal with the Indians, who are not on any assessment roll, exactly in the same way as we shall deal with any other voters who are now going to receive the franchise. We shall place them on the voters' list. There are no assessment rolls in Prince Edward Island, yet we shall have to find some means of placing the names of voters on the list. There is no trouble about identifying the Indians who will be enfranchised in a political sense.

Mr. PATERSON. There will be great difficulty in identifying Indians on a reservation. How will electors of a county be able to determine whether Indians are in possession of separate holdings unless there is some map or plan. In municipalities a man has a lot, and you can easily determine the matter with respect to him. In a city a man lives in a certain street and at a certain number; but in regard to Indians on reservations, how are you going to trace the matter out? It seems to me that the thing is different from what it is in Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just as it is in Muskoka and Algoma.

Mr. PATERSON There have been serious differences of opinion as to whether what was right had been done there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They had no revising barrister there.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, the hon. gentleman does admit that there were difficulties there, whatever the machinery they used, and other difficulties may arise under the revising barrister. I think this is a question which demands serious consideration, but if the hon. gentleman thinks that it had better come up on another clause, I will not discuss it now. It is for him to say.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to stand I will consider it. I would like to have the hon. gentleman also prepare a clause which he thinks will cover it before we get through the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. I will have an opportunity of considering it, and of putting it in the Bill, if necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, I cannot prevent the hon. gentleman, and I would not desire to do so.

On section 18,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "preliminary," in the 15th line, will be taken out, in consequence of the alteration of the other clause, and the words "first day of May" substituted for "fifteenth day of February." This clause provides for the division of the electoral district into polling districts.

Mr. MILLS. I would suggest whether, in those Provinces where we have the same number in each polling division, 300, it would not be convenient to follow the local divisions. Under the Election Act now, when the local division is inconvenient, the returning officer has power to establish electoral polling divisions, and you are proposing to give exactly the same power to another officer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revising officer will visit each one of these polling districts for the purpose of settling the final revision. Afterwards he will sub-divide the district into polling districts, as well as he can come at it. If it should prove, afterwards, under the present system, that another sub-division is required, the returning officer, under the present law, unless it is altered, would have power to rectify the evil.

Mr. MILLS. Which should prevail?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The returning officer has to do it on the eve of the election.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see how you are going to have these two officers exercising exactly the same powers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. First, it must rest with the revising officer, and afterwards, at the time of the election, which may be three, or four, or five years afterwards, the returning officer may act under the provision of the election law and amend the division. That is a matter of continual change, on account of the continual development of the country. That is a very easily understood provision; and if, two years hence, the shifting of the population, the influx of the population, or the outgoing of population, would alter the matter, the returning officer can, under the present law, remodel the division for that election. However, next Session we may have to consider the electoral law generally. This is merely a franchise law; perhaps the attention of the House may be called to the necessity of revising our election law for a new system.

Mr. VAIL. I should like the hon. gentleman to make the date the 1st of April or the 1st of March, if possible. The 1st of May is a very inconvenient time, in the Province of Nova Scotia, because it is just the time our fishermen are away.

Mr. MILLS. There may be 35,000 away.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But he has settled his preliminary list, and he has to sub-divide the municipality into polling divisions. He has nothing to do with fishermen or anybody else.

Mr. EDGAR. By section 38 the revising officer has the right to change the polling sub-divisions from time to time.

Mr. MILLS. This is a power the returning officer exercises annually.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be we shall hereafter deprive the returning officer of that power. When he has the list before him he will be obliged to do it annually. There is no election coming, and the returning officer ought not, perhaps, to have that duty thrown upon him, because he may so sub-divide as to please one party and displease another.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, that can be done by either one or the other, and there is less danger from a judge than from a returning officer. I think it is much safer, where the revising officer is a judge, that the power should rest with him. But in some of the Provinces the number of voters in polling places, for provincial purposes, is the same as the hon. gentleman proposes, and the parties resident in the townships are the most likely parties to make the division. Unless the revising officer saw some good reason for departing from their division, we might provide that, where convenient, he should follow the municipal divisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause in effect provides that. The question depends on the number, and the

local division may not be applicable. Of course, the revising officer must be considered to be a man of intelligence, and he will not, of necessity, upset the boundaries. On the contrary, the danger will be, if there is any danger at all, that he will be too much inclined to accept the local divisions. I think we may safely leave it to him.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 19,

Mr. WELDON. How does the hon. gentleman propose to number the polling districts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Polling district No. 1, polling district No. 2, and so on.

Mr. WELDON. I think that would lead to some confusion. People are more likely to be familiar with the locality than with the mere number, in a county with thirty or forty sub divisions. I would suggest that the township be designated as well as the number. For instance, St. Martin's, No. 1, St. Martin's, No. 2, and so on. I would also suggest that the duplicate of the list should be filed in some public office—in New Brunswick with the secretary-treasurer of the municipality. In Ontario it may be different.

Mr. LISTER. If, after the words "polling districts," the words "in each municipality, parish or township," were put in, this would meet the difficulty, and would not add to the expense.

Mr. EDGAR. In the Province of Ontario we are accustomed to have voters' lists made up separately for each municipality, and to number them accordingly.

Mr. RYKERT. The returning officer does not do this. He sub-divides them.

Mr. EDGAR. I have hardly ever seen that done. Of course, this is made more for the final revision, to facilitate the final revision. It is made to facilitate the final revision, and we are certainly accustomed, in Ontario, at any rate, at the revision of the voting lists, to use the township polling division in each municipality.

Mr. MILLS. It would be in the last degree inconvenient if the revising officer had the power of putting the different parts of the municipality into one division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 18th clause shows he has not that power. It says: "Every city, town, ward, parish, township or other municipal or corresponding division in the electoral district therein."

Mr. MILLS. If we number them, the question is whether they had better be numbered from one up to thirty-five or forty, for the entire division, or whether each municipality should have its polling division numbered separately? If we are not to have separate polling divisions in each municipality, and are not going to confuse the parts of a municipality with the parts of another, for the purpose of making a polling division, it would be very desirable to maintain the practice of having separate numbers for each municipality. Every ten years we have a revision of our electoral districts, and there is no reason to suppose that that practice will be abandoned. These electoral districts are mere transitory divisions; the permanent divisions are the municipal ones. A municipality may be in one county in one election and in a wholly different county in the next election, and all the numbers of a polling division will be broken up with the new distribution of seats that takes place every ten years. That would be an undesirable and confusing state of things.

Mr. TROW. It would simplify matters and add nothing to the expense if the polling divisions in each municipality were taken.

Mr. VAIL. In our county the districts number from one up—different altogether from what is the case in Ontario; and I think it would create confusion there if you were to number the polling divisions by municipalities—township No. 1 or 2.

Mr. WELDON. It is not township No. 1 or 2. In the cities it will be every ward. Take the city of St. John, where there are twenty or more polling places. A man will not know where poll No. 1 is, as the polling lists are not required to be posted; but if we were to designate them, say Queen's ward, poll No. 1, and so on, he will know the locality and easily ascertain the polling place at which he is entitled to vote. When the returning officer makes his proposition we will have to do what he proposes. In Digby township—which is divided into the townships of Digby and Clare—the polling places could be designated township Digby No. 1, and so on, and township Clare No. 1, and so on. What I want is to attach locality to the number.

Mr. EDGAR. A little confusion occurred in the minds of some hon. gentlemen, from remembering that when an election takes place the returning officer numbers the polling divisions from one, consecutively, over the whole township, and so he will now. But, for the purpose of revising the voters' lists, they have never been numbered that way, in Ontario, at all events. The revision is according to the municipal voters' lists, which are printed for that purpose. It would not be the slightest additional trouble, and, moreover, it would suit the purpose of this list, which is to go to a final revision, and that takes place in each separate municipality. All we want is to add the municipality or parish, to show where the polling division is. If the division was numbered twenty or twenty-five in a certain township, the people there would, of course, know where that was.

Mr. LISTER. If the changes suggested by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), and others, are not adopted, great confusion will be created in Ontario, at any rate. There the revising officers will adopt the municipal boundaries adopted by the municipal authorities, so for as the polling districts are concerned. They are divided by the townships, and numbered, and with those numbers the people of the townships are perfectly familiar. It is very likely that the revising officer will adopt those boundaries. If not, there will be great confusion. Take a county of 30,000 or 40,000 inhabitants; you will have to refer to the voters' lists to show where polling district No. 20 or 30 is; but if the course suggested be adopted, there will be no trouble at all, as the people are familiar with the polling districts throughout the different townships. Even if the exact limits provided by the municipality be not adopted, still it is what the people are accustomed to, and there will be no difficulty if the provisions of the Bill are carried out.

Mr. DAVIES. The suggestions, no doubt, are very proper, as regards those parts of the country which are divided into municipalities, but it would not do for us, for the simple reason that the polling divisions are not coterminus with the township at all. There are thirty townships in my riding, and they take natural boundaries, like rivers and highways.

Mr. LISTER. I understand the suggestion of the hon. member for St. John would suit all the Provinces except Prince Edward Island. We might except Prince Edward Island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is not a very important matter. I think the electors may be trusted to find out their number—to get the number of their berth. I move:

That the polling districts in each municipality or other corresponding division, as in the last clause mentioned, shall be numbered, with the local designation attached to such number, in and by the order of the revising barrister, by whom they are established, and such order

shall be forthwith, after the making thereof, filed and kept by the revising barrister for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. MULOCK. There ought to be some publication given to that order. It might as well be attached to the list of the polling sub-divisions, and go round with them.

Mr. HICKEY. When the list is published, it is published for the several polling districts.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that you add these words, "and shall be published in like manner as is required for the publication of the list of voters under section 21." It does not cost any more money, and it does not put the revising officer to any trouble. He makes these polling sub-divisions and makes alphabetical lists of the voters in those sub-divisions. Now, they will not know the meaning of the partial list that is given to them unless they know that it is limited to the list of persons who are admitted by this list of voters to be entitled to vote in respect of a certain area of the country. But in order that men shall intelligently understand the meaning of this partial list that is sent to them, they should know what area of land is embraced by this list.

Mr. ABBOTT. Section 21 expressly provides for that, in line 8.

Mr. MULOCK. No; I do not think it does. It is not sufficient to tell a man that he is, according to this list, put down as for such and such a sub-division. A man is interested in knowing what division he is placed in. He requires to have an opportunity to correct the list.

Mr. RYKERT. The property is described on the list.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing any person is looking over a list of 200 names, and he is not only seeking to ascertain whether he is enrolled, but also whether everyone else within certain limits is enrolled, or to ascertain whether certain persons are left off that ought to be enrolled, is it not necessary for him, in the first instance, to know what area is intended to be covered by this thing called a polling district? He cannot tell whether a name is left off that ought to be on or not, unless he knows what territory is included. Now, is there anything in this Bill requiring any publicity to be given to the sub-division?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The 21st section does so. That is the law, as it has always been in Ontario.

Mr. EDGAR. Section 21 only applies to the description of the polling district in which the list is to be posted up, and does not include the description of the other polling districts, even in that municipality or county. But this order of the revising officer—not a long document—would cover all the polling districts in the county. Section 21 does not provide for that at all; it only gives the voter information of his own polling district, and where the bounds are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He does not care to know about any other but his own.

On section 20,

Mr. DAVIES. I see there will be some difficulty in Prince Edward Island. We have the same polling divisions since 1873. They are well known, and it will create some confusion if they are altered. The 18th section provides that he must divide each township into polling divisions. I would suggest: "In Prince Edward Island polling divisions may comprise parts of townships," as a clause to be added at the end of section 18.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is necessary, in clause 19, to require that the revising officer shall publish his order showing the polling sub-divisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would involve the printing and sending of the information to the candidates and other persons. We must suppose that candidates will have sufficient intelligence to know where they can obtain information as to the sub-divisions.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Some notice with respect to where the polling sub divisions are should be published. The expense of publishing such information in one or two newspapers circulating in the locality would not amount to very much, and it would convey much information to the public. The east riding of my county is a long distance from the county town, and it surely could not be expected that a person should be compelled to travel forty or fifty miles to the revising officer's office to secure this information.

Mr. TROW. It will be a very simple matter to give the boundaries of the sub-divisions, from lot so and so to so and so, and on certain concession lines. Without that information the people cannot understand the true position.

Mr. MILLS. In the voters' list of Ontario it is stated, at the head of each polling division, what are the limits of such division. I do not know whether that would be applicable to all the Provinces or not, but there can be no difficulty whatever in adopting that principle, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. And when the revising officer puts up the list he can indicate the limits of the polling division.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think it would cost 10 cents extra. I have one of the lists for the municipality in my own county, and I find the whole description does not occupy more than three lines.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman wants this before there is a list.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What is the meaning of the words in the 8th line of the 21st clause, "with the description of the polling districts to which it relates," unless it covers what the hon. gentleman has just described. If you want to find the description of a polling district in any municipality in Ontario you have to take the general voters' list for that municipality. But if this Act is carried into effect you will simply have to write the revising officer one letter, if you wish a copy of the list, while under the present system, in Ontario, you have to write to the different clerks of the municipalities. The system provided for in the Bill seems to me to be better than the one we have been accustomed to.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. I move the following amendment:—

That the revising officer shall be bound to furnish, to any person applying therefor, a copy of the order, if printed, on the payment of the proper proportion of the cost of said printing, and if not printed, of payment therefor at the rate of 10 cents per folio.

Amendment negatived.

On section 20,

Mr. MILLS. This refers, I suppose, to the final revision. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes, under section 17, to add on the names and mark those objected to as objected to. Should not that same provision be made here, and the names be marked on this list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. I remember that the hon. member for the west riding proposed, also, that there should be appended to the list all applicants whose applications were not accepted. I propose to add to the 48th line after the word "district," the words, "showing the names objected to," and in the 50th line, after the word "officer," the following words: "and shall append thereto the names of the claimants whose claims have not been accepted."

Mr. EDGAR. I very much approve of the amendment which has been suggested by the hon. First Minister, but I

think there should be an addition of these words: "and shall publish the same, as provided by section 13." There is no provision made in the Bill, as it has been modified to-day, for the publication and distribution of any copies of the complete lists divided into polling districts. Clause 21 shows that a list of each polling district shall be published in that district, but there is no provision made for distributing this list, after the preliminary revision, at all. By section 13 it is only the rough draft list, prepared by the revising officer, without any special means of information, that is to be published, posted up, and distributed. That is right enough; but it is very much more important that the list, as revised at the preliminary revision, should be distributed, because a great many names, such as those of a large number of tenants, wage-earners, income voters and fishermen, will be on the preliminary list, and I think it is only right that that list should receive, at least, as much publication as has been provided already for the rough draft list. That would be the effect of this amendment, and I hope the First Minister will see his way to accept it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have a clause prepared for the 21st section to that effect.

Mr. EDGAR. If so, I will withdraw my amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. WELDON. If we stop at the word "officer," then, when we take the sub-sections on pages 13 and 17, they will cover the whole ground.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that all the words after the word "officer," on the 49th line, page 12, be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. To prevent confusion, and for the convenience of the electors, the boundaries of the polling divisions should be described. If easy access be given to the description of these polling divisions each voter will know where to give his vote, and the simplest way would be to adopt the plan followed in many municipalities in Ontario, by placing at the head of the voters' list a description of each polling division. I move that after the word "district," in the 48th line, the words, "also a description of the said polling divisions," be added.

Mr. SPROULE. That is covered in the 21st clause.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposed, in reply to my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), to deal with the subject of the Indian voter. Does the hon. gentleman propose to take up the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My idea is, that when we get through the Bill, then the hon. gentleman can prepare his amendment, and he will have an opportunity of moving it. If adopted, we will consider what is the most proper place to insert it, while in committee.

On section 21,

Mr. EDGAR. The charge for these lists ought to be fixed. In the 13th section we have provided that the whole list shall not cost more than 50 cents. If the list for a polling sub-division were made to cost 10 cents, that would be much more than 50 cents for the whole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Make it not to exceed 10 cents.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is too much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to add to this section a provision that the revising officer shall deliver or transmit, by registered letter, copies of the list, as follows

—to each member of the council of the municipality and to the clerk and treasurer, and to the postmaster, one copy of the list for the municipality; to the sheriff, warden, clerk of the peace, etcetera, one copy relating to the electoral district; and ten copies relating to the electoral district to the members for the House of Commons, and the unsuccessful candidates at the last election.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister has mentioned the names of municipal officers, of officers of the Local Legislature, and of the municipal councils, as to receive copies of the list. I suppose it is for the purpose of furnishing facilities for the correction of the lists; but, after the list is finally revised, there is not the same reason for furnishing them with it. Now, surely it is of as much consequence that the local representatives should receive the list as the municipal councillors. The cost would be very little, indeed, of sending the list to the members of the Local Legislature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These parties who are named are local officers. These lists will not be of much value to the provincial members, because the qualification will be different, and the franchise will be different, and it will give them no information. Besides, it will be adding to the cost.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the phraseology in lines 11 and 12 would be improved if the hon. gentleman would strike out "three of such copies shall be posted in conspicuous public places," and make it read, "by causing copies to be posted in three conspicuous public places."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are quite right; it is better.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 22,

Mr. MILLS. This is for the final revision, which the hon. gentleman told us last night is the important one. It seems to me that the revising officer will require to indicate where and when he will hold his court in each municipality for the purpose of making this revision. It is important that full notice should be given with respect to the time and place of holding the final revision. Notice should be given in the newspapers.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Section 21 provides that copies of the notice shall be posted up in three conspicuous places, and that an advertisement shall also be inserted in a newspaper. So the whole notice does not depend on the newspaper publication. That is only additional. The only difficulty I see is with respect to the wording. I think it might be provided that the publication should be made in the nearest newspaper.

Mr. DAVIES. I move, in amendment:

That if there is no newspaper published in the municipality, then the the notice shall be published in one or more newspapers published in an adjoining municipality.

Amendment negatived.

On section 23,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That clause will have to be amended. I think, as at present, a person might not have one day to appeal at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to strike out the words "nor more than two weeks."

Mr. PATERSON. I would suggest something like 30 days.

Mr. MILLS. There ought to be at least three weeks after notice. In Ontario there are 30 days given for appeal to the county judge from the time of the publication of the list, and then the judge himself may fix any time after 10 days. There are 40 days allowed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would move that the words, "not less than one week nor more than two weeks" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof: "Not less than four weeks nor more than six weeks."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would agree to "not less than three weeks" after the publication.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In a large electoral district, with seven or eight municipalities, your agent or yourself would have to visit every polling sub-division, and you would find it impossible to take one municipality a day. In my riding I am sure there are some municipalities which would require two or three days. I should say that four weeks ought to be the least time allowed for the preparation of the list.

Mr. EDGAR. If it is intended to give three weeks for making appeals it is necessary to put four weeks in the first part of the section, because the person who is to appeal has to give one week's notice, which would leave only two weeks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Make it four weeks.

Mr. DAVIES. That being settled, I would suggest that the word "locality," in the 28th line, be struck out, and the words "parish or county court circuit" be put in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the first part of the clause be amended to read as follows: The day to be fixed, as aforesaid, for such final revision, shall not be less than four weeks after the publication, by posting up of the said lists as aforesaid, and the place shall be in the city, town, township, incorporated village, parish or other known territorial revision; and, in the Province of Prince Edward Island, in the local electoral district which includes such polling district; and in the electoral district in the Province of Nova Scotia, in such places, comprising not less than three polling districts, as the revising officer may think most convenient.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE moved that after the word "so," in line 33, the following words be added: Shall give proper notice for such purpose in the preliminary revision of such lists. This clause provides that a party desiring to object to any person or to amend or correct such list on the final revision shall have the right to do so on giving notice. I think we ought to provide that he shall have previously given notice at the preliminary revision of the list. It is not intended he should give notice twice after giving the notice required for the preliminary revision.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not see any object in having the remainder of the clause, from the 36th line, left in:

"And the day to be fixed in the said notice, as the day for the giving of notice of such objections or claims from any person, shall be not less than one week before the day named for the final revision."

The objection I see to it is this: The day to be fixed by the revising officer on his notice is not to be less than one week before the final revision. Now, we have provided that there are four weeks with reference to him, and suppose the revising officer was to fix as this day a day four weeks ahead. He has no option to fix it at less than a week, but he might require them to give three weeks' notice; the day he might fix might require three weeks' notice.

Mr. WELDON. The intention is that the party shall give at least one week's notice, but he does not fix the day in the notice. I think the language is very inapt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a good deal of verbiage there. It might be simplified in this way:

And any person desiring to object or add to, or in any way amend or correct such list, on the final revision, shall have the right to do so, on giving the same notice and following the same procedure as is provided for in the 16th section as to objections and amendments under the preliminary revision, and the notice of such objections or claims from any person shall serve not less than one week before the day named for final revision.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg to move:

That any person desiring to object to or add to, or in any way amend or correct such list, in the final revision, shall have a right to do so, if he has given proper notice at the preliminary revision, or upon giving such notice and following such procedure as is provided in the 16th section.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 5th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

Mr. EDGAR. I think this is the proper time, before petitions are read at the Table, to draw the attention of the House to one of the petitions which is in order to be read to-day. I will explain why I think so. I am not proposing to deal with the contents of the petition, which has not been read, but I propose to draw the attention of the House to the contents of the petition, as stated by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), when he presented it the other day; and I am inclined to think this is the proper time to do so, in order that the petition may not be read, if it is one which, under the circumstances, should not be read. It seems to be laid down in Cushing's practice as follows, with respect to the question of presenting petitions:—

"Two courses only are open. Either to allow all the petitions to be presented in the first instance, and upon reading them determine whether they are proper or not to be received, or to determine beforehand and without reading whether they are fit to be received. It might be said in favor of the first course that in no other way as well as by hearing the petition read could the the House determine on its character. But on the other hand it is obvious that if it were the duty of the House to hear all petitions of the House read, in the first, instance that might be offered, its time, and the time of its constituents, might be completely wasted in listening to petitions, upon which it would be impossible to proceed, or which might be made the vehicle of insult and outrage towards the House or its members. In view of the inconveniences by which this course would unavoidably be attended it is the established practice in Parliament to determine beforehand, and without reading a petition in the House, whether it is fit to be received."

If the hon. gentleman had not stated very fully the contents of that petition to the House it would have been impossible for me now to raise this question, but having done so, I think it is the proper time for me to point out the reasons why it should not be read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps we had better dispose of the other petitions first, and then we will come to that one. I suppose it is the petition of W. A. Milloy.

The remaining petitions having been received,

Mr. SPEAKER. The petition of W. A. Milloy having no signatures on the sheet of the apparent petition is therefore not in order, and cannot be received,

Mr. RYKERT. I move for leave to withdraw that petition. I do so, Sir, because I understand there are not three signatures attached to the original sheet. As it is important that the prayer of that petition should be accepted, I

would like to have the opportunity for the same gentleman to re-sign the petition, and to get two or three hundred more to sign it.

Mr. EDGAR. I am in favor of the motion of the hon. gentleman carrying, not only for the reasons he has given, but for others—because I am satisfied that the substance of that petition is not one which the House can entertain, or allow to be read, or receive after it has been read. Nothing can be clearer than that fact as laid down by the text books. I quote now from Cushing:

"The first essential requisite to a petition, so far as its substance is concerned, relates"——

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman has not the right to discuss the contents of the petition.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is whether it shall be withdrawn or not, and the hon. member has a right to speak on that question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes; I think the hon. gentleman has a right to discuss it.

Mr. EDGAR. I am supporting the motion of the hon. gentleman:

"The first essential requisite to a petition, so far as its substance is concerned, relates to the language in which it is expressed; it should be decorous and proper in itself, and also respectful towards the House to which it is addressed as well as its individual members, and to other co-ordinate bodies and authorities. And a breach of the rule is not only an insult to the legislative body but to the whole constituency, including the petitioners, of which that body is the representative, tending rather to excite ill-feeling than to promote calm deliberation, and admitting of no answer, consistently with parliamentary reform, beyond the simple rejection of the offensive document."

One of the tests which is to be applied to a petition in presenting it to the House, is:

"That when the language of a petition is such that, if spoken by a member in debate, it would be disorderly and unparliamentary, it is improper to be employed in a petition."

There are some instances given, as, for example, where a petition was presented to the English House of Commons, complaining of the great and unnecessary delay in passing the Reform Bill, and declaring that it was impeded by the upholding of corruption in the honorable House, who, upon the most frivolous pretence, wasted the public time. That was held to render it necessary that the petition should be rejected because it was improper to receive it. Now, this petition, as explained by the hon. gentleman who presented it, reflects upon the minority of the House of Commons, because it characterises the Opposition in this House as an unscrupulous Opposition.

Mr. RYKERT. That is true.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not true—every word of it is false.

Mr. EDGAR. It uses language which should not be used across the floor of this House by hon. members, regarding other members, and therefore it is entirely disrespectful to the House, as well as to a portion of the members of this House, that such a petition should be received. More than that: we know that under the rule it is improper to take advantage of the privilege which everybody in this country has of petitioning the House, to make allegations which are improper about either individuals of this House or other important bodies. We know that courts of justice cannot be attacked by petition, that even the social and local standing of individuals cannot be attacked by petition, while this petition, as explained by the hon. gentleman, reflects on a majority of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, by characterising them as designing and unscrupulous men.

Mr. RYKERT. That is true.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. RYKERT.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman is equally out of order with the petition when he says that. For these reasons I think it would have to be held that the petition in itself, in addition to the irregularity of signing it, is entirely out of order; and as to the irregularity of signing it, I think the hon. gentleman was quite right in asking to withdraw it on that account. The reason given for that rule is very plain indeed. In Bourinot's book, at page 263, in a note to the statement of that rule of the House, I find the following:—

"The reason of this rule may be understood by referring to a statement of Lord Clarendon. (History of Rebellion, Vol. II, page 367). That, in 1640, 'when a multitude of hands was procured, the petition itself was cut off, and the new one framed, suitable to the designing hand and annexed to the long list of names which were subscribed to the former. By this means many men found their hands subscribed to petitions of which before they had never heard.'"

For that reason I think it is quite right that the petition should be withdrawn.

Mr. RYKERT. In presenting the petition I did not look at it carefully to see whether the names were properly signed or not. Of course, my attention was drawn to it, and I therefore, very properly, I think, took steps to withdraw it. It is unfortunate, however, that the hon. gentleman has objected to the contents of the petition, because I think it is very necessary that the electors outside, who are our masters, should have an opportunity of telling us what they think of us here. However, the rules are such that the truth cannot always be told. I hope the motion will prevail, and I hope to be able to present the petition in another form in a few days, with 200 or 300 names added to it.

Motion agreed to, and petition withdrawn.

SCOTT ACT PETITIONS.

Mr. FOSTER. The motion I wish to make is to strike the name of John Hamilton, of Shelburne, from a petition which was presented to the House on Monday the 1st of June. I have had a letter from Shelburne, and accompanying it, this certificate:

"SHELBURNE, 1st June, 1884.

"I hereby certify that I did not sign or authorise any individual to sign my name to the petition (in favor of the sale of wine and beer) purporting to have come from Shelburne, Dufferin County.

"JOHN HAMILTON."

As Shelburne is not a very large place, and as Mr. Hamilton is an active member of the Scott Act Association, and does not wish to be held as standing sponsor to the prayer of the petition, I think it right that his name should be taken off.

Mr. CASEY. May there not be another John Hamilton in the place?

Mr. SPEAKER. We do not know that there is no other John Hamilton; there may be some other John Hamilton there, and there is no practice to warrant such a motion as this. In England there is a committee before which petitions are referred, and which reports, after making enquiry, that certain names should be struck off for being improperly signed, or signed without authority; but in this case, I think the House has already evidence enough to show that there is no other John Hamilton.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think the hon. gentleman's purpose is served by his calling attention to the fact that a Mr. John Hamilton, of Shelburne, whose name is supposed to be on this petition, did not sign it. He is therefore relieved from the responsibility of having signed it; but I do not see how we can strike off a name simply because a person of the same name says he did not sign it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not see how we can strike off the name of John Hamilton, who did sign this petition, at the request of John Hamilton who did not sign it.

Mr. FOSTER. Shelburne is a small place, and he gives me his opinion that there is no other John Hamilton there. I therefore felt it necessary to call the attention of the House to the matter, and the only way in which I could do so was by moving. There are several things about this petition which, to my mind, go to show its worthlessness as an expression of public opinion. After the petition had been signed, some person to whom it has been sent has taken the liberty to interlard remarks all through it in red ink. For instance, before the name of A. Henderson, he has put the word "reverend," and after it, "Church of England, Orangeville." A similar note is made with reference to the name of W. E. McKay; a number are stated to be leading merchants; and another is stated to be a merchant tailor. I find also, column after column, of names in this petition evidently signed by the same hand. There is one column of nineteen names evidently signed by the same hand, with the same kind of ink, and I judge at the same time. But the astonishing thing about these nineteen names is that they are of men who come from five different townships or villages. At the end there are forty or fifty names signed without the least clue to their residence or place of abode. All these things go to show that this petition is not a very valuable exponent of the will or wishes of the people.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is a little hard to please. He began by objecting because someone had added to the names on the petition something in red ink, and then he objects that at the end there are a number of names without any additions. I think the best way to get rid of Mr. Hamilton's difficulty would be for him to present a petition in favor of the reverse of what this petition prays for, and that he should say, like the police court reports, that it is not the same John Hamilton.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the rule is that a person signing his own name should give his place of residence and his own description.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all. In England the other thing is often done.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 24,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that after the word "complaint," in the 43rd line, the following words be added: "To add to, amend or correct the list as on the last clause mentioned."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The revising officer, though he has all the powers of a court of record, can dispose of all those appeals without evidence on oath. It does not necessarily follow he is bound to take evidence at all. This clause states: "And shall hear and dispose of any objection or complaint of which notice shall have been given as aforesaid, hearing the parties making the same if they appear, and any evidence that may be adduced before him in support of or in opposition thereto." Section 25 states this is a court possessed of the powers of a court of record, and the judge has all the powers of a judge of a court of record. He is at liberty to call witnesses and examine them under oath, but, by this section, he can dispose of the objections without calling witnesses at all, and can hear the evidence without its being under oath. I would suggest to add after the word "dispose," in the 42nd line, the words "on evidence," and after the words "opposition thereto," in the 46th line, the words "on oath." An appeal would be wholly useless for the revising officer unless the evidence were taken down in writing and given under oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's objection is merely hypercritical. Take the formation of any court in the world, you do not say it will be obligatory on the court to take evidence under oath. That is *ex necessitate*; the two clauses taken together show that the evidence must be on oath. The hon. gentleman says it must be only on oath. He would not allow the Quaker and the Mennonite to give evidence.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They could give what is equal to an oath. Under section 25, the revising officer has the power to administer the oath, but is not bound to do so.

Mr. CASEY. The First Minister has given his opinion, but other lawyers are as likely to differ from him as the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron). The right hon. gentleman may know that the intent is that the evidence shall be taken under oath, but that is no guide to any person interpreting the clause afterwards. If he finds in the words of the Act liberty to dispense with the oath, he may avail himself of it in spite of the intention. The hon. gentleman says this barrister will be bound to take evidence under oath, as much as the judges of any other court, but they are bound by continuous practice, if not by statute. Evidence would be useless in those courts unless given under oath. The court it is proposed to create here has no precedents. It is something purely anomalous, and different from any other court in existence. The Bill sets the revising officer, who is to be the court himself, free from all the trammels of the ordinary courts. Under clause 40, the whole of the preliminary proceedings are at his mercy. He may dispense with notices, and allow cases to be tried which would be informal even under this Act. "He is not to be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure." He is expressly set free from following precedents or rules of other courts, or the rules laid down in this Act itself. Under these circumstances, it is simply trifling with the House to tell us that he will be bound to take evidence on oath under this section. Under section 55, he is authorised to strike out names, or add them, and generally to correct the list, upon such information as he may possess and without objections or claims being made. I must support the amendment of my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron), and, speaking of the matter calmly and deliberately, I have very little doubt that the right hon. gentleman will, on mature thought, accept it; because I cannot assume, in justice to him, that it was his intention to allow the revising officer to proceed without sworn evidence in dealing with such an important matter as the vote of a citizen. No matter how small a matter may be at issue in a division court or before a county board, the evidence is taken on oath, and these are matters quite despicable in comparison with this. I have never heard of a court of revision before a county judge deciding any matter in regard the voters' list except on oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this case, he must do so.

Mr. CASEY. That is the right hon. gentleman's opinion, but his opinion has been so frequently and continuously wrong on questions of law, that we cannot pay any special attention to it. The subsequent sections of the Bill say distinctly that he need not take evidence on oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know the clauses.

Mr. CASEY. If he does it is most extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should speak as he has in regard to them. The 55th section does not mean that the revising officer is to take evidence on oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Move against that clause.

Mr. CASEY. We will discuss that clause when we come to it, but that clause expresses the intention of the Bill as much as this one. If the hon. gentleman's intentions are to require that the evidence shall be taken on oath, let him show the sincerity of his intentions by accepting the amendment. If he does not, I shall have to withdraw what I said a few moments ago, that I could not credit him with a deliberate intention to allow these matters to be decided without the sanction of an oath. The inference will be so obvious that we need not go into it. The objection to the word "oath" is very trifling, because it is generally understood that it includes an affirmation on the part of those entitled to affirm. The clause could be easily so arranged as to require precisely the same sanction from a man giving evidence in regard to a vote as in regard to property. That is all we ask. It would be perfectly scandalous if a man's vote could be taken from him on evidence given under any less sanction than is required in the case of goods and chattels.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will move the amendment which I suggested. I did not for a moment suppose that the hon. gentleman would object to this amendment. He states that the revising officer cannot hear any evidence, except on oath, and cannot adjudicate on any objections unless they are sustained by evidence given on oath. I think otherwise. I think under this clause he can adjudicate without any evidence at all, and certainly without the evidence having the sanction of an oath, at all events there is a doubt about it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no doubt.

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman intends that the revising officer shall hear no evidence except on oath, he should put that beyond any question. There is a question now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. CAMERON. Other lawyers take a different view of it, though, perhaps, not of the eminence of the hon. gentleman. I move that, after the word "dispose," in the 42nd line, the words "upon evidence," be inserted, and after the word "thereto," in the 45th line, the words "on oath or affirmation," be inserted.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. Minister's attention to the meaning of this clause with regard to evidence. Would the production of a deed, without its being sworn to, be evidence of a man's title? The man says: "This is my title, and I claim to be the owner." Would not the revising officer be entitled to accept that deed as evidence adduced without the party being sworn? I think that he might. It seems to me that the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), cannot do any harm, at least. Then I would ask the hon. gentleman's attention to the statement that he made the other day, that he proposed, in case the revising officer was not a judge, that there should be a re-hearing of the whole case anew; that it would not be simply an appeal, but, that the judge to whom the appeal was made, would be entitled to take evidence anew. I would like to know if I understood the hon. gentleman rightly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said there might be an appeal as to fact as well as to law.

Mr. MILLS. Beyond that, whether in case there was an appeal from the revising officer to the county judge, the latter should take evidence anew, if desired by the parties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman said the judge would have original jurisdiction.

Mr. CASEY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A judge in appeal cannot have original jurisdiction.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not speaking about a judge in appeal. I put the question to the First Minister some time ago across the floor of the House, as to whether the appeal to be granted would be a complete appeal, and whether the judge sitting, you may say in appeal, but sitting and reviewing the action of the revising officer, would have original jurisdiction; and the First Minister said yes, and that he would have appellate jurisdiction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh no, I did not say anything like that—certainly not.

Mr. MILLS. That is what I understood from the hon. gentleman—that there was to be a re-hearing of the whole case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never contemplated anything so absurd.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman calls it an absurdity, but it is an absurdity that exists in many courts, and I could give him many instances where an appeal is not simply in the sense of hearing questions of law and reading evidence, taking facts from the notes taken at the original procedure, but beginning the procedure anew, and taking all the evidence anew. The hon. gentleman will see that if he is not going to adopt that rule, and if the county judge is to take evidence from the notes of the revising barrister, then it is of immense consequence that the revising barrister should be called upon where necessary to take down the evidence of the witnesses, and that the evidence should be subscribed by the witnesses, that there may be no dispute, and that there may not be an unfair representation of the evidence before the county judge Now, the hon. gentleman does not propose to carry out that intention as we understood him the other day, but intends that it shall be simply an appeal in the ordinary form from the decision of the revising officer. It is therefore of the greatest consequence that the evidence should be taken down with care and subscribed to by the witness, in order that there may not be a colored representation of the evidence, and especially ought it to be so when taken by a man with little practice and without any professional skill. We all know that the revising officer, where he is not a judge, must be a man of very little practice; he must be a man to whom it will be an object to accept the position, and probably a man of inferior legal attainments and of no legal standing. He is not likely, therefore, to have the confidence of the community, and consequently it is very important that the evidence should be thoroughly reliable. We all know the old practice of taking depositions in the Court of Chancery in Ontario, where the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor took down the evidence, and read it over to the witness, and, if it was not such as the witness intended it should be, corrections were made, and it was afterwards subscribed to by the witness. It seems to me that is the proper form for preserving the evidence wherever parties may desire it before the revising barrister. I therefore trust that the hon. gentleman will make an amendment, adding the words, "such evidence to be taken down in writing and signed by the witness where either of the parties require the same." I think this is nothing more than an adequate protection to parties whose rights are to be affected, and it is only fair to the county judge before whom the case is to be tried, that the evidence should be accurately presented to him, since he is not to have an opportunity of examining the witnesses himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are drifting again into the unwholesome practice of looking ahead instead of at the clause before the committee. The question is this, whether this clause sufficiently contains the junction—if I may use the word—of the revising barrister, with the evi-

dence taken under oath. I think it is so clear that it scarcely requires an argument. But I think there is a strong objection to putting these words in. It must be remembered, Mr. Chairman, that this revising barrister—if I may refer to the Ontario practice, as others have done—is doing the work of a court of review, in settling the list. This is not a contentious matter, in which proceedings, as well as the right of parties, are brought up hostilely between plaintiff and defendant. The revising officer is to prepare a true list. Now, if we put in words that the evidence that must be taken on oath, or what is equivalent to an oath, in all cases, you will see how completely you choke and obstruct the whole machine. Now, I will give you an instance. To continue the illustration of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), a man is entered as an owner, and opposite his name is written "objected to." He comes before the revising barrister and says: "Here is my deed." Well, the objector, perhaps, withdraws his objection. There is an end of it, and the man's name is passed. But in this case, when the objection is once entered, evidence must be taken on oath, in every case. He sits there, supposed to be an indifferent party, as a judge. Every name is called up, and when objection is made the party is again asked: "Do you object?" He says: "Yes, I persist in my objection." He will turn round to the party who is objected to, and say: "What have you to say?" "Here is my deed," he replies. The objector looks at the deed, and the matter is settled. If, in the case of every objection there is to be evidence taken, hon. gentlemen will see that it will obstruct and clog the wheels of the whole machine. But, when the objection is once made and persisted in, the party must give evidence—it is before court; the whole tenor of the clause shows that legal evidence must be offered. There is no doubt about that. I cannot accede to the amendment.

Mr. WELDON. The very arguments used by the hon. gentlemen, show the necessity of the amendment. This is not a court of record, although the judge will have like powers. Frequently, in a court, objection is waved as to legal evidence. A deed is produced, and the party says I do not want the deed proved. So, in the case cited for purposes of illustration, the objection made by the party would be withdrawn, and the matter thus settled. The proposed provision with respect to taking evidence under oath is, however, desirable; because we must remember that a great many of the revising officers would be barristers of five years' standing, during which period a lawyer does not gain much experience. It is just as well to make the clause so plain that he who runs may read. With respect to the justices court, that is a court of common law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not a court of common law, but a court of statutory enactment.

Mr. WELDON. With respect to the justices court, we find that when it is a matter outside of the ordinary investigation, the Act provides that the justice shall not issue a warrant until satisfied, not by evidence, but by evidence on oath or on affirmation. This is not an unreasonable amendment to propose.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. First Minister said a few moments ago that this clause and the next clause compelled the revising officer to take evidence upon oath. But when he spoke last the hon. gentleman said, if the revising officer were to be compelled to take evidence in all cases on oath, it would be "clogging and obstructing the wheels of the machine." Perhaps it might be so. If this Bill is intended to be a machine, and for a certain purpose, we can easily understand that the requirement of evidence on oath might clog and obstruct the machine. But that is not a reason which should weigh with the House in passing this section. This is the beautiful position occupied by the father of the Bill. He has given expression to two different views within fifteen minutes. "Machine" is a very favorite word with American politicians. I do not know whether it is intended to create, by this Bill, a machine, such as was worked by Boss Tweed in New York; but it is a very significant and peculiar word to use in this connection. The hon. gentleman says we have fallen into the unwholesome practice of looking at the rest of the Bill. I do not think it is an unwholesome practice. If the section is not clear, we must look at other sections in order to endeavor to understand it; it would be a very unwholesome practice to go on with an imperfect knowledge of what the section meant. On the face of this section it simply says that the revising officer shall hear and dispose of any objections or complaints. It does not say how he shall hear or how he shall dispose of them. We have to look for that information elsewhere. In the 40th section it says that the revising officer is not to be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure. Section 55 says he may make changes without complaint being made, and on any information within his possession. It distinctly says that he need not require evidence. Those sections, taken with the First Minister's last statement, show that our suspicions were correct, and that it is not intended that the revising officer shall take evidence under oath. Consequently, we are bound to return to the suspicion we first entertained, namely, that there was an intentional omission of any obligation to take evidence on oath, and that it was made for some purpose. A statement of the purpose has now been given to us. The omission of the requirement to take evidence under oath is to let the machine work, the hon. gentleman has told us. That is all very well for those who are going to run the machine, but we cannot be expected to look at it in the same light. The hon. First Minister said the revising officer would be "supposed to be sitting as an indifferent person." Who will suppose him to be so sitting? Not the hon. gentleman himself. He will never suppose one of his revising officers to be sitting as an indifferent person. He knows where the officer's sympathies will be and how cases of doubt will be decided. The hon. gentleman said that a person might object to another man's vote; that the man objected to might produce a deed which would satisfy the objector, and thereupon the case would be settled, and the revising officer would not have to act. Of course, he would not have to act, and, in such a case would not have to take evidence. We only ask that he shall take evidence where he will have to give a decision. He would not be required to take evidence in the supposed case, because there would be no case before him and nothing to be tried and disposed of. And there is nothing in the objection which he evidently makes on the spur of the moment; and when that objection is dropped, the case is dropped. I think the hon. gentleman's own speeches have shown clearly the meaning and intention of this clause; and that, I think, against his own will; and now that we do know the object, it is all the more necessary, in the interest of both parties, to contend that the sacred right to vote should be guarded by an oath or its equivalent. Even if the revising officer is a partisan Conservative, he will have his dislikes, his feelings of ill-will to individuals; and where it does not injure the party, he will be ready to gratify these feelings even against Conservatives. When this side of the House comes into power, if they chose to continue such an iniquitous law, if they chose to appoint revising barristers, I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite how they would like to have their right to the franchise left at the mercy of this partisan officer, without the safeguard of taking evidence on oath? I do not ask hon. gentlemen literally to put themselves in our places, because I know they are not at all likely to move over to this side at our request, but I do ask them to do so

theoretically, and to imagine a Grit revising barrister settleing the franchise of themselves and their friends without taking the evidence on oath. They now complain that Grit assessors are frauds, that they cheat them out of their votes, but not only is the assessor a sworn officer himself, but his work is revised at the first revision—the court of revision —on oath, and it is also revised on oath by the judge at the final revision. But here there is no such safeguard, for we have no revision except this final one, and there the revising officer is not only not compelled to take the evidence on oath, but he need not take evidence at all. He is not compelled to keep a record of the evidence to be used in the case of appeal, and under such circumstances what a farce an appeal will be! This section undoubtedly requires to be altered in the direction of both amendments which have been placed in your hands.

Mr. LISTER. I cannot see why the First Minister, as he has stated that it is intended that the revising officer shall take the evidence under oath, should not accept the amendments proposed. In the English Act I find that the word used is not "evidence," but "proof," which would imply that the proof must be under oath, but that on the other hand the word "evidence" does not necessarily mean that the proof adduced before the revising officer shall be under oath. The English Act provides that the revising officer is to examine upon oath, all persons who come before him, whether they are the persons objecting, or those objected to. I find also that the Ontario Act in providing for appeal against over assessment, provides that certain evidence shall not be required under oath except under certain circumstances, so that the mere fact that the word evidence is used, does not make it imperative on the revising officer that the evidence shall be under oath. Now, when you consider that there is to be an appeal from the revising officer, unless he is the county judge, upon questions of fact, it must strike every person who considers the matter, that it is exceedingly important that the evidence taken at the first revision should be in writing and under oath, unless it is intended to give the judge original jurisdiction. The First Minister says that is not the intention, and that being the case, it is infinitely more important that the evidence should be taken on oath in a matter of this kind, and that it should be fully and properly taken, than in a question as to the rights of individuals regarding property or money, because it affects the right of the individual which no money compensation can make up for. The revising barrister is created a court for the hearing of complaints. The decision of that court is subject to appeal to another tribunal, and when the First Minister says it is not necessary to state in this section that the evidence shall be under oath, although that is intended, it seems to me he has some sinister object in refusing this amendment. If the evidence is to be under oath why not make the section clear to that effect? Why should there be any doubt about it? Why depart from the words of the English law? If the word "evidence" were sufficient to require the revising officer to take the evidence under oath, I submit that the words "under oath" would not have been used in the English statute. They are not there for nothing; they are there for some object; and if it is necessary that these words should be used in the English Act, there is an equal necessity for them to be used in this Act, and I think it would be the grossest oversight on the part of this Parliament to pass an Act and neglect to provide distinctly in so essential a portion as this, what the duties of the revising officer are. We have reason to think that these revising officers will not be particularly favorable to the Liberal party; there is a feeling throughout the country that these gentlemen, whom the hon. gentleman himself appoints, will, in some cases, be unduly favorable to the side which has appointed them. Therefore it is the duty of the Government to remove that fear as far as possible. I am not charging these men with wrong-doing; but, under this law, there is a possibility that grievous wrong may be done, and if the Act is to receive that respect which an Act of this kind is expected to receive, it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to place this question beyond all doubt and cavil. If you look at every other Act in which it is intended that witnesses shall be examined on oath, the words are distinctly used that the witnesses shall be examined on oath or that the evidence shall be taken on oath. I do not say that the hon. gentleman is not right; but it is open to cavil and argument; it is open to the revising officer to do perhaps, some great injustice to a person appearing before him. The amendment is a most reasonable one. The First Minister, at the last sitting, evinced a desire to meet the views of the Opposition; and why should he not insert these words and put this question beyond all doubt? He intends to allow an appeal where the revising officer is not a judge of the county court; yet he says the judge is not to have original jurisdiction. He is not to have the right to bring before him the evidence which was brought before the revising officer; he is just to take such evidence as the revising officer thinks proper to take down, be it under oath or not under oath. He has not power to bring the witnesses before him for examination. If there is to be an appeal, and the judge has not power to bring the witnesses before him for examination, then it should be declared that the evidence taken before the revising officer should be in writing and should be taken under oath, then the parties would have an opportunity of examining and cross-examining. This is a very vital amendment, and without it the Act will be very imperfect. I hope the First Minister will reconsider the matter and accept the amendment.

Mr. MACMASTER. The question is whether the provisions of the Bill are sufficient to authorise the revising officer to take evidence under oath.

Some hon. MEMBERS. To compel him.

Mr. MACMASTER. Yes, to compel him to take evidence under oath. The hon. gentleman who spoke last would not undertake to say that the interpretation the hon. First Minister placed on this section was wrong; but he thought that for greater precision the words "under oath" should be inserted. If the Bill is so explicit that there can be no reasonable doubt that the revising officer must take the evidence under oath, then it is undesirable to clog it with unnecessary words. It seems to me, on reading the 24th and 25th sections together, that hon. gentlemen opposite are making captious objections against the Bill. The 24th section provides that the revising officer shall hear the parties who make the complaints, and any evidence that may be adduced before him in support of or in opposition thereto; and when we turn to the next section, we find that he is there fully empowered to take evidence under oath.

An hon. MEMBER. He can do as he likes.

Mr. MACMASTER. Hon. gentlemen know perfectly well that if he proceeded improperly he might be compelled by a higher court to do otherwise. But I would refer hon. gentlemen to the terms in which the Ontario statute gives similar powers. The hon. gentleman did not read all the provisions; he only read one or two of them. In the 56th section of the Municipal Act, it is declared that the court of revision, or some member thereof, may administer an oath—it is not shall; it is not made obligatory—may administer an oath to any witness before his evidence is taken.

Mr. LISTER. But for that no person could administer an oath. It merely authorises them to administer an oath.

Mr. MACMASTER. This is a declaration of the authority of the court of revision to administer an oath, although there is nothing saying that they shall be bound to take the evidence under oath, yet we find a subsequent section in the Ontario Act dispensing with the necessity of doing so. Sub-section 16, of section 56, says:

"It shall not be necessary to hear upon oath the complainant or assessor, or the party complained against, unless where the court deems it necessary or proper, or the evidence of the party is rendered on his own behalf or required by the opposite party."

So that the framers of this statute, which governs in Ontario, clearly intend that the earlier section giving the power to administer the oath, should imply the authority to take the evidence in that way and in no other way; otherwise there would not be a subsequent section in the statute exempting the court from the obligation to hear a party under oath. A good deal has been said about a few remarks of the First Minister as to parties who appear before the revising officer and produce a deed from which it is evident there can be no serious contestation. An occurrence of that kind may take place before a case is actually opened. A man, on the case being called, may produce his deed, the opposite party sees he has a good sound title, and the case is withdrawn. I do not see, according to my views of the construction of the statute, how there can be the slightest doubt under the terms of these two sections, 24 and 25, as to the revising officer being obliged to take evidence under oath, and in no other way, when he proceeds to the trial of a case. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) states he has found some subsequent sections in the Act that seemed to lend countenance to his view, one being to the effect that the revising officer, in the discharge of a summary duty, need not proceed with the ordinary legal strictness as to the rules of evidence, that he shall not be bound by the strict rules of evidence or procedure, but that does not relieve him from hearing evidence under oath, it is only a declaration that he is not bound to proceed with the same strictness as to form, the same particularly as to the rules of evidence, which, as the hon. member for West Elgin must be aware from his long experience at the bar, would be thoroughly impracticable in summary proceedings. This is a matter of legal opinion, and, according to my view, there cannot be any reasonable doubt that under the section as it stands, the revising officer is bound to administer the oath when he proceeds to try the case.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has confused two entirely distinct questions. The one is where a party may be in power to administer the oath and may require evidence to be taken under oath; the other is whether it is evidence unless taken under oath. It is the latter we have under consideration. The First Minister holds that the section, as it stands, leaves the revising officer no option, that he must take the evidence under oath. It is true he subsequently modified that view, he said it would be highly inconvenient to insist upon any such rule; but I do not think we can understand, after all, that he meant to seriously argue that his first contention was wrong. On the contrary, I think he still holds to the view that "evidence" means legal evidence in the sense in which the expression is used in court, and that it could not be admitted unless it was under oath. How are we to understand the word "evidence" in this Bill? Are we to understand that it means sworn testimony and no other? If we look at the different provisions, I do not think we can come to that conclusion. My hon. friend from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has shown that the word is not used in that sense in the English statute. You find the qualifying word "under oath" used when it is obligatory upon the revising barrister so to take the testimony, and if these words are used in one portion of the statute and omitted in another, you cannot give to the word "evidence" where it is not qualified the same meaning as where it is qualified. Take the next section, the words "taking evidence under oath before him" are used. Why say "under oath before him", if it is clear that the words "under oath" are not necessary? Now, when we look at the Act relating to summary convictions, 18th section, we find "if the justice is satisfied on the evidence upon oath or affirmation." If the word "evidence" always implies sworn testimony why qualify it by saying "on oath" in the statute? It may be according to the ordinary practice of courts, that evidence is taken in a particular way, but when we use the word evidence in a statute, we do not always mean to use it in a strict sense, and when we qualify it as we have done in parts of this Bill and fail to qualify it in other sections, it is perfectly clear we do not give to the word evidence, with the "restrictive" words applied, the same sense as we give it without them. My hon. friend points out that in this particular statute relating to summary convictions, when you are speaking of evidence before a court you do so not qualified, but when speaking of evidence outside of a court it is qualified. This revising officer is not a court of record; he has some of the functions of a court of record, but what he does is not done in a court of record, and it seems to me there is no intelligible reason for using in a subsequent section the words "and the taking of evidence under oath before him," and using the words "any evidence that may be adduced before him" in the other case. If the qualifying words are required in the one case they are required in the other.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) says this is a matter of legal opinion entirely, and he gives his opinion that this section requires the evidence to be taken under oath. We are not merely discussing whether this section requires that evidence shall be taken under oath, but whether the revising officer is required by it to take evidence at all. This section does not say that he must. The legal opinion of the hon. gentleman goes for a great deal, and he has the good fortune to agree with one of the opinions of the First Minister, who gave two distinct contradictory opinions. The latter said in the first place that this section does require evidence to be taken under oath, and in that he has the hon. member for Glengarry with him. In the second place, about 15 minutes later, he said that to insist upon evidence being taken upon oath would block the wheels of the whole machine. Here we are in a nice box of legal opinions. We have the Premier deciding against himself, and some of his supporters agree with one of his opinions and some with the other, though we have only heard of the one yet. There are many lawyers on that side and we should hear from them on this subject. The member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who is so frequently in consultation with his leader, should tell us which of these opinions he agrees with.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not agree with yours.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with the second of the Premier's opinions, that these sections do not provide for the taking of evidence on oath. The hon. member for Lincoln disagrees with me, so he must disagree with the Premier on that point. There are plenty of other lawyers there who must tell us which horn of the dilemma they choose. When we find a house divided against itself, and a party divided against itself, and the Premier divided against himself in regard to the meaning of this clause, what are we to do? I think we should cast legal opinions to the dogs, and look at the Bill with the aid of common sense.

Mr. RYKERT. Then you are ruled out.

Mr. CASEY. I am gratified by the compliment, as I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks my sense is so uncommon that it cannot be described as common sense. If it is not intended, as the Premier now says to require evidence

on oath, the vote of everyone is left at the mercy of a partisan lawyer without any safeguard whatever. If the member for Lincoln believes that to be in consonance with the common sense of the country, I hope he will show us where the justice is. His leader has not shown it at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not propose to discuss the legal aspect of this question, but I propose to call the attention of the committee to this fact, that, when the objection was first taken by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Cameron), the answer of the Premier was distinct and plain, that it was a work of supererogation, that it was quite superfluous, that he was not going to overload this clause by inserting perfectly useless words. That is what he said in the first instance in reference to the amendment, but at a subsequent stage he declared that his objection was of a totally different kind; he stated that he objected to introducing the words because they would seriously clog and retard and interfere with the proper working of the court. There can be no denying that these two lines of objection will not stand. If the language was superfluous it would be mere redundancy, and could in nowise interfere with the working of the clause. But there is another matter which requires more attention than has yet been given to it. If I followed correctly the language of the First Minister, he declared that he did not intend to permit the county court judge, to whom these decisions might finally be referred, to exercise original jurisdiction, in other words, he would be confined entirely to the evidence which was taken on this occasion. If that be the case—and, if I am wrong, I should be very glad to be corrected on that point—then it does appear that my hon. friends are perfectly right in requiring that this evidence should be put on record and taken upon oath, because, if it only is to become the basis of a subsequent appeal, it would be very unreasonable that evidence should appear before the revising officer on which he affirms his decision, which, not being taken down and not being on oath, might not appear before the party to whom it is finally referred. That is a point on which I think the committee might fairly ask for some further information, whatever the legal aspect of the case may be.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the section is sufficiently important to justify the whole of the committee in wishing that it should be placed beyond reasonable doubt. The 25th section gives power to the revising officer to take evidence. I should say, if I were asked my opinion, that it meant legal evidence, and, if I was sitting as revising officer, I should require it to be taken on oath. But the administration of this law is to be entrusted, in some instances at any rate, to those who are not accustomed to construing legal evidence, to those who are just commencing their legal career, for instance, to the notaries in the Province of Quebec, and I do not see why we should not make it perfectly clear. It is evident now that there is a difference of opinion. I to some extent agree with my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) as to the legal construction of the clause, but I have heard other hon. gentlemen, who perhaps are more distinguished than my hon. friend, who have a different opinion. Why not put in the words to make it clear? I do not suppose the First Minister thought much about it when it was first mentioned, and he said there were cases in which it would be desirable that the matter should be settled without any evidence at all. That could be done, as the hon. member for Glengarry pointed out, whether these words are put in or not; but, as the law is to be carried out by those who are not accustomed to construe statutes, and who may put different meanings upon it, it may give rise to incalculable trouble and mischief if you leave it in this way.

Mr. MACMASTER. Any anxiety I might have felt as to the accuracy of my opinion is entirely dispelled by the circumstance that my opinion is in agreement with that of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think, however, that my hon friend has such a very high opinion of his own ability that he would pit it against some of the hon. members on the other side who have expressed a different opinion, even when he is backed up by my poor opinion.

Mr. MACMASTER. It is not necessary I should express any opinion on that subject.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that, before this question is decided——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you have done groaning, I will talk. If the revising officer is called upon to discharge his duties in connection with this Act, and swears a number of people when they consider it a question whether he has a right to swear them or not, they might feel annoyed. Now I hold it should be imperative upon him to take evidence under oath. We know that there is likely to be some political spite between parties in different sections, and a man in political sympathy with the revising officer may make complaints against certain parties in order to have them struck off the roll, and the revising officer may hear the evidence under oath of the witnesses whom the objector may bring up, while he may refuse to put those witnesses under oath whom the parties defending may bring up. It is absurd to say the revising barrister shall have the power to say whether he shall swear a man or whether he shall not. Now, the First Minister stated that these proceedings were very much after the mode of the revision court in Ontario. If the hon. gentleman was acquainted with the proceedings of the revision court he would know that in the municipal courts everyone is sworn; they have power to administer the oath if a party claims to be put on or claims to be put off, and the oath is nearly always administered. As the hon. gentleman says this is a mode of the court of revision, the practice should be the same, and the revising officer should be compelled to take evidence under oath if required to do so, the same as in the court of revision. This clause and the other clause are drawn evidently with ambiguity, for the purpose of allowing the revising officer to refuse to take evidence under oath if he is disposed to refuse. I am sorry to find that whenever an amendment is offered defining the power of the revising barrister the First Minister refuses to accept it. The hon. gentleman evidently desires to leave this officer power to do just as he pleases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says that the court of revision is sworn. Quite true; so will the revising barrister be sworn to perform his duties. The hon. gentleman says the court of revision is compelled to take oath whenever it is demanded. If the hon. gentleman will look at the 16th clause of the municipal law of Ontario he will find that it is not necessary to hear witnesses and oath.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is not so with parties tendering themselves. The hon. gentleman will read the whole clause carefully and he will find that when parties——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.—

"It shall not be necessary to hear upon oath the complainant or assessor or the party complained against unless where the court deems it necessary or proper."

Mr. CAMERON. Go on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.—

"Or the evidence of the party is tendered in his own behalf or required by the opposite party."

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman only read one line; if he had read the whole section he would have found that if a party to the litigation tendered himself as a witness his evidence cannot be taken unless he is sworn, and

any person can be compelled to be sworn if it is demanded by the opposite party. That is all we want here. When I made my proposition first the hon. gentleman contended vigorously that under clauses 23 and 42 of this Bill the revising barrister was to take evidence on oath. At a subsequent stage the hon. gentleman declared that to compel the revising barrister to take this evidence on oath was to clog the whole machine.

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

Mr. CAMERON. Did the hon. gentleman not say so?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just go on.

Mr. CAMERON. Certainly I so understood him. However, I took it for granted that the hon. gentleman adheres to his view that this evidence cannot be taken except upon oath. Now, Sir, that is not the proposition the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) submitted. He went upon the assumption that we argued that the revising barrister had no power to administer the oath. We did not so argue. We admitted that he has the power to administer the oath under clause 25, and we say that having that power he ought to be bound to administer the oath, and ought not to receive any evidence unless he does so. If our contention is correct the effect will be that the revising officer can swear one side and may not swear the other side—he can swear whoever he pleases. It may be said that is an extreme case; perhaps it is, still, if the hon. gentleman wants to have his Bill logical, he must base it upon logical consequences. He argues that the word evidence implies an oath. I say it does not imply an oath. What is the meaning of evidence? It does not mean an oath at all. It is the matter or the material by which a given proposition is proved. For instance, you take a promissory note that is sued upon, and the note is denied. You say that the promissory note is the evidence. You take a deed and you bring an action of ejectment upon it, you produce the deed as evidence of your title. That deed is not the evidence of your title; you have first to show whether it is a deed or not. You establish that by the oath of witnesses, or in some other way known to the law. Evidence is the matter or material that you use for the purpose of establishing your proposition. That is the technical meaning of the word evidence. Now, Sir, it is laid down by Holthouse in his Law Dictionary:

"In its general sense, then, evidence may be said to signify any matter which is brought forward for the purpose of ascertaining the truth of any particular fact, or of any point in issue."

It is the matter brought forward, it is not the way to bring the matter forward or the mode or the condition upon which the matter is brought forward. The condition of evidence on oath implies that the man must be sworn. The fact must be established upon oath, and evidence itself is only the material by which to establish the proposition; and that matter cannot be established except subject to the law of the land that it must be established under oath.

"It is called evidence because the point at issue is to be made evidence."

True it is called evidence in the first instance, but it is not evidence unless it is established by oath. The hon. gentleman says that evidence implies evidence taken on oath. I challenge him to find any warrant for his statement. It does not mean that. But even assuming that it does mean it, what does this Bill say? If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at the Bill they will see that the revising officer can decide matters of controversy without taking a particle of evidence. What does the Bill say? "He shall dispose of any objection and complaint of which notice has been given, after hearing the parties making the same, if they appear before him." It simply required the revising officer to hear the parties; not hear them on oath and take evidence, but simply hear statements. It says hearing the parties, and any evidence adduced in support of the proposition. Suppose there is no evidence except the evidence of the parties themselves. The returning officer can hear complaints, and without a tittle of evidence, he can adjudicate. In what position are the parties to the objection to be placed if the revising officer is simply to hear the complainant and respondent without evidence being given on oath? Suppose the parties are dissatisfied and there is an appeal. The hon. gentleman now tells us that the appeal is to be an appeal in reality. But how can an appeal be taken if there is no evidence, nothing on which to base an appeal? How is there to be an appeal if the revising officer is not bound to take down a tittle of evidence; if he is not bound to swear the parties? The clause says that the revising officer may upon the statement of parties dispose of the case. One party may be dissatisfied and appeal; but there will be no evidence taken down, and, if the evidence is taken down, it is not taken down under the solemnity of an oath. If the hon. gentleman really desires this Bill to be a proper Bill, that justice and fair play shall be meeted out to both political parties, and that the revising officer shall not do anything but what the law allows him to do, then the hon. gentleman ought, if not in the words I have adopted, in his own words, provide that evidence shall be taken under oath. The hon. gentleman said that evidence means evidence under oath. We say it does not. If there is a doubt why should not the hon. gentleman remove it, and leave the matter so plain that there can be no question about it, by providing that the evidence taken shall be evidence on oath. I should be sorry to say that hon. gentlemen opposite are actuated by ulterior motives in this matter; but when a grave question of this kind comes up, and when lawyers declare on their responsibility as members of Parliament and as members of the legal profession that the hon. gentleman's interpretation is not the correct one, surely it is the simplest thing for the hon. gentleman to put it beyond doubt. The hon. gentleman cannot arrogate to himself all knowledge of law. He is a very wise man no doubt; but his judgments have been overruled by the courts, and it might occur that the hon. gentleman's intrepretation of this clause might not be sustained. Then hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, men eminent in the legal profession, have given an opinion contrary to that of the hon. gentleman. If there is nothing more than a doubt, it should be removed so that no dispute may arise. It is the simplest thing in the world to do. But the hon. gentleman is so wedded to his own notions and to his own interpretation that he refuses to accept any amendment offered from this side of the House, except by the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Weldon), who appears to have the ear of the First Minister. The hon. gentleman thinks his Bill is perfect and it does not require amending. Assuming that there is a doubt, the hon. gentleman ought to remove it, and put the Bill in such a form that the evidence adduced under it will be given under oath, and the First Minister should afterwards provide that the evidence be taken in writing so as to have a satisfactory appeal.

Mr. MULOCK. Listening to the arguments on both sides, it seems to me that the quarrel is over form rather than substance, and it is simply necessary to get a set of words to carry out the wishes of the promoter of the Bill and of hon. members on this side of the House. The First Minister says in his opinion the true construction of this clause is that a revising officer must require evidence to be given under oath. Perhaps that is a mistake. We know there are many kinds of evidence besides evidence given under oath. Admissions are received as evidence; documents are received as evidence. There are many kinds of evidence which do not depend on the testimony of any individual. So evidence in itself implies nothing in connection with an oath. It in no way involves the solemnity

of an oath. The position of parties to an issue of this kind should be the same as that of ordinary litigants. In the case of an ordinary suit it is open to either party to waive points, to make admissions, to take matters to be proved that have not been proved. In the case in question why should we not modify the clause by saying that the opposing party might require persons to be sworn? In that case there would be no compulsion except when there was a stand up fight. The looseness that would prevail in a court like this would on the average prevail in nine cases out of ten. The parties would appear in an informal way, unattended by lawyers, and would tell their own stories in a simple way, perhaps without being sworn, and, no individual objecting, the court would be satisfied with the proof of their statements and a decision would be arrived at—which I hope will be a correct decision. Let us assume the case of there being strict opposition and the parties desiring that everything should be legally proved. In that case, the First Minister would not be acting unreasonably if he gave to the objecting parties the right to require that all witnesses should be sworn, if it were demanded. It is to be remembered that the precedent furnished by the Municipal Act of Ontario does not quite apply in the present case. There is a good deal of laxity in the proof and argument of cases before local courts. And why? Because the courts of revision are composed of local men who know the witnesses, their characters, their positions, who know as much about the subject matter as the parties themselves. Suppose a court of revision was sitting, composed of local men, such as come into the township council. There is not the same necessity for witnesses being sworn before them as there will be under this scheme, because the revising officer will be entirely without local knowledge of the people, their property or their reputation for veracity, and that being the case it certainly ought to be allowed to the objecting party to require the oath to be administered to all witnesses before their evidence is tendered. This would not make it compulsory on the revising officer to insist on an oath where it was not insisted upon by the opposing litigant. I think that an amendment of that kind should be made.

Mr. WELDON. To meet the views of the Premier with regard to documentary evidence, I would suggest that some such words as these might be inserted—that all witnesses produced be examined on oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. member for Huron will find that instead of all the lawyers being with him, he will find that there are none with him. I think it is so clear that there can be no doubt about it, that the word "evidence" must mean when this revising officer is holding a court of this kind—that it must be held to be evidence under oath. As to what I said about clogging the wheels, hon. gentlemen knew perfectly well what I meant—the hon. member for Bothwell, and every hon. gentleman knew I meant that it applied, in a matter of this kind, in settling a list of votes where even if the party wishing to withdraw an objection did so somebody else might press it. I contend that in all cases where it would be necessary for the oath to be administered, the word "evidence" in this clause means evidence on oath. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island, the hon. member for St. John, the hon. member for Glengarry, and other hon. gentlemen differ from the member for West Huron—I shall not allude to the tone of his speech—in this respect; they are all opposed to his view of the subject.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely it cannot be argued that nothing is evidence which is not under oath. Take the ordinary admissions of counsel in court; they are treated as binding evidence though not under oath. So are documents handed in by counsel and admitted by the opposite side. I think where it can be clearly shown that the oath is necessary to make it evidence, as it can be in this case, it is unreasonable to entitle the revising officer to adjudicate upon these rights without being compellable to swear witnesses, if the opposite party insists upon it. If that is to be the case, you are appointing an officer who may not fully know how to deal with these matters, who may be lax or unfair, and why not give litigants some guarantee that their rights will be protected.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it as the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., does, that the word evidence means legal evidence. If it is oral evidence, it must be on oath. Admissions of course remove all litigation and the question of swearing does not come in. All matters of oral evidence will be taken on oath, but documents may be legal evidence without being on oath.

Mr. WELDON. I do not think that an admission always settles the case. We admit the signature to a note but that does not finish the case.——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. WELDON—within the scope of this Act, I think that county court judges and lawyers of standing probably would take the evidence under oath, but the question is whether the revising officer is bound to do it or not. If the clause were amended in the way I point out, that any witnesses produced shall be examined on oath, I think that would meet all objections.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that I was the only lawyer on this side who held that evidence did not imply or mean evidence under oath. On the contrary, I understood my hon. friends who spoke to argue that the word evidence did not mean or imply that it should be evidence on oath. I quite admit that a respectable county court judge, though not compelled, would, as a matter of right, have every witness examined on oath; but what I argue is that the word evidence alone does not compel him to do it; and I doubt if the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), on his responsibility as a lawyer, will say that the word evidence necessarily implies that; if he does, he will go counter to the law dictionaries.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived.

Mr. WELDON. Would the hon. gentleman accept my suggestion that any witnesses produced shall be examined on oath?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is in effect what has just been decided.

Mr. WELDON. No, it does not refer to documentary evidence.

Mr. MILLS. I think "evidence" is a much more comprehensive expression than simply "testimony of witnesses." "Evidence" may imply a great many documents which are admitted as a matter of course. There may be records, abstracts of titles, and other documents which might be accepted as evidence, and might be conclusive evidence if taken on oath. Therefore the word "evidence," whether it means taken on oath or not, is a kind of statutory expression; and when you look at the phraseology of the very next section of this Bill, it is very doubtful whether the revising officer would not have discretionary power to hold that the testimony of witnesses might be taken otherwise than on oath. The man who accepts the position of revising officer, no matter how honest he may be, will necessarily be a lawyer of very limited practice; no other could afford to accept it; and the hon. gentleman should aid him as far as possible by leaving no doubtful expression in the clause. I think the suggestion of my hon. friend that the testimony of witnesses shall be taken on oath will remove the doubt, and tend to uniformity in carrying the law into effect.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman, I understand, does not accept that proposition. Whether the evidence is taken on oath or not, it will be of no use in case of an appeal, unless it is taken down in writing. It is all important, in case of an appeal on a question of fact, that all the facts should be before the court. Therefore I move that the following words be added to this section:

Such evidence shall, if required by either party to the said contestation, be taken down in writing by the revising officer, and signed by the person giving the same.

This does not provide that the revising officer shall be bound to take down the evidence in every case; that would be quite unnecessary, because in the great majority of cases there would be no appeal. I propose also that the evidence shall be signed by the witness, after being read over to him by the revising officer, in order to verify it as correct.

Mr. DAVIES. The necessity for this amendment will depend altogether upon the meaning which is afterwards given by the statute to the appeal. If it is to be an appeal in law pure and simple, a record must be made up of the evidence, so that the Court of Appeal shall understand it. It would not be fair for the revising officer to make and certify a case out of his own head. If it is to be a re-hearing by the Supreme Court, the necessity of my hon. friend's amendment might not exist. Therefore we ought to know what the nature of the appeal is to be—whether it is to be a re-hearing, or an appeal in the ordinary sense.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am strongly opposed to this amendment. It would be an endless task if every matter discussed should be taken down at length and put on record. I was looking in *Hansard* at the question put to me by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I scarcely understood it when he put it to me awhile ago; but the system he proposed is infinitely preferable, that is to say, that the judge going round to each municipality should rather try the case appealed *de novo*, and hear the evidence, than that the evidence should be taken in the first place before the revising officer. There is not one in a hundred of these cases tried by the revising barrister which will go to appeal. I would rather accept the proposition of the hon. gentleman, and have the cases on appeal tried as if there had been no proceedings before the revising officer. It would be better to accept that proposition, and when we get further on make a provision to that effect.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). My amendment only requires the revising officer to take down evidence in cases in which there is to be an appeal. Still, if the hon. gentleman is going to give the court to which appeal is made the trial of the case, as if it were originally commenced there, I will withdraw my amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; in the sense that he will hear the evidence *de novo*.

Amendment withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although this is not exactly relevant just now, I will read the opinion of Blackstone, which has just been handed to me, on evidence:

"Proofs or evidence, for the terms are generally used as synonymous, are written or oral. The former consists of records, deeds, or other writing of public or private description; the latter, the statements of witnesses who appear before the court and are sworn."

Mr. MILLS. I can refer the hon gentleman to Bouviers Law Dictionary, which gives the definitions of Taylor, Stephens, and a great number of decisions of the English judges, as to the meaning of the word evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Stephens is the last commentator on Blackstone, and I do not think he would controvert the definition of Blackstone.

Mr. MULOCK. I was very glad to hear the observations the First Minister has made in regard to the evidence in appeal cases. I had formed a clear idea, from what occurred in committee on 1st May, that that was the kind of appeal we were going to have. The knowledge that the appeal as guaranteed now by the First Minister, is of the kind indicated in *Hansard*, will go a long way to remove some objections to the system; not that it is not very objectionable, and we reserve our protests all the same. In the further discussion of the Bill, it does to some extent assist us to know in advance what are to be some of the leading changes in the measure. No doubt, when there are appeals from the revising officer, the county court judge in Ontario and other judges elsewhere will go on circuit in the electoral districts, and at convenient points hear the cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

On section 25,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that in the first line instead of "the said preliminary revision" the words "the preliminary revision of the first list of voters" be substituted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. I would draw the attention of the committee to the necessity which exists for the attendance for this final revision of the clerks and assessors.

Mr. MILLS. When the lists are to be made up in the first case, it would be almost impossible for the revising officer to know whose name shall be struck off, on account of death, or expiration of lease, or change of property, etc., unless the assessor and the clerk of the municipality are present. It is better they should be required to attend than to be left to be subpœnaed at the expense of either party. In England this information is furnished in the locality where the list was made up in the first instance. If the assessor and the clerk are required, as a matter of course, to attend, the revising officer would be able to make up his list much more correctly, and it would be much less apt to occasion litigious proceedings.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question arises about the power to summon, except by subpœna, those men. It has been to a certain extent decided that the Dominion Parliament has the power to summon anyone in the country, but that is very wide; especially when the person to be summoned is a public officer not appointed by this Government, but by other authority. I do not mean to contravene the power or diminish the power of the Dominion Parliament in that regard, but the hon. gentlemen will see that it might come in conflict with duties imposed by the appointing power. To give an illustration, suppose you were to throw a certain duty upon the clerk of the peace or the sheriff in any Province; supposing the Provincial Legislature to say that, in case any such officer obeyed the order of the Dominion Government or the Act of the Dominion Parliament, *ipso facto*, he should cease to be sheriff or clerk of the peace, I fancy he would cease; and the Provincial Legislature might have the power of rendering nugatory any legislation here in that regard. I throw that out as showing that the doctrine that the Dominion Parliament can force officials, provincial or local authorities, to do whatever they want, must be read with great caution. It is provided in Ontario that, at the court held by the county judge to hear appeals, the person having charge of the assessment roll shall appear and produce such roll and such papers as are in his custody so the power is given under a provision of the Provincial Legislature with reference to provincial officers. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will appreciate, I am sure, the point I have taken. Did the hon. member prepare an amendment in this regard?

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Mr. EDGAR. As it is conceded apparently to be a desirable thing to accomplish, and as there may be some doubt as to the power to enforce those duties, I think it would be easy to do it in another way. Under section 39 the revising officer may issue, at his own instance, summonses and may require the production of papers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. EDGAR. It might be well to suggest that the first duty of the revising officer should be to summon the proper officer, I suppose the clerk, who has the custody of the rolls, and make him produce the papers in his possession.

Mr. HICKEY. I submit that this evidence would be of no use to the revising officer from the fact that the only evidence the assessor and the clerk could give would be the assessment roll. They have no papers. The assessment roll is taken, and they have that. Further evidence they could not give. As to the death of any individual on the list, they could give no better evidence than any one else, except as individuals.

Mr. MILLS. I do not agree with the view just expressed. As to our power, I do not think there is much room for doubt. Of course, we can suppose the Local Legislature to provoke a direct conflict in the way suggested, but, in the decision of the Privy Council in regard to the trial of controverted elections, it was settled that, where we have the power to deal with a subject, we have also the power to name the parties for the purpose of carrying our authority into effect. In that case, we declared that the provincial courts should be courts for the trial of controverted elections. They were courts for other purposes, created by the Local Legislature, but, as the power to try controverted elections was vested in this Parliament and was not part of the civil procedure of the country, the Judicial Committee held that it was wholly within the power of this Parliament to designate the parties to carry that into effect, even though we designated them as existing courts. In the same way you could designate a local officer and impose upon him a duty. It is no part of his local duties, it is no part of the functions he derives from the Local Legislature, but is a duty which you impose upon a particular individual, and you have marked out the individual by saying he is the party who shall for the time being hold a certain local office. He derives the power from you. I do not see any difficulty or doubt about the matter, neither can I see any distinction between the principle involved in that case and the case involved in the trial of controverted elections. If that be so, when we designate the assessor and the clerk of the municipality as parties who are to discharge certain duties which we impose upon them, we name them as such, and we have just as much power to say they shall discharge those duties as we have to say it should be done by John Smith. We can designate them by their office as well as by particular names. Then the question is, is it convenient or to the public advantage that these parties should be named for that purpose? I think it is. It is true that the assessment roll will afford the revising barrister, from time to time, certain information, but the revising barrister looks at the assessment roll and sees John Smith down as the owner of a particular property, and when he looks at the old voters' list, revised the year before, he finds it is not John Smith but William Jones who is the owner of that property. What he does not know is whether William Jones has ceased to have such an interest in that property as to entitle him to retain his name on the voters' list or put John Smith's on alone. He subpœnas the clerk and the assessor, not for the purpose of getting the information that is already on the assessment roll, but to get additional information. They are parties that are not, perhaps, able to give him all the information he requires in regard to everybody in the municipality, but they are so well conversant with the municipality that they are able to give him a good deal of additional information, and if, by getting that information, he can put on 20 or 30 names or strike off 20 or 30 names without any litigation and without any contested proceedings, there is a positive gain to the public, for it is no advantage to the public to have the parties who are seeking to amend the voters' list put to a large expense. The money comes out of the community in some form or other, and, if it will save expense and avoid litigious proceedings to any considerable extent, it does seem to me that it is desirable to do so. These are two officers who are often in Ontario employed for years together in discharging the same duties, and are likely to be able to give information which will be of the greatest possible assistance in making the list perfect from year to year. I think, therefore, that there should be a clause providing that the revising officer shall, as a matter of course, subpœna these parties to his assistance either at the final revision or at the preliminary revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will not contest at all the point about our power, because I have no doubt that the decision of the Privy Council with respect to election courts settles that point in a very great degree, though I think it is a subject that will be reviewed some day or other. Looking at the municipal Act, I see that, when the county judge goes round to revise the assessment list, the officers having charge of it must be present. That is when the assessment list is to be corrected on appeal from the court of revision. A person objects to the amount of his tax, he appeals, and the assessment roll must be present to be corrected according to the decision of the county court judge. But here that is all done. The revising officer gets the assessment roll after the final revision, after it has been settled. He takes that and takes the names of the persons who have the right to the franchise according to the finally revised assessment roll. He has no discretion. We have settled that. That is to be *primâ facie* evidence, and those persons must be placed upon the roll. He has a certified copy of the assessment roll finally revised before him. He must get that before he can commence his preliminary revision. He must have that and will have that, of course, when he settles down to the final revision, and I do not think there can be any necessity for making it a statutory obligation that either he shall be put to the inconvenience of being present, or that the parties should go to the expense of having him there. I should rather prefer the suggestion of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) when we come to a subsequent clause, that it may be necessary in a particular case—it may be, though I do not see how the case can arise—that he shall be subpœnaed like any other witness—by a subpœna *duces tecum*. His testimony can be of no more value than that of any other person in the township. Therefore I think it would be unwise to make it obligatory upon him attend at every sitting. It must be at his own expense, because he will not be subpœnaed by any particular individual who has to pay for it.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman's attention to this point. The assessment roll, after the first revision every year, is to be furnished the revising officer for the purpose of correcting and revising the lists that have been already made. Now on the new assessment roll there will be the names of a great many tenants not on the old list, and upon that list the names of tenants whose leases will have expired, and the names of those who may require to come off the voters' list. Does the hon. gentleman intend, as a matter of course, that the revising officer obtains a new assessment roll the names of tenants or

others upon the old voters' lists shall come off, as a matter of course, if their names do not appear upon the assessment roll?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the subsequent revision?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we are discussing the first revision now.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, but we are dealing with the question as to who, once for all, shall appear before the revising officer for the purpose of giving information. Unless he throws the list of the previous year aside altogether and makes a new one, I do not see how he is going to make corrections without special information from the parties in the locality, and I mentioned the clerks and assessors, because they are likely to be the best informed. Either he must begin the whole work anew, starting upon the assessment rolls as the basis, or if he starts upon the existing roll as the basis for his corrections, then he must have some way of knowing who he shall strike off the existing roll and put on the new one.

Mr. EDGAR. I think upon the preliminary revision is the time when this assistance would be most required, because the assessment roll will not furnish the information. The first assessment roll this year will be short of a great deal of information that will be certainly required, and even in subsequent years a great deal of information will not be furnished by that roll because this Parliament has no authority over that roll and we cannot say what it shall show. For instance, the income franchise in Ontario. The roll this year will show an income up to $400. We are giving a franchise to incomes of $300, and the Ontario franchise in future will give it to $250. But all between $300 and $400 will not be put on this list by the revising officer at the preliminary revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. O, yes, they will. A person is assessed according to the value of his property, not according to the franchise.

Mr. EDGAR. I am speaking of the preliminary revision of the first voters' list. Then there is another class that will have to be put on by the revising officer as to whom he cannot obtain the necessary information on the assessment roll—that is, the tenants who qualify in respect to rental but not in respect to the value of property on the assessment roll. Then there is the income franchise people, who are not receiving their pay in money but in time; they will not go on the assessment roll at all. Landowners' sons also will not appear on the first list. The revising officer will have to get that information when he makes his preliminary list, and who but the assessor can give it to him?

Mr. DAVIES. The last line of this clause seems to me unnecessary, where it speaks of the powers of a court of record.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This provides that he shall have the power of a court of record *quoad* forming this list. If we give him court of record powers he has the power of committing for contempt and all that sort of thing. If the hon. gentleman wishes to magnify his office, very well.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it might give rise to doubt. The revising officer has power to summon the witnesses before before him and to administer the oath. If a man refuses to take the oath and sets the court at defiance then the revising officer has power to commit him. Is that the intention?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, that is necessary in order to carry out the powers of the Act. A court of record has the power of fining—you do not want him to have the power of fining, do you?

Mr. DAVIES. He must have sufficient powers to enable him to carry out his functions; otherwise he will be set at defiance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, I will accept the amendment of the hon. gentleman and strike out all after the words "court of record."

On section 26,

Mr. LANGELIER. According to this section the duty of publishing the list devolves on the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. There should be, however, some provision compelling him to publish in the Official *Gazette* the notice immediately on its receipt. We have known cases in connection with elections where the notice has not been published until weeks afterwards.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Such delay would be improper; it would be a dereliction of duty, in fact a maladministration of office.

Mr. MULOCK. The committee will see that under this clause lists are binding although there are appeals pending. I can understand the clause having been drafted in this way at the time when it was not contemplated that there would be any extensive system of appeal. Now that we are guaranteed a practicable appeal, it becomes necessary to amend this section. My idea is that, if the appeal is to be of any use, it should be such that it can take place before the list is binding. Under the Ontario Act the clerk of the municipality publishes an advertisement to the effect that the voters' list of his municipality is on deposit at his office where it can be inspected. At the expiration of thirty days, if there is no appeal, the judge certifies the list as a matter of course, and that list so certified to supersedes all prior lists, and therefore is the list on which voting takes place. If there are appeals to the judge from the list thus adjudicated upon, the judge takes the list before him and amends it in harmony with his judgment. Then he certifies to it, and that list, so amended, becomes the list to be used until a new list similarly prepared is adopted. In the Province of Quebec the practice is somewhat different. There the appeal is to the court of revision, composed of three judges, and the list is binding before those judges have dealt with it. That list prepared by the municipal officer is then handed in to the municipal council, and they bring it into force. They in Quebec to-day discharge the same duties as the revising officer will discharge hereafter. It may go without saying that on general principles we have not any confidence in the revising officer, and we do not want to be bound by his actions until the courts have been given an opportunity to correct his mistakes. The practice in Quebec does not furnish a precedent, because, though the elections take place before the appeal to the final court, yet they do not take place until the list has had the sanction of the municipal council. I have drafted a section which I submit for the First Minister's approval. If adopted it will save two or three other clauses on which there may be considerable discussion. The clause I propose is as follows:—

After the list for a polling district in an electoral district has been so completed, revised, and corrected, it shall be certified in the form contained in the schedule in this Act by the revising officer, and in the event of there being no appeal therefrom, or from any part thereof, the court or judge to which such appeal would lie shall certify such list in duplicate, and in the event of their being an appeal therefrom the court or judge having jurisdiction to hear such appeals, shall determine the same in manner hereinafter provided, and amend and correct said list in accordance with the judgment of such court or judge, and shall forthwith thereafter certify such list in duplicate, and so soon as such list shall be so certified by the court or judge, the revising officer shall forthwith transmit one of the duplicate copies of such list to the clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa, and shall retain the other duplicate copy in his office for the purpose of this Act, and thereafter and until another list for such polling district in a future year shall have been made, corrected and revised by the revising officer, and certified to by

the court or judge in the manner above provided, the list so completed, revised, corrected, and certified to by said court or judge, as the case may be, shall be the list in force for such polling district, to be used at an election of a member of the House of Commons of Canada, and the persons whose names are entered thereon as voters shall be held to be duly registered voters in and for such electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Supposing a list is before the revising officer and there is an idea either of this revising being just before the time when Parliament will naturally expire or a suspicion that there is going to be a dissolution and a general election, each party will go in and appeal against the other side and nobody could vote in the constituency.

Mr. MULOCK. That is not the effect of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the provision of the Bill is a reasonable one, that so far as the assessment roll goes it is *primâ facie* evidence that they have a right to vote. Then, of those who are put on afterwards, it will be found I think that the great majority of the appeals will be dismissed, *ex necessitate*. Therefore, I think it is fair to both sides that the principle that is laid down clearly in the Province of Quebec should be observed, that when an election comes on unexpectedly or otherwise, the roll as filed with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, shall be the list. I think that is fair to both sides, and I must resist the temptation even of getting rid of half a dozen clauses, by accepting the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman's answer to the hon. member for North York is not at all satisfactory. It might be that a large number of appeals might take place; that is barely possible as a supposition, although it is not likely to be realised. Still, if they were proper appeals, that is the best reason in the world why the list should not be used, for the larger the number of appeals the more perpicious would it be to use the list. Now, it is always possible to fall back on the list for the previous year, and there is not likely to be more appeals under that list if it is fairly prepared than there would be under the list of the previous year under the existing law. What reason has the hon. gentleman for his supposing that there will be more appeals for the purpose of frustrating this law than there are for the purpose of frustrating the present law? Experience has shown that the law has not been abused, and why should a man be allowed to vote whose right to vote has been contested, and has not been settled in his favor. If his name is on the previous year he will have the opportunity, but if his name is not on the list he will be in no worse position than if there was a delay in making out the list, or an election was brought on before the list was revised, so as to make it possible to use it. In England, in case an election is contested, if it is decided that a party has not a right to be put on the list, his name is struck off by the judges. If a man's right to be on a list is contested and has not yet been finally settled, when the trial of the controverted election takes place by the House, it was the duty of the committee to take notice of the decision of the judge and if it was adverse, the name was struck off the voters' list. Either one of two courses should be taken. One course is suggested by the amendment, which would be a reasonable course, which would be no more disadvantageous to the one party than the other, and another would be that you might vote under numbered ballots, and that in case the vote was held to be bad, the party's vote should be struck off, and if it were good, the vote should be allowed. Supposing that in an election in a particular constituency, one party carried by a majority of 20, and you had 50 votes on the roll contested and not disposed of, and 25 of them were disposed of adversely to the party having the majority of 20. Under this law he would still have a seat in Parliament although it was perfectly clear that the majority of legal votes were against him. why should the list be final and conclusive if it is afterwards held that some names are improperly on the list or some names are improperly excluded? If you will not adopt the amendment of my hon. friend, you ought to provide for voting by numbered ballots, so that the claims or parties might afterwards be decided by the court. The plan proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has been tried already; it has been the law of Ontario for years, and no practical mischief has come from it. Besides it would be a rare thing that more than one or two polling divisions in a riding would be contested. If you make the list for each polling sub-division separate, which appears to be the intention of the Bill as it stands, the list in any polling division, so far as it was not contested, would be the list used. That is the law at present in Ontario. In an electoral district where there are half-a-dozen municipalities, you may have the roll of the present year used in five, and the roll of the last year used in the remaining one. The amendment does not exclude the list in each municipality, but only so far as it has been finally completed. A serious wrong might be done by allowing a list to be used that contained a number of names that parties believed ought not to be there, or omitted a number that they thought ought to be there. Both cases are met by the amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I really think this is one of the most objectionable clauses in this whole Bill, so far as the latter part of it is concerned. When the list is completed the revising officer is required by this clause to transmit it to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who shall publish it in the *Canada Gazette*, and the clause goes on to declare that after its publication the list shall apply to and be final in all elections taking place before such appeal has been disposed of or the result communicated to the revising officer. I understand that to mean that the moment the list is published in the *Canada Gazette*, if an election should take place pending the appeals from the decision of the revising officer, that list is final and conclusive between the parties, no matter what the judgment of the court of appeal might be. To show that that is the intention of this clause, it is provided by the latter part of section 28 that the list so published "shall be binding on any judge or other tribunal appointed for the trial of any petition complaining of an undue election or return of a member to serve in the House of Commons." Assuming that a petition were presented contesting the right of a candidate to a seat in Parliament, to which he had been elected on the list published by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, no judge could question the right of any person whose name was on that list to vote. The consequences might be very grave. Take the first list, which will in all probability be published very shortly before the next general election; suppose there are 50 appeals, and pending those appeals the general election takes place; suppose the court of appeal gives judgment sustaining 40 or perhaps the whole 50 appeals, and holds that they were improperly on the list; suppose the candidate is elected by a small majority—10, 20, or 30; and suppose there is a petition presented against his election on the ground that one or two more than the actual number of his majority ought to be struck off the voters' list; and supposing they should be really struck off by the court of appeal; still, a man elected by that majority might continue to hold his seat, according to this clause, on votes which the court of appeal decided had no right to be on the list, or in consequence of names being improperly left off. No court in this Dominion would have any right to enquire into the question whether or not that candidate was elected by legal votes or not. I say that is not fair; it puts it in the power of one party to commit a serious wrong to another party, and it puts it in the power of a candidate to keep his seat in Parliament for five years although receiving a minority of

the legal votes and no court in this Dominion can interfere with him. I say it is not right. No man should keep his seat in Parliament unless he has the majority of the legal votes. If he has not, there ought to be some power to unseat him. There are two ways of meeting the difficulty —one by the proposition made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I do not say that is the best proposition, but it is a mode of dealing with it, that if there is an appeal from the voters' list, that voters' list shall not be used until its validity is pronounced upon by a court of appeal. It is, in fact, the Ontario law that the list shall not be used until after it has been pronounced upon by the highest authority; and in case it is not so pronounced upon before the general election takes place, the returning officer is bound to use the list for the preceding year. There is another way suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell, that all those appealed against should have the right to vote, but that their votes should not be placed with the general ballot box. They should be put in a separate box, in separate envelopes, and should not be counted, except upon a scrutiny, until the court of appeal had given its judgment as to the validity of the votes appealed against. In that way justice could be done to both parties. A man is returned who has a minority of the legal votes, his opponent who has the minority can secure his right by appeal to the court, filing his petition and asking a scrutiny into the validity of the votes Upon that, the ballots in the separate envelopes should be counted, and if it should turn out that the court of appeal decided that a sufficient number of those ballots were good to give him a majority of the votes, they should be counted in his favor. It may be said that would violate the secrecy of the ballot. It would not, because you observe no person's name is struck off except that of the man who has no right to be there; of course you could tell how he voted, but as he is not entitled to a vote he has no right to be there, and secrecy is not violated. You keep in perfect secrecy the name of every man not appealed against and of every man appealed against where the appeal has not been successful. With that provision in the law you will do justice to the two candidates and do away with the extreme impropriety of allowing a man to sit in Parliament who has a minority of the legal vote. Under the Bill, as it stands, take the case of 50 appeals, the court may decide every one of the appeals to be well founded, and yet, on those illegal votes, one of the candidates may have been declared elected. Take my own county where the majority is only 29; supposing the same majority would be given at the next election, all the revising officer would have to do to defeat me, would be to add 30 names of people who have no right to vote to the list. I appeal against them, but the election takes place pending the appeal; these men all vote against me, and under this Bill I have no remedy. There are 50 perhaps 100 constituencies in the Dominion where the same thing may happen. In every constituency where the majority is less than 100, the same thing might happen. The First Minister ought to direct his attention to this, and so arrange the provision that a wrong of that kind could not be perpetrated by either political party. In England before the ballot was adopted and when election cases came before a Committee of the House, the election committee was bound to act on the judgment of the Court of Appeal. If the Court of Appeal struck off a vote the committee was estopped from questioning that. The same provision should prevail here. The election court judge should not be restrained and prohibited from enquiring whether or not a vote is good; under this clause he cannot do so. The man that is not returned to Parliament may have an absolute majority and yet this aggrieved candidate has no redress, he cannot appeal to Parliament or the courts; his hands are tied by this Bill if he appeals to either.

Mr. LANGELIER. At the time the Bill was introduced, it was not proposed to give the right to appeal except on questions of law, and with the consent of the revising barrister; but after long discussion the right of appeal has been given, even on questions of fact. If the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Mulock) or something to the same effect is not accepted, the right to appeal will be a dead letter; the door of the stable will be closed after the horse has got out. What would be the use of taking an appeal and incurring serious costs after an election has taken place? It would be perfectly impossible to correct the mistakes or make any use of the corrections made by the judge on the appeal. The list is only good for one year; it cannot be pretended that if the corrections are not used for an immediate election, they will be of any use in a subsequent election. The result will be that after an election takes place just after the list has been made by the revising barrister, it will be made on the list prepared by him, although a hundred appeals may have been taken against such list. We cannot act upon the supposition that the revising barrister is infallible; his infallibility is admitted. It is admitted there should be an appeal; well, that appeal must be of some use or it would be just as well to do away with it. The effect of the amendment would be to put the law as it was under the Consolidated Statutes of Canada—not exactly, perhaps, but for all practical purposes. That law provided that the list to be used should be the last list prepared, which had been deposited for 30 days in the office of the registrar. The list could not be deposited in the office of the registrar as long as there was an appeal pending on it, so that the list used for the election was a perfect list. There is more reason for adopting that course now than there was at that time, because then it was possible to have a scrutiny and to strike out bad votes, but it would be perfectly useless now to take an appeal after the election, because there is no possibility of knowing for whom an elector has voted. In England, and I think in Ontario, the ballots are numbered, so that in case of a scrutiny it is possible to discover for whom an elector has voted, and, if he was not entitled to vote, his vote might be struck off; but we cannot do that under the Dominion election law, and it would be impossible to strike off a bad vote unless some machinery were provided to discover for whom the vote was cast. Unless the appeal is to be perfectly nugatory, either the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North York, or another as suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell should be adopted.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the last speaker that now that an appeal is allowed, in cases of law and fact, this provision is inconsistent with the rest of the Bill. The list when it leaves the hands of the revising officer is no further ahead than the present list in Ontario when it leaves the municipal court of revision, because up to that time it has not been revised by anyone except the makers of the list. There are under this Bill certain processes which are termed preliminary revision and final revision, but they are not really revisions in the ordinary sense, because a revision is a correction by some independent person outside of the original maker of the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Revision is seeing again.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the revising officer will see it again a good many times. He will probably see the right hon. gentleman or hear from him before the list finally leaves his hands, and he is quite certain to see the candidate several times, and he can go out and see a man, but with all this the list will not have been revised as we understand it. Notwithstanding the joke of the right hon. gentleman, the revision of anything is the correction by some outside and higher authority. If the unrevised list may be used at an election while an appeal is in progress, it makes the

appeal a farce. It is an insult to the intelligence of the country to say that we may appeal and have the list corrected after the election has been held. I understand that the hon. gentleman said—I was not in at the moment—that, if the amendment were adopted, the Reformers would all be appealing from the list just before the election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that. I said both parties would do so.

Mr. CASEY. Neither party would appeal against the list on the eve of an election for the purpose of having the list before used, unless it was thought that the list was unfair. Another point is that there is no time limited by this Bill during which the multifarious duties of the revising officer shall be performed. He may take the whole year of 1886 if he chooses. He may be occupied from the 1st of January to the end of December in preparing his first list; then appeals against that list will have to be made in the year after. There is no time limited during which the appeal shall be tried before the judge. The judge may take his own time to try appeals. In the case of a revising barrister, from whom the appeal lies to the county judge, it is probable the appeal will be decided within a reasonable time, because the county judge is not so extremely busy; but where the appeal is from a county court judge to a Superior Court judge, it may sometimes take a whole year. I think I may set it down as very probable that in all cases the revising officer will take at least a month for the preliminary making up of his list, and another six weeks for the notice of the preliminary sittings, for the holding of those sittings, and making the preliminary amendment of the list. After that he will take his own time before he holds his final revision, and this revision will take an indefinite time, proportionate to the number of claims and objections put in. After that he has to give certified copies to the parties concerned. I think, in general, we may take it for granted that at least four or five months will be occupied by the revising officer before the list gets out of his hands, and that another month or two will be occupied in making up and hearing appeals to the judges. In fact, there will be scarcely any year in which, for more than half the year, there will exist a list which has been through all the stages in the hands of the revising officer, and which has been appealed to and rectified by the judge. In other words, for half the time there will be no list which has been regularly revised by an independent authority, and the chances are at least equal that an election appointed for any day you choose in the year would fall upon a day in which either the list for that year was in the hands of the revising officer or in process of appeal from him to the judges. Under these circumstances I say it is absolutely necessary and in the interests of every voter that the last list finally corrected should be used, the last one which has passed through an independent revision and has been really revised and corrected. I can see no good reason for the hon. gentleman refusing to accede to this amendment. It inevitably gives the impression to the country that he does not wish to see justice and fair play done to both classes of voters. He has the reputation of being an excellent tactician, but it is extremely bad tactics to give even his opponents just grounds for believing that he is trying to take an unfair advantage of them—still more, when that impression is shared by his friends, as we have seen it is by articles in the Montreal *Herald*, *L'Etendard* and other Conservative papers. It is unfortunate for him and his party that he should put scores of his supporters in the position of being held up to the country as having supported a measure which was intended to give them an unfair advantage. The great majority do not need any advantage. Their seats are reasonably secure, and even if they were mean enough to desire to take an advantage, they would not care to be placed in the false position in which they are placed by this clause. The hon. gentleman has signally failed in his policy in framing this clause, as he has failed in securing justice for the people at the elections. I could not utter a more crushing denunciation of his policy than this, and the country will re-echo this sentiment.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman intend to imply an appeal to the higher courts of justice of the Province, and does he intend to imply, as well, an appeal to a county court judge as against the revising barrister?

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. EDGAR. While I think the clause as it stands, considering the Bill as we have it now, is entirely indefensible, still I conceive, as the Bill was originally framed and as it nominally stands now, although it is proposed to alter it, there was some argument to be used in favor of this clause. It must be remembered that the Bill as printed provided only for appeals on questions of law. Now the appeals are to be upon questions of fact as well as of law, and that makes a very great difference. I am sure the First Minister would never have thought of proposing this clause if it had been provided that there was to be an appeal on questions of fact. On questions of law appeals would have been comparatively few in number, and they only could have been made if the revising officer reported that there was reasonable ground for the appeal, so that the evil of which we complain would have been very much less indeed from that point of view. Even under those circumstances, however, when it was contemplated that appeals should only be on questions of law, a large concession was made, in section 43, towards the principle we are advocating. It cannot possibly be argued that it is right or defensible that a voters' list should be sent to the returning officer, to be acted upon at elections which does not contain the truest possible record of those entitled to vote. Even when it was only possible to appeal upon questions of law, by section 43 provision was made for a system by which, until the very day of polling, all the results of appeals made on questions of law from the revising officer would be communicated to the returning officer, so that he might amend his list up to the very last moment, and use, so far as he could, the corrected list. That is wide enough, as far as it goes, but it may not go any distance at all. We must assume that it is not the intention of any one to have an improper and incorrect list used at the polls. Let us see, therefore, how it is possible to arrive at a system which will best meet the object everyone must have in view. The system proposed by the amendment is the old system, the one we have been acting upon in the Province of Ontario, and it is also the system that was used in the old Province of Canada. By the Consolidated Statutes of Canada provision was made that the list, after being revised and corrected and appealed upon to the judge should be used, and unless that list was ready you would have to fall back upon the old original lists. That has been the plan always acted upon, and it is certainly infinitely better than this system, which would force a wrong and incorrect list to be taken to the polls. The only argument I can see against going back to the thoroughly corrected old list is that considerable time must necessarily have elapsed since that list was perfected. If the new list has gone so far as to be revised by the revising officer, that implies that a considerable time has elapsed since the voters on the former list were qualified, that considerable changes have occurred, and that the list is some-

what stale. I admit that is an objection, but it is one that we have always had to contend with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In Ontario.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes, and in old Canada as well, as the hon. gentleman will see by the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, 1859, chap. 6, sec. 15. Well, what other system can we adopt. One was indicated by the hon. member for Bothwell, which might, perhaps, be carried out very simply. The revising officer, when he has completed the final revision, has to supply to the returning officer the list, so far as it is made out. Let him accompany that list with a statement of the votes which are appealed. The decisions on the appeals would be handed by the judge to the returning officer, appointed by section 43, up to election day, who could amend and correct his list. As to the remaining ones which are appealed but not decided by the day of the vote, nothing could be easier than to provide that those should be numbered against the name of the elector on the poll book, and against the ballot, and those could be reserved, and after the appeals are finished either party could have simply a recount of the votes, just as anybody is entitled to have now. That is a simple and inexpensive process.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is the secrecy of the ballot?

Mr. EDGAR. None of these ballots will be looked at by the judge on the recount, unless the court of appeal had said it was a bad vote, when it would be struck off, and thus the secrecy of the ballot would not be interfered with at all.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the others?

Mr. EDGAR. None would be marked, except the few which were appealed from, and as to which the appeal has not been decided at the time the vote is taken. I cannot see that there would be any practical difficulty in the way, and I certainly think it would prevent bad votes from being polled, while no additional machinery would be required, except this small additional list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the amendment of the hon. member for North York is indefensible, for, as I read it, on one vote being objected to and appealed, the whole list would be hung up.

Mr. MULOCK. Only for that polling sub-division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. That is the way it is to-day in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I prefer the Quebec way altogether, where it is provided that in case of appeal when an election comes on the parties whose names are on the list, whose votes have been passed by the court of revision, shall have *primâ facie* the right to vote. The hon. gentleman says there is a mighty alteration, because the appeal is to be in matters of fact as well as in matters of law. I do not see that that makes any difference. The important matters of appeal are matters of law, because they may affect whole classes of voters, whereas matters of fact affect only a single voter. Then I take it that the revising officer is just as good a judge of the simple facts of the case, of whether a man has the qualification or not, as the court above, as he is on the spot and has all the surroundings. Indeed, he is a better judge than the court, which follows afterwards and hears the evidence. I do not think the scope of the Bill being widened has any effect whatever in altering the plan. The object is to get a good list as soon as possible, and the chances of an election happening before the court of appeal had an opportunity of deciding cases is very small, in comparison with the principle involved, in all the cases being hung up by an appeal to the court above. I am altogether opposed to the Ontario system of numbering the ballots. It has its advantages or it would not be adopted both in England and in Ontario, but when the ballots are numbered the people get to believe that their names may be found out, and the dread of that causes them to vote as if they were voting openly. They are afraid of their employer, and they will vote in the way their interests induce them to vote; that is a dread that I know exists in Ontario. So I prefer our system, where the secrecy is absolute; there is no practical fear that it will ever be known which way the voter votes. Therefore, I am against the numbering of ballots, or anything approaching to that. Now, let us take the working out of the first revision of the list under this Bill. The assessment rolls will all be finished by the 1st of January next; on and after the 1st of January the revising officer begins to act; he will get a copy of the assessment roll, and between that date and the 1st of June he will have the list settled. If an election takes place before the 1st of June it will be held on the provincial lists which now exist. If an election takes place after the 1st of June—I think that is the time the list must be finally revised by the revising officer——

Mr. MILLS. No; five weeks after.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, up to the time the final revision takes place and the list is returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the provincial list will operate. Then the appeal takes place, and it will be settled in the autumn. There may be a casual election by death or resignation——

Mr. EDGAR. Or a general election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is any great chance of that. So that practically the list will be settled before there will be a general election. The elections that will take place about the 11th of September, 1887——

Mr. EDGAR. The 17th of September.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the lists will be settled, I fancy, by that time. The chances of any given election coming off between the time of the final revision of the list by the revising officer and the decision of the appeal are very small. On the other hand, by not adopting this clause you will hang up the voters' list for any given polling district, and you will have to take the list of the year before, and that list must be more imperfect than the list of any given polling district, with two or three votes objected to. Then, again, the chances are greatly in favor of the objections being dismissed after a solemn decision of the court of appeal. I think the consequences of an alteration in this system would be so inconvenient that it is infinitely better to trust to the list as settled by the revising officer than to have the appeal. The cases will be so few, of elections taking place after the revision of the revising officer and before the decision by the court of appeal, that it is scarcely worth while considering the matter; whereas, if we adopted the system proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite we should certainly have a very imperfect list. The consequences of taking the lists of the year before would be much more prejudicial to the electors than was the case when there was a more restricted franchise than there is now. We shall have wage-earners, wage-earners' sons, with a reduced income franchise, fishermen, and a number of other men, who would be excluded by throwing the election on the list of the year before. The chance of having a full and perfect vote of the electors of any given electoral district will be much greater under this system than under the method proposed by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I am amazed at the statement of the First Minister. He cannot give us credit for common intelligence when he discusses this measure in this way. He tells us that if we take the prior list we shall have a

smaller number of constituents. When his Bill goes into force, when the roll of 1886 is made up and perfected, do not all of those enfranchised under this measure get on the first list? Who, then, will have his name on the list of 1887 who will not have it on the list of 1886? He tells us that the appeals are principally on questions of law; he does not value appeals on points of fact. Any person who has had any experience in these matters knows that in almost every case the appeal is on a question of fact. What is the subject-matter of an appeal against the name of a voter on the voters' list. The appellant seeks to prove that he is or is not the owner of a certain property; that he is or is not a resident on a piece of property; that it is of a certain value or is not, and so on. These are questions of fact, and they are practically the only questions that are submitted on appeal. Well, he tells us that in his opinion elections will not be held on lists not confirmed by the county court judge. I say it ought not to be possible that this should happen; but it is possible that every election held between the two Sessions may be held on the list made by the revising officer and not confirmed by any court. The revising officer makes his list on the 1st of June and posts it up; four weeks from that time he can hear appeals; he then confirms his roll, certifies it, and sends it to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and that is done practically on the same day by every revising officer in Canada. About the first week of July every revising officer of Canada ought to have his roll in the hands of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa. The hon. gentleman opposite having it in his power to name the time when the election shall be held, could have these elections brought on in the second week of July; and not one of these rolls could be confirmed, not one appeal could be adjusted, and we should have members elected to this House on rolls which might be altered to such an extent as to materially affect the result of the elections. We are offered now an appeal to correct the roll after an election is held. The mischief is done, and we have the satisfaction of knowing that it is incurable. When the hon. gentleman told us that we were to have an appeal, a full appeal, what did it mean? It meant an appeal of practical value; it meant that the action of the revising officer would not be binding until it was ratified by the proper court. Now he says that the elections must be held on the lists of the revising officer before his acts have been investi gated. If you read the 28th section you will find it says that in the succeeding year he shall bring in another list which shall supersede every preceding list. Take these two sections together, and I do not care what appeal you may make, it will have no practical effect. I am more than amazed that, at this stage of the discussion, and considering the spirit in which the scheme for appeal has been tendered us, we should now be told it is an illusory form, that cannot be taken advantage of. I protest against such a proposition, and will fight against it as long as I can.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman promised that there should be provided an appeal to a county court judge, both as to law and to fact, where the revising barrister was not himself judge. It is clear that appeal should be provided for at the beginning of the section. The first part of the section says:

"After the lists for the several polling districts have been so completed revised and corrected, they shall be certified, in the form contained in the schedule of this Act, by the revising officer, and kept by him for the purposes of this Act, and a duplicate of each, certified as aforesaid, shall be transmitted forthwith by him to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, at Ottawa."

That is not to be done, according to the statement the hon. gentleman made, unless there is no appeal from the revising officer; but if there is, then the action of the officer is not final. He cannot complete the list; he cannot do what is stated here to be done; that can only be done by the county court judge, and it is not until after he has so certified that the list can be said to be completed. The hon. gentleman will see that if he carries the section in this form he is not carrying out his promise to the House. It is clear the list must be completed by the county court judge, as, so far as he is concerned, appeals must be decided before there can be a complete list. The clause further provides "that the persons whose names are entered on said lists as voters shall be held to be duly registered voters in and for such electoral district, subject to correction or amendment by the judgment of the Superior Court on appeal, as hereinafter mentioned." This provision is for the use of the list that is completed, so far as the action of the county court judge is concerned, but not completed, so far as appeals may be made from the decision of the county court judge to the Superior Court. I do not precisely know what the effect would be if the hon. gentleman were to carry this section in this form, but it is pretty clear there could be no question then of appeal from the revising officer to the county court judge. That must be had before the list is completed; the list is not finally revised until that is done, and to carry out that view the judge should have the right, in all cases of appeal, to take the evidence *de novo*. That would require to come in before any portion of this clause; it is the completion of the revision. Surely the hon. gentleman does not propose to say that he is going to deal with the question of appeal from the revising officer to the county court judge, as from the county court to the Superior Court. But arguing that the hon. gentleman's intention is to carry out in good faith the promise he made to the House, it is still very important to consider, assuming that the list is completed by the county court judge on appeal from the revising officer, this question of appeal to the Superior Court. There may be cases where there would be left off the list persons who claimed the right to vote. As the Bill stands, the hon. gentleman would disfranchise them, although, upon further consideration, these claimants might be held to be legally entitled to have their names inserted on the voters' list. No provision is made for them whatever. In the case of persons who are on, but whose right to remain on is contested, they would have the right to vote although it was subsequently held they were not legally entitled to do so. That is an indefensible proposition. It is impossible to suppose that this Legislature is so wanting in intellectual capability and capacity as not to be able to frame a clause that would meet such a case. I think the proposition of the hon. gentleman is a simple way of meeting the case. Every voters' list that remains is the voters' list in point of law, until superseded by another list completed in itself. If this Legislature declares that a list is of no use until all questions of appeal are finally disposed of, the old list will remain in force. What have we done, under the provisions of this Bill? Our assessment roll is completed in May, and the hon. gentleman did not intend it was to be utilised until the succeeding year, under this Bill, as it is framed. In many of the Provinces the rolls are prepared late in the season, and cannot be utilised until the next year. There would be no way of making lists that could come into force immediately after the materials are available, except by adopting different periods in different Provinces; but if the hon. gentleman adheres to a fixed period of time, if he can afford to keep off for months, from the list, the names of parties who are shown in the early assesment rolls to be entitled to vote, why such extraordinary haste to bring an imperfect list into operation? The proposition is a simple one, which would carry out this intention easily; but if the hon. gentleman refuses to adopt that, he has the other alternative which we have suggested; let the parties vote by tendered ballots. The hon. gentleman says there is a great aversion to the Ontario system, but where does it exist? Certainly not in Ontario. It did not exist in the hon. gentleman's mind when this system of

absolute secrecy was proposed here, because I think the hon. gentleman opposed it. It is an open secret that a majority of the House were opposed to the system of absolute secrecy at the time; but the Minister of Justice, Mr. Dorion, was strongly in favor of it, and he was promoting the Bill, and his view prevailed. Whether that system of absolute secrecy, or the Ontario system, is the best, is not the question. It is not proposed to interfere with that system. It is proposed to vote by a tendered ballot, in the case of all those parties who claim to go upon the roll, and whose right is contested. If you allow those parties to vote under a numbered ballot it is only necessary that the counting of those ballots should be suspended until the decision of the court is had, and then those who are not entitled to vote may be ascertained and struck off, and those who are entitled to vote may be counted, along with those that were counted before. The proposition of the hon. gentleman is to give a vote to men whose right to vote is contested, and to maintain that their votes were properly cast, after the court has held that they were not entitled to vote at all. I say that proposition is wholly untenable, and there is no practical necessity for having recourse to such a proceeding, in order to uphold the right of a person entitled to vote. If you had a number of imperfect lists, with a large number of appeals, you might possibly have the majority of elections in the Dominion carried by voters that the judges of the different courts would subsequently hold were not entitled to be on the register at all. That condition of things would be intolerable. The public opinion of this country would not sustain the authority of a House that was elected by such means, and it is highly inexpedient that any such condition of things should be made possible. I think we are entitled here to the amendment promised by the hon. gentleman, in regard to the appeals from the revising officer to the county court judge. We are entitled, under the understanding had, to hold that the list shall not be considered finally revised until it is revised by the county judge; and then we have, besides that, this question of appeals raised by the amendment of my hon. friend from North York.

Mr. EDGAR. In my remarks I assumed that the revision would not be complete until, where the revising officer was not a county court judge, it had been revised under the system promised by the First Minister, and it was on the same basis that the hon. gentleman himself made his remarks subsequently. The whole argument was therefore based on the assumption that there would be a final revision by the revising officer, when he was a county court judge, and by the county court judge where he was not. I think it is almost essential that this provision should come in in this clause, or as a new section before it, because the list cannot be spoken of as revised and corrected and in a shape to be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until the county court judge has passed upon it. I do not know whether the First Minister has drafted the clause yet, but I think this is the place where it should go, or it might stand until it can be put in there. Then the evils of the latter part of section 26 would be minimised to the extent the Prime Minister said they would.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the remarks of the First Minister, a few moments ago, must have been very disappointing to members of the committee, or at least to some of them. I had formed the impression that the difficulty had been pointed out so thoroughly this afternoon that after dinner the First Minister would have been prepared to propose some solution of the difficulty, which, it seems to me, must be apparent to him as well as to other members. Of course, we are proceeding, in a measure, upon what we have understood from the First Minister, that there was to be a larger ground of appeal, and opportunity for appeal, than the wording of this original Bill would indicate; but it seems to me that the First Minister cannot fail to see that if this clause is allowed to remain as it is now his promise to the House would be virtually done away with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, virtually, if I understand it aright. What benefit is it to me to be told I have the right to appeal to a Superior Court if I have been defeated by a certain number of illegal votes placed upon the list by a revising barrister, if there is a provision in this Bill that, notwithstanding I get the verdict of the Superior Court in my favor, and show conclusively that I have had a majority of the legal votes cast at that time, nevertheless there is no remedy, but the seat is held by my opponent for the five years. Virtually, the appeal is wholly wiped out it would be of no more use to me than if a criminal should unfortunately be hanged upon circumstantial or other testimony, and after a time it was found out that the testimony was not correct. If the man's life had been taken from him, finding out that he was not guilty of the crime would do him no good. It may be an extreme illustration, but it answers this case. Here is the contest for the seat to be decided, and, if the First Minister insists upon passing this clause as it is, the question is decided beyond a peradventure the moment the votes are cast that are upon the list improperly. It is the duty of the First Minister and the duty of the committee to find some solution of the difficulty, to find some plan whereby the promise of the First Minister that an effective appeal—for I take it he is not trifling with the committee when he promised it—that some way shall be devised whereby an effective appeal may be secured. I was disappointed in his remarks, because he admitted the possibility that there might be a few names in the polling subdivision put on in error, or otherwise, but he seemed to see greater difficulty in hanging up, as he termed it, the votes of that whole polling sub-division because two or three names were improperly on the list. But the First Minister knows that the fact that there are two or three names in each polling sub-division on a list, that have no right to be on that list—if these names cast their votes in the same direction, they would determine, I would almost say, a majority of the elections of members to serve in this House. If these votes in the polling sub divisions of the various ridings of the Dominion were cast in one way it would have the effect, almost, of electing a majority of the members of this House, while the members so sitting would be in a minority of the legal votes cast at that election. Surely we cannot afford, as a committee, to allow a clause in the Bill to pass that would have that effect. Whether there be difficulties in what has been suggested by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), I do not know. I am not sufficient lawyer to determine all fine points, but I can see very clearly that this clause, left as it is, practically nullifies, not only the broader ground of appeal that has been promised by the First Minister, but entirely nullifies the provision given us in the original drafting of the Bill. The First Minister must not forget the fact that it is not possible for us on this side of the House to view the revising barrister with the same degree of confidence that he does. The First Minister seems to think there might be no difficulty, because, possibly, only bye-elections would come on under it. He will not, of course, feel annoyed if we say that under it, with a First Minister so designing, we could see how a general election could be brought on at a period when the vast majority of the seats in the House would be affected by it, and the First Minister would hardly claim it is desirable that such should be left in the hands of the First Minister of the day were that First Minister leading any particular party in this country. A general election might be brought on when a large majority of the members of this House would be affected by the operations of this clause. I again repeat that it is the bounden duty of the

committee to address themselves to devising a clause whereby justice shall be done, whereby the will of the people, as expressed by the legal voters, shall be carried out, and not be thwarted by illegal votes, that may be, by fraud or design, placed upon the election list.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know what the legal effect may be of the words in the last lines, "final and conclusive as to every election for such electoral district," is intended to be. I should like to know from the First Minister whether, in his judgment, the words, "final and conclusive," would debar the party who is defeated from bringing up the question of the validity of those votes on an election petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, it might have the effect of getting off an election petition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me it would. There is a very considerable *primâ facie* case that it would do so. Now, nothing could well be more unjust than that a man who had received a majority of the legal votes should be deprived of the seat to which he was entitled, because we have decided that an election should be held on a roll which had not been revised. Then, as to another argument the Prime Minister used, which was that there would be an unusual number of appeals for the purpose of protracting this revision. I think, under the clause he has introduced as to sub-divisions, that would not be very likely to happen. I presume it would be easy enough to introduce the practice we have in Ontario, where each separate municipality is appealed by itself, and if the judge certifies that the municipal list is correct then for that municipality that list is used. In other municipalities, where appeals are lodged, the list of the preceding year may be used. Now, I presume the same thing could be done in the case of these various sub-divisions, and that would greatly minimise the difficulty to which the First Minister was alluding when I came in. There is another consideration which deserves some weight. If you maintain the clause as it now stands, there would always be a special temptation to parties to endeavor to get the list, before the revising officer, made in their favor. The fact that a list should not be used until it had been finally revised on appeal would serve, to some extent, as a check against improper applications or demands to strike off names. But if you allow this clause to stand, politicians on either side will be much more disposed to make a vigorous struggle before the revising officer, prior to the final revision of the list, than otherwise they would do; and there would be probably a worse list and more irregularity caused by that particular temptation than would occur in the ordinary nature of things. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the fact that the list is going to be subject to revision before it can be used in an election, would be a check both on the revising officer and, what is probably more important, on the hot partisans of either side who are endeavoring to gain advantages over each other. Moreover, as a mere matter of justice and common sense, it appears to all impartial persons that the list should be finally revised before it is allowed to be used. Day by day election petitions, of which many of us have had unpleasant experiences, are becoming more expensive and troublesome to members on both sides of the House, and I think it is not desirable that they should be encouraged, as I think they would be certain to be encouraged, if an election is disposed of on an imperfect list; and if it turns out, as I think hon. gentlemen would find it would turn out, those words, "final and conclusive," would, at all events, have to be amended, so that if a man was elected on a list which had not been subject to appeal he might be and would be entitled to bring that question before the courts.

Mr. LISTER. When the Act was first introduced it was intended to give only an appeal on questions of law to a judge of the Superior Court. Since that time the First Minister has agreed to give an appeal on questions of fact as well as questions of law to the judge of the county court. I could have understood very well the use of this section if the Bill had remained and had been carried out according to the original intention of the First Minister. But I can easily see, in view of the changes to which he has consented, that it will cause very great difficulty, if not great injustice, unless the section is amended in the direction desired by the Opposition. What is the position of the candidate under this Bill? It is quite possible that before the time for finally revising the list, or before the time for determining appeals has expired, an election may take place, and the last revised list may be used, pending those appeals. It is provided that persons on that list who have been appealed against will be entitled to vote at that election, and their votes will be final, to the same extent and in the same manner as if the appeal were not taken against them. We know that many of the constituencies are very close, and if an effort were made, and it is not beyond possibility that such might be made, a sufficient number of improper voters might be placed upon the list to determine the result of elections, against the wish of the duly qualified voters. It is not for this Parliament to recognise, to legalise, such a possible injustice as may take place if this clause were passed. The difficulty can easily be overcome. If those lists were prepared by the local officers, if the revision and preparation of the lists were left in the hands of the people, we would have no reason to apprehend the danger which we might apprehend if this Bill were allowed to pass in its present shape. The people themselves would look after the list; but under this Bill we have an officer of the Government, not only to prepare but to revise those lists. I can only say, without wishing to cast any odium on the revising officer, that it is possible, in his zeal for the party that appointed him, he may overstep the mark and do injustice to the opposite party. It is not just to our self-respect that this House should place on the Statute Book a measure which may have the effect of doing any injustice to a single individual. The result of the section, as prepared, is this: That while those appeals may be many or few, those votes will be cast, and they may have the effect of electing a man who is not the choice of the qualified electors. This section applies not only to appeals to the judge of a county court but to appeals to the Superior Court. The section might be amended by providing that the voters' list should not be considered final until the time for entering appeals before the judge had expired; that might be within a few days, or two weeks, at the utmost. Or the difficulty might be obviated as suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills): a tendered ballot might be given. A list might be prepared which should contain the names of those whose right to vote had been questioned, and against whose right an appeal might be pending. If it turned out that they had the right, the ballot would be counted; and, in the other event, the reverse would be the case. In that way complete justice would be done, not only to the candidates but to the voters themselves. Section 26, as it at present stands, should not be allowed to become the law. I trust the First Minister will take the matter into consideration, and make some such amendments as have been suggested by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Mr. FAIRBANK. As it is generally considered that this is a question which should be discussed chiefly by legal gentlemen, I would not have risen, but to my mind the position is so outrageous that if the lay members of the House did not speak upon it the very boys on the floor would feel bound to speak. When the Bill was first introduced the decision of the revising barrister was practically final; he really decided who should sit in this House and

who should not, and the remaining clauses were in keeping with it. But after long discussion we were granted the right to appeal, and then, of course, this clause became absurd. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite would be willing to defend the proposition that members for this House should be chosen by men having no vote. In fact, the proposed appeal after an election is too ridiculous to be considered at a country debating school, much less the Parliament of Canada; it is only trifling with the House and with the country; it is an appeal only in name, and if the hon. gentleman does not wish this Bill to bear this stamp of outlawry, to make it a Bill which every good citizen would feel called upon to destroy, wherever he met it, it should be amended in this respect. To pass this Bill, with this clause as it is, in the fifth month of the session of this Parliament, would be, I think, a burlesque on legislation. Perhaps these terms may consider somewhat strong, but I venture to say that they are not a particle stronger than the country will be considered justified if this clause passes. I thought we had heard the last about the extension of the franchise by this Bill, but the First Minister this evening again spoke of the disadvantage to the electorate of a restricted franchise. Does the Bill extend the franchise in Prince Edward Island, in British Columbia, in Manitoba or in New Brunswick? That question has been answered by members from those Provinces. It has been shown, by returns under the official seal, by those who are competent to give them, that in some counties 400, 500 or 700 voters will be struck off the list, under this Bill, men who have voted for years and who are the holders of real estate.

Mr. FOSTER. That has never been shown.

Mr. FAIRBANK. True, it is stated that it extends the franchise to other classes; but even admitting that it does, the total number cut off will be very great. In Quebec, alone, is there no reduction; and it was not in the Bill originally, even as to that Province, but the change was made at the suggestion of hon. gentlemen from that Province. The franchise is not extended in Ontario by this Bill; and hon. gentlemen, when they refer to the law of that Province, constantly refer to the old law. Hon. gentlemen understand very well that the next election will virtually be decided before the revising barrister. Under the Act, as it now stands, it is perfectly possible for a general election to be brought on very shortly, after the revising barrister has returned the list, before any appeal can be made whatever, and if this provision is retained it will create the greatest doubt in many minds whether a general election will not be brought under such circumstances. The proceedings in the House would almost indicate that. We have been refused an amendment to have the evidence before him taken under oath, notwithstanding that his decision is virtually to be final. Even if he acts in good faith, a person may come before him and make any sort of statement he chooses without being subject to the consequences of an oath. As the Bill stands now, with the First Minister's refusal to make this amendment, I consider it to be a worse Bill than it was when it was introduced. If I were leading the Reform party I would say, as a matter of political tactics, by all means pass the Bill as you have it. But I believe we have something higher than party considerations here. I think it is our duty to make this Bill, I will not say respectable—I believe that is impossible—but something approaching it. I do not profess to be a legal gentleman, and perhaps it is just as well, in considering a point of this kind, that my mind is not confused by legal considerations at all. I think, however, I bring to the consideration of it a little of that kind of common sense that the hon. gentleman will find pretty prevalent in the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am rather surprised at the hon. gentleman being so anxious to have this Bill amended when he says it would be greatly to the benefit of his party to be carried. That is an excess of patriotism that I have not usually found occupying even the most patriotic minds. The whole argument of hon. gentlemen opposite has been based on the supposition that all the elections are going to take place in the short period between the time the revising officer settles his list and the time of the appeal to the court above. This thing is going on from year to year, from day to day, and from month to month, without reference to a general election or a particular election; and the elections that will take place in that short period will be few and insignificant, in comparison with the disadvantage that would exist from throwing the electorate upon the voters' list of the year before. That would disfranchise a great many men, especially of the working classes. However, I am anxious always to weigh the arguments that are used; I must say that I am opposed to this amendment altogether; but after disposing of that, if it is lost, with the permission of the House I would postpone the consideration of the clause for another day, and proceed to the subsequent clauses. I want to consider that, and see if there is any means of meeting the objection, I think almost the causeless objection, of hon. gentlemen opposite; still, I see the objection and the earnestness with which they speak upon it. Two suggestions have been made, one from the other side of the House and one from this side, which I shall consider before we sit again.

Mr. WELDON. This is not a question of detail, but a question of principle. In cases where there is a narrow majority a great injustice might be done; a candidate might be practically elected by persons not entitled to vote. Again, there is a difficulty in the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) which was pointed out by the Prime Minister, that it might affect the list. We have adopted the principle that the work of the revising barrister shall be referred to the county court judge; then, it seems to me that the election should be postponed until we have got the decision of the judge. It strikes me that the list ought not to be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until the county court judge has passed upon it. In the one case, when the county court judge is the revising officer, he passes upon it first; why should he not in the other case? There ought to be some precaution against the difficulty of persons not entitled to vote controlling an election. We have to look at this as a permanent matter, because it is not confined to the first revision, but will apply to all future lists. It is well known that sometimes after an Act becomes law, some point arises that has escaped attention; it is almost impossible to meet all cases, no matter how carefully you draw a Bill; but we ought to endeavor to do so as far as possible. We ought, if possible, to prevent the possibility of voters being appealed against when an election is about to take place. It seems to me the difficulty might be avoided by providing that the list shall not be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery until it has been certified by the county court judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be understood that I shall carry out in its integrity the proposition that there shall be an appeal to the county court judge, when he is not himself the revising officer, and all the consequences that must naturally flow from that proposition. The question here, however, is not that. The question is the balance of difficulty—whether, when an election takes place before the judge disposes of the appeal, we should take the chance of a few bad votes slipping in, or disfranchise a number of voters by taking an old and effete list, and this question is weighed, in my mind, with the balance in favor of a full franchise—rather in favor of the first system than the last. If there be any amendment at all, it must be, I think, in the direction of the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to see if we cannot contrive some

mode by which the votes objected to can be segregated, in such a manner that they will not interfere with the purity and correctness of the return. I see great difficulty in doing it, but I shall try my hand at it, and for that reason move to postpone the clause, to have an opportunity of considering it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In any case, I presume the right hon. gentleman is willing that in the case of the revising officer, at any rate, the list shall not be considered final until the county court judge has passed upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the point I will consider.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is only one of the points. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to concede that, and take into consideration the further point, as to the appeal which might be made from the county court judge to a higher court.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Anybody who has had experience in Ontario elections, and I suppose the same is the case in other Provinces where there are county court judges, knows that county court judges disposed, in former days, of the various appeals made to them in a very short time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the revising barrister is not a county court judge—and that will occur in a very few instances in Ontario—there will be, as a matter of course, an appeal to the county court judge, and a trial of all objections and of refusals of applications to vote. As the hon. gentleman truly says, he will quickly dispose of them, and the hon. gentleman's chances of an election coming on in the interval are very light. Hon. gentlemen opposite exaggerate, I think, the importance of the clause; still, I see the logic of their arguments, and as the construction of the clause is a little involved, I will ask to postpone consideration until to-morrow. I am, however, opposed to this amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. As a lay man, I must express my gratification at hearing the First Minister assure the House that he wishes to place this clause in the best possible form, and has therefore determined to hold it over for the purpose of consideration. I wish to call his attention to one or two points. He tells us the whole argument on this side seems to be based upon the assumption that the elections will take place between the returns made by the revising barrister and the settlement of appeals before the court. I do not think they will, as a rule; but there may be some that will take place during that interval, and it is but right to guard against any such contingency. Most of the general elections within my recollection have been upon voters' lists several months at least in force. The elections of 1882 were upon the lists of the previous year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That objection will be avoided.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it should be arranged that the voters' list will finally settled before a general election takes place. The hon. gentleman promised us an appeal, but we want it to be arranged in such a way that under no possible circumstances it will fail to give practical results. The Bill professes to be modelled upon English legislation, but we have departed from the English model in the matter of rolls and preliminary revision. In England, the rolls are made by the local officers, and the preliminary investigation takes place before the revising barrister. With regard to appeals, the English provision, 6 Victoria, chapter 18, section 66, provides:

"And be it enacted that every judgment or decision of the said court shall be final and conclusive in the case, upon a point of law adjudicated upon, and shall be binding upon every committee of the House of Commons, appointed for the trial of any petition complaining of the undue election or return of any member or members to serve in Parliament."

Although the law provides that the voters' list certified by the revising barrister shall be taken as the complete list, and that no voter on it shall be deprived of his vote in consequence of an appeal pending before the court, yet the law provides that if that appeal has held his vote to be improper and illegal, that vote shall, by the committee of the House of Commons trying the election case, be thrown out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are no election committees in England now.

Mr. CHARLTON. But there are Election Courts, and the functions and powers exercised are those exercised by the Election Courts, and the Election Courts should have the same power to throw out votes which were found to be illegal votes by the court of appeal that the election committee had.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause the hon. gentleman is reading is the other way. The final decision shall be binding on the judge or other tribunal trying the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. Shall be binding upon the committee of the House or Election Court trying the election case. All that the Opposition desire is that the lists—although we object to the mode of preparation, yet if they are to be prepared by revising officers, and an appeal is to be given, we ask that it may not be a mockery, but that any vote decided by the Court of Appeal to be an illegal vote shall not be counted in the final result in case of election protest and contest.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the 28th clause, on the same ground as this, stands over. The concluding part of that clause involves the same point. There will be two points to consider, with regard to this matter of voting by numbered ballot. The one is the case of a judge or revising officer who has put upon the list parties whose right to remain on it is contested, and the case of parties who claim to be put on the list, but whose right is denied. Suits may be pending with regard to both; both should have an equal right to vote, and vote in the same way. Then, whether their votes where counted or not would depend upon the decision of the court. The question arises, with whom should the sealed ballots remain during the pending stage? Should they be transferred to the Court of Chancery or sent to the clerk of the court where the suits are pending, leaving the judge, upon the decision of the case, to report to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the number of votes that should be struck off the list or the number that should be added?

Mr. MULOCK. If the clause stands over, my amendment should stand over and be moved again. I beg to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The numbers of the clauses will have to be changed, but that is done by the law clerk.

Mr. MULOCK. It would be well if the First Minister could, to-morrow, with this proposed section, lay before us the scheme for the appeal. The two are involved together.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that, but we will see.

Mr. MULOCK. It would help to reconcile us to the clause generally. We have not very much confidence in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman and his friends were in the English House of Commons I am afraid they would be called the irreconcileables.

On section 29,

Mr. FLEMING. The time of eight days is not sufficient. The election law requires that the proclamation shall be published at least eight days before the nomination.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You have to furnish to the returning officer, not merely a list of the voters, but a description of the polling districts, which is always included in the advertisement, and the returning officer has to advertise that eight days before the nomination.

Mr. RYKERT. Not until after the nomination.

Mr. FLEMING. The proclamation contains the description of the polling sub-divisions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Make it twelve days.

Mr. FLEMING. That would not be sufficient.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will read: "At least twelve days before the day of nomination." I think you will find that will be time enough. The dragging on of the days of an election is not very pleasant for the candidates on either side. We should have as short a time as convenient for full notification to the electors. This will give the returning officer four days to get out his proclamation. I think that is plenty of time.

Mr. CHARLTON. In some districts, such as Algoma, some of these large, sparsely-settled ridings, that would be insufficient.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to remind the First Minister that the returning officer has only twelve days in which to make his preparations. He has only eight days in which to get the list printed, and send it all over the county to be put up, and it only leaves him four days to have it printed before nomination. In some of the counties of New Brunswick, which are very large, this would not give him time enough.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In an election you do not send one man out to go around the county and stick it up in every polling district, but the sheriff or returning officer will send out copies to men in different districts to post it up. He will take either one man or twenty men, if necessary. He is paid for it; it is always allowed in his accounts.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think twelve days is quite sufficient. My county is the largest one in the Province, and I have done it many a time as sheriff. You do not get the writ on the twelfth day; you do not get it before that; and the returning officer or sheriff goes to work and prepares for it, to have it all ready. He has got four days in which to get it out. I have done it in two days, in the largest county in the Province.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid the First Minister will get into difficulties under this four days provision. I do not see how, in districts such as Algoma and Gaspé, it is possible to comply with the provisions of the law. There can be no objections to extending it to seven or eight days, which would make the thing more workable.

On section 30,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the 3rd line make it 1887 instead of 1886. This is for the second list. Then, in the 13th line, after the word "appointed," I propose to insert "where there are no assessment lists or certified copy or certified copies of the last revised list of voters in such electoral district." That is to meet the case of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELDON. A revising officer may, in erasing the name, completely destroy the name, so that a person would not know the reason why it has been erased. After the first list is made up it should be kept intact until it is finally revised at the subsequent revision. I shall therefore move an amendment to provide that, instead of adding names to the previous list or erasing names, the revising officer shall make up a list of names proposed to be added and a list of names proposed to be struck off, and he shall state, opposite the names, why such action was proposed. I move that at line 29, the following be inserted:—

Make up a list of names of all persons whom it is proposed to add to the list.

Also, at line 39, the following:—

Make up a list of names of persons whom it is proposed to strike off, stating the reasons why such names are proposed to be struck off.

It is very important to know the reason why the names are proposed to be struck off; because in many such cases the person could at once attend at the final revision, if he desired, and have the matter determined. Such action would be in harmony with the principle of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The following words might be inserted: "Noting on the said list the names of any persons who are dead, or who are not, according to the terms of this Act, entitled to vote, and stating the reason in said note."

Mr. MILLS. What I would suggest is, that here there is no provision in this preliminary revision for objecting to any names or suggesting that they should be left off. Does the hon. gentleman intend that the proceeding should be taken as at the final revision——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is intended.

Mr. MILLS. How are parties on the old list to be taken off, as, for instance, a man whose tenancy has expired, and yet his name may appear on the new roll. There should be some evidence, I think, but if no one takes any interest in the matter the old name would be left on. If he required the attendance of the clerk or the assessor to give information before the list is made up, he would be able to make it more accurate, and no names would have to be added or struck off, except upon application.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the second list the revising officer has the list of the year before, and the assessment roll of that year, the year subsequent to the year for which the first list was made up. He comes to the name on the voters' list of the previous year, "John Jones, owner." He looks at the assessment roll for that year, and he finds that the name of John Jones is not there; but he would leave the name on, and make a note on it: "Objected to; not on the assessment roll," giving the reason why the name is objected to. That gives notice to everybody, and that vote will have to be substantiated at the final revision.

Mr. MILLS. That is just the point. The revising officer sees that A is down as the tenant of the property for which B was down last year. No one makes application to him. He strikes off B and puts on A. Would it be the duty of the revising officer to note that B's name is objected to because it is not on the new roll?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly. He will not strike it off; he will note it; and he will put A on, that being a new name.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose the name of B is not challenged; will it be his duty to notify B, and summon him, without the application of any other party? Will it be his duty to take steps himself to ascertain the truth before he strikes that name off the voters' list?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not, as regards A. He finds A's name on the assessment roll as tenant, and that is sufficient to establish A's right to vote, and he will put his name on the list, without any suggestion or application.

Mr. MILLS. Taking B's off?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will not take it off, but will mark it as objected to, and I should think he would strike it off if he found no such name on the assessment roll, and found no person coming to vindicate its right to be on the voters' list.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose that, in the Province of Quebec, where there is no provision for putting the names of wage-earners on the assessment roll, in a constituency the names of 500 people were on the voters' list as wage-earners for the last year? What is to be done in that case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was fully discussed on the settlement of the first list. He will take such evidence as he can, and will publish the names of all claimants, as in the first case, marking all objected to, and then proceed with the same evidence as is provided for in the case of the first list.

Mr. MILLS. Suppose no one appears on behalf of those wage-earners; are we legislating to make it the duty of the revising officer to summon those whose names were on the list last year, to show why their names should be continued this year, or is he going to leave their names on, unless some one appears to have their names struck off? Are we going to make it the duty of this revising officer to make the list as perfect as possible, without some one to urge him to that duty—either to put on or take off names? If so, it seems to me we must alter this clause. I am asking for information, just to see how far the hon. gentleman proposes to go, because it seems to me the completeness of the list will depend on the duties we impose on the revising officer; we cannot depend on the simple interest of the two contending parties who are attacking the voters' list. We ought to make it the duty of the revising officer to make the list as complete as possible, and we have to enquire how far he is to go in looking after those who may be considered a precarious class of voters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it, with respect to voters who are not on the assessment roll, that if they were on the last voters' list he will hold them to have the right to vote, unless some one objects, or unless he has information before him to the contrary.

Mr. MILLS. But so far as wage-earners are concerned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no doubt they will be objected to. If they have gone away they will not vote.

Mr. MILLS. They might come back.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD If they come back, unless there is some objection taken by somebody, the fair inference is that they have the right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. Then it will not be the duty of the revising officer to ascertain whether they have the right to vote or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is it intended to make a new list, or only an amendment of the old list in existence? In the Province of Quebec a new list is made every year, but the local officer uses the list already in existence. He does not content himself with adding new names or striking off old names, but makes a complete list, so that when an election comes on it is only necessary to refer to the last list. It would seem, from the wording of this clause, that it is not proposed to make a new list, but simply to add names to or strike out names from the old list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revising officer files one copy of the revised list with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and he keeps the other copy, certified, himself. He sends for the assessment rolls of the municipalities, and from them he makes out the new list and publishes it. The names are to be published without striking any off; then objections are written against the names of those objected to.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman proposes that this revision will be at the beginning of January. In Ontario the assessments begin in February or March, so that the assessment roll the revising officer would have before him would be a roll ten or eleven months old. Under sections 21 and 22 the final revision is said to be the 1st June; now, the second assessment roll will be in the hands of the judges before that. Is it intended that the parties who are entitled to vote on the second roll shall be put on the list, and will it be open to the revising officer to use this roll on the final revision?

Mr. RYKERT. In the cities, the assessments do not take place until August and September, and are not finally revised until the 3rd September, and in the country districts they may be appealed from till the 1st August.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have to the 1st of August to go to the court of revision. Then it will be October or November before the rolls are finally made up. It is advertised for thirty days after the 1st August. That brings you to 1st September, to allow the party to appeal. Then the appeal will be tried as the county judge directs, so that it will be pretty nearly the end of the year, in October or November, before the assessment roll made in the spring or summer is finally decided in appeal by the county judge. Then, as regards cities, it is provided that these rolls will not be finally made up till the 31st December. Therefore, in order to embrace the whole electorate, in the urban as well as the rural districts, we have started it from the 1st January. I do not think it would be well for the revising officer to be guided by a roll not finally concluded. If any party can show he has a right to vote, and can prove it, of course his name will be put on, but I do not think the revising officer should be forced to send for an incomplete assessment roll, not finally decided on.

Mr. MILLS. The time for making up the revision is in June; then five weeks are allowed, which would make it some time in July before the final revision under this Act takes place. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is confounding the revision of the voters' list with the revision of the assessment roll, because the latter takes place in May. The court of revision sits in May.

Mr RYKERT. There must be fourteen days' notice to the court of revision given after the 1st May. The court of revision generally meets about the 28th May. Then there is an appeal to the county judge up to the 1st August. Immediately afterwards, if there is no appeal, the clerks make up the voters' lists, which are published for one month, for the electors to give notice of appeal, and afterwards the judge fixes the date of his courts throughout the county. The object now is to have a complete list for a whole county. In a county containing a city you cannot have that until the 31st December, so that if you proceeded as my hon. friend from Bothwell wishes, you would have a partial list at one time and the rest of the list at another.

Mr. FAIRBANK. That revision is the revision of the voters' list, not of the assessment roll, which is finished long before the time the hon. gentleman mentions.

Mr. RYKERT. It cannot be completed until fourteen days

after the 1st May, and after that there is a right of appeal on the assessment roll to the county judge to the 1st August.

Mr. FAIRBANK. That does not change the assessment roll, only the voters' list.

Mr. RYKERT. I am talking about both the assessment roll and the voters' list. I have been twenty-five years reeve, and ought to know.

Mr. FAIRBANK. We are talking about the assessment roll, and the hon. gentleman persists in talking about the voters' list.

Mr. RYKERT. The assessment roll is not completed by the 1st June, for they have up to the 1st August to appeal.

Mr. LISTER. There is no appeal from the court of revision on the ground of assessment. The only appeal is in regard to the voters' list.

Mr. RYKERT. There is an appeal from the court of revision to the judge of the county court in regard to any errors of the assessment roll.

Mr. LISTER. That is for the purpose of the voters' list.

Mr. RYKERT. Section 59 of the Assessment Act shows distinctly that there is an appeal to the county judge against the decision of the court of revision. I am surprised that any one who has been in the profession as long as the hon. gentleman, should not know that.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken. The county councils are now in session, and they have to make a final revision of the assessment rolls which are transferred to them by the township councils.

Mr. RYKERT. I am surprised at the ignorance of the hon. gentleman. Does he not know that the county council has nothing whatever to do with the assessment roll for that year, but takes the roll of the preceding year, and upon that equalises the assessment.

Mr. LISTER. There is no occasion for the hon. gentleman to lose his temper.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not lose my temper, but I am surprised at the hon. gentleman's ignorance.

Mr. LISTER. I am not surprised at yours, as far as your social qualifications are concerned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PLATT. For all practical purposes, the list, as it leaves the court of revision, is as good as when it leaves the hands of the judge, if it is to be *primâ facie* evidence of the right of the person assessed to vote. On the 1st June it could very well be used as *primâ facie* evidence.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am surprised that the proposition of my hon. friend from Lincoln could be, for a moment, doubted, and that hon. gentlemen opposite are not aware of the fact that there is an appeal to the county judge from the proceedings of the municipal court of revision. Not only am I thoroughly certain of that, from having examined the statute, but within the last ten months I conducted a very important case of that character, in which an appeal from the local court of revision, composed of the local council, was made directly to the county judge of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, regarding the assessment of the Hon. D. A. Macdonald, formerly a member of this House.

Mr. WELDON. I think a similar provision should be inserted here to that in the 12th section, as to this being *primâ facie* evidence. It is desirable to make the section uniform.

Mr. CASEY. This is a point in which the right hon. gentleman should state his intentions. He has changed section 12, referring to the primary formation of the list, so as to make the rolls *primâ facie* evidence. There should be some language inserted in this clause to show that the same rules should be followed in regard to succeeding revisions of the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, of course.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has not inserted anything in this clause to the same effect as in the 12th section. Then, about the tenants. The hon. gentleman announced his intention to provide that a tenant assessed for $150 or $300, as the case might be, whatever the qualification is for a freeholder, his name should be put *primâ facie* upon the voters' list as being a tenant and paying $20.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What I stated to the committee was this: After a long fight on the clause about tenants, I said that if hon. gentlemen opposite would promise me not to re-open that clause I would add a proviso, that in cases where there was no rent specified in the assessment roll, if it showed that the property was assessed for $150, that would be received as *primâ facie* evidence of the amount of the rent.

On section 32,

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me all these sections, down to the 38th, are, in one sense, unnecessary, as they are re-enacting the same thing that was enacted before. The whole of them might be put in one section.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I put these in the second time so that persons who are not lawyers may not have occasion to look back. It makes the Bill a little longer, but a lay man just looks at them without looking at the previous section. I thought it would be better to have a repetition.

On section 37,

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to call attention to the fact that twelve days is too short a time for the necessary work to be done. The law requires the returning officer to be furnished with the revised list before nomination. The proclamation has to be up eight days before the nomination, and in that proclamation the time and place of holding the polling in each case has to be stated, in the event of a contest. Some of the electoral districts are over one hundred miles in length. The returning officer has to make himself acquainted with the polling districts, so as to ascertain the most convenient places in which to hold the polls. In order to do that it is necessary to summon the township clerk, and his advice in that regard is largely acted upon. It is utterly impossible for the returning officer to get the information and do the posting and other work within four days.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the duty now thrown on the returning officer will, if he finds the district too large, be performed by the revising officer. He will fix the polling district. No difficulty has been experienced in Ontario, and I have known elections come on very rapidly. As to the posting of the notices, three or four men would be employed, instead of one.

Mr. MILLS. The returning officer has to appoint deputies, who have to be hunted out, and appointed in the polling divisions; and their advice is generally taken with respect to the places of polling. All the work cannot be done in four days.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No arrangement for polling places is made until after nomination; and this is then done by the sheriff.

Mr. WELDON. The reason so little difficulty is experienced in New Brunswick is that the sheriffs are returning officers. It seems to me that four days is a very short time, especially in some counties, where there would be considerable distances to travel.

Mr. WATSON. In my county it would be impossible to get up the notices in that time, as it is 150 miles in length, and a great deal of the travelling has to be done by stage or buck-board.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will make it fifteen days then, which is quite enough. To make it longer would make it only to protract the agony; and if hon. gentlemen are canvassing their constituencies they want to get through with it as soon as possible.

Mr. CASEY. That has nothing to do with the length of the campaign at all. The length of the campaign is fixed by the issue of the writ.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I have made you a very good offer; will you take fifteen days? There are limits to human endurance.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 38,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen will see that this duty of laying out the different polling districts is to be put upon the revising officer instead of the returning officer, which is much better. All the returning officer has to do is simply to put out his proclamation, choose convenient places and select his deputies.

Mr. MILLS. There is still concurrent power. Would it not be well to provide for the repeal of that clause of the Election Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be so. I will take a note of that.

Mr. CHARLTON. One great objection to this entire Bill is the amount of confusion it introduces into the elections as between the Provinces and the Dominion. It will also introduce confusion in the matter of the arrangement of the polling districts. I think we might at least avoid that objection to the Bill by providing that the polling districts for Dominion purposes shall be the same as those for provincial purposes. I therefore beg to move that the following be substituted for clause 38 :—

That the polling districts fixed for the purposes of provincial elections shall be, in each Province, adopted as the polling districts for the election of members for the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would save a great deal of trouble, both to the revising officer and to the returning officer, if this amendment were adopted, because people are familiar with the boundaries of the provincial polling divisions and with the places where the voting usually takes place. The practical question is, whether, in all the Provinces, the same limit of polling divisions is required as is required by this Bill, namely 200 voters; if that is the case, the proposal of the amendment would be a real convenience. I hear it objected to that the boundaries of the electoral districts are different. No doubt they are; but the polling divisions are the same; a certain number are simply taken from one county and added to another; so that no difficulty would arise in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The objection to the amendment is simply this, that the franchises are different, and if the different polling districts are to contain, as near as possible, 200 voters, those in the provincial elections would not be the same as those in the Dominion.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is quite true. But the number would not exceed 200, because the provincial franchises are, in most cases, more liberal than the Dominion. The amendment would certainly secure greater convenience to the public; that confusion as to the boundaries would not exist in the public mind; trouble and expense would be saved to those who have to work out this franchise, and we should secure uniformity in the boundaries of the polling districts both for Dominion and provincial elections.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. BOWELL. We have not had that in the past.

Mr. CHARLTON. But we would have it in the future.

Mr. BOWELL. In new sections of country, where the settlements are in groups, perhaps eight or ten miles apart, our experience has been that in the last election the polling districts were divided by the returning officer so as to afford the greatest facility for voting; but the year after, when the local elections came on, the local returning officer abolished them. In the township of Carlo, for instance, where there is a large settlement, voters were obliged to go to the north-west corner and poll their votes, and the result was that a large proportion of the voters of that township did not go out, because they would have to travel twelve or fifteen miles. So there is no uniformity now. The arrangement of the polling divisions altogether depends on the whim of the returning officer or the influence brought to bear upon him, whether he is the sheriff or anybody else.

Amendment negatived.

On section 38,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move to strike out the words "may issue, at his own instance," and insert the word "shall."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. I think the clause, "Witness fees and expenses allowed under the tariff of the Superior Court," is rating the expense too high. The cost of a court of revision should be sufficient.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust the hon. gentleman will change that. Of course the costs of the Superior Court are double what they are in division court. The witnesses in division court are paid 50 cents a day, and in the Superior Court, $1.25, and, as they are acting in the public interest, they ought to be satisfied with a smaller sum.

Mr. LISTER. If a solictor issues this subpœna, it will make up quite a bill of cost, amounting to $20 or $30. Under the Act of the Local Legislature, the tariff is division court costs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the words, "and expenses," be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the revising officer chooses to summon any witness, the expenses incurred by him will be borne by the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy he will put that into his account. I propose that the fees to be tendered to the witnesses so summoned shall be those allowed in the Province of Quebec in the Superior Court, in the Province of Ontario in the division courts, and in the other Provinces in the county or district courts.

Mr. MILLS. The revising officer may desire to summon some persons on his own initiative. He ought to have the power to do so, and yet he would be obliged to pay the expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will consider that when we come to the money resolution.

Mr. CASEY. Then I infer that witnesses summoned by the revising officer at his own instance will be paid for at the public cost?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid, on consideration, that there will be a great deal of pressure on the judge to summon those at his own instance who would be brought in the interest of a party.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps this clause might stand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I am almost inclined to ask the committe to go back and strike out the words "may at his own instance," leaving the revising officer obliged to summon witnesses only on the application of the parties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Hear, hear.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would suggest to the Premier that we have finished the 39 articles in orthodox fashion. The hon. gentleman has been in very close attendance himself, and I think we might reasonably adjourn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 6th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 141) respecting administration of justice and other matters in the North-West Territories—(Sir John A. Macdonald)—*(from the Senate.)*

Bill (No. 142) respecting canned goods—(Mr. Bowell)—*(from the Senate.)*

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the committee to return to clause 26. After consideration of this clause, I have thought that on the whole it would be well to adopt the substance of the suggestion of my hon. friend from Bothwell. I propose to strike out of the 29th line the words "and be final and conclusive as to," and to make the following addition to the clause:—

But the ballot of any person, whose name has been included in the certified list of voters and is the subject of an undecided appeal, shall be numbered by the deputy returning officer, and a corresponding number shall be placed opposite his name on the poll book; and upon the counting of the ballots, the ballots so numbered shall be by the deputy returning officer separated from the ordinary ballots and returned to the proper officer, sealed up to await the decision of such appeal; and if under such decision the name of any such person shall be struck from the voters' list, and if the election at which such vote has been given has been contested and a scrutiny of votes demanded, the vote given by such person shall be ascertained from his ballot and shall be struck from the poll; and if any person whose name has been excluded from this certified list of voters, and whose exclusion is the subject of an undecided appeal, shall desire to vote, the deputy returning officer shall receive his ballot and shall number the same and the name of the voter in the poll book, and keep separate such ballots as hereinbefore provided, and if upon such appeal, the decision of the revising officer shall be maintained, the vote of such person may be ascertained and struck from the poll book upon a contest and demand of scrutiny as hereinbefore provided.

Mr. MULOCK. According to the General Election Act I think the deputy returning officer is required to seal up the ballots immediately after counting them in the presence of the contestants. Would it not be prudent to put in two or three words providing that he shall seal them up at the same time and in the same manner as he is required to seal up the other ballots?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the hon. First Minister would do well to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). It should not be left to the deputy returning officer to carry those ballots away and seal them up in the absence of both parties. He ought to do it in the presence of both parties.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman will see that there is something more than that required. Of course following the analogy of the Election Act, the moment the ballots are counted, they would be sealed up in the presence of the scrutineer while the revising officer was present, but in case there was no contestation of the election, according to the clause as it stands, the election would stand as the ballots were counted. This ought not to be treated as part of the proceedings of a controverted election. It is not a part of the proceedings of a controverted election; it is a part of the preliminary proceedings of an ordinary election, and when it is found that any of those parties who vote are not entitled to vote, the returns should be corrected as a matter of course. Suppose a man is returned, and upon the final decision of the Court of Appeal it is found that 30 of those parties who voted for him should be struck off, they should be struck off, as a matter of course, after the decision is had, and the result of the election amended accordingly, no matter whether it is a controverted election or not. It is a question of the proper counting or enumeration of the result of the election.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) Under the law, of course there can be a recount within a certain number of days before the granting of the count. According to the amendment of the First Minister, the contestant would need to get a judgment of the Court of Appeal which occurred between the election and the recount, and there will be all the expense of filing a petition. There is a good deal in what the hon. member for Bothwell has said: it is, after all, but a count of the ballots, and not a part of the controverted election.

Mr. MILLS. If there has been a count, and the question as to the accuracy of the count has not been contested at all, the candidate ought not to be compelled to intervene in order to revise it after decision by the court. The correction of a miscount is a different proceeding, but if the court holds that of those parties who voted 30 or 40 ought not to have voted, it is a mere correction of the count. It is not a recount, it is the striking off from one candidate or the other, or both, the names of those who ought not to be on the list. There is no necessity for the candidate to interfere and be put to the expense of interference.

Mr. ABBOTT. As respects the recount, there ought to be no difficulty. There is a period upon which a candidate can insist upon a recount under the ordinary proceedings of the election law. If it should turn out before that time expires that there has been an error in this way, that persons were put on the list who had no right to be there, this error could be corrected on the recount. It would be very inconvenient and inexpedient that a member who has not been returned should be in an uncertain position after he has occupied his seat, when without his election being contested in any way, his right to occupy the seat may be interfered with any moment, on a return to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

Mr. MILLS. Certain proceedings must be taken in order to have a recount. Steps must be taken within a particular period of time, and weeks may elapse before a decision is had, and the law should be changed in that respect. But why should those proceedings be had. The party does not complain of

irregular proceedings, he admits his right to have the seat must depend on the validity or invalidity of the votes which are contested, and they could be contested quite as well without any application or interference on his part. You do not add anything to the regularity of the proceedings, or its fairness, or his moral right to have the seat, by calling on him to contest the election. The whole of that proceeding is a part, not of his taking any proceedings, but of the returning officer's act. You say to him, you must make a return, but as soon as votes contested are decided the return must be corrected accordingly, and if it should happen that the man who was returned in the first instance was held not to be elected and the man who had the minority in the first instance is held to have been elected, your returns should be made right. There is no want of diligence on the officer's part, he can do nothing to hasten the proceedings. Everything depends on the promptness with which the Court of Appeal decides the question as to the validity of the votes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) Suppose the judgment of the Court of Appeal is not given until after the time limited for the presentation of the petition, 30 days, is expired, what is the candidate to do? He has no remedy because the Superior Court has not given judgment in his favor at the proper time. There is another reason. Primarily, if the Court of Appeal decided in favor of the man who was not returned, he is entitled to get the seat. But then he has to file his petition and allege that he is entitled to the seat, because he has the majority of votes. The opposite candidate, the man who got the seat improperly, will say: You are not entitled, because some other irregularity has taken place. We shall be trying on the petition some things that ought not to be tried there at all. You are putting the respondent in the same position as if he were the petitioner. I am not prepared to suggest any way in which the desired end could be reached. Why should not the House amend the writ on the judgment of the Court of Appeal? In England, as the hon. gentleman knows, under the old law, before the ballot was introduced, the committee appointed to try contested elections was bound by the judgment of the court as to the validity of the vote. Why should not Parliament in the same manner amend the return? Parliament ought to be at liberty to amend the return and give the man entitled to it, by the judgment of the court, the seat.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must, of course, see that the man who is the representative should represent really the majority. That is the principle on which we sit here. On the other hand, we have, as much as we can, consistently with that axiom, tried to prevent members, who have been elected and returned, feeling uncertain in their places for a long period. It is of very great importance to the independence of the member himself, and to his usefulness here, that he should feel that he represents his constituents for that Parliament. I have had petitions presented against me, and I have, with those hanging over my head, never felt the same assurance that I truly and really represented the constituency, or could have the same influence in this House, as if I had been assured that I really represented the constituency in Parliament. It is the interest of us all to remove that feeling of uncertainty, which affects the usefulness of every member when a petition is hanging over his head. I am anxious to accept any suggestion on this subject which will meet the difficulty. I do not see why we should insist upon the opening of the ballots when the other party gives it up altogether.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is a good deal in what the hon. gentleman says, but the judgment of the Court of Appeal may not be given until after the time has expired, and you are bound to present the petition within a limited period.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. BLAKE. In cases where there was a question pending before the Court of Appeal at the time of the election, the time within which a recount could be demanded might be extended, so as to give a short delay from the giving of the judgment of the Court of Appeal.

Mr. CAMERON. Why not extend the time when the returning officer is to make his return? There is no use in his making his return until after the Court of Appeal gives its decision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Supposing a member was returned by a very large majority, and there were a certain number of rejected ballots, why should not the other party be allowed to give it up and say he did not want a recount, because, even if all the names should be added, and it should prove that they had voted for him, it could not affect the result of the election? It appears to me that, if the parties really surrender, seeing that they had no chance, we should not insist upon having the matter re-opened for no good purpose whatever. I think you may safely leave that, in view of the activity of the political parties in this country, to the defeated candidate. I think we are raising a practical difficulty which will operate in many cases, and which is of no real value on the whole.

Mr. MILLS. The case the hon. gentleman puts does not meet his proposition now before the committee. If the number of parties whose cases are appealed is not equal to the majority of the candidate who has polled the largest number of votes, there is no object in delay and there is no impropriety in the party being returned, as there is no decision by the Court of Appeal that can alter the apparent result of the election, but, supposing the majority of either candidate is small and that the number of cases in appeal might be quite sufficient to turn the election, the case would stand in a wholly different position. The leader of the Opposition has suggested a way out of the difficulty. The time for asking for recounts might be delayed in all such cases until after the appeals were decided, or, as I suggested in the first instance, these sealed ballots could be sent to the courts in which the appeals are pending, and the result of the count should not be reported to the returning officer until the court had decided.

Mr. BLAKE. I attach more importance than the hon. gentleman seems to do to this question from this point of view. I think it is highly important that there should be as few elections brought on, while yet it is uncertain what the voters' list is, as possible. I think we ought to do everything that we can in the way of legislation to minimise the temptation on the part of the party in power to bring on an election at that inconvenient season. Such a temptation there might be supposing the list, as it stood on the face, were more favorable than it was expected to be after the appeal had been disposed of. It is important to prevent that temptation from being operative by showing that as little gain as possible may result from it. I hope that we are dealing with an entirely exceptional class of cases; I hope, for instance, that such a thing would not be thought of as, in a general election, the Government which had control of the issue of the writs, not having regard to the general condition of appeals from the voters' list. I think it would be a very great abuse of power to cause a general election to be had when there was a very considerable number of the voters' lists under appeal pending before the judge, when consequently, in a considerable number of constituencies, it was uncertain who would have the right to vote. But such a thing might happen; and if such a thing did happen, or, if it happened in the case of a bye-election when we know the writ must issue upon the demand of two members, yet still you want to provide for the exceptional cases, and to minimise the inconvenience or possible wrong that may result from it. There are two or three plans

which have been suggested; the radical plan would be to postpone the actual return until the decision of the Court of Appeal, and then let the returning officer, with that before him, so attend to the list as that might demand. I cannot conceive of any serious delay, because I am quite confident the Court of Appeal would not delay under such circumstances its judgment. I think we may depend upon promptitude being used by the judicial tribunal in a case of that description, when they saw the question of the return and the rights of the people were depending upon it. But if that proposition is not feasible, though I think it feasible, my own suggestion covers the ground and removes any objection on that score. Let everything proceed in its due course, and in that exceptional class of cases enlarge the period in which the right to a recount may be had until the decision of the Court of Appeal itself. Then under these circumstances you give an opportunity, in the least expensive way, of doing that which ought normally to be done before the election, namely, of getting at the majority on each side according to proper voters' lists, and having the return according to that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, that is the great objection; but the point that strikes me most is the inconvenience and uncertainty of the plan. To illustrate my view, I will take the case of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as an instance. He has been a member of the Government here, and I suppose he hopes to be a member again. Well, suppose, during the course of the Session, there was a change of Government and the members of the Opposition came over here. They have to go to their election; Parliament would be adjourned until they were elected. Well, there is a temptation to put in objections in order to provide against a return. These objections are hung up for a certain time, and there will be, of course, a corresponding delay in the decision of the Court of Appeal. It occurs to me we are threatening every member, having once got his return, with a great uncertainty and great inconvenience, and perhaps cause great ministerial inconvenience by not leaving it as it is now.

Mr. MILLS. You are arguing against your clause altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. Yes. The hon. gentleman proposes that certain ballots shall be counted conditionally. Why, if the argument is good for anything, it is good against the clause. The chances are one hundred to one that the decision would not take place within the four or five days allowed for the purpose of a recount, and, unless it did, then the clause would be nugatory, and the hon. gentleman's proposition would be good for nothing. If his argument has any value he ought to withdraw his proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no, because, of course, if the seat was going to be contested, why should the matter hang over? Why should not the matter of review be insisted upon? Why should not the judge in appeal be obliged to go on with the matter if no party is interested?

Mr. BLAKE. My proposal is simply to deal with a recount, and that deals not with the returning officer's action in any shape. Of course, formally a return to the House does not take place, but there is simply a delay until the judgment of the Court of Appeal. Now you put a number of cases. You put the suggestion of a change of Government during the Session, and you put a suggestion of a delay in a Minister's election until the recount, and several other improbable contingencies. What we have got to do is to deal with the ordinary case of the matter. Although a formal return is delayed for a very short time by the suggestion which I make, I maintain that we cannot contemplate any serious delay by a court of justice under such circumstances. The judgment will be given promptly, the recount will follow promptly upon it, and the result will be ascertained with reasonable despatch.

Mr. DAVIES. If the proposition of the First Minister is accepted, I think the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition ought to be adopted. I want to draw the attention of the First Minister to the proposition itself. I must say that in its entirety it does not commend itself to my mind, and I do not think the members of the committee thoroughly understand it. He proposes in the first place, that those who have succeeded in getting their names upon the revised list, shall have the privilege of voting, even if there is an appeal against the names being there. That part of the proposition is not open to very serious objections. They have a *primâ facie* right to vote, and *primâ facie* they should be allowed to exercise that right. But look at the latter part of the proposition. He proposes that men who have applied to get their names on that list, and which have been ruled out by the revising barrister, shall still by merely making their formal appeal, be allowed to vote at an election and turn the election, and the man who is defeated will have to be put to the expense of contesting it, and of getting those names struck off that ought never to have been there at all. Take any county where 50 men apply to get their names on, and the revising officer says: You have no claim at all. You say they are worthless men, and you have nothing to lose. They appeal, and in the interim, pending the appeal on a point which may be worthless, they put in their votes and turn the election.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole tenor of the discussion on the other side of the House was in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not care from what Province that suggestion came; it does not commend itself to my mind, and I do not accept it.

Mr. BLAKE. The tenor of the discussion yesterday was that the prior year's list in case of appeal should be taken. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made towards the close of the discussion this proposition, as a suggestion of his own; but the main stress of the discussion was upon the other proposition, a proposition much more in accordance with the views of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was pressed, but not very strongly, that the list of the previous year should be taken. A good many hon. members saw the inconvenience that would arise by excluding a very large number of people, especially wage-earners who cannot be regarded as being so permanently on the list as other parties, they moving about a good deal.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not apprehend at the time that the clause would have the effect that the hon. member for Queen's points out. It will offer very great temptations to fraudulent and improper appeals, which we should avoid as much as possible.

Mr. CASEY. The only inconvenience alluded to yesterday as likely to arise from using the previous year's list was one suggested by the First Minister himself, that if that plan was adopted it might lead to fraudulent appeals for the purpose of having the last list used. The possibility of that has been recognised; but the possibility of inconvenience would be much less under that plan than under the one now suggested. The possibility of disfranchising any considerable number of voters would not arise, except in the event of an election taking place before the first list under this Bill was completed, in which case some wage-earners, people having $300 income, and certain classes of tenants, might be excluded; but after the first list has been completed, there can be no disfranchisement by taking the previous year's

list. The principle of using the previous year's list when the current year's list is incomplete is already recognised. It is the proper thing to use the previous list when the one for the current year is not complete. The only question is when is it complete? Is it when the revising officer has passed it or when the judge has passed upon it? My contention yesterday was that the list was not a complete one until the judge has corrected the action of the revising officer. The proposition made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was only an alternative one in case it was decided to use lists while under appeal.

Mr. MILLS. I did not argue the point as to claimants voting, but I suggested it as one of the questions which the hon. gentleman would have to consider in framing the clause. I have roughly sketched out a clause indicating my view, and from it the committee will see my notion as to the best way of accomplishing the object in view. It reads as follows:—

In case of an appeal to a superior court upon the claim of any person to be put upon the voters' list or the right to remain upon such list, such person may vote, but his ballot shall not be counted but shall be sealed up by the deputy returning officer in an envelope, endorsed with the polling division, the election and the number opposite the voter's name upon the poll book, and such ballots shall be forwarded to the court in which such appeal is pending and when the appeal is decided the court shall certify to the returning officer the votes to be added, if any, to the numbers counted for each candidate and the return shall be corrected accordingly, and the court shall also certify the result of the appeal to the revising officer, who shall amend the voters' list so far as may be necessary in accordance with such certificate.

That is what I have in view. If the hon. gentleman were to adopt something like that, he would avoid all expense to the candidates without increasing the expense to the public. If that plan were adopted, it would save a great deal of trouble and get rid of the possibility of fraud in the way spoken of by the hon. member for Queen's.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not agree with my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). The theory on which the First Minister proposes to allow a name on the voters' list to vote in the event of an appeal is that *primâ facie* he has a right to vote, his name being there, and the theory upon which it is urged that a man's name not upon the list, although he appeals to be put on, is that *primâ facie* he has a right to be put on. I agree that a person whose name on the list is appealed against should be allowed to vote in the first instance; and also a man who makes an application to be put on the voters' list, and whose name, if the appeal succeeds, is placed on the voters' list. But the First Minister ought in both cases to guard against fraud in the same way as fraud is guarded against in Ontario. In Ontario you can put in what is called a tendered ballot, but the man putting it in has to pledge his oath as to his qualification, and I think the least we could do, when a man's right to vote has been determined against by the revising officer, is that we should compel him to pledge his oath as to his qualification.

Mr. BOWELL. The tendered ballots are not counted only in cases of contestation.

Mr. CAMERON I know that, but here the hon. gentleman proposes that the votes shall be counted. I think that in such cases we should at least have the guarantee of an oath that the man is acting *bonâ fide*.

Mr. BOWELL. If a man tenders his vote under the Ontario law, and his name is not on the roll, he is obliged to take the ordinary oath which states that he is of the required age, that he is a British subject, and that he has the necessary property qualification.

Mr. CAMERON Certainly, and if he takes the oath he is given a tendered ballot, and his vote is not counted except in a scrutiny. Unless you provide for an oath, I am afraid you will find that there will be thousands of people who would appeal against the decision of the revising officer, simply to put in their votes, and their votes would be counted.

Mr. DAVIES. Even if they took the oath I do not think they should be allowed to vote. I can see a broad distinction between the two classes, one class being those whom the revising officer allows to remain on the list, and who have *primâ facie* the right to vote. But when a man is not allowed on the list at all by the revising officer, although he tenders his oath, he is not a voter at all *primâ facie*, and I think it would be an outrage to count his vote in the first instance. The solution of the whole difficulty seems to me to lie in the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What will the judge do with the ballots?

Mr. DAVIES. They are sent by the deputy returning officer to the Court of Appeal. The court certifies to the returning officer how many are allowed to each candidate, and these are added on, the object of this being that they shall not be counted until the court determine that they have legally a right to vote. To my mind it seems utterly absurd to allow a man to vote—and to count his vote—who has been disallowed in the first instance, and merely appeals against the revising officer.

Mr. CASEY. The more I think of it the more I feel bound to agree with the view that neither those who are appealed against, to be taken off the list, or those who appeal for the purpose of getting on the list, should be actually allowed to vote, and that in both cases they should be allowed to put in tendered ballots, as they can under the Ontario law at present. I do not think the vote of any person whose right to be on the list is still in question should be counted for either candidate, but I think it is quite right that persons whose right to vote is in dispute should put in tendered ballots, which should be counted as soon as the Court of Appeal has settled the question of their right to vote. The Minister of Customs thinks that this would involve a scrutiny under this Bill, as under the Ontario law, but there is this difference: that under the Ontario law no list can be used until all the appeals against it are decided, and there is no means of ascertaining which of the tendered ballots can be used, except on a scrutiny. But in this case the appeal goes on just as if the election did not occur; the validity or invalidity of the vote will be decided as soon as the Court of Appeal has given its judgment, and the returning officer amends his return accordingly.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It seems to me that in this case, as in others, when the lawyers get in, they mix matters up, and the people will have to pay the costs of straightening it out. The object is to have members elected by those who have the right to vote When the voters' list is completed no question arises upon that ground, but we are providing for the contingency of an election before the list is completed. We cannot delay the election, and what are we going to do with those who have not finally been allowed the right to vote? Let them present their tendered vote, which shall not be counted until we know whether it is good or not. If such votes do not amount to enough to affect the election, that would be the last of them; but if they are sufficient to change the result, then they should be counted. As it is now proposed, a number of men are allowed to vote who have not been decided to have that right, it amounts to a contest in every closely contested election, and a man has to go into the contest before he knows whether he is elected or not. But if these votes are placed in the ballot box, in case it is proved they have a right to vote, it will be an entirely different matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how that will work, because nobody can tell which way these men, who have tendered their votes, but whose votes have

not been accepted, will vote, and nobody can tell what effect their votes will have on the election. The difference of opinion is so strong and so radical that I am tempted to go back to my clause. I think that settles the whole thing. The clause as it now stands is simply this: that in the very rare case in which an election shall take place between the time the revising officer has made up his final list and the time the appeal cases are decided, it is very likely that the decision of the revising officer shall be retained. It occurs to me, considering all the difficulties that have been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the simple plan is this: One of two things you must do; either you must declare that no voters' list is complete until the appeals are all decided, or you must adopt the plan proposed in the clause, that the final decision of the revising officer shall be the voters' list for an election that may take place between the time he has made his final revision and the time at which the appeal has been rendered. I think the latter mode is the better, inasmuch as it will not have the effect of excluding a great many new voters, as would be the case if the last year's list was taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman consent to provide that in the case of revising officers who are not judges the list should not be used until it had been appealed to the county court judge? I think that would very largely diminish the objections which are entertained to this clause, and it would reduce the number of possible cases to a very small fraction. The objection of my hon. friends is not so much to the county court judge as to depriving them of an appeal from the revising officer who is not a county court judge.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. gentleman to deal with that yesterday. The appeal we are dealing with is the appeal to the Superior Court.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I asked to be struck out. I thought the hon. gentleman understood that my plan was that in case the revising officer was a judge, there should be no appeal; that, I think, was perfectly understood. The list, as finally made up by the revising officer, who is also a judge, is final for all purposes, and it is only in the few cases where the revising officer would not be a judge that there would be an appeal.

Mr. MILLS. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman; neither is that the Bill. It is perfectly clear that this Bill throughout provides for an appeal on questions of law from the county court judge as revising officer, otherwise you could have no uniformity; you might have one law in one county and another law in another county. The Bill provides for an appeal on questions of law from the county court judge to a Superior Court.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; that is struck out all through.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit that. I am sure no one on this side of the House so understood the hon. gentleman; certainly there was to be an appeal on questions of both law and fact from the revising officer to the county court judge before there was any list, and on questions of law from the county judge to the Superior Court. Otherwise we have been misled—unintentionally, it may be, but certainly misled—as to the position taken by the hon. gentleman. We supposed we were dealing with appeals to the Superior Court judge from the county court judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That never was proposed.

Mr. CASEY. The Bill, as it stands, provides for an appeal from the county court judge on points of law, and when the question of appeals generally came up the hon. gentleman, while he agreed to continue the appeal from the county court judge on points of law only, made the appeal from the barrister, who might be the revising officer, both on points of law and fact; but there was never any hint of his withdrawing the appeal from the decision of the county court judge, who might be the revising officer, which the Bill gives.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I must really despair of coming to any arrangement with hon. gentlemen opposite. The question of appeal was discussed, and hon. gentlemen opposite came to me from the opposite side and stated, if there be an appeal from the revising officer who was not a county judge much of the objection would be removed. It was distinctly understood that in case the revising officer was not a county judge the appeal should be both on matters of fact and law; but in case the revising officer was the county judge, then his decision was final. That is the position I proceeded upon, and upon which the whole discussion proceeded, and I am quite surprised and rather indignant at the attempt to get rid of that.

Mr. MILLS. I do not admit that the hon. gentleman's position is accurate, nor do I admit that that was the representation made by the hon. gentleman, as we all understood him, last evening. He said he had made a proposition that there should be an appeal from the revising officer to the county judge both as to law and fact, and that should be carried out; and he proposed an amendment, and I think the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Edgar) crossed the House for the purpose of consulting him as to that amendment, which was wholly distinct from the appeal to the county judge. There is provision for an appeal to the Superior Court on questions of law. Then the appeal on matters of importance is from either the revising officer or the county court judge, as the party may think proper, for the purpose of settling a uniform law for the Dominion. Otherwise one county court judge may interpret the law one way and another judge another way, and there would be no such thing as uniformity at all. If the hon. gentleman means that there should be no appeal from the county court judge all this discussion to-day is irrelevant, and the amendment he proposes is irrelevant.

Mr. WELDON. What I understood the First Minister to mean was that where the revising barrister was a barrister an appeal would be allowed to the county court judge on law and fact, but where he was a county court judge an appeal would be allowed on law to the Superior Court judge. That is important, because questions might arise on law where it would be necessary to have, if possible, a uniform opinion.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not attach the slightest importance to any form of appeal from the revising barrister, be he a county court judge or otherwise, to the Superior Court. When I read the Bill and saw that it offered an appeal on points of law to the Superior Court, I thought that procedure was going to be surrounded with trouble and anxiety and expense, and argued that you should offer to the electorate a remedy of which they could avail themselves. When the simpler plan, an appeal to the ordinary courts, was suggested, it satisfied me on this point. It is useless to offer an appeal that cannot be taken advantage of. If we are satisfied that the county court judge is a proper tribunal to correct the revising officer, surely we must be satisfied that he is a safe person to do directly what we give him an opportunity of doing incorrectly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was certainly a misunderstanding. I never heard it mooted or a doubt raised, when I agreed to extend the right of appeal to matters of fact, that in cases where the revising officer was a judge there would be necessity for an appeal. If he is fit to revise the matter, to sit as a Court of Appeal, he is fit to sit as a court in the first instance. It is absurd to have an appeal to the Superior Court, to drag the people, at an enormous expense, to Toronto or Quebec, or wherever the

seat of the court may be. That would amount to no appeal, whereas there is a ready protection by having the county court judge either judge altogether *ab initio* or as judge in appeal. The argument that you want uniformity falls to the ground, because the Superior Court of New Brunswick may decide against the Superior Court in Nova Scotia, and the Superior Court of Quebec may decide against the Superior Court in Toronto. You can have no assurance of uniformity in any way. It is destroying the right of appeal, by making it beyond the power and beyond the purse of most candidates, if they are forced to go to the Superior Courts. However, we have not got to the clause on appeal, and I really think, under the circumstances, I will have to move the 34th clause as it stands.

Mr. CASEY. There will be no difficulty about agreeing on the clause. The right hon. gentleman says this proposal has created such a difference of opinion that he proposes to withdraw his amendment. But he need not do that. It is agreed that the object he has in view is a proper one, and there is only a slight difference as to detail. By moving the adoption of the clause as it is he will be getting out of a slight difference of opinion into a very great difference.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In justice to myself, I must repeat what I said on the 28th May. In such cases—that is, where the revising officer is not a judge—there shall be an appeal as to law and to fact.

Mr. ABBOTT. It seems to me that there are some arguments in favor of counting the votes; and I quite agree that we should not abandon the idea of having this amend ment, which seems to be satisfactory to the whole House. Suppose the rule were adopted that the votes should not be counted till the appeal was disposed of, and there were but half a dozen votes to appeal against, while the majority was 200, the return would be delayed uselessly. There is a remedy which is more simple, perhaps, than the remedy proposed in the first instance. It is that proposed by the leader of the Opposition, namely, that the scrutiny of votes should not be exactly a scrutiny, but that the correction of the roll, if correction be needed, should be made on the recount. I understand the right hon. gentleman, the Premier, is disposed to consent to an amendment similar to that which the leader of the Opposition proposed, namely, that there should be a recount, that it should not be necessary to have a contest and cause an expensive petition, and if the decision of the judge will not be received in time for the ordinary recount, then the time fixed by the law should be extended; and that alteration should be made in the election law itself, because there may be some machinery required to carry it out in a proper way. At the same time, I think the object may be served by striking out from this amendment the words which refer to a contest, and declaring that the whole may be corrected on a recount in the usual way in the election law, and if the judge's decision is not rendered in time to correct the roll before the election, the time should be extended. That would be more satisfactory than abstaining from counting the votes until the judge's decision is rendered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After hearing the remarks of the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend who has just spoken, I have got the amendment so framed that I hope we shall all agree now:

But the ballot of any person whose name has been included in the certified list of voters, and is the subject of an undecided appeal, shall be numbered by the deputy returning officer, and a corresponding number shall be placed opposite his name on the poll book. And, upon the counting of the ballots, the ballots so numbered shall be, by the deputy returning officer separated, from the ordinary ballots and returned to the proper officer, sealed up, at the same time as other ballots, to await the decision of such appeal. And if, under such decision, the name of any such person shall be struck from the voters' list, the vote given by such person shall be ascertained from his ballot, and shall be struck from the poll upon a recount. And if any person whose name has been excluded from the certified list of voters, and whose exclusion is the subject of an undecided appeal, shall desire to vote the deputy returning officer shall receive his ballot and shall number the same and the name in the poll book, and keep separate such ballots, as hereinbefore provided, and if, upon such appeal, the decision of the revising officer shall be maintained, the vote of such person may be ascertained and struck from the poll upon a recount. And if an appeal respecting the vote of any person placed on the poll book under the provisions hereof be not decided within the delay fixed by the existing election law for recount, such delay shall be extended until six days after the decision of the appeal.

That will provide that there shall be an ordinary recount, and if the judge has not decided in time, then the recount shall be six days after he has given his decision. I think that ought to meet the views of hon. gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand this proposition involves the right of the claimant who has been rejected by the revising officer to have his vote counted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but it is put in a separate ballot, and the judge will decide upon all these cases, and six days after he has decided there will be a recount.

Mr. MULOOK. It is not very different from the system in Prince Edward Island now. In that Province any man can tender his vote, and it has to be received.

Mr. DAVIES. No; it has not be received, unless he swears.

Mr. MULOCK. Swears to what?

Mr. DAVIES. Swears that he has the right to vote.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The man whose name is off the list does not appear to be subject to take the oath.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is a franchise Bill and not an election Bill, though it rather infringes on the election law in some respects. There will, no doubt, have to be some machinery adopted in the election law next Session to work this in. I agree with the hon. gentleman that the man who tenders his vote and is not on the list should not be allowed to vote, as a matter of course, unless he takes the oath.

Mr. DAVIES. The anomally which appears to me is that the man who applies to a judge to have his name put on the list, and gives all his evidence and his reasons, and is rejected, and who, therefore, *primâ facie* has no vote, is allowed by this to go in and vote.

Mr. ABBOTT. It is only provisional.

Mr. DAVIES. But it throws upon the candidate the necessity of filing a petition and having a recount to get the vote struck off.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The vote is taken, but as the whole thing has to be surveyed and a recount is a matter of course, there is no final return until that recount has been taken, after the judge has decided for or against the man. I think it is no advantage against either of the candidates when it is understood that the whole thing is hung up till the judge has given his decision.

Mr. DAVIES. Evidently I have not much sympathy on either side of the House, so I shall not press it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be better, if possible, for the Act to explain itself. If the man whose vote has been rejected is to be required to swear the vote in, the provision could be put in this Bill very simply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It opens another field. You would have to enter into a discussion of the election law. There cannot possibly be any election under this law until after Parliament meets again, so that the election law can be amended.

Mr. CHARLTON. But suppose that point should be then overlooked?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I may trust my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron) not to overlook it.

Mr. MILLS. Under the proposition I suggested it would not be necessary for candidates to demand a recount. The whole thing will be a part of the proceedings on an election, and it seems to me that is the more consistent course to take. If the number of votes in dispute were not sufficient to effect the result, it would simply alter the numbers, and nothing more. If it were sufficient to affect the result of the election, then the returning officer would be called upon to correct the return. I thought I need not provide what should be done with the ballots after the judge had given his decision, but if it were thought necessary to preserve them for any purpose it could be provided that the courts should forward the ballots, after the decision was given, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The adoption of this plan would get rid of the objection of my hon. friend as to allowing those to vote against whom there is a *primâ facie* case. They would not vote, although they deposited their ballots, until the court held that they were entitled to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must disagree with the hon. member for West Elgin, who said the party who claimed the right to vote had not the same right as one whose vote was objected to and whose name was on the previous voters' list. There is no reason in the world why one should have a preference, although he appeared on the previous voters' list.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 28,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have one or two amendments to make to this clause. After the word "revised," in the 40th line, insert "or amended and corrected on appeal." And after the word "revised" in the 41st line, insert the words "and amended or corrected on appeal." And after the word "stead," in the 42nd line, strike out all the words until "those persons," in the 44th line. And after the word "revised," in the 45th line, insert "amended or." That meets the whole thing.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 29,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Last night we inserted fifteen days instead of eight, in the second line. It has been suggested by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) and there is a great deal in it, that it is quite useless to hang up and keep matters in suspense for fifteen long days, especially when, in such a contingency as I spoke of, it is important to have a return as soon as possible. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) suggested the insertion of the following words:—

The revising officer shall be bound to furnish the returning officer of each electoral district, within 48 hours after demand by the returning officer therefor, one copy of the list of voters then in force for such district.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 40,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose, after the words "revising officer" to insert the words "or judge."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it would be exceedingly unwise and dangerous to retain that provision of the clause which provides that the revising officer may dispense with a notice. That is the very foundation of the appeal, and to dispense with it would be much the same as enabling a judge sitting in *nisi prius* to dispense with a statement of claim or a statement of defence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think this portion of the amendment is taken from the English Act.

Mr. CAMERON. I have read the English Act over several times, but I do not recollect that it is the same as this in that respect; but even if it were, I do not think we should adopt such a provision here. I think we should bind these revising officers to the strict letter of the law, and oblige them to take all the proceedings that the law requires. There is also another provision at the end of this clause which I think very objectionable.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps we had better settle this first.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we might strike out the word which provides for dispensing with the notice. As to the latter part of the clause, as this is not a matter of litigation, I think it is well that summary justice should be given, the same as is given in the division courts and other tribunals, when you want to get early decisions and where the strict rules of evidence are not required. What is needed is that the revising officer should be able to do substantial justice without being confined to the strict rules of evidence.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, these questions which the revising barrister is called upon to settle are very important, and I do not see why he should be in a position to act differently than any other judge. If I recollect aright, the judge in a division court is bound by ordinary legal rules. The only difference is, that having taken legal evidence he can administer either law or equity, or what might be called rude justice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it would be a great mistake to have all the technicalities of a court surrounding him—he would never get through.

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be willing to strike out that portion of the clause dispensing with the strict rules of evidence, but allowing him, on that evidence, to administer justice as he thinks justice demands. It will be giving him too much latitude for safety to allow him to dispense with all forms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Take the case of a man whose vote is objected to. He produces his deed; the witnesses are in Manitoba or British Columbia, and the other man says: "Prove that deed; I object to it." How is he to prove it? He may say: "I am ready to swear to it." The judge may know his signature, or it may be that the man is in possession; and still, though he produces his title, according to the strict rules of evidence, it would not be allowed.

Mr. CAMERON. That was the case which the right hon. gentleman submitted yesterday, and in which we yielded to him. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that you can very easily prove a deed in several different ways. You can prove the man's writing, or you can produce a copy, which would be perfectly good evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Would not the man producing the deed have to prove it by the subscribing witnesses?

Mr. CAMERON. No; he could prove it by the signatures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is beyond the jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. CAMERON. But no matter where the witness is, you can prove the signature of the grantor, and that is perfectly good evidence. There is no necessity of calling a witness to prove a deed.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no difficulty about it. A man comes into court and swears: "I am the owner of a piece of land, and this is my deed of that land." That is proof enough. A witness is not necessary to prove a deed.

Mr. WELDON. Besides that, a deed that is registered, and certified as registered, is evidence in our courts.

Mr. CASEY. The ordinary practice in division courts at present is that a person swears he owns the property; he does not need to produce his deed. His own oath is *primâ facie* evidence of his ownership. Unless some one is prepared to prove that someone else owns the property, there is no possibility of rebutting his testimony, and the thing is proven at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because the strict rules of evidence are not required.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; the judge sitting in the division court does follow the strict rules of evidence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We want to avoid that.

Mr. CASEY. That is the reason we object to the clause. The rules of evidence are made to secure strict justice. There is no objection to having the strict rules of evidence followed, so long as you allow the proviso my hon. friend has suggested—that the judge may decide, as in the division court, according to law or equity. We want to be bound by strict rules of evidence, but we want substantial justice. Hitherto, in Ontario, whenever a voters' list has been appealed against, the judge has construed the evidence strictly as in any other case that came before him. It is of the utmost importance that a man's vote should be decided on strict evidence, when the ownership of property by no means so sacred to him—a calf or a dog—is decided on those rules. It is not a question of technicalities; it is a question of what should or what should not be admitted in proof. In reality, the rules of evidence are the embodiment of what the best legal minds have considered necessary to get the truth of the case before the judge. With regard to the notices, I do not suppose there would be any objection to allowing the notices to be dispensed with by consent of all parties, as is done, I believe, in other courts. As to forms of procedure, I do not know how far the revising officer should be bound by those, or how much this phrase is supposed to cover. I should be disposed to give him a good deal of latitude in the way of procedure, so long as he stuck strictly to the evidence and did substantial justice on that evidence. But I am quite sure, from the spirit the hon. gentleman has shown in dealing with the other clauses, that it is not his intention to leave him at liberty to admit whatever class of evidence he chooses.

Mr. ABBOTT. I did not understand my hon. friend the Premier to say that he proposes to relax the rules of evidence by this clause. What I did understand, and what I think would be understood, from the clause, by any judge or lawyer having to administer cases in this way, is that those rules, usually regarded as the strict rules of evidence, would not be enforced in such a court. For instance, there is a rule that you shall not ask a leading question, another that you shall confine your question to the point exactly in issue, and a dozen other rules of a similar kind. If these rules are all to be enforced before the revising officer, days might be spent over the discussion whether such a question was relevant or not. We have got rid of that sort of difficulty in Lower Canada, in ordinary matters, by such legislation as this, construing it as I think this must be construed. The judge takes the evidence as it is offered, unless it is clearly irrelevant, and does not allow discussions for hours as to whether a question is a leading question or not. He takes the evidence, without regard to those strict rules, and decides according to justice. I think that is a fair construction of this clause, that in dealing with the matter the judge shall deal with it summarily, and shall not allow these little quibbles which all lawyers—I may say freely, being myself a lawyer—are fond of adopting, and tries to get at the root and marrow of the matter, and renders a decision that does justice to the parties. I think the clause means that. It does not relax the taking of the evidence on oath or the force of the evidence taken. It simply relieves the judge from those forms and ceremonies which delay the judge in cases where those strict rules are enforced.

Mr. CASEY. I did not mean that such technicalities as those should be maintained. What I was anxious to attain was simply that the nature of the evidence to be admitted should be of such a kind as is considered good legal evidence in other courts.

Mr. ABBOTT. I think that would be so, under the clause.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Argenteuil says this clause does not relieve the revising officer from the obligation to restrict himself to such evidence. That is a question of legal opinion, but as a layman it does seem to me to relieve him from that obligation, and there are lawyers here who hold the same view. If that clause is not intended to relieve him from that obligation it would be very easy to put that meaning in such words that nobody could misunderstand it. I do not see that there can be any objection to making any such amendment as will make this clause clear. I do not know but that the technicalities the hon. gentleman spoke of might come under the head of forms of procedure. The right hon. gentleman said there would be an appeal, and that we need not be so particular. Now, he has been contending that he never intended to give an appeal from the county court judge, where the latter is the revising officer. So in that case there will be all the more necessity for following the strict rules as to the admissibility of evidence; and even if there were an appeal in all cases, that is no reason why the rule should not be applied so as to limit the necessity for making appeals.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). If the hon. member for Argenteuil's interpretation of the clause were correct, and the only interpretation that could be put upon it, I would not object. The hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying the revising officer should not be tied down to strict rules of evidence in the cases he has indicated—for instance, with regard to asking leading questions. In law, at the examination in chief, leading questions cannot be put; but the hon. gentleman must recollect that there are other rules beside that. That is not a rule of evidence. It is only the practice, the mode in which evidence is to be given. What I understand is that the revising officer shall not be tied down as to the evidence itself—"He shall not be bound by the strict rules of evidence." That has no relation to what the hon. gentleman spoke of. What he spoke of is the mode in which you are to give the evidence, not the evidence itself. Suppose the plaintiff or respondent, instead of giving the best evidence, sees fit to give secondary evidence, the rule is quite clear, that in establishing a proposition you are bound to exhaust the best evidence first; if you do not, you cannot go on with the case at all. As I understand this clause, the plaintiff or respondent is not bound to give the best evidence. A minor, for instance, makes application to be placed on the assessment roll. The question arises. Is he of age? The best evidence that could be given would be that of the father or mother, especially the mother or the register of his birth. Now, instead of giving that evidence you call a neighbor, who says: "I know he is of 21 years of age." That would be the kind of evidence he would be justified in giving under this clause. The revising officer should have no right to take evidence of that kind until he has at first exhausted all means of getting better evidence. We ought not to permit the revising officer to adjudicate on evidence like this on secondary testimony, but on the best testimony that can be submitted. I am desirous he should have full power to adjudicate upon every case on its merits, leaving aside all technicalities as to the distinc-

tion between equitable and legal rights, but I am not willing he should adjudicate upon my rights, except upon legal or equitable principles—that he should judge it upon evidence that was not the best that could be given.

Mr. MACMASTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite are putting a strained interpretation on the clause. The clause provides that the revising officer shall not be bound by the strict rules of evidence, but that he shall determine the case in a summary manner, which, in his judgment, will do justice to all parties. The latter part of the clause imposes on the revising officer the obligation to do justice to all parties. To do that he must hear the evidence properly and decide according to justice. The only reasonable construction that can be put on the words referring to his power to relax the strict rules of evidence is this: Take the case the hon. gentleman put himself. He said it would be improper that secondary evidence should be given, of a man's title to vote, until primary evidence is exhausted. That would be the rule in a court of law, undoubtedly. If we allow the clause to pass the revising officer may say to a farmer, or a mechanic, or a wage-earner, who may be unable to retain a lawyer, and who offers, in the first instance, secondary evidence: I will take your secondary evidence now, and I will see that you have the primary evidence afterwards; but, if not permitted to relax the rule, he might be estopped in the progress of the case, and the applicant would be told: You must give the best evidence at this stage. And the secondary evidence cannot be heard. The voter would be bulldozed by legal technicalities. The result of insisting on adopting the views of hon. gentlemen opposite will be this: We are going to have a serious contestation in this matter, which will be summary; lawyers may be retained, and the poor man, who has a right to vote, and whose right is contested, and who might, by coming before a just judge, have his right to vote decided summarily and speedily, will be compelled to retain a lawyer, because, forsooth, the opposite side may have retained one, who will insist upon the strict rules of procedure being enforced. The rich man will retain his counsel; the poor man, who is unable to retain a counsel, and who knows nothing of the strict rules of evidence, may ask a question which might not be put in a legal way, or at the right time; the opposing counsel objects; the judge will be bound to rule in his favor, and the poor man will be practically crowded out. If this clause is allowed to stand as it is the judge may say to the lawyer: You are perfectly correct, according to the strict rules of evidence, but I am going to allow this voter to ask the questions; he may ask the proper questions later, and I will then settle the whole matter. That will be a fair way of proceeding. That will enable a man who cannot afford to retain a counsel to come into court, feeling confident that, although not armed with the wealth of legal lore, he may put his case before the revising officer in his own way, and get justice. There is another matter. Some objection is made to the retention of the words "form of procedure." In the Province of Quebec I do not think that any cause would be tried if those words were struck out, unless a regular petition was filed contesting the vote and an issue joined and an answer put in.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not object to those words.

Mr. MACMASTER. I think, leaving the clause as it is will greatly facilitate cases coming before the court, and will enable people to come before the revising officer without any fear that their cases will not be disposed of in a common-sense way.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it would be very unfortunate if the plausibility of my hon. friend prevailed with the committee. He seems to argue that common sense and the rules of evidence are in opposition to each other. According to his argument we should remove from the presiding judge of any inferior court the duty of taking legal evidence, and should allow him to take evidence according to the length of his own foot. A great many bugbears have been started about evidence. I was surprised to hear my hon. friends talk about leading questions. According to modern law, nothing is a leading question unless the judge decides it to be so. There is nothing in that whatever. No revising officer, who understood his duty at all, would prevent a leading question being put, unless he saw it was being put for the purpose of misleading the witness, or leading him on to say what he was not willing to say himself. There is no appeal from the majority of most of these judges, and to allow a judge to dispense with those rules of evidence, which are based upon common sense, would be to leave the door open for the committal of grievous wrongs. Rules of evidence are not what they used to be, and this provision would allow the judge to dispense with primary evidence in all cases, and to allow a witness to say what Jack Smith told Tom Brown, and so on, until we got the story of the three black crows. If you do do not insist upon legal evidence, where there is no appeal, you are simply bound by the fashion, or feeling, or whim, or prejudice, of the judge for the time being; votes may be put on or struck off on what, for the sake of courtesy, might be called evidence, but which would be the merest and the flimsiest hearsay.

Mr. MACMASTER. A judge could do that now.

Mr. DAVIES. No; not if he is bound to hear and determine on the rules of evidence. In that case we would have something like reasonable fair play.

Mr. MACMASTER. The clause only relaxes the strict rules of evidence, not all rules of evidence.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, the strict rules of evidence and the rules of evidence amount to the same thing. The use of the word "strict" does not add to or detract from the construction of the clause. The rules of evidence are plain, are based upon common sense, and are the result of the experience of ages. In modern days they have been simplified, and there are no rules now that would prevent the fairest and the most honest justice being done, even in the case of the most ignorant person.

Mr. MACMASTER. If you have a lawyer engaged in every case.

Mr. MILLS. The words "when he sees fit" are not necessary. We wish to give to the revising officer a certain amount of discretion, but it must be a legal and not an arbitary discretion, and I ask if the hon. gentleman has any objection to strike those words out. The hon. gentleman has consented to strike out the words in reference to dispensing with notice, which are not necessary when you do not require personal notice to be served. The latter part of the clause might be struck out altogether. The words, "he shall not be bound by such strict rules of evidence and forms of procedure," are very objectionable. It may not be necessary that he should be bound by strict forms of procedure, such as those laid down in a court, but when you say he shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence you give to the revising officer any amount of discretion. If the party appears in person and is not conversant with the principles of evidence, and undertakes to submit secondary evidence, the judge has the power to postpone the proceedings, to call his attention to the fact, and to tell him what kind of evidence is required, instead of admitting evidence which, in an ordinary proceeding, would not be evidence at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, in the interest of voters to come up honestly and, perhaps, without counsel or assistance of any kind, and who really, in the majority of cases, have a claim to be put on the roll, I think it is necessary that the judge should know that he may do summary

justice without adherence to the strict rules of evidence. Of course, evidence is evidence, and the revising barrister or the judge know what is evidence, and they will know how far they are to be bound by strict rules of evidence. I propose to add the words "or judge" after the word "officer," in the 17th line. I think we must keep the clause with this amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) I move to strike out the words "strict rules of evidence" and leave the rest of the clause as the hon. gentleman has given it.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron) negatived.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On section 41,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think this clause is not required, and we can well get rid of it.

Mr. MULOCK. The only part that seems to be necessary is that which provides for parties being allowed to appear by deputy. I think they ought to be allowed to appear by agents, solicitors or counsel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume they would have a right to do that, and that portion of the clause might remain.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How does the hon. gentleman provide for costs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We provide for witnesses' fees. I do not think there ought to be costs.

Mr. MILLS. Then, in case a voter's right to remain on the list was contested, and he would be put to the expense of calling witnesses from long distances, and obliged to appear by council, nothing but the witnesses fees would be taxable?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be all.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 42,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think "subject to the provisio in the next following section" is not necessary. I will read the 43rd clause, as proposed to be amemded. The clause, down to the word "him," in the 47th line, remains as it is, and will read hereafter as follows:—

Noting thereon the name of all persons who have been retained on the voters' list, notwithstanding objections, and the names of all persons who have been struck off the voters' list, and of all persons who have appealed to be placed upon the voters' list, and whose application has been refused, and who have respectively appealed from the decision; and the list shall serve and avail according to the provisions of the Act for the election with reference to which it is furnished.

The remainder of the clause remains as it stands.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has informed us that there is no appeal, except an appeal from the revising officer to the county court judge, and if there is to be no appeal except that particular appeal, there is no reason why the list should not be finally revised and completed. If the county court judge is acting as revising officer the list will be finally completed, but in the case of other revising officers the list might not be so completed. The latter class are those about whose conduct the public will have no confidence; and if there are appeals from those officers to the county court judges it is of the utmost consequence that the list should be completed and finally revised before used in any election. It is in the public interest that the list of the previous year should be used rather than the list on which appeals are had to the county court judge from the revising officer when they are not complete. The county court judge may not have an opportunity, although he may exercise the greatest diligence, to adjudicate upon the cases before an election is held. I am satisfied that, unless the First Minister amends the clause, so as to provide that the revising officer, in all cases, shall be a judge, this section is one that will prove exceedingly unsatisfactory to the public, and one that may lead to very serious abuses. It should be amended in the direction of providing that the lists should not be finally settled until questions of appeal from the revising officer to the county court judge are finally disposed of.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Under the law, as the hon. gentleman now lays it down, there is no such thing as an appeal. The hon. gentlemen allows no appeal. If the revising officer is a barrister the judge in the county court revises again. He has original jurisdiction; he possesses precisely the same power as the revising officer himself. He is practically a second revising officer. He is not a judge sitting in appeal; he takes the evidence all over again. He has, moreover, the right to take additional evidence from that which is taken before the revising officer in the first instance. So, in the proper sense there is no appeal. There is what is better than an appeal. The county judge goes to the locality and examines into the rights of the parties all over again, and after hearing all the evidence from both parties, he adjudicates on the case, not by way of appeal, but because he exercises original jurisdiction. If that is so there is no reason why, for all elections that take place after the first one, if the voters' list for the year is not finally completed by the judge the prior list should not be used. The chances are ten thousand to one that the first voters' list will be used at the next general election, which is expected to take place in the early part of 1887. But the hon. gentleman is not in favor of using the previous year's list, because the list will be changed, and names will disappear. It is very difficult to get over this difficulty. I think it can be avoided, by providing that the voter shall take an oath, declaring that the name which appears on the voters' list held the same qualification at the time of voting as at the time of registration. I do not see how the hon. gentleman can work out section 43 without enormous difficulty, and without having the labor and expense and machinery provided by section 26. Of course, there would be an enormous expense incurred by so doing, whereas, if you adopted the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell, it would put both parties on precisely the same footing, and convenience would be very much better served.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot do that without going back to clause 36.

Mr. CAMERON. That only applies to the first revision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Section 34 applies to the subsequent revisions, and they have been so passed; we cannot go back upon that. Different alternatives were offered to the committee, and the committee deliberately adopted the suggestion which was thrown out by the leader of the Opposition, that it should be done by way of recount, after the final decision of the county judge in appeal. I propose to amend this clause by putting in what was inserted in the previous section: "Noting thereon the names of all persons struck off the voters' list, all persons who have applied to be placed on the voters' list and whose applications have been refused, and who have respectively appealed from his decision."

Mr. MILLS. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman says, that clauses 34 and 36 would have to be changed in order to adopt this amendment, but the hon. gentleman forgets that at the time his amendment was proposed and discussed we supposed that the appeal spoken of was to the Superior Court. I may say that I went and saw the leader of the Opposition, and his understanding of the matter was precisely the same as that of myself, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon); and I could read what I said on that occasion, to show that that was my understanding of it, at all events,

The hon. gentleman will see that it makes all the difference in the world, with regard to this clause, that the appeal is not as we understood it. In the case of appeals to the Superior Court, months might elapse before a decision might be had, and therefore there would be some propriety in saying that the old list would be used, and that you should make these provisions which you have made. But when you propose an appeal from the revising officer to the county judge, which must be completed in a very short time, that list ought to be used, if completed, and if not completed, you can go back to the old list, because that list would not be very old. If you appealed to the Superior Court the old list might be a year and a-half old, but in the old case no such condition of things could exist, because it would only be a question of twenty or thirty days until it was finally disposed of.

Mr. ABBOTT. The hon. gentleman must argue on this point altogether from the practice in the Province of Ontario. I am not able to say what delay there might be, in Ontario, in appealing to a county judge, but in the Province of Quebec, for instance, the appeal must necessarily be to the Superior Court judge—I know of no other to take it—and a Superior Court judge has sometimes three or four counties. I do not think any hon. gentleman would be rash enough to assert that with us, at any rate, a decision could be obtained in twenty or thirty days. I think it is extremely doubtful, in either of the Provinces, that a decision could be relied upon within that time. I may say that I heard the statement of the Premier, and I think there can be no doubt, from his explanation, what kind of appeal he meant, though I agree that my hon. friend misunderstood him, judging by some remarks which he made. *Hansard*, of 28th May, reporting what the Premier said on that occasion, shows plainly that there could be no misunderstanding as to what he intended. It is said there:

"In such cases it must be that a person other than the judge shall be appointed; but the measure will provide that in such cases, where a revising officer other than the judge is appointed, there shall be an appeal both as to law and fact."

And in the conversations that have taken place across the House, and otherwise, I think it has been understood that there should only be an appeal when the revising officer was not a judge—that there should not be an appeal when the revising officer was a judge. That was my understanding, and I think the understanding of the majority of the members. The clause now before the committee is really only the machinery for carrying into effect sections 26 and 34. These sections provide that a vote shall be taken in a particular way, the votes which are appealed against being retained provisionally, without affecting the return to this House, until there is a recount; and at the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition it was provided that this recount should be suspended until the question in appeal was arranged. So there could not be any injustice. As to using the previous year's list, I think the consequences would be serious, especially in the case of wage-earners, who are birds of passage, to a large extent. There might be hundreds of those on the last voters' list, of whom there might not be one on the voters' list as revised and corrected by the barrister, and he may have put hundreds of others on that list, not one of whom would be objected to; so that if the hon. gentleman's idea was carried out those workmen whose names were on the previous list, and who had left the country and ceased to have any right to vote, would appear on the list as having the right, while many others would be deprived of the right to vote. I cannot see that there will be any disfranchisement, which hon. gentlemen opposite said would be brought about by this Bill, so great as the disfranchisement might be from using the old voters' lists. That certainly is a great evil that would result from that scheme. There is another evil that would result from the other scheme, of not allowing the vote to be counted until the judge had decided the appeal. Suppose only ten or a dozen votes were appealed against, and the election had been carried by a majority of 100, what would be the object of holding back the counting of the votes until the decision of those appeals had been rendered? A man might be kept out of his seat, awaiting a decision of the court, that could have no effect one way or the other. It is said that what the Bill provides for is a very expensive process. It is not expensive; a recount can be obtained at a very small expense, and that is the only process required, to show by the poll books the proper result. All that would be necessary is, that as soon as the polling is over the parties should await the decision of the judge to make the recount, if there is a demand for a recount. Of course, no demand will be made for a recount unless there is a prospect of its altering the result; we must presume that no one will ask for a recount unless he has a reasonable probability of obtaining a right by that recount. In the case of a large majority, with a few votes objected to, I think there would be no demand for a recount. It seems to me that to both of the schemes proposed in opposition to that of the Premier there are strong objections, while to the manner proposed by the Premier I do not see any serious objections at all. I see no other means of arriving at the true result by a simpler means. Section 43 should not be a matter of discussion, as it is nothing more than the machinery to enable sections 26 and 34 to be carried out.

On section 44,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to strike out the words "not less than eight days before the nomination," and substitute, "on demand, within forty-eight hours," in the 19th line.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MULOCK. I think section 44 should come before section 43. Section 44 gives the duty to the returning officer to obtain, at a certain time before the election, from the revising officer, a copy of the list; section 43 provides for the revising officer doing something after he has delivered the list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I have no objection to that.

On section 45,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that that clause shall stand over. In consequence of various discussions on the matter of polls, I am prepared to substitute a clause, which I shall read, in view of 46, 47, 48 and 49.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman going to have those clauses printed? Because it is not easy for hon. gentlemen to understand the full bearing of such important clauses by just hearing them read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are a simplification of the former clauses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say they are all right.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They involve very considerable changes, and it will be quite impossible to consider them intelligently at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They might be adopted provisionally, and then they would be printed in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. MILLS. Have them printed on the Orders of the Day, and we can consider them the first thing on Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are drawn as simply as possible. However, we will have them printed.

On section 51,

Mr. CAMERON. There is a question on this clause which is worthy the consideration of the First Minister. I suppose we all desire to get a proper voters' list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. I think you can get the best voters' list by utilising, as far as possible, the local machinery. In every municipality, at least in Ontario, there is a clerk of the council, who is generally selected for his intelligence and knowledge of the locality, and that official would make the very best to assist the revising barrister to prepare the voters' list. In selecting him as the clerk of the revising barrister the hon. gentleman would be able to avail himself of the knowledge of the local authorities. I do not know what the political leanings of these officials are, but I believe that their selection would result in making a better voters' list than if the revising officer were left to select his own clerk.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am quite of the same opinion. The work will be done efficiently and more thoroughly by the clerk of the municipality than you could hope to have it done by anyone else. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that it would be done more cheaply than if you hired a special person to do it. It is open to no objection, from a political standpoint, because I suppose these officials are divided. They hold their offices for years, and there could not very well be a charge of partisanship against them. For my part, I should look upon the clerk, if he were appointed by the revising barrister, with more dread than upon the revising officer himself. If there was to be any crooked work done I should imagine it would be done in that direction. If we could imagne it possible that any crooked work would be attempted under this Bill it would be likely to be done by the clerk, who is not responsible to the people or even to this Government, but only to the revising barrister. It has been urged, with some force, that a judge or revising barrister could not afford to risk their reputation in doing that which was unfair. But that argument cannot have weight with reference to a clerk, and he may, unfortunately, be subject to political bias to such an extent as to make him perform his work in an unsatisfactory manner. That is an objection that has great weight in my mind, and it might be removed if we were to provide in this Bill that the clerk of the revising officer shall be the clerk of the municipality. I consider that correctness would be gained, fairness would be served and cheapness would be obtained, by such a provision.

Mr. DAWSON. What would be done in case there is no municipality?

Mr. PATERSON. I would provide for that.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is one side of this question to which I would like to draw the attention of the committee, as it applies to Ontario—and I presume the same thing may be said of other Provinces, where the municipal clerks are known by other designations. We provide that the assessment roll shall be copied and furnished to the revising officer as the basis upon which these lists are to be made up. It occurs to me that if it were possible to arrange machinery so that the municipal clerk in each of the minor municipalities should be the officials employed under the revising officer for making up these lists, we would have this advantage, that he would be, as the custodian of those rolls already in existence, the officer who would be in charge of them, in whose office they are permanently filed, and who could always give information respecting them. It seems to me that if that officer were so employed as clerk to the revising barrister it would be almost unnecessary to go to the initial expense of obtaining copies of these assessment rolls. That expense would be considerable, as I have found in my municipal experience. Now, when we consider that there are, on an average, five to seven municipalities in each district, and that there are 211 districts, you will see that the copying of those rolls alone must require a very large expenditure. Every time that a revision of a list takes place before the revising barrister or the county judge, if that is gone about with a stranger to these matters as his clerk, it must be done at a disadvantage, without reference to all the other matters in connection with the names upon the assessment roll. The municipal clerk has all that personal knowledge that long experience in handling these rolls gives him. In addition to that, I have never heard any charges made against a township clerk of an attempt to defraud an elector of his right to be placed upon the voters' list. Besides, I do not think that the duties devolving upon a revising barrister's clerk will be sufficient to employ him for even half the time, and if the township clerk did this duty it would come in as a supplement to the ordinary work he does for the municipality, and for a moderate remuneration they would be glad to do it. Then, when the revision of the list is finally made, the familiarity of the clerk with the names upon the roll and the general information his position gives him point to him as in every way the person who ought to be employed as clerk to the revising officer. The duties of a township clerk are, to a large extent, merely clerical, and afford no opportunity for the exercise of political partisanship. In my own riding to-day all the township clerks, with the exception of one, are in political sympathy with my opponent. In fact, in the township that has always been solidly Liberal, to which I largely owe my seat in this House, and which has given me a majority of over 250, the clerk of that township, for the last 20 years, has been one of the most pronounced Conservatives in the whole riding. His political antecedents and associations are well known; he makes no attempt to conceal them, and freely exercises his political rights. Although a majority of the council are Liberal, they have faith in his probity and uprightness, and undoubtedly he has always performed his duties in a satisfactory manner. Now, I think this instance shows that the municipal clerks can be fairly trusted to perform impartially the duties of clerk to the revising barrister, and for this and other reasons which I have pointed out, I think we ought to make a provision that they should be so employed.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see how municipal clerks are to be made clerks of the revising officer, unless the hon. gentleman re-casts that whole section, which provided that the preliminary proceedings of the revising officer should be held in only one place in the riding.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause had better stand over, for the present.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 8th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the adulteration of food, drugs, and agricultural fertilisers.—(Mr. Bowell)—(*from the Senate.*)

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to read two telegrams conveying to me the glad tidings of the safety of the prisoners in the hands of Big Bear:

"CAMP, 16 MILES FROM FORT PITT, 5th.

"*Via* STRAUBENZIE, 7th, *via* QU'APPELLE.

"News just received that Mr. McKay and eight scouts of General Strange's have brought in Mrs. Delaney and Mr. Gowanlock and eight men, five half-breeds and two Wood Crees, who were encamped by themselves. The breeds say that they have been prisoners, and one of the Crees is the man who let Mr. and Mrs. Quinnie and the other three men escape. We go on to-morrow after Big Bear. Shall keep up communication with Fort Pitt.

"F. MIDDLETON."

"FORT PITT, N. W. T., 6th.

"*Via* STRAUBENZIE, 7th.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON:

"Have opened telegraph office about 40 miles from here. General Middleton is after Big Bear. General Strange at or near Frog Lake. Following prisoners who escaped recently from Big Bear's camp came in yesterday:—Mrs. Delaney, Gowanlook, Dufresne and Simpson, Glader wife and one child; Moisan, wife and four children; Pritchard, wife and eight children; Alfred Smith, wife and four children; Huzil, wife one child; Abraham Moots, wife and six children; Gregoire Donnaire, Pete Blondin, André Dreneau, Henry Dufrex, two of Simpson's stepsons, two Indians and two squaws. These prisoners are all well.

"VAN STRAUBENZIE."

THE DEATH OF MR. BENSON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the occasion of the Orders of the Day being called, it is my painful duty to make the announcement that one of our body has been called to his last home. Mr. Benson, the member for Leeds and Grenville, has been suddenly taken away from us while he was in full health apparently, and acting here with us, energetically performing his duties as a member of Parliament. I think it will be admitted by hon. gentlemen on both sides, that a more estimable person, in style, manner, demeanor, and character, is not to be found among us. Without reference to political feelings, we all must regret his loss; Canada must regret the loss of a man of his standing, education and enterprise in forwarding the industries of the country; we must feel that Canada has lost a worthy son. I cannot say more just now. He was a most particular friend of my own, and I feel that I have suffered a great personal loss. I think Canada has lost a man whom she can ill spare.

Mr. BLAKE. Both sides of the House must concur in the expression of regret and sorrow at the announcement the First Minister has just made. The relations of myself to Mr. Benson were not of the character which he has just described, but I had the honor and pleasure of his assistance, and I am sure all of us, on both sides, feel a sense of personal loss in knowing he is to be no more with us. He was an estimable and respected member of Parliament. He was, I have no doubt, a warm friend to those who had the happiness of being on terms of friendship with him, and to all of us he is one whom we are, indeed, sorry to lose.

TREATMENT OF RIEL IN PRISON.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I draw its attention to a matter which I think it should consider. The following paragraph has appeared in all the newspapers during the past week:—

"Regina, N.W.T., 4th.—Riel's life in the jail here is a monotonous one, and admits of no detailed description. He is in good health. He sits in his cell most of the day with his head bowed, apparently in deep thought. He seems to enjoy his hour's exercise every day, walking up and down, carrying in his right hand the chain weight attached to his leg."

It seems to me to chain a prisoner cannot be justified, except in very rare circumstances indeed. I quite admit there may be circumstances where it may be absolutely necessary to manacle a prisoner; but in this instance, I do not see there is any reason. I do not say the treatment is not justified, but it does not seem to me, from the circumstances we know, justified. I merely call the attention of the Government to it. I am sure the Government will agree with me it would not be justifiable to keep Riel chained or manacled, or compel him to carry a chain, unless it be absolutely necessary. I hope the Government will make enquiry, and see that the prisoner is not subjected to any more restraint than is necessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My attention was not called to that portion of the paragraph the hon. gentleman has just read. Of course, the prisoner before trial is to be subjected to no greater restraint than is absolutely necessary for the purpose of securing his safe custody. He is now at Regina in custody there, and perhaps, as most of the House know, there is no safe prison there for prisoners charged with or convicted of any offence. The only place at hand is the police station. He is kept there, and, of course, is strictly guarded. I shall at once communicate by telegram to Regina and ascertain the facts; and if there has been any restraint other than mere segregation and being kept in prison, I will ascertain what the reasons are, if there are any.

FORT MACLEOD RANCHE TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. HALL. In the absence of Mr. McCarthy, I beg to move the concurrence of the House in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Company. The only amendment of importance is the one changing the time for the completion from one year to two. Under the Bill, the work was to be commenced and completed within one year after July next, but the protraction of the Session has made that impossible, and the Senate has extended the time to two years, a change to which I believe the Government has no objection.

Amendments concurred in.

NORTH-WEST SURVEYS AND CLAIMS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When were the plans of surveys at Edmonton and Battleford respectively finished? When were they approved? When were they forwarded to the Land Board or Mr. Pearce or the local agent? When were the papers in connection with settlers' claims at Battleford and Edmonton forwarded from head office to the Land Board or Mr. Pearce or the local agent? When was the investigation made? When was the report made? Has it been acted on, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Edmonton was surveyed in 1882; the map thereof was completed in the spring of 1883; approved on the 25th of May, 1883, and the lithographing completed in March, 1884. A copy of that map was sent to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands, on the 27th of March, 1884, and by the latter handed to Mr. Pearce. The map of Fort Saskatchewan, a settlement in the neighborhood of Edmonton, was completed in the spring of 1884. It was approved on the 14th of May, 1884; lithographed on the 1st of June, 1884; and copy sent to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands on the 5th of June of the same year. This copy Mr. Pearce obtained. St. Albert, also in the neighborhood of Edmonton, was surveyed in 1882-83. The map was completed about the 1st of January, 1884; was approved on the 2nd of May, 1884; lithographed on the 4th of June, 1884; and a copy forwarded to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands on the following day, but miscarried. Mr. Pearce

telegraphed for another copy, which he received at Edmonton early in the following August (1884). That portion of Battleford south of the North Saskatchewan River, was surveyed in the summer of 1882. The map was completed in March, 1883, approved in the May following, lithographed in March, 1884, and a copy thereof forwarded to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands on the 27th of March, 1884. This copy was handed to Mr. Pearce and taken with him to Battleford. That portion of Battleford north of the North Saskatchewan, was surveyed in the summer of 1883. The map was completed at Battleford in January, 1884. It was received in Ottawa on the 21st of January, 1884; was approved on the 10th of June, 1884, and lithographed on the 8th of July, 1884. Mr. Pearce, of the Land Board, did not get a copy of this map from the Department, but obtained from the surveyor his working plan and had a tracing made thereof. The papers in connection with settlers' claims at Battleford and Edmonton were forwarded from head office on the 30th of May, 1884, to the Commissioner of Dominion Lands for the use of Mr. Pearce. The investigation of those claims was made in July, August and September, 1884, by Mr. Pearce, of the Land Board. Mr. Pearce made reports in July, August, September and October, 1884, concerning nearly all the claims. Reports, in a few cases, were made subsequent to the above dates, owing to the incomplete nature of the evidence at the time. In possibly a dozen cases sufficient evidence has not yet been filed. The Land Board decided all cases reported on up to the 20th of October, 1884, and the Minister of the Interior, from the 20th October to the 1st of January last. The decisions reached in the cases in the Edmonton agency were communicated to the agent of Dominion lands there, commencing in February, 1885, and since that date as fast as they could be got in shape. The decisions reached regarding claims in the Battleford agency will be communicated to the local agent there so soon as an agency is established.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Is it proposed to bring down the Order in Council of June, 1883, under which Mr. Russell was charged with certain duties in relation to land claims in North-West Territory?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many pages of those North-West papers, which it is intended to submit to Parliament this Session, have been copied? How many pages remain to be copied? When is it expected that the task of copying will be completed, and the papers submitted?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The number of pages copied, or to be copied, have not been reckoned, but the return will be brought down either to-morrow or next day.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was an Order in Council passed on the memorandum of the Minister of the Interior, dated 18th October, 1884, on the subject of the settlement of the settlers' claims at Prince Albert, Edmonton and Battleford? What is the date of such Order? Were the papers referred to in the letter of the Department of the Interior to Mr. Walsh, of the 18th October, 1884, forwarded to Mr. Walsh? If so, what date or dates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No Order in Council was passed on the memorandum of the Minister of the Interior dated the 18th of October, 1883, on the subject of the settlement of claims at Prince Albert, Edmonton and Battleford; but the same memorandum was remitted in the following February, and upon it an Order in Council on the subject of the settlement of claims at the places mentioned, was passed. This question, no doubt, refers to the memorandum of the Minister, of the 18th of October, 1883, although 1884 is mentioned. The papers having reference to the claims at Prince Albert were sent to Mr. Pearce on the 12th of December, 1883, and those having reference to claims at Edmonton and Battleford, on the 30th of May, 1884.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What was the date of the telegram from Prince Albert of Mr. Pearce to Mr. Burgess, as to the claims of the French half-breeds at St. Laurent brought down? Was that telegram a reply to one from the Department; and if so, will the latter be brought down? What was the date of the letter as to the survey of St. Laurent, from Mr. Hall to Mr. Deville brought down? Was there a reply to that letter? Of what date, and will it be brought down? What was the date of the letter from the Secretary of the Interior to Mr. Pearce on the same subject, brought down? Did the Department communicate with Mr. Pearce as promised therein? At what date? And will the communication be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The information called for by these questions is embodied in the additional correspondence now being prepared.

Mr. BLAKE asked, At what date were the plans and surveys of St. Laurent settlement received? At what date were they approved? At what date were they forwarded from the Department to the local authorities? Were they forwarded to the Land Board or the local agent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The plans and works of St. Laurent were received on the 15th March, 1879; approved and confirmed, 12th February, 1884; sent to agent, 15th February, 1884; sent to land commissioner, 15th February, 1884.

Mr. BLAKE asked, At what date were the papers at head office relating to the St. Laurent settlers forwarded to the local authorities by head office with a view to investigation? Were they forwarded to the Land Board or to the local agent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There were no papers in the Department bearing upon the claims of the settlers at St. Laurent. The applications of the claimants were made to Mr. Pearce direct. There were memorials upon North-West matters generally, which were of record in the Department, and which had some reference to the subject of claims to land at St. Laurent in common with other places in the Territories. These form part of the returns now in course of preparation.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—TRIAL OF LOUIS RIEL.

Mr. McMULLEN (for MR. LISTER) asked, What, if any, steps had been taken for the trial of Louis Riel? If so, what are they? When, and where is the trial to take place? Before what judge is he to be tried? Have counsel for the prosecution been retained? If so, who?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Louis Riel is now in custody at Regina awaiting his trial. That trial will proceed in the ordinary way, and before the ordinary tribunal. Counsel have been retained for the prosecution. They are Mr. Christopher Robinson, Q.C., Mr. Britton Osler, Q.C., Mr. T. Chase Casgrain of Quebec, and Mr. Scott of Winnipeg. There may, perhaps, be others employed before the trial comes on.

EXTRADITION OF GABRIEL DUMONT.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Have any steps been taken with a view to the extradition of Gabriel Dumont? If so, what has been done towards that end? If no such steps have been taken, is it the intention of the Government to apply for his extradition?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not usual or expedient to warn felons as to what proceedings are going to be taken against them.

CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. BURPEE (for Mr. WELDON) asked, Has any contract been entered into for the construction of the new Dominion building at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island? If so, who is the contractor? What was the amount of his tender? What is the amount to be paid under the contract? Has the Department of Public Works permitted such contractor to use stone different from that required in the advertisement or specification for tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contractor is Thomas C. Connor, of Moncton; the amount of contract is $57,397, the amount to be paid on the contract is the amount of the tender; the contract was signed on the 13th April, 1885. The specifications called for "reddish brown sandstone," equal in quality and colour to a sample exhibited at Charlottetown and Ottawa, which was obtained from Cumberland county, N. S. The stone submitted and approved is from John River, N.B., and is quite equal in every respect, if not finer in quality and color, and is therefore in accordance with the specification.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—REWARDS FOR THE VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Whether, if any particular acts of valor on the part of the volunteers be brought under the notice of the Government, it is the intention of the Cabinet to recommend them to the Home Government for the Victoria Cross or some other reward?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is no part of the duty or within the jurisdiction of the Cabinet, any more than it is within the jurisdiction of the Cabinet in England, to make any such recommendation. It is a military matter, attended to entirely by the military authorities.

SALMON FISHING IN THE HARBOR OF BATHURST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any rules have been made under which the salmon fishing in the harbor of Bathurst is regulated differently from salmon fishing elsewhere and from the accustomed rights? Whether the present rules prevent proprietors of land on the Harbour of Bathurst from fishing for salmon opposite their own land?

Mr. McLELAN. From many of the stands in Bathurst harbor interfering with the navigation and the ascent of slamon to the spawning grounds, licenses have been withheld.

RENTAL OF RIVERS AND STREAMS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to bring down and lay before Parliament a return of all correspondence between the Auditor General and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to rental of rivers and streams and all correspondence in any way relating to any irregularity or inaccuracy connected with matters of said Department, in accordance with the Order of the House of the 9th March last? If so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. If there be any correspondence between the Auditor General and the Department not already brought down, it will be brought down. There is no correspondence relating to any irregularity in the Department.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to bring down a return, in accordance with the Order of the House of the 9th of March last, showing the dates of deposit in the bank to the credit of the Government of the sums received by the Marine and Fisheries Department on account of rental of rivers and streams; and if so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. The return brought down to the 28th of last month gives all this information in particular. If anything is wanting, and the hon. gentleman will tell me what is omitted, I will supply it.

Mr. McMULLEN. It just requires what I asked for. It does not give dates.

Mr. McLELAN. The return brought down, I think, gives the dates.

Mr. BLAKE. No, it does not. I saw it, and the dates are not there.

NAMES OF PLACES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. TASSE asked, By what authority have the old names of localities in the North-West, names recognised by history and geography, been replaced in many cases by names more or less uncouth and utterly alien to the traditions or to the primitive inhabitants of the country? By what authority have places, most of them along the line of the Pacific Railway, been gifted with the following names: Lorfeden, Nordland, Linkoping, Upsula, Carlstad, Ostersund, Ingolf, Monstrie, Varna, Donnacona, Buckstone, Raith, Hecla, &c.? Is it the intention of the Government to publish a new map and to reinstate the names until recently recognised, and which have been either suppressed or disfigured? Is it the intention of the Government to authorise hereafter only such names as shall have been submitted for its approval, and to adapt the names as far as possible to the localities they represent?

Mr. POPE. The same authority is that usually exercised by men who build railways was the authority that decided in respect to these names. The company have fixed the names of the stations themselves. But in many cases the names of stations such as Swift Current, Medicine Hat, Crowfoot Crossing, and other places, are names that have been known for many years. In the small places, such as here mentioned, of course, I do not know what the names refer to. The attention of the Government had not been called to this matter until my hon. friend put the notice on the paper. I will bring it before the Government, and it will be taken into consideration.

DEPOSITS IN POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the amount of deposits in the Post Office Savings Banks of Canada on May 31st, 1885, subject to payment on demand, and also the amount of deposits subject to notice of withdrawal on the same date?

Mr. CARLING. The amount of deposits on the day mentioned will not be known until the 15th or 16th inst., about a fortnight being necessary to obtain and compile the returns. When they are ready they will be brought down.

REPORT OF NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police made his report, as customary, for the year 1884? At what date was it made? At what date did it reach the Minister? Why has it not been presented to Parliament? Is it intended to present it to Parliament this Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report has been received, but the volume has not yet been sent to me. There has been an evident dely in the matter, which I think has been overlooked in the Department. The report is now in galley, and will be laid before the House very soon.

PROTECTION OF THE FISHERIES.

Mr. VAIL asked, Have any steps been taken by the Government to provide the requisite protection of the fisheries

after the 1st of July next? Has any arrangement been made with the Imperial Government whereby the assistance and co-operation of Her Majesty's ships of war on the North American station can be relied on?

Mr. McLELAN. This matter is receiving the attention of the Government, and I hope in a few days to be able to submit the fullest information upon the subject.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On section 46,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In this clause I think it would be well to provide with more particularity as to the time at which the appeal shall be made. If the committee will look at the resolution in amendment it reads thus:

In any case where the revising officer is not also a judge of any court any person or persons who under the foregoing sections shall have made any complaint, objection or application in respect of the list of voters in any polling district, whether such list be the first or any subsequent voters' list, prepared under this Act for such polling district, or any person or persons with reference to whom such complaint, objection or application shall have been made, who shall be dissatisfied with the decision of the revising officer in respect thereof, may give to the said revising officer or his clerk, within seven days after the day of such decision, notice in writing of his intention to appeal from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of, and his reason for appealing against it, and shall cause a copy of such notice to be served upon the party in whose favor such decision was given, either personally or by leaving it at his residence or place of business; and upon producing to the revising officer satisfactory evidence of the service of such notice, he shall forthwith transmit such notice, together with a copy of his own decision, to the judge to be appealed to as hereinafter provided, and shall sign the same as revising officer, and shall deliver to such appellant or his counsel or agent and to the respondent or his counsel or agent if required, a certified copy of such decision.

The words "within the same delay" shall be inserted—seven days.

Section 47. The judge appealed to shall thereupon appoint a convenient time and place for the hearing of the appeal, which place shall be within the municipality, parish or other local territorial division within which the polling district in which the appeal arises is situate, of which time and place due notice shall be given to the revising officer and to the parties interested, in such manner as the judge shall order. And if, at the time and place so appointed, the appellant does not appear, or appearing withdraws his appeal, the appeal shall be dismissed; but if the appellant appears, and neither the revising officer nor any other party does so, or appearing does not oppose the appeal, the judge shall maintain the appeal. But if the appeal be opposed by the revising officer or other party (if any) then appearing, the judge shall either immediately, or at such time as he shall then fix for the purpose, and at the same place, proceed to hear and decide upon the said appeal, summarily hearing the parties and receiving such legal evidence as shall be adduced before him, respecting the facts in dispute, but without being bound by any technical rules of procedure; and such decision shall be subject to no further appeal, and if any judgment be rendered in appeal which shall require an alteration in the certified list such judgment shall be forthwith notified, in such manner as the judge shall order to the revising officer. And for the purposes of any such appeal and in respect thereof, the judge shall have all the powers conferred upon the revising officer by section 39 of this Act, with regard to summoning witnesses, obtaining evidence, and punishing the persons summoned before him. And the judge may award costs to or against any party in the case.

I beg to move the adoption of these clauses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I observe that the appellant is bound in his notice of appeal to give the grounds upon which he proposes to appeal. It strikes me that appeals from the judgments of the revising officer ought to be made as simple as possible. The object is that persons aggrieved by any adjudication of a revising officer may appeal to a judge, where the revising officer is not a judge, without the necessity of employing a lawyer. If the notice compels the appellant to declare that he appeals from a particular decision of the revising officer, without compelling him to assign all the reasons therefor, the demands of fair play and justice will be fully met. The hon. gentleman will see that if the appellant is bound to assign reasons for the appeal, he is bound to assign every reason on which he proposes to sustain his appeal before the judge. No object can be gained by compelling a layman, who is perhaps a long distance from the nearest point where he can obtain professional assistance, to set out in his notice the grounds of the appeal. The object of the notice is to show the respondent and the revising officer that an appeal is proposed to be made from the adjudication of the revising officer. Unless the appellant were to secure the services of a solicitor or attorney it would be practically impossible to prepare a notice of an appeal that would hold water. I hope, therefore, the hon. gentleman will omit the words, "and the reasons of appealing against it." In the following line I observe the hon. gentleman only provides two modes for the service of the appeal; either personally, or by leaving it at the residence or business place of the party. Many cases may arise where it would be impossible to serve the notice by either of these methods. Suppose a person lived in the United States for the time being, personal service could not be made. I suggest another mode; that the notice of service be sent by registered letter to the last known post office address of the party. I propose to move in that sense as follows: "Or with his solicitor or agent, or by mailing the same in a registered letter addressed to his last known post office address." In other cases it is provided that notices may be served. Sometimes, as the hon. gentleman is aware, you cannot effect personal service of a writ, and you are obliged to make application to dispense with service. If the hon. gentleman insists upon this mode of ervice, appeals will sometimes be cut off altogether. In the next line it is provided that proof of the service of the notice must be given to the revising officer, and he must be satisfied that notice has been served on the respondent. I am not sure that such is a correct method. It places it in the power of the revising officer to say whether there shall be an appeal or not. Would it not be better that the appellant should satisfy the judge that he has fully complied with the terms of the law? In other cases of appeal the court decides whether it is fully charged with the case. As to the first and second points, I am very strongly of the opinion that some amendment should be made, and that an appellant should not be bound to state the grounds on which he proposes to appeal, that it would be quite sufficient and would meet every emergency if the appellant stated that he proposed to appeal from the decision of the revising officer upon his case. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman should provide for other modes of effecting service than by serving personally or leaving the paper at the place of residence or place of business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the reasons for appealing, I think that there should be some reason given in the notice, as otherwise you would encourage appeals without reason. It is at any rate a reasonable conclusion that where an appeal against a man's right to vote is made, the party appealing should give some reason for it. In Ontario they state the reasons for appeal, whether the assessment is too high or too low, or that the wrong person is assessed, and so on, and I think we must adhere to that. Of course it would not prevent the judge from taking a patent objection to the vote, of his own mere motion.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the notice of appeal puts every thing in issue; that is the rule under the Ontario Act to-day, and the people have got into that form.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, That is not the case under the assessment law, I think.

Mr. MULOCK. Quite true, but different reasons apply there, pertaining to the value of property, and so on.

Mr. MILLS. So far as the appeal from the revising barrister to the county judge is concerned, the hon. gentleman proposes that in all these cases the judge shall have power to take the evidence anew, and therefore it is not necessary to settle the point the same as it would be in an ordinary appeal. It is simply a re-hearing; the judge deals with the case as though the revising officer had not enquired into the matter at all, and under such circumstances, I should think a general notice should be sufficient.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it is important that—speaking on behalf of us all—some protection should be given so that notice of appeal might not be given in a mere fit of temper or disappointment at a ruling. I think there ought to be some reason set out, though I have no objection that there should be a provision added to the clause that it is open to the judge on appeal to hear and decide on other reasons besides those given in the notice.

Mr. DAVIES. I take it that a man might appeal on one ground and yet succeed on another.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. As the notice of appeal is the basis of the right to appeal unless it is complete, the notice of appeal will be lost, and therefore it would be necessary for a man to get a lawyer to put in the reason, as it is an essential part of the notice. My recollection is that under the old Summary Convictions Act we used to have to set out the grounds of appeal, but experience showed that it was injudicious, and I think that clause was repealed.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is very important that some reason should be specified in the notice, because parties may come without knowing what they are expected to prove.

Mr. DAVIES. It will not bind him.

Mr. SPROULE. But it gives him some idea of the nature of the appeal.

Mr. MULOCK. How does the present Act work?

Mr. SPROULE. It very often happens that people are appealed against and come a long distance to the court to find that there is no evidence against them, and that the appeal was a mere matter of form.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Formerly, in the case of appeals, the reasons for appeal had to be set out, but that practice has been abolished in all appeals in our courts. And so in an appeal from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court, all you require to do under our law is to give notice that you propose appealing; your grounds for the appeal are not set out. If that is so in cases in which many difficult and complicated questions arise, it appears to me that there is a great deal stronger reason here, especially as the hon. gentleman desires to make this Bill as economical as possible. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) stated, if the hon. gentleman persists in retaining this clause, it will necessarily involve the employment of a lawyer in every case. Would a workingman or a farmer's son be prepared to appeal and assign reasons therefor? He would not know what was meant by reasons. The revising officer raises the issue by his decision; the appellant says, I appeal from your decision. That surely sets out the whole matter before the court. A strong ground is urged by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that here it is really not an appeal at all, but a re-hearing; the judge is to have full power to go into the case *de novo* as if he were revising officer, and the assigning of reasons for the appeal could serve no purpose except to make the process expensive and complicated for the unfortunate man who finds it necessary to appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see that that consequence will occur at all. The revising officer gives his decision, the party is dissatisfied and he appeals. He knows why he is dissatisfied; he knows the reason why he wishes to appeal; and all he has to do is to state that reason.

Mr. CAMERON. Suppose he cannot read or write?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He gets some one to do it for him; he gets any friend. I am quite satisfied that most hon. gentlemen must come to the conclusion that this provision is necessary. As I said before, I have no objection that it should be provided that the judge shall adjudicate upon the appeal for any reasons that may not be assigned in the original notice.

Mr. CAMERON. All the hon. gentleman would require to do in that case would be to say that the party should give one or more of his reasons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At least one reason—we can put it in that way.

Mr. MILLS. If I understand the First Minister rightly, he proposes to leave it discretionary with the judge to say that if the party proposes to proceed upon any other reason than that expressly assigned, he need not investigate the matter, and may throw the whole thing out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that at all. That is not my intention.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose the hon. gentleman means by this that there must be a substantial reason for appealing stated in the notice. Suppose, while a man is out of court for a moment, the revising officer strikes his name off. The man wants to appeal; he may give as a reason for being on the list, I own a piece of property; but what reason would he give for appealing against the decision? He must state that the decision is wrong for some reason.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No man would appeal without having some reason.

Mr. BOWELL. Suppose the reason he gives is: I am qualified. Suppose the revising officer says, you are not of age; he says, I am.

Mr. DAVIES. Even a Minister of the Crown can be astray on this matter. No county court judge would receive the appeal.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not suppose it requires anything more than common sense to understand the practice. In my own Province, I have been in the courts repeatedly to look after the voters' list, and I have never employed a lawyer. If a man's name was struck off the list, all I had to do was to appeal to the judge on the ground that he was entitled to vote, giving, as a reason, that he was of age, or owned a piece of property, or some other good reason; and the hon. First Minister proposes that the judge, acting equitably, shall not be confined to one reason. I have never found any difficulty.

Mr. DAVIES. There is a distinction which, perhaps, the hon. gentleman did not see. The reason for appealing must be part of the notice, and without your reason for appealing your whole notice fails.

Mr. SPROULE. If the revising officer struck a man's name off, I take it he would have to give his reason for doing so. If I were looking after a voters' list, and a name was struck off, I would ask: Why are you striking off this name? He would say: He is not the party who owns the property, or he is not of age. I do not suppose the revising officer would be likely to strike a name off without giving his reasons.

Mr. MILLS. The reasons assigned for an appeal, both by the Minister of Customs and by the hon. gentleman who

has just spoken are not what are known in law as legal reasons. Take the case of an illiterate man who comes before the revising officer and claims the right to vote on some ground or other which he sets out, but he does not produce sufficient evidence, and the revising officer leaves his name off, giving as a reason that the party has not shown that he is qualified. Upon what ground is he to appeal? If he stated the reason truly, it is simply that he did not produce adequate evidence. There may be a lawyer present who tells him that he has good ground to succeed, but he must produce other evidence than that which he produced before the revising officer; is he to be at liberty to produce that evidence before the judge? Clearly, if we are to give the judge the right to hear the case anew, he ought to be at liberty to do so. He is an illiterate man, unacquainted with the law; he does not know what is sufficient legal evidence, and he has failed to produce sufficient legal evidence. The decision of the revising officer may be all right in itself, and yet the party would not have the right to appeal if he is required to assign a reason. Suppose he assigns the reason that the evidence he produced was not held sufficient, the judge may say: But you had no right to succeed on that evidence, and an appeal would not be allowed, although the party might have a good vote and might have been advised to give sufficient evidence to show he had a vote. The First Minister in asking for a reason, is going to place difficulties in the way of the right to appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause provides that the party decided against may, within seven days after that decision, give notice of appeal. Some hon. gentlemen say: Suppose he cannot read or write? Well, he must find some friend who can. That friend will ask him: Why do you appeal? He replies: The revising officer thinks I have not proved my qualification, and he will have to give some reason to support his statement. He has seven days to think over it. A man might be inclined to appeal on the spot, but, on calm second thoughts, if he finds he cannot give a reason, he would be apt to drop it. Then he is in no way, because he has given one reason, to be precluded from assigning other reasons when the case comes before the judge.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the following words be added after "business," in the 12th line:—

Or with his solicitor or agent, or by mailing the same in registered letter addressed to his known post office address.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. People generally have solicitors when they go to have their names put upon the voters' lists, and the solicitor may be retained only to press the claim. It does not follow that his powers are continuous. I will accept that portion of the amendment which states by registered letter, leaving out solicitor or agent.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister would do well to accept the whole amendment. The universal practice is to allow service upon the solicitor *ad hoc* to be service upon the party for whom he is serving.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The solicitor can say I have nothing more to do with it.

Mr. DAVIES. The law would say, if you appear for a man, service upon you is sufficient. It is the universal practice in our courts to make service upon solicitors service upon all parties.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No doubt there is something in what the right honorable gentleman has said. In a transaction like this, a solicitor may be retained simply for the isolated transaction. That is rather a matter for the person who employs the solicitor to decide, but he cannot complain if the opposite party serves the agent he has seen fit to employ. There is perhaps more safety in service on a solicitor than in a registered letter. It comes to his attention at once, and he indicates it to his client, whereas in sending it direct through the post office delay may occur. In country places there are not always daily mails, and people do not go to the post office daily, so that a letter might lie a week in the post office and the time expire before the letter was received. The hon. gentleman knows that if you serve a document upon the solicitor and he does not repudiate the service, he is bound by it. If he repudiates the service, the appellant can send the notice through the post office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The result will be, a poor man who happens to employ a lawyer to establish his claim before the revising officer, will be obliged to keep that lawyer when he goes to the court of appeal.

Amendment as amended, agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to strike out certain words, which will make it read thus: "And the revising officer shall forthwith transmit such notice, together with the copy of his own decision, to the judge in appeal," and so on to the end of the clause.

Mr. DAVIES. I think that the revising officer should send something more than his decision, which would be: I strike off John Smith, or, I put on Thomas Brown. He should send his reasons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been contended all along that it should be tried *de novo*, and that the judge in appeal should have an original as well as an appellate jurisdiction; and in that case there is no ground for him to give his reason.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Any one who has been engaged in the trial of causes knows how great an assistance it is to a judge in appeal to know the reason for the action of the judge of first instance.

Mr. GEOFFRION. That does not apply here.

Mr. WILSON. While it is perfectly right that there should be every provision for an appeal from the revising officer when he is a barrister of five years' standing, I feel that we are virtually placed in the absolute power of a revising officer who is a judge. Many of the revising officers will be quite as competent and quite as impartial as a judge of a county. Every voter ought to have the opportunity, if he feels aggrieved, to appeal to a higher court. It was originally intended that we should be permitted to appeal in a matter of law, and I think that was quite correct. If we had that right, the dread of an appeal would have a wholesome effect upon the county judge who was trying the question of appeal. If you do not allow this appeal you will find a judge in one county ruling in one direction, and a judge in another county ruling in an opposite direction. Now, why the First Minister should wish to make that county judge the final resort, I cannot understand. The county judge, when is revising barrister, first makes up the voters' list, then he presides at the primary revision, and still again at the final revision. Now, if you take an appeal from the primary revision to the final revision you appeal to the same person; and do you suppose that the revising barrister is going to change his mind from the time he made his list until the final revision? You virtually do away with this revision altogether, so far as the county judge is concerned, if you do not allow any appeal from him. If the First Minister desires to make his Act perfect, he will grant an appeal from the county judge when he is revising barrister I think the First Minister ought to grant an appeal on matters of law, if nothing more, if he still persists in refusing an appeal on matters of fact, so that there may be a precedent to govern revising barristers when they are county

judges. I say this Bill will not satisfy the general public unless you allow an appeal from the county judge. It may be thought that I am speaking from a prejudiced point of view, in view of the county judge in my own locality. Be that as it may, I think I have shown sufficient reasons why we ought not to confine the final appeal to the county judge when he is revising barrister. I would just as soon have any lawyer of five years' standing to be the revising barrister, as to have a county judge. I believe they would act with equal impartiality. Does the First Minister pretend to tell me that a man who has always acted with his party, as soon as he happens to be appointed county judge, is going to lay aside all his party feelings? It is unreasonable, it is unnatural; you need not expect it. The judges are but human, and they will still be inclined to give preference to their own political party. We have heard of unjust judges, and as soon as this Bill becomes law we will have an opportunity of witnessing unjust decisions, and I appeal to the First Minister to know whether it is reasonable and fair to the general public to prevent them appealing from the unjust decisions that are very likely to be given.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought this matter had been fully threshed out on Saturday. However, I can leave the hon. gentleman in the hands of our mutual friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) on this point. The hon. gentleman says the judges are human. Well, that is just what I want them to be. I think that my hon. friend is afraid that the judge in his county will be inhuman. But we will make a compromise. If the hon. gentleman will get the consent of his party, we will appoint another revising officer for his county, and not Judge Hughes. Will that suit the hon. gentleman?

Mr. WILSON. The hon. gentleman must understand that it does not only affect the county of Elgin; I speak for all the counties throughout the Province. I say that every man has an inherent right, if he is dissatisfied with the first revision, if he is dissatisfied with the opinion of one judge, to appeal to some other judge. The hon. gentleman knows that as well as I do. I will not refer to my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock); he has a right to speak for himself. I am speaking for myself, and I say it is only right and fair, whether the First Minister may appoint some other man in my county or not as revising barrister, that he should allow an appeal from his decision. The hon. gentleman may appoint the county judge in my county, if he likes. He can do his worst. He can visit me there again if he likes, as well as he did in the last election; he can gerrymander the constituency once more.

Mr. CHARLTON. The radical defects of this Bill, of course, can only be remedied by dropping it; but if we are to have a Bill at all, and, as the First Minister has shown a considerable disposition the last day or two to make it as fair as we can reasonably expect, it seems to me he will be required to go a step farther in that direction. It strikes me the appeal made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is a reasonable appeal. In case the revising barrister who is appointed is not a judge, there is an appeal from his decision—an appeal from the preliminary revision of the roll; and I think the request that there should be an appeal from the decision of the county judge, is also a reasonable one. There are many other cases where the public interest would not be served, and it will appear a little invidious to say that in one case there shall be an appeal from the revising officer's decision and in another case there shall not be an appeal. Before this question is finally decided, the hon. First Minister had better take all the facts bearing on this matter into consideration. I believe the Bill will look better and will be a better Bill if there is an appeal from the revising officer, even when he happens to be a county judge.

On section 47,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I incorporate in this clause the suggestion of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) with respect to notice of service.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand that, as a matter of course, the county judge will hold his court in each locality, and that it will not be necessary for an appellant to travel to the county town, perhaps a distance of 50 miles, to satisfy the judge with respect to matters connected with the appeal.

Mr. ABBOTT. Suppose there was only one appeal, the judge went to the locality and witnesses appeared, and it then turned out that there never had been any notice of appeal given, the judge would have gone to all the trouble and expense without achieving any result. I think the original plan is preferable, that proof of service be made with the revising officer. Then the revising officer will return the notice to the judge, after satisfying himself that there was a notice given—and that is all he has to satisfy himself about—and the judge not only fixes a day for the trial but sends notice to both parties, and consequently both parties would be there with their witnesses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman evidently does not understand our practice in Ontario or he would not have submitted his objection. Precisely the same difficulty which has been suggested by the hon. gentleman might be urged in regard to every court held in outlying districts. The judge has to attend there at a certain time. There may be only one case, and there may be some flaw in respect to the procedure, and so it cannot be heard. That does not, however, prevent the judge from attending. There is no hardship with respect to witnesses. The judge will have power to allow the parties the costs so incurred.

Mr. ABBOTT. Only on deciding the appeal.

Mr. CAMERON. The balance of convenience is altogether against the proposition of the First Minister. Every appellant would be compelled to travel to the county town, where the judge lives, for the purpose of satisfying him that the appeal had been properly served, and every step taken to make the appeal effective. Let the judge fix his circuit, as he does now, and dispose of the cases in the locality. In Ontario there will be no difficulty, because in nine cases out of ten the division court work does not occupy more than a quarter of a day, and the judge can fix that day or the following day for hearing complaints under this statute. To compel men to travel for no purpose, even to the county town where the judge lives, for the purpose of proving that notice has been given, and to make a second journey, is to cause two sets of costs unnecessarily.

Mr. ABBOTT. Those are excellent arguments for the adoption of the amendment as it stood. Under it there would be no occasion to go to the county town, for the proof of the notice would be settled by the revising officer. In Quebec, if the trial were before a Superior Court judge, very great difficulty would arise. In many cases he would have to go to hear one appeal, for in Quebec there is often not more than one appeal on the voters' lists in a dozen municipalities, and yet he might find that the notice given was insufficient. It would be very much more simple if the revising officer were to receive proof of notice, and if he found there was reasonable proof he would transmit the notice to the judge, who would name a day and place for the hearing. In the interests of the public, this plan is desirable instead of that suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not agree with the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). To satisfy the revising officer would give just as much trouble as to satisfy the county judge. I suggest that the amendment proposed by the

First Minister be introduced at the commencement of line 28. It would be unnecessary to take up the time of the court in showing that there was a service. Another part deals with the appellant making default, and my experience under the Voters' List Act in Ontario is to this effect: that where these notices of appeal had been given the appeals have been pressed. I am quite satisfied that there has been no abuse of the system in that respect, and I think it would be premature to assume that there would be abuses here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept your amendment.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not quite sure if the clause covers the whole ground yet, or whether it applies simply to the class of cases mentioned after the word "but" which begins the sentence. Of course it was intended to apply to the service of all notices, but I doubt if this covers it.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the words: "The judge shall maintain the appeal." Suppose the revising officer does not oppose the appeal, and no other person appears to oppose it, there ought to be *primâ facie* evidence of the right of the appellant to succeed. Yet, according to this provision, by the mere fact of appealing, he would be entitled to have his name put on the voters' list without giving evidence that he was a voter, the judge has no discretion in the matter, and would have to allow his appeal. That is surely not the intention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the party does not appear, I think he is quite satisfied the *primâ facie* evidence cannot be sustained.

Mr. MILLS. The party has his appeal sustained not on any evidence he produces, but as a matter of course, simply because nobody appears to oppose him. He ought even in appeal to produce sufficient evidence to show *prima facie* that he has a right to go on the voters' list.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think so.

Mr. MILLS. Then it amounts to this: that if a revising officer chooses he may say to 20 men: I will not put your names on this list, but you may appeal; and because he fails to appear against them before the county judge, all of their names go on the voters' list. This facilitates fraud, and is wholly contrary to the whole tenor of the Bill. You say by this Bill that the whole case before the judge is to be heard anew, yet you leave the judge no discretion, such as the revising officer has, to enquire into the right of the parties to go on the list; but because the revising officer does not appear against them—and they may be his political friends—they go on as a matter of course. It appears to me that the proposition is monstrous.

Mr. LISTER. Evidence should be given of a person's right to go on the list; yet there is nothing in the Bill to compel the revising officer to oppose the appeals from his decision. Upon simply appealing, a party has a right to go before the judge, and without any evidence establishing a *primâ facie* case, he is entitled to ask the judge to put his name on the list, and the judge cannot refuse. Unless the First Minister makes it the duty of the revising officer to oppose the appeal, either by notice or in some other way, which will require the person appealing to give some evidence of his right to be placed on the list, surely it is no hardship to say that the person himself shall be sworn, in order to show that he has at least a colorable right. Either do that, or make it compulsory on the revising officer to appear and oppose the appeal. If the First Minister considers the matter for a moment, he will see that a person without being entitled to a vote might get on the roll in a very simple way. If after appealing he appears before the judge and asks to be placed on the list, the judge must place him there. I think that is not the intention of the Act.

Mr. MULOCK.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course there is no obligation on the revising officer to appear, and perhaps he may not be expected to appear; but the clause says, "if neither the revising officer nor any other party appears."

Mr. LISTER. Any other party may not receive the notice. If you say any other elector, that might get over the difficulty.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think any person should go on the list unless he has *primâ facie* evidence to show his right to go on. If he appeals, he ought to be required to produce evidence to satisfy the judge, no matter whether any party appears against him or not. Otherwise, there might be connivance between the revising officer and certain persons not entitled to go on the list.

Mr. LISTER. In the division court, unless the law expressly provides that where the defendant does not appear a judgment shall be entered by default, the court requires the plaintiff to sustain his claim by some *primâ facie* evidence of his right to recover. This is more than a matter between individuals, it is one in which every person in the electorate riding is interested, and it is reasonable that in such a case evidence should be given. All a person would have to do would be to say to the judge: I ask to be sworn, I own such a lot. It is very simple and will prevent frauds being committed. As it is now, it is quite possible frauds may be committed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To meet the views of hon. members, I propose the following amendment:—

If the appellant appears and neither the revising officer nor any other party has done so, or, on appearing, has not disposed of the appeal, the judge shall maintain the appeal, except in the case of an appeal by a person struck off the list or whose name the revising officer refuses to place thereon, in which cases the judge shall require satisfactory evidence as the right of the appellant to be placed on the voters' list.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The First Minister has adopted my suggestion of the other day so far as to provide that, in this case, the judge shall be bound by the rules of evidence and shall accept only strict legal evidence. I think, in order to make the Bill consistent, he should go back and make the same provisions in regard to the revising officer. Otherwise, the revising officer may decide correctly upon the evidence before him, and the judge may reverse his decision with equal justice upon the evidence before him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 40th clause has been adopted in committee. We will not go back to it now.

Mr. CAMERON. There is no provision that the revising officer shall make the necessary amendment in the roll after the decision of the judge in appeal.

Mr. ABBOTT. The 43rd clause covers that.

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps it does, but it is not very clear.

Mr. ABBOTT. The substitution of the word "any" for the word "the" would make it clear.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, probably it would.

Amendment to section 43 agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON. It is not clear in this present clause, what costs are to be awarded? If the judge is to have the power to award costs, the scale ought to be fixed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been already decided that the only costs shall be the witnesses' fees.

Mr. MULOCK. There ought to be some provision to prevent a case being decided by default, in the absence of the parties concerned, and I would move the following amendment:—

Any elector may appear at any sitting of the revising officer or of the judge in appeal in support of or in opposition to any claim, objection, application or question arising before such revising officer or judge.

It prevents *ex parte* applications being disposed of. A number of persons might apply to be put on, and the application would be simply between them and the county court judge; there would be no one contesting their claim, and the application would wholly be *ex parte*. In this case each of the great political parties will appoint a representative, and he will prevent any frauds being perpetrated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You had better put it at the end of the clause: "provided always," etc.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would suggest that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) should add "any person" instead of "any elector." This is the system which has been adopted in the Province of Quebec. Formerly, in the election law of 1875, we had the same enactment as the amendment proposes. This was altered, and the right of appeal was given to any person. We found in many cases there was a good deal of difficulty in inducing an elector to come forward. He was afraid of being saddled with the costs, or of having some trouble in contesting the lists. A party who took the trouble to have the corrections made in the election lists, found great difficulty in obtaining the name of an elector to contest the list. The result was that the Legislature of Quebec amended the law, and I think the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) originated the amendment. I do not know how it is in other Provinces, but in the Province of Quebec farmers are generally very much afraid of lawyers and of having to go to court.

Mr. MILLS. I think if the hon. gentleman looks at his Bill he will see that there is no provision for costs in the appeal before the county judge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The witnesses' fees.

Mr. MILLS. Parties who are subpœnaed as witnesses, of course, must be paid before they are called upon to obey the summons, and the costs may be awarded against the other party, but there is no provision made for meeting it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would move the following amendment:—

The judge in appeal may award costs to or against any party in the case, which costs shall only be witnesses' fees and the expense of summoning such witnesses, and such costs may be levied on the order of a judge by distress, as under a warrant of conviction, under statute 32 and 33 Victoria, chap. 31.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the phrase in the amended clause, "and such decision shall be subject to no further appeal." That seems to me totally unnecessary, and it may give rise to trouble. An appeal is a pure creature of a statute; if you do not give an appeal, it does not exist; so that this language is surplusage. If the intention is to take away the common law jurisdiction of the Superior Courts, it must be expressed in other language.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that may perhaps be necessary, in consequence of some independent jurisdiction of the Superior Court by *certiorari* or *mandamus*. It has to be provided that there shall be no further appeal.

Mr. DAVIES. It does not take away the right of the courts above to interfere by prohibition or *mandamus*. If you wish to take away that right, you must say: "and such decision shall be final."

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There may be something in what my hon. friend says; but I hope the hon. First Minister is not going to deprive the courts of the right to correct any wrongs that may be committed, by issuing a writ of *certiorari* or *mandamus*, or a prohibition, as the case may require. I propose moving a proviso to this section, providing for an appeal on questions of law. I do not think that subject has been threshed out yet; and I think it is a most important point. The hon. gentleman, in his original Bill, proposed that there should be an appeal from the revising officer on questions of law, and on questions of law only. Subsequently he assented to the proposition, which was made on this side of the House, that there should be an appeal from the revising officer, where he was not a county court judge, on questions of fact also; and he stated, as I understood him, that he contemplated no further appeal. I think that is hardly fair. I believe that on naked questions of law there ought to be an appeal to the highest court in the Province in which that appeal arises. The hon. gentleman must remember that this is the first time we have had such a Bill as this, and interpretations upon some of the terms used in the Bill will arise for the first time. For instance, according to his definition, the word "freeholder" means the owner of an estate in freehold, in free and common socage, while, as was argued very fully, there are estates in Canada held under a different tenure. Questions of the first consequence will arise in the Provinces in connection with the meaning of the word "landholder," as defined in the interpretation clause of this Bill, and it is of great importance that we should have uniformity of decision on these points. We cannot be certain of uniformity of decision throughout the Dominion unless there is an appeal to the Supreme Court; and for my part I prefer doing without the uniformity to incurring the enormous expense of an appeal to the Supreme Court. But as the hon. gentleman proposes to pass the Bill, there will be no uniformity in any Province; each of the 30 or 40 judges in the Province of Ontario may take a different view of the law. We ought to have uniformity in the Provinces at least. The appeal from the revising officer to the county court judge will, in my judgment, dispose of 999 cases out of 1,000—at all events, a very large percentage; both the appellant and the respondent will be perfectly satisfied with the adjudication of the county judge on questions of both law and fact. But, on the other hand, legal questions may arise in some of the Provinces affecting a large class of the electorate, and it may become the interest of either political party to obtain a decision of the very highest court in the Province thereupon. In England, where the revising officer is appointed by the judges with large powers vested in him, the Legislature evidently did not think it wise or judicious in the public interest that there should be no appeal from his adjudication, and they therefore allowed an appeal from him upon naked questions of law; and that appeal is looked upon there as of the first possible consequence. Bretherton, in his work on Voters, says:

"The right to appeal on points of law from the decision of the revising barrister to the court of common pleas is conferred by 6 Victoria, chap. 18, sec. 42. It is one of great importance to the claimant, the objector, or the party whose name has been expunged from the list, enabling any of them, should they feel aggrieved or dissatisfied with the decision of the barrister on any point of law, to have that decision reconsidered by the highest legal authority."

There the revising officers are lawyers, perhaps not of the first rank, but of some professional standing. They get an allowance of 200 guineas a year for the discharge of these duties, and even with lawyers of the class appointed by judges there, the Legislature thought it proper that an elector should not be bound by their decisions, but that there should, on questions of law, be an appeal from the adjudication of the revising barrister to a higher court. Bretherton further says:

"The question reserved on appeal must be one of the law, material to the result of the case on which the appeal is requested; and section 65 especially enacts, that no appeal or notice of appeal shall be received or allowed against any decision of any revising barrister upon any question of fact only, or upon the admissibility or effect of any evidence or admission adduced or made in any case to establish any matter or fact only."

The appeal is only upon the naked legal proposition that may arise before the revising barrister, from his judgment to that of a higher court. The whole tendency of modern legislation upon the subject of appeal is that the adjudication of lower courts should not be conclusive and final. There was a time, not very long ago, when the adjudication in our division courts was conclusive and final, but the Legislature saw fit in certain cases to provide that a litigant in a division court should not be absolutely bound by its decision. So in the adjudication by a magistrate of cases of summary adjudication, the Legislature always thought there should be an appeal from his decision to the court of quarter sessions. So from the judge sitting at *nisi prius*, there is an appeal to the Court of Appeal, and thence to the Court of Appeal—the Supreme Court and the Privy Council. The whole tendency of modern legislation is that a litigant shall not be bound by the adjudication of a judge of an inferior court or even of a judge of a higher court, but that he shall have his resort to the Supreme Court of the realm. Rights of the first possible consequence are to be investigated by the county judge, and I say that those rights should not be pronounced upon absolutely by either the revising officer or the county court judge, but that there should be an appeal. If men see fit to have their rights investigated, they should have an opportunity of having them investigated before the higher courts in the Province. While I have every faith in the honesty and integrity and ability of our judges to administer the law correctly, I say there is a great safeguard for the public, when a judge of the court below knows, as a matter of fact, that his judgment is a subject for revision. We know that judges are still men subject to all the frailties our common humanity is subject to. I do not say that our judges, when upon the bench, are influenced by political leanings. I trust that we can have this assurance at all events, that when our judges, those who are even taken from the ranks of the profession who have been actively engaged in political struggles, are placed upon the bench, they cease to be politicians. This is the general and perhaps the universal rule. That is the case, in so far as our common humanity will enable them so to act, but if they are human and subject to all the frailties of common humanity, they may be somewhat careless, somewhat indifferent, and they are more apt to be so when they know their decisions are not subject to appeal to a higher court. If you allow the appeal to the very highest court of the realm, from the adjudication of an inferior court, you may rely that the judgments of the latter will be more carefully, more deliberately prepared than if the judge were aware there was no appeal. When he has nothing to check him, nothing to restrain him, there is nothing to protect the public either against careless or indifferent judgments. Apart altogether from mere political proclivities or leanings, if judges are supposed to have any, it is of the first possible consequence to the people that there should be an appeal from the decision of the judges of the lower courts. We know that the judge of a county court is a judge of an inferior court; we know that the revising officer will be the judge of a still more inferior court, because there is to be an appeal from him to the county court judge. Therefore, we ought to have an appeal from the revising officer to the court of common pleas, as we have in England. The power of appeal is a check and restraint, and I trust the Government will insist upon its being given. While I go that far, I still believe there will be very few appeals from the decision of the county court judge, but the fact that he knows this is an appeal, the fact that the revising officer knows that there is an appeal, will operate as a wholesome restraint upon each in the careful preparation of his decisions. With these views, I would beg to move the following amendment, almost in the identical words of the hon. gentleman's original proposition:

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

That any person or persons who, under the foregoing sections, shall have made complaint, according to the practice therein provided for, in respect of the list of voters in any polling district, with respect to the final revision thereof, whether such list be the first or any subsequent voters' list for the polling district prepared under this Act, or any person or persons with reference to whom such complaint was made, who shall be dissatisfied with the decision on any point of law of the revising officer or the judge in appeal in respect of such complaint, may give to the revising officer or the judge in appeal, within seven days after such decision, notice in writing of his desire to appeal to a superior court from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of and his reasons for appealing against it; and if the revising officer, as soon as he conveniently can do so, state, in the form of a special case, the facts established according to his opinion by the evidence, and necessary to be laid before the court above in order to determine the said point of law, also his own decision on the same, as nearly as may be according to the form and practice provided for the stating and hearing of a special case in the court intended to be appealed to, and he shall then sign the same as revising officer, and shall require the appellant, or his counsel or agent, after reading the same to him, to sign a declaration at the end of such special case in the words, "I appeal from the above decision," after which the revising officer shall endorse the said case with the names of the parties appellant or respondent, if there be a respondent or party desiring to maintain the decision appealed from, and the number of the polling district, and the name of the electoral district thereby affected, and shall deliver to such appellant, or his counsel or agent, a certified copy of such case, and, also, if required, to the respondent or his counsel or agent.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be a great pity to spoil the Bill by allowing such an amendment to pass. The result would be to throw litigation into the hands of those best able to afford it, while the poor man would be unable to carry it on from court to court. There is no force in the hon. gentleman's statement that there would be very few appeals. The whole history of litigation is an argument to the contrary effect. There is scarcely a lawsuit that is not carried from court to court as long as the lawyers can find a man able to furnish the money, and many people forego their rights in equity because there is such an opportunity to carry the lawsuit on. One of the great evils of litigation is the number of openings for appeals. This is throwing it more and more into the hands of the rich, and defrauding the poor man of his rights. In this case it is not money which is involved, but only a vote, and every man wants the same opportunity of putting it on. There should be no opportunity given, where political feeling ran high, for the wealthy to carry on litigation and deprive of their rights those who are as much entitled to them as they are, but have not as much money to expend in defending them. If there is no appeal, the matter will be kept in the hands of the people and out of the hands of the lawyers, and I think the country will be far from endorsing the proposal to have another court of appeal in this matter.

Mr. MILLS. It is very extraordinary that the hon. gentleman did not express such opinions at an earlier period, because he is taking exception to a provision in the Bill as it originally was introduced, and as it was passed at the second reading.

Mr. SPROULE. We did not reach that clause of the Bill. I have expressed my opinion privately in reference to it, and, if it had not been taken out of the Bill, I would have expressed my opinion as I have now.

Mr. MILLS. On the second reading, we were discussing the whole Bill, we were discussing the principles of the Bill, and, if the hon. gentleman will look in *Hansard*, he will not find any qualification expressed of the support which he gave to the measure. He looks upon the lawyers as a very slippery and unscrupulous lot. It is strange he should have given such earnest support to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government. It is strange that he should have so little confidence in the honesty and fairness of the lawyers whom he has so long supported——

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say anything about their being unscrupulous. I spoke as to their disposition to litigate.

Mr. MILLS. He said it would give an opportunity to the lawyers to pick the electors and that, as long as an elector had any money left, the lawyers would lead him on to these courts. I think this is a necessary provision. I was under the impression until Saturday that the hon. gentleman was going to provide, as a matter of course, for an appeal of this sort to the Superior Court, I did not suppose, when he provided for an appeal from the revising barrister to the county judge, that he intended that to be the only appeal. In fact, my impression was that it ought not to be regarded as an appeal at all, but that it was simply giving to any elector in any constituency where a revising barrister was not a county judge the opportunity of saying: I will not abide by your decision, but I prefer to have my right investigated by the county judge rather than by the revising barrister. It seems to me that it was not the intention of the First Minister to treat it as a matter of appeal but rather as a part of the original proceedings, as an alternative offered to the voter to go before the county judge to establish his right, instead of leaving it to be disposed of by the revising officer. In addition to that, I understood it was intended on all questions of law to give to the parties who were not satisfied with the interpretation of the county judge the right to appeal to a higher tribunal. I do not suppose that there would be many appeals, but I believe it would be of immense advantage to the electors to feel that, if the county judge gives a decision which they think contrary to law, they will have the opportunity of taking the case before a higher court, where judges of greater ability and more eminence administer justice. There is also this important consideration that, as long as a county judge knows that it is possible to make an appeal from his decision to another tribunal by which that decision may be reversed, he is likely to exercise far more care and give to the question at issue more attention before he expresses an opinion. Then supposing one judge interprets the law in one way and another interprets it in another way, there ought to be an appeal to some tribunal which will give the same construction to the law all over the Province at least, and I think there should be a provision, where the higher courts construe the law differently, for taking it at public expense before the Supreme Court, in order to make a uniform law for the whole Dominion. I have looked over the 30th section, for instance, and I cannot say how a judge will construe it, and when I ask the hon. gentleman how he understood it, it seemed to me that he did not hold a uniform opinion during the time he was speaking. One revising officer may honestly construe the law in one way and another in another way. In such a question I think the law ought to be uniformly interpreted, and the only way to do this is to give an appeal to a superior court. I am sure that their construction of the law and the care and deliberation which they would give to the case will be very different when such power exists than if no such power exists.

Mr. WILSON. I think my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was not very consistent in his course on the question of appeals. He ought to have considered that the Bill, as we find it this afternoon, allows an appeal from the revising barrister.

Mr. SPROULE. It is to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, not ours.

Mr. WILSON. If it were to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, it was his duty, if he was opposed to the principle of appeals, to have said so and to have opposed it. He sat very quitely the whole afternoon and allowed a provision for appeal to be passed, yet when we ask that there may be an appeal from the judge, when he is revising barrister, to a higher court, my hon. friend says: Oh, no, it will involve heavy costs upon the poor man. If he be poor and if he be unfortunate I say he ought to have just as much opportunity to preserve his rights, as the rich man.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it will be necessary to turn back to section 41. In the proviso that was to be added to section 46, allowing an elector to appear before the court, we struck out of it that part where he was allowed to appear before the court of revision, the First Minister showing that it was not germane to that particular section. I move that the following be added to section 41:

Any elector may, in person or by agent, appear at any sitting of the revising officer in the electorate district in which he is such elector, in support of, or in opposition to, any claim, objection or application arising before the revising barriscer."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 51,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that section 50 shall stand over for the present, and we shall take up section 51.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I desire at this stage to move an amendment to section 12, that the following words be inserted at the 36th line:

That in the case of an Indian living on a reservation his name shall be entered only on his applying in person to the revising officer, and there shall be given such a description of the separate holding as shall determine its exact location, and the value of the improvements on which he qualifies shall be determined by evidence given under oath, and the post office address of such Indian shall be given on the published list.

With respect to the first provision, it might be considered somewhat exceptional in its nature. It might be said: Why not allow the Indian's name to find its way upon the roll in the same way as does the name of any other person? There is this difficulty: Section 12 provides that the assessment roll and the list of voters prepared by the municipality shall be taken as forming a basis for the action of the revising officer, and as *primâ facie* evidence of the right of the person to be on the voters' list. With respect to the Indians on reservations, we know there are not assessment rolls and voters' lists. There is no enumeration of them that I know of, except a roll upon which the Indian agent pays them their money, and, therefore, we find the circumstances are exceptional from that standpoint. The returning officer being thus debarred from having access to assessment rolls and voters' lists, from the fact that no such list exists on any reservation, how shall he get his information? What would suggest itself to some persons would be that the Indian agent having a list of the Indians upon that reservation for the purpose of paying their interest money or gratuities might be able to furnish the information. But I hold it is something that will not commend itself to the good sense of the committee. I will not at this stage, and only at a future stage if I should find it necessary, say anything as to the peculiar position occupied by the Indians towards the Crown. Upon that point I have very strong views, and I could urge even stronger reasons than I have already presented with respect to the Indians. I will assume at present that it has been settled by the committee that an Indian living on a reservation, with property improved by his own hands to the extent of $150, shall have a vote. It would hardly be a proper or decent thing to contemplate as regards an Indian, a ward of the Crown, superintended by an officer of the Crown, nominated by the Crown, for such official to hand in as an official a list of those who are to become entitled to the rights of citizenship and to the right to vote. It would be something so repugnant

that we could not contemplate it. Then what shall be done? We have no assessment roll or voters lists with respect to Indians for the guidance of the revising officer, and, if my idea is adopted, it will not be considered a proper thing that the Indian agent should have anything to do with placing the names of the Indians upon the voters' list. It is because they occupy that particular position that the amendment I submit appears to be necessary. Another point I desire to press on the Minister's consideration is this: Some of the more adanced tribes of Indians, who were not original proprietors of the soil of Canada, who came here under treaty with Great Britain and had certain lands given to them, many members if not the whole of the nation desire to maintain their tribal relations, their semi-independence and their position, as they view it, as allies rather than as snbjects of the Crown. The First Minister has himself given us to understand that one of the main reasons why the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act are not more availed of, the strong feeling among the Indians in favor of maintaining their tribal relations—their distinct nationality. I have declared more than once during this discussion that nothing would be more unwise on the part of the Government than to attempt anything in the direction of force. The Indians should be led, and in my view they should assume the responsibilities as well as the privileges of citizenship. They have their rights under treaty, rights which have been secured to them by the Crown, and they are jealous of those rights. The fact that they have not availed themselves of the principle of enfranchisement shows that they value those rights, and I think they would resent anything which would look like this Parliament putting upon them unasked, and by the mere force of will of this Parliament, something they have not asked for or desired. It may be said, if they are placed on the voters' list without their own request, they need not exercise the privilege of voting if they think it will entail any difficulties upon them. But you have passed that stage, which you have not a right to pass without the consent of the Indians, and therefore, in the proposition which you have before you, I have laid down no provision on that point. I have accepted the decision of the committee, that the Indian living on a reservation, with the property qualification by way of improvements, has the right to go on the roll. My motion will not accomplish the exclusion of the Indian from the roll, but will make him a party to the transaction, instead of forcing it upon him as we have done. Here we are at the initial step, not having consulted with the Indian, not having asked the Indian if he desires it, not having the slightest intimation that we are aware of, from the Indian, that there is any desire on his part to be brought within this law, and this motion will enable him to go on the voters' list by his own personal application, in which case he will express his desire to participate in the benefits—if he considers they are benefits—flowing from the Act. Therefore, I think the proposition is a reasonable one, one which will secure accuracy, and one which is of more significance with reference to some of the older bands of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says the Indians have never intimated a desire on this subject, but he must be making a mistake. He must have overlooked the letter of Dr. Jones which appeared in the *Mail* some weeks ago, and a letter from another doctor saying that the Indians wished it, and that they were entitled to it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I stated that they expressed no desire to this House. Dr. Jones nor Dr. Oronhyatekha never petitioned this House that I know of, and I question very much that if we knew the views of those who might be considered the most fitted by their advancement than others, to partake of some kind of representation in this House, if we would not find that the idea in their minds would not be in the direction they meditated at all, but an amendment of the constitution, providing that the Indians might have representatives selected by themselves, representing themselves on the floor of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. What more advanced Indians could there be than those I have mentioned?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That I think is their desire on the subject, if any desire prevails. The hon. member mentions these gentlemen having written letters, and I am cognisant of the fact that they did, and the letters are written with considerable ability. The two gentlemen who wrote them are men of culture, education and advancement; no doubt they are conversant with the political history of the country, and they would be able, I think, to give intelligent votes. But they themselves, by the course they have pursued, have shown that they want to maintain their independence, their separate existence and relations, even while asking that they should have the right to vote. Has Dr. Jones or Dr. Oronhyatekha proposed that their bands shall come under municipal government and contribute to municipal taxation; do they desire to allow the white people to have a voice in their councils, which they maintain are practically supreme within their own limits? Do they propose an amalgamation in that way? No; they are as anxious to maintain the separate existence of the Indian in the community as are the others. They simply ask that the Indian shall have the right to vote, but they do not ask that the Indian shall have entailed on him the same responsibilities as other citizens, and in that respect I do not think their position is very logical. Having pointed out the difficulties with reference to these Indians, let me consider the application of the first part of my resolution to those Indians who are not advanced, to the uncultured, unlettered, ignorant Indians, to those who have not adopted the ways of civilisation, so to speak, for there are many of them in Ontario and Quebec who have been enfranchised, even leaving the newer Provinces and Territories out—there are Indians in the older Provinces occupying positions which you could hardly call the position of being civilised. Would it be right for the Indian agent who will be over such Indians as these, who will have a more absolute control over them than he can exercise over the more intelligent Indians—would it be right for the Indian agent to hand in a list of these Indians to the revising officer and have them put on the roll—Indians, many of whom may have no names by which they can be identified. There must be provision for meeting such cases.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). When we reached the dinner hour, I had dealt with the more advanced bands of Indians who are occupying their lands under somewhat different conditions from some of the other Indians in the country, and I was pointing out how I thought the amendment I had to propose would have a beneficial effect on those Indians. I was about to proceed to show that there was an absolute necessity for the amendment with reference to bands of Indians living on reservations who are in a less advanced condition and therefore more likely to be controlled, guided and directed, if not commanded, by the agents of the Government; and I was about to show, from a description that was given to us by one of the strongest supporters of the First Minister in this House, the condition of some of the Indians who are given the right to vote by this Bill. I will just read the remarks he made, so as to impress on the minds of the committee the necessity there

is that there should be an entire absence, as far as it can be secured, of control by the officers of the Government over these Indians in exercising the vote. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), at an earlier stage of the debate, while the question of giving the vote to the Indians was under discussion, in replying to the hon. member for Lambton, said :

"If the hon. gentleman had been as fair as he professed to be, he would have admitted that the Province of Ontario has given the Indians the right to vote already, and that they have voted time and again. Yet he says the law which allows them to vote is fair in every particular, but it is not fair for this House to pass a law to give them a right to vote. I know something about how the Indians were dealt with. In the election before last, in the Muskoka district, the timber inspector there, who supported Mr. Mowat's candidate, went out among the Indians, and it was currently reported, and I believe correctly, that he bought up all the Indians in the district, collected them all in one place, and took them to the polls and got them to vote. After that he took the Indians away, took their dresses from them and put them on the squaws, and took them in, and got them to poll their votes. That was done under the law of Ontario and by the friends of the Ontario Government. But it was rumored that Mr Mowat's timber inspectors did not retain that control over the Indians that they ought to have, and he inserted in his Bill that nice little clause, that any enfranchised Indian receiving any money from the Dominion Government should have no right to vote; but as he could get the votes of the Indians, he was perfectly willing to give them the right to vote."

Apart from what may have been possible for the Indians under Mr. Mowat's Act, which is not a subject of discussion here, we have here a description of what the hon. member heard and believed with reference to the influence exercised over the Indians. If that description be correct, it is seen how absolutely the Indians of that class are under the control of those in authority; and it seems to me a thing that cannot be contemplated by the committee at all. That those who will have the right of voting, perhaps the turning of the election in many constituencies, should be in the position of having their names—it may be unknown and unsought for by them—entered on the voters' list, and on the day of election being marshalled by some official to the polls to cast their votes. No harm could be done to these Indians in requiring that they shall take the trouble of personally requesting the revising officer to put their names on the voters' list. Mind, I am recognising the fact that the committee have decided that they have a right to be there. We are dealing with the question how they shall get there. The revising officer, from the assessment rolls he is instructed to get, will have no knowledge of these Indians, as there is no assessment roll among them; therefore, it is not asking very much to the detriment of the Indian or putting him to very much trouble, if we ask that he should personally request his name to be entered on the voters' list. It is a trouble that will have to be taken by a good many voters who will be enfranchised under this Bill for the first time. True, it may be said that some friend will ask for them, and that I am seeking to prevent the Indian having the same privilege; but I hold that the Indian occupies a different position in this respect. Though not being privileged to vote heretofore he has been dwelling in the midst of a free people and knows the process of voting; he knows the machinery by which it is necessary to avail himself of that privilege and I have no doubt he will look after himself in that respect. If the Indian is intelligent enough to have the vote, he ought to know that much; he ought to know that the privilege is one that he must make application for. Therefore, looking at the matter, whether from the standpoint of the intelligent Indian who may view this as a measure forced upon him that he has not asked for, and that may compromise him in his relations with the Crown, or from the standpoint of the less intelligent Indian, there is a necessity, in the interest of the country, in the interest of the electorate, in the interest of what is right and proper in those entitled to the great privilege of casting a vote for those who make the law under which they live, that they should be intelligent enough to know what is conferred upon them, and to express the desire for it themselves. Passing to the next point of my proposal, it is that there shall be given such a description of his separate holding as shall determine its exact location. That ought to commend itself to any one who looks at it as being obviously desirable. The clause to which I propose to append this—though I leave that to the discretion of the First Ministe—provides that a farmer's property shall be described by the lot, the concession, and so on—a description which is easily made and understood. You have the peculiarity again that these Indians dwell on reserves, that many of these reserves will probably not be in concessions, in numbered lots, that the Indians dwell upon the reserves promiscuously, and there is no way of determining their location; so that if an Indian's name be put upon the list, and it will be in the Indian tongue, the revising officer will have to give the best description he can, and that description will be totally inadequate for any one to investigate the right of any Indian to be put upon the list, to determine whether he has a holding or not. It seems to me it is desirable, and the Bill itself contemplates it, that there should be such a description of the separate holdings of the Indians who claim to be put on the voters' list, as will enable any one to determine their exact location. In order that this may be accomplished, the First Minister will probably have to get surveys and plans made of the reserves, and some method will have to be devised by which a description such as is contemplated here will be given. It will be no answer to that to say that it will cause expense, for above all things it is necessary, if we are to have a list, that we should have a pure list, and that any safeguard applied to prevent improper names being placed upon the voters' lists among the whites should apply with equal, I will not say greater force, to those who hitherto have not exercised that right at all, who are living separately, in circumstances and conditions peculiar to themselves. If there is absolute necessity for a safeguard in the one case, there is absolute necessity for it in the other. I then propose that the value of the location upon which an Indian qualifies shall be determined by evidence under oath. I do not know that it is requisite to make this special provision, because, if I understood the First Minister rightly, evidence with respect to other persons' properties shall also be given under oath; but I have placed this in, so that there might not be any mistake. If the values of grants are to be determined from the testimony perhaps of the agent of the band, then, I think it is nothing but right and proper that the agent, in giving his testimony, should give it under oath. I have also added that the post office address shall be given in the public list. That is provided for with reference to other classes, but as it is repeated in the case of farmers' sons, although used in the earlier part of the clause, I thought it well to place it in this connection. Having made myself understood, I will place this resolution in your hands, not having filled in that it be inserted after a certain word in a certain clause, though I am prepared to do that if left to myself; but I am desirous of giving the First Minister the opportunity he wishes to have, of saying in which part of the Bill it should find place, provided it should meet with the acceptance of the committee.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman advances as the reason why the Indians should be compelled to make application before being allowed to vote is, that there are no assessment rolls in their reserves. In many parts of Ontario there are no assessment rolls? In many parts of the Province the white people are in precisely the same position in this regard as the Indians. There are districts where there are no municipalities, where there are no townships laid out, but where there are, nevertheless, settlers entitled to vote and who have hitherto enjoyed the franchise. Why make a rule for Indians which would not apply to white people

placed in very much the same circumstances? The rule should apply equally, if made to apply at all. The hon. gentleman has advanced statements in reference to circumstances reported to have taken place in Muskoka to the prejudice of the Indians, such as that women dressed themselves up like men and voted after the men had voted. In regard to very many elections, stories are brought up. Some singular circumstance may have arisen to give a little color to them, but I treat them all as a general rule as being absolutely absurd, and I think this story, from what I know of the Indians, is exceedingly absurd. I do not believe any number of Indians could be got to do such a thing. The poor people have enough against them without bringing up little ridiculous stories of elections and things of that sort. I have been looking over the census of Indians in Ontario and making a sort of calculation about the number of wild Indians and the number that are settled on reserves. According to the statement in the blue books, according to the census taken by the Indian Department, there are between 15,000 and 16,000 Indians in Ontario altogether. It is not an overestimate to say, that at least 5,000 or 6,000, perhaps 7,000 of these Indians are still wild Indians in the forest, not living on reserves, not having houses, but living the wild life of hunters, so that they would not come under the Act at all. All that would come under the Act would be 7,000 or 8,000, or I shall say 10,000. Let us take 10,000. How many voters would there be in that 10,000? I do not suppose that if all the people who could be called upon to vote in that 10,000 were brought out, there would be one in seven; but supposing there were 1,300 or 1,500, is that going to corrupt the whole electorate in Ontario? It has been estimated here, since the discussion began, that there will be over 350,000 to 400,000 voters in Ontario. Are they all to be corrupted and led astray by giving the franchise to some 1,000 or 1,500 Indians. What a wonderful effect is this going to produce? But it is to the principle I look. Here are Indians that are to a certain extent civilized. They build houses, they live like other people, and surely it is desirable to encourage them, but if this motion carries, difficulty will be thrown in the way. There will be much complication, surveys will have to be made, the Indians will have to take so many oaths, they must apply for the right to vote and all that sort of thing. I do not see that such difference should be made in their regard. A great deal has been said about this being the only instance of Indian enfranchisement, that in the United States nothing of the sort ever occurred. Well a few days ago I was reading up some returns of the United States, and I found that the Indians were enfranchised in some cases.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Living on reserves?

Mr. DAWSON. Yes, living on reserves. I find that Mississippi, in a statute of 1829, extended all the immunities and franchises of white persons to Indians and declared them competent witnesses where white men would be so. So that we do not exactly take the initiative in this. It has been tried before and I have never heard that any great evil resulted from it. I would be very glad, as far as I am concerned, to agree with my hon. friend in anything that is at all reasonable, because he for one has always seemed to me to take a warm interest in the advancement of the Indians, but this proposition of his would be so complicated a matter that I cannot give it my support.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course I understood that the hon. member for Brant was going to oppose, and would oppose, the Indian franchise at a subsequent stage of this Bill. When he mentioned, however, that he was going to move an amendment in committee, I said that of course he would have every opportunity of doing so. It is a matter of but little importance what clause this may be attached to, so that it does not interfere with the symmetry of the Bill, if it should be adopted. I hope, however, that it will not be adopted. I think the hon. gentleman will see that, if an Indian on a reserve is to have the franchise under the conditions which have already been agreed to in this Act, he should have it unshackled by anything which would draw an invidious distinction between him and his brother of the white race. The moment it is admitted that the red man should be allowed to vote, there should be as little distinction as possible drawn. It would only be a cause of irritation and a mark of inferiority planted upon their brows by an assembly like this, composed altogether of white men. I think that the provision in the Bill which was already adopted after very long discussion, quite sufficiently meets the view of the hon. gentleman without stamping inferiority on the Indian. Under the qualifying clauses, the Indian, as a person having the necessary property or other qualification, has the right to vote. Under the disqualifying clauses, it is provided that Indians in Manitoba, British Columbia, Keewatin and the North-West Territories, and any Indian on any reserve elsewhere in Canada who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land in such reserve shall not be allowed to vote. The hon. gentleman wants the reserve to be surveyed, laid out in lots, and numbered, I take it, and that the parties living on the reserve should be altogether disqualified until that expensive process is gone through. If the Indian has a distinct and separate tract of land marked off, with his house and improvements upon it, I think that is all that can be required. The Indian is obliged to prove his qualifications, and to prove that he comes within the Act, the same as a white man. He is obliged to go before the revising officer, and, in case the revising officer is not a judge, there will be an appeal from his decision. There is already a difference in the clause as against the Indian compared with the white man. If the white man has a separate and distinct tract of land of which he is the occupant, and that is of a certain value, he has the right to vote. But the Indian in such a case has not the right to vote. The value of the distinct tract of land is not taken into account at all in regard to the Indian. I have regretted in one aspect being induced to put that in the Bill, because it is a mark of distinction between the white man and the Indian. If the white man has a vacant lot and he is the occupant or the owner of that lot, although there are no improvements whatever on it, if it is of the value of $150, he has a vote; but, in consequence of the strong arguments, the strong expression of opinion of many gentlemen on the other side of the House, that, in consequence of the tribal relations, and in consequence of the reserve belonging to the whole tribe and not to any individual Indian, and because no portion of it was alleged to belong to the individual Indian, the distinction was drawn against the Indian when compared with the franchise of the white man; because it is provided that no Indian is qualified who is not in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land in such reserve, and whose improvements on such separate tract are not of the value of $150. The land on which he has his house, on which he has his improvements, his cattle, fences and stables, is not to be taken into account at all, and he must have not only a distinct holding but improvements belonging to himself of the value of $150. I think it would be exceedingly unwise, if we are going to give the franchise to the Indians at all, that we should draw any further invidious distinction between the white man and the Indian. It would decidedly be a grievance in the mind of the Indian; he would feel it as such; and I would say to my hon. friend that I am quite sure that this provision will be felt in his own riding to be rather an affront offered by the hon. gentleman to the Indians. I do not believe that the hon. gentleman has any such feeling. I believe, however, that he has an exaggerated

opinion in his own mind about the danger of the Indian vote without these checks; but I can assure the hon. gentleman, and I think the majority of the House on both sides will agree with me, that there is a sufficient protection now, and that it would be felt as an annoyance, an insult perhaps, and a grievance to the Indians to have a further distinction drawn against them. I took occasion some time ago to speak on this subject to Mr. Plummer, whom I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows, a very old officer of the Indian Department, who is highly respected by everyone who knows him, and whom I should be very sorry to see the Department lose, though perhaps we shall have to, for he is an elderly man now. He has been inspector for very many years, and he knows nearly all the reserves in the Province of Ontario. I asked him about this matter, and he wrote me as follows:

"SIR,—As regards the question of the title under which the Indians hold the lands they occupy. The reserve occupied by the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinté has been sub-divided into lots and concessions, and each Indian of proper age has been located or allotted by the band in council for at least one lot, averaging from 50 to 150 acres, on which he resides with his family. These several claims have been entered into a book which are recognised and confirmed by the Department. Some of these Indians have been in possession of their lands and homesteads, from father to son, for nearly 100 years, and as they have complied with the regulations of the Department, and the provisions of the several Indian Acts, no power can legally dispossess them. The Six Nation Indians hold their lands in the same manner as that of the Mohawks of the Bay of Quinté, and the same may be said of all the other Indians in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, as well as those of the Lower Provinces. Most of the Indians in the Upper Provinces hold their lands not only by right of allotment by the several bands in council, as provided under the 17th section of the Indian Act, but they also hold location titles as provided by the 18th section. All of the Indians here referred to have not only the undisputed right to hold their lands while they live, but the right to devise the same by will, provided it be to a relative not further removed than a second cousin. To all intents and purposes the Indian is the absolute owner of his land (although he cannot sell it), and no power on earth can lawfully dispossess him."

That is really the situation of these Indians. By a uniform practice amounting to law, from father to son, they do hold their land by a much more than the occupancy that whites are allowed to vote upon. I have received a very interesting letter from Dr. Jones, who is one of the chiefs of the Six Nation Indians, and who is a very intelligent man. He writes me thus:

"HAGERSVILLE, 30th May, 1885.

"MY DEAR SIR JOHN,—I should have written to you some time ago to thank you for making the Indian a 'person' in the Franchise Bill. Other affairs, however, have prevented me from performing my duty.

"I now thank you, on the part of the 'Grand Council of Ontario,' of which body I am secretary, and at the meeting in September last the vice-president, Chief Solomon Jones, introduced the subject, having previously given me notice by the enclosed letter, which kindly return to me. The matter was fully, and, I must say, ably, discussed, and the unanimous decision of the council was that the time had arrived when we should insist upon a representation or voice in the Dominion Parliament. I was instructed to take action in the matter, and Mr. Plummer is able to show the nature of my ideas and work. This council was composed of delegates from nearly every reserve in Ontario.

"I now, as head chief, thank you on the part of my own band, the Mississaguas of the Credit, who, in council, have heartily and with cheers approved of the step the Government are taking.

"I now thank you on the part of the memory of my father and on the part of myself, as for many years we advocated and urged this step as the one most likely to elevate the aborigines to a position more approaching the independence of the whites.

"There is not an Indian in this neighborhood, there is not a Conservative, but what approves of the noble stand you have taken in this affair, in spite of the bitter opposition you are meeting with in the House, and I have spoken to several Reformers who also approve of the measure, so that the 'seething excitement' has not reached this part of the Province where the Indians are so well known.

"There is one feature of the debate of a personal character in respect to myself and my band, and a reply to which I think is due by me through you to the House.

"I refer to the remarks made by Mr. Mills on Thursday last, that the payment of a claim urged last year by my band, was made to influence our votes anticipating this Franchise Bill.

"Allow me to say, dear sir, that my band are fully aware of every cent we have invested with this Government, that we know the exact amount of interest it bears, and that we are not receiving any bounty or support from the Government more than what we have earned by the sale and surrender of our lands, and far more than this interest do we expend yearly in our local municipal tax and in the purchase of dutiable goods, the revenue upon which goes back to you to support the Dominion Government.

"My band also know perfectly well that even if the vote were not by ballot and nine-tenths of them should vote the Reform ticket, it could by no possibility affect our financial standing with the Government. But as nine-tenths can and do read the newspapers, there is every probability that they will come to the conclusion to cast their votes against the party which is not holding meetings from one end of the Province to the other with the express purpose of degrading the character of the Indian in the eyes of the people, and to raise a political excitement to deprive us of our just dues. This is rather a long letter, Sir John, but you have been so accustomed to lengthy harangues in the House upon this subject that I hope the five minutes' views of an Indian will be acceptable and not make you 'tired.'

"I am, my dear Sir John,
"Your obedient servant,
"KAHKWAQUONABY, M.D., Chief.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,
"K.C.B., &c., &c., &c.,
"Ottawa."

Mr. LISTER. It is not very difficult to see that the gentleman who wrote this letter is a strong supporter of the Conservative party. The letter which the First Minister has read from Mr. Plummer, of the Indian Department, professes to give a legal opinion, but as that gentleman is not a lawyer and probably knows very little about law regulating the holding of real property, we can easily understand how much value that opinion is entitled to. If the Indian tribes are the highly intelligent body that the First Minister would have us believe, I ask him, as I have asked him before in this House, why is it that he does not sever all connection between the Government and the Indian? Why is it that in the face of his own announcement, in the face of the statements made by his followers in this House, that the Indians of this country are the intelligent class he represents them to be—why is it that he does not entrust them with the entire control and management of their own affairs? Why is it that he continues to hold the Indians of this country in a sort of bondage? Why is it that he does not give to these people who are so intelligent, so fit to exercise the franchise, and to exercise it creditably—why is it that he has not given those Indians the lands which he says belongs to them, and over which this Government has no control? How is it, Sir, that the Government of the day continue to be the custodians of the money belonging to the Indian tribes of this country? If this money belongs to them, why does this Government continue to keep control of it, and from year to year dole out to them the miserable pittance that the Indians receive. Only five short years ago the First Minister, who has read that letter to-day with such unction, in his report stated that the Indians were not fit to attempt the simplest duties of municipal government, and yet to-day he stands up and tells us that in five short years the Indians, who were then not fit to exercise or enjoy the simplest forms of municipal government, are now so far advanced that they are capable of exercising intelligently the highest privilege of free men. I say that people who look at his statements made then, and the statements he makes to-day, will draw their own conclusions as to the motive of the hon. gentleman in introducing this Bill. He knows very well that the Indian tribes of this country are under his thumb to-day through his agents from one end of the country to the other. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has made himself, since this discussion commenced, the particular champion in this country of the Indians, and do we believe the hon. gentleman is animated by purely disinterested motives, or does he hold letters similar to the one which the First Minister has read to-day, assuring him that if the Bill passes the votes of the enfranchised Indians will be cast for him? Sir, it has been pointed out in this House that it is improper to give the Indians a vote in the condition of semi-slavery in which they are living. It was pointed out that the Indians are wards of the Government, that they have not taken upon themselves the

rights and liabilities of free men, that they cannot enter into contracts which are binding upon them, that they have no right to dispose of their lands or of the timber or minerals upon them, that they cannot make leases without the consent of the Government, that they have no control of the money in the hands of the Government, that, in a word, they are directly under the influence, control and power of the Government. The proposition to enfranchise Indians under these circumstances is a monstrous one, and one which I believe would never have emanated from any man in Canada except the First Minister. The Indians have never asked for the franchise. The letter we have just heard read, purporting to be from an Indian chief, is the first intimation the House has had that the Indians desire the franchise. The letter itself proves that the man who wrote it is a partisan, and is an assurance to the First Minister that whatever Indian votes may be cast, they will be cast upon his side, and will have the effect of destroying the votes of the free tax-paying citizens of Canada, which is in itself a wrong and injustice on the people. It will have the effect of destroying, to a certain extent, public opinion. If, however, the Indians are sufficiently intelligent to exercise that high right, if they are in a position to be placed on an equality with white people, then it was the duty of the Government to have severed the bonds which bind them to the Government, and in word and deed make them a free people, and place them in a position to exercise the franchise freely, without coercion or influence on the part of the Government or its officers. But to say that the Indians shall have the franchise, when they are existing in a condition such as I have attempted to describe, is a proposition so bad that I do not believe any other public man in the whole of Canada except the First Minister, would have proposed it to a Parliament such as this. I repeat that the Indians have not asked for the franchise. We are proposing to entrust a high privilege on a body of people which they have not sought. You are about to give them something they will not appreciate, which will be little availed of, and which if exercised, will be exercised under the influence of the Government's minions. The Government have displaced Liberal Indian agents and have appointed Conservatives in their places, and we know now the object with which that was done The Indian, though he be enfranchised, is no more a free man than were the slaves in the Southern States, and it would have been just as proper to have given votes to the African slaves of the South as to give it to Indians, in their present condition of bondage. If, however, you are bound to give the vote to the Indians, then every proper precaution should be taken that they will properly exercise that privilege. The Indian pays no taxes and does not contribute in any way to the Government; he pays no taxes to municipalities; he has no responsibilities; the white people have little knowledge as to the Indians locations and know little about them. It is but fair, therefore, that the Bill should provide that they shall exercise the franchise in a proper manner. The Indians live on reserves, and little is known about their lands. Is it not a fair proposition to say to the Indians, that if you want this right you must apply for it, state on what land you live, and state what improvements you possess, before being placed on the voters' list? The First Minister says no such application shall be necessary. In fact, the Indian agent, living on the reserve, controlling the Indians, shall be the man to go to the returning officer and say to him that such and such Indians are entitled to vote. No one knows anything about the matter except the Indian agent, and unless at very great trouble, it will be impossible to verify the statements of Indians asking to be placed upon the voters' list. Is it not a fair proposition to say, when you are giving the Indians what you call a great privilege, that if they desire to avail themselves of it they shall apply to the revising officer to be placed upon the list, in person. If necessary, let the revising officer himself go to the reserve, so as to give the Indians as little trouble as possible; but if we are going to give the Indians a great privilege, it is but fair to ask that they should apply for it. If an Indian agent desires to act dishonestly he has every opportunity to do so. There is no chance for people outside of the reserve to satisfy themselves as to whether the Indians are entitled to be placed on the roll or not. That is an unfair position to take, that the Indian agent, the Government of the day, from whom the Indians expect every advantage. The Government, if we are to judge by the reports we read, has extended to different tribes of Indians throughout the country favors—because I can call them by no other word —in the shape of seed grain, and so on. These are the men the Government propose to enfranchise, and without giving the white men of the community the opportunity of seeing whether they are entitled to votes or not. We are giving those Indians a privilege. They are different from white men, and they cannot be expected to be dealt with the same as white men. If they were there would be no difficulty about it; we would know on what lands they live. The First Minister decided, however, that the Indian should be equal to the white man, so far as the vote is concerned, but less than the white man in everything else which constitutes manhood in this country. I believe sincerely that the enfranchisement of the Indians will work most disadvantageously to them. Heretofore they have been the wards of the Government, no matter what Government was in power, but the moment you extend the franchise to them you render them liable to all the allurements and degrading influences which can be brought into elections. The moment they vote in a body, that moment you make them the enemies of one portion of the community of this country, if it is proved that the Indians of Canada throw their influence in favor of one party, it must create a feeling of hostility towards them, so far as a large portion of the people are concerned. If you give them the right to vote it must ultimately result in their being put on the same footing as other citizens of the country. The system which we have had in force for years must be abolished, and if the Indians exercise the right of franchise they must assume the rights of citizenship, instead of being taken care of under the parental system which is now in force. It will be the destruction of the system which has been in existence in the past; it will have the effect of wiping out entirely the Indian population of the country, for if we are to believe the First Minister's own reports for years past, the effect of doing that and giving them their property would be that it would be squandered, and we would have a large number of paupers dependent on the Government. I think the amendment of the hon. member for Brant is a reasonable one in every particular, seeing that we have determined to give the Indian the right to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. It is with some feeling of regret that I find that the Indian question has broken out again, with the probability, if it should get into full swing, that it will have a good swing; and if it is possible in any way to find a solution of this question, and to avoid any longer discussion of a question which has been fully discussed already, but upon which, I dare say, a great deal still remains to be said, I think it will be to the general advantage of the committee and the House. Hon. members on this side have pointed out to the committee on several occasions the peculiar relations which the tribal Indian occupies towards the Government, and strong points have been made to the effect that the Indian will not be free, when he is given the franchise, to exercise it as he would wish, that he will be under governmental control through the Indian agents. In order to meet that objection I drafted an amendment, which

I will take the liberty of submitting for the consideration of the committee:

Than any person being an agent within the meaning of "the Indian Act of 1880," and who, either directly or indirectly, seeks to induce or compel any person being an Indian or of part Indian blood, and qualified to vote only in respect of personal property forming part of a reserve, as defined by said Act, to vote or refrain from voting at any election of a member of the council, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and if found guilty thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $200, and by imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labor, and shall not be entitled to hold any office or place of emolument in the appointment of the Governor or of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, for a period of two years from the date of his conviction.

I think it is due to any Government that they should give it clearly to be understood by the agent that he has no authority from the Government to interfere, and the best way to secure neutrality on the part of the agent, or one of the best ways, is to make him punishable, personally, for any breach of duty and to endanger the office which gives him his authority. Some hon. members may think that the present law sufficiently meets the case, that his interference would be construed by the courts as undue influence, and that the election in which he so interfered would be voided. But such is not the law. It is necessary to establish agency in order to have undue influence as an element in voiding an election. But the Indian agents, and all agents appointed by this Government, will, of course, be intelligent men; they will be shrewd enough to connect themselves with the candidate, and thus the general election law would not meet their case. By the provision of this amendment it will not necessitate any petition in order to reach the agent, but it provides a summary way, by which any charge against him may be investigated. I think, also, that a provision of this kind incorporated in the Bill will be appreciated by the Indians themselves. It will, I think, help to secure the purity of an election in which they are a factor, and will, to a certain extent, be an answer to that portion of the argument which says that the Indians will be under the agent's control.

Mr. McCALLUM. Is it an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. MULOCK. Since my hon. friend from Monck (Mr. McCallum) has asked me whether it is an amendment to the amendment or not, I may say that I intended to move it as a substantive motion, and when I rose it had not occurred to me that an amendment was put in. So, under the circumstances, I suppose I shall have to leave it to some other hon. member to move at a later stage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman was good enough to show me the amendment he intended to move, and to state that he was going away, and therefore he asked me to look over it. I fancy, if the agent exercised undue influence, under the election law, as it stands now, that influence would be held to be undue, most likely. Still, there is, perhaps, a good deal in what the hon. gentleman states, that there might be a difficulty in tracing that the influence used by the agent was in any way used by him as agent of the candidate in whose favor the Indians were solicited to vote. I quite agree that an Indian agent ought not to exercise any of the influence his office gives. My experience of the Department has been, however, that the Indian agent, as a general rule, has no influence; the Indians set themselves against him; they like to show their independence of him. I think the hon. member for Bothwell, who held the office I hold, must know that one of the chief nuisances of the office is that the Indians always kick against the agents, and always appeal against them. There is naturally a supposition among those who are not so much behind the scenes as myself that the Indian agent exercises influence over the Indians. He ought not to exercise political influence, I admit; I go with the hon. gentleman thus far; and if the hon. gentleman leaves his motion, as he says he will, in the hands of the Chairman, I will see that it shall be fully discussed. Speaking on the first impression, I am in favor of the clause. It ought, however, to be in the election law, and not in this Franchise Act. However, there may be no objections to calm the apprehensions of the hon. gentleman by putting it into this Act; and at the subsequent consolidation of the statutes it can be put in its right place. Without stating that I support the resolution, I must candidly state that my impression just now is in favor of some such clause as that.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not wish to detain the committee any length of time on this question. I listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman, in which he used just the same arguments that I heard him use seven weeks ago. I do not intend to discuss this Indian clause, only I am surprised that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) should have moved the amendment he did. Knowing that he is a fair-minded man, and that he has always taken an interest in the Indians of this country, I do not see why he should take this occasion to discriminate against the red man as against his white brother. The revising officer is sworn to do his duty between man and man, and are we to suppose that he is going to perjure himself. If the hon. gentleman's amendment carried, the revising officer, if it came to his knowledge that an Indian had any amount of property, could not put him on the list, unless the Indian went to him and requested him to do it. That is not the case with the white man, and I do not see why the hon. gentleman should want to discriminate against the red man. Probably he did not see the bearing of his amendment. Further, it has been said by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that the Indians do not pay taxes. The Indians do pay taxes on all the dutiable goods they consume, just as much as the white man. Therefore, there is no reason for discriminating against him on that ground. In the county of Haldimand, which adjoins my constituency, there is quite an Indian settlement, and I am satisfied that the revising officer will have no more trouble in placing those Indians on the list than any other portion of the electors. Of course, I cannot speak for the county of Brant; but I hope this amendment will not pass, because it would be an unjust discrimination against these men. If a man has the property qualification he should have a vote. I do not know why this amendment is brought up now, if it is not for obstruction; I do not wish to accuse the hon. member for South Brant of obstruction, but it looks very much like it. The hon. gentleman says you are forcing on the Indian a thing he does not want. I do not see that it does the Indian any harm to put his name on the list; you only treat him in the same way as you do his white brother; but by the hon. gentleman's amendment, if it passes, you will force the Indian to go to the revising officer and demand personally that his name be put upon the list, or otherwise he will be disqualified. That would be the effect of the hon. gentleman's amendment. I do not think the hon. gentleman himself saw the injustice it would do to his red brother by his amendment.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is very much afraid of wounding the Indian's feelings, of exciting his hostility, of awakening in his mind feelings of resentment towards a certain class of the white population for discriminating against him. What has been the character of all the legislation in this House on the subject of the Indians? Take the case of selling liquor to an Indian. The hon. gentleman may step up to the bar and take his glass of whiskey, but if an Indian chief were to do the same thing the party who sells or gives the liquor to the Indian would be taken up and fined $50. The hon. gentleman has supported that kind of legislation. Does he propose to abolish it? Does he propose to put the Indian on the same footing as he holds himself in that respect? How is it that the hon. gentleman has been himself voting for discriminating, if he is in favor of

putting the Indian on the same footing as the white man in this respect?

Mr. McCALLUM. I am in favor of giving the Indian all the rights we have already conceded to him under this Bill, and you are not, at this stage, going to take them away. We have decided to enfranchise the Indians, and by a side wind you want to take his name off the list.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman is perfectly willing to give the Indian a vote, to treat him in this particular as a white man, so long as he will vote the Tory ticket; otherwise, he is not so disposed to treat him as a white man, and he is not afraid of offending the Indian by discriminating against him. If you propose to deal with the Indian as an ordinary citizen, to do away with the discrimination that exist between him and the white man, to impose upon him the full responsibilities of citizenship, the hon. gentleman is opposed to that. He wishes to retain him as a ward of the Government, but at the same time he insists upon giving him the electoral franchise. There are several things worthy of consideration besides what the hon. gentleman has said about discrimination. If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman has, during this discussion, discriminated against the Indians of British Columbia and Manitoba. It is true many of the Indians of British Columbia are, perhaps, more energetic and enterprising than those on this side of the Rocky Mountains, but he has not hesitated a moment to declare that all the Indians of British Columbia shall be disfranchised. They might not be so useful to the Government as the Indians near the capital, and therefore it is not necessary to confer on them the franchise; but as regards the Indians of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who are immediately under the influence of the Government, it is of great consequence they should have the right to vote, as otherwise the existence of the Government might be put in jeopardy. Now, I observe that the First Minister, speaking on this subject, said he did not wish any invidious distinction to be made, and that this amendment would make an invidious distinction between the Indian and the white man. But the hon. gentleman began by making the distinction. He has provided in this very Bill, and in the amendment he proposed himself, that the Indian shall not vote merely for the value of his reservation; that his vote shall depend upon the valuation of the improvements he has put upon the reservation. On that very matter the hon. gentleman has made a distinction between the white man and the Indian. Why? Because he knows the Indian has no such interest in the reservation as the white man has in the property he occupies. He knows, notwithstanding what he read from Mr. Plummer, that the title to the Indian reservation is in the Crown and not in the Indian; and it is on the value of the Indian improvements he proposes to give the Indian the franchise. But most of the improvements upon which the Indians will qualify are improvements made by the Government. Take almost any Indian band in the west: their lands have been divided amongst them; location tickets have been issued by the Superintendent General; houses have been built, not by the Indians but by the Government, out of the Indian funds which have been provided by the sale of these Crown lands reserves for the Indians, and there would practically be no difference between giving the Indian a vote on the value of the land he occupies, and giving him a vote on the value of the improvements which have been made, not by him, but for him, by the Superintendent General.

Mr. McCALLUM. Was it not done out of his own money?

Mr. MILLS. If it be their own money, why are not the Indians allowed to manage their own affairs? If he is to obtain a vote, why is he not allowed to use his own money in his own way? If a white man comes into the possession of property which he has not purchased by his own labor and his own industry, and is not competent to look after it, he loses it, and with it loses his vote. The hon. gentleman knows that if the Indian were allowed to control his own property he would not hold it, and would not have a vote. Therefore, he will not allow him to control it, but gives him only nominal possession of it, and allows him to vote on property held by the Crown for him and over which he has no control. The hon. gentleman says it is not fair to put the Indian in a different position from the white man. Why, suppose an Indian rents part of his holding to another Indian, or to a white man, with the consent of the Superintendent General, what does the law provide? That law which the hon. gentleman himself put upon the Statute Book provides that unless the Indian farms what he retains in a satisfactory manner, the rents which are derived from the portion of land he has transferred to a tenant for the time being shall not go to him, but to the band to which he belongs. So that, although the hon. gentleman professes to be so anxious not to wound the feelings of the Indian, and so anxious to protect the interests of the Indian, yet he treats the Indian, so far, as a mere serf to the Government, that he will not allow him to receive the rents of lands he has placed in the hands of a tenant, unless he cultivates well the part he retains for his own use. I observe the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) went on to state that the Indians in the United States were treated as white men.

Mr. DAWSON. I instanced one State.

Mr. MILLS. The Indian in the United States, before he can exercise the right of citizenship, must break with his tribal relations, must ask to have conferred upon him the responsibilities of an ordinary citizen, and when he has done so he is in all respects dealt with precisely as any other member of the community. That is precisely what we have provided in our Indian Act. We say that upon certain conditions he may be emancipated, that he may apply to the Superintendent General, and when he is emancipated and receives his own portion of the reserve or allotment belonging to his band, he then has his own property under his own control, he is liable to taxation, he is capable of entering into a contract, he may sue and be sued—he has, in fact, all the responsibilities of an ordinary citizen; and if he has not the capacity of looking after his own property he must lose it, as any other person would. Such an Indian is entitled to the elective franchise now. There is no objection to his then exercising it; if he shows he has the capacity of managing his own affairs, we say let him be enfranchised, but so long as he is the ward of the Government, under the control of the Government, we say that the franchise should not be conferred upon him. The committee have agreed that it shall. We have the next step in the proposition of my hon. friend. He proposes that before you confer the elective franchise on the Indian, or put his name on the voters' list, he shall apply in person. If he is interested in becoming a voter he will do so; if he is not, the public will derive no advantage, nor will it be a gain to himself to have his name on the list. How is it with the white population? Their names are on the assessment roll; the revising officer takes the name of a white man from the assessment roll. The Indian is not assessed, he pays no taxes, he is not under municipal control, you do not know what his property is worth, and you have not the ordinary means of information in his case. I hold, therefore, he should be obliged, personally, to apply to the revising officer to have his name on the roll, and to give such a description of his property as will enable any one to identify it so as to ascertain its value. That is only a necessary security against fraud, against the voters' roll being stuffed with names of parties that should not be there

at all, even under the law as you propose to make it. The First Minister referred to the letter of Mr. Plummer, and it seemed to me a very extraordinary thing that an hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government, who was for many years Minister of Justice, and who claims, and has asserted again and again, that he is a great constitutional lawyer, should quote the opinion of a man who is not a lawyer at all on the subject of the Indian's title to his property. That is what the hon. gentleman did. He read a letter from Mr. Plummer, assuring the House that the Indians who reside upon certain lands own those lands, that those lands are as much the property of the Indians as the land of a white man is his property. That is not the theory of our law, or the principle upon which we have proceeded. On the contrary, if the Indians abandon their claim to any property it is the Crown that makes the title to any party who purchases. There is no title, or recognition of valid title, so far as the Indians are concerned. But this is a matter of no special consequence in this case. If the Indian has a title to his property let it be acknowledged, the same as in the case of a white man. If an Indian is competent to vote he is competent to take care of his own affairs. Give him his property, mark it out for him, acknowledge his right to his property, and let him do with it as he pleases. If he is competent to take care of it he will exercise the franchise, the same as any other member of the community. But you do not deal with him in that way. You say: You shall not be responsible for your debts, you shall not be liable for any contract you may make, you shall not be subject to taxation, you shall not be subject to military service, or to serve on any jury; upon you shall devolve none of the duties of citizenship; and yet this man, who pays no taxes and bears no share of the public burden, is to be called upon to take his share in the government of the nation; the man who is not competent to direct his own affairs, you say, is to be called upon to take part in directing the affairs of the country. I do not wish, nor do the white population of the country, generally, wish to interfere with the Indian bands, or to disturb their domestic concerns. We allow them to manage their own local affairs in their own way, and so long as we do that, and do not do away with the distinction between the Indian and the rest of the population, we have no right to say that distinction shall disappear in this Parliament, but shall be continued in every other relation in life. The hon. gentleman read a letter from an Indian chief, who professed himself a very devoted supporter of the hon. gentleman, and who declared that the Indians of the Mississagua band had a valid claim to the sum of money the Government had awarded them. The accuracy of this declaration is extremely questionable. I think, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman acted in a highly improper manner in regard to the claim of what is called the Mississagua band. What are the facts? They claimed payment for property said to have been surrendered to the Crown more than sixty years ago, and that the Crown had never accounted for that property. This question was before a Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, as early as 1858. Why did he not deal with it then? Why was it not disposed of at that time? Why was not the Indian claim acknowledged at that time? But there was nothing of that sort done, and now, eighteen or twenty years after the Union, he has recognized the claim of that band to the amount of upwards of $68,000. By what authority did he do that? I say he had no authority for recognising any such claim. If that claim was a valid claim it was a claim against the old Provinces of Ontario and Quebec; it was the business of those two Provinces to acknowledge it, before the hon. gentleman did anything in the matter. He ought to have submitted it to the Governments of those two Provinces, and ought to have had their sanction, before he communicated to the Indians that they would be paid this $68,000. He has agreed to pay the Indians that sum. Does he suppose the Governments of Ontario and Quebec will recognise his right to make a charge against those two Provinces for a claim of this sort? I cannot suppose for a moment that he will do so, and I hold in my hand a speech made by the Treasurer of Ontario, last winter, in which he refers to this subject, and in which he says:

"In fact, for upwards of sixty years this claim has remained in abeyance, and now we are presented with a claim of $18,839 in principle and $51,834 in interest, payable to these Indians. Well, I think it is rather extraordinary that we have not heard of this claim before, and then I may say that it was only presented to us a few days before the meeting at Ottawa in October last. It seems to be a new discovery, and it was recognised by the Government at Ottawa without any communication with the Governments of the Provinces."

What are we to believe with regard to this? The hon. gentleman says it is a good claim. So far as I can gather, the Governments of the two Provinces say it is not. Why did the hon. gentleman recognise it at this moment? In my opinion, the introduction of this Franchise Bill shows why he proposed to confer upon the Indians the elective franchise, and before this elective franchise is conferred upon them it is very important to secure their good will, by recognising a claim, upwards of sixty years old, for the sum of nearly $70,000. The hon. gentleman read in that letter that this was a meritorious claim. I am not going into that question. It may or it may not be a meritorious claim, but it is a very old one, and there has been great negligence on the part of the old Government of Canada, which existed before the Union, if this money belonging to the Indians remained in their hands for so long a period unaccounted for. But as to the effect of the recognition of this claim there can be no doubt whatever. The letter the hon. gentlemen read from the Indian chief, and the letter I read to the House a few days ago from another Indian chief, show how the Indians regard the action of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman would have us believe that these Indians are a highly intelligent, a well-informed class of the population, that they are men of public enterprise and public spirit, and that they are, therefore, qualified to exercise the elective franchise, that it will tend to elevate them, and to make them a more self-reliant and more useful class of the population than they have been hitherto. This is a very extraordinary position for the hon. gentleman to take. He has submitted to us a Bill which disfranchises upwards of 130,000 of the white population of this country, of the men who now possess the elective franchise, and at the same time that he is declaring by his Bill that a large portion of the white population, who now possess the franchise, are not competent to exercise it, he proposes to confer the elective franchise upon an Indian population, that have not shown themselves capable of managing the most ordinary concerns of life. The hon. gentleman has dealt with the Indian population in a very extraordinary way. He at first proposed to embrace the entire Indian population, from Vancouver Island to Halifax, but he found that he could not confer the franchise upon them in the face of public opinion. There was great danger of losing a larger number of white supporters than he would get from the ranks of the red men, and therefore he made his Bill somewhat less extensive; he confined the franchise to those Indians residing within the older Provinces of the Dominion. Sir, are these Indians self-relient men? Do they manage their own affairs? Do they exhibit any of those habits of life which show they are likely to become intelligent and industrious citizens? Not at all. A great majority of them receive, every spring, seed grain and garden seeds, in order that they may produce, in part, the means of subsistence. If these Indian refuse to vote for the amendment they may get less. They are dependent upon the Government, who may distribute as little or as much as they please. If they fail to give to the Government the support that is expected, the Superin

tendent General has it in his power to withhold from the Indians the usual annual contribution, and he therefore has the means of coercing them into voting for the Government.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The First Minister was bound to have proposed, if he does not approve of my amendment, some plan whereby the difficulty that I proposed to obviate might be got over in some other way. The only reply he has made is that he does not approve of the amendment, because it draws invidious distinctions between the Indian and the white man. If there are any invidious distinctions existing between them they have been put upon the Statute Book of Canada by the First Minister himself. To say that a proposition that the Indians to whom it is proposed to give the franchise shall be placed upon the voters' list by making a personal application to have it done, to say that it is placing him at a disadvantage, as compared with other classes of the community that are newly enfranchised, such as the wage-earners and others, is absurd. Why, last Session the right hon. gentleman proposed, and placed it on the statute book, that the Indian might make a will, and if the will suited the pleasure of the First Minister, when the Indian died his property would go to the person he willed it to; but if it did not suit the pleasure of the First Minister, then the Indian should be deemed to have died intestate. Is there not an invidious distinction here between the Indians and other classes of the community? He put on the Statute Book that the Indian may not have liquor sold to him or given to him. You may call it invidious, or otherwise, but there is a clear distinction drawn between him and the white man, for the hon. gentleman has not yet ventured to make it a penal offence for any one to sell or give a glass of liquor to a white man. Why, Sir, the Statute Book is full of distinctions crystallised into law by the hon. gentleman himself. In the Indian Act the hon. gentleman says that the very land upon which the Indian shall qualify he cannot dispose of without the consent of the Superintendent General I do not care if he is an educated Indian, the most intelligent Indian on the reserves, he is not at liberty to lease the land that is given to him. If he be a minister, a lawyer or a doctor, he cannot lease his land, but the Superintendent General may lease it for his benefit. I say that when it is proposed, as this Bill proposes, to give to men so entirely deperdent upon the Government a vote, under the control of agents appointed by the Government—I say it is an indecent thing to propose that there should be no remedy, that there shall be nothing to prevent the Indian agent, of his own motion, handing in to the revising officer a list of the Indians placed on the reserves, and to have their names entered on the voters' list. There is nothing to prevent the agent going to the revising officer, and from his pay-roll giving the names of those Indians, with a description of the holdings that will enable them to vote. You cannot tell who the person is upon the roll; you cannot tell what the Indian's property is upon which he qualifies. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, it will necessitate the running of surveys, that could not be got through in time for this election. That was one of the great objections which the First Minister saw. If there had to be a survey and a description given of the separate holdings it might necessitate such steps being taken in the way of surveys which would not be completed in time for the Indian to vote in 1887. And that is what the Government want the Indian vote for—it is, above all things, to vote in 1887, for in that particular year the Government think that, if ever they will need the Indian vote to save them from an outraged people, it will be then. I do not, however, ask that the Government shall not avail themselves of the Indian vote at the next election. My motion does not go so far, but it simply provides that there shall be a description given of the Indian holdings. It has been pointed out by the First Minister, by a letter from one of the Government's agents, that the Indians have a system of land transfer among themselves; that the transfers are recorded in a book; but that book is controlled by the Indian agent and is not open to public access. If electors went to the agent and asked to have access to that book they would be denied. I want that book to be made open, so that a description can be given of the different locations, as is done in the case of white men; because if this is not done, I hold that the Indian vote is in the hands of the Government and will be controlled by them. Am I to be met and told that my proposition shall be voted down because it draws an invidious distinction? Am I to be told that by the First Minister, who has placed Acts on the Statute Book by which the Indian is not allowed to lease his land, make a will, who, if absent from his reserve, in the United States, for five years, forfeits all rights in the land, who has put such Acts on the Statute Book; and yet, forsooth, we have to be told that my proposition is to be voted down, because I have ventured to ask that the Indian shall be allowed free agency in this matter of having his name placed on the voters' list. I ask that the Indian shall not be placed in a position in which the Government can place his name on the roll without his consent, and I am not afraid of what the First Minister suggested, that in my own county the Indians would regard this proposal as an affront, and consider I was drawing invidious distinctions. I have very great doubt whether, in my own county, the Indians will avail themselves of the privilege of voting. I have in my hand a letter written by a gentleman of standing in Haldimand, in which he states distinctly that the Indians spoken to in regard to this matter of giving them the vote said they did not want the vote and would not have it. I believe that will be the case largely, and I have reason to know that they will resent it. But if the Indian agent can go and place their names on the list, without their consent, they will be compromised. And then there might arise an agitation among the white people, setting forth that the Indians, having claimed to be placed on the list of voters, must bear their share of municipal taxation, must contribute to the county rates, and to the cost of the administration of justice; and thus there will be questions raised that should not be raised, and feelings excited that have not been excited before; and that result is not in the interest of the Indians. My motion asks that the Indians shall be consenting parties to having their names placed on the voters' list, and that they themselves shall make a request to the revising officer to be so entered. I do not propose that the Indians shall travel miles in order to enter their names; but the revising officer might, after proper notice, visit the reserves, for the purpose of making up the voters' list. The First Minister says we must not pass this amendment, because it will draw invidious distinctions. That argument is not worthy the attention of the committee. That the Indian property should be described, as the property of white people is described, is surely a fair proposition, and that evidence should be given under oath as to the value of the improvements is surely a fair proposition, and the same remark applies to the suggestion that the post office address should be put in the published list. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they assume the responsibility of so dealing with the Indians, cannot blame me for not having pointed out the danger involved in proceeding to force on them a measure they do not want. Why do I think they do not want it? Last Session the First Minister introduced an Indian advancement Act, one which had been much enquired about since 1880. It was stated that the reports of the Indian agents went to show that the bands were not sufficiently advanced to have a simple form of municipal government among themselves. Last year the First Minister placed on the Statute Book an Act by which the more advanced Indians

might avail themselves, with the consent of the Superintendent General, of a simple form of municipal government. The Six Nation Indians, in March last, met and considered whether they should avail themselves of that privilege; and they decided they would not do so at the present time. I would be a recreant to their interest if I did not offer a proposal that would save them from questions arising between the whites and the Indians, by which the relations existing might be disturbed. Is it not possible that the Indians will never ask to be placed on the voters' list. If it be true, that is the strongest reason why their names should not be placed on the voters' list, contrary to their desire, why, in fact, they should be left to exercise their own judgment. And if Dr. Jones, the Credit Indians, or any other Indians, desire to avail themselves of that privilege, and assume all that it involves, voluntarily, all right. I do not oppose that, but I ask that the Indians themselves should be consenting parties.

Mr. McCALLUM. They will be consenting parties before they go to vote.

Mr. PATERSON. No; I tell the hon. gentleman that I believe, with reference to many of these Indians, unless their views have changed, as I knew them, such are their ideas of the peculiar relations which exist between them and the Government of this country that they will not vote, even if their names are put on the list, unless pressure is brought to bear on them. But they are compromised by their names being put there, and I ask that they should not be compromised. If it is simply an act of justice to the Indian, why go a step further, and allow the paid agent of the Government to put the Indian's name on the roll. I object to it; I think the Indians will object to it; I think the good sense of the committee will object to it, and I think my motion should be allowed to prevail.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not intend to delay the committee, but I wish to say a few words upon this question of granting the franchise to the Indian while he retains his tribal relation—not only granting the franchise to him but thrusting it upon him. I hold that the course taken by the Government in connection with the Indian clauses of this Bill is utterly indefensible. The hon. member for Monck says that the objection taken, that the Indian is not a taxpayer, is not a valid objection, because the Indian is a taxpayer by consuming goods subject to duty. I say that in the same sense every white man in the Dominion of Canada, of the full age of 21 years, is entitled to a vote, because he contributes to the revenue in the same way, and by this Bill you are discriminating against the white man and in favor of the Indian. The First Minister says it will not do to make distinctions and differences between Indians and the white men, in connection with the franchise, and that the Indians will consider this an affront. Well, as the hon. member for Brant has pointed out, we do make distinctions and differences in almost every paragraph of the legislation on the Statute Book of this country, relating to Indian affairs. We exempt the Indian from jury service, and from military service; and yet the Indian, living in the tribal relation, not liable to jury duty or military duty, the men of a tribe, of a distinct organisation, a *quasi* nationality within the bounds of this Dominion, is to have the franchise thrust upon them. Now, what are the antecedents of the Indian, if we treat the question ethnologically. How long is it since the ancestors of the Indians were barbarian. How far removed is he from the condition in which the red men of America were when this country was discovered by the Europeans? How far have they attained the position which men should attain before being entitled to the franchise. Sir, I wish to read one page from Francis Parkman's work on the Jesuits in North America, referring to the treatment of certain Jesuit missionaries by a certain tribe, whose descendants it is proposed to enfranchise.

Mr. MACMASTER. What year?

Mr. CHARLTON. The year 1642.

Mr. MACMASTER. That's a long time ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some time ago, I admit, but at that time our ancestors were civilised; they were worthy of being entrusted with the franchise, and not only so, but our ancestors were worthy of that privilege a thousand years ago.

Mr. IVES. How long is it since they burnt witches in Massachusetts?

Mr. CHARLTON. They may have done so, but they did not commit the enormities which were committed by the least barbarous and least cruel of the Indian tribes on this continent not one hundred years ago. This extract refers to the capture of certain Jesuit missionaries by the Mohawk tribe at Three Rivers. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the work in question.) I do not claim that the Mohawks of to-day would practice the barbarities which were practised, in 1642 on the Jesuit fathers; but I do claim that it may be doubted whether people descended from the Mohawks, who were one of the most advanced of the Indian tribes, have attained that degree of advancement in civilisation which would fit them for the exercise of the franchise, and make them the peer of the Anglo-Saxons, and especially to warrant us in enfranchising them against their will. Many of these people are pagans to-day; they have their sun dances, their dog feasts, and their medicine feasts, and they indulge in various pagan rites, even in Ontario. The uniform usage in the United States with regard to the Indians is one that we may very well profit by. I believe that so long as the Indian retains his tribal relations he has no right to ask for enfranchisement, and the supposition may reasonably be, that he has no desire for it. Although the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has referred to the fact that the State of Mississippi admits the evidence of Indians, so far as I know, both by the law of the United States themselves and the law of every State; in that country, where there is universal suffrage, where the negro is enfranchised, the uniform custom is that the Indian, in order to become a citizen of the United States and to have the franchise, must cease to be a member of an Indian tribe, must assume all the duties of citizenship, must hold property in his own name, and must be liable to be sued. I believe that is a proper distinction to make, and I believe, if we enfranchise the Indians in Canada in advance of this surrender of their tribal relations, we shall be going too fast. The fitness of the Indian, or of any descendant of a barbarous tribe of people, for the franchise, should not, in my opinion, be too readily accepted or supposed. The Indian, at least, should be required to ask for the boon which it is proposed to give him. Contrary to the principles of sound policy, it has been decided that the tribal Indians, under certain circumstances, shall be invested with the franchise. What is the next step in this discussion? The next step is the proposition of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who has had as great experience in Indian affairs as any member in this House, who has lived from his boyhood in a riding where a great number of Indians are congregated. It is the motion of that gentleman, urged with an eloquent speech, that if we are to enfranchise the tribal Indians we ought to require them, at least, to ask for that privilege before we invest them with it. I hold that that is a reasonable proposition, and that it is a safeguard both of the rights of the people and of the Indians themselves. It is absurd to decide that the tribal Indians shall be invested with the franchise, and then deny the motion of my hon. friend, that as a preliminary they shall be required to ask that it shall be conferred

upon them. I hold that the hon. First Minister can do nothing less, in fairness, than to accept that proposal. To insist on thrusting the franchise upon the tribal Indian, without his asking for it, is an absurdity that should not be perpetrated, and that will not be in the interest of either the Indian or the white man.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not intend to take any part in this debate, but when my hon. friend who has just sat down read from the book of the historian, Parkman, a statement of the condition of the Indians in 1642, I thought he had taken the trouble to go very much further back than was necessary. I thought the contemporary records of our own country would enable us to ascertain the exact condition of barbarism in which the Indians live. I take the *Free Press* of the date of 8th June, 1885——

An hon. MEMBER. That is no authority.

Mr. DAVIES. Nothing is authority for the hon. gentleman; but I am sorry to say it is a very sad authority for the unfortunate people, the account of whose murder I shall read. But the same despatch is in the *Mail* newspaper of this morning, and I suppose they will swear by that as gospel. In a despatch, dated Winnipeg, 8th June, I find the following:—

"A correspondent writing from Frog Lake gives a description of the scene upon arrival there of the Winnipeg Light Infantry on Queen's Birthday. The settlement consisted of the Roman Catholic Mission, a mill, and some eight or nine settlers' houses. The church, parsonage, mill, and every settler's house, were burned and levelled to the ground, and their contents strewn around. In the cellar of the parsonage, and guided there by the terrible smell, one of the most awful sights ever seen was witnessed. Four dead bodies were found huddled together in a corner. Two of the bodies were those of Father Fafard and Father Lafiac, and another was that of a lay brother, and a fourth some one unknown. The corpses were horribly mangled. All four heads were charred with fire beyond recognition; the four hearts torn out; wide incisions had been made in the lower part of the stomachs (those who know the Indian method of torture will know for what purpose) and the feet and hands of some were missing. Every body was rotten with corruption, and when taken out of the cellar and laid upon the grass the sight was simply horrible. Strong men of the regiment cried like women."

This is a description, not of what took place in the year 1642, but what took place at the hands of a band of Indians, of the same class as those whom the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill to enfranchise and to put upon a par with the white men of this country. So far as the proposition to enfranchise the Indians is concerned, it is not at present before the House; but I desire, before I sit down, to emphasise the fact that the Opposition were not and are not opposed to the Indian exercising the franchise simply because he is an Indian. The Opposition have formulated the position they take in clear language, that is, that every capable and free citizen in this country, who has arrived at maturity and is a British subject, should, if not disqualified by law, have the right to exercise the franchise. What we opposed and oppose now is the enfranchisement of incapable citizens. What we asserted and assert now is that the right hon. First Minister himself, who now enfranchises these Indians, is the man who has disfranchised them. The hon. gentleman smiles, but since my advent in this House I have heard him declare that the Indians were not sufficiently advanced to be entrusted with the smallest share of municipal government. I have seen him carry into law an Act which describes these Indians as mere children, as wards of the State, incapable of holding any land of their own, incapable of making valid contracts, incapable and unfit to serve on juries, or to bear arms as volunteers, incapable and unfit to do any of those duties which every free citizen should be able and liable to discharge; and he ought to be able to discharge them before he can claim the right to be placed on the list of voters by this Parliament. If Parliament has deliberately declared the Indian to be a child, a ward of the State, and if it has, with gross inconsistency, it may be, now declared that he shall have a vote, the question before the committee is

the simple one: What prudent restraints should be cast upon that Indian when he is exercising the vote? Now, the amendment submitted by my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) involves three distinct propositions. The question for the committee to consider is: Are all those propositions fair and just? or are any of them unfair and unjust? What are the propositions? The committee is asked to assent, first, to the proposition that the Indian, if he is to have a vote, shall come forward and apply for it himself. What is there unfair or unjust in that? The hon. gentleman will remember that when you come to confer a right upon white citizens you go to the assessment rolls of the parish or municipality, and if there are no parishes or municipalities, as there are not in Prince Edward Island, you go to the poll books of the last election. You have some groundwork, some data to go on. But with the Indians there are no assessment rolls, no poll-book, no voters' lists, no tax-payers' lists. Therefore, we say, instead of going on these reserves and taking these Indians' names, which are not even known to white men, from the Indian agent, let those Indians who claim the right to vote come forward in their own person and demand it. If the Indians are what they are in my part of the country, a low, degraded race, incapable and unfit to exercise the franchise, hon. gentlemen opposite would be afraid to oppose this proposition; but if they are not, if there are any of them intelligent and capable of exercising the franchise, let them come forward and apply to be put on the list. I know what the Indians in the Maritime Provinces are like. I have heard hon. gentlemen here express their opinions about them; I know a dozen of hon. gentlemen who support this measure, but who are ashamed to express their opinions, because they know that the Indians there are a low, degraded race, unfit to exercise the franchise. We are told that in other parts of the Dominion they are as intelligent as the whites, and just as capable of exercising the franchise. Well, if they are, why object to this proposition. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) says there is no harm in putting on the assessment rolls 800 or 900 names, whether they exercise the franchise or not.

Mr. McCALLUM. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman declared that their names should be put on, and that they might exercise the franchise——

Mr. McCALLUM. I never mentioned the words "assessment roll" at all.

Mr. DAVIES. That was a mere slip of the tongue on my part; I meant the voters' list. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I say he declared that all they wanted was to get the names of the Indian on the voters' list.

Mr. McCALLUM. If the hon. gentleman will allow me——

Mr. DAVIES. I will not allow the hon. gentleman's interruptions. He has deliberately chosen to take a meaning from my words which I did not intend to put on them.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not know what you intended to put; I know what you said.

Mr. DAVIES. I said that the hon. gentleman argued here for some time that there could not be any possible harm in adding a large number of names to the voters' list who never heretofore exercised——

Mr. McCALLUM. I argued nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES. The sound of the hon. gentleman's voice is ringing in my ears yet. It is not an hour ago since he said there could be no possible harm in putting a large number of names on the voters' list, and he not only stated the fact, but gave the reason, because, he said, they would

not vote afterwards, if they did not want to. How can he justify placing upon the lists hundreds of these men who never voted before, unless he has some sinister motive, some party motive, some motive not of good to the country, but possibly of gain to the party he follows and worships. That is the only reason. I believe in my heart the reason he wants to get the names on the voters' list is that he believes, and those associated with him believe, and I think the First Minister believes, that the Indian agent will have sufficient influence of a corrupt and sinster kind over the Indian bands, and will be able to compel them to vote in the way the Indian agent wishes, that is, in favor of the Government. I think the fact should be emphasised that the proposition, and the only one made by the hon. member for South Brant, is that, as you have given the Indian the right to vote, you should confine it to those who have the manliness and courage to come forward and ask it. Do not force the right to vote on men who do not want it; do not put hundreds of names on the voters' list of men who do not seek to be put there. It is all nonsense to talk about drawing a distinction between the white and the red man. That argument has been so fully presented that I will not go over it again. Every part of your legislation which has reference to Indians draws a broad distinction between the Indian and the white man. It treats the former as a child, as one not capable of controlling his own affairs. You have declared, time and again, that he is unfit to manage his own affairs, and you now seek to give him a share in the management of ours. The proposition is untenable; but the committee have accepted it, and we now seek to surround it with the safeguard, that the man who has never exercised the franchise and is wholly under the control of the Government agent, should, if he wants the franchise, come forward and ask for it himself. What is the second proposition involved in the amendment? It is, that if he is going to vote on property he will give such a description as will enable you to identify it. There are Indians half civilised, living on reserves granted by the Crown, and if they are going to vote on distinct parts of the reserve, which they claim to occupy, let them define the boundaries, so that a third party can verify the descriptions and find out whether they have the right to vote or not. Is there anything unjust in any one of those propositions? But your proposition simply involves this one broad fact, that an Indian agent, having 200 or 300 or 400 men on a reserve, may come forward himself and put all their unpronounceable names, which are no indication to white men that they occupy locations on the reserve, on the list, without giving any description of their location, so that no white man can identify the lots of those Indians, to find out whether there has been fraud or misrepresentation or not, and those Indians put on the list by the agent himself, controlled by the agent, under the Superintendent General, may and will be induced to vote in favor of the political party that they think will confer extra privileges upon them. The very statement of facts made by the hon. member for Bothwell should open the eyes of hon. gentlemen. The First Minister was not making his proposition in a hurry. He was laying his grounds carefully, for months and months back, before he made it, to curry favor with the Indians, taking steps, which I say are indefensible, with reference to moneys claimed as due them by the Indians, allowing the Indians to receive moneys which certainly he ought not to have allowed them to receive, except with the consent of those parties against whom the moneys are to be charged. And he had not a word to say in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, when he read from the speech of the Finance Minister of Ontario. I shall read the closing part of that speech, which that hon. gentleman did not read.

Mr. McCALLUM. You may as well give us the whole of it.

Mr. DAVIES. It would be very much better if some hon. gentlemen who interrupt would endeavor to frame some kind of reply to the charge contained in the statement which has been read from the Treasurer of Ontario. That gentleman, after the statement which has been read, went on to say:

"But a few days before that took place, on the 21st October, we find an Order in Council had been passed by the Dominion Government, on the 7th of that month, on the recommendation of Sir John A. Macdonald, directing that this sum should be charged against the Province as a liability and credited to the Indian fund; and more, he directed that the Indians should be notified that the amount had been placed to their credit."

Careful man, prudent man, far-seeing man; he was not simply going to credit the money to the Indians, but he took care to notify the Indians that he had done it. I have done it; I, in my own proper person have appropriated the money, without asking Quebec or Ontario for their assent or consent, and what you get, you owe to me, the great chieftain of the Dominion Government, whom I ask you to vote for in the future, or for those whom I will name to you, the great chieftain whom you have christened "Old To-morrow." The Treasurer of Ontario goes on:

"And they have actually been allowed to draw a portion of the money."

I say this action is most astonishing, particularly when we consider that an arrangement was entered into between the Dominion and the Provinces, some years ago, that no charge should be made by the Dominion or allowed against the Provinces without the concurrence of the Provincial Treasurers. Yet, in defiance of that, we find this charge made against the Province, and to complicate matters, to enhance the difficulties of a settlement, we find the Indians have been notified that the money has been placed to their credit, and that they have drawn some $6,000. Here is a large amount of public money, which, on the authority of the Finance Minister of Ontario, we learn has been drawn in direct defiance of an arrangement between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the Dominion of Canada, placed to the credit of the Indians, appropriated by the Indians, under the authority and at the request of Sir John A. Macdonald, some months ago. It looks as if it was done to pave the way for this Bill which he has introduced, and to give him an argument to use when he goes before the Indians and asks them to record for him the votes which he, as the great chieftain, by this Bill hopes to confer upon them—nay, not hopes to confer upon them—the votes he is seeking by this Bill to force upon them, against their will. He will not accept the amendment of my hon. friend from Brant, that they shall have the votes only when they wish them. He will not accept the amendment, of my hon. friend from Brant, that they shall have the franchise only when they can show that they occupy a distinct part of the reserve. He will not accept the amendment, that they shall only have the franchise when they can show, on oath, that they are entitled to the vote. But he forces the vote upon them, after paving the way to their good graces and favour, so that, after forcing the vote on them, he may induce them to use it for his own purposes. This is a reasonable, fair and just amendment. There has not been an argument used against its acceptance, and it will present itself, to every thoughtful man in the country who reads it, as based on justice, fair in itself, and one which, if the committee desires only to grant the vote to those Indians who should have them, the committee would accept without reserve. If the committee votes it down in silence, on the other side of the House, it will show that those hon. gentlemen do not desire to confer the vote on the intelligent Indian, on the Indian who has got the status of a free citizen, but to force the vote upon a class of Indians who are not fit to exercise the franchise,

and who, they hope, will be made to vote in favor of the party supporting the present Government.

Mr. MACMASTER. We are engaged in discussing a plain business question, as to whether the Indians of the Dominion of Canada, or rather of the old Provinces of the Dominion, have arrived at a stage of advancement which would warrant this Parliament in conferring upon them the right to exercise the franchise, which is exercised by every other man possessing the necessary qualifications throughout the country. I think, if anything could illustrate the extreme poverty of the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is the fact that the hon. gentleman who last addressed the committee cited instances of alleged cruelties committed by Indians in the North-West, the truth of which has not yet been established—enormities which it is represented they quite recently committed, and which, it may turn out—as I trust, in good time, it will turn out—were never committed at all. But yesterday we were informed that Mrs. Delaney and Mrs. Gowanlock, the two unfortunate ladies who were seized by the Indians in the North-West, had been murdered or subjected to the grossest barbarities. The latest report from the North-West is that these two ladies have been treated kindly by the Indians. We have also heard from the other prisoners, who were supposed to have been murdered, that they have been treated kindly by the Indians in whose custody they were; and that, under circumstances of very great temptation, when the Indians were practically starving, when they were fired upon by our soldiers, in nearly every instance we find the whites were treated with the greatest care. But that argument, even if the atrocities existed, would only avail the hon. gentleman in the event of its being intended to extend the suffrage to the Indians of the North-West Territory to the savage tribes. It is not so intended. It is only to the Indians of the older Provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. How was it when the Bill was introduced?

Mr. MACMASTER. Does not the hon. gentleman know perfectly well that there is no Bill introduced into this House that goes through in its entirety? Does he suppose that the House of Commons is to abdicate its functions as an advisory body? Does he suppose that every Bill goes through exactly as it is introduced? Nay, does he not know perfectly well that the Bills introduced before this House are submitted to the good sense of the House, and that the Bill which eventuates in an Act is the result of the deliberate wisdom of the House—not merely of one side of the House, not merely of the majority of the House, but of the best opinion of both sides of the House? Does he not know that, during this discussion, he and other hon. gentlemen opposite were invited by the First Minister to make their suggestions? Were they not told that if their suggestions were in keeping with the spirit of the Act, and contributed towards perfecting the measure, they would be adopted? I appeal to the committee whether, whenever those hon. gentlemen made suggestions which would contribute to the perfection of this Bill, they were not adopted by the leader of the Government. The argument of the hon. gentleman could only avail if we were going to extend the franchise to the savage Indians of the North-West. Nothing of the kind is contemplated. The First Minister, one evening, jocularly stated that the franchise would be extended to Strike-him-on the-back and Lucky-man, and several of the other Indians in the North-West, who are opposed to the Government like hon. gentlemen opposite; and hon. gentlemen took it seriously, and not only so, but their principal organ, the *Globe* newspaper, took it seriously, and for weeks, after the First Minister said it was not the intention to extend the franchise to the savage tribes of the North-West, the hon. gentlemen, through their public organs—though they did not dare to do it in this House, where they might have been confronted with the contradiction of the statement—their organs, and notably their leading organ, the Toronto *Globe*, sent through the length and breadth of the land the statement that it was the proposition of hon. gentlemen on this side to enfranchise the Indians of the North-West, when, in fact, nothing of the kind was the case. But if the hon. gentlemen wished to make an argument against the proposition to enfranchise the Indians existing in a particular state of affairs, they must have something better than the imaginary argument of the hon. member from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and much more must they have a better and a more recent argument than the statement of the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, in attempting to support the amendment of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and to oppose the proposition of the Government, cites from Parkman, with reference to the condition of the Indians in 1642. Well, if there was anything necessary to prove that the hon. gentleman had no case it would be to cite the condition of the Indian in 1642.

Mr. DAVIES. They are the same brothers still.

Mr. MACMASTER. They may be the same brothers still; but will my hon. friend tell this House that the Indian has shown no capacity for development? Does the hon. gentleman forget that Tecumseh, an Indian, was practically a brigadier in the British army, and fought for British rights, the same rights which hon. gentlemen opposite are pretending to support in this House? Will the hon. member for Brant tell me that the Indian whose name his constituency bears was not a noble specimen of the tribes which we now seek to enfranchise? Will he deny that many Indians residing in his own constituency to-day are the lineal descendants of Joseph Brant, one of the noblest Indians that ever was produced on this continent—a man who, not only in himself, but in his descendants, was well worthy of "the grand old name of gentleman?" The Indians of this country, and some in the United States, although they may not advance so quickly as the white men, although they may not have all the aptitudes for modern civilisation that white men have, though they may have some disadvantages incident to their peculiar constitution, are capable of advancement, and are advancing; and I say, Sir, that as white men and as Europeans, as soon as we find them capable of exercising the franchise, we would not be true to ourselves, and we would be unjust to the red men, if we did not extend to them the opportunity of having a voice in the Government of the country of which they are citizens, and which they have always been ready with their blood and valor to defend.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why not give it to the British Columbia Indians?

Mr. MACMASTER. It was contemplated to give it to the Indians of the old Provinces, and I have no doubt that in good time, when the British Columbia Indians show a greater stage of development, they will also receive the franchise; and as I believe that development, education and culture, together with the possession of property, are the truest test of qualification for the franchise, I have no doubt that in proper time the Indians, and all other classes who are entitled intelligently to have their say in the public affairs of this country, will have the franchise. But why should hon. gentlemen go back to 1642 to cite the condition of the Indian? Is that any parallel to his condition at the present time? Will the hon. gentleman tell me that the Indians in his own county are cutting off thumbs to-day, are lacerating the breasts of women and committing those frightful atrocities, that Indians committed in 1642? If they are not so acting, then it is a false parallel drawn between these men and the Indians of 1642. Has my hon. friend not read the lessons of history? Does he not know

it was more than one hundred years later than that before the trial system against which hon. gentlemen are now inveighing was broken down in one of the most civilised countries of the earth, the north of Scotland—not until 1745, when Cumberland's troops marched through the north of Scotland and broke down the clan system—that not until then did my noble countrymen, having succumbed to the fortunes of war, acquire all the advantages of civilisation, with regard to such matters as are now under discussion. Lord Chatham, with that great foresight that always characterised him, saw in those men susceptibilities for great mental as well as physical development, and at once sought to enlist them in the British army, and to afford them opportunities of empire; and I think time and experience have demonstrated that those men, in many instances, proved themselves to be the strongest members of the British army in more than one country on the face of the earth, and qualified for the most honorable positions. Why, Mr. Chairman, it is not one hundred years since women were burned as witches in Scotland and elsewhere. It is not one hundred years since a Roman Catholic did not dare to own a horse in Ireland. It is not much over fifty years since a Roman Catholic, even in civilised England, was not entitled to the ordinary rights, the ordinary civil rights, that are now so freely bestowed throughout the whole United Kingdom. My hon. friend, in citing from the condition of Indian affairs in 1642, should see at once that the historical allusion has no bearing on this case. Those poor people may have been savages in that year, but he should not forget the development that has since taken place. He should not have forgotten that on many a hard-fought battlefield they were the allies of the British on this continent, they were the supporters of that very power we are now maintaining, and whenever the question of allegiance to the British sovereign was at stake, the Indian was found to be the faithful ally of Great Britain, whenever he was treated fairly. I think it is one of the greatest tributes to the wisdom of our treatment of the Indians that, while our Indians in the North-West, in their day of trouble, have acted with so much leniency and consideration towards their prisoners, we see, in the neighboring country, that where prisoners are taken by the savage tribes, their lives are not safe for a moment. I would say to my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with regard to the progressive development of the Indian, what the poet said with regard to human progress, and I hope my hon. friend will take note of it:

> "This fine old world of ours is but a child,
> Yet in the go-cart;
> Patience! give it time to learn its limbs;
> There is a hand that guides."

And so there is a hand to guide the affairs of the Indian—but, Mr. Chairman, it is not the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. If hon. gentlemen opposite could keep the Indian in primeval degradation and savagery, in the condition of 1642, they would do it. If hon. gentlemen could possibly extend the franchise to the other Indians in the North-West opposed to the Government, it might possibly suit their purposes better. The object of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and of the hand that guides, and I trust will long guide, is that when the Indians have shown, by progress, by development, by thrift, by culture, that they have acquired——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACMASTER. Hon. gentlemen sneer at the Indians; of course they do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We do not.

Mr. MACMASTER. Hon. gentlemen sneer at the Indians, I repeat. They are not ready to recognise that there has been any building up of the Indians from the place which they occupied in 1642 to the place which they occupy in the constituencies of North Norfolk and Bothwell, and some other constituencies. That is a delicate tribute paid by hon. gentlemen opposite to the condition of the Indians in their own particular constituencies. They have a right to their judgment, and the Indians will have a right to their judgment also. But I was proceeding to say that the hand that guides on this side of the House, the hand that guides in this House and in this country, and the hand that has guided in this country for thirty years, with the exception of some five years, during which period the affairs of this country were misguided, provides: That when the Indians have shown, by progressive development, by the acquisition of habits of industry and thrift, that they have become peaceful citizens and have respectively acquired property in a separate location to the extent of $150, that Indian shall have a vote. You cannot change, in some respects, the conditions of his origin. He is an Indian, though an improved Indian. My own ancestors in the Highlands of Scotland had not escaped from the bonds of savagery 150 years ago.

Mr. BLAKE. They stole cattle.*

Mr. MACMASTER. I have no doubt my noble ancestors stole cattle and proved their powers in war by going down to the southern country; and no doubt they crossed the channel to where my hon. friend's ancestors were. They proved their prowess by the peculiar methods adopted at the time. But what are we proposing to do here? We say this: The Indians, as a tribe, possess certain property. It is theirs; it is not the property of the Government; it is the property of the Indians themselves.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why, then, do you not let them sell it and handle it?

Mr. MACMASTER. We have had experience in past years on this subject. This is not a new question, and it has been determined that the Indians' property shall be taken care of in a peculiar, particular way, for their special benefit. Do hon. gentlemen say those methods are wrong? No. Those hon. gentlemen cannot make that statement. But what is proposed on this side of the House is this: That when an Indian has shown that he has, within the tribal property, a fixed location, not a vicarious occupation, and when he has placed on that piece of property improvements to the value of $150, and thereby given proof of his thrift and industry, he shall have a vote. For my own part, I am not afraid to go to my county and defend that proposition before my Highland constituents; and no hon. gentleman on this side will have the slightest fear in going before his constituents and defending what is but simple justice to the Indian. The whole question is, whether an Indian, who has given such proof of thrift and industry, in putting improvements on his property to the extent of $150, shall not be entitled to the franchise? I do not wish to make comparisons; but do we not give to the fishermen of the Lower Provinces the right to vote upon possession of property in nets and certain other property, amounting altogether to $150?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACMASTER. It may be there is some real estate with it; but the whole is put together, and if the nets, boats and other property are, together, worth $150, the fisherman is entitled to vote.

Mr. KIRK. He must own real estate in fee simple.

Mr. MACMASTER. If an Indian has $150 worth of improvements on a fixed location he should be entitled to vote. Hon. gentlemen opposite want the Indian submitted to indignity, by asking that he shall be compelled to come

*See Mr. BLAKE's explanations, p. 2451; also Mr. MACMASTER's, p. 2619.

up to the revising officer and ask to be put on the roll; they want to go even further, and compel the Indian to give proof of his qualification. We must treat fairly the Indian, politically, and if he is entitled to vote, as is a white man, we must give him the vote; and if, having come from the degraded condition which he occupied in 1642, referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk, the Indian lives peaceably and quietly on his reserve, in a fixed location, which is practically the Indian's, and of which he has a much better tenure than that of a tenant, and has made improvements to the value of $150, he is justly entitled to vote, and I believe the country will sustain his obtaining it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been accused most unjustly and unreasonably, on various occasions, of casting reflections on the Highlanders of this country. I need not say that nothing would be further from my desire than to cast any aspersions on a gallant race, among whom, I am happy to say, I numbered then, and I have numbered since, a great many personal friends and excellent supporters. Nothing that I have said, I must observe, has at all equalled the reflections thrown on those gallant men by the hon. gentleman, who claims descent from them, and who has told us that 150 years ago the Highlanders were savages, that 150 years ago the grandfather of the hon. gentleman he spoke of so much was a savage. If I had said so the whole vials of wrath of hon. gentlemen opposite would have been poured out, and deputations would have come up from Glengarry. It would have been safer for me to have fallen into the hands of Pie-a-pot or Big Bear than into the hands of the constituents of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that among other claims the Indians, whom we proposed to enfranchise, had upon us, was this, that they had, in times gone by, been allies of Great Britain on many a field and in many a conflict in this country. He was good enough to tell us that one of Lord Chatham's proudest boasts was that he had converted the so called savage propensities of his Highland ancestors to good use and turned them into some of the most gallant soldiers that Great Britain ever possessed. But he might have told us also that in all Lord Chatham's flights of eloquence there is not one more famous or more deservedly famous than those words in which he rebukes the folly and wickedness of the then British Government in launching their Indian allies upon men who formerly had been British subjects. I recommend the hon. gentleman to study once again the all but dying speech of Lord Chatham, in which he declared that if he had been an American instead of being an Englishman he would never have laid down his arms as long as the savages and foreigners were allied with British subjects in the endeavor to subdue the Americans.

Mr. MACMASTER. The hon. gentleman is doing an injustice to Lord Chatham. He did not quote his words correctly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. His language is on record, and no condemnation could be stronger or more just than that which Lord Chatham launched against Lord North and his colleagues for their gross violation of all propriety, of all sense of Christian honor, when they loosed the savages of the border settlements upon those who had been British subjects, acts condemed equally strongly, as I well know, by many of the U. E. Loyalists, whom those same men had driven to take refuge in this country. I speak of what I know, because I have seen, in the old records which still remain, very strong condemnation of the British Government in making use of Indian modes of warfare and Indian allies to subdue that revolt.

Mr. MACMASTER. We are not justifying those atrocities in order to prove the right of the Indian to vote.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the hon. gentleman is not justifying the atrocities which were then committed on the revolted colonists of North America. He is occupying himself in justifying an attempt to commit other atrocities in this country, under the guise and color of law, which, in the ideas of all right-minded persons, are even worse, are even likely to produce greater ultimate injuries to this community, than the atrocities condemned by Lord Chatham. But I am glad there are some points in which we can agree with the hon. gentleman. He tells us there is no doubt there is a hand that guides these Indians, and that is the hand of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. We do not doubt that in the least. We know perfectly well—my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Paterson) will know to his cost, I am afraid, whose is the hand—from whose hand the weapon comes which is destined to strike him out of the place which he has so long and honorably filled in this House. Still, I am inclined to think that, as my hon. friend has already baffled the efforts of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs in another way, he may still prove himself more than a match for all attempts made by Act of Parliament to turn my hon. friend out of the Parliament of Canada. Now, what does my hon. friend propose by the amendment? And let me say here, again, that there is no member of the Reform party in Canada who objects to Indians, as Indians, exercising the franchise. They are perfectly willing to sustain and support the hon. gentleman in any measure which he chooses to introduce for the purpose of giving votes to Indians who are governed by the same laws, who are subject to the same conditions as their white countrymen. Let every Indian who is willing to submit himself to white laws as unreservedly as the white man have the franchise, if he possesses the proper qualification which is required from the white man in order to give him the franchise. But we object that while, for all other purposes, for all ordinary purposes of life, you treat the Indian as a child, for the purpose of giving votes to the Superintendent General he is to be treated as a fully grown man and as a rational creature. You will not allow an Indian to make a will, to sell a piece of property, to treat of his own affairs, in the way that you permit an ordinary white man; you treat him as a minor, as a ward; you subject him to all manner of restrictions, except only when you want to get his vote in particular localities, for the purpose of discomfiting certain particular members of Parliament or strengthening the seats of other members of Parliament. Those are the conditions on which the Indian becomes a fully grown and rational man, while for all other purposes he remains a child, under the tutelage and protection of the Superintendent General. By-the-bye, I may call the attention of the hon. gentleman from Glengarry to this fact, that in all his speech, from beginning to end, I did not observe that he said one word on the amendment now before the House. Now, what is that amendment? It simply asks that the Indian should, of his own free will and motion, come forward and ask for a vote. Is that too hard a condition? Is it too much to ask that before the Indian shall vote he shall ask for the right to vote?

Mr. MACMASTER. He will do that at the polls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What petitions have we had from Indians asking for the franchise? There may be a letter or two from particular friends of the Superintendent General, but outside of that we certainly have had no evidence. We have no evidence in the various voluminous reports submitted to us by the Superintendent General, or in the voluminous reports made by his agents at various times, which, so far as they make any allusion to the question at all, go to prove that, in the opinion of the Superintendent General and his officers, the Indians, so far from desiring to have the franchise, are not fit and do not want to be trusted with even the control of their own municipal affairs. What

does the amendment propose? It simply asks for two things. First of all, it asks that the Indians who are to be enfranchised should themselves signify their desire to be enfranchised. Well, Sir, is that unreasonable or unfair? Is it not right and proper that those who have never exercised the franchise before, if they are really desirous, as appears to be assumed by the hon. gentleman opposite, of obtaining this privilege, should ask for it. And my hon. friend's amendment also proposes that the particular pieces of property on which they are to obtain a vote should be set off in such a fashion that they may be identified. Now, I speak under correction, but I think that, as a matter of fact, in most of these reserves no division, no survey, has ever been made of the interior portion of the reserves. We have simply set off large tracts of many thousands of acres, and the Indians have, to a great extent, occupied these in common, and although, in process of time, certain small sections may be set off for this man or that, nobody but the Indian agent, or some men of the tribe themselves, can, by any possibility, know what the particular portion of the property is as to which any one of them would qualify. There is great force in another remark which was made here, that knowing as little as we do of these Indians it would be a matter of the extremest difficulty to identify them, in the case, at any rate, of those Indians who are still in a more or less pagan condition, and to decide whether this or that particular man who presented himself was or was not the particular Indian who had been qualified, under the Bill, to receive his franchise. If there is no design on the part of the Government to abuse this provision they would be quite ready to accept the perfectly reasonable proposal of my hon. friend; and if they refuse a proposal so reasonable, if they insist, on their own free will and proper motion, on conferring votes on certain Indians, whether they like it or not, we can only, after all we have seen, draw the conclusion that the Government, in this matter, are not in the slightest degree actuated by any desire to give votes to the Indians, as Indians, but simply are desirous of obtaining control of a certain number of voters who, in a disputed election between whites, may be able to turn the balance. I took occasion, at an earlier stage of this debate, to point out that if it was thought desirable for any reason that the Indians, as Indians, should be represented in this Parliament, and their numbers were sufficient to entitle them to representation, they might obtain it, by simply associating together their various bands and giving them a vote. I did not pretend to say there was anything in their position or in the position of this country which rendered it necessary that that should be done; but I did point out that if the object was to give Indians representation in this House that was the way to give it, and not by giving them a vote, which will be of very little use to them, and will only be used to decide between the votes of white men. Now, it has been denied, again and again, that the First Minister, when this measure was introduced, designed to take power to enfranchise a vastly larger number of Indians than those residing in the older Provinces. Let us see what actually did pass on the subject. In the very earliest part of this debate, as reported in *Hansard*:

"Mr. MILLS. What we are anxious to know is, whether the hon. gentleman proposes to give other than enfranchised Indians votes?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. Indians residing on a reservation?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; if they have the necessary property qualification.

"Mr. MILLS. An Indian who cannot make a contract for himself, who can neither buy nor sell anything without the consent of the Superintendent General—an Indian who is not enfranchised?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether he is enfranchised or not.

"Mr. MILLS. This will include the Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes."

Well, he may have altered his mind since then, as he has in a great many of the details of this Bill; but it is not open for him or his followers to maintain, without contradiction, that when this Bill was originally brought before us the Premier did not intend to include a larger number of Indians than those residing in the older Provinces. It was only when he found that public opinion would not consent to his giving the vote to those other classes of Indians that he withdrew it. It was not, in any respect, because the Bill was so loosely drawn as to include them, but because he found it necessary in this, as in a great many other cases, to recede from the position he originally intended to take. As my hon. friend remarks, the prowess displayed by Poundmaker, and Pie-a-pot, and Big Bear had probably more to do with inducing him to limit the rights to be granted to the Indians than any argument, I am afraid, that was employed on this side. I repeat, for the last time, that we do not object in the least, if the First Minister sees his way to remove the disabilities under which the Indians now labor, and to put them on the same footing as their white fellow-citizens, that all such Indians should receive votes; all we do object to is, that you should treat the Indians for all other purposes as the mere wards of the Superintendent General, but for the purpose of exercising the highest right which white men possess, and for that purpose only, you should treat them as persons who have fully come to their majority, and are capable to understand and form a fair and honest opinion upon questions of the greatest importance, not only to the Indians but to the whole population of Canada.

Mr. McCALLUM. I would not say a word, but the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) misrepresented what I said. As usual, he started by misrepresenting what I did say, by building a man of straw, and then knocked it down. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat did not explain this amendment as far as it goes. It requires the Indian to give the whole valuation of his property before he can be put on the voters' list, and yet we do not ask that of the white man. That is what I object to. Hon. gentlement are not satisfied with all they said on the second reading of the Bill, and with all they have said for the last seven weeks; they discussed this Indian question for three weeks; and now, after the House has adopted the principle of enfranchising the Indians, they are trying by a side wind, to prevent the Indians being placed on the voters' list.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has followed his leader in his method of treating this question. He says we try to make an invidious distinction between the Indian and the white man. Who has made the invidious distinction between the Indian and white man? Is it we? Is it not the great "guiding hand," the great Manitou, the great To-morrow? Is there a man on this side who has said that he does not want the Indian treated in the same way as the white man? We have said, and have shown by our votes, that we are willing and anxious to enable the intelligent Indians of Canada to become citizens of the country. But the hon. gentleman, the great "guiding hand," would not allow them to become citizens of Canada. He has refused, time and again, to allow them to become citizens; but, he says, although I will not let them be citizens, I will make them voters; I will allow them to out vote people who are citizens. I will make use of these wards of the Government, who are in the position of children in a go-cart, as the hon. member for Glengarry so neatly expressed it, when polling time comes. The men who, he says, are not fit to be the equals of Canadians in any other respect of citizenship, he is going to make our equals at the polls. That is an insult to us, and it is an insult equally to the Indians. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has told us of the past prowess of the Indians, and said a great many true and

deserved things of the Indian character; but what is the answer to all that? The answer is, that his leader does not believe the Indian fit to be a citizen. He would not give to him the privileges he gives to the negro, privileges which have always been given to the negro, even when he came here as a fugitive from slavery, bearing all the degradation of slavery. Who are making inviduous distinctions against the Indian? Is it we, who wish to make him a citizen? Or they, who treat him worse than the negro escaped from slavery? It is unfair, unjust, unparliamentary, in view of the facts, to try to stir up prejudice against hon. gentlemen on this side amongst those people whom the right hon. gentleman wishes to have the vote. It is not we who want to keep them in degradation. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McMaster) charged us with the desire to keep the Indians in "perpetual degradation and savagery." Have not Liberal Governments shown themselves as willing to allow Indians to become citizens as any Conservative Government? Have not the Liberal party agreed to the proposition that Indians might become citizens? But what we object to is, not the admission of the Indian to citizenship, but the admission of the Indian, while he is not a citizen, to rights which are the property of citizens and of citizens only. There is another argument. The hon. member for Glengarry says the Indians' property is theirs. It is not the property of any of those individul Indians who are going to vote upon it. Why cannot they sell it, if it is their property? was asked of the hon. gentleman, and he replied: Because the best wisdom of this House has decided that the Indians' property shall be taken care of in a particular way, that it should be in the guardianship of the Government, and managed for him, as the property of other minors is managed. Here is the answer to his own statement. The property is not the Indian's, in the ordinary sense of the word. The tribal Indian is a mere user of the property while he is allowed to use it by the Indian agent. He cannot even hold his location without the consent of the Indian agent, and it comes to this, that the Indian cannot have that location which is to qualify him for a vote, except by consent of the agent of the Superintendent General. The wisdom of the House is acknowledged by the hon. member for Glengarry, which has decided that the Indians are not fit to own property. Now, he tells us that the property is theirs. He knows they cannot sell it; he knows they cannot sell the produce of their farm in the way an ordinary person can, but he seems to think the Indian should have something of value to sell, and now he proposes to give him something to sell, and his leader proposes to give him something to sell, and that something is the franchise. There is progressive development for you! The Indian has got along in the world; but it is certainly a new way to begin by giving him, in the first place, that valuable commodity which is generally supposed to be the last reward of thrift and industry, the highest crown of citizenship, the greatest right of freedom—the franchise. I am surprised to hear such an argument from a gentleman who is generally so clear in his views as the hon. member for Glengarry; but my surprise at his urging that argument is lessened when I find one other extraordinary statement he has made. When I find him telling this House that the Highlanders of Scotland, 150 years ago, the heroes of whom Scott has written in prose and poetry, whose names are household names over the civilised world, the synonyms of heroism, of everything glorious, of valor and remarkable intelligence, were savages, I am astonished at nothing he can say. I have known a great many Scotchmen. I represent a constituency composed almost as largely of Scotchmen as the constituency of Glengarry, and I cannot believe, even on his word, the word of a Highlander, the representative of a peculiarly highland constituency, that his ancestors, 150 years ago, were savages. I know what is in them; I know what they would be, even without the education and privileges they have at the present day, and I know that they would not be savages in the sense the Indian is a savage. It is an insult to any one having any Scotch blood in his veins to say that the people of that country, 150 years ago, were savages. Did they scalp women and children? Did they murder priests, and cut them into small pieces? Is that the kind of people who inhabited the Highlands 150 years ago? I think not; but that is the kind of savages we are discussing now; and when the hon. gentleman said the Highlanders were savages, we know he was comparing them with the Indians of 1640, with the Indians of old times in Canada, with the Indian of to-day, on the far western plains. The object of the hon. gentleman in making this assertion is not far to seek. He, no doubt, intended to show what the Indian was capable of in the way of development. He said the Indian has not got very far yet, to be sure, but there is no knowing what he may come to. Why, my ancestors, 150 years ago, were savages, says he, yet here am I to-day! One hundred and fifty years from to day the Indian may become a Q.C., a member of Parliament, a representative of a Highland constituency! The argument does seem to have force when put in that way, but the deduction he drew from it did not amount to a great deal. He said the Highlanders were never civilised until their tribal system was broken up by British arms. Does he propose forcibly to break up the tribal system of the Indians? Is he going to send soldiery into the Indian reserves and forcibly break up the Indian tribal system, in order that they may become civilised? I do not think that is his proposal. If not, the argument goes for nothing. At any rate, although the tribal system was not broken up at the time he speaks of, among the Highlanders, the Highlander of that day, who was as independent a man as walked on the face of the earth, possessed the very essence of independence and self-government and was far from being in the same position as the Indian on the reserve. Where was the "guiding hand" that ruled the Highlander of 150 years ago? Where was the guiding hand that Rob Roy submitted to? Was there a General Superintendent of Indian Affairs over the Highlander of 150 years ago? I think, if there had been, the "guiding hand" would have become paralysed before it had guided my hon. friend's ancestors very long. There is no parallel between the cases. The Highlander of that day had everything to qualify him for the franchise, except the education and the training which his descendants now possess. He had the personal independence, the fealty to his chieftain, the intense patriotism, the love of country which fitted him for self-government. Can it be pretended that the tribal Indian has the same qualifications now, even after generations of training? Even my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), with the opinion he holds of his ancestors, will not maintain that. But to come down from these high and lofty topics to consider more closely the position of the Indian, leaving the high-flown comparisons that have been indulged in, in what position does the Indian stand to-day? The leader of the House said early in this debate that he is an ally; he does not know whether he is fully a British subject, and therefore liable to military service. Are we going to give votes to all our allies? When England and France were allies the French did not exercise the franchise in England nor the English in France. If he treats them as allies he cannot give them the franchise; if they are not allies, but subjects, they should be citizens.

Mr. SPROULE. If the French allies had been citizens they would have had votes.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; and if our Indian allies became citizens they would have votes. We have asked to have them made citizens, but without success. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has urged, in defence of the Premier, what that gentleman has not urged

in his own favor. He has asserted that when the Premier solemnly told an hon. member that Pie-a-pot and Poundmaker and Big Bear and Strike-him-on-the-back would have votes, and allowed the statement to be put in *Hansard*, he was making a joke. The hon. gentleman has made many a joke on serious subjects. He has treated many of the best interests of the country as a huge joke, but we cannot let him off on a joke on this subject, for did he not propose an amendment to exclude these people, to exclude Poundmaker and Big Bear and Stab-him-under-the-ribs? If the wording of the Bill did not include them, why did he move an amendment to exclude them? He has shown, not only by his statement which is now said to have been a joke, but by the amendment which he certainly moved in earnest, that he intended to include these men, and if they had put off their rebellion until next year we would have had a rebellion of the hon. gentleman's constituents instead of a rebellion of homeless, wandering savages. I notice that hon. gentlemen are groaning. It must be described as a groan to make it parliamentary. No doubt they groan at this exposition of the hon. gentleman's policy. I am sure many of them who are making that peculiar noise are as much disgusted with that policy as I am myself; so, as they are not permitted to express their disgust by word of mouth, they express it by their heels. I am glad to find that it cannot be repressed, and that, if their condemnation cannot find issue by one extremity of the body, it finds expression at the other. The hon. member for Glengarry has said further, that it was the greatest tribute to the good management of the Indians, under present auspices, that they had treated their prisoners leniently. It certainly is a point to be scored in favor of those Indians, but it is only under present management that Canadian Indians under British rule have ever taken prisoners at all, or been in a position to treat citizens of Canada otherwise that leniently. After all the talk about the development of the Indian, even in Old Canada, I do not find that those best qualified to speak about his condition think him qualified for the franchise. I have said that the Indians on the Muncey reserve are among the most intelligent in Canada; that individuals among them were as intelligent and well educated as any white men; but I have also said frankly that I did not think them, as a body, in a fit condition to exercise the franchise. I find that the head of a great missionary institution among those Indians, which is subsidised by this Government, endorsed the view I have expressed. At a public meeting of the Methodist Conference in Chatham, I find the following took place, as reported in the *Globe*:—

"The greatest sensation yet produced during the present Conference was that occasioned by the Rev. Abel Edwards, of Muncey, in his address on the report of Principal Shepherd, of the Mount Elgin Industrial Institute. In the course of his remarks the reverend gentleman denounced, in strong language, the Franchise Bill, as one for which the Indians are neither qualified nor prepared. (Applause.) If enforced, he said, it would work great damage and produce no good results. (Cheers.) If the Government had, 20 years ago, extended the benefits of the common school system to the Indian, and enforced attendance thereat, the Indians might be in a better position to become enfranchised; but now they are not, and the prospects are they will not be for many years to come. He was greeted with prolonged applause throughout his address."

This was at a meeting of the Methodist Conference at Chatham, Ontario, on Saturday last. The report of Mr. Shepherd is not given here, but I judge, from this, that the reverend gentleman's address is in harmony with the tenor of that report. Now, Sir, if the Indians on that, which is one of the most advanced and progressive reserves in the country, who are so far developed as to have an Orange hall, are in this condition, what must be the case amongst other Indians, not so far advanced as they are in politics or education? The calm decision of public opinion, no doubt, will be that the Indian who is under "a guiding hand," who is not a citizen, who is a child in a go-cart, who has no possibility of giving independent expression of his views, who cannot even have the franchise, unless the right hon. gentleman gives him a location ticket—an Indian, under these circumstances, is not a proper person to be entrusted with the franchise. This is altogether apart from his intelligence. I say if he was as wise as the Premier, as eloquent as the member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), and as scientific as the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), he would not be fit to have the franchise while he is situated as he is at present. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) asks that more than ordinary efforts should be made to ascertain whether the Indian who is to be put upon the list is really qualified under the terms of this Act. The white man is not in a position to have his vote put on the list by an agent who has control of him; white men cannot be put on in shoals by Indian agents, but the Indians can be. The revising barrister's oath, we are told, is a safeguard. What is his oath? To make up the voters' list according to the information in his possession. Will not the instructions of the Indian agent be information? Will not the information sent down to him, perhaps from Ottawa, be that which he will regard as the best kind of information? I say there is every reason for asking for more safeguards in the case of an Indian voter than in the case of a white voter, and for these reasons I am in favor of the amendment of my hon. friend from Brant

Mr. CAMPBELL (Renfrew). I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) speak so disparagingly of our countrymen, and compare them to savage Indians of 150 years ago. He was mistaken. I am sure the Highlanders, for 400 or 500 years past, were not at all what he represented them to be. They were intelligent men, and the hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to speak of them as he did. What excuse can he make to his constituents in Glengarry, when he returns to them, for what he has said about them to-day?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the amendment of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) ought to receive the assent of this House. It does not exhibit any party bias or leaning; it does not display the guiding hand of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and consequently we will probably have the opposition of those who follow the Superintendent General in this House. Now, Sir, the Liberal party in this country always endeavor, and have always endeavored, to elevate men, to lift them up, to make them better men, and to do what is best for the country. That has been their policy in the past. That has been the guiding policy of the Liberal party, to elevate the standard of morality, and to do what is best in the interest of the country. Now, Sir, the amendment that is proposed is of such a character that it commands the assent of every patriotic Canadian. It is quite plain that the purport of this Bill is that every tribal Indian located on a reserve is to have the franchise, is to be guided by the Superintendent General, to vote as he desires. I consider this an assumption of a power which no party should attempt to arrogate, in this age of the world. I consider that it is an immoral practice to resort to for the purpose of obtaining power and of securing a perpetuation of power. It matters not to me which party attempted to do a thing like that, I would condemn it; but I do not believe that the Opposition in this House would ever endeavor to keep themselves in power by any such means. The proposition of the hon. member for South Brant gives to the Indians who are possessed of the property qualification, the right to vote when they desire to vote, and imposes upon them the duties of citizens, and it is something that I hope will be upheld by this House. It is more preferable than giving all the Indians living on reserves a right to vote. I say such is a vicious proposition, and ought not to be sustained by this House. Why, Sir, the idea that

a Government is going to create votes, is going to give the franchise to men whom it will force to vote for themselves, in order to keep themselves in power, appears to me to be a most cowardly thing. Although this measure has been long discussed, the full extent of its villany has not yet been disclosed. We are beginning to see the hidden hand, and great good is going to be done by the able discussion that has taken place, as it will serve to show the country the position which the Government have chosen to take in order to create votes to keep themselves in power. The idea of giving votes to men who are otherwise disqualified, who are not citizens, who cannot make a will without the assent of the Superintendent General, who do not pay taxes, is a preposterous one; and yet hon. gentlemen propose to give these men votes which will offset those of our citizens, an action which is an outrage and which the people will not stand. The observations made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) I am here to oppose and resent. I have a noble band of Highland men dwelling in my riding, and they will not be satisfied if I do not resent the idea that their ancestors were savages, like Indians, a few short years ago. I deny it. The Highlanders showed intelligence and culture long anterior to that period; and I cannot understand how the First Minister, who is of Highland blood, should have allowed a prominent supporter to make that remark, without himself rising and correcting the misstatement. On behalf of the noble Highlanders I represent, I hurl back that accusation as one unworthy of any hon. member of this House, and I will not permit it to be made without resenting it as being an insult to the whole Highland race in Canada. I remember, a few years ago, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) made some statement, mild in comparison with that which the hon. member for Glengarry has made; and what was the result? That statement was published in my own constituency, in the Gaelic language—and it received the assent and support of the First Minister, and I believe of his Minister of the Interior (Sir David Macpherson) also. I do not know but that he is Minister yet—he is not here now; but I am sure after the determined resistance he made to the supposed slight cast by the hon. member for South Huron, he would not have consented to allow such a slander as that pronounced by the hon. member for Glengarry, to have passed without resenting it; and I repeat that I am surprised that the First Minister should have allowed a prominent supporter to have made such a charge against any class of the people of this country without resenting it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the proposition of the hon. member for Brant is a reasonable one. I agree with the First Minister that I am opposed to invidious distinctions. It has been said that the Indians should not be called upon to apply to the revising officer to be placed on the list. It must be remembered that the wage-earner has to make this application, and why should there be an invidious distinction between the Indian and the wage-earner in this respect? Why should the Indian be placed in a better position than the wage-earner? For while the Superintendent General will make application to have the Indians on a certain reservation placed on the voters' list, the wage-earners will have individually to spend their time in order to get their names put on the list. The hon. member for Glengarry stated that suggestions were invited by the First Minister from hon. members on this side of the House with a view to improve the Bill. The question of enfranchising tenant farmers' sons was urged from this side of the House, and was discussed. But the Bill is now almost through committee, and those persons will not be allowed to vote. The sons of manufacturers, who are tenants, are also excluded. Why should such men, who earn their daily wages, perform the duties of citizens, and volunteer to go out in defence of the country, be debarred the privilege of the franchise, while tribal Indians on reserves, who pay no taxes, are allowed the right to vote? It is an outrage on the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is no evil intent in enfranchising the Indians. There must be some special reasons, and the main reason is that hon. gentlemen opposite expect to obtain a political advantage. The hon. member for Glengarry has let the cat out of the bag. The Indians of the plains are not to be enfranchised, because they are opposed to the Government, while the Indians of the older Provinces, who are given the right to vote, are supposed to be in favor of the Government. If it were thought that they would vote against the Government, no doubt the Bill would yet be amended, and they would be struck out. This Indian clause is also an attempt to strike down some members of this House who have discharged nobly their duty as representatives of the people, who are respected by both sides, whose names will be handed down to future generations, as men who nobly did their duty on the floor of this House. There is no other object in adopting the Indian clause, because the Indians have not asked for it. They are going to be forced into harness; they are to be told, first, that they have votes, and if they do not record their votes they will be looked upon as opponents, and the result will be that they will be drawn up, as a band, and compelled to exercise the franchise in the interest of the Government. I say that the revising barrister provision of this Bill is bad enough; the Indian vote is worse, and the two together are sufficient to condemn the Government that introduced them, in the minds of every independent man in this country. I hope the day is not far distant when the people will open their eyes, when, in place of supporting legislation of this kind and allowing it to go unpunished, legislation which fetters their rights and liberties, they will rise up and condemn it. It is high time that the people woke up to the fact that their rights are being fettered and trampled upon. I say that every man on this side has a right to express his opinion candidly and forcibly on this question, and while we have a single son of a European race twenty-one years of age, who is not permitted to exercise the franchise, it is a gross insult that you should allow the Indian on the reserve the right to vote, while you deprive the sons of tenant farmers and the sons of tenant manufacturers from exercising their franchise. This shows, on the face of it, that there is an object in view. If the tenant farmers' sons could be gathered together on a reserve, in a group where they could be influenced to vote in favor of Government candidates, they would be enfranchised; but because they cannot be controlled like the Indians, they do not get votes. Mr. Chairman, I could not permit this thing to go through its last stage without entering my solemn protest against it.

Mr. MACMASTER. An attempt has been made by certain hon. gentlemen opposite to misrepresent my meaning, in the remarks which I made to the House to-night. I do not attach very great weight to those statements, because I think I can defend myself before any Highland audience in which I my chance to appear. While I described the state of savagery which existed in byegone years in Scotland, a fact which, historically speaking, cannot be doubted, I also pointed out the progressive development of the people of that country to one of the foremost nations in Europe, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), far from recognising such development in the remark he made, far from recognising that the Highland race to which I belong, and of which I am as proud as any hon. gentlemen in this House or outside of it—far from recognising the great progress they made, and that they are now one of the most cultivated nations on the earth, producing most eminent men in every walk of life, stig-

matised them as still possessing the "predatory instincts," practically characterising them by that remark, as possessing the old instincts which they possessed when they were a savage race, and as carrying those instincts down to a later time. I repudiate here, as it has been repudiated elsewhere, the insinuation so made against the Highlanders; and I take it as a displacement of this debate for the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to stand up here and profess to vindicate the Highland character—to say, on behalf of the Highlanders in his constituency, that he dissented from the remark of the member for Glengarry against the Highland race. I made no such charge against the Highlanders. I spoke of the facts of history; I recognised the progress of that race, and I equally enter my dissent against the statement that their acts or conduct are characterised by the predatory instincts which may have characterised them in their early days.

Mr. CHARLTON. What the hon. gentleman did was to compare the Highlanders of 150 years ago with the Mohawks of 1642.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is false.

Mr. CHARLTON. He compared them with the savage Mohawks of the seventeenth century.

Mr. MACMASTER. I made no such statement.

Mr. MILLS. What the hon. gentleman did was to refer to a statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. member for North Norfolk had referred to the acts of the Mohawk Indians in 1642, and what the hon. gentleman did was to argue that the Mohawks of to-day were not to be judged by those of 1642. He said: Look at me; my ancestors were savage Highlanders 150 years ago. He described the Highlanders of 150 years ago, and he said if these savages produced such a splendid specimen of a man as the member for Glengarry, what may we expect will be the Mohawks of to-day. The Indians have been progressing for ninety years more than the Highlanders, and if I, in 150 years, have become such a splendid specimen of a man from the Highland race, what may we not expect from the voters of Brantford, whose ancestors committed the depredations in 1642. That was the argument of the hon. gentleman, and if it was more, he was simply arguing that the Highland race were a progressive race; that 150 years ago they were a nation of savages, and to-day they were able to produce such a splendid specimen——

Mr. MACMASTER. I ask the hon. gentleman, across this House, if I made any reference to myself or produced myself as a specimen?

Mr. DAWSON. I think it is unjust to press upon the hon. member for Glengarry remarks which he says were contrary to what he uttered, or to try to fasten upon him the assertion that he said anything derogatory of the Highlander. He is a Highlander himself, as I am, and speaking of the Highlanders, he spoke in a relative manner. The Mohawks have been run down as savages, but let me read to you what an American writer has said of their nation:

"The Confederacy of the Iroquois, or Five Nations (and which was known as the Confederacy of the Six Nations, after the Tuscaroras were admitted into the Union), might afford the subject of a historical sketch, in the hands of a master, replete with the deepest interest and curiosity. It was distinguished, from the time of the first discovery of the Hudson down to the war of 1756, for its power, policy, and martial spirit. At the close of the seventeenth century that Confederacy was computed to contain 10,000 fighting men. * * * The Five Nations, during the time of their ascendency and glory, extended their dominion on every side, and levied tribute on distant tribes. They blockaded Quebec for several months, about the year 1660, with 700 warriors. The Mohawks were the terror and scourge of all the New England Indians, and those dwelling west of Connecticut river paid them tribute. They extended their conquest down the Hudson to Manhattan Island, and subdued the Carnase Indians on the west end of Long Island. The Iroquois pushed the conquest to Lake Huron, and fought desparate actions with the Hurons and the Chippewas on the borders of Lake Superior."

They are described, still further, as extending their conquests up through Illinois and the plains of the West on the one side, and to the Atlantic coast and the Carolinas on the other. A race that could do such things cannot be considered a despicable one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with the extract that has been read. Anybody who has read the history of America knows that the Mohawks were the kingly tribe of this continent, and leaving that behind, I admit that they are now the most advanced Indians we have; but advanced as they are now, and warlike and brave as they have been before, the Superintendent General has his hand as firmly upon them as upon any other Indian in the land. His Indian law holds them under the same tutelage as any others; so that they cannot lease their own lands, even if they be educated men, sign contracts, or even make a will, but the Superintendent General can annul it, if he sees fit. The ground taken on this side of the House cannot be misunderstood. We say, give the Indians all the rights and liberties, and all the responsibilities of citizenship; but we say: Do not force them upon him—it is not wise. If the Mowak Indians prefers to maintain his connection with the tribes, it is his own choice; he feels happier there; and as long as he remains in that position do not try to force him out of it; and this proposition to force a vote upon him while he is in that position is a proposition which, I believe, he will repudiate; and in his interest, as well as for other reasons of another kind, referring to loss advanced Indians, I have moved the resolution. It is evident, from the First Minister not having suggested any different way of obviating the difficulty, that he does not seem inclined to accept my proposition, and this committee is sufficient to vote it down. But I call his attention to this, that the other night, when I pointed out to him the difficulty of getting the Indians on the lists, and suggested that it would have to be done in a different manner from that adopted for white voters, owing to their having no assessment rolls, and when I pointed out that the only way to get the information would be through the paid agents of the Government, and that that would be a wrong and indecent thing to do, and asked the First Minister what plan he would propose, he said that he had not given the question consideration, but that he would do so, and asked me if I would put my opinions on paper, that they might be considered. That I have done; but I have been so unfortunate in the expression of my opinions there as not to have met the views of the First Minister. I therefore hold that if he allows this proposition to be voted down he is bound to find some solution of the difficulty that I desire my amendment to obviate, that is, that it would be an improper thing for the revising officer to take his list of voters on an Indian reservation from the Indian agent, under whom the Indians are, and who is under the control of the Superintendent General himself; and the only method I can see is for the revising officer to go down on the reservation and let every Indian who wants to be put on the list come to him and say so, the same as the wage-earner has to do. Some hon. gentlemen ask why I want the information to be given under oath. I want it to be given under oath, not so much because I want the Indian to be put under oath, but because, when the revising officer seeks testimony from others, it is under oath; and if the Indian agent's testimony is to be taken, I hold, from the peculiar position he occupies in relation to the Indians, that it should be taken under oath. But if there is any great objection to that, strike it out and leave the other part. The hon. First Minister must know that all Indians are not equally advanced. While it may be a proper thing to give many of them votes if they are full citizens, in even the most advanced bands there are many who are not

qualified to exercise the franchise, and if you leave it to the option of the Indian you may secure the most intelligent and advanced of them, and you would not have the evil in our midst that the ignorant, uneducated, semi-civilised Indian, who is possessed of $150 worth of property, shall all at once be elevated to the right of exercising the franchise. Therefore, I think the process of selection should be in the hands of the Indians themselves. I do think it is a reasonable proposition, and one that ought to be accepted by the First Minister. He has given me no reason for refusing to accept it, except the one that it is drawing an invidious distinction; but he will remember that it is not my resolution but the Indian Act that makes the invidious distinction; and if he asks his supporters to vote my amendment down he should devise some plan to obviate the difficulty, else I shall not promise not to try to draft some other proposition to obviate it. But the question ought to be dealt with in some way, for it seems to me that it is not proper to leave with the Indian agent the power to have what Indians he likes put on the list of voters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the Bill, as it now stands, the Indian and the wage-earner are exactly on the same footing. There is no clause in the Bill stating that the wage-earner must go personally to the revising officer and ask that his vote be put on.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He is not under control.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said they should be put on the same footing; I say they are on the same footing now, and in making a change they will be on a different footing. I take it that under the reading of the Bill the revising officer will put on all those he finds on the assessment roll as having a *primâ facie* right to vote. Those who are not on the roll must come forward and have their names put on, whether they be wage-earners or Indians. That is not especially provided in the Act, but it is necessarily intended, and it would be drawing quite a distinction between the wage-earner who happened to be a white man and the wage-earner who happened to be an Indian to say that the latter must come forward personally, when we do not say that in respect to the former. Both stand on exactly the same footing; and as for the agent coming forward and putting on all the names, that is absurd; the agent will not do anything of the kind. And in case anything of that kind should be attempted, I have no objection to its being prevented. I have already said that on first impression I agreed to the motion in amendment, which was suggested by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that the agent who, directly or indirectly, interfered with the Indian voters, would be committing a misdemeanor, punishable by loss of office and fine or imprisonment. I have no objections to preventing the agent, directly or indirectly, interfering with the request of an Indian to put his name on the voters' list, but what I object to is that the Indian must personally come forward and swear to his right to vote when the wage-earner is not put on the same footing.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that there is a difference between the two.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You do not recognise the difference in position.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there is a substantial difference.

Mr. MILLS. The white man who owns property has to give a description of the property upon which he qualifies. There is the concession, the number of the lot, and other descriptions. What do you propose to do with the Indian property, in order to describe it with such exactness that it may be identified? You know his name, but the Indian name is unfamiliar; you cannot tell one from another by name, unless you know the Indian tongue. How will you know whether the Indian on the voters' list owns any property or not? The Indian, in that respect, does not stand in the same position as the Indian who is assessed on income. My impression is, that there will not be any such, perhaps not a dozen, in the entire Dominion. The Indian, the ward of the Government, dependent on it for a large portion of his means of subsistence, is not in the same position as the ordinary wage-earner. If the hon. gentleman will meet the case I have mentioned, and give such a description of the property as to enable us to identify it, he will do much more than he is doing now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not going to enter into that discussion again; we have had it *ad nauseam*. With regard to the hon. gentleman's statement, which is erroneous, that the wage-earner is obliged to go and put in his vote, and that the Indian's name shall be put on the list, whether he likes it or not, there is no such proposition in the Act. They stand in the same position. As to the argument how the land is to be identified, the provision is that the Indian must be in possession and occupation of a separate and distinct tract of land. If the hon. gentleman will look at the original clause giving the franchise he will find that the property must be described in the voters' list by lot, concession, and so forth, or other available description. It must be so described that it can be identified. Those words were put in advisedly, because in large portions of the Dominion there are no lots and concessions, but an available description can always be got, and the revising officers will have to see that such description is given.

Amendment negatived. Yeas, 41; nays, 36.

On section 52,

Mr. LANGELIER. I would suggest that in the Province of Quebec the bailiffs of the Superior Court should be entrusted with these duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the revising officer, who is responsible for all this work, should have the selection of his own officers, as returning officers have now.

Mr. LANGELIER. Where will the list of the notices of objections be kept? The revising officer might come from a city 60 or 80 miles distant from his district, and it would be exceedingly inconvenient if those interested had to go to his place of residence to see the objections. The notices of objections, or a copy of them, might be kept in the same place in which the list is deposited.

Mr. MILLS. Is it intended that the revising officer shall, until the list is finally revised, have an office within the electoral district? If not, the list ought to be kept at the office of the county judge in the nearest county town.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to go back to clause 51, and amend it in this way:

The revising officer shall appoint as his clerk a person residing in the electoral district.

Mr. SPROULE. How would it be if it was a judge, and he was attending to two or three electoral districts? In my county there are three electoral districts, and I have no doubt one judge will attend to the three.

Mr. MILLS. Then he would have three clerks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think he should have a clerk in each electoral district.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now we can amend section 54. I move the following:—

The revising officer shall keep at his office in the electoral district a list of the notices of objections, etc.

I think that will meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 55,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is a very objectionable clause, and I trust the First Minister will strike it out altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the system in England.

Mr. CAMERON. Not to the same extent as this, I think.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONAND. I think so.

Mr. CAMERON. Whether it is or not, we ought not to have it here. It is an extraordinary clause, and gives the revising officer extraordinary powers. It enables him, without any complaint or notice to the parties to be affected by his proceeding, to strike names off the list, and to change names where the same are incorrectly entered on the list, and generally to correct such list, so far as any information in his possession will enable him to do so, in order to carry out the intention of the Act. It is an extraordinary power to give any individual, that he should, by his own mere motion, without notice of any kind, and without evidence of any kind, so far as this clause is concerned, be enabled to change the whole voters' list. Something might be said, possibly, in favor of leaving him the power to strike off the list the names of dead men.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If they are dead they cannot vote.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think he even should go that far without some evidence. We have latterly had instances of men and women who were supposed to have been dead, but who, fortunately, turned out not to be dead, and if a revising officer, under the operation of this Act, should have struck their names off, it would have been improperly done. It may be said they might be "personated," but they may be personated alive just as well as dead. I believe the chances of fraud by leaving a dead man's name on the list are much less than the chances of fraud by permitting the revising officer to strike a name off without any proof whatever. The revising officer may act in perfect good faith in striking off the name.

Mr. SPROULE. Supposing he attended the dead man's funeral?

Mr. CAMERON. Even then he could not be sure that the man whose funeral he attended was the man whose name was on the list. But you not only enable him to strike off the name of a dead man, but the name of a person who becomes disqualified. Now, how is the revising officer to get information that a person has become disqualified? Even if he had some information, it would be outrageous to strike that man's name off without notice to the man himself. There can be no hardship, no wrong done, because, if the person has become disqualified, it is the business of the political parties to make an application to strike his name off. Upon what evidence could the revising officer act, in order to justify him in striking the name off? The man's name may appear on the assessment roll, and he may have the qualification to vote under the statute, or he may have no right whatever to vote under the statute. So I say that the material which the hon. gentleman authorises the revising officer to act upon will not justify him in striking the name of any person off, for either death or disqualification, without giving notice to the person supposed to be disqualified that he was to be struck off. But the hon. gentleman goes further, and enables this revising officer to correct the list in any way, upon such information as he may have in his possession. He may have information communicated to him by some person, a verbal intimation that a person has become disqualified, or that he has come under some legal disability. There is not one of the three cases in which the hon. gentleman enables the revising officer to act under this clause that I think ought to be here at all. The whole clause ought to be removed from the statute. No harm can be done by striking this clause out and leaving the law just as it stands without the clause. I am strongly opposed to giving the revising officer power to interfere with a man's rights behind his back, and without giving that man an opportunity of showing his claim to have his name remain on the voters' list. I therefore beg to move that section 55 be struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause was not thought an unnecessary power in England. The revising officer judicially knows the person, and is satisfied, when parties die or are disqualified by loss of their property, that he should correct the list. It comes within his own cognisance. There is, however, at present, unfortunately, in my opinion, a most unwholesome dread and suspicion of the revising officer that does not exist in England; by-and-bye, when members of Parliament become better acquainted with the working of the Act, they will have more confidence in the revising officer, and they will see the advantage of this clause. But I shall not insist upon it; I shall withdraw it. I think it is a good clause, and ought to be here, but perhaps it is just as well, at all events, in the inception of the system, that it should be struck off.

Mr. DAVIES. I am sorry myself, personally, that the First Minister has withdrawn the clause. I have my own opinion about it, and I do not agree with all the hon. member for West Huron said in his remarks upon this clause. I think, so far as giving him power, of his own notion, to strike off disqualified persons, that he should not have it, but he must have power to strike off men who are dead. In the English Act the revising officer shall correct a mistake which has been proved to him to have been made on any list, and shall expunge the name of any person whose qualification shall be insufficient, and also the name of any person who shall be proved to him to be dead. I think it is highly improper to allow the list to be encumbered with the names of dead men, voters who may be personated.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be very much better to leave the clause as it is, because if the object of having a revising officer is to obtain a correct voters' list, some discretionary power must be left with such officer, as certain facts respecting a voter's qualification and non-qualification come within his own knowledge.

Mr. MILLS. The whole question is as to what evidence shall be deemed sufficient on which the revising officer can act. The same question involved in this clause is involved in clause 30, and the First Minister should examine into both clauses, in order to determine what the powers and functions of the revising officer are to be.

Section withdrawn.

On section 56,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to make the date 1st August, 1886.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am afraid the assessment roll will be no use, except the assessment roll of the previous year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Immediately after the 1st of January the revising officer will send for the assessment roll, which is made up to 31st December, as regards cities, and to September or October as regards counties. That is in Ontario. In August the voters' list for the elections must be completed.

Mr. LANGELIER. In Quebec, according to the municipal code, the valuation rolls must be made in June and July. Thirty days are allowed for the revision by the municipal council. If the date were placed at 1st September it would be all right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revising barrister will make up, in the spring of 1886, his preliminary list, taking the list of the previous year. It always must be the list of the year before.

Mr. MILLS. The assessments are generally made in February, in the rural districts, at all events, and they are revised in May and the voters' list made up. It may be that the revising officer, in preparing his preliminary list, will be obliged to use the old assessment roll, but when the list comes to be revised the new roll will be available.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under the words "such other information," he can send for the last roll.

Mr. MILLS. I think he ought to have that power, because the chances will be very great.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has that power. I think the 1st of August will be sufficient.

The words "1st day of August, 1886," were substituted for the words "15th day of April, 1887," and the clause, as amended, agreed to.

On section 61,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I desire to move an addition to this section. It is quite clear that under the provisions of this statute a large number of officials are to be appointed. It is of the first possible consequence that those officials should discharge their duties properly, and if they do not they ought to be punished. All the clerks, constables, bailiffs, and other officials, ought to be liable to some severe penalty in case of a wilful violation of the law. I find that the English Act provides that for any wilful violation of the law committed by any official under it the person aggrieved can exact a penalty not exceeding £100 sterling, and full cost of the suit. I propose to move that every person appointed to any office or position under this Act, or required by this Act to do any matter or thing, shall, for every wilful violation of the Act, or wilful act of commission or omission, forfeit to any person aggrieved the sum of $500, or any less sum which the jury or judge before whom the suit may be tried shall consider just. It is not for every violation of the law that I propose making the official responsible; it is only when he does the thing wilfully, with the full knowledge that he does wrong. You can easily understand how an official appointed under this Act may commit a very serious wrong on an elector or a candidate, who may have no redress unless we provide for it in this law. It is no compensation to the person aggrieved to say that the official is liable under the Election Act. We know that in that Act the punishment is a small fine, which is merely nominal; and these officials, who are given those extraordinary powers by this statute, ought to be made responsible, if they wilfully violate the law, to any person aggrieved thereby.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a returning officer refuses to make a list, under what section would he be fined—under this section, or section 61?

Mr. CAMERON. I do not propose a fine. This is compensation to the person who is injured by what these officials do wilfully, not by mere oversight or mistake.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This 61st clause provides for the specific offence of not furnishing the revising officer with copies of the assessment roll. If the custodian of the assessment roll will not give it, he will be liable to the penalty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CAMERON. Why make it a fine? Imposing a fine, on many men, is practically no punishment. It is no punishment to a man who has nothing, to pay a fine of a $1,000. I would make it a misdemeanor, penalty of three months' imprisonment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it ought to be a misdemeanor, and I will make it so.

Mr. CAMERON. The party aggrieved should have a chance of getting something if he has been wronged by any act of omission or commission of any officer.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the English law. There the party aggrieved gets a £100, with full costs of the suit, for any wilful act of commission or omission on the part of any of those officials, and in adopting the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron we would follow exactly in the English line.

Mr. LANGELIER. If there was no other punishment than a misdemeanor, it would amount, practically, to very little. In the prosecution of a misdemeanor the public prosecutor has to take the case in hand, and unless he was strongly pushed to it by parties interested he would not be disposed to take up a case of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. For the offence of omitting to give the copy of the assessment roll, to make it a misdemeanor is quite sufficient.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 62,

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that sections 62 and 63 are adequate to meet the purposes of the Act. It may be all very well for the party who commits an offence against any of the officers; but, supposing the officer himself fails to fulfil his duty, the party ought to have the same remedy that he would have against the returning officer or sheriff at an election. In the Ashby case the parties had the right to vote, but the sheriff was of opinion that they had not, and though their candidate was elected, yet Chief Justice Holt still declared they had a remedy against the sheriff. There ought to be some remedy against a revising officer who wilfully fails to do his duty. He has certain duties and certain ministerial functions, and the revising officer who is not a judge ought to be treated as a ministerial and not as a judicial officer. The greater part of his duties are ministerial, and he ought to be held responsible, as a returning officer is held responsible. I think the English statute relating to revising officers makes a similar provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I doubt whether the revising officers in England are held liable.

Mr. MILLS. I think so, for all duties they discharge as ministerial officers.

On section 62,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The 57th clause provides that all Acts of Parliament respecting elections of members shall apply to this Act, and this clause provides that all offences against this Act shall be punishable in like manner as similar offences against the said Acts.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman think a prosecution could lie under such a general provision? I should like to see him prepare an indictment under it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend could prepare one which would hold water. However, we will strike out that section.

Section 62 struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now will come the amendment of the member for North York (Mr. Mulock).

Mr. TROW. I would prefer to move it on the third reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I told the hon. member for North York, when he showed it to me, that I thought I would accept it, and he said he would leave it to be moved to-night.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MULOCK) moved the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. It is not germane to the Bill, but should come in an election Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I said, but the hon. gentleman was very anxious to have it in the Bill. When the statutes are consolidated next Session—I cannot ask that they shall be consolidated this Session—this clause can be put into the Election Act.

Mr. CASEY. If this clause is accepted, any other employé of the Government should be inserted as well as the Indian agent.

Mr. MILLS. It ought also to refer to persuading an Indian to go on the voters' list.

Mr. DAVIES. This section, as drawn now, only applies to an agent who unsuccessfully seeks to induce, but if he had succeeded in inducing, it would not affect him at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think, if the hon. gentleman wants to make the thing effectual, he should make it apply to any officer or any official of the Government. I think I have heard of a gentleman whose name was mentioned to-night—but I will not say it, because I am not positive—who, in an Ontario election, used his influence against the Mowat candidate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Distinct objection was taken against the action of the Indian agent from his supposed influence, and this was a distinct clause, prepared by the hon. member for North York, to make agents, whose influence was supposed to be paramount over the Indians, punishable. That was the object of the clause, because they are, under the present law, liable to be indicted for acting improperly or using undue influence.

Mr. MILLS. I believe in most cases the agents are not very popular with the Indians, although at the same time they have great influence with them. I must say that I do not think this clause is of much value, without the adoption of the amendment suggested by the member for North Brant. If that had been adopted this would have been an important supplementary proposition, but standing alone, it is a most delusive proposition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I shall not make any delusive proposition, and I shall withdraw it.

Section 63 agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are several clauses that have been held over, but as it is two o'clock we will not go into them now. In consequence of several amendments that have been made in the Bill, some of the forms in the schedules will have to be altered, and that is being done.

Mr. MILLS. What about the 53rd section. There was no definite statement as to the amount to be paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not want to make any arrangement. I think I will be able to ascertain absolutely what it will cost; I think it will cost very little indeed. It would be improper that the officer should receive an uncertain amount. I therefore propose that the revising officers shall not commence their duties till 1st of January, and I propose that the first thing to be done will be to have an enactment as to what the allowance of those officers shall be. The Government will, next Session, introduce a Bill to settle specifically the allowances to revising officers, clerks and bailiffs.

Mr. MILLS. Is the sum to be paid to the revising officers to be uniform in all cases?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not say that. Several county judges have written me that they will be able to perform these duties in addition to their own duties. I think an officer taking a small constituency, and one having two or three ridings, should not be paid the same allowance. The county court judges, I believe, could be compelled to do this work as part of their judicial functions, in the same way as it has been decided that provincial courts can be obliged to sit in controverted election cases. As regards county judges, I believe a good many of them are quite willing to perform these duties with a very small addition to their salaries, and these duties can be performed quite easily in connection with their own duties.

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman had adopted the rule of making the judicial districts the districts by which the revising officers were to operate, each municipality being in itself a complete unit, then we need not have changed the boundaries of the constituencies, but have adhered to the judicial boundaries, in Ontario, at least. But under this Bill, as it stands, a judge, where a county is divided, can take a whole district. He cannot take part of a constituency.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been provided in the Bill that a revising officer can be appointed for more than one electoral district, and for fractional parts.

Mr. MILLS. I am satisfied that difficulty will arise.

Mr. TROW. I desire to ask the First Minister the position in which the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) stands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Bothwell said the clause was altogether illusory and the hon. member for Queen's said it was of no value, and some other members made like statements. I said I did not want to introduce an illusory clause.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 2:10 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 9th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

LOANS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

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

Resolved, That in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorised by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, the Governor in Council be authorised to raise, by way of loan, such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole the sum of thirty million dollars, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion, and for the carrying on of the public works authorized by the Parliament of Canada; the rate of interest on the sums so to be raised by loan not to exceed four per cent. per annum.

Motion agreed to.

FRANCHISE BILL PETITIONS.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to say a few words in reference to the letter that was presented to this House last week, in answer to some remarks made by the hon. member for King's N.S. (Mr. Woodworth). It was in reference to some criticism he had made about a petition sent from Meaford against the passing of the Franchise Bill. One of the parties whose attention was attracted to that item in the *Hansard*, drew up a declaration setting forth that the signatures were made by the parties as represented in the petition, and a letter was read in the House by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen), purporting to be from one of those parties, but which in reality was from McMillan, who is one of those who carried round the petition for signature. I marked the copy of the *Hansard* containing that letter, and sent it to Mr. Oliver, who was referred to in it, and asked if the expressions made use of by him as stated, or if he had anything to say about it. In reply, I have received a letter from him dated June 5th, and addressed "T. S. Sproule, Ottawa."

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your question, as written on the margin of the House of Commons *Debates*, now before me, I beg to say that, in conversation with Mr. McMillan, I said in a jocular way that my vote or signature was as good as Sir John A. Macdonald's, but deny most emphatically having used the language attributed to me in reference to Mr. Woodworth. Had no idea McMillan was going to make an improper use of any remarks made by me. I am not in the habit of applying such offensive expressions towards any person."

That is from the gentleman who is said to have used those expressions; it is from the gentleman that this letter purported to be from, though it was not written by him at all. I have another letter from another gentleman, to whom I sent a copy of the *Hansard*, and asked for his opinion of it. He says:

"Your favor of the 25th ult. to hand, also copy of *Hansard* with reference to the petition from Meaford against the Franchise Bill. The most daring lying was practised by James McMillan and James Drummond in circulating this petition. What few Conservatives they got was through misrepresentation. They assured the people that all the wild Indians in Manitoba, the North-West Territory, British Columbia, and Keewatin would have the franchise."

He goes on to say that the two names mentioned on it as Conservatives are not Conservatives and never were, and that two or three Conservatives who are on the petition acknowledged this:

"The only persons I have found out that signed the petition were George Tomlinson Sewell and James Sparling, and I have spoken to them about it. They say it was the misrepresentation about the Indian vote in the North-West, and at the time every person was mad about outrages committed by the Indians at Frog Lake."

This is an explanation, I think, of many of the signatures that have been attached to this petition. As to this McMillan, the man who carried round that petition, he is a man who has always been in the habit of doing that sort of work, and is always ready to do it when he can get a fair day's wages, so long as he can make it tell against the Conservative party. He is a person who is entirely unscrupulous as to his representations, and I can well understand that he was fitted for that very important duty in the interests of his party.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sorry that this letter, which was unfortunately read the other day, which I said was out of order, as it reflected upon a member of the House, should have gone into *Hansard*. I think that was the mistake that was made, and I think it lowers the position of this House to have letters of that kind read. I think it would be wise and well if hon. members would discontinue the practice of reading private letters.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask when we may expect the returns to some addresses in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway which I have called attention to on divers occasions. Most of them refer to information which is not in possession of the Government directly, but which they promised to obtain, and which the hon. gentleman no doubt has been pressing the Canadian Pacific Railway to give. Some of them, however, have been passed so long ago that I dare say he has forgotten all about them. For example, on the 5th February, there was an Order of the House for a statement as to the emigrants and immigrants by rail, a monthly statement which the hon. gentleman was in the habit of giving us before the Session was over, and we know that the Session is properly over a long while ago. Then, on the 9th February, an Address was passed for the gross and net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the years 1883-84, divided into three divisions.

Mr. POPE. The answer they gave the Government was that they did not keep their accounts in that way, and it was impossible to furnish the information in that way.

Mr. BLAKE. That is hardly a satisfactory answer to the House. If the Canadian Pacific Railway has placed the Government in a position to give that answer to the House by the shape of the document which we can ask for, then I should be prepared to take action on that document at the earliest convenient moment after it was received. But at the present moment we are in this position: an Address has been passed for that on the 9th February, as it has been passed in former years. Then there was an Address for the transactions between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Government, in regard to town sites, on the 12th February; and on the same day there was an Order for various statements, three or four different sets of statements, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and on the same day there was an Order for a statement with reference to land grant bonds, of which the hon. gentleman, some time ago, brought down that part relating to what the Government had done about land grant bonds; but the Address of the House called for information which was in the possession of the company about land grant bonds, and that was not answered. On the 17th of the same month there was an Order for various statements, and another Order for various statements on the 24th. There was an Address for the cost of construction of 1,650 miles west of Winnipeg, and on the 27th April an Address for the stockholders of the Ontario and Quebec Railway, which is said to be distantly connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those are all that I have to direct the hon. gentleman's particular attention to, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway is concerned. I have done so more than once heretofore, and I do so now because we may, I presume, as the Session is getting on a little, perhaps have a resolution about the Canadian Pacific Railway brought down to us in the course of a month or so, and this information would be important in that discussion. Then there are some other returns which I may suggest as important. There was an Address for papers connected with disallowances for the year. There was an Address, on the 6th February, for the High Commissioner's report. There was an Order of the House on the same day for the details of an estimate made by the Deputy Minister of Interior of $58,000,000 as the proceeds of our estate in the North-West. On the 12th there was an Order for petitions and correspondence with the colonisation companies; and on the same day an Order of a like character for petitions and correspondence with the railway companies in the North-West, not including the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. POPE. What is that for?

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman knows that there are a number of persons formed into railway corporations in the East, who sometimes ask him for money, and then for more money, and it is that class of correspondence I mean,

with reference to the West. Then, on the 12th March there was an Order for papers in reference to a speech of the Minister of Public Works on the subject of immigration, and on the same day for papers with reference to the License Act. On the 27th April there was an Order for papers with reference to the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company.

Mr. POPE. I would like the hon. gentleman to send me a list; and perhaps he had better get some one else to write it out for me. With respect to the report of the High Commissioner, I believe it has been brought down. With respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they have been told what we wanted, and they have informed us that the information was in course of preparation.

Mr. BLAKE. If my hon. friend will only press the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as hard as they press him, it will be all done.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend who has just sat down has had a pretty good share of returns this Session, while the sole return I have asked for this Session has not yet been brought down, and I would like to ask the First Minister when we are likely to get it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only answer that I can give to my hon. friend is that I don't know.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears that it is your duty to find out.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to remind the First Minister that we were promised the correspondence on the subject of the northern boundary of Ontario early in the Session; it has not come down yet. Also, the correspondence with the Ontario Government, with reference to the claims made by the Dominion Government for land on account of the purchase of the Indian title, and also concerning the expenses connected with the subject of the disputed boundaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would remind the Minister of Customs that time has been up a good while for the savings banks returns, to which I called his attention two or three times.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee,)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think we may take up those clauses which were postponed. The first item was the paragraph in section 2, defining the word "farm."

"'Farm' means land actually occupied by the owner thereof, and not less in quantity than 20 acres; and a 'farmer' means the owner thereof."

Some objection was taken to this definition, upon the ground that in the vicinity of large towns there were market gardens of less than 20 acres equally valuable with a plot of 20 acres. I think we had better retain the clause, as I see there is a similar provision in the existing Ontario Act and in the new Bill. Of course, I am willing to hear any argument on the point. Five acres of land, while cultivated as a market garden, may be very valuable, but the moment it becomes used for other purposes the value may sink into insignificance. Under all the circumstances, I think it desirable to maintain the words "20 acres."

Mr. MILLS. I do not see there is anything to discuss in reference to the matter. The son of a proprietor of, say 19 acres, will vote, because of the proprietary interest in the property, if the property has sufficient value. This Bill gives every owner of property of a certain value, no matter whether it is a farm or not, a vote. It also gives the son of the proprietor, no matter whether he is a farmer or a proprietor of real estate, a vote.

Mr. EDGAR. I had an amendment which I was prepared to move, but on considering the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Bothwell, and looking at the subsequent section of the Bill, I do not think it necessary to move it. The son of an owner of real property, not otherwise qualified to vote, is given a vote; and that would apply to a market garden of 10 acres within the city limits. As to counties, sub-section 8 of section 4 gives the son of an owner of real property, other than a farm, a right to vote. So it is of no consequence whether we place the extent of land at 20 acres or 10 acres.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire to insert the following, with respect to the qualification as to farmers' sons: "Grandson, stepson, or son-in-law;" also, the following: "Father shall include grandfather, stepfather, and father-in-law. Mother shall include grandmother, stepmother, and mother-in-law."

Mr. LANGELIER. I call attention to the fact that cases frequently occur in our Province of sons by adoption and fathers by adoption.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As I understand, the father by adoption can afterwards repudiate that adoption, and not be bound by it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Supposing the case of a farmer having 20 acres, and it is assessed sufficiently to allow himself and one more to vote. Supposing he has a son and a stepson, or a son-in-law, or a grandson, which would be entitled to vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the son would have it over the others.

Mr. McMULLEN. The son-in-law might be the eldest, and the owner of the property would not have the power to say who should have the vote.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the interpretation of farmers' sons would cover that. If the word "sons" includes stepsons or sons-in-law, the elder would have the vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That would be the construction, I suppose, but I do not know if that would be fair, because the daughter might marry a rich old man and cut the others out.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it would be unfair that the son-in-law should vote while the heir of the house would not have a vote.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose the proprietor would practically determine which name would go on the list with his own.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. EDGAR. If it is true that the section giving the qualification to farmers' sons is still unsettled, a few words might be introduced there which would cover the case mentioned by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That section does not stand over, but we have been going back from time to time, without adhering to any technical rules, and it might be amended.

Mr. MILLS. It should apply, not only to farmers' sons but to sons of all owners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was another point with respect to tenancy. A discussion arose when we were considering the franchise in counties, and I said I would have no objection to a proviso being added to the clause, by which it would be provided that where there was no rental stated on the assessment roll, if the property were assessed at $150, that should be held as *primâ facie* evidence of the right of the tenant to vote. That I am pre-

pared to move. I would ask the consideration of the committee as to whether there should be some provision made under the head of tenancy in cities and towns. There the rental is nearly always a money rental; a rental of any other kind is so rare that the number of such cases would not be appreciable. The reason I bring it up is that what I said before was with reference to counties altogether. Meanwhile, however, we might turn to the franchise for counties.

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to re-open the question further than to say that it would simplify the preparation of the voters' list very much if the hon. gentleman, at all events in counties, if not elsewhere, should adopt the rule of taking the assessed value not simply as the *primâ facie* right to vote, but as the actual right to vote, thereby putting tenants, in that respect, on the same footing as owners and occupants.

On section 4, paragraph 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the insertion of the following words:—

Provided further, that where, in any revised or final assessment roll, the amount of a tenant's rent is not stated, the fact that the real property in respect of which he is entered on such roll as tenant thereof is assessed at $150, or over that sum, shall be held to be *primâ facie* evidence of his right to be registered as a voter.

Mr. EDGAR. As to making that applicable to towns and cities, surely, if the same proportionate value has been arrived at in this Bill, to fix the qualification as to ownership or occupancy, it would be simple enough to make the same limit *primâ facie* evidence of the tenant's right to vote. If $150 in the country is about equivalent to $300 in towns, it would be quite safe to take the assessed value in the cities and towns as well as in the country. I do not see why this principle cannot be made applicable to cities and towns as well as to the country. It would simplify the trouble of proving the right of tenants to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must say I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I think in the cities and towns the rental is likely to exceed the simple interest on the assessed value of the property. I would like to hear from other gentlemen acquainted with cities who can speak on that point.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. MILLS. I am satisfied that to take the assessed value of the property would be a better precaution against fraud, and would facilitate the placing of names on the assessment roll. Of course, I except the Province Quebec, because there, I believe, the amount of the rental is marked on the assessment roll; but that is not done anywhere else, and I have never been able to understand why the hon. gentleman desires to take the rent as the basis instead of the actual value in the case of tenants. Without that, how is the revising officer to obtain *primâ facie* evidence for putting the names of tenants on the voters' list? Is he to make personal enquiry in every case? For instance, take the case of an owner of property having about the necessary value: if he found that the tenant was politically opposed to him he might have no objection, on condition that it did not give a vote, to accepting a rent just below the amount necessary to qualify the tenant. That could not happen if the assessed or the actual value of the property were taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose that at this stage we should re-open that question. It may be re-opened at a subsequent stage. The reason I asked that the 5th clause should stand over I mentioned at the time. The Act provides that the property qualification shall be, in cities $300, and in towns $200. It has been pressed upon me that there are two towns in the Province of Quebec, Hull and St. Hyacinthe, which got themselves declared cities, in which a large number of voters, who are now qualified, will be disqualified, if the qualification is raised from $200 to $300. I do not desire that these voters shall be disqualified, because these towns, by a rather misjudged ambition, got themselves declared cities, when I do not think either their wealth or their population entitled them to that position. I believe that everywhere else, in all the Provinces, the cities are sufficiently important to justify the distinction in value the Bill provides for. There are two ways of meeting the case of these two places—either by excepting them, and stating that in those two cities the qualification shall be $200, or by providing that all cities of a population under 9,000 shall be considered as if they were towns.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think there is a better way, which is the system adopted in the election law of the Province of Quebec. There, there are different qualifications; one $300 and the other $200. The higher qualification applies only to cities which return one member or more, and the other applies to every other municipality, whether parish, township or town, or even city. If you apply this rule it will be general, and there will be no difficulty whatever.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the case of cities like Hull and St. Hyacinthe, which are cities by Act of Parliament, but still, from their population and position, the value of property there is not greater than if they were towns. The effect of making a distinction between cities and towns in the value of property would disfranchise a great many men in those places. I think the better plan would be to make it a matter of population. I find that these cities are both of them under 9,000, in which case they would be considered for valuation purposes as towns, still we cannot prevent their being cities as they are so by Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has maturely considered this, and will propose such an amendment as will be in the public interest.

Mr. CASEY. The suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) is by far the most logical way of getting at what he desires. A limit of population is not as logical a distinction as the distinction between cities that return members and those that do not. There are several cities in Ontario which are over the limit of 9,000 population, and yet in which property is no more valuable than when they only had 9,000 or than it is in other places of 9,000 population. Take St. Thomas, which is a very prosperous city, the value of property there is not at all to be compared with the value of property in London, Toronto or other cities. The best plan would be to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Quebec.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will let this proposition stand, and consider it, and in the meantime the section can be adopted as it is.

Mr. MILLS. In clause 9 we carried a provision disqualifying, amongst others, police magistrates, stipendiary magistrates and recorders. Some of these are not salaried officers, but are only municipal officers.

Mr. VAIL. I pointed out to the First Minister that seven or eight officials were appointed in Digby county last year, and that, though they were called stipendiary magistrates, they received no stipends. Under the Bill they will be deprived of a vote, but I am sure that is not the intention.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One cannot very well see how a man can be a stipendiary magistrate without a stipend. I have no objection that the clause should be re-opened, with unanimous consent. We might say "police

magistrates and stipendiary magistrates, receiving no stipend." It is *lucus a non lucendo* business, though.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In Ontario, police magistrates are sometimes appointed without salary at the instance of a municipality, as it is a convenience, where the population is less than 5,000, to have one magistrate to attend to the business, instead of allowing the justices of the peace to carry it out. When this clause was up, the committee was rather in a hurry; but there can be no doubt that it is not desired to disfranchise those officers who receive no salary.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). In some counties of Nova Scotia, stipendiary magistrates are appointed to carry out the Scott Act. If they are to be disfranchised, I am afraid they will refuse to act. There are five in my county.

Mr. VAIL. At the last sitting of the municipal council, county of Digby, certain men of the first position in the county were appointed stipendiary magistrates without salary. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Inverness, they are to act under the Scott Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the difficulty arises out of our legislation here. We give certain powers to certain individuals whom we call stipendiary magistrates, and, in order to give these powers, they have to be appointed under that name, even though they are patriotic enough to act without remuneration. I confess I do not see very well the principle upon which even a stipendiary magistrate who has a stipend is disfranchised, as long as the stipend comes from the locality and not from the Government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This was in the old law, but I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. After consultation with my friends, I was just about to propose, as I do now, that the words "police magistrates, stipendiary magistrates and recorders" be struck out of the disqualification clause.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 50,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that this clause shall run as follows:—

The appeal shall be:
(1). In the Province of Ontario to the county judge in whose county the polling district where the appeal arises is situated;
(2). In the Province of Quebec, to the judge of the Superior Court resident in or having judicial charge of the judicial district within which is the polling district where the appeal arises;
(3). In Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and Prince Edward Island, to the county judge;
(4). In British Columbia to the county judge, but, in any electoral district which is not included within the jurisdiction of any county judge, then to the Supreme Court, which court shall assign the duty of trying any appeal to any judge of the said court.

There is rather an anomalous state of affairs in British Columbia. That Province some years ago passed an Act appointing county judges, and subsequently they passed an Act adding two judges to their Supreme Court. It was held here, after communication between the Minister of Justice and the Government there, that with the two additional judges of the Supreme Court, there was no necessity for so many county judges. So that there are now two additional judges added to the Supreme Court, but a vote has been passed here which gives a salary to only one county judge. There is one county judge on the mainland at Cariboo or Lillooet, and the judges of the Supreme Court do all the rest of the work. They are situated somewhat like the district judges of the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec. There is a certain number of Supreme Court judges at headquarters in Victoria, and some judges are on the mainland, doing, in fact, circuit or district work. That, I fancy, would be only temporary, because, with the increase of population in the Province, the salaries will be provided by the central Parliament here for all the county judges. Therefore, I think that at present the appeal in British Columbia should be to the "county judge in any electoral district which is not included in the jurisdiction of any county judge, then to the Supreme Court, which court shall assign the duty of trying any appeal to any judge in the said court." I think that is the best way of meeting the temporary difficulty.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask why the hon. gentleman makes a distinction in the language between Ontario and the other cases in which county judges are now employed? Will it not be better in all cases to provide that it shall be to the county judge having jurisdiction over the polling districts out of which the appeal comes? And if that definition which the hon. gentleman has prescribed for Ontario is to remain, it may be necessary to provide that the revising officer shall not make his polling district to be composed of more than one county, or pieces of more than one county; because the hon. gentleman knows that he has changed the townships of Ontario in such a way that some divisions are composed of parts of three counties, and the duty of the revising officer in making polling districts is to make them composed of not more than 200 electors, so that it might be made of parts of two counties, and in that case you would not find any single county judge having jurisdiction over such polling division. Then, as to British Columbia, I think it would be better if the appeal could be arranged to be so that a judge of the Supeme Court who is resident and discharging his duty in the place most contiguous to the electoral district, to appeal on the facts as well as on law; but to appeal away to Victoria from the interior, and then to have the court at Victoria to decide to what judge that appeal should be assigned, and then to have it go back to him, seems to me like a cumbrous method of performing the work. The appeals that come from the Island of Vancouver might, no doubt, be as well disposed of in that way. If all the judges who are resident on the island are in Victoria, there is no difficulty in providing that the appeal shall be to the Supreme Court. If I remember rightly, at the time we discussed the British Columbia judiciary, one judge was to be at New Westminster, one at some point in the interior, and one at Kamloops. Why should you not provide having those stations assigned to them, that it should be that judge of the Supreme Court whose official place was nearest to the electoral district from which the appeal came? Then it would go direct to him instead of going all the way to Victoria and calling upon the Supreme Court judge to assign, and coming back to the mainland again.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In British Columbia there will be no practical difficulty under the present system. The revising officer will just send the appeal to Victoria where the Supreme Court judge will select a local judge. But it so happens, at this moment, that one of the local judges is in ill-health, and he would be unwilling to undertake the work. I do not think there would be any difficulty about it. The appeal goes at once to Victoria, and the court will at once assign the judge. Then, with respect to the remark of the hon. gentleman as to the difference between the electoral districts and the counties for judicial purposes in Ontario, I do not think there will be any difficulty as the sub-divisions of the polling districts are by the Act, if I remember aright, confined to the division of the municipality into electoral districts, while each municipality must belong to one judicial county or the other.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) moved the insertion of the following clause:—

That any person appointed to any office or position under this Act, or required by this Act to do any matter or thing, shall for every wilful malfeasance, or wilful act of omission or commission, forfeit to the person aggrieved the penal sum of $500, or such less sum as the jury or

judge before whom the case may be tried, or any action brought for the recovery of the above mentioned sum shall consider just to be paid to such party, the amount to be recovered from such party with full costs of suit by action for debt in any court of competent jurisdiction: provided nothing herein stated shall prevent the application of any other remedy, civil or criminal, against any such party.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. The clause which I think stands in the way of the hon. gentleman's plan is clause 15. It says that the revising officer shall hold sittings for the primary revision of the list in such place in the electoral district as shall be deemed most convenient for the purpose. That will stand in the way of a judge who is acting as a revising officer in one part of a riding and another judge acting as revising officer for another part of the riding. The hon. gentleman will see that it treats the electoral district as a unit, and some amendment of the clause would make it possible for the hon. gentleman to carry out his plan, which I think would be much more convenient than this provision.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have a memorandum of the verbal errors in consequence of the numerous amendments, but I cannot bring them before the committee now, and I think that meanwhile, the clause will be so amended as to meet the hon. gentleman's views. We cannot go on with the schedules now because the forms are being altered to meet the various amendments which have been made, and besides there is the money clause which will have to go through committee.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD—ORDER DISCHARGED.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Since the Bill (No. 120) to give effect to an agreement made by the Department of Public Works for the sale and transfer of the Dundas and Waterloo road, was introduced, we have had a communication from the Government of Ontario. They claim that this property forms part of their assets and that therefore we should not dispose of it. The Ontario Government do not affirm the claim, but they submit the question, believing that this property will be found to belong to Ontario and not to the Federal Government. Under these circumstances, and until the matter can be investigated with a view of ascertaining whether the claim of the Ontario Government is well founded, I would move the discharge of the Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are there any papers to be submitted from the Local Government?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there is a letter from the Premier of Ontario, and of course that has been acknowledged. It was impossible for me to look into the matter now, but it will be investigated as soon as the House rises.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 105) respecting the Bank of British Columbia.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL. I explained the object of this Bill to the House when I moved the second reading. This bank was chartered in England and the charter having expired it was under the authority of the Treasury Board the charter was renewed, retaining its former powers, but bringing it within the meaning and scope of the Banking Act of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would explain generally what provisions of the General Banking Act are not applied to the bank.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

Mr. BOWELL. According to the note furnished to me by the Deputy Minister, the exceptions apply only to the management and internal economy of the bank—the opening of the books of subscriptions, the transfer and transmission of shares and the payment thereof; the voting of shareholders; the power of shareholders to regulate the management and administration of the bank, with regard to the remuneration of the president, the qualification of directors, the election of directors, etc.; the calling of general meetings of the board of directors, and their quorum; the general powers so far as the management of the bank is concerned, as the making and enforcing of calls, the statement to be laid before the general meeting of shareholders, the inspection of the books, and the declaring of dividends, except that they cannot declare any dividend exceeding eight per cent. unless the rest equals 20 per cent. of the paid-up capital. These are provided for in the original charter of the bank. Otherwise it comes within the provisions of the Canada Banking Act.

Mr. BLAKE. If I rightly recollect, we had to deal exceptionally in the case of the Bank of British North America when dealing with the banks generally, and are these exceptions on the same general line as those we made when we had to deal with any other exceptional case?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say, as I have not looked into that question.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 117) respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.—(Mr. Bowell.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me this is a pretty strong clause. I do not wish to be understood as assenting to it.

Mr. BOWELL. Let it pass on division.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 31) to amend and consolidate the Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1833, and 1884, be read the second time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the hon. gentleman just state generally what these are?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first amendment is only a formal one. At page 9, in clause 4, the words "increase of salary of any clerk or employé" are altered to "increase of salary of any clerk, officer or employé."

Mr. BLAKE. What is the difference?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is no difference. The main amendment is this: That any candidate who has presented himself for examination and had failed to pass should be entitled to receive back copies of his papers, if desired, on payment of a fee. I understood from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that it was objectionable such papers should be communicated, that it would be likely to render the duties of the examiners unpleasant; I said I thought that in examinations before the bar, candidates were entitled to such copies. I was mistaken as regards the present system. At present such papers are not returned at the demand of candidates. I consulted with the members of the Civil Service Board, and it was found that in a certain manner it would be objectionable to adopt a system not fol-

lowed by universities or other bodies. I propose therefore to ask that the House do not concur in this amendment. I move:

That the House do not concur in the third amendment of the Senate, for the reason that, inasmuch as the practice to allowing candidates to get copies of their examination papers, after such examination, would be unusual and contrary to the rules, adopted in universities and other bodies, where similar examinations are required.

Mr. BLAKE. I recollect when my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) was severely lectured by the Secretary of State when he ventured to make the suggestion that the proposed amendment of the Senate was objectionable. The hon. member for North York has his revenge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. member for North York said that never at the bar examinations was such a thing allowed. I said I knew it was allowed, and I ascertained it was allowed, but it is not allowed now. I had no special objection or dislike to the amendment, and I said I did not see any danger in allowing candidates to get back their papers, but to prevent objection and be in accord with the practice of other institutions, I am willing to move that the Senate amendment be not concurred in. There is no revenge to be had, and there is no satisfaction in that revenge.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no more revenge to be had.

Motion agreed to, and amendments concurred in.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASE BILL.

Mr. POPE moved the second reading of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 44) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. POPE. They made an amendment in the other House which I do not think was very necessary, adding after the word "horses" the words "where specially mentioned." I do not think it can do much harm, and it practically makes no difference in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend has ascertained that this practically leaves the measure, so far as horses are concerned, in the same position as it left this House. I had some apprehension that the added words must have some occult meaning, but as the hon. gentleman assures us that there is none, and the Senate asks us to state simply that, where we specially say "horses" we mean horses, we may leave it like the other chips in the porridge.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I am sorry that the Minister accepts the amendment, which I think is very objectionable in view of the almost unanimous vote of this House to strike out the provision in regard to horses.

Mr. POPE. I think it would be better if that were carried out by the Local Governments, some of which have already made arrangements in regard to it, and I have no doubt the others will follow. We must take the responsibility of quarantine and of prohibiting if there is danger.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Oxford seems to think that this makes an alteration in the Bill as it was adopted here, but I understood the Minister to say that it did not.

Mr. POPE. Not the slightest alteration in the world.

Amendments concurred in.

PROOF OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 113) respecting proof of entries in books of account kept by officers of the Crown. He said: The Bill is to provide that copies, on the oath of an officer of any Department, in reference to any entries produced in a court, will be considered as *primâ facie* evidence in either civil or criminal cases. It is to prevent the carrying outside of the Departments before the courts the original registers or books.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman intend to provide that the contents of books can be proved by either one or the other of the officers named in the Bill, or is an officer bound to make the affidavit in each case?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It must be by two persons, one to the effect that the entry was made in the ordinary course in such a book, and that the book is in the custody or the control of the officer, and another witness to show that he has examined the copy with the original and that it is a true copy from such book.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then, in order to establish this piece of evidence from one of the public books, you require to have the evidence of two individuals, the one makes an oath or affidavit that such a book was at the time of the making of the entry one of the ordinary books kept by the officer, that he made the entry, and that the book is still in his custody or control, and the other must be the man who compared the copy with the original. The first must not only have made the entry and have had the book under his control then, but at the time of making the affidavit he must still have the book under his control. But that is not sufficient, for somebody else has to make another affidavit that he has compared the copy with the original entry. Now is that what the hon. gentleman means? Does he mean that in order to establish this piece of evidence he requires two witnesses? Because it is perfectly absurd if he does so. Why should there be any necessity for that? We ought to be able to prove a document, or the entry of a public document, by the certificate of the head of the Department, or the deputy head, that it is a true and correct extract from the book. But under the clause before you, you will never be able to prove the entry in a book by this mode. Suppose, for instance, that the officer is changed from one Department and goes to another. Suppose a clerk in the Department of Finance is transferred to the office of the Secretary of State; he cannot make an affidavit according to sub-section *a*, because, under that section, the man who makes the affidavit requires to be the same person who originally had control of the book, and he requires still to have control of the book. But when the clerk's position is changed in the Department, he does not control the book, therefore he cannot make this affidavit, because, by the absurd way in which this Bill has been drafted, this official must, before he can make the affidavit, have been in control of the books, they must have been in his hands originally when he made the entry, and the book in which he made the entry must be still under his control at the time he makes the affidavit. If the hon. gentleman will adopt the law of Ontario, where extracts from books in the Crown Lands Department and public officers can be established by a certified copy, certified to be a true copy under the hand of the head of the Department or the Deputy head, he will have a feasible mode of attaining his object. But no person will avail himself of such a mode as this in order to prove an entry in one of the public books. It would be far cheaper and better for him to subpœna the clerk of the Department to produce the original document, than to procure the affidavits required by this section. I believe this Bill originated in the Senate; I do not know who had charge of it, but the Senate must have had little to do when they prepared a Bill of this kind. It is the most absurd Bill I ever saw in my life. In Ontario you can have, not only entries in books, but you can prove documents that are filed in the Department, and you can prove the existence of certain other documents by producing extracts of them

certified to be true extracts by the head of the Department. Now, if the hon. gentleman desires to facilitate the mode of proving documents that have been filed in the public Departments, a copy of the entry, or a copy of the document certified to be a copy of the entry or a copy of the document by the head of the Department, ought to be *primâ facie* evidence in any court. The hon. gentleman knows that, especially in the Department of the Interior, some cheaper mode of proving entries in the public books there, and the existence of documents there than now prevails, ought to be adopted. For instance, we require some particular fact to be proved with reference to lands in the North-West Territories, and instead of being able to prove the entries in the public books, as we can in Ontario, by an extract certified under the hand of the head of the Department or his deputy, we require to send witnesses all the way from Ottawa to produce the original documents and to prove the original entry. Now, this Bill evidently contemplates that entries in books kept by the officers of the Crown shall be proved by two affidavits, one to be made by the officer who made the entry originally and who had charge of the book originally and who has charge of the books still, and one by another officer who proves that the copy is a true copy. The hon gentleman will see that that legislation is utterly useless. I dare say the man who had charge of that book ten years ago, in nine cases out of ten, has not charge of it to-day.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That makes no difference.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, it does, under this clause, because sub-section *a* says:

"By the oath or affidavit of an officer of the Crown that such book was at the time of the making of the entry one of the ordinary books kept by such officer and that the entry was made in the usual and ordinary course of business, and that such book is in the custody or control of such officer; and"——

It must be the same officer, the book must still be in his custody and control. But if the book passed out of his control, if the officer has gone into another Department, he cannot under this clause make an affidavit as it is required to be made. The hon. gentleman cannot point to any precedent for this.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand it is copied from the English law.

Mr. CAMERON. I doubt it. I would like to know what law in England it is copied from.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have the document in my Department, and I know this law has been copied from an English law upon the same subject.

Mr. CAMERON. I have been unable to find any English law to serve as a precedent for this legislation, and I have examined the work of Taylor upon Evidence and several other works, and I have been unable to discover where the hon. gentleman found a precedent for this clause of the Bill. I say that the proper plan is to do as they do in Ontario, and permit extracts from public documents, certified by the head or deputy head, to be *primâ facie* evidence of those extracts. I am satisfied that, if the hon. gentleman desires to reach the object he has in view, he will not reach it by this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like some explanation as to the class of cases and circumstances under which it is expected by this Bill to provide for the admissibility of evidence in civil cases. Of course, the Parliament of Canada, having exclusive authority to legislate on the subject of criminal law, with the exception of the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, everything connected with criminal law belongs exclusively to Canada, and therefore the law of evidence in criminal matters belongs to Canada, and therefore, in so far as by this Bill it is proposed to provide for a *primâ facie* admissibility of certain proofs of certain documents in criminal proceedings, I see no objection to it myself But I fail at the moment to observe what the limits are under which the hon. gentleman proposes effectually to provide for the admissibility of evidence in civil proceedings under this Legislature. In so far as under the laws of Canada affecting civil rights, and it is civil proceedings which are mentioned here I presume, although we may be able to constitute a court under our powers for the better administration of our laws, yet I apprehend that everything else must be governed by provincial authority, and we are not competent to provide for anything affecting the organisation of provincial courts, to alter the laws of evidence as they apply to civil cases. I find great difficulty, in consenting to the proposition that we here should alter the laws as to evidence, especially in civil cases. I should like to know, before the hon. gentleman persists in his motion for the second reading, what will be the cases and in what courts it is proposed to apply this measure, because though it appears to be an innocent measure, and it is innocent if it is amended to some extent, I agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) that it seems to be unnecessarily precise and limited in its provisions; but if we are able to provide for the *primâ facie* admissibility of one kind of evidence, we must be able to provide for the *primâ facie* or other admissibility of all other kinds of evidence even in matters of civil proceeding over which we may have legislative concern. As to the latter I do not know what the range of those may be according to the hon. gentleman's view; but it may be that this Parliament may have power to originate a court for the better execution of its own laws without having authority to alter the laws of evidence so far as they apply to questions of civil rights.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think there is something in the objection taken by the hon. gentleman. The Court of Claims, proposed to be established during the present Session of Parliament, would have been a court to try civil actions, and in the prosecution of those cases the evidence to be brought, being evidence concerning accounts kept in the different Departments, might have been brought as provided in this Bill. To what extent, having established courts, which we have undoubtedly power to do to adjudicate upon cases of a civil nature, can we at the same time legislate about the procedure for the taking of evidence or make laws affecting evidence in those courts, that is a question to be considered, and there may be something in the objection taken although I do not see if at this moment. I have enquired from my colleague who conducted the measure in the Senate, whether the affidavit of the officer keeping the books at the time the copy of the entry is wanted, and who would have succeeded the officer who had made the entry, was the only affidavit needed. It stands to reason that the officer succeeding the officer who had made the entry should be allowed to make the affidavit that such a book was kept in the Department and kept by such officer. The Bill provides that besides the evidence of the officer keeping the book, another affidavit shall be required from another person stating that he has examined the copy of the entry in the book, and that it is a faithful copy. I presume that the same party may make an affidavit containing both allegations. I ask leave of the House to withdraw my motion, because I should not like to volunteer any opinion immediately on the point as to whether we could regulate the laws of evidence in cases of a civil nature, even if we had the right to provide for a tribunal to adjudicate upon civil matters.

Motion for second reading withdrawn.

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION.

Mr. POPE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 126) to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the

Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. Minister any further information to furnish in respect of the preparations made?

Mr. POPE. Space has been obtained, and the exhibits at Antwerp will soon be brought over. We find that people are much more willing to send their exhibits to the London exhibition than they were to Antwerp, and many who declined to send to the latter have signified their intention of sending goods to London. The space acquired is 54,000 square feet in a very prominent position. As I stated before, the work done for the Antwerp exhibition was also done for the London exhibition, so far as sending exhibits is concerned. That is all that has been done up to this time with respect to the London exhibition. As I explained to the hon. gentleman, that exhibition is going on very well, as I am informed by those attending it, and the number of exhibits far exceeded what we thought we would be able to get in the short space of time at our disposal, considering also that some exhibitors seemed indisposed to exhibit at that place.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is gratifying to know that the Antwerp exhibition is likely to prove a greater success than was hoped for, especially as the work was undertaken on short notice, and there were grave fears for its success. I think it is important that these exhibitions should be made a great success, and as there is ample time to supplement the Antwerp exhibition, and as I am sure Parliament will be glad to vote the money, I trust the Minister will see that every effort is made to make the other exhibition a success. I would not like to say that I have any doubt that the Minister will exercise his full powers in that direction, and I think a little extra effort to bring our country as prominently before the country as possible, is well worth being made.

Mr. POPE. I quite agree with the hon. gentlema , and I think it is important that we should have a first rate exhibition in London and I think we shall have one. I think perhaps we can be a little more economical than we sometimes have been, and still have a good exhibition. Experience ought to teach us something, and without complaining at what was done at former exhibitions, I hope that these two exhibitions will not perhaps cost us more than the one at Paris.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act 43 Vic., chap. 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend from time to time certain provisions of the said Act, be discharged. He said: I find that a previous Act gives the powers necessary, without passing this Act.

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman did not know what authority he had with reference to his own Department before now, how in the world is he going to know his authority when he assumes the duties of Acting Minister of the Interior?

Mr. McLELAN. I have acquired that knowledge before becoming Acting Minister. I might say that after examining into the matter with my deputy and the Law Clerk it was ascertained that an Act passed by the late Sir Albert Smith was sufficient for all we required.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882. He said: This Act is simply to provide for another class of engineers, called fourth-class engineers, to those already provided for. We find that there are a number of men needed who have not the qualification of the third-class, and that it is important that they should be included. I may say that prior to the Act of 1882, a fourth-class was provided for, but in the latter Act they were omitted.

Mr. BLAKE. Then this simply restores the law to its former condition?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The amendment was in the wrong direction?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, the steamboat inspectors considered that only three classes were necessary, but it has since been found that the fourth class are required.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Is the provision now inserted substantially the same as the law prior to 1882?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. I wish to add some words to the first clause in the fifth sub-section of the present Act. After the word "steamboat," in the 14th line, the words, "requiring under such Act a certificated engineer." Under the Inspection Act, freight vessels of less than 150 tons, not carrying passengers, are not compelled to have a certificated engineer, and this might shut the fourth-class out.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not suppose it could be construed that a fourth-class engineer should be prevented from acting on a steamboat on which any other person might act as engineer. There can be no harm done, I suppose.

Mr. EDGAR. Would that exclude a fourth-class engineer from acting on the smallest description of vessels.

Mr. McLELAN. I want to provide that it shall be so construed as not to prevent them from acting on such vessels.

Mr. EDGAR. On what classes of vessels will they act?

Mr. McLELAN. Tug-boats, pleasure yachts, and boats carrying freight under 150 tons are not compelled to have certificated engineers.

Mr. EDGAR. Then the only difference between a fourth-class engineer and one who is not an engineer at all is that he is permitted to act as second engineer on these large vessels.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to amend this by striking the word "marine" out of the 20th line. That is, to make the service in any steam engine shop sufficient. There are not many marine engine shops in this country, and it is considered sufficient if the engineer serves the required length of time in any steam engine shop.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is section 36 repealed?

Mr. McLELAN. The copy on which I have been working does not contain this section, and I move that it be struck out.

Bill reported,

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 134) respecting the Liquor License Act, 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret the hon. gentleman has not specified clearly the portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883 which the court declared to be *ultra vires*. I could not do so in the motion I submitted; I simply took the general phraseology the hon. gentleman has adopted. A good deal of difficulty and doubt will necessarily arise under the operation of the Bill. For instance, it has been held by some courts in the Dominion, that a portion of the Act of 1883 supersedes the Act of 1878, especially that portion relating to prosecutions for violations of the law. That question ought to be settled beyond reasonable doubt. Either the clause in the Act of 1883 should be continued or that in the Act of 1878 should be repealed. There are other questions of great gravity which necessarily come up for discussion here. I propose to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to one or two. The hon. gentleman has authorised a Board of License Commissioners to enforce the law this year. In Huron, which is a Scott Act county, having adopted the Act by a majority of 1,600, the board undertook to enforce the Act. The hon. gentleman in the Act of 1878 provided that in counties where it was adopted liquor could be sold for certain purposes only, medicinal, art and manufacturing, and only on the certificate of the proper authority. The sale of liquor cannot be effected without a license obtained from the board, and if my memory serves me right the board have the power to license either a druggist or some other vendor. In the Act of 1883, there is a provision, I think section 84, enabling a druggist to sell without license or certificate up to a certain quantity, six ounces, and to sell any quantity above that with the necessary certificate. The intention was that in Scott Act counties there should be no liquor sold for medicinal, art or manufacturing purposes except by the druggist where one could be obtained. In the town of Goderich there are four druggists, three of whom applied for a license to sell liquor, under the Temperance Act, but the commissioners refused to give a license to any of them, and licensed instead two tavern keepers, not the best in the county. In the village of Dungannon with a population of 200, licenses were given to two old tavern keepers. In Clinton licenses were given to two tavern keepers; in Seaforth licenses were given to a wholesale whiskey dealer and a tavern keeper. In Exeter, to a wholesale whiskey dealer. Throughout the county of Huron, which has three, four or five druggists in each town and a drugist in every village, the Board of License Commissioners refused to license a single druggist. But on the other hand, they licensed in each case the old tavern keepers. That is simply an outrage in a Scott Act county. If the board have the right to act thus under the law, the hon. gentleman ought to amend the law and confine the sale of intoxicating liquors, in Scott Act counties, to the druggists, where there are druggists in the municipality; if there are none, of course there would be no option but to license somebody else. It is clear, however, that no one contemplated that the people who would be licensed to sell liquor would be tavern keepers. We have a tavern keeper in the town of Goderich, who keeps his tavern away from the business part of the town, so that an individual who went to a druggist to get a prescription on a doctor's certificate could not, if intoxicants were prescribed, get his prescription completed at a druggists, but would have to travel to the docks, a mile distant, to this tavern keeper's place who sells liquor. I trust the hon. gentleman will make some amendment by which outrages of the kind could no longer be perpetrated. I do not suppose that he knew anything about these matters, but the facts are as I have stated. If my memory serves me aright, only two licensed druggists are allowed in towns, two for every 4,000 inhabitants in cities, and one in each other municipality; yet in the village of Dungannon, with only 200 people, there are two men selling liquor. Liquor cannot be obtained except on a medical certificate, but these are obtained by wholesale sometimes. One medical man in my county gave certificates so freely that the hon. gentleman's own Board of License Commissioners had to notify tavern keepers to whom they had given a license that they were not to accept the certificates of this doctor, because liquor instead of being vended by retail under his certificate was being vended by wholesale. I knew of the case of a person who went to this doctor to obtain a pint for medicinal purposes, and he gave him a certificate for a gallon, and it was only when the man went to the liquor vendor that he found out he had the certificate for the larger quantity. This shows the necessity to confine the sale of liquor to the druggists in the locality. There is not so much danger of the law being violated where the vending of liquor is confined to the druggists. They are generally men of respectability, and they have an interest in keeping up that respectability; but, if you allow the ordinary tavern keepers to sell liquor, as they are permitted to do in my own county, it is better to repeal the Scott Act at once and have no liquor license law at all.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to see that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is getting some light on this subject, even though at a late date. When the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act was before the House, the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) and myself endeavored to get a clause introduced to allow druggists to dispense liquor for medicinal purposes only. I drew attention to the fact that, though there might be one or more druggists in the place, a license might be granted to a tavern keeper or some other person, and the druggist might not be allowed to dispense liquor at all, and I said I thought it better to confine the dispensing to druggists or medical men, and to so amend the law that others should not have the opportunity of selling it. I think the member for West Huron voted against that amendment, giving that power to druggists.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). They have it now.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I do not understand that they have it or will have it. A number of the hon. gentleman's political friends contended that it was impossible for any violation of the law to occur under the Bill then proposed to the House. I contended that it was possible and very probable. Now, the same thing is coming to light that was predicted would come to light, and the same evils have arisen that it was predicted would arise. I think it is very important that such a change should be made. It must be evident that, if the right to sell for medicinal purposes is given to a hotel keeper, he is very likely to violate the law, because he has the opportunity of keeping liquor about the premises; but if it were confined to druggists to dispense in small quantities on the prescription of a physician, it is not so likely that the law will be violated or that any great amount of liquor will be sold other than is required for medicinal purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to the facts which my hon. friend

has brought under his notice as to the administration of the law in the county of Huron. If these facts are correctly stated, as I have no doubt they are, it appears to me that the First Minister should take action in the matter, and should cause the commissioners to be replaced by persons who will attend to their duties better. Similar complaints, have been made to me, and, although I do not possess the personal knowledge which my hon. friend does, still I have no doubt, from the character of my correspondents, that very grave abuses indeed have taken place; and, as in this large county the Act was passed by a majority vote, I think, of 2,000 strong, it is a very gross outrage that the Act should be so abused as my hon. friend has stated. I quite understand that the attention of the Government cannot hitherto have been called to this, but it is now called to it, and I think the hon. gentleman ought to make a note of it, and ought to overhaul or cause to be overhauled the doings of these commissioners.

Mr. FISHER. There are two points in this Bill which I think will have to be discussed before the Bill goes further. One is the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act by the Boards of License Commissioners appointed under this License Act. In my county, which is a strong temperance county, the License Commissioners are not nearly so much inclined to temperance as is the county. I know they have given licenses for the sale of liquor for medicinal purposes in three out of the five municipalities in the county to hotel keepers, and I am informed that the result is that it will be almost impossible to prevent the sale of liquors in quantities not contemplated by the medical certificate. It is easy to see that, if a hotel keeper is allowed to keep liquor for medicinal purposes, it will be practically impossible to prevent his selling it to his guests. In that way we are practically deprived of the power under the Scott Act to search the house, and to throw the onus of proof on the owner of the liquor, that he has not been selling it for drinking purposes. I think the hon. gentleman from Grey has misunderstood the drift of the remarks of my hon. friend from Huron. The discussion is not as to whether druggists should sell liquor in consequence of their being druggists, but whether these special licenses which are given to one individual in each country municipality for selling liquor for medicinal purposes should be given to people who are inclined to enforce the Scott Act and to act in sympathy with its spirit, or to persons who are likely to try to prevent the Act being carried out. I regret to say that in many instances the commissioners appointed under this Dominion License Act are not in sympathy with the spirit of the Scott Act, and in Scott Act counties, instead of trying to carry out the Scott Act as it was intended to be carried out, they are trying in every way in their power to defeat it. In my own county it happens that the warden, the only member of the Board of Commissioners who is under the control of the people, is a good temperance man, and I know he has done his utmost to have the Act carried out, but unfortunately the other members of the board are not what I can call good temperance men, and the result is what I have described. There is another matter of greater importance still in connection with this Bill. My hon. friend from Huron has alluded to the judgment of the Supreme Court in connection with the Liquor License Act, and I find in that judgment the following:—

"Except also in so far as the clauses of the said Act respectively relate to the carrying into effect of the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878."

These clauses of the Dominion License Act, which are not *ultra vires* according to the decision of the Supreme Court, are not specified, and it is a little difficult, I think even for a lawyer and certainly for a layman, to find out which clauses are *intra vires* and which are *ultra vires*. I am particularly interested in clause 145 of the Dominion License Act. The right hon. gentleman will remember that this clause has already occasioned some little discussion in this House. This took place when the amendments to the Scott Act were before the House and the repeal of this clause was proposed. That Act provided that this 145th clause, which the temperance people feared would create a good deal of confusion in carrying out the Scott Act, should be repealed. In consequence of the fate of that Bill so far, I am not sure whether it will become law. I understand that the other day, when the Bill to which I refer came back from the Senate with some amendments, my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) asked the Government to name a day when the amendments could be considered, and the Government took no notice, as I am informed, of that request. At the present stage of the Session I suppose it would be rather difficult for this Bill, being in the hands of a private member, to be reached and carried through the House unless the Government will promise to facilitate its progress in the same way as it was facilitated in its earlier stages. If that Bill becomes law, as I said before—which I am afraid will not be the case—this 145th section will be repealed. But, Sir, I believe that in this Bill of the hon. gentleman we have a very easy method of accomplishing that object, irrespective of the Scott Act Amendment Bill, and if the hon. gentleman will just add a clause to this Bill stating that the 145th clause of the Liquor License Act of 1883 shall be repealed, he will accomplish that object specifically.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question has already been dealt with during this Session.

Mr. FISHER. It may be that it cannot be done. I have not had sufficient parliamentary experience to know what steps are open for us to take; but if that can be done by addition to this Bill, I would be glad indeed if the right hon. gentleman would take it upon himself to move that addition. I know the other Bill passed through this House repeals the clause to which I refer, although in consequence of other amendments it may not become law. Still, there has been a very decided expression of opinion in this House upon that point, and if there is any way, according to the procedure of this House, by which this clause can be repealed by the present Bill, I think we would be obtaining the result aimed at by the people and approved by a large majority of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill has only the one object of suspending the operation of the Liquor License Act until the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is obtained. That committee has entertained the appeal and it will be disposed of, I presume, in the course of this season. This Bill, which is in effect the resolution introduced by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) carries with it the suspension of the Act until it is known what may be the ultimate fate of the measure known as the McCarthy Act. The hon. gentleman suggests that this clause should be more specific in stating what portions of the Liquor License Act shall be suspended. Well, I think it is better to leave it as it is. The answer of the Supreme Court here will speak for itself, but it is better that it should be in general terms in this clause, rather than that we should select from that very short answer and state our idea of what portions that have been suspended. The remarks of the hon. member for Huron about the abuses under this Act, have reached me and have reached my colleagues, for the first time. Any such abuse as he states must be dealt with, but I do not suppose it can be dealt with in this Bill. I never heard before that there could be such a total disregard of the spirit of the Act. The hon. gentleman says that a doctor, not a tavern keeper, gave a certificate for a gallon when a pint would do for medicinal purposes. That man must be an allopath, and he is resolved not to give homœopathic

doses. With respect to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) that a clause should be introduced repealing a clause in a Bill that has already passed this House, I fear that is impossible. The House have not dealt, and we cannot deal, with that specifically. However, that question will more properly arise when the hon. gentleman carries out his intention of moving an additional clause in committee; and I have no doubt the House will consider the point and will listen to the ruling of the Speaker upon the point, whether it is within our power to repeat in another Act what has been stated in an Act of the same Parliament. I am not at all sure about the point, but certainly we could not act adversly to this clause, and perhaps we may have power in a subsequent Act to repeal an enactment which we have previously adopted. In the meantime I hope the House will read the Bill a second time.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that the clause which my hon. friend very properly introduced, as it is to be a resolution on which a Bill might be based, would be very much improved by some further parliamentary specification of what portions of the Act are to be suspended. But even if it is to remain in its present brief form I think we ought to insert a declaration more pointedly of what the Supreme Court has declared by their short answer—perhaps by a schedule to the Act. It ought not to be a subject of doubt, or of explanation, or of enquiry in any of the numerous courts in which this question may arise. And when you say: We now leave to the judges who are the interpreters of the law—as we have given them what the declaration of the Supreme Court is we have given them a suspensory clause—and it is for them to interpret what that means, and instead of saying "it shall be suspended" it is better to state "is hereby suspended." I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that very early in this Session I moved for correspondence with respect to the different License Commissioners and the instructions given them. That return has not been brought down; and yet we are now called upon to consider a suspensory clause. I hope that before we proceed with the measure much further the hon. gentleman will bring down the information so that hon. members can see what is going on as to the administration of the Act and the instructions that have been given. A circular was issued by some of the commissioners, making certain declarations, apparently on the part of the Government, that the Act would be enforced after a certain time; in fact giving a sort of notice to those who wanted licenses to apply and obtain them or certain penalties would be imposed. The hon. First Minister gave notice some time ago of certain amendments which he would move in committee—either the hon. gentleman or the Minister of Inland Revenue gave notice of a long string of amendments.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not.

Mr. BLAKE. We have been otherwise engaged so that these matters have somewhat passed out of our recollection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find I did give notice of amendments, I had quite forgotten the fact.

Mr. BLAKE. We might have some explanation as to those amendments.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen opposite have so absorbed my attention with their able amendments on the Franchise Bill that other matters have been somewhat lost sight of. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it would be well to have the question of the judgment of the Supreme Court by way of recital to the Bill before it is passed through committee. Unfortunately, and I think it is unfortunate, the decision was given shortly and without reasons. Although it was in one sense a constitutional reference to the Supreme Court in another sense it was a statutory reference, and it was said the decision would be final, unless it was afterwards submitted and adjudicated upon by the Privy Council. The whole question is more in the way of a judgment than of answers to a question. The statute evidently contemplated that it was to be a *quasi*-judgment, and there was to be an appeal from it. There cannot well be an appeal from a question asked by the Crown for the information of the Crown. We are in some degree in fault in being absolutely ignorant of the reasons which actuated the judges in answering the question as they did. That somewhat hampers us in pointing out in what respect the judgment of the Supreme Court affects the McCarthy Act. However, when we go into Committee of the Whole I will consider this point, and also reconsider the resolution of which I have given notice.

Bill read the second time.

CENTRAL PRISON OF ONTARIO.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act respecting the Central Prison for the Province of Ontario. He said: This is a Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice in another place after communicating with the Government of Ontario, and it speaks for itself. It gives power to the provincial authorities to act in the manner signified.

Bill read the second time, considered in committee reported and read the third time and passed.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Bill (No. 130) respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada be withdrawn and the Order discharged.

Bill withdrawn and Order discharged.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament. He said: This measure was very fully discussed on the resolutions on which the Bill is founded, and I shall therefore content myself with moving the second reading.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will not take the committee stage I shall not object, but I am anxious to have some discussion in committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Bill read the second time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE FORCE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:

"That it is expedient that the Governor in Council should be empowered from time to time to authorize the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police to increase the present number of constables to one thousand men, and to appoint from among them non-commissioned officers of different grades, and to appoint supernumerary constables not to exceed in the whole twenty men, and to employ, not to exceed in the whole, fifty men as scouts; and that such constables and scouts should be paid the same rates of pay as now authorized by Law for the present force.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has at no time given any explanation of this measure. It would seem to me that before going into committee something ought to be said upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This resolution is in effect to double the force. It will be remembered that this measure was not introduced in consequence of the late outbreak in the North-West—I may say the present outbreak, though I hope that we will soon be able to speak of it in the past tense. It was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, as

it was found that the increased work thrown on the Mounted Police was such that the duties could not be performed. The men were broken up in small detachments scattered over many thousands of miles. They were watching the frontier, and with the perpetual increase of population there came perpetually more harassing duties which it was found to be too much for them to perform. When this force was first formed the country was comparatively unsettled, and the duties of the policemen were principally confined to watching the movements of the Indian tribes, and keeping the peace in the vicinity of the reserves. They performed that duty very efficiently, but still the duty was an easy one in comparison with what is required of them now, as there is a large mixed population and a long frontier for them to guard. Along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and between that line and the boundary, there is now a large and rapidly increasing population, with flocks and herds; there are men with considerable herds of cattle and horses as well. Along that frontier to the south of the line I am sorry to say that there is a regularly organised system by which people cross the line and steal horses especially, and everything which can walk except the bipeds themselves—the owners of the stock. Everything else is fair game to these raiders. I believe there is a very gratifying contrast between the law-abiding condition of our people north of the line and the lawlessness which prevails on the southern frontier, but still our own people are not altogether blameless. There are occasional complaints coming from the American Government of raids or forays across our own line to the United States, and the carrying off of cattle. In consequence, however, of the different system prevailing in Canada from that in the United States, the injury done to the inhabitants south of the border is not at all equal to what we suffer. From the fact that the force employed along the line in the United States is a military force they are altogether helpless, and can do no service unless called out specially in aid of the civil authorities. If cattle or horses are stolen and taken across the line into the United States, they must be followed by the owners, who must go to a magistrate—a western magistrate at that—some of whom have peculiar notions of *meum et tuum*, and who require to get their fees, and very considerable fees, and are obliged to have a regular trial, with an examination and information on oath, before a magistrate. The cattle in the meantime may disappear, may not be held; and the American military force, although exceedingly anxious to do their duty and to put down this state of things, may see this whole thing go on before their eyes, without being able to do anything unless they are called on by the magistracy to come in aid of the civil law. The consequence is that when there is a raid into Canada, getting back the property is a very difficult and expensive matter, and in a great many cases the pursuit has to be given up, because there is not a ready and efficient means such as we have in the Mounted Police. Our police having military organisation and being armed men, and every police officer being a magistrate, the moment there is any reasonable belief that a herd of cattle, or an animal or animals, come across the line, that have been taken away from their owners, they do not hesitate at once to act, and to act most efficiently; and they restore the stolen property to the owners without any litigation except by the officer in command of the detachment. The Americans have again and again acknowledged the superiority of our system. The force has been very efficient in that regard; but with the increase of population surging up to the line to the south of us, and with the increase of our herds of stock, both of cattle and horses, the duties of the police come to be very harassing, besides the normal duty of acting as policemen in keeping the peace in our portions of the North-West. In consequence of the increasing demand for their services, some years ago the force was increased from 300 to 500; but it is found that it is now quite insufficient, and the police are to a considerable degree demoralised by being scattered in small parties. They are, therefore, not being able to keep up to that habit of drill and discipline which, if they were kept together in large numbers, they would have the advantage of. Besides, it has been found that the duties are so excessively severe that after a very short period of service the men wish to leave the force, that is, the strain on them, physically and otherwise, is so great that they desire to leave the force whenever they can do so legally. The applications for discharge, even though they have to pay a considerable sum of money in making them, are numerous. Their duties are very fatiguing and harassing; they have a great deal of night work in pursuing trails, and following horse thieves and such like, and the men become weary of the force. So much has this been the case that twice the Government have raised the purchase money of the discharge in order to prevent the force becoming altogether depleted by the men leaving just as soon as they become efficient—because they must acquire some experience before they are efficient. Of course, during the late events the purchase of discharge has been inoperative. That this additional force will be required I am satisfied, and we came to that conclusion without referring at all to the necessities which have arisen in our unhappy experience during the last two months. I move that you do now leave the Chair.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a very gratifying indication of the growing greatness of the Dominion that the proposition now brought before our consideration should be treated as a minor matter. It is a proposition involving a permanent charge, it capitalised at the rate at which the hon. gentleman proposes by the other resolutions on the paper to raise money, equivalent to about $20,000,000. That we should deal with that as one of the unconsidered trifles that should be disposed of among a number of others to-day is a very pleasing proof of our growing greatness and prosperity. Our mounted police at present consists of 500 men. It is proposed to increase the force by 570 men, including 20 supernumeraries and 50 recruits, being an increase of 114 per cent. The expenditure on the Mounted Police for this year is I think about $427,000; the expenditure for the previous year was considerably larger; and I think we may fairly assume about $450,000 to be the normal cost at present prices of 500 men, according to our experience up to to-day. The addition to our expenditure on that scale for the 570 men would amount to $513,000, making a total proposed expenditure on the Mounted Police of very close on $1,000,000 a year, the increase of $513,000 at 4 per cent. being equivalent to about $13,000,000 of capital. The hon. gentleman in the few remarks which he thought were all that were requisite in order to induce the favorable consideration of the House to this proposal, stated that it was not in any sense due to the outbreak in the North-West, and in proof of that statement he referred to the Speech from the Throne, which he said indicated that the proposal was then intended. Well, I think there is a reference to the Mounted Police in the Speech from the Throne, but I do not think it is extremely precise; I think it would be very difficult indeed to apprehend from that reference that it was proposed to more than double the strength of the force. The reference in the Speech is this:

"Several other measures of importance will be submitted to you; among them will be Bills to amend the Insurance Act of 1877, the Civil Service Act, and the law relating to contagious diseases among cattle, as well as measures for taking, at an early period, a census of the

population of the North-West Territories, and one relating to the North-West Mounted Police."

Whether it had to do with drill or discipline or pay, or with the rules of the force, or whether it had to do with more than doubling the strength of the force, were things that were left entirely undefined by this diplomatic reference in the Speech from the Throne. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has accurately stated the fact that it was proposed to increase the North-West Mounted Police before the Session commenced, and that irrespective altogether of circumstances attending the outbreak. That statement makes the proposal all the more alarming, because, if it were thought necessary, for the peace and security of the North-West before the outbreak, to more than double the Mounted Police, we are face to face with the question, what are the proposals, upon the whole, which will be necessary for the country after the outbreak? They may not, I presume they will not, involve any further increase for the Mounted Police, but it is impossible to dissociate from each other the various proposals which are required for securing peace, order and good government in that Territory, in the way, whether of a semi-military, semi-civil force as the Mounted Police, or of our militia, which is a mainly a force also used for the purpose of repression of minor disturbances, and in that sense acts, to a certain extent, in a constabulary or almost civil form. It is impossible to dissociate the consideration of these two questions; they are, in fact, one question; and therefore, if this proposal in its entirety, as it is now presented to us, was a proposal which was to be brought forward entirely irrespective of the outbreak, I repeat the question: What is to be the scheme of the Government on the whole with reference to the North-West, having regard to that not unimportant fact the outbreak? I admit the hon. gentleman has long, too long deferred the consideration of this proposal, but I think, under the circumstances, he might have deferred it a little longer. I think, when it was proposed to more than double the strength of the force, it was the duty of the First Minister, who happens to be the Minister specially charged with the force, to have brought down the annual report, to have given the House and the country the valuable information we will assume, from former reports, this report will contain, of the general operations of the force for the year. And I think that the more, because I well recollect that in 1882, when the hon. gentleman proposed an increase of this force, he depended largely on these reports, and he referred to copious extracts from these very reports as his just vindication for that course. Although we are now past the usual term of Session, although we are at the 9th of June, the report for the Mounted Police is not yet brought down; and a detailed enquiry being made to the hon. gentleman as to when the report was dated, when it reached him, and so forth, he is conveniently ignorant of what these dates are, and he says there has been an oversight in the Department. I wonder how many oversights there have been in the Departments in connection with the North-West? I wonder what oversight there has been which prevented us, in this critical period, when the report of the Mounted Police would have been very interesting reading, if we had it, from having the benefit of the information to be derived from the perusal of the report. He indeed, consoled us, by telling it was in galley, and being in galley we might expect it shortly. The report is in galley, and some of the hon. gentlemen's officers ought to be in the galleys for its being there. The proposal of the Government was no doubt very well considered; the previous proposal was no doubt well considered; it was a thoroughly matured proposal, a proposal which had been deliberated on for a long time, and with respect to which the Government have reached conclusions based upon a careful consideration of the exigencies of the situation. How do I prove that? How am I able to give the hon. gentleman that meed of praise? Why it is by the Votes and Proceedings, from which I find that on the 7th April the hon. gentleman put a notice on the paper to increase this force to 800 men with 20 supernumeraries and 20 scouts. That was the matured proposal of the Government which on the 7th April they proposed to submit to Parliament for its adoption. Within a week after that the hon. gentleman brought down another proposal to increase the strength of the force to 1,000 men and 20 supernumeraries and 50 scouts; or an addition of 30, 2½ times as many scouts, and of 200 men, two-thirds as many men in addition to that which he had proposed a few days before. I think a little explanation was due the House of these two notices; I think, when the hon. gentleman told us on the 7th April that his views on the exigencies of the situation in the North-West, after careful and mature deliberation, were that we required in all 840 men, and when he now asks us to arrange for 1,070 instead, we ought to have had a little explanation upon what the hon. gentleman's earlier and his later, his very little later, estimates were based. What was the ground he took when he decided upon 840 men, and what circumstances occurred to modify his opinion between the 7th April and a few days later, when he brought down the proposal for 1,070 men? We ought to know now upon what ground these figures are based. We must assume, when he made the statement in the Speech from the Throne, which he now tells us had reference to an increase of the Mounted Police, that it had reference to this measure to increase it to 840 men in all, and as that measure continued unchanged from the 29th January, when we met, until the 7th April, when he put the notice on the paper, we want to know what, between that and the 10th or 11th of April, brought about a change in his opinions and led him, in his judgment, to propose an addition of 230 more men, in round numbers, very nearly twice as many as he had proposed in the first instance. When I look at the varying figures and different proposals, when I consider the very short difference of time in which the hon. gentleman's mind was changed, there is, to speak seriously, evidence of haste or evidence of some new and strong and powerful consideration affecting the hon. gentleman's mind, which led him to believe that his proposal of the 7th April was so wholly inadequate that he was obliged to drop it from the notice paper without further consideration and modify that proposal by nearly doubling it. I think another observation is fit to be made in this same connection. I enquired of the hon. gentleman, having seen in the newspapers that recruiting was going on, a little while ago, whether the number recruited was in excess of the number authorised by law, and if so how many. I think he answered me it was about 230 men in excess of the number authorised by law. Now, I am not one of those who are at all disposed, when a great emergency exists, to criticise the conduct of a Government which acts, but acts properly and accurately within the maxim *salus populi suprema lex*; but at the time the hon. gentleman was making these arrangements, Parliament was in Session, those who had power to give him authority to do this lawfully were here. He had made his proposals, he had laid them on the Table, he had the conduct and control of the business of the House and the Parliament. It was for him to decide what measures it was urgent to bring first before the consideration of Parliament, what legal authorities it was requisite for him to obtain in the interests of the country. He asked us to take no steps in this measure, he did not give us even the opportunity to vote, he did not ask the vote of the House upon it; in fact he made possible no debate or consideration upon it, but having put the notice on the paper, he proceeds coolly to violate the law by enlisting two hundred and thirty men in excess of his lawful authority to send to the North-West and he caused them to go. And I think it is a very serious question what the position of those men was—men enlisted without the authority of

law and in excess of the powers that the law gave. I say that the hon. gentleman's duty to Parliament and the respect that he ought to owe to Parliament indicated an entirely different course, and that his duty was not to violate the law, not to act in excess of the law unless necessity quired. There was no necessity, because we were here, prepared to listen to the hon. gentleman's proposals. We proceeded with other Bills certainly of minor consequence. We passed a Bill, and His Excellency came down and gave the Royal Assent to it, to appoint a gentleman to fill your chair in cases of emergency. That was done, but the enlistment without the authority of law of 230 men was not thought of sufficient consequence to propose to us for legislation, and to invite the three branches of the legislature so to act that the law might not be violated. I say, therefore, that in this respect the hon. gentleman has too long deferred bringing before the House the consideration of this question. When the hon. gentleman does bring it before us, he brings it with explanations extremely inadequate. As far as I could gather, it is a question of flocks and herds, it is a question which the hon. gentleman has put before us of proper protection to the ranches and those who have placed stock upon the ranches in the southern portion of those territories; and a few words upon that subject and upon the difficulties that we have with reference to the people on the border, and the horse thieves and cattle thieves who take the cattle across, and the greater difficulty that our people have in obtaining restoration of their cattle, are deemed sufficient to warrant a proposal for the increase of the annual expenditure of the country by a sum exceeding half a million of dollars. This is the hon. gentleman's explanation; this is the stress of his statement. Surely some further statement was required. Surely, when the hon. gentleman's own proposals a few weeks ago were so much less than those now submitted, some further statement, some further detail, some further explanation, some further calculation and elaboration on this subject were required before the House should be asked to take even this step on this occasion. Turn back to 1882. At that time the force was only 500 men; it is now to be increased to very nearly 1,100; it is now to be very nearly quadrupled, and that in a very few years. What were the statements which, in the year 1882, were made when we were asked to make this increase? On what grounds did the hon. gentleman then propose it? On what grounds did he advocate it? What difficulties were suggested to him, what proposals were made to him, and what were the expectations he held out to the House and to the country as to a further increase or an approaching diminution of this force? The hon. gentleman brought up the subject on the 24th March, 1882, now just three years ago, and he said:

"It is found, however, that its strength is overtaxed. Again and again the commissioner in charge of the force has represented that they are insufficient for the duties demanded of them, especially on the frontier, where, on more than one occasion, there has been great hazard of a collision with large forces of hungry and, therefore, discontented Indians. By a mixture of courage and discretion, these occasions have passed by without collision; yet I need not remind the committee of the continuous danger which exists of collision, and the necessity of endeavoring to avoid it by all means in our power. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that the strong pressure brought to bear on the Government and on Parliament by the officers in command should result in an increase in the force. So long as the Indians were alone with a few Government officials and persons of a superior class, they were kept under control; but that control is passing away, as it has passed away in the United States, with the influx into the country of persons of all ranks and all degrees of intelligence and morals; and, as in the Western States, there is great danger—happily we have avoided it hitherto,—of collision between the Indians and the white settler going in there and thinking that he can treat these wild sons of the prairie as he would a fellow white man. The commissioner has reported again and again on that point."

Then he proceeds to read, not the report of the commissioner but some other references as to the dangers of collisions with the Indian tribes.

"It is well known, says the hon. gentleman, resuming his own argument, that, while there has been no actual outbreak, while through combined courage and discretion an outbreak has been prevented, yet, I regret to say, on two or three occasions the forces of Indians were so overwhelming and their conduct so threatening to the handful of police that, *ex necessitate*, they were obliged to yield to the demands, sometimes insolently and arrogantly, with the consciousness of power pressed upon them by the starving Indians surrounding them, of course, the less these facts are known the better, but I take the responsibility of stating, on the part of the Government, that they believe it is absolutely necessary to increase this force."

Then my hon. friend the member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) alluded to the very topic which the hon. gentleman has brought up to-day as the ground for doubling up the force. My hon. friend from Huron said:

"In connection with this, I might say it is quite clear that very great care will have to be taken in granting pasturage lands to the numerous candidates now applying for them. It is a very serious element in consideration of the policy of granting those lands, if a force of troops should be required for the purpose of protecting cattle on the ranches; and I think, for that reason and others, that very considerable care will have to be exercised in granting the numerous applications which are being made for those pasturage lands. I do not in the least degree object to such portions of the country suited to the purpose being applied for, although it is provided that the Government retains the right of retaining portions of the land if found fit for agricultural purposes; but I think it would be an extraordinary course if we should place ranches in the midst of more or less turbulent tribes, who will be more tempted to commit depredations on cattle placed before their eyes than on any other form of property."

The First Minister did not then think the cattle ranch question had much to do with the matter, for he said, in reply to my hon. friend:

"I feel very glad to have an opportunity of speaking on those points, although the subject of cattle ranches is not immediately germane to the motion before the committee."

But you have heard how germane it was; you hear how germane it is; because it is the cattle ranches he has brought forward as the principal reason for increasing the force, which was then 300, to about 1,100 men. He went on to discuss the question, and he pointed out his notable scheme for exchanging the Indian's Winchesters for fowling pieces; and, after a while, I took leave to make some suggestions which I think are of very considerable consequence, which were then so regarded, and upon which I think it is absolutely necessary we should now touch, in order that we may understand what is the policy and what is to be the policy of the country with reference to the means that are to be taken for the preservation of peace, order and good government in the North-West. I said:

"Taking all these circumstances into consideration, the advantages thus secured are entirely overbalanced by the other changes in circumstances, so that the force requires to be nearly doubled, and here the situation becomes serious. The hon. gentleman says we must nearly double the force. I do not know what that may mean, but it seems to me impossible to set the limits of it. On a former occasion the hon. gentleman has said that we must feed the Indians in order to keep them quiet, and it now turns out that we must keep up the mounted police in order to keep the white men quiet. I do not know how far the proposed operation of the hon. gentleman with these guileless children of the prairies may be succes-ful. He says he thinks he will induce them, with his well known powers of persuasion, and there is no doubt he has been able to exert great influence over persons much more astute than the children of the prairies, and some of whom I have the pleasure of looking upon at this moment—I say I do not know how far this great power of persuasion may be successful with them. He says he may have convinced them that fowling pieces are necessary, but the observations he has just made indicates that he expects occasions to arise when the Indians may be supposed to pursue the larger portion of mounted policemen, and when that comes I have no doubt the Winchester rifles would be an arm much more satisfactory than that which the hon. gentlemen proposes to present them with. I therefore, do not expect to hear next year of any extensive exchange made of Winchester rifles for fowling pieces, unless the hon. gentlemen should pay for the Winchester rifles about double what they are worth. It does seem to me that the proposed changes, which of course, do not involve so large an expense as they otherwise might, because the rate of pay has been very properly reduced—involve a consideration of policy which is to be adopted to have a headquarters, if it is thought necessary—and I do not say it may not be right to place so large a proportion of the force in different and isolated parts, as 350 or 400 men, and to leave only 150 at headquarters for the purpose of mobilisation—then I think we are engaged in dealing with the Indians in a policy which may lead us a long way in point of expense. It seems to me we have got to warn, in

the strongest way, the white settlers who are going into that country, that they must take care of themselves to a great extent, and to take care of themselves the exertion of that prudence, restraint, and self-command ought to be enjoined upon them, and by pursuing a course entirely different from that pursued by the adventurous person who has settled among the Indians, and whose conduct or cruelty has provoked some of the Indian difficulties. While we must give some reasonable protection, and I do not say that the mounted police ought to be disbanded, we have to avoid giving people who are settling in the North-West the idea that a very large and continually increasing, expensive force is to be maintained there at the expense of the Dominion. At the earliest moment we ought to adopt some arrangement for the utilisation of local forces, for the organisation of the militia, and for the organisation under, perhaps, a special system of officering, which should give some special advantages, incurring, perhaps, a great expense, but giving a more efficient force, not merely in soldiery purposes, but also in those higher elements to which I have referred, self restraint and moderation in the use of power. But to control the North-West by a large and extensive force of this kind would be an undertaking which I, for one, would shrink for contemplating.

Sir John A. Macdonald then replied to me:

"I quite agree with my hon. friend in much he has said. Of course a force of 500 men can act as peace officers, serve processes, take prisoners and guard the courts, and do the whole of the work that has been done by the peace officers that are now scattered over the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. 500 men is not too large a force for this purpose. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that eventually that country should be organised under a special system, like a militia force, so as to perform the duty of keeping the peace and, when called upon, to aid the civil power, just as they are in the rest of the Dominion, but at this moment I am afraid that as between the white men and the Indian, the Indian will get the worst of it, perhaps one danger as great as any in connection with the militia is that of the too active interference of the ordinary magistracy of the country. I might mention one instance of that kind which occurred There was a rumor arrived at Prince Albert that an outbreak of Indians had taken place to the south, and one magistrate gave a requisition calling out a newly formed militia company, and they started fully armed to suppress the infant rebellion. They went down, and if they had unfortunately come in contact with the Indians we might have had an Indian war. Luckily, however, they were met by an officer of the police force, who remonstrated with them, sent them back, and quieted what was only after all an Indian riot * * * * and we must trust very much to the reports of the officers on that subject; and I have every confidence that with this additional force of police, that the country may be reasonably expected to be as quiet for the next ten years as it has been for the last ten years."

Now, you will observe that only three years after that, and before the outbreak, the hon. gentleman decided that the country that he expected would be adequately served for the next ten years by these—and, as I shall show presently, by a lesser force—will require, irrespective of the outbreak, more than double the amount of 500 men which he thought adequate three years ago. I said I would show that the hon. gentleman's contemplation was not a continuance even of a force of 500 men. In answer to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), then representing the County of Lambton, the hon. gentleman said:

"I am quite satisfied that the addition to the force will add to the safety and security of the country, and will give greater assurance to those who go to make it their home, and when the settlement of the country, which now promises to be very rapid, takes place, necessities for keeping up the force may be removed or at least diminished. Of course, it can very readily be diminished at any time, it being necessary."

So there you see that the hon. gentleman thought he had reached the maximum, and that as the country settled up he would be able to diminish the force and even to disband it altogether. Instead of that, the hon. gentleman's expectations having been realised as to the settling up of the country, his expectations as to the police force before the recent outbreak were so far falsified that he requires more than double the force. Then, once again, my hon. friend said, at a subsequent stage of the debate of the 11th April:

"There will be, of course, at Calgary, at Edmonton and at Prince Albert, a certain number of men, but as much as possible they will be concentrated.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. What are they to be sent to Prince Albert for? Surely there is population enough there to maintain order without the police being sent for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If my hon. friend could only see the complaints of settlers when there is even a suggestion of moving any of the police force, he could quite understand the difficulty and the sense of helplessness and defencelessness that comes over settlers when they go to any place where there is no police force. It gives them great confidence to have those men stationed near them, but when the country is settled to a greater extent than at present, that necessity will be done away with, and concentration will be carried out."

Here the hon. gentleman contemplating a diminution and not an increase of the force; its concentration as the locality settled up, believing that the local service in each locality would supply the want in the outlying parts at that time requiring a detachment of police. My hon. friend from East York said:

The hon. gentleman must not pay too much attention to representations from well peopled localities. I can recollect very well the difficulty I had in withdrawing the volunteers from Winnipeg. We were threatened with all sorts of calamities if we did so. We did it nevertheless, and no harm came of it. I observed some time ago that at Prince Albert they had men enough to form a volunteer company. I do not know whether there are or not, but a company was formed, and I cannot think that a community or that size requires the rest of the Dominion to maintain a police force for their protection. I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider that, for if the force is to be enlarged for the purpose of placing guards at places such as that it is absurd, and an entirely wrong policy. The police force, as I understand it, has to maintain order in outstanding districts where there is not a large resident population, but should have no occupation in populous places like Prince Albert.

Then the right hon. gentleman said:

"It is quite true that where there is a large population as at Prince Albert or any other place they ought to be able to raise and organise a corps of citizen soldiers for the protection of the place, but at present I do not think it would be safe to risk volunteer corps coming into possible collision with the Indians. I think militia forces should be carefully handled."

Then the hon. gentleman repeats the statement which he made in a former debate and which I read as to a formidable rising. Now, Sir, I read this in order that the House may see what the purposes were, so short a time ago as 1882, which were expected to be answered by the Mounted Police force in the North-West, and for what purpose it was expected that force would be adequate; and you find it was not the question of protecting the proprietors of ranches from their cattle being stolen, it was the question of protection of the outlying settlements, particularly of dealing with the Indians. You find the statement of the hon. gentleman that 500 would be adequate for the purpose, and that as the population went on, the more the people, the fewer the special force of police that would be required. You find the hon. gentleman to-day, three years later, coming down to us, having then acknowledged the force of the observations as to the course he ought to take with respect to the settlers in the North West and the organisation of the militia—coming down to us, I say, and telling us that he desires to more than double the force. You do not find that his statement is as to Indians or is as to outlying settlements; it is cattle and not men who require protection now. I adhere to the view which I stated in 1882, and to which the hon. gentleman then gave his assent, that in considering this very large question of our management of the North West Territories we must take into account the absolute necessity of encouraging and stimulating the people of that country to engage in the formation of those local corps to discharge a large part of the business. I am not at all saying, any more than I said in 1882, that the Mounted Police should be disbanded. I am not at all saying that their number should be reduced. I am not even arguing, at this moment, that if you were to take the outbreak into account the hon. gentleman's proposition may not be reasonable one. But he declines to do so, and says: I do not take the outbreak into account; I do not submit it with respect to the outbreak, or with respect to the altered state of circumstances; you have to deal with it irrespective of those facts. I am, therefore, handling it for the moment on his own lines and on his own ground. I am not negativing his proposal; I am merely pointing out to what it leads. I am showing that in 1882 the plan led to an indefinite increase of numbers, and that we ought to direct attention to the formation of local corps. The hon. gentle-

man denied that it led to an increase of numbers; he said it led to a diminution of numbers, but he agreed that we ought to take up the formation of local corps. I want to point out that the policy of the formation of local corps, which was assented to formally by the hon. gentleman in 1882, had really been adopted by the Government in 1879, and that it had progressed a certain distance at that time; and I want to point out that, instead of dealing with the North-West in the spirit of the preceding occurrences and in the spirit which he indicated in that debate, he dealt with this subject in an altogether different spirit; and this subject, intimately connected as the two parts of it are—the defence and security of the North-West by local corps and the Mounted Police—does require serious consideration at the hands of the House. I have said that so long ago as 1879 the present Government recognised the necessity of arranging for the formation of local corps in the North-West, with reference to the defence of the settlements largely against the Indians. We have not got a very full account in the official reports of the proceedings that took place when Colonel Osborne Smith, then Deputy Adjutant General of the Militia, on the instructions of the Government, went forward to crrry out their views and organise the corps. But I have secured from the contemporary literature of the day, from the local newspaper, statements which show the spirit in which the people at that time received those propcsals of the Government and the ease with which it was possible, had proper steps been taken, to render them efficient. In the Saskatchewan *Herald* of the 6th October, 1879, there is a report of a meeting held in the school house at Battleford, to hear from Colonel Osborne Smith his explanation of the scheme for the proposed organisation of frontier companies.—

"A meeting was held in the school house on Monday evening to hear from Col. Smith an explanation of the scheme on which the proposed organisation of frontier corps was based. The meeting was opened by the appointment of Col. Richardson as chairman. He then introduced Col. Smith, and requested him to address the meeting.

"Col. Smith said that as commandant of the volunteer forces in Manitoba and the North-West he had been instructed by the Government to proceed as far as Battleford, to organise companies of volunteers on the plan which had been found so effective in the older Provinces for a good many years past; and where the population was too scattered to permit of full corps being organised, to establish the neucleus of companies which could afterwards be filled. The exceptional circumstances of the country might lead to a modification of some of the regulations which prevailed in the East. The general provisions of the Act may be summarised as follows: Volunteers will be required to take the oath of allegiance."

"They will be required to drill not less than 6 nor more than 12 days in the year; but the time may be so divided as to be of the least inconvenience, three hours constituting a day's drill. For this they will receive 50 cents a day, with an additional allowance of 75 cents a day in the case of cavalry companies. The arms to be supplied are of the very best kind, and have all been carefully examined and packed, so as to ensure their being served out in good condition. There will also be an abundant supply of ammunition. Both arms and ammunition have been shipped to a central point and can be forwarded to any given place without loss of time. No uniform will be used during the first year."

I call your attention to that statement, because its importance will be found when we consider and read the subsequent reports with respect to the North-West corps. There was a promise of uniform after the first year:

"If called out on active duty they will be paid at a rate to be decided by the Governor General in Council. He would, therefore, leave the matter, for the present, in the hands of Mr. Scott, who would enroll the men and forward the names to him. He would go to St. Laurent, Duck Lake and Prince Albert, where he expected to be able to raise the number of companies now required, namely, two companies of infantry and three of mounted men. He thanked the meeting for assembling to hear him and offered to give any other information that might be required."

"The chairman said the present meeting reminded him of a similar one that was held at the country town in which he lived at the time of the Trent affair, 20 years ago, when he, amongst others, enrolled his name as a private. He continued with his battalion until 5 years ago, when he was allowed to retire, retaining his rank, having risen from the lowest to the highest position in the battalion to which he belonged; and he was quite willing to begin again by enrolling his name as a private in the company now about to be formed.

"The following resolution was then passed:

"Moved by Mr. Forget, seconded by Mr. Laurie, That it is expedient to form an infantry company at this place, and this meeting pledges itself to aid in the perfecting of such an organisation.

"A vote of thanks was given to Col. Smith and the chairman, and the meeting broke up."

In the same paper, on 17th November, 1879, I find the following:—

"The arms and ammunition for the Battleford volunteer company arrived on the 3rd, and were at once taken charge of by Captain Scott. We are pleased to learn that he has been successful in organising the company. The feeling of the members is in favor of its being a mounted corps, in which case a considerable accession could be had to its ranks, besides which it would be much more effective in the event of its service being required James McFarlane, our pioneer settler and an ex-volunteer, has been made first lieutenant, and Hugh McKay, chief officer of the Hudson Bay Company at this post, second lieutenant."

In the same paper, 22nd September, 1879, was the following:—

"The visit of Col. W. Osborne Smith, referred to in our telegraphic columns, will probably result in the formation of a company of cavalry or mounted rifles at Prince Albert. Captain Moore offered, some time ago, to organise such a force, in which the men would, at their own expense, uniform themselves in a dress suitable for the plains, if the Government would furnish the arms and pay a nominal sum—say $2 a day—for a man and horse when on duty. Prince Albert has all the material for an excellent corps of this character. The young men are born horsemen, and accustomed to life upon the plains, while there are also several gentlemen of military training and experience fitted to take command, and a fair sprinkling of others who have served in volunteer forces in the Provinces."

In the same paper, on 20th October, 1879, was the following:—

"Col. Smith at Prince Albert.—Enrolment of one infantry and two cavalry companies.—A company formed at Duck Lake.—On the evening of Monday the 6th, a meeting was held at the restaurant, Prince Albert, to meet Lieut.-Col. Smith, and to hear his explanations in reference to the duty with which he had been entrusted by the Government, the formation of volunteer militia corps in the Territories. Nothwithstanding the short notice given, but one day, and the disadvantage of a very dark night, a large number assembled, many being present from the most remote parts of the settlement.

"The Lord Bishop of Saskatchewan being voted to the chair, spoke earnestly and forcibly on the necessity of assisting the Government in the measures they were taking to raise a force sufficient to back the civil powers in keeping peace, and paid a warm tribute to Col. Smith's military services, and to the good judgment shown by the Government in choosing him to perform the important work of organisation on which he is now engaged.

"Col. Smith, having been introduced by the Bishop, fully explained the object of his mission and the provisions of the militia law, announcing that he had decided to establish two mounted rifle corps in the settlement, under the respective commands of Captains Moore and Young, who would submit for approval the names of their subaltern officers and make the necessary appointments of non-commissioned officers.

"A number of questions put by intending volunteers were answered by Col. Smith, and a desire being shown for the establishment of an infantry corps, in addition to the two mounted companies, he consented to remain over another day, in order to enable its enrolment to be made, Mr. Thomas McKay being nominated as captain.

"After votes of thanks to the Bishop for presiding, and to Colonel Smith for his address, the meeting closed with cheers for the Queen, the Bishop, Col. Smith, and the officers chosen to command the companies.

"A large number of volunteers handed in their names for enrolment, and there is no doubt Prince Albert will have three crack corps.

"Mr. Owen E. Hughes is succeeding very well in the enrolment of the Duck Lake and St. Laurent company.

"The arms, accoutrements and ammunition arrived on the 8th at Carlton, from which point they will be distributed.

"Col. Smith left Duck Lake on the morning of the 8th to proceed direct to Winnipeg."

And I find, Sir, in the same paper, on the 15th December, 1879, a report from Prince Albert, on the 8th December, 1879, stating:

"The volunteers mean business, and are drilling most of the time. Capt. Moore's and Capt. Thos. McKay's companies have put in their annual drill during the evenings. The following are the names of the officers of the several volunteer companies:

"*Troop A, Mounted Rifles.*—Capt., Chas. F. Young; 1st Lieut, Justin D. Wilson; 2nd Lieut., Thos. J. Agnew.

"*Troop B, Mounted Rifles.*—Capt., H. S. Moore; 1st Lieut., Edward Stanley; 2nd Lieut., Thos. N. Campbell.

"*Infantry Company.*—Capt., Thos. McKay; 1st Lieut., J. J. Campbell; 2nd Lieut., George Tait."

I find, on the 23rd February 1880, a report in the same paper from Edmonton, dated the 26th January 1880, of a meeting, there of which the report says:

"Then the formation of a volunteer rifle company came under consideration. The proposition was made by Col. Jarvis, and was coincided in by the meeting as a necessary measure of protection against expected Blackfeet and Sioux hostilities next summer. Over 30 names were put down at once."

Now, Sir, there are the statements I have been able to collect from outside sources, of the mode in which the proposal made by the Government to enroll a force in these localities was received by the people themselves, and the excellent spirit which they displayed as to the call which was made upon them. Turning, now, to official sources, I will take the report of the officer commanding the militia for the year 1879, and I find that he makes this statement:

"Lieut.-Colonel Osborne Smith, C.M.G., Military District No. 10, Manitoba, points out the necessity of increased forces, in consideration of the influx of foreign labor, in view of the large works of railway construction now in progress. This is a very reasonable suggestion, as experience has shown that this may, at any time, be a very disturbing element. His progress in organising mounted and infantry companies in the North-West Territories has been already fully dwelt upon in the report. He states that the action of the Government in extending the militia law to those Territories and Keewatin has been thoroughly appreciated and availed of by the settlers, as far as their yet comparatively sparse numbers would admit. He looks upon the North-West militia spreading with the newly formed settlements as calculated to form an important agent in civilising that vast Territory, and to become a powerful link in the chain of Dominion defences between the two great oceans."

At another part of his report, the officer commanding says:

"In the course of the past summer, accounts were received tending to show that Indians of the North-West Territories were beginning to suffer hunger from the disappearance of the buffalo. It was supposed that necessity might drive them to plunder or steal for their support. Although the Government had taken precaution to provide a stock of supplies, it was presumed that as the long and severe winter of the prairie district proceeded, marauding parties might cause alarm and trouble among the settlers. It was therefore determined to organise some militia companies round the most populous settlements, to give confidence, and accordingly Lieut.-Colonel Osborne Smith, the Deputy Adjutant-General for Manitoba, was entrusted with that duty, and dispatched to make the necessary arrangements.

"That officer carried out his instructions, and acted with the judgment which distinguishes him, in selecting the most important points for the establishment of armed corps, and the general dispositions with regard thereto. His report will be found in full in Appendix No. 1, and I need only draw attention to it, as I think it will be read with interest by all who look towards the importance of that great region in its not distant future. Lieut.-Colonel Osborne Smith has succeeded in forming the nucleus of one company of infantry at Battleford, the seat of Government, under Mr. Scott, the registrar for the North-West Territories, although the population capable of bearing arms hardly admits of a full company being formed until the winter season, when freighters and hunters will have returned.

"At Duck Lake, between the branches of the Saskatchewan, and a few miles south of Carleton House, a troop of mounted riflemen has been formed, under Mr. Owen Hughes, who is in charge of that important trading post. He feels sure that with the men about his post, the settlers in the neighborhood, and the half-breeds at St. Laurent, he will be able to maintain a thoroughly efficient mounted troop. The Rev. Father André, of the St. Laurent mission station, who exercises an almost unbounded influence over the French-speaking half-breeds in the settlement, corroborates his views. The headquarters of this troop will therefore be at 'Stobart,' Duck Lake.

"On the north branch of the Saskatchewan, near the Forks, the main settlement of Prince Albert lies, and here there are more houses and stores now than some six or seven years ago there were in Winnipeg. The enterprise which is apparent bids fair to make this district one of, if not the most important, in the whole of the North-West Territories. The population are most anxious for military protection, in reference to the gradual influx of armed Sioux Indians in search of subsistence. Prince Albert will therefore furnish two troops of mounted riflemen and one company of infantry—the troops under command of Captain Young, late of Her Majesty's 50th Foot, and Captain Moore, late of the Antrim rifle militia; the infantry company under Mr. Thomas McKay, an influential native of the country and agent of the Hudson Bay Company.

"The action of the Government in extending the militia organisation to the North-West Territories is appreciated, and I would recommend its still further extension to other localities, such as among the settlers of the Little Saskatchewan, and others on the western portion of Manitoba. Arms, ammunition and saddlery have been accordingly issued for the equipment of these corps before the setting in of winter; but owing to the deficiency of clothing in store, from causes I have foretold in previous reports, they cannot be supplied with uniforms at present."

There, again, you find allusion to the question of uniforms, to which I have already directed your attention, and which will become more marked as I proceed:

"When orders were issued for the organisation of militia in the North-West, I noticed that the Act did not apply to those Territories; accordingly, an Order in Council was passed, in November, directing proclamation to be made that the entire Militia Act should apply to the North-West Territories and Keewatin. An enormous additional country has thus been added to the militia responsibility, which now extends over the entire Dominion of Canada."

Then the officer commanding proceeds to discuss the question of the Mounted Police and of the existing condition of the country in the light of defence, and he points out:

"If it is desirable to occupy the posts noted besides Fort Ellice, Saskatchewan, Battleford, McLeod, Walsh, Wood Mountain and Souris, each should, if possible, be individually strong enough, at least for self-defence. There are but 350 officers and men of Mounted Police, but there are about 15,000 Indians, of whom 3,000 may be fighting men. They are well armed with repeating rifles, and for the most part mounted.

"Should starvation ensue and the Indians be in despair to provide food for their people, they may become troublesome and aggressive. Therefore, it may become imprudent to have so many small police posts, 150 miles or more apart, without mutual support. A military axiom forbids a force being divided, beyond individual power of self-defence and mutual support. Qu'Appelle should be strong and entrenched; Fort Ellice also. Saskatchewan need only be a small garrison, but also entrenched. Prince Albert will have two mounted and one infantry corps of militia; they should have a *place d'armes* in entrenched lines. Battleford, the seat of Government, will probably be frequented by Indians clamoring for food, and should, besides its company of infantry militia, as yet not very reliable, have a body of police, with works of defence. Duck Lake and St. Laurent will have their mounted militia troop."

So that, in the views of the officer commanding, you will observe how inextricably interlaced are the questions of the organisation of a militia force for the North-West and the question of the Mounted Police. I find it stated, in the former discussions of 1882, and you find that the officer entrusted with the duty of advising the Government as to what is necessary for the defence of the Territories, when he is discussing the Monnted Police, their numbers, their efficiency, their distribution, points out the necessity of the co-operation of those other ingredients of strength, and referrs to those points to which I have alluded, and to the local militia as ingredients of strength to be taken in connection with the Mounted Police, which it might be advisable to have at one or other of these points. I do not propose, on this occasion, to go outside the lines of the North-West Territories, although I believe I might very fairly deal with the question of the defences of Manitoba and the North-West Territories as one. Colonel Osborne Smith, in his report, says:

"In August I received from you instructions to be prepared to proceed without delay, when telegraphed to, to certain indicated localities, for the purpose of organising, as a precautionary measure, corps of volunteer militia.

"As I have so lately reported fully to you on the steps taken by me in carrying out this duty, there is not, I presume, any necessity that I should embody a synopsis of it in this report."

We have not been favored with this special report, which would be an extremely interesting document. We have not even a synopsis of it here, but simply a reference to it, and so I was obliged to have recourse to the only sources available:

"It has been satisfactory to find that the action of the Government in extending the militia law to the North-West Territories has been thoroughly appreciated and availed of by the settlers, so far as their comparatively sparse numbers would admit.

"There can, however, be no doubt that in the process of developing these splendid regions of the Dominion that it will be found requisite to establish, as a mean for defence against possible aggression, and for the maintenance of law, a proper military force, which, disciplined and bound together by the strict and well recognised rules which govern such a body, would be looked upon with confidence and respect by the volunteer militia, who would supplement its strength should emergency arise.

"If fostered and encouraged in its infancy, the North-West militia, spreading with the newly forming settlement, will form an important agent in civilising that vast territory, and become an important link in the chain of Dominion defences between the two oceans."

Then, in the following year, on the 15th of November, 1880, Colonel Osborne Smith reports:

"On the 6th January last the territorial limits of this district were vastly enlarged by the incorporation of the North-West Territories and the district of Keewatin with the then previously existing area (which consisted solely of the Province of Manitoba), thus extending district No. 10 northerly to the confines of Canada, and easterly and westerly from the boundary between Ontario and Keewatin to the dividing line in the Rocky Mountains, between British Columbia and the North-West Territories. The corps at present existing in the district are as follows (omitting Manitoba):—Two companys mounted rifles, Prince Albert; one company mounted rifles, Duck Lake; one Battleford infantry company; one Prince Albert infantry company."

Then, dealing with the corps in the North-West Territories, the report is as follows:—

"These corps, in consequence of the season, have also received permission to postpone their annual drill until the ensuing spring."

The officer states that the season had been such that the Manitoba corps had received permission to postpone their drill, and the same permission had been given to the corps of the North-West Territories:

"They have been somewhat discouraged in consequence of non-receipt of uniforms. But I ascertain from reports, that they are maintaining their organisation, and in some cases performing voluntary drill. The officer commanding the Battleford company, which the paucity of the population there rendered difficult of formation, reports very encouragingly of his increasing strength and the desire of the company to become proficient. I trust that it will be found practicable, in the early spring, to forward uniforms for these important corps."

Now, you see, so early as the year 1880, the statement made by the Adjutant General that discouragement had already begun in the corps in consequence of there being no uniforms, and a strong expression of the wish that in the ensuing spring of 1880 they might be supplied with uniforms. He goes on:

"Applications for permission to raise corps from 12 different localities have been received and duly forwarded by me to headquarters, and with any prospect of the applications being successful, a number of others could readily be obtained; thus showing that the willingness to bear arms exists in these more recently settled portions of the Dominion as generally as in the older Provinces."

So you see the officer had received and forwarded to headquarters, during 1880, applications from no less than 12 other points in the North-West Territories, that corps should be established at those points, and those applications, so far as we can learn, remained without response. Then, Sir, if you turn to the following years, the report of the Deputy Adjutant-General for 1881 states:

"*Corps in the North-West Territories.*—The above corps not having been able to perform their drills last year, in consequence of the season, received permission to postpone their annual drill until the spring of the present year; but, so far, only one officer, namely, Captain Scott, of the Battleford company, has reported having acted upon this authority, and forwarded an acquittance roll, wherefrom it appears that 26 of all ranks had so drilled last spring. All the corps in the North-West Territories have been selected for drill this year; but not having received any official communication from them on that subject, I am unable to state what progress they are making. I learn, however, from private resources, that some, if not all of them, have been performing more or less drill this season. I may here again draw attention to the circumstance of these corps not having been as yet provided with uniforms, which is anything but encouraging to young soldiers or their corps."

The whole force in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, with arms, was, at that time, only 536 rank and file, with 39 officers, and the authority to drill the whole force had been given in this early year. Then, in the following year, the officer commanding the militia reports:

"There are two districts also, viz., Manitoba and British Columbia, where, in consequence of the expense of living, the staff officers should receive increased pay, as also should all ranks of the militia in those districts when called out to duty."

Col. Osborne Smith had ceased to be Adjutant-General, and Col. Houghton, the Deputy Adjutant-General, states that while the Manitoba troops had been authorised to drill none of the North-West corps had been authorised to drill—Prince Albert mounted rifles, two companies; Duck Lake mounted rifles, one company; Prince Albert infantry, one company; and Battleford infantry, one company; a total of 225 officers and men. So that you will observe, that having been authorised to drill in one year, having substantially performed their drill, it having been stated, in two successive years, that there was increasing discouragement in consequence of the non-receipt of uniforms, in the third year there was no authorisation to drill at all. The detailed report of the officer goes on as follows:—

"The North-West corps, consisting of three mounted infantry and two infantry companies, have never been inspected since their first organisation in October, 1879. In consequence of not having received any uniforms, they were relieved from drill this year, by an order of the Adjutant-General, dated 10th August."

We now find from the Deputy Adjutant-General why these three corps, which it was so important to establish, which special efforts had been made to establish, which were established with such enthusiasm, were refused permission to drill. It was because they were not supplied with uniforms, and for that reason were relieved from drill by the order of the Adjutant-General, dated 10th August.

"A copy of this letter, including reference to the inspection of arms, was forwarded to each officer commanding a company in the North-West on the 1st September; but, up to the present day, replies have only been received from Captain Scott, commanding the Battleford infantry company, and Captain Hughes, commanding the Duck Lake mounted rifle company, both of whom reported the arms, etc., in their charge as complete and in good order.

"In reference to these corps, I may state it is hardly to be expected they will give up much of their valuable time, and supply their own horses for drilling purposes, or even regard themselves in the light of a properly organised body of militia, until after they have been furnished with uniforms of some pattern or denomination."

Then he makes some general remarks, in which he points out the aspect of the North-West:

"Manitoba has so altered since the first organisation of a militia here, that I strongly recommend the reconstruction of the whole force, the necessity for which force cannot but be apparent to all when the immense increase of population of the last three years is taken into consideration."

Then the Major-General commanding makes these observations on that:

"It would seem that of a total established strength of 580—and of 450 authorised to drill—only the strength of the Winnipeg Field Battery, 76, actually drilled. It appears clear to me that this district is in an unsatisfactory condition—but without seeing it for myself, and conversing with the officers and others connected with the militia of the district, I do not feel justified in making recommendations for its improvement."

Then, in the next year, the report for the year 1883, Colonel Houghton, dealing with the North-West corps, gives the almost final order, the penultimate order:

"The North-West corps, consisting of three companies of mounted infantry, were relieved from drill until further orders by instructions received from the Adjutant-General, dated 10th August, 1882."

There you see they were relieved from drill, not for the year only, but until further orders, and that it was on account of their not being supplied with uniforms, for they were not to be expected to drill until the uniforms came, and the uniforms not coming, they were not expected to drill at all:

"Surely this western district has a reasonable right to expect that the Government of Canada will deal liberally with it, and afford young men the opportunity of carrying out their most praiseworthy wishes in this respect. In the same connection, I would beg most respectfully to urge the advisability of the reorganisation or, more properly, the organisation, of the new corps, which, although now more than three years enrolled, and shortly afterwards outfitted with arms, ammunition and saddlery, have never since been assembled for drill, in consequence of no uniform having up to the present time been furnished to them. These corps are still in existence, and could be readily resuscitated by their original commanding officers, were they to receive encouragement to do so."

So you see once again pressed upon the attention of the Government the actual condition of these corps, the fact that they would require to be organised, not to be reorganised, but organised, because they had never been supplied with uniforms, and the statement that they were still in existence and could readily be resuscitated by the commanding officer,

were they to receive encouragement to do so. This observation is made by the officer commanding the forces:

"I commend this to the serious consideration of the Government. * * Considering the state of the various corps reported on in this district, it appears to me that it would be desirable that as soon as the 90th Battalion are organised, the whole district should be seen by the general officer commanding."

Now I come to the report which is brought down this Session, the report for the last year, and I find the Deputy Adjutant-General reports that

"On the 1st July last, all the strength of the active militia in the district was nearly 775 men, that the whole number authorised for drill was 380, and that 'the whole of the remaining corps in this district were relieved from drill.'"

"I may here state, says he, that since the commencement of the current year, 1884-85, viz, by *Gazette* of the 13th September last—No. 5 general orders (18)—the three companies of mounted rifles and two companies of infantry in the North-West Territory have been removed from the list of corps of the active militia."

There I have traced the history of these five corps. I have shown you that in 1879 the Governement thought it important that they should be organised; I have shown you the military authorities were of the same opinion; I can shown you, by a reference to your votes, that a special sum of money was asked for the emergency, for the extra expense involved in organising them; I have shown you how it came about, with what zeal, ardor, enthusiasm, the people of the localities received the proposal, under what happy omens the five corps were started; I have shown you where the signs of disorganisation came in, and how early; I have shown you the repeated monitions and warnings and notices that the hon. gentleman obtained, from year to year, of these difficulties, and the demand for the uniforms, the lack of which prevented the corps from being drilled; I have shown you that the officer pointed out, once and again, and thrice, the discouragement which they were under, that it was not to be expected that the men would drill unless they got uniforms, and he hoped they would get them; and I have shown you that the answer was not uniforms, but an order relieving them from drill until further orders, and in the end the matter culminated after their having been relieved from drill two or three years, in their being taken out of the list of active militia altogether. While that is so, what is the general report of the officer commanding the district? He points out some difficulties which occurred with reference to different corps of the Manitoba force, and he said:

"In lieu of the four last named companies, I would most respectfully recommend that authority be granted me to organise four other companies as follows, viz.:—

Portage la Prairie	1
Brandon, &c	2
Indian Head, or Broadview	1

"At all these places there is plenty of good material for that purpose, both of trained officers and men, who are only too anxious to receive permission to organise. (*Vide* my last report above referred to; also, a communication dated 28th April, 1884, and previous communications and enclosures therein referred to)."

I have here to read some portions which apply to Manitoba, but it is because Manitoba and the Territories are mixed by being all in the one military district:

"I have here substituted Portage la Prairie for Regina (from both of which places, however, applications have been received), as the latter, being the headquarters of the Mounted Police, is less in need of protection."

Once again you see the intimate connection between the Mounted Police and the militia force of the country:

"While the former, being now a rapidly growing city, should be entitled to some safeguard against possible incursions of Indians or bands of horse thieves and marauders, with which the country immediately south of the border is well known to be infested, and who might, at any moment, organise successfully a plundering expedition in that direction, without fear of the consequences, owing to the unprotected situation of the settlers in that locality.

"In making this recommendation, I have also in view the advantage which would be derived from the facilities which would thus be afforded for the mobilisation of the whole militia force of the district, Portage la Prairie forming, as it were, a connecting link between Brandon, and Winnipeg, and Broadview or Indian Head (whichever, if not both, were selected), between Brandon and Regina; at any of which points a large force could thus be easily assembled in a very short time, to await the reinforcements from the more distant posts.

"I also beg leave to remind you that an application is before you from Mr. S. L. Bedson (see covering letter, dated 1st March, 1884), for authority to raise a corps of mounted rifles in the vicinity of Stony Mountain, of which all the members are in a position to supply their own horses, being composed entirely of young farmers residing in the immediate neighborhood, and who, being all good riders, would constitute a most useful and formidable force, exactly such as would be best adapted to this prairie country. They would be only twelve miles distant from Winnipeg and about forty-five from Portage la Prairie, so could easily be utilised in either direction.

"I would strongly urge the advisability of giving favorable consideration to Mr. Bedson's letter, above referred to; and I even venture to go further, and suggest, with all respect, that another such corps might be easily, and with the greatest advantage to the force of the district, organised at Portage la Prairie, either instead of or in addition to (I should prefer the latter) the infantry corps already recommended in this report. And when it is taken into consideration that three mounted and two infantry corps have recently been disbanded in the North-West Territory, and replaced by Mounted Police."

Once again you see the intimate and inevitable connection between the two questions:

"I have reason to hope that, should my recommendation in this matter meet with the approval and concurrence of the Major-General commanding, the Hon. Minister of Militia may be induced to take a similar view of the matter, and, recognising the invaluable utility of such a force, in the event of any such contingencies arising, at any time, as those previously herein referred to, sanction these organisations last mentioned, and empower me to proceed with the formation of these new corps at as early a date as possible, so as, if they are to be formed at all, they may be in a position to prove their capabilities of enrolment before the opening of the ensuing drill season."

Then, after a statement of the geographical condition of the country, and the means of communication, he continues:

"Such being the case, what force have we, as at present constituted, to oppose to such intruders?

"I answer, on a frontier of 1,260 miles, namely from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, only 400 militiamen, all told, with, perhaps, an equal number of Mounted Police, that could be made available for this purpose within any reasonable time; in the winter season, particularly, when the forces at Battleford, Carlton and Prince Albert, may be fairly considered as out of the field for all practical purposes.

"Since writing my report for 1883 I notice that circumstances occurred which at one time threatened to but too fully verify my forbodings of danger in the near future, even from within ourselves (*Vide* 2nd paragraph of report, page 58).

"Fortunately, this catastrophe was averted by the excellent management of Major Crozier, Superintendent of Mounted Police, and the steadiness and discipline of the men under his command. I allude, of course, to the Battleford *fracas* with the Indians in the early part of last summer. Having already, however, reported to you fully with regard to the impressions formed by me when travelling through that section of country last July (see report of 28th July), I must not here repeat my views therein expressed, and which have not since altered."

More than once have I, as persuasively as I could, called upon the Minster of Militia to produce that report of the 28th July, and it is important, now that we are dealing with the question of the defence of this country, with a proposal to expend half a million dollars a year in a force more military than civil, after all, that we should understand the report of the officer as to the condition of the country, as to impressions formed when travelling throughout that country last July, with reference to that very subject of defence; but, for some reason or the other, we cannot get it. In the discussion in this House last Session on the subject of the militia, when the hon. gentleman in Supply was asking for his vote, my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson) said this:

"I would ask the hon gentleman if it is the intention to establish any more volunteer battalions in the North-West. There are several towns in Manitoba where there might be good companies organised I should like to know if it is the intention to furnish them with accoutrements as soon as they are ready to organise."

The Minister of Militia said this:

"The organisation of the volunteer force in Manitoba and the North-West is a very large question. It has been, and still is, engaging the attention of the Department. Under the estimates as they now exist, it would be impossible to get anything like a proper organisation in that district; but the battalion which has just been provided for is the

beginning of what I believe will be a proper organisation of the force there."

My hon. friend from Marquette said:

"I think probably too much of this money is spent in Winnipeg. There are rural towns which might have a company and have their headquarters in Winnipeg. There is Portage la Prairie, Minnedosa, Rapid City, and also Brandon. It should be distributed more through the Province and not confined to Winnipeg."

As I have said, there was a feeling, obviously, in 1879 and 1880, and I will say throughout, as far as we can judge, except in so far as that feeling was chilled by the action of the Government, in favor of their policy of establishing local corps, and I observe, in the Prince Albert *Times* of 4th April, 1884, a statement upon that subject:

"We are glad to learn that an officer, who has been for years in command of a battalion of militia, is exerting himself to have one raised in this district. We have no fear of the necessary number of volunteers being forthcoming, if the Government will do its part in supplying the necessary arms and uniforms. We may urge upon them the advisability of doing this with peculiar force just now, where so many disquieting rumors are in circulation. It is not only that rumors of expected trouble with the Indians are more rife, but that they must be considered in connection with the recent disturbance at Long Lake and File Hills. It is a pity that the public, whose lives and property are immediately at stake, can not obtain exact and satisfactory information touching the causes exciting and the means taken to suppress these disturbances, were it only to enable us to contradict authoratively the present rather widely-accepted verson. Rumor asserts that the rising at Long Lake, at any rate, was the result of a semi-starvation policy pursued by the worthy Indian commissioner. We sincerely trust that report exaggerates the truth in asserting that, while the Indians are compelled by a parental Government to live on their reserves, they have been in receipt of 2 ounces of pork and 4 of flour, each, per diem. We have failed to ascertain whether the weight is Avoirdupois or Troy—also, if amount was mailed every day from council's office."

Then we find a statement in the Winnipeg *Sun* of the 25th July, 1884, which is the only information we have had as to Colonel Houghton's tour of inspection—an extract which I will read:

"Colonel Houghton returned last night from a tour of inspection of arms in the Saskatchewan district. As to the corps organised throughout the Territories, they had ceased drilling some time ago, in consequence of the lapse of the three years. The Government in view of the unsettled state of affairs in the Saskatchewan district and the probability of an outbreak among the half-breeds at any time, deemed it wise to collect all the arms, as in the event of an uprising they might be used with great advantage against the whites."

Then I find, in the same paper, of the 15th November, 1884, an account which was given at Ottawa by Mr. White, the controller of the Mounted Police, in an interview as to the North-West. Mr. White said:

"Matters are moving along splendidly, despite the sensational reports that have been put in circulation to the contrary. With regard to the congregating of a large body of the Mounted Police at Prince Albert, he says that this was done to move the men about, and not from any anticipation of trouble in that section of the country. The policy of the Government, he says, has always been to keep the men on the move, that they may get a more thorough knowledge of the country."

Then he alludes to some things in connection with the disturbance, which I do not wish to introduce at present, and he goes on:

"The report that the strength of the Mounted Police is to be raised from 520 to 800 is without authority. He, however, believes that the force should be increased, as the duties of the police are greater than can be satisfactorily carried out by the present limited number of men. Nothing, however, could be done, until Parliament meets, and he was not prepared to say what recommendation the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs would make to the House in regard to strengthening the force. When he arrived at Regina he was surprised to see, in the Fort MacLeod *Gazette*, a report of the massacre of Major Crozier and the shooting of Riel. An effort will at once be made to discover the originator of the report, which Capt. White believes he can trace to the right party. The disappearance of the buffalo, he says, has proved a great assistance in inducing the Indians of the North-West to settle on their reserves. While the chase lasted, it was impossible to prevent them from roaming all over the country; and although the extinction of the buffalo has deprived them of what at one time seemed necessary to their existence, he believes that it will greatly assist the Government in bringing them sooner into a state of civilisation."

He does not say in which they may enjoy the franchise. Here you have various statements, which I think require further explanation from the hon. gentleman as to the course he proposes to take, and the general policy upon which it is based, in addition to his extended reference to the cattle and herds in the southern part of the ranching district of the North-West Territory. On the 23rd of January, 1885, the local paper of Prince Albert made a statement in reference to these volunteers which is important to be read, also:

"Some time has elapsed since our attention was drawn to various remarks, in the papers below, upon the subject of the disbanding of our volunteer militia companies, and although we have never intended to sit down quietly under the unjust and offensive reflections cast upon our people in accounting for this fact, the presence of matter calling more immediately for notice has made our silence of longer duration than we desired. Perhaps, the most frequently repeated explanation of what has been called the disarming of our companies has been grounded upon the suspicion of loyalty while the least offensive one has been the inefficiency of our corps. Now, our answer to any remarks anent the disarming of our companies, is simply to be met by a statement of the fact, that as there were no men enrolled at the time the arms were removed from our settlement, we hardly see in what sense they can be said to have been disarmed. The fact of there being no men enlisted may require some explanation, and as the true one will serve to remove the so freely attributed stigma of disloyalty, we may briefly explain what resulted in this state of things. When the officer who came to the Territories, charged with the formation of these companies, reached Prince Albert, and called for volunteers, so far from finding any want of loyalty and zeal on the part of our settlers, he was offered men enough to form three companies instead of the two he proposed to enrol, and we safely say that had there been a moderate amount of interest taken in them by the authorities they would have been efficient to-day, and enabled the Government to dispense with a large proportion of the Mounted Police force, which they find necessary to keep ready against contingencies in our neigborhood at present. The officer who represented the Militia Department upon the occasion referred to assured the volunteers, in very graphic language, that as soon, after he returned to Winnipeg, as a message could be flashed along the wires to Ottawa, our uniforms would be ordered, and no unnecessary delay occur in forwarding them to us. On the faith of this the men began to drill, many of them driving in considerable distances, after their day's work was done, to get instruction. When the time arrived for annual drill the men cheerfully assembled, and although the circumstances of the country necessitated their camping and messing at headquarters, away from their homes during the course of instruction, and made it very hard for them to leave their work, no allowances could be obtained for themselves or horses. This they submitted to as long as their officers could hold out to them the slightest hope that the Department felt sufficient interest in them to furnish them with uniforms, but when year after year passed, and the companies were left without anything further than a rifle, sword, bayonet and belt, to distinguish them from civilians, it will be easily intelligible to any one in the slightest degree conversant with military matters, how utterly hopeless was the attempt to keep up any military enthusiasm, or *esprit de corps*. Instead, then, of attributing our inefficiency to want of loyalty, and offering it as an excuse for removing the Government arms from the settlement, we wish the people below to understand that nothing but neglect on the part of the Militia Department prevents the existence of efficient and loyal companies of volunteers in the Territories to-day. No doubt there is a good deal of dissatisfaction among people—some of it, undoubtedly, the result of ample provocation—but, as to loyalty at heart and readiness to do their duty when called upon, we believe that the people of the Territories, taken as a whole, compare very favorably with others, who have not had so much to discourage them in various ways."

I say that the hon. gentleman, in bringing forward, this very important proposal, a proposal which is of such great magnitude in its pecuniary aspect, a proposal which, as I pointed out, in the year 1882, the hon. gentleman agreed required to be considered in connection with the militia or citizen soldiery policy for the North-West—in bringing forward this proposal in view of recent events, and at a time when we are called upon to revise our policy with reference to the North-West, he ought to have brought it forward in a different tone and spirit, with a larger grasp of the subject, with a wider scope of observation, and as part of an entire plan which we could understand, instead of in the limited mode in which he has done it. I say it is not satisfactory. I say that having given us the view, in the year 1882, when he told us that 500 men were all that were then required, that a less number would be required as the country grew, that the time would come for diminishing that number, and, as he says, without reference to this outbreak, being now obliged to reverse that statement altogether, and to propose to more than double the force in three years, nearly quadruple it, compared to what it stood at up to 1882—the hon. gentleman ought to give us more reasons for

it. What are the unexpected circumstances? We knew of the ranches then. The hon. member for Huron had pointed out that the ranching mania was in full blast at that time, that there was application after application, some well-known names applying for ranches—here, there and everywhere; all sorts of fortunes were expected out of them, and out of other things in the North-West. There is nothing new as to the increase of population; and as to the condition of the Indians, I have read an extract from the hon. gentleman's speech in 1882, which shows how ominous was the condition at that time. Then it was agreed by the hon. gentleman that it was a good policy to establish local corps in the North-West, which should supplement and co-operate with, and form a junction, at the proper points, with the force for defensive purposes, for the peace, order and good government there. Not merely was that the statement of the hon. gentleman, but I have shown that was the established policy of the Government itself. We know that in 1879 corps were established at places which have lately become notorious, and I have shown how those corps languished and died. It is true the hon. gentleman stated, in answer to somebody, that the arms were removed because there were no men enlisted. Of course, the season of three year's service had expired. Why were there no men enlisted? Why had there been, for years, only a nominal force? I have shown the reason. It is because this force was systematically discouraged, for some reason or other; and so it has happened that the policy of the Government has been, as announced to Parliament by its Acts, between 1879 and 1882, as stated in the debate when last discussed, the increase of the Mounted Police—their policy has been departmentally or executively reversed; and instead of encouraging the formation of local corps, instead of yielding to applications that were made from various points in the district, as I have proved to you by the Deputy Adjudant General, and authorising the formation of more corps, instead of purchasing uniforms, instead of authorising drill to be performed, the applications were neglected, the uniforms were not purchased, the drill was not authorised, and ultimately the corps were gazetted out of the list of the active militia altogether. Now, if it is the intention, as it seems to be the intention, since the North-West corps have been gazetted out, that the North-West is to be defended and protected and regulated, so far as force is concerned, entirely by the Mounted Police, and not by local corps, we ought to know it. As I said, this policy may lead to indefinite expansion of expense. The subject requires to be treated, as I have said, in a more comprehensive manner than the hon. gentleman has adopted. It involves very large considerations—the expense of half a million dollars or more a year, and it involves still larger considerations of policy. It involves still larger considerations as to how the North-West is to be handled—even as to how it was to be handled before the outbreak, and as to how it is to be handled, considering the present condition of things and the consequences for some years to come, of the events of this winter. I am not making these observations with a view to express any definite opinion as to whether the hon. gentleman's proposition to double the force of mounted police ought to be rejected. I do not think we are in a position to express that opinion. I think that in order to express that opinion, in order to say whether it should be dealt with at all, we require to have some statement from the hon. gentlemen opposite of what their views are, generally, upon these two subjects, which, as I have pointed out, are necessarily and inextricably intermingled. Is it true that the disturbed districts in the remoter parts of the Territory—the districts of Edmonton, Battleford and Prince Albert—are, for the future, to be garrisoned by the Mounted Police? If so, we want more Mounted Police, and that is a reason for that policy; if not, the question arises how far the formation of local corps is to be applied, and to what extent it can fairly be applied; and you have got to settle both these questions in some general sense before you can decide the exact amount of corps that you propose to put in motion. Sir, I trust that after what I have said the hon. gentleman will feel disposed to give us that further information to which I have referred before we are asked to make much progress in this matter. We ought to have the Mounted Police report, we ought to have the report of Col. Houghton, to which I have referred, and we ought also to have a statement from the Government of a larger and more comprehensive character, before we are asked to decide how our votes shall be recorded upon the proposition now before us.

Mr. CARON. I regret that I was not in my seat when the hon. gentleman referred to the Department over which I preside. I regret, also, that I am not in the position of having a brief so carefully and elaborately prepared as the brief from which the hon. leader of the Opposition has spoken. But I believe, that without a brief and without any previous preparation, except a knowledge of the facts which have come under my notice as Minister of Militia and Defence, I can give, possibly, some information to this House and to the country contradictory of the statements which the hon. gentleman has just made. When the hon. gentleman stood up to-night and spoke of the administration of the Department of Militia, it seemed to me that he was forgetting that on more than one occasion the hon. gentleman, when I appealed to the House and the country, and asked the House to provide the money which was indispensable to keep up a force, a force such as Canada should have keept up, invariably met me with the opposition of himself and his friends to every vote I asked for the purpose of maintaining the militia. I remember well, that at the very outbreak of the disturbances in the North-West, when remembering what had taken place, which the hon. gentleman knew as well as I did, that he had opposed every vote I had applied for, he nevertheless, from his place, as leader of the Opposition, declared that he would hold the Government responsible for the life of every man who should not be provided with all requisites when sent forward to fight the battles of Canada in the North-West. The hon. gentleman at that moment, rising in his seat and appealing to the feelings of the House, and stating that among his friends and family some had been sent up to the North-West, announced that he would hold the Government responsible for any deficiency, although, if any deficiency had occurred, it was because the hon. gentleman and his friends, Session after Session, refused to vote the amount which the Minister of Militia brought down to this House and asked it to vote. I am ready to leave this question to be discussed before the country, and I am ready to leave the people to decide whether the leader of the Opposition, at that time, was following a patriotic course, and whether he was doing his duty by his country in refusing, and in his friends refusing, to sanction the votes required to keep the militia force properly organised. But I take the statements which the hon. gentleman has made to-night, and I find that the hon. gentleman objects to the money which is being expended in maintaining the Winnipeg corps, the 90th Battalion——

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CARON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He said that from the reports which had been made the whole money spent in the North-West was being expended upon the Winnipeg corps.

Mr. BLAKE. No. I beg your pardon. I read an extract from the speech of the hon. member for Marquette. I made no such statement as the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman read an extract from a speech by the hon. member for Marquette, and he gave his sanction as to the opinion it expressed.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. CARON. He gave his sanction to the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Marquette. The hon. gentleman does not read the speech of any hon. member if he does not wish to give his sanction to that speech. I ask this House whether the money which has been expended upon the Winnipeg corps has not been money well invested in the interests of the country. After the record which has been achieved by those Winnipeg battalions, by the 90th and the other battalions, which have been at the front and which have sustained the brunt of the battle, I ask whether any hon. member, whether any man in the country, will stand up and say that the Department of Militia did not exercise proper judgment in expending money upon those corps, which really were the first battalions we sent to the front and the first to meet the great emergency through which we have just passed. The hon. gentleman has referred to reports which he says have not been brought down. The hon. gentleman occasionally supposes reports which do not exist; and the hon. gentleman, with his usual confidence in himself, imagining that he is infallible, invariably believes that what he supposes must be right and true. But I tell the hon. gentleman, from my seat in Parliament, and taking my position as Minister of Militia, that when he asked me for those reports I told him that the reports which we have brought down were the only reports we have in the Department. The hon. gentleman did not contradict my statement; he did not refuse to accept it—that we had followed in the North-West exactly the same rules and regulations we apply to every district in the Dominion. I told the hon. gentleman that in the North-West we had several companies, three companies, I believe, which had been organised as mounted infantry; that those companies, after an inspection by the inspecting officer, such as is held in every other district, were considered to be so disorganised that the inspecting officer could not allow them to be kept on the roll of the militia force of Canada. The hon. gentleman says they were disorganised through the neglect of the Department of Militia, and because no uniforms were served out to them. I tell the hon. gentleman, although his brief may be a well-prepared brief, that if he cares about going into the facts and ascertaining what is right and what is wrong in reference to his statement, he will find that when those companies were organised the Department of Militia undertook to give to them saddlery and arms, and refused to give them any uniforms. They were formed under that understanding. I will give, the House the reason why the Department refused at that time, to serve out uniforms to newly organised companies. It was not at a time when I was presiding over the Department, but when a colleague of mine, who was more able than I am to preside over the Department, occupied the position, that the companies were organised, and the then Minister refused to serve out uniforms, because, as the hon. gentleman has stated, from a speech of mine, he said the organisation of the militia force in the North-West Territor was a grave question. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask this House, whether it was possible, upon the money voted by Parliament, maintaining, as we are maintaining in the older Provinces, a force of about 40,000,or more precisely, 37,000, to organise, in a territory so great, expansive and vast, that one battalion would be like no battalion at all—whether it was possible for any right-minded man to expect the Department of Militia, upon the vote of Parliament, to organise a force in the North-West. I stated that the reason why uniforms were not served out to that force—and it was a good reason—was simply because in that Territory, as recent events have shown, it became a question to know what kind of uniforms should be given to our men. Take a corps of mounted infantry, and every man who has studied the question will say that it was perfectly useless and destructive of the organisation to have served out uniforms that are used in our infantry and cavalry corps at present. Since the outbreak in the North-West the Department has been called upon to send forward uniforms, and the hon. gentleman himself, with the great care which he took of the volunteers at the front, taking for once upon himself to give advice and not criticism, suggested that we should send up to the men who were fighting our battles some kind of uniform which would be more useful and more available for their purpose than those served out in the different infantry corps, those constituting the organised corps of Canada. Yet, the hon. gentleman not knowing that these companies were organised on the understanding that no uniforms should be sent out, but that arms and saddlery alone would be served out—the hon. gentleman, reckless in his charges, stands up in his place and says that through the negligence of the Department of Militia these companies were disorganised, because they had no uniforms served out to them. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman knows as much about military matters as he knows about everything else, and that is saying a great deal, I admit: but the hon. gentleman knows well that if they had saddles and arms they can go through their drill without having green or scarlet tunics on their backs. It was no question of the organisation of the force, no question of whether they were served with uniforms, but a question of whether the Department knew its duty in giving to the mounted infantry the saddles they required to ride their horses and the arms they required to go through their drill. The hon. gentleman says that in three years several of these companies completely disappeared, because of the neglect of the Department. Sir, they disappeared because in that great western country men move about from one district to another, and the companies organised and composed of a certain number of men one day find that those men have been transferred to some other district, for some reason or other; and still the hon. gentleman believes that the Department of Militia would be justifiable in allowing those saddles and arms and accoutrements to be distributed all over that country, and probably, to day, if the Department had not acted judiciously, those articles would have been in the hands of the men who are shooting down our volunteers. Well, Sir, I believe it was the bounden duty of that Department to see that those arms should be returned into the Department, who were responsible for them to the country, and placed in such a position that if required at any moment they would be at the call of the Department, and could be placed in the hands of the men who, instead of fighting against the country, were fighting to defend the country. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred to some application of Mr. Bedson and others, to organise a c rps. Now, I wish to appeal to every impartial man, whether sitting on your right or on your left, to say whether it was possible for me, with the estimates which were voted by Parliament every year, to organise a force in the North-West. I have stated, as the hon. gentleman stated to-night, that it is a large question; and, Sir, I hope that when the estimates of my Department come down, if I propose to organise the force which I consider to be necessary and indispensable to the country—I hope that hon. gentlemen will not, as in the past, rise in their seats and state that the expenditure of the Department of Militia is so enormous that with their great love for their country, and their great love for economy, they have to vote against those estimates. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, when he speaks of uniforms, if I have not, year after year, since I have been at the head of the Department of Militia, come down with estimates, showing the House that we required 8,000 suits every year, for the force which we have, the force authorised by Parliament, recognised by

the country. I came down year after year, and I told Parliament, not using my own information, except as I acquired it from the men who are known by every hon. gentleman here as those who composed the staff of the Department of Militia, men who have acquired large experience, men who know the requirements of the force, I have stated, year after year, and Session after Session, that we required 8,000 suits a year, and yet these patriotic gentlemen, who find that we should have sent up uniforms to three companies in the Duck Lake and Saskatchewan district, only voted the amount required for 5,000 uniforms.

Mr. BLAKE. How much were we asked to vote?

Mr. CARON. I made my statement year after year, and every item was criticised for weeks and weeks; and the press controlled by the hon. gentleman took intense pleasure in stating that they had been able to keep the Minister of Militia before the House on his estimates for weeks and weeks, criticising the items. I say, that nobody caring for his country, nobody who has any love for his country, would have incurred the expense of the speeches of these hon. gentlemen in criticising items which were absolutely indispensable to make the force efficient, and to make it such as it has been. Yet, I am prepared to say that, even with the adverse votes of these hon. gentlemen, I was able to get up such a force, at the moment when the country called upon that force to come forward, at a period when it was almost impossible, as most people believed, to send a force up to the North-West; at a period when our great highway, the Pacific Railway, was unfinished; still, with all these obstacles in the way, it was possible to organise within the smallest possible time, a force that has done so much for Canada, because it has shown that Canada's sons are deserving of the name of men, who showed themselves ready to go to the front and fight our battles; but I must say, knowing what I say, that it was not due to the hon. gentlemen on your left, Mr. Speaker, if that force went up organised and equipped as it was. The hon. gentleman, the other day, in a speech he made, stated that he would take the earliest possible opportunity, from information he had received, to show that great extravagance had been perpetrated in connection with supplies and in the transport service which enabled our men to go to the front and do their duty. I did not hesitate for one moment—nor would I hesitate to-morrow, even after the speeches of the hon. gentleman—to take the proper steps to enable that force, without any delay, to obey the call of their brilliant commander, General Middleton, who, in his despatches to me, says that at no moment was he delayed by either defect in the transport or defect in the commissariat, and that it was wonderful to him how Canada was able, in that emergency, to organise the force that was sent to the front. Not having been in my place when the hon. gentleman commenced, I do not know whether I have answered all his objections, although I hardly hope that, because he always puts forward so very many. It is disadvantageous to discuss a question of this kind, involving great details, before the papers are brought down; but I believe that when they are brought down it will be established beyond the possibility of doubt—I do not say of discussion—that everything that could be done for the North-West was done. In regard to the three companies that have come under the special protection of the hon. gentleman, I never heard him say anything about them until they were disbanded and their arms and accoutrements had all been returned to the Department; but as soon as everything had been done to secure the responsibility of the Department, the hon. gentleman said they should not have been disbanded. I am very sorry that they did not exist, but we were bound to do what the Department did at that time. Now, I have only one word more to say before I resume my seat. The arms the hon. gentleman refers to had all been collected for safe-keeping; they were all brought in and put under the control of the Mounted Police. We had no organisation in that vast district. The only officer representing the Department of Militia was Col. Houghton, who was Deputy Adjutant-General at Winnipeg; and hon. gentlemen will understand what an enormous expense would be involved in sending an officer up, starting from Winnipeg and going over the whole of that district, merely to inspect three companies. Those arms which had been collected and placed for safe-keeping in the hands of the Mounted Police were the first arms which had been given to the first men who rose for the purpose of defending that district against the rebellion which had broken out. Therefore, judging, not as the hon. gentleman has judged, without any facts, but in the light of experience, I think the course followed by the Department of Militia has turned out to be, so far, successful. Of course, I have the greatest possible respect for the opinion of the hon. gentleman, more especially on military matters, and I am perfectly certain that when he takes the same amount of trouble that he does in other matters, and looks into the papers and studies up the question, if he can find time to study militia questions, he will not be as severe in his criticism as he has been to-night.

Mr. WATSON. I am a little surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia, especially with regard to something I said two years ago. I believed at that time, and I believe still, that if the Government had spent more money farther west than Winnipeg on the Militia, it would have been better for the Province. I think the Government made a great mistake in not keeping up those three companies that have been spoken of so slightingly, at Duck Lake, Battleford and Prince Albert. I believe that if those three companies had been kept up the trouble in the North-West would not have taken place. Those three companies would have been larger in number than the half-breed rebels who rose at Duck Lake and took part in the massacre there. The expense the hon. gentleman speaks of, in Col. Houghton going as far west as Prince Albert to inspect those three companies, would have been money well spent, and would have saved the money and blood that have been expended in the late trouble. The remarks I made were with regard to the desire that existed to form some companies in the Province of Manitoba. For instance, in the town of Portage la Prairie, where I reside, for the last four or five years the people have been petitioning the Minister of Militia to have a company of mounted infantry formed in that district. If a few hundred men had been formed into such companies at different parts of the Province, a few years ago, and had been placed at the call of Col. McLeod and Major Walsh, and those gentlemen had received their instructions from the Militia Department, this whole rebellion would have been put down within two or three weeks, and millions of dollars would have been saved to the country. I have some reason to know why the companies at Prince Albert and Duck Lake were disbanded. Some three years ago, when I, along with a few others, were actually trying to form a company of mounted rifles at Portage la Prairie, we were informed by Col. Houghton that the companies had been disbanded and that all they had were rifles and saddlery. And the reason the companies were disbanded was, according to his statement, because the volunteers were dissatisfied with the Government for not paying them for the time they drilled and not furnishing them with uniforms. Of course, that being the case, we wanted to form a good company, but did not wish to receive the rifles, which were claimed to be rusted and out of repair, having lain there a long time, and the saddles were of a very cheap class. The Minister of Militia has stated that the Opposition criticised the estimates for the past year, of his Department. The Opposition were quite justified in criticising the hon. gentleman's estimates. So far

as I am concerned, I will criticise them in this way: that I believe the money has not been spent in the right direction. It appears the North-West is the only portion of our great Dominion that has been protected by an armed force. That force, in the past, was composed of 300 mounted men, and it speaks well for the Mounted Police that they should have maintained order in that country during the past number of years in which they have had control of it. Instead of having to increase the Mounted Police at this date we ought rather to be able to dispense with a portion of them. If volunteer companies were formed in the Territories, and the money we spend on the Mounted Police was paid to them for two or three weeks drill every year, it would be much cheaper than keeping up a standing corps of Mounted Police. The money that it takes to keep half a dozen mounted policemen would keep a whole company of volunteers, and the volunteers have proved themselves quite as capable of meeting any emergency as the Mounted Police. The Minister of Militia has stated that the Government have kept up 37,000 men in the older Provinces. I think it is a great mistake to spend all the money in keeping up 37,000 men in these Provinces, when little or nothing has been spent in the North-West. The North-West is the only portion of the Dominion which requires protection by an armed force, and certainly the greater portion of the money should be be spent there. I felt very much grieved at the answer I received from the hon. the Minister of Militia, in the earlier part of the Session, at the time of the breaking out of the rebellion. I asked him if it was his intention to furnish arms to volunteer companies who would organise for protection or to go the front. I was answered that the Government were very careful in whose hands they placed arms in Manitoba. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say "hear, hear," but they may live to see the day when they may regret glorying in such statements. The people of that Province are as loyal as any in the Dominion, and the Minister of Militia has stated to-night that the volunteers of Winnipeg have stood the brunt of battle; and the volunteers from all over the Province of Manitoba, who have gone to the front, in all, some 1,000 young men, have stood the brunt of battle; and I think it ill becomes any hon. member of this House to sneer at the volunteers of the West. But we may probably expect such things from hon. gentlemen opposite. We find that an hon. gentleman, a member of the Government, the Minister of the Interior, in the Upper House, a few days ago, said he had no doubt, when the papers were brought down about the troubles, that it would be found among Riel's papers that the Farmer's Union had a great deal to do with the recent rebellion. I repudiate any such statement, coming from an hon. member of the Upper House, or from this House. The people of Manitoba are as loyal, and have proved themselves as loyal during the late trouble, as any other citizens of the Dominion. I say, with reference to this Bill before us, that I believe the money intended to be spent in more than doubling the present strength of the force would, a portion of it, be much better spent in maintaining volunteer companies. We have hundreds of young men in Manitoba who have proved themselves willing to go to the front within the last two or three months, although they were not drilled, and I say that a portion of this money spent in the maintenance of an increased Mounted Police force would be much better spent and have a much greater effect in forming a large number of men into a militia company, ready to go into action at any time. I do hope that, whether the Mounted Police are increased or not, the Minister of Militia or the First Minister may see fit to organise volunteer companies all over the Province of Manitoba and the North-West. If there is a Province in the Dominion in which volunteers should be encouraged it is that Province and the Territories. It is the only one where there need exist any fear of the Indians, or, I might say, from the frontier. We have a frontier of about 100 miles in extent of prairie country. We have been isolated in the past, to a certain extent, from other portions of the Dominion; our Province and the Territories have been under the control of 300 armed men, and little or no arms or ammunition have been kept in the Province for distribution among the settlers for their own defence. The Mounted Police deserve credit for the work they have done in the North-West. It is wonderful, when we consider the struggle that has taken place lately, how 300 men managed to keep these Indians so well under control. This trouble having arisen, and the Government having seen fit to increase the mounted police, I hope the Government will not omit to organise volunteer companies, either mounted or infantry, in Manitoba and the Territories.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. Minister of Militia will not give the House further information, I hope to be able to extract it some other time. I do not propose to trouble the House with further reference to this matter, but wish to say a few words with reference to some things the right hon. gentleman has stated. He has declared that the statements I have made are not justified by the facts; and he said that I had drawn upon my imagination for them, or upon information from outside. Now, the history that I gave to the House of the rise and fall of the five companies of the North West volunteers was extracted from the hon. gentleman's own reports. These were the sources of my information. It was from these I derived the facts. If those reports are unreliable, if they do not convey to the House and the country the truth, if they do not state the facts accurately, then, of course, I have been inaccurate, but it was because I was guileless enough to believe that the hon. gentleman's reports were correct, and because I supposed that he, at any rate, would accept them as correct. I have shown from those documents the difficulties which those men were beset with. I have shown from the reports, from year to year, of his own officer, to his own Department what their trouble was. I have shown that, in consequence of their not being furnished with uniforms they were not authorised to drill; that they were relieved from drill because the uniforms were not sent out. I have shown what was their discouragement by his own officer, and I have shown the views of his own officer, from year to year, of the necessary results of that discouragement; and what were the reasons the hon. gentleman gave for letting those companies fall into this condition? They were two-fold. First, he said it was true, as I had read in a speech of his, that the organisation of the militia forces of the North-West was a large question. That was one of the reasons why they were allowed to fall into decay. It was a large question, it was too large a question for the hon. gentleman to handle; it was too large a question for him to grapple with.

Mr. CARON. Too large for the vote you gave.

Mr. BLAKE. I will deal with the vote presently. It was too large a question for the hon. gentleman to handle. The Government declared, in the year 1879, that it was their policy to organise forces in the North-West; that these Territories should have a corps wherever there was a population sufficient for it. They told Parliament so. They obtained a small special vote for the initiation of that. They proceeded in that line. They declared it each year, and, without telling Parliament what they were going to do they seem, administratively and executively, to have adopted the opposite policy, of extinguishing the forces in the North-West Territories. It was not the policy announced to Parliament. The hon. gentleman did not say: The result of my consideration of the North-West affairs is that I have decided to reverse the policy which I sent to Col. Osborne Smith, in 1879, when I told him to tell the inhabi-

tants it was highly important to organise forces in those Territories, and they were organised; but I think now they may be allowed to die out, and I ask Parliament to let them die out. Nothing of that kind said he, but he did it. He says there was another difficulty. Why were they not furnished with uniforms? He says: There was another Minister who preceded him and who discharged the duties of his office with greater ability than he could pretend to. There are some things in which we are inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman, and that is one. He says that his predecessor found that there was a difficulty in those days. He wanted a little time to consider what the proper form of uniform should be in the North-West. It is a peculiar country, where the climate is severe, where it is very hot in the summer, and I am told that it is a little cold in the winter, where the country is a little difficult and the distances may be great, and he wanted to find out what uniform would be the proper one in the North-West; and this practical question, which might have been settled, I should think, by enquiry of those mounted men who have been doing duty under the charge of another Department of the same Government for some years, by enquiry as to the views held in reference to the situation of the troops on the other side of the line in a somewhat similar climate, discharging somewhat similar duties—this was another great branch of the North-West militia question; and it has taken the hon. gentleman and his predecessor from 1879 to 1885 to find how the troops should be clothed. Well, he has had to settle it experimentally and in a hurry, in the middle of a war. He nods assent. Is it not a pity that they did not have a mimic war some years before.

Mr. CARON. Your friends tried to get it up.

Mr. BOWELL. You had it here.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not hear of it; but, if so, it adds to the culpability of the hon. gentleman, because with that danger staring him in the face, and being charged with the peace and protection of the country, and believing, as I suppose he did, as he has said so, that the people were trying to get up a war before, still the clothing of the North-West militia is too great a question for him to grapple with. The tailor's question—the question of the cut of the clothes of the men—all these questions were so difficult, and required so much time to solve, that it was necessary that the forces he organised in 1879 should languish and die as an organised force before his great mind could successfully grapple with the question. He says there was another great difficulty—even if I could have grappled with this question, I could not have handled it, any way, because you refused to vote me the money. I am prepared to defend every vote I have given, every speech I have made on the subject of the militia of this country. When the hon. gentleman condescends to particulars, as I now challenge him to do, either now, if he wills, or when his departmental estimates are before the House, if he wills, when he wills and where he wills, I challenge him to the speech or to the vote which will justify his statement in this matter. I speak for myself; my friends will speak for themselves; he made a personal attack and a personal charge upon me, and declared that my speeches and my votes were of a character that, he said, no man who loved his country would engage in at such a crisis. He was disorderly in making that statement, but I did not call him to order for it. I repudiate the charge, I hurl it in the hon gentleman's face, I deny it to his teeth. I say the criticisms I have administered to his militia estimates, such as they were, I am prepared to stand by, to reiterate, to defend and to repeat. I say, further, that the defence of the hon. gentleman is—I cannot use the word; I was about to say ignoble, but I understand that that word, from this side of the House, is out of order, so I do not use it—but I say his defence is unworthy of a Government. Here is a Government in power with a majority of two to one in Parliament. They bring down the estimates for the public service of the country which they say are adequate to the discharge of the public service. They are bound by their oaths of office, they are bound by their duty to the country, they are bound by the power with which their country has entrusted them, to call upon the representatives of the people in Parliament assembled for such supplies as are necessary to carry on the public business efficiently, for such supplies as are necessary to protect the public peace and secure good order in the land. That is their bounden, their plain, their obvious, their sworn duty. And the hon. gentleman tells me—what? Not that he brought down a large vote, which was rejected; not that he brought down a large vote which, a combination of the Opposition and of his own followers prevented him from carrying. He says: I brought down too small votes because I, the Minister of War, at the head of a force twice as numerous as that opposed to me, was afraid of the criticism of the Opposition. The Minister of War, with all the power, with all the patronage, with all the grandeur of his position, and sustained by forces twice as large as those opposed to him, sustained by drilled and organised battalions, which fill one side of this House, spread over to the other, and almost crowd our feeble force out of the chamber, knowing that his public duty called on him to bring down large estimates to Parliament, abnegated his duty, was false to his oath, was unfaithful to his trust, and brought down small estimates, inadequate to the discharge of his duty, and rendering the country insecure. That is the hon. gentleman's statement. Now he says: I turn round, I, with my power, I, with my organised battalions, I, with my numerous forces, I, with the control of the Treasury, I, with all in my hand to do what I please, and with my sworn duty to do it, my defence for my abnegation of my duty is that I was afraid of what the Opposition would say. Is it really so? Is it because the Minister of Militia was afraid of the criticism of the Opposition that he did not bring down the necessary estimates? For, Sir, every shilling that the hon. gentleman asked from Parliament had been voted. But with reference to the particular estimate which we are now dealing with—I refer to the estimate for uniforms—unless my memory greatly deceives me, I do not believe that there was a criticism in this Parliament or in the last Parliament hostile to the amount of that vote. On the contrary, unless my memory greatly deceives me, it leads me to the impression that more than once hon. gentlemen on this side of the House—I think I will say my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), amongst them—have pointed out the necessity of improving the equipment, of improving some portions of the uniform of the volunteers.

Mr. CARON. Buttons.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has a soul above buttons, I observe, looking as straight as I can before me. But I do not think that we discussed the subject of buttons. And I recollect something more, with that memory which the hon. gentleman says is so unfaithful, and which he is so little disposed to trust, I think I recollect a discussion on the subject of head gear, and I think my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Fairbank) pointed out what ought to be done in that way, and I think I recollect my hon. friend from Elgin speaking on the equipments, and calling the hon. gentleman's attention to that. I think I shall be able, when that challenge to which I referred is met, to show the hon. gentleman—although I speak only for myself—I shall be able to show him that suggestions were made from this side of the House that more should be done in the nature of an equipment for the volunteers than the hon. gentleman himself proposed. But, Sir, if it were as the hon. gentleman has alleged, this is certainly a humiliating position for a powerful Government to stand in, that their defence for not doing

that which was essential in their view to the interest of the country is, that they were afraid to bring down the necessary vote because they feared the criticism of a weak Opposition—an Opposition that hon. gentlemen jeer at and deride, when it serves their purpose, but which now, it seems, is strong enough, without one word, by the mere fear of words it may perhaps speak, to control the policy of the Administration of the day. Now, the hon. gentleman found no difficulty in proposing last year a vote of twenty-nine millions and a-half for the Canadian Pacific Railway. He finds no difficulty this year in proposing a vote altering the condition of our securities, and making a further loan of five million dollars. He has found no difficulty in proposing to Parliament an expenditure in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, upon the whole, of something over one hundred million dollars, in one way or another. These things did not stagger the hon. gentleman, but he was so afraid of the criticisms of the Opposition that he could not find the money, he could not find it in that brave and gallant heart—which must be brave and gallant, when it belongs to a Minister of Militia—to ask for money for uniforms for five companies in the North-West—three mounted companies and two infantry companies. What a curious sort of difficulty this is. The Government are bold when they want to do a thing. They were not apprehensive of our criticisms when they proposed that you, Sir, should be put in that Chair. They went on. They were not apprehensive of our criticisms when they proposed that we should have two heads to the Library. They went in. They are not apprehensive of our criticism when they propose, in one block, to vote half a million dollars more in permanence for the Mounted Police. But they are so afraid of us that they could not ask for money for the uniforms for the volunteers, so that because there were no uniforms they had to go without drill, and thus the whole thing came to an end. What a curious kind of cowardice this is in the hon. gentleman. It strikes him just when he wants to be struck. When he wants to be afraid of something he is very much afraid, but when he wants to do something he is as bold and as brave as need be. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that I am in the habit of declaring things upon my own imagination, and that what I believe I believe so strongly that I am quite sure it is a fact, although I am contradicted, and that I believe there must be a report of Col. Houghton, and because I believe it, I say it. The hon. gentleman denies it, and he tells me there is no such report.

Mr. CARON. Except the one that appears.

Mr. BLAKE. No such report, except the one that is in the Blue Book, that there is nothing to be brought down. Now, Sir, I know that there is such a report from Col. Houghton—I do not merely believe it, I know it as a positive fact. I aver it to be a fact, and I shall prove it this moment. I read from the report of Col. Houghton himself in this very Blue Book:

"Fortunately this catastrophe was averted by the excellent management of Major Crozier, Superintendent of Mounted Police, and the steadiness and discipline of the men under his command. I allude, of course, to the Battleford fracas with the Indians in the early part of last summer. Having already, however, reported to you fully with regard to the impressions formed by me when travelling through that section of the country last July (see report of 28th July), I must not here repeat my views therein expressed, and which have not since altered."

Now, there is Col. Houghton's own statement, that he made a report on the 28th of July last, to the officer commanding the forces. He does not repeat it, but he declared, I think in the month of November, that this view remained unchanged. These are the reasons why I said I knew there was a report from Col. Houghton, and I think the hon. gentleman should admit that they are good reasons, since he brought that Blue Book down to Parliament. The hon. gentleman has said that I said nothing about the North-West companies while they existed, but that I waited until it was all over. The hon. gentleman is mistaken there again. I said nothing about specific companies, but I have read to-night my statement made in the year 1882, on a debate such as this, with reference to the Mounted Police, as to the importance of creating and encouraging important corps of volunteers in the North-West; and I suggested, so far as from being disposed to unreasonable critisism, that extra expense in the way of pay should be incurred in order to make them efficient. I have read that in the House to-night; therefore the hon. gentleman will see that in the year 1882 I expressed myself at one with the policy of local corps in the North-West, and indicated that it might be necessary that increased expense on an unusual scale should be incurred, in order that that should be done, and of course took the responsibility of tendering the advice to the Government. I am not going to say a word about the conduct of our volunteers, about the hon. gentleman's management of the campaign, about the various other patriotic topics by which he sought to escape from a somewhat difficult position. I am aware that the hon. gentleman says that I do not know much about military matters. We are both lawyers; and I will not dispute the hon. gentleman's superiority in our profession, and certainly not in military matters. But it does not require much knowledge of military matters to understand that particular art which is employed when an hon. gentleman gets into a difficult position and proposes to beat a retreat. There are feigned attacks, diversions, something to draw away the attention of the enemy, something to cheer and encourage one's friends, something to raise a cloud of dust, under which the retreat is made. So the hon. gentleman, with patriotic exultation and an exuberant expression of praise with respect to his own conduct, sought, amid the cheers of his followers, to escape from the question in hand. We are not going to discuss the campaign or the hon. gentleman's conduct of it, or the conduct our volunteers. Neither are we going to discuss the munitions supplied to our volunteers, or the tunics and uniforms supplied to them, or the transport supplied to them, or the hard tack and pork supplied to them. These are not the questions for discussion. I was pointing out that we had a policy with respect to the defence of the North-West, and the maintenance of order there; that that policy consisted of our having two classes of forces in that country, the Mounted Police and the volunteer force; that we had debated the subject of the conjoint action and development of those two forces; that both sides of the House had agreed, myself speaking from the left, as leader of the Opposition, and the First Minister speaking from his place, as leader of the Government, in substance to the proposition that there should be encouragement of the local forces, and they were to discharge an important part of the duty. I was pointing out that that policy had been adopted in form by the Government for two or three years before; and I was pointing out from the Blue Books of the hon. gentleman how that policy had been handled subsequently, and in what it had resulted when the time of stress came. That was pointed out. I pointed out that the question was: What shall be our policy in the future? Has that question yet been settled? Are we going to organise a large volunteer force in the North-West? Have we settled the great question of trowsers? Is that great question, like the question of buttons, settled yet, and is the hon. gentleman prepared to decide what uniform shall be worn? If so, you want to handle the subjects together, as the hon. gentleman's own officers have dealt with them. I have read extracts from reports from the hon. gentleman's own officers, containing suggestions as to how to manage in places where there is a small force of police and a company or two of militia, and in other places where there are no police and quite sufficient militia. What is to be the policy of the future? I say these are very important questions, and they are all the more important when we consider the

hon. gentleman's views with respect to the expenditure of money. What is the militia vote? Small as it may be, what is the militia vote which the hon. gentleman took last year? It was a trifle under a million. For the whole militia force for the whole of Canada there was a trifle under a million of dollars. We are now going to expend on the Mounted Police, after this proposition is adopted, just about $1,000,000, an equal amount to that expended on the whole militia of Canada. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), with the shrewd, practical common sense which distinguishes him, pointed out that the Minister could do a great deal, by way of encouraging local corps in the North-West, by expending a fraction of the amount, by expending the interest for one year on the sum he is going to expend annually on the Mounted Police. That is a serious and important question. But the hon. gentleman is not afraid of proposing to expend $1,000,000 a year on the Mounted Police in the North-West; he is not afraid of our criticism. That is all right. It is only when you come to the expense of uniforms for five companies that the hon. gentleman's heart drops into his boots, and instead of being a Minister of Militia he becomes a political poltroon.

Mr. CARON. I have more than admired the various talents of the hon. gentleman. I have admired how he displays that kind feeling, that gentlemanly feeling, for which he is so notorious. But the hon. gentleman appears before us to-night in a new *role*. He has lectured hon. gentlemen upon courage and bravery, and has talked of poltroonery. I believe the hon. gentleman is the last member of this House who can assume that *role*. From his past career and from my experience of him, I believe he is the very last member of this House who should stand here and lecture any hon. gentleman upon his courage and bravery. The hon. gentleman was evidently carried away by the very few remarks I made for the purpose of conveying information to the hon. gentleman. I meant merely to convey information, nothing else. But the hon. gentleman says the policy of the Government has been to extinguish the forces in the North-West, to destroy the companies which were at one time existing. The hon. gentleman forgets that immediately upon the reduction of the forces, in so far as regards those companies which were disorganised, we immediately organised a battalion, which was commanded by Col. Kennedy, who lost his life a short time ago when showing the devotion of Canadians to the British Government. That is a record of the policy of the Government in regard to its extinguishing forces at that time existing in the North-West. We merely collected the arms of companies which did not exist, and organised a battalion, which was the first battalion to go to the front, and which fought the first battle in defence of law and good order. That was the policy of extinguishment and of destruction that the hon. gentleman seems to be so delighted to bring before the House, in the hope that he will induce the House and the country to believe that such as he depicted it was the policy of the Government. It was not a policy of extinguishing or reducing the force, but of having a force that could be relied upon in case of emergency, as the 90th Battalion has proved itself to be, a battalion perfectly equipped and organised, and ready, at a moment's notice, to take the field and fight for the country, as every militia regiment in Canada should do. So far as those disorganised companies were concerned, that was the policy followed. Were the Government to blame for collecting arms, which were handed over to the first organisation that was raised in that district when the emergency arose occurred? The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) said he had been advocating a policy of giving arms to home guards and other military organisations in the North-West. But the hon. gentleman tried to find fault, because that wish which he expressed had not been complied with. Well, Mr. Chairman, we could not recognise any other organisation than the regular militia force. What authority had I, as Minister of Militia, under the statute, to go and distribute the arms of Canada, and to give those arms to any organisation, except those which are recognised by the law of the land. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) came to me, as several others came to me, and said the ranches were unprotected, and some other interest was unprotected; that they required a home guard, and that they required me to arm them to protect those various interests. I told the hon. gentleman that when it comes to the militia force the Department of Militia is supposed to look after the armament and equipment of that force. If any organisation is required for any special purpose, then, it is for the municipal authorities or other authorities in that country, to take the necessary precautions, so as to procure the arms which they think it proper and right to place in the hands of those men. The hon. gentleman seemed to insinuate that these arms had not been given because we had doubted the loyalty of the men applying for those arms. Well, I can only say that it was not a question of loyalty, it was a question of the Department carrying out the law which organised that Department. It was a question with the Department of doing what it was bound to do, and not going beyond its duty, by giving arms which it had no right or authority to distribute to any force other than the one recognised by that Department. Now, the leader of the Opposition has thrown out challenges. Well, when the time comes, when the papers are brought down, as to any challenges which the hon. gentleman has put forward, notwithstanding the want of bravery on the part of the Minister of Militia, I believe we can meet together upon the same ground, and I am not at all afraid to meet him when that time comes.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not propose to prolong the discussion, but the statement which the hon. gentleman has just now made, with reference to the force in the North-West, is one which should not pass without a word. I have been discussing, Sir, the question of the North-West Territories, the question of the defence, of order, in the North-West Territories, as distinct from Manitoba. You know the extent of the North-West, the comparative inaccessibility and remoteness of many points in these Territories. We are engaged in discussing that question with reference to this proposal to add 500 men to the Mounted Police. I have been arguing, as I did consistently in 1882, as the Government then agreed, as they agreed for three years before, for the formation of local forces in different parts of those remote Territories, where there might be local means advanced and a sufficient aggregation among the people, where you might strike at a moment, and not wait until you organised battalions, which would have to march 200 miles in the depth of winter.

Mr. CARON. We did organise a force.

Mr. BLAKE. What force?

Mr. CARON. The 90th Battalion.

Mr. BLAKE. Where?

Mr. CARON. At Winnipeg. Where would you organise it?

Mr. BLAKE. I am not talking about the organisation of battalions at Winnipeg, but of the armament of the organisations you had in the North-West.

Mr. CARON. Which had disappeared—which did not exist.

Mr. BLAKE. I know it disappeared; I know it did not exist. That is what I charge—that is my point. I say we

had a policy for the organisation of local corps in the North-West at different points. It was a settled policy, an agreed policy, a policy consented to by both sides, and when that organisation has disappeared, I charge its disappearance upon hon. gentlemen opposite. That is the point, and the hon. gentleman now says: Oh, it did not disappear, because I did not reduce the forces. If I allowed the local organisations to disappear it was that I might create additional forces in Winnipeg. That does not answer the question at all. It may have been all right to create that battalion in Winnipeg—I am not questioning the creation of the additional battalion in Winnipeg. I dare say that was a judicious thing to do—I am not discussing it now—I will grant it for the moment, but it has nothing to do with the question of the reversal of policy as to local corps in the North-West. That is what we have to deal with.

Mr. CARON. Allow me to ask the hon. gentleman whether he would have been more successful in keeping men together who were going from one portion of that immense territory to another, thereby completely disorganising these companies. It is not a question of disorganisation, but they disappeared completely. It is not, as the hon. gentleman stated, that they were disorganised because they had no tunics, but because, if they had tunics, there were no men to wear them, and the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement which requires attention. He says that was the reason, and that I know it. I say again that my information is derived from, perhaps, an eminently untrustworthy source. I am beginning to believe so. It is derived from the hon. gentleman's own reports.

Mr. CARON. You have said so before.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, let us see what the cause was, as stated by the hon. gentleman's own reports. In the report for the year 1882 the commanding officer declares:

"The North-West corps, in consequence of not yet having received any uniforms, were relieved from drill this year by order of the Adjutant-General, dated 10th August."

He goes on:

"In reference to these corps, I may state that it is hardly to be expected that they will give up much of their valuable time and supply their own horses for drilling purposes, or even regard themselves in the light of a properly organised body of militia, until after they have been furnished with uniforms of some pattern or denomination."

Then, in the following year, after this report was made, the officer reports again:

"In the same connection, I would beg most respectfully to urge the advisability of the reorganisation, or, more properly, the organisation of the North-West corps, which although now more than three years enrolled and shortly afterwards outfitted with arms, ammunition and saddlery, have never since been assembled for drill, in consequence of no uniform having, up to the present time, been furnished to them. These corps are still in existence, and could readily be resuscitated by their original commanding officers were they to receive encouragement to do so."

The Minister of Militia says he knew, and that I knew, that these men, who were scattered all over the country, had all gone, that they had all disappeared; that the arms were there, and the saddles were there, but that the men who enlisted were gone. I find that his own officer tells him that "the corps are still in existence and could readily be resusciated by their original commanding officers were they to receive encouragement to do so." What was the encouragement they got? The encouragement was to disband them. We have the statement in the report of the 1st July last, of the number there is for drill, only 380 out 775; and that statement includes these companies. The officer adds:

"I may here state that since the commencement of the current year, 1884-85, namely, by *Gazette* of the 13th September last, the three companies of mounted rifles and two companies of infantry in the North-West Territories have been removed from the list of corps of the active militia."

I stated that from an earlier period the growing discouragement was pointed out; that the hon. gentleman was told by his officers that it was not expected that the force could go on without being supplied with uniforms; that last year he was told the corps were still in existence and could easily be resuscitated, if only they could be given any encouragement, and that the encouragement he gave was to disband them.

Resolution to be reported.

INSPECTION OF GAS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would throw a little light on this, in the absence of his colleague.

Mr. McLELAN. The previous Act required that notice should be given to the manufacturers of gas when the quality of the gas as well as the meters were to be inspected. It was thought unwise to give the manufacturers notice when the quality of the gas was about to be tested as well as the quantity, and this Bill is just to amend the Act so that notice of an intention to inspect the quality of the gas will not be given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The clause I have before me appears rather to provide that the manufacturers should have 24 hours' notice, although I entirely agree with the Minister that it is not desirable that the manufacturers should get notice. I have had a good deal of practical experience of the dexterity of the manufacturers of gas in altering the quality to suit the inspection, and in various ways in playing tricks on the consumer.

Mr. McLELAN. The clause which it is proposed to substitute for that now in the Act provides for notice only of the inspection of the meter and not of the quality of the gas.

Bill read the second time.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at at 1:25 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 10th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

CULLING AND MEASURING OF TIMBER.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in Ontario and Quebec and to provide that the Governor in Council may by regulation direct that the number of cullers employed shall not exceed thirty-three who may be employed as he directs; that annuities granted to cullers may be three hundred dollars per annum, and that the tariff of fees levied under the said Acts may be varied for the purpose of meeting expenditure thereunder and to allow to cullers average yearly earnings of seven hundred dollars each.

Motion agreed to.

THE FRANCHISE BILL—REMUNERATION OF REVISING OFFICERS, &c.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That the remuneration of revising officers and of their clerks and bailiffs who may be appointed under the Bill respecting the Electoral Franchise, and their allowance for expenses, as well as the mode of payment thereof, shall be fixed by Order of the Governor in Council, and the amount thereof shall be a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue of Canada, and paid out of the same.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolutions:—

That for the final settlement of the claims made by the Province of Manitoba on the Dominion, it is expedient to provide:

1. That all lands in Manitoba which can be shown to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government to be swamp lands, be transferred to the Province and enure wholly to its benefit and uses.

2. That an allotment of land, not exceeding 150,000 acres, of fair average quality, be selected by the Dominion Government and granted as an endowment to the University of Manitoba for its maintenance as a university capable of giving proper training in the higher branches of education, and to be held in trust for that purpose upon some basis or scheme to be framed by the university and approved by the Dominion Government.

3. That the sum now payable annually to the Province under the Act 45 Vic., c. 5, as an indemnity for the want of public lands, be increased from $45,000 to $100,000, such increase to date from the first day of July now next.

4. That the yearly *per capita* allowance to the Province of 80 cents per head, made under the Act 33 Vic., c. 3, on an estimated population of 17,000 (increased by 45 Vic., c. 5., to 150,000), shall, from the said first day of July next, be allowed only on an estimated population of 125,000 souls, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—A census of the Province shall be taken in every fifth year, reckoning from the general census of 1881; and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made on the first day of September next, and at equal intervals of time between each quinquennial and decennial census; and whenever the population, by any such census or estimate exceeds 125,000, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said *per capita* allowance shall be increased accordingly, and so on until the population shall have reached 400,000 souls.

5. That so much of the said Act, 45 Vic., c. 5, as relates to the amount of the indemnity for the want of public lands, or the *per capita* allowance on the population of the Province, be repealed; and that the allowances provided by the foregoing resolutions be not limited to the ten years next after 1881, or to any other period.

6. That the capital sum on which the Province is entitled to receive half yearly payments of interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum as fixed by the Act 33 Vic., cap. 3, and as readjusted or increased by any subsequent Act, shall be charged with such advances as have been already made to the Province, and with such expenditure as has been made therein by the Dominion for purposes of a strictly local character, and with a further sum of $150,000, which the Dominion Government may advance to the Province to meet the expenditure of constructing a lunatic asylum and other exceptional services.

7. That the grants of land and payment, authorised by the foregoing resolutions, shall be made on the condition that they be accepted by the Province (such acceptance being testified by an Act of the Legislature thereof during its present Session) as a full settlement of all claims made by the said Province for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory, or the reference of the boundary question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and all other questions and claims discussed between the Dominion and the Provincial Government up to the 10th day of January, 1885.

8. That the sums authorised to be paid by these resolutions may be paid out of any moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Motion agreed to.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

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

That it is expedient that the provisional contract entered into between Mr. Andrew Allan and the Postmaster General of Canada, under the authority of an Order in Council, dated the 12th day of April, 1884, for a weekly service of ocean mail steamers on the terms and conditions set forth in the said contract (a copy whereof and of the said Order in Council has been laid before Parliament), should be sanctioned and authorised by Parliament as required by the terms thereof, in order to its becoming valid and binding.

Motion agreed to.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE MAGISTRATES.

Mr. CARON moved:

That the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 128) to make better provision respecting summary proceedings before justices and other magistrates (from the Senate), be transferred to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, under the authority of its shareholders, as provided by the 28th section of its Charter, may issue and deliver to the Government first mortgage bonds to the extent of $35,000,000, bearing five per cent. interest, such bonds to constitute and be a first lien and charge on the entire property of the company, real and personal, now owned or hereafter to be acquired, or owned, by it (save and except the lands granted or to be granted by the Government to the company under the said contract), including its main line of railway with its tolls and revenues, the extensions thereof, its branch lines of railway (except the Algoma Branch), the whole of its equipment, rolling stock and plant, and all its steamers and vessels; saving always, however, the rights of the holders of the existing mortgages on the extensions of the line of the railway from Callander to Brockville and Montreal as security for the unpaid balances of the purchase money of the said extensions.

2. That the company may secure the payment of the said bonds and of the interest thereon by a deed of mortgage executed by the company to trustees to be approved by the Government with the authority and of the tenor and purport, and containing the conditions, remedies, provisions and powers authorised and provided for by the 28th section of the charter of the company, to such extent and in such manner and form as shall be approved by the Governor in Council.

3. That upon the issue and delivery of the said bonds to the Government, the lien and charge created by the Act 47 Vic., chap. 1, intituled: "An Act to amend the Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and for other purposes;" upon the railway and property of the company affected by the said bonds and by the deed of mortgage securing the same shall cease to exist, and shall be released and discharged in respect of the railway and property so affected, and the shares in the capital stock of the company, to the extent of $35,000,000 now in the hands of the Government shall be cancelled and destroyed. But the Algoma Branch shall still remain charged with the lien and charge created by the said Act.

4. That the time for the payment of the entire loan to the Company of $29,880,912 shall be fixed at the first day of May, 1891, and so long as default shall not occur in the payment of principal or interest at the times when they shall respectively become due, the interest upon the said loan shall be computed at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum. But the company may at any time pay the amount of the said debt or any part thereof in sums of not less than $1,000,000; and if such payment be made on account of the sum of $20,000,000, hereinafter mentioned, a corresponding amount of bonds shall be returned to it.

5. That as security for the payment of $20,000,000 of such loan and of the interest thereon the Government shall hold and retain $20,000,000 of the said first mortgage bonds, and in respect of such bonds shall have all the rights of bondholders except to as the rate of interest as provided in the last preceding section. And upon payment of any half-yearly instalment of such interest the half-yearly coupons as to the said bonds, corresponding to such half-yearly payment of interest, shall be cancelled and surrendered to the company. But if the company makes default in the payment of the interest on the said sum of $20,000,000 or of the principal thereof at the time when the same shall become due respectively, the rate of interest upon the whole loan shall thereafter be computed at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum; and such default shall be equivalent to a default in the payment of the interest on the said bonds, and shall entitle the Government to the same remedies as if default had been made on the payment of the interest or principal of the said bonds, and upon the company remaining in default in respect of either the principal or interest on the said $20,000,000 for a period of 12 months, the trustees shall be authorised and empowered to take possession of the property mortgaged and to administer the same for the benefit of the bondholders generally.

6. That as security for the payment of the balance of the said loan amounting to the sum of $9,880 912, and the interest thereon, the Government shall have a first lien and mortgage, subject to the outstanding land grant bonds, on the whole of the unsold lands forming the remaining part of the company's land grant earned and to be hereafter earned, such principal and interest to be paid out of the net proceeds of the sale of such lands; and the Government shall continue to hold and

retain the entire amount of land grant bonds now in its custody and possession as provided by the said Act. And if the net proceeds of such sales to be made from time to time in due course, shall be insufficient to pay the interest on the said last mentioned amount as the same shall fall due, or the principal thereof when the same shall become due, the Governor in Council may order the sale by the trustees of such lands or any part thereof in such manner as shall be fixed by such order, in satisfaction of the interest or principal in respect of which default has occured. And after the sale of the whole of such lands any deficiency in the proceeds thereof to pay the amount charged thereon, shall be a charge upon the company's entire revenue after providing for its fixed charges, and by preference over the shareholders. And no further or other charge shall be created on the property mortgaged as security for the said first mortgage bonds until the said sum of $9,880,912 and interest and also the sum of $20,000,000 and interest shall have been paid in full. And after payment out of the proceeds of such lands of the outstanding land grant bonds, and of the said sum of $9,880,912 and interest, the remainder of such lands shall remain charged with a first lien and privilege in favor of the Government as additional security for the payment of the said sum of $20,000,000 and interest.

7. That the Government may make a temporary loan to the company of $5,000,000 to be repaid by the company to the Government on or before the 1st day of July, 1986, with interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, payable on the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July, 1886, the company to have the right to repay the said loan by instalments of not less than $1,000,000 each, and to receive on the payment thereof a corresponding proportion of the amount of said bonds held as security therefor. And after reserving part of the said bonds to the amount of $8,000,000 to be held by the Government as security for the said temporary loan, and to be delivered to the company on payment to the Government of the said sum of $5,000,000 and interest in whole or in part in proportion to such payment, the remainder of the said bonds shall be from time to time paid by the Government to the company, to be applied by the company under the supervision of the Government, to the payment for work done or to be done for the development, improvement and extension of the railway, its connections and equipment, and for the maintenance of the credit and efficiency of the company generally to the satisfaction of the Government. And if the bonds in the hands of the Government or any part thereof shall be sold by the company at a price satisfactory to the Government, the proceeds of such sale shall be paid into the hands of the Government in the place and stead of the bonds so sold, and such proceeds shall be dealt with as is hereinbefore provided with respect to the bonds they represent.

8. That the proportion to which the Government is entitled of the moneys realised by the trustees of the land grant bonds (and after the redemption of the land grant bonds, the proceeds of all sales of land granted or to be granted to the company under the contract) realised as provided by the said Act,—shall be applied to the payment of the interest and principal of the said sum of $9,800,912. And after payment thereof in full, towards the payment to the Government of the interest and principal of the said sum of $20,000,000.

9. That the said Act of last Session (47 Victoria, chapter 1) shall remain in force, except in so far as it is affected by the provisions hereof.

10. That if at any time any line connecting with the United States system of railways shall be in course of construction to a point on the river St. Mary's, and there shall be a probability of the early completion thereof, and the company shall desire to continue the Algoma Branch to a junction with such line, the Governor in Council may, in their discretion, and upon such conditions as they shall determine, order the release and discharge of the said Branch from the lien and charge thereon created by the said Act, and continued by this Act, and may, by such order, authorise the company to exercise, in respect of the said Branch, the power of mortgaging the same in manner and form as provided by its charter with respect to mortgaging the main line thereof, to such extent per mile as shall be fixed by such order, the proceeds of such bonds to be applied exclusively to the construction of the extension of the said Branch to such junction.

Motion agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENTS.

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

That it is expedient to amend "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883," and to make better provision (*a*) for the marking and storing of goods warehoused; (*b*) for preventing the sale of unlawfully manufactured spirits or malt; (*c*) for preventing fraud by the use of packages which have been already used; (*d*) for the enforcement of penalties; (*e*) for allowing an abatement of duty on spirits for shrinkage by evaporation, for allowing the Governor in Council to impose an additional duty of five cents on each gallon of spirits, and for prohibiting spirits being entered for consumption before a specified time after manufacture; (*f*) for the protection of the revenue in relation to compound articles, breweries, tobacco and cigars; (*g*) for defining the packages and boxes in which tobacco and cigars may be put up; (*h*) for the cancellation of stamps and allowing the modification of caution labels in respect of tobacco and cigars; (*i*) for the warehousing and ex-warehousing of tobacco and cigars.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX.

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

That it is expedient to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a harbor master at the port of Halifax, and to provide that the said harbor master may, out of the fees received by him, retain for his own remuneration, one thousand eight hundred dollars instead of one thousand six hundred, as provided in the Act 35 Victoria, chapter 42.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE INTERPRETER.

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

That the controller, the interpreter and other persons who may be appointed under the Bill to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada, should be so appointed, and their remuneration be fixed by order of the Governor General in Council, the salary of the interpreter not to exceed three thousand dollars a year, and that the amount of such remuneration be held a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue of Canada and paid out of the same.

Motion agreed to.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882.—(Mr. McLelan.)

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the report of the Committee of the Whole on resolution in reference to the number of the North-West Mounted Police force, be now received and read a second time.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman give us some reasons why he proposes to increase the force?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought that I had given explanations why the increase was needed—not at length, certainly, but length is not my prevailing excellence. The hon. member opposite, in his speech, complained that I had confined myself to the question of protecting ranches. Now, I did not say anything about ranches. I spoke about protecting those living near the frontier, protecting their flocks and herds. The ranches are, in the far west, coteing the eastern declivity of the Rocky Mountains. Those have always been protected. I believe there has been very little raiding there, for the very good reason that the companies who own these different ranches employ a strong force of very efficient herdsmen, known in the United States as cowboys, who protect their flocks very well. But the chief scene of raiding is on the southern frontier of the Province of Manitoba, and extending westward until we come to the country of the ranches. There the people are agriculturists, settled on their lands, and they all have horses, cattle and sheep as well, though I do not hear of any abduction of sheep. There is an organised system of forays from the United States into that country. With respect to the frontier of Manitoba, it is true that, to a great extent, the Province sees to the proper administration of the law and to the protection of life and property along that frontier, but the Province is quite unable to organise and maintain a force such as is absolutely necessary for the pur-

pose of protecting it. There are certain well known trails from the United States into Canada. They are followed by raiders, to a very considerable extent, and these people carry away cattle. The Dominion Government assume the protection of the frontier, so far as the Mounted Police can do it. These raids are the subject, I will not say of daily, but of weekly or monthly complaint to the American Government. We think we are more sinned against than sinning. The raids come principally from the other side; and without a mounted force, which the Province of Manitoba, I do not think, could well keep up, there is no real, practical protection. Cattle cannot be followed on foot and be recovered.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Have the raids not been wholly west of the boundary of Manitoba—in the Territories, not in the Province?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We use the force to protect the international boundary line as well in the Province of Manitoba as west of the Province. There is a great deal of raiding into Manitoba proper, and a great many complaints arise on both sides. The House will see that it would be putting a strain on the resources of Manitoba to compel that Province to maintain a mounted constabulary for the purpose of preventing those raids. The hon. gentleman said that by my short statement yesterday it would appear that the main object of the police was to protect the herds. I dwelt on that, as it was a new phase, an increasing phase of duty on the part of the Mounted Police. Their duties are increasing daily by the altered and altering circumstances of the country. The police have a very difficult and very dangerous, as well as a delicate, series of duties to perform. Under the Indian treaties certain reserves were set apart for the Indians. It has been only by slow degrees that the Indians were got—they have not all been got there yet—to confine themselves to their reserves and endeavor to live by the agricultural products of the soil. The better Indians, the good Indians, to use a common expression—and I think the majority of them are of that class—have been induced to go to their reserves. It has, however, been accomplished by a series of mingled coaxings and threats. In every Indian band, as in every assembly of white men, there are good and bad people. The bad, the impatient, especially the indolent Indians, those who hang about the different settlements and stores, are very difficult to get upon the reserves. Sometimes indolent Indians will hang around an Indian station or a place where there are stores—sometimes round the Hudson Bay station—they will deliberately settle themseves down and declare that they will starve rather than leave. In such cases the policy has been to keep them on the lowest quantities of food which will sustain nature, in order to compel them to do what the majority of the band have already done—go on the reserves. That policy has been, on the whole, successful. But still there must be a continual, hourly pressure upon the Indians, to hold them upon their reserves. Besides this delicate duty, the duty also devolves upon the police of preventing the Indians breaking into stores, whether they belong to the Government or to the Hudson Bay Company. Whenever there is a small force, hundreds of Indians will come and will break into the stores where supplies are kept. The duty of the police is, therefore, a continuous one, and an increasing one, and the increase in the number of white settlers adds to the difficulty. A white man settling on his farm is apt to be very regardless of the sensibilities and the claims, just or unjust, of the Indians. Settlers, as a rule, take a hostile position against the Indians, just as it has been in the experience of the United States all along the western frontier. The duty of the police is not only to protect the white man against the Indian but the Indian against the white man. And, therefore, with this increasing duty and the increasing responsibility involved, the Government ask the House to consent to the increase of the force by 500 men. Recent events have shown that the force is overworked; that they are obliged to watch every reserve, in order to keep the Indians on the reserves. They are apt to get away; they are unwilling to endure restraint, and this can be prevented if there is a good agent on the reserve, and a sufficient force at hand to let them know pretty well that if they will not listen to reason they will be forced to carry out what they have agreed to do. Sometimes there have been outbreaks. These will break out occasionally, especially when the Indians find themselves, in a given locality, in a majority; then they are apt, too apt, to presume on that majority and insist, by threats of personal violence against the agent, on obtaining supplies from the Hudson Bay Company's or Indian stores, all of which are in the locality for the supply of the Indians under different treaties, and to prevent absolute starvation. In that work the Mounted Police are constantly employed, and the annoyance and worry is great. As I said yesterday, the work is so hard that applications are received from men to leave the force. A policeman must be under training for a time, for a year, certainly, before he is of much value. He will not understand his duties; he will not see the way in which the Indians are treated—the way that the system works; and we are very apt, at the end of the first year, to have a good many applications from policemen to retire. We compel them to pay a fee for that purpose; and we have twice, I think, increased the fee, for the purpose of preventing the men from going away just at the time that they become useful. But it must be obvious to the House and to common sense that the unwilling officer is not a good officer, and therefore it is important that the work should not be too harassing, too constant. I believe that no soldiers known to the British service, no constabulary known to the British service, either in Ireland or in India, as police, have as much work to do, individually, and collectively, as the force in the North-West; and it would be unwise economy to have that force deficient in number. The Bill to be founded upon the resolution is an empowering one, by which the Government are empowered, if they see it necessary, to increase the force to the extent of 1,000 men. Just now, or until lately, it was 520 men and some scouts, the force authorised by law. Now, with respect to the relations between the militia in the North-West and the police force, their duties are quite different. They have one common duty, of course, when called out. They have the common duty of protecting law and order, and in case of outbreak or rebellion, to put it down and keep order. But there the similarity ceases. The militia men, whether they be in one place or another, must be, to a great extent, if not altogether, a defensive force. They are drilled for that purpose. If there is a threatened danger at Prince Albert the militia there would defend Prince Albert, and so with the militia in other points.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish hon. members would keep order. We cannot hear a word here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope hon. gentlemen will keep quiet, as otherwise it is impossible for me to speak, except with great difficulty. As I was saying, in case of insurrection, of course the militia in the North-West and Manitoba will go to the field readily, as they have done, but they will go into the field to put down a pronounced insurrection, an outbreak, or to defend the locality, just in the same way as the militia in the eastern Provinces have gone there to put down the outbreak. They cannot always be in the field. It would, of course, be destructive of the very objects for which these people have gone to the North-West if they were continually employed as a permanent force, watching the protection of the coun-

try from individual outbreak, individual assault, individual raids, and so on. The Militia are at home attending to their various duties. If they are summond to meet insurrection or defend their homes they are most efficient for that purpose, but the duty of the policeman is a daily duty. He has got to be employed—I was going to say in 500 different places, but certainly in 100 places, in parties from two to 500; they have to move about day and night; they have to watch the frontier. If there is a suspicion that there is going to be an exodus from any reserve, either to go on the war path or the more peaceable but more dishonest path of stealing their neighbors' cattle, they have to be watched. Stores are scattered all over the country, Hudson Bay stores, Government stores, as well as the stores of the individual trader, who pierces to the far west with the enterprise of the western trader—they have to be protected. There is ceaseless action—ceaseless movement of the police force from station to station, from point to point; they have to be watching continually. I think the House can quite understand that I am not all displeased with the interruption caused by an hon. gentleman (Mr. Orton) coming into the House, who, after performing his duty to the country in a creditable manner, as acknowledged by everybody from the general in command down to the suffering patient in the hospital—he comes here as soon as one duty had ceased, to perform another duty—a duty to the country and those whom he represents in Parliament. I will continue my remarks by stating that we might as well entrust the daily or nightly duty of the Metropolitan or London police to the Horse Guards, or to the troops stationed at Knightsbridge, as to throw on the militia of the country the daily, nightly and hourly duty of protecting life and property, which must be and is the duty of the Mounted Police. As I said before, the Act empowers the Government to increase the force. The hon. gentleman called attention, as perhaps he had a right, to the fact that the first notice I gave was to increase the force to 800 instead of 1,000. Well, it arose in this way, as he can quite understand. I thought 800 would be sufficient, but on talking it over with my colleagues, and especially considering the threatening condition of affairs, we thought we had better take power to have 1,000 men. If it is found that there is no necessity for 1,000, the number will be 800. When it is found that the force can be reduced, it can be reduced. Fortunately, in one sense, there is no difficulty in reducing the force. Applications for discharge are such that without a long delay the force would melt away, if we would allow the men to have their discharges. I must say one thing in favor of the police. The measure was introduced in 1873 when 150 men were collected—the original measure was for 300 men, and it was increased from 150 up to the number authorised by law. This force, whether it be 300, when there were few whites, and when the thing which had to be done was to keep peace among the Indians —whether it were that number or 500, they have performed their duties well. It is a remarkable thing that for so many years past peace reigned among the Indian tribes, and would have reigned yet, so far as the action of the Indians was concerned, if they were not roused by the outbreak among the half-breeds. If you look across the line to the United States, along the frontier, while we had 300, the Americans had 6,000 men watching the Indians on the northern frontier. We did the same thing, and we succeeded in a greater and better degree with this small and insignificent force, in keeping the peace to the north, than the Americans did, with their enormous force, which experience had taught them was required for the purpose of repressing Indian outbreaks. I think it is proper that I should make that statement with regard to the force. I have not disguised from myself, nor have I from the House, in the remarks I have made on this subject, ever since I have held my present position, that we could not always calculate on that state of things. The Indian nature, savage and wild, is a very uncertain quantity, and if you look at the history of the various wars and insurrections that have arisen in the United States, and the constant outbreaks of savagery that have occurred, you will find that in some cases there is no reason assignable or appreciable by the white mind for them. Having had some little reading on that point—for it is a very interesting point to any Canadian or American—I have always expressed my apprehension that some time or other, for some cause, or without cause, there might be an unpleasant end to the state of quiet that had hitherto existed in the British North-West. The hon. gentleman stated that while Parliament was sitting we had given notice of a measure, and that we had stated that an increase of the force was to have been asked for, irrespective of the recent outbreak. That is quite true. I felt, and the Government felt, that the force ought to be increased for the purpose of efficiency, and therefore it was settled that the measure should be laid before the House. The men were recruited for this reason: When it was known that there was a very great amount of discontent among these half-breeds, and indeed when they had risen in arms, and formed themselves into a hostile combination, the officers were instructed that there was no time to be lost, and to recruit men as fast as possible. I was quite well aware that Parliament would assent to the increase. I was quite well aware that the reasons were so overwhelming that when the Government came down and stated, on their responsibility, that the force ought to be increased, the increase would be granted. And it is always well to take men when you can get them. At the time the hon. gentleman asked the question there were some 200 odd more recruited, on the strength of this measure being adopted. You can get plenty of applications to enter the force, but it is difficulty to get men with all the requisites of a good policeman. Besides having a good physique, he must have some degree of intelligence and respectability. He is not merely food for powder, like the soldier, whose physique is the chief requisite, but he must be intelligent, must be educated, to a certain extent, must be able to read and write, to serve a process and to make a report when sent on duty, and I must say that in all these particulars the force has acted very creditably and very well. These are the explanations that I now have to make. The measure enables the Goverment, if they think 1,000 men are wanted, to increase the force to 1,000, without coming to Parliament for a new authority by another Act. If it is found that the 1,000 men are not wanted, they can keep the force down to a smaller number.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman did not make these explanations in the course of the debate to which they properly belonged, instead of making them on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman remarked that his speech was brief, and that therefore he did not define particularly where this raiding took place, which he gave as the justification, if I remember rightly, the sole justification, for this increase. Not unnaturally, as the hon. gentleman spoke of flocks and herds, I assumed that it was where the flocks and herds were, and where we know there has been considerable difficulty in times past. The hon. gentleman says it is not the flocks and herds of the ranches, but those of the inhabitants of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not of the ranches only.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it was the flocks and herds of the ranches, but also those of the inhabitants of the country stretching from the limits of the ranche region down to the eastern limit of the Province of Manitoba, in so far as it borders on the United States. The hon. gentleman's statement on that subject is, of course, of high consequence, and it shows the importance of the House being possessed of fuller information than it has heretofore received. The hon.

gentleman has informed us that this raiding is on both sides, and that he has had daily and weekly complaints from the United States Government of raiding from our territories into theirs, and it seems from his statement that this is a large cause of his proposed increase. It is not to prevent our cattle being stolen and carried into the United States territory, but it is to prevent our people going into the States and stealing their cattle and carrying them into our territory. If that be so, I am sorry to hear an account so serious of the lawlessness of our population. If it is so that there have been daily and weekly complaints from the United States Government of incursions from Manitoba and the North-West Territories into the States and territories of the south for felonious purposes of this kind, I really think we ought to have the papers. I think this justification which must be a recorded justification, capable of being produced by giving evidence of these complaints from the United States Government, ought to have been brought down by the hon. gentleman. I think also, inasmuch as he has stated that the question of flocks and herds is only a part of the reason for the increase, and that the ordinary duties of the Mounted Police are also to be considered as having been enlarged, requiring an increase, that it was essential, before he proceeded further with this resolution, that we should have had the report of the force for the year. I do not see that he is treating Parliament with proper respect when, upon an allegation of the increased duties to so numerous a degree, he proposes to proceed with this legislation without giving us the officers' reports; and we have really had no plausible excuse for that report not being laid on the Table. Many reports are laid on the Table in manuscript. It could have been laid on the Table any time since the 29th of January last, and it is secreted from us because he says it is in galley form only, so that we shall not receive it in manuscript or otherwise. Then he says Manitoba is unable to cope with this difficulty—to prevent her citizens engaging in felonious forays into the United States, or United States citizens engaging in felonious forays into Manitoba; and it is to ease Manitoba that he proposes this increase. I have no doubt from the condition of things, that there have been representations from the Government of Manitoba on that subject, that they have shown a very exceptional condition of things exists there, that they have pointed out it was impossible for them to protect the peace along the border, and that they have requested the hon. gentleman to make some special provision to meet the circumstances of their position. To suppose anything else would be to suppose they had failed in one of the first duties of Government, and they do not seem to be indisposed to apply to the hon. gentleman for what they want. In fact, I have heard the hon. gentleman say they were sometimes rather unreasonably pressing, that the Prime Minister of Manitoba, firm friend though he is of the hon. gentleman, was rather exacting. I recollect at the commencement of the last Session of Parliament, I read extracts from some of the speeches of the Prime Minister of Manitoba with reference to the condition of that country, and its demands on the Government, and the hon. gentleman, in reply, said we must not take all that for actual fact, that Mr. Norquay put his case in the strongest manner, in order, I suppose, to drive the hon. gentleman into a little more vigorous action than he otherwise would take.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He left a margin.

Mr. BLAKE. He left a margin. Well, as Mr. Norquay, to use the statement of the hon. gentleman, is in the habit of more demanding than he expects to be granted, in order that there may be a margin for discount, a margin——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are along the margin.

Mr. BLAKE. They are to be along the margin. Let us see what the condition of things in Manitoba is and what the complaints of Manitoba are, before taking the serious step the hon. gentleman proposes with reference to an organised Province. The hon. gentleman says there are a great many complaints on both sides. It will be all the easier for the evidence of these complaints to be brought down and to see exactly what the emergency is which the hon. gentleman proposes to meet. He proposes to deal with that which, speaking from my recollection of his statements yesterday, he did not then deal with the ordinary or what are supposed to be the normal duties of the police. He spoke largely of its duties with reference to the Indians, and he seemed to give that as the basis for his demand to increase the force. He pointed out, with perfect propriety, that the duties to be assigned to the police and to the militia were, in many respects, entirely distinct. I must have been very unhappy in the expressions I used, if I failed to convey any other impression. I had no idea whatever, that in that country, other than in our own, we could expect the militia force to perform the ordinary duties of a police force. That country being exceptionally circumstanced as regards the sparseness of the settlements, the presence of Indians, the remoteness of the country, require some special protection, and it is obvious what we could not do here we could do much less there. Nobody proposes that the farmers or mechanics of the North-West Territory, should be engaged from day to day, from hour to hour, as volunteers in the discharge of police or constabulary duties; but I pointed out that there was admittedly, as there always has been, a necessity for an organised force for protection, in case of local outbreaks or threatenings of local outbreaks, and I read from the reports to show, for instance, that when the force was disorganised and disbanded at Prince Albert, the Mounted Police force was sent there instead. The one was gone; the other substituted. You have this danger there, apart from other dangers, the danger arising from the presence of Indians on the different reserves. You have, therefore, a special reason for the organisation of a special militia force wherever there is strength enough in any locality to organise that force, which, supplemented in some localities by the Mounted Police, might accomplish the purpose of preventing by display of strength an outbreak; and anyone who has followed the reports of the recent outbreak cannot fail to see that the display of strength is important with a view to repression. It is plain, from recent events, that the Indian will look to that, will consider that, will see what your defensive preparations are, in what condition they are, how soon and how hard you can strike, and he will be guided very largely, with reference to his rising, by his opinions of the efficiency, the rapidity, the multitude of your preparations in the immediate locality. I say it is of the last consequence that we should consider the whole situation of the North-West as to its defence from the danger of an outbreak, whether by insurrection amongst those not purely savage Indians, or by a rising among the Indians; and it is there that the hon. gentleman has wholly failed, even to-day, to justify his statements of 1882. His statements then were that for 10 years to come he would preserve the peace of the country with the 500 men, the increase he was asking, and that as the population increased the necessity for the force would diminish; and he now tells us that as he has distributed the Indians on reserves—which was going to render them less harmful, less dangerous, less a disturbing element—the danger increased, and the necessity for the police increased, and, as the white population increased, the danger also increased, and therefore the necessity for the police increased. This is not what he said in 1882, when I pointed out that as the population increased, local forces could be established that would diminish the necessity for Mounted Police. The statements that as the hon. gentleman's operations for the settlement

of the Indians go on, as he is putting them on the reserves, the danger increases; the statements that as the white settlers increase in numbers, the number of the Mounted Police must increase, is, from a financial aspect and from other aspects as well, a most alarming and unsatisfactory statement. He says the Mounted Police force has done its duty. Well, that, so far as I know, is a fair statement of the case. I have made no imputation, directly, indirectly, or impliedly, on the conduct of the Mounted Police.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be extremely unreasonable that I should do so, but I recollect such imputations being made from the other side. I recollect the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), some years ago making a series of the strongest imputations against the Mounted Police. He, of course, had the advantage of local knowledge, the advantage of acquaintance with the people in the territory, he had the duty, the responsibility to a very large extent, as the representative of an important constituency, in a certain sense the representative of a somewhat distinct class, of making a statement of what he believed to be true, and in the discharge of his duty he made statements I am sure the House heard with great pain. I have no information which would enable me to say anything on this subject which would be condemnatory of the Mounted Police, and of course I assume, in the absence of such information, there is no cause for condemnation. I am sure some of the hon. gentleman's observations with reference to the requisitions of the Mounted Police and the care to be taken in selection will hardly be in accord with some former observations and with the reports, which, at a subsequent stage, I will have the pleasure of bringing in contrast with his statements to-day. He has said that peace prevailed amongst the Indians. It is not the first time he has made that statement. I will not enter into a discussion of that to-day, but my reading of the official papers does not lead me to that conclusion. I find very strong statements, from 1879 onwards, which lead to the conclusion that his statement is altogether too rose-colored, and as soon as the report emerges from the galley form, if it be a correct report for the year 1884, he will find my observations confirmed, though I have not the advantage of having seen the report, and, therefore, I speak with respect only to other sources of information which are open to him as well as to myself. The hon. gentleman has said that he justifies the enlistment of this force, this House in session, in advance of the authority, because of the urgency of the case, and his knowledge that the House would approve the Act. I maintain that the hon. gentleman, having this resolution on the paper, or having the capacity to put it on the paper long before, as far as we know, he took the first step to enlist a man, long before, as he has told us, he took the first step to enlist a man, was bound to have prosecuted this resolution and to have obained the sanction and authority of this House before enlisting men in excess of his authority and in defiance of the law. He says: I was satisfied with regard to the emergency, the anticipations of discontent, and so forth, that Parliament, which was then in session, would ratify my Act. I said yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that I would be the last man to accuse a Minister who, under some pressing necessity, acted in excess of his authority and came down to the Parliament and said: I have my political life in my hands, the safety of my country required me to act, and I call upon you for indemnification. That is the course a patriotic statesman would take, that is the risk a patriotic statesman would run. But it is a different thing when action is taken *sedente parliamento*. I say the necessity which justifies that action does not then exist. I say, that, when the authority can be obtained, you have no right to act in defiance of the law, you have no right to exceed the law. The hon. gentleman has no right to count even upon his majority in this House ratifying what he does in defiance of the law, when this House is sitting. His duty is to invite their attention to his views, to ask them to promote his legislation, to ask them to clothe them with the legal authority to do these things in the interest of the country, which he thinks the good of the country requires. That is his duty, and that call would no doubt be obeyed, but to tell us that he was quite sure that, whatever he did Parliament would ratify, and that, therefore, this Parliament sitting, he acted with perfect confidence in excess of and in defiance of the law, is to make a statement which certainly indicates the hon. gentleman's very great confidence in the submissive character of the majority of this Parliament, but very much less respect for its dignity, its honor and its independence.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not rise to oppose this motion, but I feel that, at a crisis like this, it is well that, before we commit ourselves to a permanent charge upon the country, we should look around and see what it is for and where the necessity exists. I am not going to say one word against the Mounted Police, but there have been a good many statements made about some portions of the Mounted Police that I think should be laid before this House before we undertake to double their number, and to double the charge upon the country. I do not think that the present time is exactly the one to deal with it or discuss it, were it not that we are now asked to increase very seriously the charge upon the country for this particular branch of the service. I am not going to say that 1,000 men are not required in that country in the west, but I feel that, after the very satisfactory manner in which the campaign in that western country has been conducted and the insurrection put down, this Government, strong in the success of their recent efforts in that region, may ask us, and very likely will ask us, and the tendency of the Government under such circumstances is to ask the country, to increase the charges and place more power in their hands, and necessarily increase to the people of the country the taxation which we are not prepared to increase now, if we can avoid it. I am not going to say anything more about the Mounted Police matter, but, in discussing the numbers of the Mounted Police required in that country, we cannot confine the discussion to the Mounted Police alone. We should have laid before us, when we are asked to increase the liability of this country as we are asked to increase it, the whole treatment of the North-West; we should have the whole Indian policy submitted, and we should have this Parliament asked to advise and consult with the Government, to direct the Government what policy should be pursued with reference to the Indian tribes in that country in the future. I am one of those who believe that the arrangements as to the Indian tribes have been most unfortunate, with regard both to the settlement of that country and the future of the Indians themselves. The right hon. gentleman has described to us the condition of the Indians around these Hudson Bay stations and supply stores, and I presume all around the railway stations in that country. I saw somewhat of it myself last year when I was up there. You could scarcely go to a station west of a certain longitude without finding some of these Indians, with their tepees in the neighborhood, loafing around, seeking charity, and living in idleness and misery. If they are to continue in that way in the future, there is very little hope for them or for the country which contains them, for its peace, its prosperity or its advancement. I think the Government, before asking us to increase the charges for the North-West, should consider it their first duty to lay before this Parliament a policy as to the treatment of the Indian tribes in future. We should know whether these tribes, with their reserves located along the great means of

communication which has cost us so much money to establish, whether the Government intends to allow these Indian reserves to be located along these lines; whether these lands are to be tied up, so as to force the settlers to go back from the line of railway, and these poor miserable creatures, seeking charity and living in misery, to remain in the vicinity of these settlers, retarding the growth of the country, keeping people from going in there, and at the same time being a positive injury to the Indians themselves. I feel it is my duty to call attention to the fact that one of the first duties of the Government should be to lay before us some policy as to the treatment of the Indians in the future. I do not suppose that any advice I could give would have much effect, but I suggest that some policy should be adopted in regard to the removal of these Indian tribes from the line of railway, that those bands who have proved to be rebellious and murderous in their character should be removed to the far north. We know that, in many cases, it is necessity which has driven the Indians to plunder. There is no fish in the lakes and very little in the rivers in the south, the buffalo are all driven away, the game is all gone; the Indians will not live by work, they cannot live by hunting as they did formerly. Remove them to the north, where the game exists, where the lakes and rivers abound in fish, where they will be free from the track of civilisation, and will not be subject to the evils that civilisation often brings upon these tribes. Before considering this question of the increase of the police force in the North-West, we ought to have some statement of the policy of the Government in regard to them in the future. I do not wish to detain the House any longer, but I desire to call attention to the fact that this is the duty of the Government in the present crisis.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say if the Government adopt the policy of moving the Indian tribes to the far north it will be found to be rather a tedious and expensive process. The experience of the United States in removing Indian tribes, such as the Seminoles of Florida, for instance, to the Indian territory west of the Mississippi, shows that in almost every case it has been at an expenditure of a very large sum of money. I think the removal of the Seminoles, only a few hundred Indians, from the everglades of Florida, cost the Government of the United States $12,000,000. I am sure it will be found cheaper to pursue the policy that is being pursued in some measure by the Government, of feeding the Indians where they are, rather than attempt their removal to the far north. I think it is doubtful whether, if you remove them to the far north, the necessity of feeding them would be obviated. But I rose more especially to call the First Minister's attention to an expression he used a while ago which I am afraid will not be received in a very good spirit by our volunteers. We have now very nearly completed the suppression of the insurrection in the North-West, and it has been done in a manner so creditable to our volunteer force as to secure for them enconiums from the United States and from abroad. We may congratulate ourselves upon the result of the first trial of our troops in action. It has raised Canada very high in the estimation of the various States as a military country. It has given us confidence in ourselves, as well as in our own ability to cope with difficulties of this kind. I was very sorry to hear this expression fall from the lips of the First Minister, in speaking of the qualities that were required for a member of the Mounted Police force. He said: "He is not merely food for powder, like the soldier, where the only thing required is physique." Now this expression is an unhappy one as applied to our volunteer force, and is a most unjust one, because they are something better than mere food for powder, and they possess qualities other than mere physique. It is a highly intelligent force, a brave force, a force who not only met the dangers of action, but endured great hardships in moving from the eastern Provinces to the west, and endured those hardships in a manner highly creditable to their spirit, to their endurance and to their intelligence. I repeat that I was sorry to hear that expression from the lips of the First Minister with reference to our soldiers, who have acquitted themselves so creditably in every way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should be very sorry, indeed, to think that any of my remarks could be understood as in any way disparaging to the general intelligence as well as to the patriotism of our volunteers. Our volunteers are much more than mere soldiery. I was drawing a distinction between a purely military force and a police force. In a military force, as arranged by armies in Europe and in the United States, the recruiting officer looks at the man and sees if he has the requisite height and physique, and if he passes the military examination he is taken on as a soldier. I pointed out that in this constabulary other qualities are required. We know perfectly well that our volunteers are not mere soldiery, and are not raised from those ranks which usually, especially in England, form the enlisted soldiery. They are taken from all ranks. We have relatives of the first men in society serving as mere soldiers. They have turned out voluntarily and patriotically, bringing with them all their education and intelligence. There can be no comparison between our militia in Canada, both those who have gone to the front and those who have not gone to the front—there can be no comparison between them and the enlisted soldiery of the regular standing armies of Europe or America. With respect to our volunteers, I think the Government as fully appreciate their services as the hon. gentleman. I quite agree with the sentiments he has expressed, and before this Session closes the Government will have occasion at a fitting time, not only to pay a just tribute to the services of the officers and soldiers of our active militia now fighting the battles of their country, but of marking in a material way their great sense of the services of those men. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says the Government has come down with an Indian policy. We have no new Indian policy at all. The policy that existed at the time the hon. gentleman was my colleague, exists now. It is simply this: To observe good faith towards the Indians, to treat them kindly, and to treat them firmly. If there has been a fault at all in the administration—I do not speak of the present administration but of all administrations—it is that we have been rather over indulgent to the Indians. But what can we do? We cannot, as Christians, and as men with hearts in our bosoms, allow the vagabond Indian, the pauper Indian, to die before us. Some of those Indians—and it is a peculiarity of their nature—will hang around the stations and will actually allow themselves to die, in the hope that just before the breath leaves their body they will receive some sustenance from the public stores. That sustenance has been given. It has been given very grudgingly, very carefully, very parsimoniously. Men have brought themselves down to the starvation point, believing that we would not allow them to die. Well, what are we to do with these Indians? The reserves they now hold are given them by treaty. They are their property; we cannot deprive them of those reserves without another treaty. If it has happened that after these reserves have been established near a railway, or another railway comes near them, or a white settlement comes inconveniently near them, why, the railway complains, of course, that the Indians haunt the stations. We cannot help that. They live on their own property, they are free men, and we cannot help that. We cannot drive them back

at the point of the bayonet. If a white settlement comes near an Indian reserve the Indians immediately complain. They will not do as the whites do. The whites have a whole continent before them, and if they choose to go near an Indian reservation it is their business. If they find that an Indian passes at an inconvenient hour of the night and walks off with some of their fowls or property, we cannot help that, we cannot drive the Indian away. We are going to pursue the same policy that has been pursued upon these questions so successfully under the auspices of the British Government, and which has been continued ever since, of giving them a portion of the country. That same policy must be carried out. There is no new policy. We cannot drive the Indians to the north of the Saskatchewan. Why, they are too far north now. If they had been down along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway we would not have had so much trouble as we have had. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the forcible driving of the Indians to the north could not be accomplished without bloodshed, without breach of faith towards the Indians. And what would be the consequence? We would collect an immense army, a nation of hostile Indians to the north of the Saskatchewan, continually threatening our settlements and requiring something like a Chinese wall to keep out the barbarians. There is only one way—patience, patience, patience. We see what patience has done in the older Provinces. Look at the Province of Ontario. The Indian is still an Indian. His color is the same, but he is law-abiding, he is a peaceful man. There is no more danger of leaving property in the vicinity of an Indian settlement than there is in any white settlement in the Province of Ontario. In the course of ages—it is a slow process—they will be absorbed in the country. You must treat them, and our children, and our grand-children, and our great grand-children, must treat them in the same way, until, in the course of ages, they are absorbed in the general population.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the relations between the Government and the Indian population of the North-West, and he has discussed the suggestion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) of removing those Indians from the reservations in the vicinity of the railway to other portions of the country. I do not think that question is necessarily involved in the consideration of the measure before us. I do not propose to enter into the discussion of the question. The hon. gentleman, however, tells us that we see what the Indians of the older Provinces have become, and what we may expect to make of the Indians of the North-West Territory. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is referring to what the Indians are, or to what the Government propose to do for the Indians. The hon. gentleman has by perseverance and patience attempted to do something for the Indians; but whether it will be to the Indian's advantage I do not suppose it is necessary to discuss on this Bill. But the hon. gentleman has given a rather gloomy picture of some of the Indians of the North-West. He has described them as lazy, improvident, as a class who prefer to steal and plunder rather than work—in fact, as a class who will die sooner than do anything to earn food upon which they are to subsist. Whether it is a Christian rule to feed people who are able but unwilling to work, I do not know. There is a Scriptural injunction that those who will not work shall not eat; and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman regards that as a heterodox view of the Indian's position or not. The hon. gentleman's statement with respect to the Indians reminds me of a story told by a literary man of Washington in regard to some of the whites of the south, who were very much like the Indians the hon. gentleman has described. He told of a benevolent man, a planter, who was in the habit of providing a number of lazy fellows with food. At last he became impatient and would do nothing more for them. There was one who was regarded by his neighbors as a nuisance, and he was put into a coffin to be buried alive. While the funeral procession passed him, he asked whether the man was going to be buried. The reply was: "Yes, he would not work; he had become such a nuisance that they were going to bury him." "I will give him a bag of corn if you will let him go," said the gentleman. Thereupon the fellow raised his head, and asked whether the corn was shelled. The gentleman replied, "No." "Then," said the man, "you may go on with the funeral." The hon. gentleman's description of the Indians in the North-West was very much like the description of those lazy fellows of the south. It would be advantageous to the Indians if the industrious were encouraged and those unwilling to work were left to the consequences of their indolence. I have no objection to the First Minister providing such a force as is necessary to keep those Indians in order. I am sufficiently in favor of the theory of the survival of the fittest that, if an Indian is industrious and is disposed to improve his position, I would afford him opportunities to do so that I would not force upon those who would starve sooner than work. But we shall have an opportunity of discussing that feature of the question on a fitting occasion, and I wish to refer for a moment to other observations made by the hon. gentleman. If the population settled along the boundaries of Southern Manitoba and the North-West Territories are cattle stealers on both sides of the border, I can understand how the hon. gentleman would not want to organise such population into a militia force and put arms in their hands. I could understand the exclamation of the Minister of Militia that we do not want to arm the population to shoot down our volunteers; that those are people who rather require to be governed than to assist in governing. But I cannot believe that the population of the North-West and of Southern Manitoba are of that predatory class described by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must have been misinformed, and certainly before giving my support to a proposition founded upon an assumption of that kind I would like to see the evidence upon which it rests. I would like to see the correspondence between the Governments of the United States and of Canada, where the former has called upon the latter to keep their thieves on this side of the border. Daily and weekly correspondence, the hon. gentleman said, has passed with respect to the conduct of these people. The people who reside there are mainly from Ontario and the older Provinces, with a sprinkling from the old country; and I cannot believe they are of that predatory class to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If they are, the sooner we get rid of them the better. If they are, there is something radically wrong in the steps that have been taken by the Minister of Agriculture and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has received so much active and persistent support from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), if the Government and the Company. Can it be that we have only succeeded in securing for that country a population with predatory instincts? The First Minister, before he submitted this proposition, ought to have laid on the Table of the House the astounding information he has given. It is rather extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should have found the population to be of that class, and that he should not have given to the House at an earlier period the information upon which he now asks Parliament to act. The hon. gentleman may be quite right in asking Parliament to sanction what he has undertaken. But he ought not to have asked Parliament to do so upon a statement casually made, because he did not make it at the introduction of the measure. He now asks the House to carry through this measure because a large number of the people of the North-West and Southern Manitoba are of such a

character they require a very large police force to secure obedience to the law and to prevent this country being involved in difficulties with our neighbors south of the border. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the police force being very hard worked in the North-West. They may be fairly actively employed, but I do not know that they have been overworked. We have not heard until now that the force has suffered in consequence of the laboriousness of their duties. At all events, if law and order exist in the North-West even in an ordinary degree it would not require such a large police force as the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill. At all events, we have not had the evidence before us. It must be an unusual condition of things that would require so large a force for the purpose of preventing thieving and plundering along the borders of the North-West and of Manitoba. I can easily understand how it is important that the Government should have a large force available in an emergency, a moderate police force with a large volunteer force in that country properly sustained, which would form a much stronger force than the Government propose to provide by this measure, and at very much less expense. For it only requires to look into our annual votes in order to satisfy ourselves that one policeman will cost nearly as much as twenty volunteers, and certainly more than a dozen, and surely in an emergency a dozen volunteers are of far more consequence to the country than a single policeman. I say, therefore, it does seem to me, on all the evidence we have as yet had from the Government, that one-half the policemen which the hon. gentleman proposed, supplemented when required by a large volunteer force established in the country, would provide much better protection against Indian risings, against the ordinary dangers such as have arisen there during the past three or four months, than the force which the hon. gentleman proposes to raise. Now, so far as the statement of the First Minister goes, this force is mainly required for the purpose of preventing complications arising between Canada and the United States, for the purpose of protecting the American people along the borders of Dakota and Montana from the settlers of Manitoba and the North-West. I say that before we undertake to make such an expensive provision to enable us to discharge our duties to our neighbors, we should have evidence that the wrong has been done. That we have not got. The information which would justify this measure is not yet before the House. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the House and the country should be put in possession of the information which would enable them to know the character of the population that the Minister of Agriculture has secured in the settlement of that country; that the Government itself should justify by the publication of that correspondence, the expenditure which this measure involves. Sir, the hon. gentleman does not seem to me to have at all answered the statements made by the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend has called the attention of the Government to the fact that the First Minister has undertaken to raise this force without the sanction of law, and during the period Parliament was sitting. The hon. gentleman says there was an emergency, and that it was in order to meet that emergency that he acted, relying upon the support of Parliament. That would have been the proper thing to do if Parliament had not been in session, and an emergency was present. But the hon. gentleman's action has taken place since the Session of Parliament began, and why then was not Parliament at once informed of the necessities of the position, and why did not the hon. gentleman, at the time such an emergency presented itself, call upon Parliament to give him authority to do what he is now asking Parliament to consent to. Sir, I think before this Bill is carried, and in fact before it proceeds further, the hon gentleman should give us that information, which verbally he has told us is the ground for his present action.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to state that I said that the white population along the border were a parcel of horse thieves. No expression of mine warranted the hon. gentleman in making that statement, or suggesting such a thing for a moment, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should have so misrepresented what I stated. I said there were complaints on both sides of the line, but that I believed that though there were sins on our own side, there was much more on the other side—that we were more sinned against than sinning, though I did say that complaints were made that raids came from our own side. But, Sir, those raids can be done by British American Indians as well as by white men. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that though it would be a waste of time to lay them on the Table, I could show imploring petitions made by the citizens on our southern side, imploring that the policemen should come, that their cattle were stolen, and that raids were made upon them. Petitions were numerous in consequence of those raids. But there are complaints not only from the federal authorities of the other side, but from the magistracy and from the men commanding the troops on the other side, who are very good men. Whenever there is a statement that a raid has been made, whether by the Piegans, or the Bloods, or the white desperados who are strewed along the frontier and steal across from one side to the other, and are the terror of the people on both sides, they send the complaints at once, sometimes verbal, sometimes written, sometimes formal and official, and they are attended to. But in no way could any words of mine be tortured to mean that the white population as a whole, on the one side or the other, were a parcel of horse thieves.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are we to understand that there are complaints from the other side, through the British Minister?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, there have been complaints.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Do you intend to lay them on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I do, as they would not really give much information. The practice is with the American Government, whenever a complaint is made, whether of a smuggling transaction, a seizure, or anything of that kind, they do not investigate it, but send it to the British Ambassador and throw the onus of enquiring into it upon the other. The parties probably send it to the Secretary of State; he sends it to the British Ambassador; he sends it to Canada. That is one cause of the complaints being numerous, because they do not investigate them themselves, but forward them to us to look into them.

Mr. ORTON. There is another misinterpretation of the language of the hon. Premier which I cannot allow to pass unnoticed—that is, that he said the Indians, as a body, were a pack of thieves. The First Minister did not say that; he said that there were amongst the Indians some who were lazy and who would steal.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that, nor did I say the First Minister said so. What I said was that the First Minister spoke of certain parties who would rather starve than work.

Mr. ORTON. We know that there are amongst the Indians in the North-West some who have remained loyal and true to the Crown, and it would be very wrong indeed that such a report should go abroad. We know that the Blackfeet, the Stoneys, and other tribes remained true, including many tribes in the neighborhood of Prince

Albert. I do not think that any misconception should go abroad, and I might be excused at feeling a little hurt at such a misinterpretation of our Premier's words. I may say that I do not think the time has come when the Government will be able to retrench or lessen the expenditure in maintaining the Indians of the North-West. I think rather the time has arrived when they will be obliged to increase the expenditure, for a time at any rate. I believe that country can be made in a short time and at a little expense, able to maintain the Indians very easily, and I believe it will be done by making them herdsmen. There is no class of food that can be raised more easily in the North-West, not only on the plains, but in the mountains; in the Touchwood Hills, at Fort Pelly, and along the Saskatchewan, where there are reservations and blocks of timber, cattle could live all the year around, and could be raised very cheaply. I believe that if the Government had large establishments in different portions of that country for raising cattle, they could feed the Indians more cheaply than at present, and they could employ the young Indian lads who have not been used to hunting, in tending and herding the cattle; and if the Government gave them a certain interest in the herd, they would teach the Indians by degrees to support themselves by raising cattle. I believe they would fall into that kind of life more easily than into ploughing or raising grain. I believe the young Indian can be taught any trade. The establishment at Sault Ste. Marie has done a great deal of good in teaching young Indians the ordinary trades, and enabling them like other men to earn their own living. If more money were spent in that way, I believe the Indians of the North-West would soon get into the way of supporting themselves, so that they would cost very little to the country.

Mr. WATSON. I am sure the people of Manitoba will feel grateful to the Premier when they hear that he is about to establish a body of Mounted Police to protect the settlers along the frontier. But I think there is too much stress laid on the fact that a few horses or cattle have been stolen. The discussion on that subject to-day may intimidate some people from settling along the frontier for fear of horse or cattle thieves. I think there are very few instances of horses or cattle having been stolen from the Canadian side of the boundary—not more than two or three in the course of a year; and we know that such things happen in the interior and in the other Provinces. The First Minister truly stated that the Province of Manitoba is not able to maintain a Mounted Police force out of the pittance it gets from the federal authorities, because it has no internal revenue of its own; I suppose a parental hand will continue to guide the affairs of that Province with reference to the resolution before the House. So far as my observations have gone in the North-West, they satisfy me that it is of much more importance for the Government to consider the advisability of forming volunteer forces throughout Manitoba and the Territories than to increase the Mounted Police force. The hon. First Minister has stated, and stated truly, that the Indians get very bold when they are in a majority, and that when there is not a large force available to put down depredation, they commit them, and then retire to their reserves; they make demands on the settlers with which the settlers have to comply, or suffer. Now, I have made the calculation that according to the cost of maintaining the volunteers in the east, a company of volunteers could be sustained in the North-West, at almost the cost of maintaining one policeman; and a company of volunteers would certainly strike more terror into the Indians than one mounted policeman. Too much cannot be said in praise of the Mounted Police for what they have done in protecting settlers and maintaining law and order throughout the North-West for years past; but if the Government had kept in existence the volunteer companies that were in existence in the North-West, I believe the unfortunate affair that has just taken place would not have happened. However, that is past. We cannot praise too highly the volunteer forces that were organised in Manitoba at a moment's notice and went to the front. The county I have the honor to represent furnished Major Boulton's scouts, who have done as good service in this outbreak as the Mounted Police; in fact, I believe they were more active than any force of Mounted Police in the west. If that company had been organised and drilled they could have gone to the front with a great deal more certainty of doing good service for their country, although they have done everything that could be expected of them; still, it is not fair to call on volunteers who have not drilled or had practice at rifle shooting to go and face such good marksmen as the hunters on the plains of the North-West. I agree with the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that when this matter is before the House the policy of the Government with regard to the Indians should be laid before the House. In my opinion the Indians should be compelled to stay on their reserves; and as there is now little or no game in the North-West that cannot be secured with shot-guns. I believe the Indians should be deprived of rifles, and furnished with muzzle-loading shot-guns instead. I believe also that their horses should be taken away from them, and that they should be furnished with oxen instead. If that were done, the Indians would not be so likely to leave their reserves and go about the country as they do now. There is no doubt, judging from the reports in the press, that some of the Indian bands have not been treated as well as they might be. Probably the Government cannot be blamed for that; but through their officials the Indians do not receive the full value of the money spent annually for the purpose of supporting them. For instance, at different times the Indians have been furnished with poor implements, and with provisions which have been stated as unfit even for Indians to eat, although the country has paid the full price for good articles. It is very difficult to keep the Indians on their reserves to cultivate their lands, and it is a very difficult question for the Government to consider how they can keep them quiet and sustain them most cheaply. Instead of spending the enormous amount of money that is spent in maintaining volunteer forces in the east, I think the policy of the Government should be to have as large a body of volunteers as possible in Manitoba and the North-West, the only part of the Dominion that especially requires an armed force. It appears to me that the money that is spent on military matters is spent too much in towns and cities. Of course, the hon. Minister of Militia would not be able to visit the companies, as they would be situated, more than probably, in the remote parts of Manitoba where they would be more effective in cases of emergency; he would not be able to take mess with the officers. Too much money is spent in keeping up an army of officers, and not giving attention to the rank and file. It has always been, ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, the policy of the Opposition to grant better pay to the rank and file, and prevent the Government spending so much money on the officers and on the mess room.

Mr. BOWELL. The officers pay for their own mess.

Mr. WATSON. The officers are better paid than the privates.

Mr. BOWELL. So are you better paid than a laborer.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I am a laborer, and I think I earn all that I receive.

Mr. BOWELL. That is questionable

Mr. BLAKE. And you are better paid than he is.

Mr. BOWELL. You are better paid than I. I never got $600 out of the North-West. I do not wish the hon. gentleman's remarks to go abroad that the officers' mess, either of the volunteer force or the militia, is paid for by the Government.

Mr. WATSON. I do not wish to state that the cost of the officers' mess is paid by the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. But you did say so.

Mr. WATSON. I do not wish to say that, I will take that back; but I say there is too much attention paid to the force in cities and towns, in the more civilised portions of our Provinces, than there should be. More money should be spent where it would be of more service. There is no reason why 2,000 men should not be ready in Manitoba and the North-West, in cases of emergency, to protect that country. The young men of that country have proved themselves during this trouble equal to the emergency. Those men should have had the advantage of being drilled, because petitions were sent in from different points asking that they be organised and have equipment furnished to them, but those appeals were refused. Fortunately very few of the men called into action have lost their lives expect among Boulton's scouts, who, unfortunately for themselves—I do not know whether it was on account of not being drilled—lost a few of their men. I hope the First Minister will take into consideration the advisability of organising the volunteers for the protection of the whole Province in case of emergency.

Resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 144) to authorise the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.

Bill read the first time.

THE CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT OF 1877

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 20) to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it would be as well to call the attention of the Government and the House generally to the Bill as it now appears, re-printed as amended. It is not my intention to resume the very lengthy discussion which took place in committee on the details; but, at the same time, I think it would be well to understand whether the Government have fully considered the Bill now before us, which is not exactly in accordance, if I understand the matter right, with the intentions of either the Finance Minister or the members of the Government generally. There are two objects, as I understand, which the Government designs to attain in this Bill. First of all, they intend to grant relief to certain friendly societies, which, it was alleged, were in considerable danger of being visited with certain penalties if they proceeded to grant the ordinary benefits to their members, under the existing state of the law. As to that there can be no question, and I have no doubt the House will be unanimous in desiring that these friendly societies should be relieved from any possible consequence to which they might unwillingly expose themselves; but there is another, and rather important consequence, which flows from the Bill now before us, and that is this, that a totally new and distinct class of societies, known as the mutual societies, will, under this Bill, be placed in line, so to speak, with the older societies which have been conducting their affairs on well recognised principle and which go forth to the country as having received a Government inspection, which prevents the possibility of any of the persons doing business with them losing any portion of their insurance money. I wish it to be distinctly understood that, for my part, I have no objection at all that these various mutual societies should do business with those who chose to do business with them; but I can see, and if I understood rightly the remarks of the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance (the latter of whom is unhappily not here), they also see that there is in the Bill, as it now stands, a very considerable danger that these two classes of companies which do business on different principles should be confused together in the public mind; and it did appear to me there was a great deal of force in the contention made by the representatives of the older companies, that a separate measure should be introduced for the purpose of legalising the other companies to do business. This is a Government measure; the Government is responsible, and they will be held of course responsible, for any mischief which may hereafter arise, should the prophecies of the older companies as to these mutual societies be fulfilled. I repeat I do not at all desire to prevent mutual companies from doing business; but the First Minister will understand that there is an Act on the statute book which guarantees to the public that the various insurance companies which are put under the supervision of the Superintendent of insurance companies and which report year to year to him shall have a reserve, which it is his business to examine into and audit, and that this reserve shall be one which will effectually protect all persons doing business with them. I understood that it was not the opinion of any of the parties more immediately charged with the promotion of this measure that the members of the mutual society would be or could be similarly protected, and I think therefore it is unfortunate that, as undoubtedly will be the case if this Bill, as it now stands, becomes law, the two classes of companies should be confounded together in the public mind. No doubt certain precautions have been taken, after long discussion, and certain statements are required to be made in these various policies, but, speaking from a practical standpoint, it appears clearly to me, and I think to most of those who heard the discussion, that one main object of the mutual companies was that they should be brought under this particular Act in order that they might be able to say to the public at large that they were companies making deposits with the Government and affording precisely the same security to the public which the old line companies, as they are called, are able to afford. As far as I can judge, they do not afford that security, and, although I do not desire to prevent them from doing business, I think it would be expedient that the distinction between these two classes of companies should be more clearly defined than it is in the Bill now before us.

Mr. BOWELL. If the Government and the members of the committee and those members of the House who attended the Committee on Banking and Commerce have not made up their minds on this question, it is not because it was not amply discussed. I think I may very properly call this Bill the first lieutenant to the Franchise Bill. Eight long days were occupied in the continuous discussion of this question before that committee, and no other business was allowed to interfere in any way with it. The present Bill makes provision for the protection of those insured in the societies to which the hon. gentleman has alluded; they are exempted from the operation of the Insurance Act and of this Bill. The question of having a separate measure to govern this particular class of companies was discussed for some days, and the Finance Minister took decided objection to having a separate Bill placed upon the Statute Book to govern any class of insurance. He desired by this Bill to bring these companies within the provisions and

operation of the General Insurance Companies Act. In order to prevent, as far as possible, the confounding of this class of companies with what are termed the old line companies, there is a special provision made that upon all the policies, and it is carried so far as to say upon all circulars that the company may issue, no matter of how trivial a character, and in all advertisements published in newspapers, the fact that they are mutual insurance companies, or coöperative life insurance companies, must be placed in bold type upon the face of all these documents; so that every precaution was taken by the committee to prevent the confusion to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. Provision is also made for reserves and for a deposit, and for the increasing of that deposit when the business of the society warrants it. So far as provision could be made to protect the public in dealing with this kind of coöperative insurance companies, it was taken by the committee. In fact, the provisions have been made so stringent by the committee that those who are in favor of this system of insurance have taken very great objection to them. If the committee will look at the provisions of the Bill recognising the right of this class of companies to do business, they will come to the conclusion that provision has been made for the protection, as far as is possible by Act of Parliament, of those who insure in such a company.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it is not quite in order to refer to what passed in the committee, but myself and the Minister of Customs, and all the members of the Government who were present, were outvoted in reference to a number of precautions which we desired to introduce.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but we have to deal with the Bill as it is sent to the House by the committee.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not propose to reopen the very lengthened discussion which took place before the committee on this Bill, but I understood that the members of the Government would not consent to the Bill as it left the committee. It seemed to me that the contention made by those who represented the regular insurance companies was a sound contention, and it received the assent of those who acted for the Government in that committee, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. They said that they did not desire to throw any obstacles in the way of these assessment insurance companies doing business in Canada, but they said that the principle upon which these assessment companies proceeded to do business was an experiment, a doubtful experiment at that, and therefore they should do business in such a way that those whom they solicited to take policies in their companies should know exactly and fairly the principles of the company in which they were taking out the policy, and they contended that it was not fair to place them, as it were, in the same boat with the life insurance companies, under the same Act, because the result would be that a large mass of those who entered into that very important contract, the insurance of their own lives for the benefit of their families, would, in the hurry of business and in the absence of special knowledge in reference to the matter, be unable to make the distinction between the insurance company proper and the insurance company under the new system. They further contended that the old security was an ample security, and that it was unfair that they should go into the same boat with those new companies, and that the latter should have the same Government sanction and approval. What does the Bill do? What evidence had we before the committee? I desire to call attention to the very important statement made by the Superintendent of insurance before that committee. He was examined and cross-examined at length as to his views of the safety of the principle upon which these new assessment companies conducted business, and I find in an insurance journal, the *Budget*, published, I think, in Toronto, which seems to have taken a great interest in this matter, that Professor Cherriman is reported to have replied to the following question by Sir Richard Cartwright:—

"Are we to understand that, so far as your experience goes, you do not know whether these companies are safe or not?"

Now this is the answer given by the Superintendent of insurance. I regard them, he says, in exactly the same light as the Superintendent of insurance for New York does. He says:

"I regard them in exactly the same light as the Superintendent for New York does. He says he regards them as experiments. I accept that view. I know very well the system of old life insurance companies is undeniably based upon scientific principles, and that it has been tested and proved by long experience. I cannot say with regard to these assessment companies that their principles have been proved by experience. They have not had a long enough experience to enable me to form an opinion whether they will be ultimately pronounced sound, or whether they can be permanent."

Well, I say in view of that statement made by the Superintendent of insurance companies, it does seems curious to me that the Government should allow these new assessment companies to go forth to do business in Canada, stamped with the imprimateur of the Government, with the sanction of the Government, when their own Superintendent of Insurance tells them that the principle upon which they do business is not one which he can recommend, which is purely experimental, and he does not know whether it is sound or not. This is a very serious business for those who insure. The majority of those who insure their lives are men engaged in the worry and hurry of business. They have not time to examine carefully the principles of the company with whom they insure. They imagine, and I do not know but they are right in imagining, that if the Government undertake to license an insurance company, authorising them to do business, the insurer has a right to assume that the Government have satisfied themselves thoroughly that the principles on which the company does business are safe and sound. I know of no more lamentable thing in life than that after a man has insured in a company, his family find, when the man's life drops off, that the company is unsound. Now, by this Bill a foreign insurance comes into Canada makes a deposit with the Government of $50,000, and when it does that it has authority from the Government to transact business. Now, what security has the insurer got? He imagines that he has the same security as when he insures in the old life line, because the Government licenses both companies to do business alongside each other. It has been contended, and I think the contention was reasonable, that when the Government authorised these companies on this untried system, which has been described as an experiment by the Superintendent, that they should ear mark those companies so that the person who insures should know what company he is insured in. The Minister of Customs has stated, and stated correctly, that the committee, in one or two of its amendments, made an attempt to carry that out, and to some extent they have succeeded; but the broad fact remains that they are licensed just the same as any other company, that they are allowed to make a deposit which is in one sense an illusory guarantee, and that they go forth with the same sanction as the old life line companies do, which are bound to hold reserves sufficiently to meet liabilities on every policy they issue. I think myself the contention is not a sound one. I think the Government have made a mistake in mixing the two up together and putting them under the one Act. I think it is calculated to deceive, to allow those who insure in these companies to be deceived as to the character of the company in which they will insure, as to the securities which that company will offer them, and as to the place in which they do business. I repeat that in the face of the official state-

ment given by their own Superintendent, who was not satisfied that the basis on which these companies proceed was a sound one, it was certainly indefensible for the Government to class them with the old safe companies.

On section 3,

Mr. IVES. I would not like to have the impression go abroad that the House is unanimous with reference to this measure, I, for my part, do not believe in this new fangled system of insurance at all. I would go even further than the officer of the Government who has called it a mere experiment, and I would say it is an experiment which is almost certain to result in enriching a few agents who, for the time being, are acting as receivers general to whoever likes to deposit money with them, and who, when the time comes for paying losses, will not be here to pay them. I do not believe there is any sound, scientific or commercial foundation for this kind of insurance. I am perfectly satisfied it will not succeed, that it will result in disaster and loss of the money that is deposited with these companies. Now, my objection to this Bill in the hands of the Government is very similar to that which the last speaker mentioned. If the Government undertakes to supervise the question of insurance at all, as they do the matter of banking, I think they are bound to see that no wild cat insurance companies are permitted to do business here, that the Government's own officer says are merely experimental, until they are perfectly satisfied that every man will be safe who insures with them. Now the Government very properly take charge of banking, but what would be said if they were to permit a system of banking to be introduced here which the Finance Minister himself was bound to say was merely experimental and which was as likely to result in disaster to the people as to result in good? I am quite sure that public sentiment would not sustain the Government in putting their imprimatur upon a system of banking which they and their officer were bound to say was merely experimental. Yet that is what is said of this system of insurance. From what I know of the men who are acting as agents, who are receiving the people's money, and from what happened the other day in Montreal at their meeting, a committee of investigation being already appointed, and from the whole circumstances of the case, I am just as well satisfied as I am that I am standing here, that this new fangled insurance will result in disaster and loss of money to our people; and I protest against the Government sanctioning it, as they seem to do by taking charge of this Bill and providing that these companies doing business here, by their being registered, shall obtain the assistance which Government sanction gives them, and without providing any reasonable and satisfactory safeguard to the public. I believe the whole thing is a mistake, and if anybody at a later stage sees fit to move the three months hoist for this bill, I shall be very happy to vote for it, because I do not look upon this Bill as a Government measure but simply as an Insurance Bill, which is giving recognition to a kind of insurance companies, which the Government themselves called experimental and which experiment, in my opinion, would be disastrous.

Mr. WELLS. The principal objection which my hon. friends urge against this system of insurance seems to be that it is experimental. Now, it is by no means experimental. The system of assessment assurance is the natural system, and the oldest system which we have. The other is the artificial system. The assessment system of insurance is that which has been adopted by so many societies all over the world, by labor societies of various kinds, by secret societies of all kinds, societies which have lasted hundreds of years. I do not mean to say that it is conducted on exactly the same principles as by the regular assessment companies of the present day, because, as time goes on, improvements are made, and all the improvements which experience has shown to be necessary have in the formation of the later companies been adopted. It is, I repeat, the natural system and the other is the artificial system. Can any system of insurance be reasonable which demands that a person who insures should pay about five times the amount really required to pay a death loss? That seems to be a most unreasonable system.

It has been said that the old line high premium system guarantees absolute security to the policy holder. But what is the result? While the assessment system is called experimental the experience of the other system has shown it to be utterly fallacious. Indeed I think I am safe in saying that in the history of no other public companies, except, perhaps, banking companies in the United States, has there been such a frightful loss of money and such failure as in the insurance system on the old plan. I have in my hand a list of a few of the more recent failures. The Guardian Life, Widows and Orphans, North American Life, Universal Life, Reserve Mutual Life, Mutual Protection Life, and New York State Life, all companies conducted according to the old principles, and having reserves of $20,000,000, have recently failed. Then we have another list: American Popular Life, Atlantic Mutual Life, Continental Life, Life Association of America, New Jersey Mutual Life, Security Life, with guaranteed securities amounting to $16,000,000, on which a dividend of 10 cents in the dollar only has been paid. I do not mean to say that these are all the companies that have even recently failed, but these companies are at this very moment in the hands of Receivers in New York city. Yet hon. gentlemen will tell us that this is the only safe system of insurance.

I think there has been altogether too much said about the confusion which must follow the two systems working side by side. There is no force whatever in that objection. The companies are always advertising, and there is an insurance controversy always going on over the merits of the two systems. Documents explanatory of both systems of insurance are constantly being issued, illustrating, explaining and extolling the two systems. Insurances, moreover, are not, as a rule, effected by the ignorant classes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I think, Mr. Chairman, this discussion is out of order on section 3 of this Bill.

Mr. WELLS. If that is so, the observations of the previous speakers were out of order.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not think that fact can make the remarks of the hon. gentleman in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The discussion is certainly out of order on this clause.

On section 5,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is satisfactory to see that liberal views are making progress in the minds of members of the Government, and, although it may not practically concern a member on this side, I submit that hon. gentlemen opposite must feel that this is a degradation of the National Policy in every shape and form. The idea that an American shall be permitted to take Canadian money for the purpose of insuring Canadian lives, seems to be entirely out of the regular course.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. We impose special conditions on American companies doing business here, while we do not impose such conditions on Canadian companies. That is carrying out the idea of the National Policy.

Mr. IVES. I object to Americans taking Canadian money and with it protecting their own lives.

Mr. GIROUARD. I desire to add a new section to follow section 5: "The provision contained in clauses 4, 5, 6, 7,

and 8 shall also apply to any company incorporated in Canada carrying on life insurance on the co-operative or assessment plan." I am one of those who do not believe in the assessment plan; but I am willing that those assessment companies should have a fair trial. That was the opinion of the committee; but the opinion was also expressed very strongly that everything should be done to prevent confusion between the old line companies and companies on the new system. I proposed amendments which were adopted by the committee, and among others was one providing that the word "assessment system," shall be on the face of every policy. At the last sitting of the committee the Bill having been considerably amended, so much so that we did not know the numbering of the clause, it was suggested that the amendment I now propose should be made in Committee of the Whole House. I now move it. Its effect will be this: Under clause 5 it is provided that a foreign assessment company shall be subject to the following regulations, stated briefly: Death claims shall be the first charge on all moneys received for assessment. No portion of such moneys shall be used for any expense of the administration. A clause shall be printed in colored ink declaring that this association is not required by law to maintain any reserve. Every policy shall contain an absolute promise to pay. These are the conditions which the committee laid down as forming a good safeguard to policy holders. I do not see why, if these resolutions are good as regards foreign assessment companies, they should not be good as regards Canadian assessment companies. I, therefore, move that these conditions which are required of foreign assessment companies should also be required of Canadian assessment companies.

Mr. IVES. Can any provision be made to insure that an action can be brought in the case of death loss against any of the American companies in Canada? When a policy was produced in the committee it was found that one of the prominent conditions was that no action could be brought against the company with respect to losses except in a certain court in New York city. Is any provision made which will give to our courts jurisdiction to enforce the rights of our people with respect to this class of policy?

Mr. WELLS. Our courts have jurisdiction already, and judgments are reported.

Mr. IVES. Is that the case if a man makes a contract in which he agrees that no action shall be taken except in a certain court?

Mr. WELLS. The present policies do not contain any such condition.

Mr. IVES. Would it not be better to make it a condition of their doing business here, that the companies should be amenable to our courts.

Mr. BOWELL. That question was very fully discussed in the committee, and it was put to the committee and lost. Some of the lawyers in the committee, and I think the hon. member for North Victoria, gave it as their opinion as the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Wells) has done now, that they have the power.

Mr. GIROUARD. No doubt they have, and a clause at the back of the policy to the effect that the insured shall be subject only to the jurisdiction of the United States, will be no good.

Mr. IVES. I certainly think it would be a good deal safer to make it a condition of doing business here, that they should be amenable to our courts, than that they should have to trust to litigation either here or in the United States. Supposing a party seeking to recover his claim has to go to New York or some other place to obtain his claim, and when he goes there to seek enforcement of the judgment, he is met with the original objection that the judgment obtained here was contrary to the agreement between the two parties, and consequently it would be null and void.

Mr. BEATY. I regret that such legislation is necessary at all, as it will create confusion to have the assessment companies and the old line companies operating together. But as apparently, some kind of legislation must be had, we should give every consideration and protection to the assured, so that the money invested may bring them a return when the time comes. I shall support the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), for that reason.

On sub-section 3,

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest the addition of these words: "upon such trusts as shall be determined by the Governor in Council."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With reference to that point, so far as we could understand from the evidence of the Superintendent of Insurance, it would be utterly impossible for him in practice to insist on any additional deposit. He said to us—and it is right that the House should know it—that it was quite impossible for him to estimate their liabilities at all, on the system on which they do business, and he did not expect that he would be able to advise the Minister to call upon them to make any additional deposit, unless as a mere arbitrary regulation—mere guess work, I think were the words he used.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose he would judge by the extent of business done by the company, and if the amount of business was sufficiently great to warrant a recommendation for a further deposit, he would be justified in making such a recommendation.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the amendment apply only to the additional deposit, or does it apply to the $50,000 as well?

Mr. BOWELL. The present deposit of $50,000 is, I suppose, governed by the present insurance law; and I think probably the construction put upon this amendment would be that it would apply only to the additional deposit.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not understand that the provisions of the General Insurance Act enables the Governor in Council to make any declaration as to its appropriation, nor do I understand that it is accessible in any way by a policy holder as security for the payment of his deposit.

Mr. BOWELL. This sub-section provides for the first deposit being made under the provision of the Consolidated Insurance Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, this $50,000 is the property of all the parties, all over the States as well as here, who have claims. That appears to result from the nature of the case as applies to mutual companies. You cannot reserve it for the benefit of Canadian policy holders—I think there is no dispute about that.

Mr. BOWELL. And that was one of the principal reasons why the committee insisted on making further deposits, in case they should be asked by the Government upon the report of the Insurance Inspector.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And these further deposits would be subject to the same conditions as the other—they would not belong specially to Canadian policy holders.

Mr. DAVIES. That would depend on the direction of the Governor in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think not; I think it is in the nature of the case.

Amendment agreed to.

On sub-section 4,

Mr. WELLS. Perhaps it might be better to put in the word "legitimate" before the word "death" claim.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I think not; that is a question for the lawyers to determine, and to insert that qualification might give the company the right to declare that every claim they did not wish to meet was not a legitimate one.

On sub-section 8, section 5,

Mr. WELLS. I suggest that these words be added:

Provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed to make any person liable in respect of assessments made by any such association after he ceases to be a member thereof.

No doubt that is the law as it is. I do not think any lawyer would say that the effect of this section is to make members liable after they cease to be members; but I know of my own knowledge that it is being used now by agents of rival companies as having that effect. Members are not now liable for assessments after they cease to be members; but I wish to make it perfectly clear that this section does not affect the existing law.

Mr. IVES. I have very serious objections to that amendment. It is well known that the object of these companies is to get rid of their members after they have failed for a certain number of years, in order to get rid of their obligations; and if the impression were made that the members could not drop out in this way, and escape their obligations, it would have a good effect.

Mr. MACKENZIE. At any rate my hon. friend must be proposing mere surplusage from his point of view. If that is the law now, his amendment is not required; if it is not the law, the amendment makes it the law.

Mr. WELLS. I do not make any new law. I only say that the section shall not be construed to affect the existing law.

Mr. HALL. It was suggested before the committee that members should withdraw on giving notice, and the effect of this amendment would be to enable all those who are intelligent enough to use that method of escaping liability to escape entirely. They are relieved by law at the expiration of their contract.

Mr. BOWELL. Would the effect of the motion not be to relieve every member of the insurance upon lives taken during the time he was a member? If it does, there would be no security at all for those who are left.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman says that is the law now.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not the law so far as Mutual Insurance companies are concerned. A member is responsible for risks taken and losses incurred while he is a member, and he is liable to that extent if he goes out.

Mr. WELLS. He is not liable for all losses that occur while he is in the company.

Mr. DAVIES. Suppose a man sees losses occur to the extent of $20,000 or $30,000 and retires; if he retires before any assessment is levied, he will be relieved of liability by the amendment.

Mr. WELLS. Well, I do not care for the amendment one way or the other.

Mr. IVES. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to the declaration made by the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Wells) that any member can go out without paying up, simply by giving notice. If the bulk of the members left the association, those who have been paying for a lifetime or for a half a lifetime have no recourse except with themselves for the assessments to pay their insurance when they die. That shows in a conclusive manner the objection to the whole system, and is a reason why the Government of Canada should not give aid or countenance to a system of insurance, which is so costly, and which must necessarily result in disaster.

Mr. EDGAR. I would just emphasise what the hon. gentleman has just said. By sub-section 7, we are told what the securities shall be. The two funds out of which these associations are obliged to pay losses are the death fund, and any moneys realised from assessments to be made for that purpose. But according to sub-section 6 the associations are not required to maintain a reserve, so that the death fund may amount to nothing at all, and the other fund according to the hon. gentleman, may amount to nothing either. There is to be no security if people may go out altogether.

Mr. WELLS. If they all go out there are no losses to pay. The death fund of the association is mentioned as distinguished from moneys realised from new assessments. There is always a balance over from every assessment, which is put into the death fund, and if that is not sufficient, they assess.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. GIROUARD moved, That the provisions contained in sub-sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, of section 5, shall also apply to any company incorporated in Canada carrying on the business of life insurance upon the coöperative or assessment plan.

Mr. BOWELL. The adoption of that clause will take from the Canadian companies that advantage and protection the hon. member for South Huron is so anxious about. It will place them precisely in the same position as foreign companies. It is for the House to say whether Canadian companies of this character should have any advantages other than those possessed by foreign companies. The amendment placed in my hands by the Superintendent of Insurance is to this effect: He says: "It was expected, on all sides, that Canadian companies were to be allowed to transact their own business in their own way without further conditions than that of making an annual return, and these companies actually supported the Bill on this understanding; that if they had been apprised of these conditions they probably would have appeared before the committee and claimed to be heard in opposition, and that at all events, they should have an opportunity of being heard; that it is evident there are grounds for stringently regulating the transactions of foreign companies whose management is outside Canada, and which are beyond Canada's control, while such grounds may not exist upon the part of companies existing only among our people." I have read this memo. from the Superintendent of Insurance, he having a more practical knowledge of the operation and the working of the different insurance companies and of the intention of his Department in permitting the provisions of this Bill becoming a part of the General Insurance Act, rather than give an opinion of my own. I am, therefore, of opinion that Canadian companies should have advantages not accorded to foreign companies, for the reason advanced by the Superintendent General, namely, that being in our own country we have greater control over them than we can possibly have over those companies whose headquarters are in foreign lands.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Superintendent says these companies had no opportunity of being heard on this point. Are we to be told that we have no right to make this amendment because these companies have not been heard?

Mr. BOWELL. He says they were given to understand the provisions of the Bill would not apply to them, and consequently they did not appear before the committee.

Mr. GIROUARD. That amounts to the same thing—that the Bill has come from the committee on Banking and Commerce and we have no right to amend it. At the last sitting of the committee on Banking and Commerce I moved this very amendment, but as the Bill had been already much amended and contained many erasures, it was agreed my amendment should be renewed in Committee of the Whole House. The companies had opportunity of being heard then, but they said nothing, and in fact from what I heard from those parties representing assessment companies who were present, they had no objection to this clause. As a matter of fact, whether they had objection or not, we have heard enough during the discussion this afternoon to show that this system, which, according to the Superintendent, is only experimentally, is very dangerous and should be guarded by all restrictions that the House may find necessary for the protection of the policy holders. We have found it necessary to provide, as far as American assessment companies are concerned, that death claims shall be the first charge; that no portion of the money shall be used for any expenses, that a clause shall be printed in different colored ink, in these words: "This association is not required by law to maintain any reserve." If these clauses are necessary for the protection of policy holders holding American policies, I do not see why they are not necessary for the protection of policy holders, when they hold Canadian policies. If these clauses are good as far as American companies are concerned, they are equally as good as far as Canadians are concerned. The hon. Minister says then there will be no difference. There will be a great difference; the deposit of $50,000 is not required from the Canadian companies, but is from the American companies; and really no good reason has been advanced by the hon. the Minister to show that these conditions, which I believe are necessary to prevent confusion in the public mind, and which are held to be good as far as American companies are concerned, should not apply equally to Canadian companies.

Mr. DAVIES. The restrictions in the 5, 6 and 7 subsections which the hon. gentleman proposes to apply to Canadian assessment companies, were inserted in the committee for the protection of the policy holders, and I think myself that a large number of those who voted in the committee believed that they applied to all assessment companies. I think the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. IVES. This is not a matter of advantage to the companies, but a matter of protection to the policy holders. If it is necessary to protect our people in the case of foreign companies, it is certainly necessary to protect them in the case of our own companies. If there is any distinction between these companies and the companies on the old line, why should not the distinction be marked on the Canadian policies issued by Canadian companies? Perhaps the Minister of Customs will tell us what advantage Canadian old line companies enjoy over the English or American companies; they have to deposit and comply with the same regulations. I do not see what particular advantage the Canadian old line companies have over the English or Americans, that should justify our giving this extremely new-fangled system superior advantages to swindle the people which the American companies have not.

Mr. HALL. One of the clauses insisted upon by the committee was that no part of the assessment for death losses should be applied to expenses. There could be no better indication of the wisdom of the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) than the fact that a certain society in Montreal had an income of $36,570, out of which they paid for death claims, $4,619, their expenses being $31,951; and the next year their total receipts were $59,790, their death claims had increased to $20,200, and their expenses were $39,590. That is a company that came to grief the other day in Montreal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a strong reason, I think, at any rate, that clause 6 should be made applicable to all. I am, myself, in favor of the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). The only guarantee against confusion amongst these companies is the declaration in clause 6, that every application policy and certificate shall have printed thereon the following words:—

This association is not required by law to maintain the reserve which is required of ordinary life insurance companies.

I doubt very much whether in practice that is a sufficient guarantee, but it is the only guarantee we have, and if that is to be forced on American or English companies, there is equal reason why the attention of policy holders should be called to it in the case of these other companies. Every possible attempt will be made by the insurance canvassers, of whom, no doubt, the House has had experience enough, and who are not the most scrupulous people in the world, but are as persistent a class of canvassers as you can find from one end of Canada to the other, to represent that these companies are just as good as the other companies.

Mr WELLS. A great deal better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend does not go quite as far as one gentleman, who says this is a heaven-directed system for the protection of insurers; but, however this may be, if you do not extend this provision to the Canadian companies, no ordinary man will be able to distinguish between them at all. There is nothing to tell any man insuring what he ought to know, that these companies are conducted on a totally different principle from that laid down for those the Government has taken under its special care. We have had very special and very peculiar legislation on this subject, and there is no doubt that the public are by this time thoroughly aware of the fact that the majority of these old companies are under a rigorous system of Government inspection, and that they put dependence upon them for that very reason. In introducing this measure as it stands, I warn the Government that they positively give a premium to fraudulent canvassers—we will not say anything about the companies represented by such respectable persons as my hon. friend behind me—to conceal the real facts of the case, and I think it is a reasonable demand that they shall be required to show on the face of the policies that they are not conducted on the same basis as the other companies.

Amendment (Mr. Girouard) agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD. I doubt very much whether you have jurisdiction in that matter. It seems to me to be a matter of procedure which belongs to the Local Legislature. The action must be taken in the county or district where the insured is residing. We have other modes of suing and I think it should be before any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. IVES. Surely, if we have jurisdiction over the subject of insurance, we have over the mode of carrying it out, and the amendment just carried is as obnoxious to the objection as this one.

Mr. GIROUARD. No. It ought to be any court of competent jurisdiction in the Province.

Mr. WELLS. I propose to move the following:—

No such association shall insert any provision in any certificate or policy preventing an action from being brought thereon in Canada, and if any such provision is so inserted, the same shall be void.

Mr. IVES. My objection to this is that the contract is made in New York, and the policy is issued there, and dated there, and therefore there would be nothing to give juris-

diction to our courts. There is nothing to show that the contract was made here at all, and, whether the amendment would be of any use here or not, it would only remove the difficulty of the man who had to sue at home, and that would be worse than the other amendment. It seems to me that the foreign insurance company ought to agree that, although the contract is made in a foreign country, the holder of the policy here should be entitled to pursue his recourse in our courts, and therefore I cannot accept the amendment of the hon. member.

Mr. WELLS. Surely my hon. friend does not mean to say that if a policy is made in New York to a Canadian policy holder the latter cannot sue in Canada. It has been held to the contrary in this country. Then the only effect would be that, supposing any company put such a provision in the policy, and that is pleaded against the action, the courts would hold that it was void. I go further. My hon. friend, perhaps, does not know that many of the policies made by these American companies are expressly made on the face of them payable old line in New York or elsewhere, so that, if he is going to introduce that amendment at all, he must make it applicable to them all. The policies of the New York Life, the Mutual Life, and other companies, are especially stated to be made in New York.

Mr. ABBOTT. It seems to me there is no difficulty about a suit in Canada which is not covered by either of those amendments. Canvassers for these foreign companies are frequently people who travel about and ask for subscriptions. The company itself may have no office which anybody can find, or to which anyone can have convenient access. It seems to me the chief difficulty about suing any company would be the possession of a domicile, a place where a writ could be served. If it were a condition that the company should name a place, and, as we say in Lower Canada, elect a domicile in the Province, somewhere where the writ could be served, then persons suffering losses might take their remedy in the Province. My impression is that the first amendment moved should have an addition to it, that besides stating that persons may sue within the Province for a remedy upon any policy issued, a place should be named within the Province where the writ could be served. Without that the remedy would be quite illusory.

Mr. IVES. I should much prefer the suggestion of the hon. member, although the remedy would not be quite illusory, because in our Province we could call them in by advertisement and obtain a judgment that way.

Mr. EDGAR. That suggestion is a good one; still I think the clause would be very valuable even if that suggestion were not adopted, because in Ontario there is no difficulty in serving a foreign corporation.

Mr. IVES. Nor in Quebec either.

Mr. DAVIES. I think most of the Provinces have provisions in their procedures to sue foreign corporations. I think that the suggestion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) should be accepted by the mover of the resolution, and that one should not be compelled to sue in the particular locality where the person dies, but anywhere in the Province.

Mr. ABBOTT. Allow me to refer to the General Insurance Act as it exists. In clause 9 of that Act it is provided that documents are to be filed before license is granted, and among those documents is a power of attorney, which must declare in what place in Canada the head office or chief agency of such company is situated, and it must expressly authorise such attorney to receive process in all suits and proceedings against such company, in any Province of Canada, for any liabilities incurred by the company therein.

Mr. BOWELL. I would like to suggest to the legal gentlemen in this matter, that that clause already applies to these line companies. I take it for granted that every clause in this Act of which this is a part applies to this company, except those that are specially repealed. However, I would suggest, as this is rather an important amendment, that the hon. member who has moved the amendment should withdraw it for the present, and have it carefully drawn, and move it at the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. IVES. I have no objection.

Amendment, and amendment to the amendment, withdrawn.

On section 7,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is such a thing as that within our purview.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I was not present in the committee before which the Bill was so lengthily discussed, but I think we ought to go somewhat farther than this clause provides. A good deal of litigation has arisen in testing the claims of parties, for the reason that in the application certain statements were made that were proven to be untrue. We can easily see how this can be done. People who go around canvassing for applications are very apt to meet with persons as applicants who do not know exactly the meaning of certain questions which they have to answer. The canvasser will very probably say that it does not make much difference whether the application is correctly filled up or not, and with this statement in view the applicant fills up the application. The answers given are, however, made part of the contract, and if it should turn out, afterwards, that there has been some error in the statements, although they have been made in good faith, the representatives of the party will not be able to enforce the claim. We should add the words: "Provided it has not been made fraudulently." Unless the statement, which proves to be an erroneous one, is made fraudulently at the time, the policy should not be voided. Applicants in answering as to their age may make a mistake of a year. The canvasser very probably says that the exact age is not material; nevertheless, it is afterwards made material, and if it should turn out to be erroneous, the representatives of the insurer will not be able to enforce the claim.

Mr. DAVIES I cannot agree with the hon. member for Kent. The section goes as far as it can reasonably go. Heretofore misstatements, whether material or immaterial, would void the whole policy. That was unfair and unjust. This section is in the direction of relieving policy holders from that injustice. I cannot, however, go so far as to say that if very material statements should prove false the policy should not be voided. I think it should be voided.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). In the case of fire insurance, for example, the distance of one building from another is frequently erroneously stated, and in some cases the agent has himself drawn out the rough plan. There are many answers given to questions in applications for life insurance, respecting which the parties are not certain, and if the statements are made *bonâ fide*, I think the policy should not be voided, although they subsequently prove to be incorrect.

Mr. ABBOTT. I agree with the hon. member for Queen's in his view as to the proposal just made. The contract is one which depends on the representations of the party desiring to be assured. The amount of premiums to be paid depends on the statements made, and they are absolutely the conditions on which the insurance is effected. If an applicant makes a misstatement as to his age, that may have an effect on the amount paid during 20, 30 or 50 years, and if he may make an error in regard to one year he may as regards five years. It is proper that, if the

contract be made in error, the policy should be voided, if the misrepresentations or errors are material.

Mr. SPROULE. It very frequently happens that if erroneous statements have been made the companies go on and continue to receive the premiums during ten or fifteen years, and on the death of the insured they bring up the misstatements as a reason why they should not pay the death loss. There ought to be something in the Act that would prevent the company, after a policy has been issued and been in force for some time, from subsequently raising a question as to its validity. After the company have taken every possible means to satisfy themselves as to the truth of a statement, and after the premiums have been paid during some years, they should not be allowed to plead that a misstatement was made and the policy therefore voided.

Mr. DAVIES. The obligation as to good faith should extend to both parties.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I look upon the matter as of more importance than do some hon. members, and I will move the amendment I have suggested, on the third reading, and will then be prepared to show that the series of questions put to applicants are such as cannot be answered correctly. I do not think he ought to. I think that it ought to be the duty of the company, if they want to resist a claim of this kind, to show that the statements that were made at the time were made fraudulently, that the party knew that they were fraudulent, and did it for the purpose of getting a policy upon false representations, which he knew were false at the time. I have merely given one of the instances as an illustration, but there are many of the same kind, so that it is almost impossible for the applicant to answer the questions without making mistakes.

Mr. TROW. There is such keen competition between the agents of these companies that in many instances these questions are not answered, but are taken for granted, and I think that the only cases in which a man should forfeit his rights is when he attempts to misrepresent his age for the purpose of benefiting thereby.

Mr. HICKEY. I think the observations of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) ought to have a great deal of weight with this committee. No doubt there are many candidates for examination who have insufficient knowledge of their own immediate family history. They may possibly be foreigners, coming to this country; their parents or their brothers or sisters may have died since they left, for instance, of consumption, which is a hereditary disease, and the applicant may be in good faith in not knowing of what disease they died. For that reason, I think some consideration should be extended to the applicant. At present the family history is considered very important for or against the candidate, as evidence which he can give himself, apart from the physician's examination. Most of our companies are making the examination more carefully than ever, because they are stating in their policies that after three premiums are paid nothing will invalidate the policy. For instance, the Canada Life makes that provision.

On section 8,

Mr. WELLS. It is perfectly obvious that this clause goes further than the person who drafted it intended. For instance, in the 16th and 20th lines, it includes "any person who transacts any business on behalf of such company," as those coming within the penalty of the 13th section of the Act. I do not think it was ever intended to go as far as those words go, because they would include any proprietor of a newspaper publishing an advertisement, for an unlicensed company or any carpenter putting up a shelf.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The carpenter would not be called upon to print any words in his insurance policy.

Mr. WELLS. But it is not limited in that way. This section has been compiled from two or three sections; it was moved just at the moment the committee was rising, and it was not well considered. Now, what the committee wish is to protect the public, by seeing that the public are sure that it understands it is dealing with a company which does business on the assessment principle. That, I suppose, is the object of the clause. Now, every assessment company sends out thousands of circulars, notices of assessment, etc., to its own members, and is there any object in having the words "assessment system" printed on such documents, or any other documents of that kind that are sent to its own members. I shall move an amendment which, I think, will be accepted by the committee, as it is a reasonable one. I move to insert after the word "Canada," these words:

In every circular or advertisement issued or used in Canada, addressed to its own members, and not showing that the company transacts the business of insurance upon the assessment system.

Some of these companies have enormous stocks of these circulars on hand. The company in which I am interested I know has thousands, I might say millions, of them on hand, and as many of them are pamphlets, they could not be put through the press without tearing them apart.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, they could.

Mr. WELLS. I do not see any object in putting these words in, in the case of such documents as I have described, sent to the companies' own members, and I do not think any company should be embarrassed or vexed or harassed by a provision of this kind, for no purpose.

Mr. DAVIES. If I heard the amendment aright, it is more extensive than the hon. gentleman who proposed it seems to understand. It might be desirable that papers sent to members themselves should not have the words "assessment system" on them; but the amendment goes further, because it provides that these words should not be on any document, if it could be gathered from the substance of the document that the company carries on business by the assessment system. If carrid, it would compel every man to read every report or document he received, in order to ascertain whether or not the company was conducted on the assessment system. Why does the hon. member want to dispense with that notice?

Mr. WELLS. I frankly say why. These companies have hundreds of thousands of those documents already printed. There is one company that sends to its own members 200,000 of these documents every two months, and it would be utterly out of the question to put a stamp on all of these; it would take the whole time of a man or half a dozen men to do it. This idea of safety is entirely over-estimated. Did anybody ever know an instance in which a person was insured under one system and thought he was insuring under another? I venture to say it would be utterly impossible, with the strife and rivalry existing among insurance companies; and we are only forecasting a grievance which has never arisen, and which probably never will arise. To require that a document or report will show on its face that the company is doing business on the assessment system is surely protection enough to the public. My hon. friend says a person may be deceived, because he may have to read through the document. I do not suppose anyone is going to be deceived by a document unless he reads it. I think this provision is only vexatious.

Mr. TROW. I do not think it is imposing any hardship on these companies to require them to stamp these documents in the corner with the words "assessment system." If they have a large surplus of the documents on hand, one man could, in a short time, stamp all they would require for a month.

Mr. EDGAR. If my hon. friend is so much in favor of the assessment system, and it has so many advantages, as he

says, it should be his earnest desire to have the words "assessment system" put on every document and every policy, and to advertise it in every possible way. I really cannot see why he takes the ground he does.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think the objection the hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Wells) takes to the clause is so important as he thinks it is. If the companies have the number of circulars on hand he says, it will not require half a dozen men to stamp them. They can easily be run through a power press with the same rapidity with which they were printed. The only objection, to my mind, is that of expense, and it will not be very large. The very strong opinion expressed in the committee—and I see it prevails in the House—was that all documents of these companies should bear on their face evidence that they are documents of companies conducted on the co-operative plan. I think the clause is sufficient. It makes any officer of an unlicensed company, or any person who transacts business on behalf of such company, liable to the penalty.

Mr. WELLS. By that clause you make any person doing any sort of business for an unlicensed company liable. If a publisher of a newspaper inserts an advertisement for such a company, would you make him liable?

Mr. BOWELL. He is not transacting business on behalf of the company.

Mr. WELLS. It depends on what the court will take "transacting business" to mean. I think he would be.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Insert the word "insurance" before the word "business."

Mr. WELLS. I would suggest that all the words after the word "company," in the 18th line, to the word "company," in the 20th line, be omitted, because this is provided already in the general Insurance Act. I would move to that effect.

Amendment (Mr. Wells) negatived.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) meets the objection, and makes the clause much clearer. I would move that as an amendment,

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BEATY. There should also be an amendment to the 21st line by adding the following words:—

And any director, manager, agent or other officer of the company, or any other person transacting business on behalf of the said company, circulating or issuing any policy, or application, or circular, in which the words "assessment system" are not printed thereon, shall be liable to a penalty mentioned in the 13th section of the Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. Suppose an agent circulates 1,000 copies, is it to be one offence, or more than one?

Mr. BOWELL. That question is before the courts of Ontario, as to whether bribing one man or a dozen is one offence.

Mr. BLAKE. It ought to be made clear.

Mr. DAVIES. It is monstrous that the man who issues one circular should be subject to the same penalty as the man who issues 1,000.

Mr. BOWELL. For each offence, $1,000.

Mr. DAVIES. No; the Act says not exceeding $1,000; it may be $1.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. IVES. I propose to move, as the 10th clause, the following:—

In every policy issued by a foreign company licensed under this Act in favor of a resident of Canada, a clause shall be either embodied therein or endorsed thereon to the effect that an action to enforce the obligation of said policy may be validly taken in any court of competent jurisdiction in the Province wherein said policy-holder resides or last resided before his disease.

Mr. WELLS. Would it not answer to have it declared in the Act instead of embodied in the policies?

Mr. IVES. I do not intend the clause to be annoying, but I think it is better to put it in this way. If it is merely declared in the Act, it will be binding upon those companies only so far as our own courts are concerned, and if you have to go into a foreign court with a judgment obtained in Canada, that judgment will not be binding, because the foreign court will not necessarily recognise the declaration of our own statute. If you provide that the policy itself shall contain that bargain between the insured and the insurer, it must be held to be binding in all foreign courts, upon the company as well as upon the individual. I do not consider it would more than half answer the purpose we have in view if this were simply put into the statute, because it would simply be a law as between the company and the insured in the Dominion of Canada, and nowhere else.

Mr. WELLS. That is not my notion of an action upon a judgment. The only defence, as I understand, that can be raised in such a case, is as to the regularity of the judgment. No defence can be raised to an action of a judgment which might have been raised in the original action.

Mr. HALL. That may be true, but there may be cases where parties would prefer to go to the foreign court direct. The company may have no assets here, and the parties may go to a court of foreign jurisdiction as a first resort.

Mr. WELLS. Then the clause would not apply at all.

Mr. HALL. Certainly it would, if it were embodied in the policy.

Mr. WELLS. The idea is, that they shall not be compelled to sue there. It is only a vexatious amendment.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is a condition in some of the policies that proceedings must be taken in courts of the United States.

Mr. WELLS. No.

Mr. WHITE. There were some policies of that kind read in the committee room.

Mr. WELLS. I have explained half a dozen times that that was in the original policies, which has been expunged.

Mr. WHITE. That was in a very recent policy, and there is no reason why it may not be in a policy again. If a person insured makes a condition that he will only sue in a court in the United States, what value is the statutory declaration here? He has made the contract that he will only sue in the United States.

Mr. WELLS. The amendment which I moved would remove that objection altogether.

Mr. WHITE. It would.

Mr. WELLS. I move it now.

Mr. HALL. That certainly removes one objection, but still it does not give to the assured the benefit we have intended to give him, that is, that he should have his choice of suing here or going to the foreign jurisdiction to sue. The amendment of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) would give him both, and both would be none too little.

Mr. WELLS. He has both, under my amendment.

Mr. HALL. I think not.

Mr. WELLS. Then why do you not apply this to the policies of the other companies?

Mr. HALL. Because we have more guarantee in their case.

Mr. WELLS. You may think so, but I do not; and I do not think the majority in this House think so. The principle is the same with respect to both forms of companies. If it is a wise provision in regard to foreign assessment companies it is a wise provision in regard to other companies.

Mr. BOWELL. If my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) will allow that matter to stand, and give notice of it, so that it may be moved on the third reading, I should like it much better. I confess I am not in a position to know what effect that will have upon the whole Bill, particularly as he has another clause which he proposes to move in case this is carried, making all the clauses of the Insurance Act of Canada applicable to this, except where otherwise provided. Although this is an independent Bill of itself, I understand it is an amendment of the General Insurance Act, but extending its provisions still further, in order to bring within its scope this class of companies. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow the matter to stand over until to-morrow, so that we may give it further consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope, under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman will consider how far we have power to mould a specific contract of insurance, as has been proposed by some of the amendments. I think some decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, with reference, particularly, to our jurisdiction in the matter of insurance, have been to the effect that the form of contract would rather be prescribed by the Local than the Federal Legislature, although we had incorporated the Act.

Amendment withdrawn, and Bill reported.

INSPECTION OF GAS AND GAS METERS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN. This is a substitute for clause 54 of the Inspection Act, which requires that twenty-four hours' notice should be given to the party when either the quality of gas or the meter are to be inspected; that is, that the manufacturer of the gas shall have twenty-four hours' notice and may be present at the inspection. But it has been found that the manufacturer is by that means enabled to improve the quality of the gas before the inspection is made, and it is proposed to substitute for that clause another, one allowing the manufacturer to be present at the inspection of the gas or of the meter, but only giving him notice in advance of the inspection of the meter, dropping the notice for the inspection of the quality of the gas.

Mr. BLAKE. Have the gas companies petitioned for this?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware that they have, but this is supposed to be in the interest of gas consumers.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

COURT OF CLAIMS BILL.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I gave notice of Bill, (No. 93) to establish a court of claims for Canada, some three months ago, I thought we would be able to deal with it before this. But inasmuch as the Session has already been protracted, and there is no absolute necessity for passing this measure at the present Session, I move that the Bill be withdrawn and the Order discharged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill withdrawn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the Order for the House to resolve itself into Committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting the salaries of the judge and officers to be appointed under any Act to establish a court of claims for Canada, be discharged.

Motion agreed to, and Order discharged.

CANNED GOODS.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 142) respecting Canned Goods. He said: It will be remembered that last Session a clause relating to canned goods was added to the Weights and Measures Act, specifying that they should have certain weight and be marked in a certain manner. It is proposed to repeal that clause, which was appended to the Weights and Measures Bill, and to provide that canned goods shall have the packer's name or dealer's name stamped upon the package, and that the cans or packages shall specify the nature of the contents, whether they be fresh or dried goods. It is further provided that the Governor in Council, after the Bill is in operation, shall ascertain and determine standard sizes for the various kinds of canned goods, which shall be known by number, so that dealers may sell goods of those standard sizes by numbers. It is also provided that if the dealer or packer marks the weight upon the can, it shall be the proper weight. The Bill is a very short and simple one, and meets the wants of that branch of trade.

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill has come down very recently from the Senate, namely, on the 6th instant. I, therefore, trust the hon. gentleman does not propose to take it through committee this evening, because a little time should be given for the trade to be communicated with. We made a mistake last Session, which we are now attempting to rectify, and we must not act too hurriedly. The hon. gentleman stated, in explaining the Bill, that it provided for standard sizes, and that these shall be settled by the Governor in Council. I find no such provision in the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. I find I was speaking of the Bill as it was sent to the Senate. That clause was struck out.

Mr. CHARLTON. Did I correctly understand the hon. gentleman to say that the date of the packing of the goods shall be placed upon the can?

Mr. McLELAN. It is provided that any person who places a date, which is proved to be the incorrect date, on the cans, shall be liable to a penalty.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have a letter here from a very large producer of canned goods in the west, objecting to this feature of the Bill, that the label on cans shall be dated, and he has sent me a number of extracts from papers interested in the canned goods trade, in Maryland, New York, California and elsewhere, setting forth the objection of the trade to that provision. He also sends me a list of the standard sizes adopted by the Baltimore Canned Goods Exchange. He represents that to require absolute accuracy as to weight is to ask an impossibility; that, owing to variations of temperature, when the goods are being canned part of the liquor may escape in some cases and the weight may vary half an ounce or more per can. The sizes given for canned goods on the Baltimore Exchange are five numbers, 1, 2, 3, 6 and 10. The size is determined, not by weight, but by the dimensions of the can. Those sizes give the weights within an ounce or two, and it is a much more convenient method of arranging the sizes than to have it absolutely required that the cans shall contain a specified weight of goods. Another objection made to the Bill by this packer is, that the labels, instead of specifying the quantity, should specify the quality of the goods; in fact, that the law should require a standard size of cans and that the labels should specify the quality of the goods. I shall be happy to submit to the Minister the letter and enclosures to which I have referred.

Mr. McLELAN. The Bill does not provide that the weight shall be marked upon them, but that if the manu-

facturer or dealer places on the cans a mark representing them to be a certain weight, it must be the correct weight, and if the manufacturer puts on a date, the correct date must be given. The Bill does not compel the manufacturer to give the date or weight.

Bill read the second time.

LAND GRANTS TO NORTH-WEST RAILWAYS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved, That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

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

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

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

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

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

The question of building these lines of railway has already been before the House on previous Sessions. The first railway company which is mentioned in these resolutions is the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited). This railway begins at Medicine Hat, or its neighborhood, and goes to the Hudson River, within a short distance of Fort MacLeod, a distance of 110 miles. The Government had this matter before them at different periods. It was thought very important that these mines, at such a distance in the North-West Territories, might be worked, in order to provide fuel for the railways in the immense territories of the North-West, as well as to the settlers within such a distance from the mines, that the coal could be carried at a sufficiently low rate as to allow them to buy it and use it for their ordinary fuel. The Government tried, in accordance with the true interests of the country, to help the company, as far as possible within their powers, and with the consent of Parliament; but it was found that, after the company had attempted to obtain the necessary funds to build the road, other concessions and facilities should be granted to them, and finally it was decided that, subject to the approval of Parliament, the reserve of lands made by the previous Order in Council should be increased to 3,800 acres per mile, from Medicine Hat to the coal banks of the company. The company are to pay the costs of survey and other expenses at the rate of 10 cents per acre. This reserve is to be the same as by the previous Order in Council, and the increased grant of land shall depend on the line being completed during the month of August next. The provisions of that Order in Council shall remain in force, except as modified hereby. Then there was another Order in Council which determined the location of the line of railway from its junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway, so that this is the amount of land grant recommended in this case. This company has under construction, and approved location, 107 miles. If they get to the end of their charter they will have to build 35 miles more, which would bring them to Fort McLeod, making altogether 142 miles.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the grant for the whole 140 miles?

Mr. MCLELAN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; the grant is from Medicine Hat to the coal banks on the Hudson River, about 110 miles, but I gave the total mileage besides, which would bring them to Fort McLeod. The second resolution is with reference to the South-Western Colonization Railway Company, and in this case, as in the others, it was found impossible for the company to raise the money necessary for the building of these lines, which were considered of the greatest importance for the opening up of the North-West. This line is south of Winnipeg, in the region south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and is considered a most important railway, as it opens up large sections of country, consisting of beautiful lands, where already a large number of people have settled, but where, necessarily, they would hardly remain if they were without a railway to communicate with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and enable them to export the produce of their fertile lands. The next railway is the Manitoba and North-Western. That railway begins at Portage la Prairie and goes as far as Minnedosa. That portion of the line is already built to the extent of 78 miles, besides 58 under contract, and 75 miles under approved location, with 250 miles further to go to the end of the charter, which would make altogether 453 miles, whilst the Southern Railway, which we have under consideration, has 51 miles under operation, 212 miles under location, with 115 miles more to go to the end of the charter, making 378 altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. The proposed aid is only for 152 miles to the Manitoba South-Western?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The aid to the company is for 150 miles, at 6,400 acres per mile, that distance being the distance to White Water Lake. This is a very important road, and I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will remember the discussion which took place on this matter in previous Sessions, and will agree that it is one of those railways which, if we aid any roads in the Territories, must receive the aid of Parliament. The third line is the line I alluded to a moment ago, the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. This line has already 73 miles in operation from Portage la Prairie to Minnedosa; the company is now constructing 50 miles more, and has the location approved of 75 miles further; and when all this is completed, it will still have 250 miles to construct, making a total of 453 miles. This railway will run from Minnedosa, in a north-westerly, or rather in a northerly direction, to Prince Albert. It is a very important road, because it opens up a large section of territory north of the line of the Pacific Railway, which, I understand consists of, perhaps not altogether, but to a great extent, very good lands, fit for settlement. There are a number of settlers already along the line, and I have no doubt that when opened up this district will be a favorite resort for settlers. Besides, the road will probably lead to other railways in that district which our successors in twenty or twenty-five years may have to build. The next line is that of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, which has twenty miles located and under construction, and the road will be sixty miles longer, making eighty miles altogether. Though this line is not so long or so important as the others, yet hon. gentlemen must have seen, during recent events, that a railway in that direction would have been a very great advantage. The building of this line will open, at a short distance of twenty miles, a long stretch of navigation, in the region of Long Lake, which will be very important. The grant of land, by the number of miles, is comparatively small; it extends only to Long Lake. I move, therefore, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on these resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. There can be no doubt that the question the hon. gentleman has brought before us is one of very

great, I may say, of very pressing importance; and those who have done me the honor of listening to what I have said on former occasions with reference to the construction of branch railways in the North-West will readily understand that I approach this subject with very great pleasure, at the idea that there is a prospect of some greater results being accomplished in the immediate future than have been accomplished in the last few years in that direction. It has always been my opinion that the rapid and satisfactory development of the North-West necessitates the construction of branch railways, and that it was unfortunate that a number of events should have taken place, with reference to one railway or another, some of which we may have occasion to allude to in the course of the discussion in the committee, which have prevented the more rapid construction of these lines of railway. I do not at all complain of the hon. gentleman's having entered, in the very brief statement he made, into the details, before we go into the committee. That is highly reasonable, and I have no doubt he will supplement it with still further details when we get into committee and are called upon to deal with each specific grant; and I shall not, just now, trouble the House with a reference to the particular grants, or with more than a very brief allusion to some points on which I think it reasonable that the Government should have given general explanations before asking you to leave the Chair. You remember, Sir, the varying policies of the Administration with reference to the construction of branch railways. When the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was chartered, and a very large grant of lands, besides a large grant of money, was made to that corporation, we were told by the Government that one of the inducements to the liberal treatment we were asked to accord to that company was that it would itself construct, free of charge to the country, a very large number of branch lines throughout the North-West. The First Minister, in the course of those discussions, I recollect very well, used, I think, the term "herringbone" or "gridiron" system of railways, one or other, which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to construct, which its interest was to construct, in order to make available the area of its land grant, which was beyond the immediate influence of the main line of that railway; and we were told that we were thus incidentally providing for the construction of branch railways in the North-West as well as for the construction of a main line of railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. The original attitude, or the very early attitude, of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this report, so far as their announcements to the country ,and the Government are concerned, was somewhat in the same direction; because I think the House will not have forgotten that within a very very few months after their incorporation that company announced its intention to build a very great mileage of branch railways through the North-West, amongst others, a line starting from a point not very far removed from Winnipeg—I forget the exact point—practically pretty nearly upon the pending line, by the Yellow Head pass of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and going, I think, as far as Edmonton. This line, some 600, or 700, or 800 miles long, was one of the lines which the Canadian Pacific Railway located, in a general sense, and in respect to which it invited the Government to reserve the land along each side of that railway, so that the company might have the advantage of the enhancement of value which was to be produced by its construction. That was not the only railway. A line south, also, extending in a south-westward direction, was early announced by the Canadian Pacific Railway as to be by it constructed. However, we know that, so far as the development, to any large extent, of the North-West by branch railways has been concerned, these promises of the Administration, upon the granting of the contract, and these professions of the company after the granting of the contract, have not been fulfilled, because, though there are some branch railways, small railways, which have been built by the Canadian Pacific Railway, their aggregate mileage—I do not include, of course, the Algoma branch, which is not pertinent to this discussion at all—amounts to something like 260 or 270 miles, including the Algoma branch, or 170 or 180 miles without it, and several of them are in directions other than those which were at that time contemplated, and which, although useful enterprises, perhaps, are hardly to be considered as enterprises of the particular character which was to be attributed to those to which I have referred. There was an enterprise which the hon. gentleman is proposing to assist further by these resolutions, which was in existence a very considerable time before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself was incorporated, the Manitoba and South-Western Colonisation Railway; and after the incorporation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the latter company seemed to adopt a policy of hostility, so far as I can judge, to the promotion of that enterprise. Both by its attitude towards the corporation of the city of Winnipeg and its attitude with reference to claims as to station grounds, and to claims as to lands reserved, and in various other ways, difficulties were thrown in the way of the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway, which have resulted in very great disappointment and enormous delay in the construction of that work. I believe it has since passed under the practical, in fact, I may say, the formal control of the Canadian Pacific Railway itself, which, in the meantime, engaged in the construction of a road tending somewhat in the same direction, and thus also complicating the work of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway. The result is, we have two roads, not precisely, it is true, on the same line, but passing through the same section of country, and not penetrating that country into which the people had gone many years before, in the full expectation of a railway running through it, and in which great discontent, loss, discomfort and depression have been experienced, from the general result of the policy to which I have referred and the various unfortunate events which have prevented the construction of that road. Hon. gentlemen opposite might, on this occasion, on which they come formally before Parliament, for the first time, to develop a policy of construction by the Government of the day, of branch railways in the North-West, have gone into some review of their previous efforts in this direction and the difficulties which those efforts have met with. I do not say this is the first step hon. gentlemen have taken, apart from that to which I have alluded, with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards aiding branch railways in the North-West; because, executively, they have taken steps in the way of granting lands, under the general powers conferred upon them in the Dominion Lands Act. They have taken the step of selling lands to railways at what was deemed a rate adequate to enable the companies to realise a large margin, and thus to acquire a bonus, in fact, by virtue of the low rates for the lands. But, as I have said, these were executive acts, carried out by the Administration under the general statutes, and we are now face to face, for the first time, with a policy of aid upon which Parliament is expected to pronounce. Hon. gentlemen opposite might fairly have entered into the review of their prior efforts and the results of those efforts, particularly when we remember the notions which, a little while ago, were rather current on the opposite side of the House, as to the magnificent results of the executive action of the Administration in this regard, as to the grand receipts the country was going to obtain from the sale of the lands to railway companies, at once filling the Treasury with cash and providing the country with railway accomodation by the building of many hundreds of miles of branch railways. I remember the contrast painted in the strongest, the most violent colors, between the proposal which my hon. friend from Bothwell

(Mr. Mills) submitted to Parliament, in the last years of the Government of which he was a member, and that of the present Administration; when it was pointed out that my hon. friend actually proposed to give free to railways something like 6,000 acres of land a mile, in the early settlement of Manitoba and the North-West Territory; when it was pointed out that he profligately proposed to allow the railway companies the opportunity of obtaining the benefit of 6,000 acres of land per mile in order to help the construction of these roads. Hon. gentlemen opposite then thought that was a very bad policy, a policy too liberal, unnecessarily liberal, and they were determined, by a happy combination, at once, as I have said, to fill the Treasury with cash and the country with railways, and upon that enterprise they entered, and in that enterprise they have been since engaged, for some years, and with the general results which the hon. gentleman has depicted to-night, namely, that we have got some 50 or 52 miles of Manitoba and South-Western built, and some 80 miles, I think, of the Manitoba and North-Western built, and there is the end of the account, apart from a small mileage of lines which the Canadian Pacific Railway has itself built, in the way of branch lines. After their efforts to develop the North-West, after the glorious results which they have declared they have obtained in the North-West, after the greatly enhanced value which they say they have given to lands in that country, they propose now to hand over, for the construction of branch lines, 6,400 acres a mile free, and I am sorry to say that the papers which are before me show that some, at any rate, of the corporations to which these grants are to be given, are not sanguine of being able to construct the roads, even with the aid of the grants, although they are larger, in fact, than 6,400 acres a mile, with reference to two corporations, for reasons I will point out when we get to committee, and deal with the particular grants; but, for the moment, waiving that, we have 6,400 acres a mile proposed to be given by a policy adopted in the fall of 1884 and presented to Parliament for its ratification in 1885, when hon. gentlemen told us, a number of years ago, that they would obtain the railways to be constructed and would procure for us, in addition, $1 an acre for the lands. It seems to me that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman might have entered into some detail before he asked you to leave the Chair, some review of the various proposals with reference to the railways, and some detail as to the circumstances which have given rise to a reversion, in fact, to the condemned policy of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). The original proposition, I think, was for something, perhaps, even smaller, in some cases certainly smaller, than 6,400 acres. I think the original proposal was for 3,840 acres a mile. The first scheme of hon. gentlemen opposite was to sell 3,840 acres a mile to such branch railways as they thought were sufficiently important to justify that sale, at $1 an acre—plus the cost of survey, of course, in all cases—$1 an acre cash: and upon that it was expected that a sufficient margin would be obtained to secure the construction of the railway. That policy was modified, and they decided, upon the request of the railway companies, to increase the sale to 6,400 acres a mile, at $1 an acre, cash, and thus, by the added acreage, to enlarge the margin of profit to be made by the railway company, and so to secure the construction of the railway and this sum in cash to the Treasury. Then another change was in the postponement of the time of payment. After having increased the acreage they were asked to postpone the period of payment, so that the resources of the companies might be made available for the construction of the railway, and the payment might not be exacted before the companies were able to sell to the purchasers; and to that, also, they agreed, as a modification which might be given without danger to the State and with obvious advantages to the companies. And then, an absolutely free grant is asked of the larger area. It seems to me that these statements that I have made of the various proposals of hon. gentlemen at different times ought, when they now come before Parliament for the first time, for the formal adoption of the policy for aiding railways in the North-West, to have induced a review of their past policies and some explanation of the reason why, at this time of day and in the condition of the North-West as it was in the fall of 1884, the proposals are, in their view, rendered necessary in the interest of the country, which they thought so improper at its earlier and less matured period of development, when my hon. friend from Bothwell submitted to the House. If it be that, by a more liberal policy in the earlier days, we could, many years ago, have secured the construction of branch railways through the North-West, I venture to say that the condition of that country—its material condition, and the state of its people, and the elements of prosperity in that country—would have been very much more developed, very much to the advantage of Canada at large, than that which obtains at the present day. I do not at all disguise the view that, while the construction of these railways is, as I conceive, of the last importance to the Province, my opinion is that they have been, in more than one way, practically thwarted by the course hon. gentlemen have taken. I have referred to the course with reference to the Manitoba South-Western. I refer also to the difficulties which are created by the special conditions under which the great through line was chartered. It is perfectly obvious that one of the elements of prosperity of the interior lines of Manitoba and the North-West must be the terms of connection which they make with the outlet for the through trade. So long as the railways in the North-West were restricted to connection with one line, by which only they could obtain access to the outer world, and which must, therefore, be the arbiter of the rates of freight for the through trade, it is very clear that their prospects must be much more doubtful than they could be if they could make arrangements which would secure to them a share, however little, of the profits derivable from the through trade. If they are connected with one company alone, that company having the right to dictate the terms upon which their traffic shall be taken, the margin of profit upon which this traffic can be carried, or an undue protection of that margin of profit may be extracted on the arrangements—they are not free arrangements, but on the arrangements, so to speak—which shall be effected between the branch railway and the through railway for the handling of the business; and, under these circumstances, it is obvious that prudent men have to rely on the prospects of the local freight, without relying, to any great extent, upon the profits derivable from through freight from the North-West. Another observation of a general character which I think fit to make on this occasion, and which I make with reference to the policy of the Administration, is, that I think it might fairly have been indicated by the Government, who have brought down to-night proposals to assist four railways, and four railways only, whether this is a policy which is applicable in its details to other enterprises of a character equal in importance, or fairly important, which may be projected, or which may have been projected through the North-West. I think it is of very great consequence that there should be some degree of certainty in that matter. I am not quarrelling with the view—there is no use in raising a contest upon it; it would be absurd, in the present condition of the country, and of the arrangements which have been made for the construction of railways, to enter, at this moment, upon a serious contest in reference to it—I am not quarreling with the view that a measure of control should be retained by the Government over the location of the railways. I do not express one opinion or the other upon that, but I am

assuming, for the moment, that this is a reasonable measure, as it is their obvious policy. Granting them that assumption, it would tend to settle this question more or less if we had a general declaration on the floor of Parliament as to the policy of the Government, as to other lines projected or to be projected in the North-West, with reference to grants of land. We must observe that the proposals of the Government are varied very materially, in one particular which I have already adverted to, in practice, by which, in effect, the area is made larger for two lines, but they vary also in another particular, which deserves attention, and upon which, I think, explanation at this stage of the resolution would have been perfectly fairly to be expected. With reference to one of the roads, and that a road passing through some of the choicest sections of the country, as I understand the proposal of the Government, it is that the grant of land shall be of lands all fairly fit for settlement; and as to the other of his proposals, the grant is not of that character; so that a distinction is made as to one of these Acts from that which exists as to the other. That, I think, is fairly a subject for explanation, inasmuch as it involves, very obviously, a question of policy. I need hardly say that what one of these companies gets all future companies will ask for, and indeed we may expect that those who have applied for and have been given something less than that which this company has got will call for the conditions which this company has got, and will ask why they should be placed in an inferior position to that which this particular company occupies. And so, it seems to me, it was a very questionable policy to make exceptional provisions, that the general provision ought to have ruled, except in so far as the circumstances of some particular locality might operate a difference, which, upon that ground, would render plain and intelligible a variation from that principle. I do not see any such circumstances as justify this variation. Another point which I have mentioned in the debate—I think on the Address—and which I think of very great consequence, is the question of a condition which I do not see in any of the Orders in Council, and which I had hoped to see there: that is, some condition which shall ensure that these agricultural lands shall be open for settlement, at moderate prices, on conditions of actual settlement. Now, the grant which the hon. gentleman proposes to assent to to-night is on no less an acreage than within a few acres of four millions and a half—as I roughly summed up the figures—alongside and closely adjoining a number of the railways which the Government think most important. Now, if there be one thing with reference to the land policy of the Administration which I think experience has already established we ought to be careful about, it is this question of the land being open to the actual settler, this question of the intending settler knowing the terms and conditions upon which, when he sees land vacant, he would be sure to get it. I need hardly tell hon. gentlemen opposite that our neighbors on the other side of the line have had considerable experience in assisting railways by grants of land; and I suppose I can cite six, eight or ten different provisions in different grants to railway corporations in the United States, designated, more or less perfectly, to protect the principle to which I have referred, the great principle of keeping the land open for the actual settler. Now, I am sorry that in the Orders in Council which were brought down and which indicate the conditions upon which the Government has proposed to confer those lands upon these companies, nothing should be said upon that subject, and I should be relieved to learn from the Government that notwithstanding the absence of such information in the Orders in Council we may hope for some practical proposal yet to be made by which we may secure these results. Early in the history of the various land measures of this Government they established belts, I think five in number—there may have been six—on each side of the location of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The fifth belt was a very wide belt; I think it was as much as 50 miles. They proposed to sell these lands at varying prices, but not upon conditions of settlement, and to sell them at a tenth down and the balance in ten annual instalments; and the result was that a very large area of land was taken up, choice land in the Province of Manitoba was taken up by speculators, who paid 10 cents an acre down, and speculated upon the margin. Others, of course, who bought in the $2 belt paid 20 cents, but for this trifle, this deposit, as you may call it, they obtained a title to the land, which enabled them to lock it up and disabled the settler from obtaining possession. So with reference to other operations which have, from time to time, taken place in the country; so with reference to other lock-ups which have, from time to time, taken place—some of them in connection with the original settlement of the Manitoba troubles, under which quantities of land were alienated under exceptional circumstances, but with unfortunate results as to the future of the country itself. Now, surely it is useful to refer to all these things upon an occasion in which it is proposed to initiate a system of free grants of land in aid of branch railways, in order that we may, if we can, so hedge around these grants, not so as to embarass the railway companies in obtaining substantial profits from the land, but as much as, consistently with accomplishing the object of the grant, if that be at all possible—and I believe it to be quite possible—may result in our telling the settler: Now, here is a railway belt along the line of railway where you can go, and there are Government sections which you can get free or pre-empt, and if you choose the railway lands you know the maximum price you have got to pay, and you know, if nobody else has entered into possession of that land for actual settlement purposes, you will have the right to enter and take possession and cultivate the soil. What we want is to secure, as far as possible, the early settlement of the country; and I am sure we feel, more than ever we felt before, to-day, that we must hope to secure that by settlement along the lines of railway. It seems to me extremely obvious that that must be our main dependence for a considerable time to come, much more strongly than it has been, in view of the events of this winter. Therefore, the question to which I have alluded has assumed a special degree of importance from these events. Now, Sir, I do not propose to trouble the House further at this moment. As I have said, I purposely abstain from entering into the consideration of the merits of any one of these grants, of the previous history, of the actual effect of the grant, or of the correspondence which has led up to the grant, thinking it more convenient to do that in committee, where we can have a conversational discussion; but what I have done rather refers to those considerations which I should have thought would have so far directed the attention of the Government as to have induced observations upon them on the motion that you leave the Chair.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot at all object to the mode or line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman. It is a very important subject, involving the grant of a very large tract of land, and closely connected with the future development and progress of the North-West. The hon. gentleman spoke of a change in the policy of the Government; that at first they had proceeded by executive action, under the general power given to them by the Dominion Lands Act, to sell those lands, and that now they have come to Parliament with a change of policy, in order to assist railways by free grants. Well, that is so. But we must look back a little to the change of circumstances which has taken place since the first policy was adopted. At the time when the first application was made—which, I think, was

made by Dr. Schultz and the company he got up for the Manitoba and South-Western Railway—at that time everything was *coleur de rose*; the boom was in full blast, if I may use the expression; everybody thought they were making their fortunes by owning any land. I think it will be admitted that those men who were promoting that railway, who had invested their means in it, and who looked forward to great profits from the construction of the road, might, perhaps, be the best judges of what was necessary and sufficient to help them build that road. At that time lands about Winnipeg and in almost any part of Manitoba, were held at very high prices. An application was made by the South-Western Railway for a sale of land at a minimum price fixed by the statute, which was $1 an acre. The Dominion Act did not fix that as the minimum sum, but it said that land shall be sold at $1 per acre. That was the provision of the original Act. The Government, when they were assured by the company that 6,400 acres would enable them to carry out their scheme, came forward and said: If you think so, we will grant you the land. We could not well say to them, as the hon. gentleman says, that this was profligate extravagance, when the company had said that they would complete the road with 3,840 acres per mile, at $1 per acre. That proposition being made and accepted by the Government, the other roads, following that example, and having confidence in the shrewdness of that company, the South-Western, applied to obtain the same terms, and were quite satisfied that those terms would enable them to build the railways. We all know how much they were disappointed, how completely, when the reaction took place, when the inflation took place, when the bubble burst, it was found that this arrangement was unavailing. The railway companies hoped, from time to time, that the position would improve, that the depression would be only temporary, and they still held to their contract with the Government to pay $1 per acre—I am speaking from memory, not having the papers before me. The Government granted those different applications, at the request of the railway companies, they making the application, and the Government did everything they could reasonably be expected to do for the purpose of helping the different roads. But besides the temporary depression that took place in our North-West there has been, as we all know, an unparalleled shrinkage in the value of railway property in America. Never has there been anything like it, and bankruptcy has fallen on many railway enterprises in the United States. The consequence was, and is, to a considerable extent, to this day, that capitalists in Europe look askance upon any proposition to build railways in any portion of America; and a capitalist told me, only last November, that if a railway was proposed to heaven from any portion of North America it would not find investors in England.

M. BLAKE. Perhaps capitalists do not want to go by that line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps not. Then there came another proposal. It was said by the company, with respect to the proposal to take 3,840 acres, at $1 per acre, that the purchase price and selling price did not, under the altered circumstances, give a sufficient margin, and unless larger grants were made that margin of profit would not be sufficient to secure sufficient capital to enable the companies to build the railways. Thus, by degrees, at the request of the railway company, all the time, changes were made to enable them to carry out their schemes and build the road. Thus the policy changed; first the grant was for 3,840 acres per mile, at $1 per acre; next, 6,400 acres, at $1 per acre; then it was proposed that the terms of payment should be made more liberal. All those changes have proved ineffectual, and now the Government, believing, as every hon. member believes, as the Government always did believe, that every encouragement must be given to the building of railways, as it is absolutely essential for the development of that great country that railways shall be the common highways, they have come to the conclusion that the land grants must be free. I am not at all sure that all these lines will be built, even with these grants. I think, however, they will be. The railway first mentioned, the North-Western Coal and Navigation line, which is a narrow gauge road, undertaken by Sir Alexander Galt, and some capitalists who have joined with him to open up the coal mines in the Belly River district—that is certain to be built. It is, as I have said, a narrow gauge railway, to run 110 miles, and will be completed in August or September, and will be of very great value in bringing down the magnificent coal which that country produces to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and thence to Winnipeg, and, by-and-bye, westward, to some extent. I believe the North-Western company's line, which is running from Portage la Prairie to Minnedosa and thence on, is finished for a distance of 78 miles, and has been so for some time. It is intended to complete, this year, 50 miles more. The company will proceed as they are able to raise money. The building of that road is assured. As the papers will show, the arrangement at first was that the company should build 100 miles a year. They found they could not obtain sufficient capital to do that, and so the Government agreed that if the company could build 50 miles a year they will obtain this grant, if Parliament sanctions it. Mr. Andrew Allan, of Montreal, is at the head of it, and he has induced a number of capitalists to take stock and interest themselves in it; the company have spent a large amount of their own money, and it is believed, with this assistance, the road will be built. It is certain to be built at the rate of at least 50 miles a year, and if times become more prosperous and the sale of land is satisfactory, they will push it on at an accelerated speed. The hon. gentleman speaks about the South-Western. That company has certainly been unfortunate in various ways. It got into trouble owing to litigation between different bodies of shareholders, two or three parties, two certainly, and they got up a legal quarrel as to their respective rights, went into court and, as a result, the credit of the company was materially damaged and its progress was retarded, and great discredit was thrown upon it by the litigation. It has now passed substantially under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that company will build it, so soon as they can obtain the necessary capital. The hon. gentleman says that at the time the Government assumed the responsibility of laying their scheme before Parliament, for the grant of subsidies of land and money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was promised that branch lines would be built, and that the company promised that branch lines would be built. That is quite true; but there is a considerable reservation of land to make up for the 25,000,000 acres of land grants, which are reserved at considerable distances from the railway, inasmuch as the land in the railway belt would be altogether insufficient to make up the 25,000,000 of acres The company, of course, desire to build branch lines, and have published plans, showing the branch lines they were desirous of building; but, of course, they must first build the main line before they build the branch lines. The backbone must be created before the ribs can run from it. It is the interest of the railway company, of course, to have as many branches as possible; not only to build branches themselves, in order to open up their own lands, but to encourage branch lines by other companies. I do not understand that the Canadian Pacific Railway have in any way offered any obstruction to any railway whatever, or acted hostilely in any way whatever. They would be foolish to do so; for, the more lines running and joining them, the more traffic they will get. As regards carriage, that is beyond the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be remembered

how stringent the terms of the charter are, and how the carriage is absolutely under the control of the Government of the day, whose duty it will be—and they will be liable to the censure of Parliament if they fail in it—to see that the tariff is such, that while affording a reasonable profit to the company it will, at the same time, afford a cheap and efficient mode of transport for the riches of the North-West seeking the markets of the world. The hon. gentleman speaks of the original policy introduced by the Government of which he was a member. We remember that not long ago the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) said, in Parliament, that he had merely laid before the House an experimental, a tentative proposition, to see how it would be taken. I am quite sure about that, and I have no doubt that *Hansard* will confirm the truth of my statement. But that Bill of the hon. gentleman was objectionable, upon the ground that it gave any number of people the right to build any number of railways anywhere, with a very remarkable limit, however. Any persons applying for a charter—I forget the number, but fifteen, I think—could come and get a charter, and they would have a claim for 6,400 acres per mile for nothing, to a certain meridian, and then 7,000 acres a little further off, and then 12,000 acres per mile when they got up to the Peace River district. There was a remarkable limit in that Bill, especially when we remember the charges which were brought against the Government, and against the Parliament that sanctioned it, for granting a monopoly of railway occupation in that country to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that other lines of railway were prevented from being established and were to be disallowed. Now, about the question of disallowance, Mr. Speaker, whether it was right or whether it was wrong to put in that provision. It is quite clear that no railway would have been built, for the railways which have got their charters there from the Government, which have got large grants of land at what was considered a nominal price, have been unable to build their roads; and the disallowing 100 paper charters would not have prevented the building of a single road, because, charter or no charter, not one such road would be built. But with respect to the policy of the Government in preventing rivals being built to the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the time that that railway was just chartered, and endeavoring to get the necessary funds to build the road—at the time the company was attempting to induce capitalists from Europe to invest in it, if charters were granted for the purpose of building rival roads in the same direction alongside of it, it would effectually destroy all hope of ever building the main line; and if the main line could not be built as a semi-Government line, supported with the treasure and the lands belonging to the Government, what chance would there be of other roads being built? And that idea was so completely before the mind of the hon. member for Bothwell, and the Government of which he was a member, that one of the clauses in their Bill is this: "That no company shall be chartered under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway." No railway, whatever, if running in the same direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway, could get any grant of land—having the same general direction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any branch thereof. So that no company could get a charter if the company offered to build a railway in the same general direction, east or west, as the main line, or north or south, in the same general direction as any branch; and it was provided further that it must be at a mean distance of forty miles from either the railway or or any branch of it; so that that was a sanction of the general policy adopted by the Government, to prevent the infant enterprise from being strangled shortly after its birth by a number of paper charters. The hon. gentleman has stated, among some of the objections he took—and they were quite well put, they were plausible, and they have considerable force—one objection he made to these companies in committee was, that there was no condition about the sale of land to the actual settler. Well, you cannot effect the two things. You have the object of selling the lands at a low price, or the present policy, of giving them at no price—that is, for one purpose: to give the company sufficient credit to raise money on those lands, in the first place, by the pledging of those lands, and afterwards by the selling of them, to enable them to generate sufficient capital to build the road. But to limit it, to keep it at a low price, is giving with one hand and taking away with the other. It is the prospect of these lands being largely increased in value, by the construction of the road, that makes the granting of the land of any value; and by attempting to limit that, so much do you diminish the value of the grant and the chances of the company utilising those lands in the money markets of the world. Then it must be remembered that according to the system which has obtained for some time, under the policy of the Government, the even-numbered sections are homestead sections, and the odd-numbered sections are for sale. They are given to the different railways, but there are always the even-numbered sections, which contain two homesteads and two pre emptions, lying side by side with the land granted to the different railways. So that, in that vast country there is plenty of land, and the best of land in the world, along the different lines of railway, that cannot be taken away from the settlers; and the first actual settler making an entry can have his land, no matter what value that land may attain by the fact of a railway running alongside of it. Therefore, there has been no lock-up in any way whatever, and there cannot be, so long as the even-numbered sections are kept open to the settlers. The hon. gentleman is quite right, however, in saying that there has been a large quantity of land locked up in the North-West. That was principally owing to the scrip system, which we need not discuss now, but which we all know was forced on Parliament by the circumstances of the country at the time it was first obtained. The half breeds who settled in Manitoba along the Red and Assiniboine Rivers had obtained certain possessory rights from the Hudson Bay Company which had to be acknowledged, and which were acknowledged and paid for by scrip, in the majority of cases; and this scrip got into the hands of land speculators, in their legitimate business. Of course, it is an honest business; but these land purchasers did as every man does, with respect to his property, whether it is personal or real; they held it until they found a market in which they could get their price. That, of course, was perfectly legitimate on their part, but when it assumed the large proportions it did in Manitoba, a large quantity of land scrip being thrown into the market, and that being utilised by the persons who purchased it in paying for land in and around Winnipeg, and at places where there was likely to be a fixed settlement or town, of course greatly retarded the growth of some of those localities, and kept large tracts of land unsettled, which would have been occupied long before if they had been kept open. That has been a disadvantage; but the answer is this, that the immigrant going to the North-West has as good a chance of selection of good soil and climate in one place as in another; and actual settlers going to a country where all is strange to them, if they find the land and climate to suit them, can have no great preference for one place over another, unless they have a relative who has gone before them. So that, taking the country as a whole, there never has been any want of land for any settler from old Canada, Europe or the United States. This is all that occurs to me just now. The hon. gentleman says he will discuss the grants to the various railways in committee, which will be a very proper way of dealing with them, and we shall be exceedingly glad to give him any information in our power on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. Seven or eight years have gone by since a proposition similar, in some respects, to that which the hon. gentleman now submits to the House was laid before Parliament by a former Administration. When I dissented from the observation of the hon. gentleman, that this was not a part of the policy of the former Government, but was merely a tentative measure, I did not mean that the hon. gentleman was not accurately representing the statement made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); but I did mean to express my dissent from the accuracy of that statement, because that measure was introduced with the full approval of the Government, and received its first and second readings as a measure to which the Government was committed; and it was only abandoned, so far as I know—and I think those hon. gentlemen who were associated with me in the Administration, and who are now present, will support what I say—because we believed the measure could not be carried through the Senate that Session; and it was desirable to allow it to stand over, for that reason, until the opinion of the country was had on the general policy of the Administration. I say this with the most distinct recollection of all the facts connected with the introduction and consideration of that measure in the House. Now, the hon. gentleman has made a statement, on his own responsibility, which is not strictly accurate. He said that the policy of the Government was to prevent any railway being built within 40 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any of its branches. Now, Sir, that was not the policy. There was nothing proposed to Parliament from which that inference could be drawn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I read the clause.

Mr. MILLS. It is true we introduced a Bill which received its second reading. It is true the hon. gentleman did not support it; he did not, I believe, either speak or vote against it; but when the vote on the second reading was taken the hon. gentleman informed us that he would oppose the Bill on the House going into committee upon it; and before I conclude my observations I shall call attention to the views that were expressed by some of the hon. gentleman's colleagues and supporters. Now, that measure was one proposing the free incorporation of railways. It was not similar to the measures which the hon. gentleman has sometimes submitted to this House for the construction of railways in the North-West Territories. It was a measure establishing a general principle. The principle had long been tried and had resulted satisfactorily in the United States; it had been tried in the State of New York and, I believe, in almost all the States along the border. Measures of railway incorporation are not introduced into the State Legislatures; the general principle is recognised, and people are held to invest their money in a railway undertaking on their own responsibility, precisely as in other undertakings; they only give this security to the State, that they are undertaking the work in good faith. They deposit with the Government plans and specifications, estimates of the cost, and a certain percentage of the cost, as a guarantee of good faith. That was precisely the character of the measure I proposed. We proposed, by the 18th section of that Bill:

"No company shall be incorporated under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any branch thereof, at a nearer distance than 40 miles."

That did not tie the hands of Parliament; it did not say that Parliament should not authorise the construction of a railway nearer than that distance; but we said we do not propose to authorise any railway company, under the provisions of this Act, to become organised, to subscribe stock and deposit plans with the Government, and then undertake the construction of their line at a nearer distance than that. That was all that we proposed. The rest was left open, to be dealt with by Parliament, from time to time, as it might think proper. Precisely as they deal with railway companies, it was left to Parliament to deal with those companies that might receive charters of incorporation at a nearer distance than that which is specified in this particular section. It is true the Minister who now has charge of railways and canals (Mr. Pope) subsequently expressed the opinion that the principle of this Bill was sound, but the hon. gentleman took a different view. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) expressed himself very strongly against the principle of the Bill or the policy of aiding branch lines of railways or colonisation roads, and similar views were expressed by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), and the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace). The hon. gentleman has failed to observe this in the various statements he has made with regard to this Bill, for I believe we have never had any proposition for the incorporation of railways in Manitoba and the North-West Territories where this proposed measure has not been referred to. I believe that it was a proper measure to propose; I believe the circumstances of the North-West country and the Province of Manitoba would be very different to-day had that Bill become law; I believe they would have a much larger population; I believe they would be more compact, that the country would be better settled, and the people, in consequence, more prosperous and contented than they now are. In fact, we would have had railway facilities existing years ago, which do not exist up to this moment. In that measure we proposed to grant to railway companies not more than 6,400 acres per mile, up to the 102nd meridian, and about 7,800 acres west of the 102nd meridian; a larger grant, of course, was proposed towards the Peace River country. It was not a fixed sum that the Government were to give, as a matter of course, to every railway company, but it was a maximum quantity, which was not to be exceeded. We also provided there should be no restriction upon settlement; that no company incorporated under that Act should have power to interfere with the settlement of the country, and that the Government might set apart the moneys they received from the settlers on the sale of lands would be used in paying for the construction of roads, up to $10,000 a mile, and that beyond that the companies would not be entitled to receive anything from the Government, by way of aid, in the construction of these lines. In adopting that proposition we found that the experience of our neighbors across the line had been in favor of colonisation railways. I observed that in the State of Minnesota the increase of population was 27,000 a year and the number of miles of railway built 92; in Iowa the increase of population was 52,000 a year and the number of miles built 180; in Missouri the increase of population was 65,000 a year and the miles of railway built 107; in Illinois the increase of population was 82,000, the miles of railway 166. I found that, in fact, there was a certain relation between the increase of population and the number of miles of railway constructed. Of course, the rate of increase of population, no doubt, would tend to advance with the construction of railways, but the construction of railways at convenient points, and in sections of the country suited for settlement, also facilitates the colonisation and settlement of the country; and I believe the same results would have followed the adoption of a similar policy in our North-West as those which followed the adoption of this policy in the various States of the American Union. Now, when that proposition was made a number of gentlemen opposed it very strongly. Among them was the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He said, on this subject:

"He did not know what the opinions of gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec might be, nor did he care. He had one thing to do, and that was his duty. His duty, in this case, he conceived to be, to call the attention of Parliament to the proposed spoliation of western land. It

would be unjust to the other Provinces to pass an Act like this, which would enable railway speculators and companies to absorb three-fourths of the whole western territory—that territory on which they hoped to construct the great Canadian Pacific road. He yielded to no one in the desire to benefit the North-West. But he certainly could not approve of an Act such as that now before the House. He could not believe in a scheme which would enable speculators to absorb millions of acres of land, with which it was hoped the country might be recouped for the money it was spending in opening up that great country."

The hon. gentleman, in fact, believed that the measure would be successful, that the country would be settled, that the lands would be opened by the companies under its provisions, and that, as a consequence, they would acquire a right in these lands. The hon. gentleman said: We will not do that; we acquired these lands, he said, to recoup us, by their sale, for the $30,000,000 we propose to advance for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman seems to have greatly changed his opinions. At that time he thought $30,000,000 was a very large sum to advance in aid of the construction of a trans-continental road, and he seemed to think that it was the bounden duty of the Government not to aid, either in land or money, the construction of any other railway, and to use the money derived from the sale of these lands to recoup all the older Provinces for the burdens they had assumed in advancing $30,000,000 cash towards the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman still entertains these views, and is still opposed to a policy of this sort. If he is, he will oppose the proposition before the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman will find out by-and-bye.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Agriculture spoke on that occasion, and he was equally opposed to aid being given to these colonisation companies. He said:

"He had been hitherto, and was now, a strong advocate for building a railway through that country. It would tax the powers of the Dominion to their full extent to build the one railway provided for, under the agreements entered into with British Columbia and Manitoba, and their first efforts must be given to carrying out those agreements. The construction of a Pacific railway was part of the agreement of the union of British Columbia with Canada, and the country was bound, before entering into any large engagement or making any other disposition of public lands in the North-West, to carry out that engagement. The power to build railways to any extent, provided they were 40 miles from each other, was one which should not be placed in the hands of any people without the consent of the Government being obtained to each scheme."

The hon. gentleman did not seem to have confidence in the capitalists who were about to invest their money in those enterprises nor in the people who were supposed to favor the enterprises and to whom the road would be an advantage. He declared that he was opposed to allowing them to judge of the wisdom of the enterprises in which they were engaged, and he insisted that the Government itself should have control over these transactions. He went on to say:

"He could well understand that, if the Government were about to build the Pacific Railway—and he hoped they were, for its construction was in the interests of the country—that assistance should be given in the shape of public lands, but he could not understand why, under the present Bill, Parliament should be deprived of the right of considering each charter and deciding what subsidy should be granted to each road. It was impossible to understand why a different policy should be adopted for the North-West in that regard than that which had been found quite satisfactory in the old Provinces."

In fact, the hon. gentleman was strongly opposed to the principle of the free incorporation of railways. That scheme, which has been tried for so many years in the neighboring Republic, which has prevented log-rolling, which has prevented any attempt to use undue influence in the Legislature, which has left every enterprise of this sort to stand upon its own merits, was one the hon. gentleman did not favor. He preferred one which would compel the railway company seeking incorporation to come to Parliament and fight every other company that might have an interest opposed to the one seeking incorporation. He went on to say:

"He favored the payment of the cost in money, if it were necessary, but that was no reason why they should throw away the public land, instead of endeavoring to recoup themselves from its sale. That was the policy of the late Government, which declared to the House and the country that they were about to give $30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land towards the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

The hon. gentleman expressed precisely the same view as the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He said the country is obliged to give $30,000,000 in cash for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and all the remaining land not required to aid in the construction of the road should be retained and sold to settlers, in order to recoup the country for the immense advance for the construction of the one line. Then the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) spoke in opposition to the measure, and declared himself opposed to giving land grants in aid of these colonisation roads. It is true that all the members for Manitoba, at that time, whether they were supporters of the Administration or whether they opposed it, favored the proposition, but the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, and those who had been his collegues and were then his supporters, were opposed to this policy. The hon. member then for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), in speaking on this subject, said:

"He was opposed to the principle of this Bill for two reasons. First, he did not believe that it was in the interest of this country that we should create railway monopolies; he believed that railways were the highways of commerce, and that they should be owned and run by the Government, in the interests of commerce. He thought we already had in this country an example of the evil results of railway monopoly. The companies did not look to the interests of the country, but to their own interests."

And so we find that the policy of aiding colonisation roads by grants of land was opposed by the hon. gentleman and by those who are now supporting him. These hon. gentlemen, when a large and liberal aid was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, told Parliament that that company was receiving a large extent of territory in aid of its line, which would not lie immediately along the line, and that they would have an interest in building railways in various directions through the North-West country, for the purpose of bringing their land into the market, and also for the purpose of bringing traffic to the line they were about to build. In fact, we were assured that they would be able to build hundreds of miles of subsidiary or branch lines in that North-West country without any further aid; and yet we find that the hon. gentleman, in the propositions now before us, proposes, not merely to aid lines in which the company, so far as we know, have no direct interest, but also to aid those which are under the control of the company. The First Minister has told us that the amount proposed to be given in the way of a land grant in aid of the South-Western Railway was not adequate, that the company could not succeed in carrying out its enterprise with the aid the Government proposed to give it. Now, the hon. gentleman comes down with a proposition to give all of these railway companies an extent of territory at least as large as we proposed in 1878. That proposition was pronounced an extravagant proposition, a scheme which would absorb all the lands of the North-West country, which would place them all under the control of railway companies, and the hon. gentleman comes down now with a proposition, after having failed in all the schemes that they have put forward, substantially, in this respect, adopting the scheme of aiding roads that we proposed at that time. I think it would have been well if the Administration had gone farther. We know that a railway company will not build a disadvantageous line if an advantageous one presents itself. If allowed to proceed unhampered, they would be disposed to take that which they believe to be the best route in their own interest; and, if the Government had now adopted the remaining portion of the Bill we proposed in 1878, they would propose a plan that would be more satisfactory than the one now presented.

The hon. gentleman proposes to give aid to certain specified lines, all of which, I believe, have been incorporated. If the hon. gentleman were to leave to railway companies organised the freedom to build lines where they pleased, subject to certain limitations, upon the conditions that were stated in the Bill which was submitted in 1878, they would present a more satisfactory scheme than that which is now submitted. If there was anything that could tend to justify the course suggested by the Bill of 1878 it is what Ministers are proposing at this moment.

Mr. ROYAL. The hon. gentleman said that if his Bill had been passed Manitoba and the North-West Territory would be now settled, that greater prosperity would reign all over that country, that very likely each of the farmers there would have a large deposit in the bank; in fact, that the golden era would have dawned upon that country. Well, Sir, I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman's statement. He says that in the States Iowa, Missouri and Illinois—he did not say Kansas, he did not say Dakota—the increase of population has been in proportion to the increase in the construction of railways. That may be quite true; but the hon. gentleman forgets that it may not be safe to draw a parallel from the other side of the line, for the reason that the people there enjoy other institutions and are in a different political condition from ourselves. First, they are independent; and although there are two political parties among them, as there are with us, those parties do not carry on political warfare in the same manner that parties do with us. In the United States, if one party wants to settle the country the other party will not spread abroad advertisements and newspaper articles decrying their country. It is otherwise in Canada. If the Conservative party happens to be in power, and they propose a plan for building a railway in unsettled portions of the country, hon. gentlemen opposite, opposed to the Conservative party, by their newspapers and by their organisations, immediately begin to declare that the land is unfit for settlement, that it is no use for a European immigrant to attempt to settle in the North-West, because farming there will not pay. Sir, we have had that experience in Manitoba for the last three years, a most unfortunate experience, and it has done more than anything else to retard the progress of that Province. Now, it may be that the scheme of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was a wonderful scheme, but it does seem extraordinary that the wisdom of Parliament at that time was unable to appreciate it, and, unfortunately, we are still unable to appreciate it to-day. I believe that the scheme that the Government now propose to this House is the only one that will tend to develop the interests of Manitoba and the North-West Territory. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to show that the policy of the Government has prevented the construction of branch lines. Well, how is it that this very scheme is now proposed at the request of those branch line companies? Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that those companies do not look after their own interests? Do they think those companies forget that there is only one trunk line of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territory? Do they forget that the branch lines will necessarily have to make freight arrangements with the trunk line? They know, as well as we do, that such is the case; and yet, notwithstanding, it must be admitted that the branch lines know their own interests a little better than hon. gentlemen opposite. They come to the Government and say that if the Government are willing to give them 6,000 acres per mile they are ready to construct those branch lines. Sir, it is preposterous to suppose that it is in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway not to encourage the construction of those branch lines. Surely the Government, in adjusting and controlling the traffic rates of the trunk line will see that they are in accordance with common sense, and will not be opposed to

the interests of the people. I believe that in this, as well as in many other things, hon. gentlemen opposite have erred a great deal. Now, Sir, the leader of the Opposition, at the beginning of his remarks, asked why these branch lines had not been constructed. Was it because they were afraid of the monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir, it is impossible to suppose that these companies were afraid of such a monopoly. The reason why they have met with such opposition in carrying out their scheme has been this: The land, which a few years ago was valued at such a high figure, all at once fell down to almost nothing. Why? Because, instead of the political parties having enough patriotism to value the lands in the North-West at their real value, one of the parties placed these lands very high, and assumed that the prospects of the farmer were very good, while, on the other side, the newspapers of the Opposition and the Farmers' Union endeavored to depreciate the value of the lands, to depreciate the condition of the country, and naturally conveyed an impression to intending immigrants that in coming to the North-West they would come to a desolate country, where hunger and ruin would stare them in the face. Is it any wonder that these gentlemen now say: Why have not these branch line companies built their roads? They must go for an answer to the farmers in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Well, Sir, when the contract was awarded to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company there was, no doubt, a monopoly clause. That monopoly clause was certainly the essence of the contract, and it had to be so, because otherwise no company in the world would have undertaken such a task upon the conditions that the Government offered them. After that charter was passed we saw the hon. gentlemen opposite asking this Government to destroy that monopoly, and to break faith with the company. Were hon. gentlemen opposite then acting in good faith? No, Sir; they merely wanted to destroy that clause, which was essential to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the extent of the patriotism exhibited by hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in Ontario, Manitoba, and in the North-West Territories. Now, Sir, I could not listen to the hon. gentlemen opposite without feeling that the failure to construct these branch lines was not the fault of the Government. It was not the fault of this Government; it was the fault of hon. gentlemen opposite. They, and they alone, have done everything to depreciate the value of the North-West lands, either by their own newspapers or by advertising the Kansas country, or by the Farmers' Union; and you, Mr. Speaker, know as well as I do, that the Farmers' Union is nothing else than a political organisation, the heads of which were friends, intimate friends and inspired friends, of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman said he could not sit still and listen to the statements made on this side of the House. I was a little surprised to hear that statement by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). He has further stated that the reason why branch lines of railway could not be built in that country was because there was only one road out of the country, and that controlled by one company; and thus the local companies had to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway to get an outlet; and that was one of the reasons why they had not been able to build the road with the land grants already received. The hon. gentleman went on to denounce the monopoly, and he also stated that the Opposition had decried the country in the past, and that was one of the reason of its failure. Now, we have not to go far back to find out what that hon. gentleman's opinion was as to why railways were not constructed in Manitoba. I had the honor of introducing a Bill in this House, asking for a charter to build a railway from Portage la Prairie to the Lake of the Woods. The hon. gentleman opposed that Bill in the committee—it was not discussed in the House

—on the ground that (and it must be remembered that the line went from one end of his constituency to the other) it was not worth while building a railway through that part of the country, as that part of the Province was no good. He now rises and states that the Opposition have decried the country, and that is one of the reasons why local companies could not build the roads. I have some knowledge of the reasons why the local companies have not been able to build the railways. The principle reason is that the Government have invariably disallowed charters granted by the Local Legislature. I also recollect that the hon. member for Provencher made statements with respect to the branch lines and the disallowance of local charters. The charter of the Emerson and North-Western Railway was disallowed by this Government, and that line was to run through the hon. gentleman's constituency. That company, which was building the road without a land grant, had graded 15 miles, but they were not allowed to put iron on it, because the charter was disallowed by this Government; and the reason given by the Minister of Justice was that it interfered with the spirit of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have been laboring under this difficulty in the North-West, that we have not known whether railway charters granted by the Local Legislature were within the spirit of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract or not. But when the contract was let the First Minister said that Manitoba would have a right to grant railway charters, that they could not check Manitoba, that the rights of the Province would not be interfered with. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) rose and explained different reasons why Manitoba could not be interfered with, and that this Parliament had no right to interfere, except in regard to the territory west of Manitoba. We find, later, that the reasons given for not granting that charter to the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway Company was because it would interfere with clause 15 of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. So the people of Manitoba have, from time to time, been put off with different reasons why they should not build railways detrimental to one grand and great monopoly. I can give the reason why the companies were not able to build the railways with the land grant they were to receive, of 3,400 acres per mile, and why the lands have depreciated in value. It is on account of the monopoly maintained in that country in railways. There is no country, as has been truly said by the hon. member for Provencher, where the people care about building branch lines when those lines have to make terms with the main line, because there is not the same profit from carrying trade on branch lines as there is on through traffic. We all know that, from our experience with respect to railway company's. When the charter was granted by the Local Legislature to the Manitoba and North-Western, it was expected by the people of the Province and of the North-West that the road was to be continued from Portage la Prairie, in a south-easterly direction, and connect with the Emerson and North-Western, the charter for which is disallowed. The Manitoba and North-Western has had an up-hill experience in the building of the road they have built. I am not finding fault with the terms the Government propose to grant to those local roads. The country must have railways; it cannot be developed without them. I am only glad that the Government has seen fit to come down with this liberal proposition, while at the same time I am sorry that it should be necessary to do so to enable the railways to be built. I, with the leader of the Opposition, hold that in these resolutions there should be some mention made of the terms on which the land grants would be received. I believe those grants should be made on conditions of settlement, and only so. In each case it is a large grant, and it is a free grant of land. It can be sold at a price which, while it will amply repay the company, will place it within the means of settlers to purchase. I suppose this question of disallowance will come up again, and so it is not necessary to occupy much time in discussing it now. As the hon. member for Provencher referred to the railway policy of the late Administration, I may say that they also had a monopoly, that they would not allow roads to be built within a certain distance of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Government, however, had it in their power to change their policy at any time. The present Government has not the power, according to the interpretation of some members opposite, to change the policy; they are bound by a solemn contract not to change it for twenty years. At first it was claimed that the Dominion Government had not the power to disallow provincial railway charters; next, charters were disallowed because they were not in the spirit of the contract, and now it is claimed that those charters must be disallowed. If it was not for the disallowance of the local charters, and the fact that there would be no connection, except with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, railways would be built in Manitoba without receiving any land grants whatever. It will pay any company to build a line through a fertile country, such as is Manitoba, when the road can be cheaply built; but when local companies have to make terms with the company that possesses the only outlet, it is not possible that such lines would be built, even with land grants.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Provencher, in opening his remarks, criticising the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), took the ground that a great difference existed between the causes of the development of the country to the west of the Mississippi and the country in our own North-West, and he urged, as one of the principal differences, the fact that the people in the Western Sates enjoy independence.

Mr. ROYAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I stated two causes, and I dwelt on the second cause—on the constitution and patriotism of the two parties in the States, compared with the constitution and patriotism of the two parties in this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman, however, distinctly alluded to the fact that the inhabitants of the Western States of the United States enjoyed independence. Well, Sir, they do not enjoy any greater degree of independence than we do in British North America, and so far as any difference in the two systems of Government exists, I do not believe the American people have any advantage over us. They have not, at any rate, a better Government than ours; it is not recognised by the people of the world, or by the American people themselves, as being in any material respect a better Government. The hon. gentleman went on to say that they had not only the advantage of an independent system of Government, but that the people of the United States had not decried their own country, or the Government, or the character of their country, as a field for immigration. Well, Sir, so far as my knowledge of the United States goes, the people of that country have, in all past times, criticised fully and keenly the policy of that Government. The policy of the Government of the United States, in relation to its public lands, with regard to every feature pertaining to its fiscal system and its land system, have been fully and freely criticised in that country —as fully and as freely as kindred topics have been in our own. Sir, there has been no attempt made by the Opposition in this country to decry the North-West. The advantages of the North-West have been more fully set before the people of Canada by the chief organ of the Opposition than by all the organs of the Government party. The *Globe* newspaper, two or three years ago, under the energetic action of its then news editor, sent to the North-West a correspondent, whose letters, giving a full and favorable description of the North-West, appeared in the columns of that journal from day to

day, for many weeks, and those letters had more effect in placing before the people of Canada and the people of the world the advantages of the North-West than all the measures resorted to by those on the Government side.

Upon our shoulders are laid the sins which are attributable to the Government. The difficulty with the North-West is not the criticisms of the Opposition, not that the Opposition has decried that country, but the policy of the Government with regard to the land regulations, the holding of lands at a higher rate than they were held in the United States, the placing of inducements for immigrants to go there on a lower scale than in the United States. While the United States offered him a homestead wherever he could find public land, the homestead grants in the North-West were restricted to only a portion of the public domain, while the whole public domain of the United States was open to the settler. Then, in the North-West the cheapest lands were held at 75 cents per acre, higher than in the United States for lands which were more accessible, and the natural result was, that the immigrant stopped where the cheapest lands were, instead of going on to those lands which possessed no greater fertility and where there were no better markets. Then, lands were granted to colonisation companies at half the price of those same lands to the settler; they were sold on credit instead of cash, and this was another cause for discontent. Then, the Government organised a monopoly in relation to transportation, and placed the whole country in the grasp of an iron monopoly which charged the settler whatever rates it pleased. If the settler had a choice between Dakota, on the one side, and Manitoba and the North-West, on the other, he found, on one side, that there was competition in railway rates, to bring in supplies and take out the produce of his farm, that his agricultural implements could be bought in Dakota free from an import duty of 35 per cent., that his lumber could be bought cheaper, and in consequence of these advantages, resulting from the wise and more liberal policy on the part of the United States, it was natural that the settler should remain in Dakota; and still the fact that he did remain there was charged to the Opposition as one of its sins, when it was directly due to the acts of the Government of this country. The hon. gentleman alleges that the Farmers' Union decried the quality of the land in the North-West. The Farmers' Union did nothing of the kind. It is an organisation of the farmers of that country for the purpose of securing their rights, of opposing the monopolies placed upon them, of rectifying the evils under which they labor, of protesting against the outrageous duties imposed on the implements they wish to import. The hon. gentleman alludes to the monopoly clause, and he tells us that without that monopoly clause no company could have been found who would have undertaken the construction of that road. Is that so? Has the hon. gentleman any reason or right to make that assertion? Within four weeks of the time the contract was made public, was there not a company organised and an offer made by a responsible company to build the road without the monopoly clause, and with a less subsidy in land and cash?

Mr. MITCHELL. A bogus offer.

Mr. CHARLTON. Was it a bogus offer that was made, when they placed in the hands of the Receiver General of Canada $600,000 in cash, more than the security which was taken from the Syndicate, after the contract was ratified? If it was a bogus offer, why did not the Government rake in that $1,600,000 of money which was placed in the hands of the Receiver General of the Dominion? Sir, it is an insult to the intelligence of the House and the intelligence of the country to characterise that company as a bogus company. If I had a list of the names of the members of that company I could show that they were men of the greatest weight and respectability. There was Mr. Alexander Gibson, from the hon. gentleman's own Province, and other gentlemen, who, in their own right, possessed capital and means enough to build that road without aid from the Government, and the hon. gentleman calls them a bogus company.

Mr. MITCHELL. I repeat it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was not a bogus company, but a *bonâ fide* company, able to carry out their offer to the Government, and as an evidence of their ability they made a deposit with the Government of $600,000 more than the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate were required to deposit before the ratification of the contract, and more than they deposited after it.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was bogus, all the same, and you know it.

Mr. CHARLTON. If either is a bogus company it is the one which has twice failed to carry out its contract. It is the company which, after contracting to build that road for a subsidy of $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land, and 700 miles of railway built and handed over to them free of cost—after making this contract to build the main line, failed in their conditions and came down to Parliament asking for $30,000,000 more, and they are about to come down and ask for another re-arrangement of terms, and $5,000,000 more. That is the bogus company, and if the Government had, in accordance with their duty, advertised for tenders, and given the contract for the construction of that road to the lowest tender, that contract would have been given to the second syndicate, whose security was put up, and if they had done so the country would have been saved at least $35,000,000, in addition to three millions saved in the cash subsidy and three million acres of land. So much for the assertion that no company could have been found to build that road without the monopoly clause. Sir, a company was found to build that road without a monopoly clause, within one month of the time the contract was laid upon the Table of the House.

So all these difficulties in relation to the North-West which are traceable to the sins of omission and commission on the part of the Government are industriously charged by them to the Opposition of the day in this House. The First Minister, in the course of his remarks, informed us that the Government had absolute control over the tariff rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, they have control, within certain limits. They have control when the earnings of the road amount to more than 10 per cent. of its capital. That is the extent of its control, and how did they proceed to retain their control over that road. When the contract was made the capital of the company was to be $25,000,000. And before this House or the country was consulted the company had been granted permission by the Government to increase that capital four-fold—from $25,000,000 to $100,000,000; or, in other words, the Government made an arrangement by which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to be allowed to increase its net earnings from $2,500,000 to $10,000,000 before the Government could interfere with the freight charges of that company. Was that an honest arrangement? Every man in this House knows that it was not. Every man in this House knows that the increased capital was not to represent *bonâ fide* investment, but that perhaps 60 or 70 per cent. would represent water. By means of the manipulation that company was about to engage in, it was to be enabled, on an actual increase of its investment by a comparatively small sum, to declare a net dividend of at least $7,000,000 a year on what was no investment at all, except a fictitious one.

Then, the hon. First Minister tells us that one reason that exists for the adoption of the policy the Government

propose with reference to subidising railways is that it is impossible, in the foreign money markets, to borrow money on railway securities at all. I admit that such is the case; and I assert that the hon. gentleman and his Government have been greater sinners than anybody else on this continent in producing this result. This result is due to the fact that the railway corporations of North America, in nine cases out of ten, have been dishonestly managed—that the common stock of these railways, on the average, is at least one-half water, as statistics show was the case one year ago—representing nothing but the stealings of the managers; and the hon. gentleman himself has been helping to play that game, by permitting a company under his control to water its stock to the extent of six-tenths, if not seven-tenths of the whole. For the reason that the Canadian Pacific Railway and all the other railway corporations of North America have been managed in such a way as to create a great issue of common stock in the hands of manipulators, which cost them less than one half of its nominal value, and because of other sins in connection with railway construction in the United States and Canada, the railway securities of this continent will not be touched by the capitalists of Europe.

In regard to the proposed grants, I do not know that any criticism has been made adverse to them. It may be a question whether the grants need be quite as large as they are. I believe the average grants to American railways, under the land grant system of the United States, has been only about 4,800 acres per mile; and it has been admitted that in the great majority of cases the grants have been far in excess of the actual necessities of the roads. It may be that these grants are not too great; it may be that they are; that is a question to be discussed when we get into committee. With regard to the criticisms indulged in with reference to the Colonisation Railway Bill, introduced in 1878, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I wish to say a few words. If you compare that Bill with the measure now before the House the comparison will be greatly in favor of the former. That Bill made careful provision against the formation of worthless companies. Any company incorporated under that measure was required to have a capital stock of $12,000 per mile, and before it could commence operations 10 per cent. of that stock had to be paid up. The land grants to be made to such companies—10 sections in the portion of the North-West nearest to Manitoba, and, in Manitoba, 12 sections west of the 102nd meridian, and 20 sections in the Peace River valley—were not excessive; and they were coupled with this condition, that the Government might retain in its own hands the control of those lands, was to sell them itself, and that the maximum sum that any railway company could obtain from the proceeds was $10,000 a mile. Then, with regard to the condition as to restricting the construction of parallel and competing lines, the 18th section of that Act provided:

"No company shall be incorporated under the provisions of this Act for the construction of any railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any branch thereof, at a nearer mean distance than 40 miles."

That is, no company could derive from the Government any land grant to the extent of $10,000 a mile for the construction of a line within a mean distance of 40 miles from the main line or any of its branches; but there was nothing in that Act to prohibit any company from constructing a line out of its own resources within 40 miles. It merely provided that the Government would not aid any such line by a land grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no; it said no company should be incorporated under that Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. That Act provided for the incorporation of companies receiving Government aid, and it provided that no company should receive Government aid that constructed a line within forty miles of the main line or any of its branches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the most obvious interpretation of the Bill; but there is nothing in that Bill to prevent the granting of a charter for the building of a road anywhere in the North-West without asking for a land grant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a mistake.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then the Bill has a provision prohibiting the construction of lines running parallel with the main line or its branches. An outlet to the south would not be secured by building a line parallel to the south-west. A line which would connect with other lines, and which would secure competition in the North-West, would be one that did not run parallel with the main line or its branches. It would be one running south or south-easterly, while the general course of the main line would be west or north-westerly; so that that Bill offered no obstacle for the construction of any line connecting with any American line, in order to secure competition in rates. The Bill raised no impediment in the way of the construction of lines to the south or the south-east; the Bill raised no impediment to the construction of lines anywhere or in any direction, except that it provided that no line built within 40 miles of the mentioned line or branches could receive, under that Act, Government aid. So much for that provision. That Act is frequently referred to. If the Government of the day had never been guilty of railway legislation more inimical to the interests of the country than that, we would have very little to criticise in their conduct. The Railway Colonization Bill, introduced by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), was a measure which, if it had become law and had been acted upon, would have secured the speedy development of the North-West, without injury to the interests of the country. What has been the case under the operation of that contract, which I hold in my hand, passed in 1881. Compare the restrictions contained in that Bill, with regard to the construction of lines parallel to the Manitoba line or its branches, with the provisions of the Bill incorporating the Canadian Pacific Railway. By section 15 of that Bill it is provided:

"That after 20 years from the date hereof no line of railway shall be authorised by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway, except such lines as shall run south-west or to the westward of south-west, nor to within 15 miles of latitude 49, and in the event of any new Province being established in the North-West Territories, provision shall be made for the continuance of such provisions after such establishment, until the expiration of such period."

There was nothing in that Colonisation Railway Bill to prohibit the building of any branch line that received aid from the Government beyond 15 miles from the American line. Any branch road built under the provisions of that Act might run to the American line; any company could apply, and there was nothing in the Act to prevent it from securing a charter for building a road from any part of Manitoba to the American line, or to interfere with the securing of railway connection with the Northern Pacific, or any other railway line, or to interfere with the building of any line within 10, 15 or 20 miles of the main Canadian Pacific Railway line, or any branch, except that a line built within 40 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway or branches could not apply for the land grant. The Bill offered no impediment to the development of the North-West, or to the securing railway connection with the American lines by roads running to the south or south-west, or to the building of railways anywhere, except that no railway companies applying for charters could receive Government aid in land, which roads, at a distance greater than 40 miles from the main line or branches, could receive. The Bill of the hon.

member for Bothwell is a Bill which will stand any amount of criticism, if its provisions are fairly stated.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did you not pass it?

Mr. CHARLTON. We are not debating whether it was passed, but we are debating the provisions of the Bill upon its merits, as it has been compared with other measures, and the Bill upon its merits will compare with any Bill this Legislature has passed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We have wandered a good deal from the general subject before the House, and I do not propose to follow the hon. gentleman in much of the matter to which he has referred. The question as to whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have properly fulfilled their contract, or whether they have failed to do it, in the terms originally arranged, is a matter which will be considered, no doubt, when the question comes up on the railway resolutions, of which notice has been given by the First Minister. The question which seems to me to have come before the House, with some degree of prominence, is: What was the policy of the late Administration with reference to protecting the Canadian Pacific Railway from competition? The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Charlton) takes the ground that the Act introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell, when Minister of the Interior, did not in any way prevent any railway from being built to the boundary. The question as to what was in the contemplation of the Government at that time will, perhaps, better be ascertained from the legislation that actually took place. In 1872 a number of railway charters, some three, I think, were granted to gentlemen for the purpose of building railways to connect the United States with Winnipeg and with the Red River country in our territory; and it is a curious fact that in every one of those Acts, and in the one, for instance, in which Mr. Donald McInnes, of Hamilton, Mr. Donald A. Smith, and Mr. George Stephens, of Montreal, and others, were incorporated to build a railway from the boundary to Winnipeg, the concluding clause is in these words:

"The foregoing sections and provisions of this Act shall have force and effect from and after the day which may be appointed for that purpose by proclamation issued under the Order of the Governor in Council, and not before."

You will find, in no other charters granted by this Parliament for the construction of railways, the power reserved to the Governor in Council to bring the Act into operation; the Act comes into operation by the fact of its passing Parliament; but, in these particular cases, in 1872, when the question of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was then in its initial stages, it was felt desirable by Parliament, even at that early stage, that provision should be made to protect the railway from possible competition, and to secure that when it was built the capitalists engaged in constructing it would, at least, have the guarantee of immunity from undue competition. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into office a year after. During the five years they were in office not one of those Acts was brought into operation by the issue of a proclamation under Order of the Governor in Council. Nay, more than that, I have reason to know—from statements of Mr. George Stephen and Mr. Donald Smith—that application was made by those gentlemen to the ex-First Minister (Mr. Mackenzie), who was Minister of Public Works, to bring that Act into operation, and he distinctly refused, upon the ground which he sustained afterwards in the Railway Committee, in 1879, that he would not permit connection of independent lines through that north-western country with the American system, reserving to the Canadian Pacific Railway, then a Government road, being constructed by the Government, although with the presence on the Statute Book of an Act of Parliament to authorise the granting of a charter to a company for its construction, that exclusive right. He was determined that railway should be protected, if possible, from any American competition. It was in precise accordance and in complete sympathy with the policy thus acted upon by the Government in their refusal to bring into operation the Acts of incorporation passed in 1872, to connect Manitoba and the North-West with American railways, that the clauses were put into this Bill, introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), to protect the Canadian Pacific Railway from competition, by saying no railways should be chartered under that Act which came within 40 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said that only referred to railways receiving grants from the Government. That is quite true. It was open to Parliament, if Parliament so determined, to grant a charter to any independent company, but if a company was chartered under that Act, which was supposed to be the Act to make provision for the construction of railways through the North-West, beyond and outside the Canadian Pacific Railway, no charter under that Act could possibly be given for the construction of railways coming into competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With or without subsidy.

Mr. WHITE Certainly, because this charter was for railways to which subsidies were given, but it provided the means, first, for an easy incorporation of railway companies, and next for the subsidising of railway companies. Then the hon. gentleman tells us that special care was taken by the Government or by the hon. member who introduced the Bill to secure that the lands which were given should be properly opened for settlement and should continue within the control of the Government. The hon. gentleman has not quite accurately stated the terms of the Act. The Act, it is true, gave the Government the power, if it thought proper, by Order in Council, to substitute a $10,000 subsidy per mile for the subsidy in land, but it gave to the Government the power to do either the one or the other, and everyone knows that, in the estimation in which the lands were held at that time, hon. gentlemen opposite, giving their 50,000,000 acres of land, and retaining that upon the Statute Book, for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if the lands given to the railways could have secured their construction, the feeling was that a good bargain was made for the country. But what further did they do in that Act? So little careful where they for the settlers who might have settled there that they actually provided in the Bill that if a settler happened to find himself settled within what would be the railway belt of some railway company of that kind, his homestead was to be reduced from 160 acres to 80 acres, and if he was an actual settler he was only then to have the right to purchase a pre-emption to the extent of 80 acres, and the pre-emption was abolished altogether within the railway belt, except in the cases I have mentioned. More than that, they provided that if a settler happened to have taken up a lot which turned out to be in the locality where a railway station was to be, and where the probability was that a town or village would arise, he was to be dispossessed of his lot, he was to be driven from his land, and was to be given land elsewhere, and simply paid for the improvements he had made.

Mr. BOWELL. Whether he had effected settlement before the notice was given or not.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; a settler who had actually taken up his lot within the railway belt, if he happened to be in a place which was afterwards set apart for a town or village, was to be sent abroad, and land was to be given to him elsewhere, and he was to be paid for the improvements he had made. That was the carefulness of hon. gentlemen in connection with the settler. There can be no doubt whatever, so far as that measure was concerned, that we would have had substantial grievances in the North-West if it had come into force, and we had found settlers who, perhaps, had

made substantial improvements and had made homesteads for themselves turned off, because it was the sweet pleasure of the railway company and the Government combined to make a railway station, and consequently a village, where the men's property happened to be. But, after commencing with a great eulogy of this country, of the independent character and the excellence of its Government as compared with that on the other side of the line, the hon. gentleman drifted, as is his wont, into a statement of how much better the people are off on the other side, in Dakota and Minnesota, and how natural it was that people should prefer to be there rather than to remain with us. And he put it on two grounds; first, because of the terrible monopolies imposed upon the people of Manitoba and the North-West by this particular clause of the railway charter, which duty is called the monopoly clause; and secondly, because of the other impositions, referring particularly to the duty upon agricultural implements. As to the latter point, I find that at a meeting of the Board of Trade in the city of Montreal, Mr. Wolferstan Thomas, who will be recognised by hon. gentlemen opposite as a pronounced Liberal, though I will do him the justice to say that he is a gentleman who does not obtrude his politics upon people, who attends to his business as a banker, but who is a very pronounced Liberal, submitted a letter he had received from certain manufacturers of agricultural implements in Canada, in which they say:

"For your information we desire humbly to lay before you the following facts:—Immediately prior to raising the tariff, immense quantities of American implements were rushed into Manitoba, in some cases sufficient to supply the country for several years. We, as Canadian manufacturers, are suffering from the undue competition created by this surplus stock, for ever since the raising of the tariff farm implements are cheaper in Manitoba than they are in Ontario."

That is the practical result, and there is not a man who knows anything about Manitoba, who has examined the price list of implements in Manitoba, who does not know that the farmers there have had their implements just as cheap as before the tariff was introduced, in spite of the increase of the tariff, the difference being that the manufacturers of Ontario have been able to secure the market instead of the manufacturers of the Western States. Then the hon. gentleman tells us of the terrible burdens imposed upon the people of the North-West in consequence of the excessive charges of this terrible monopoly as compared with the charges in the United States. Does he know that last year the price of wheat along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway was, on an average, 10 cents more than along the line of the Northern Pacific? Does he know that the tariff charges were very much less than they were on the Northern Pacific, and that farmers in Minnesota actually carried their wheat into Manitoba, paid the 15 cents a bushel, and went back with 4 cents a bushel more than they would have had if they had sold it on their own side of the line? Are these the burdens the hon. gentleman tells us the people of the North-West and of Manitoba are labouring under? No; he prefers to send forth from this Parliament, with the responsibility of his position as a member of this House, and with whatever authority may attach to an utterance of an hon. gentleman having a seat in Parliament, to send forth now, at the commencement of this immigration season, when people are coming into the country and when some are in the country, making up their minds whether they will go to our own North-West or to the American North-West, a statement that it is a natural thing for people to go to Minnesota and Dakota, because they were better off, and are under less burdens as to railway monopoly and competition than they are here. The hon. gentleman ought to know, if he does not, that so far as the experience of the Canadian Pacific Railway, up to this time, is concerned, the people of the North-West have suffered nothing from that so-called monopoly clause, while the people of Canada have gained, as the result of it, the construction of the line which to-day connects the Eastern Provinces with those western territories, within a period which, I venture to say, the most sanguine man in Canada, when that charter was given, did not hope would have been realised. We owe that to the wise policy of this Government in acting, not by the exact terms of the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but within the spirit of that charter, in disallowing Acts which, if they had gone into effect, though I doubt every much if the roads would ever have been built, might, at any rate, have jeopardised the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway in securing the trade of that country over their whole system. As the result of that wise policy we have secured the construction of that railway, and there is not a man in Canada to-day, who will for the moment sink his political feeling and remember only the interests of this great country, but will say that it is a matter of which Canadians from one end of the Dominion to the other should be proud, that to day, as the result of the policy of this Government, he can go from Halifax right into the Rocky Mountains, and, before this year is over, on to the Pacific coast, by a railway on Canadian territory, and with the assurance that we have one of the best railways on this North American continent. As to this policy to-day, it is a policy which will increase and develop the resources of the country in the North-West. One of the railways which is referred to here is the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. That is a railway which, if the statements of hon. gentleman were true, ought to have been built. It goes through what is really the very best part of that country. It goes along the line of the old trail, through increasing settlements, a line which was selected by hon. gentlemen opposite for the Canadian Pacific Railway. And yet, with all the advantages of prosperous settlements to be reached by it, with all the advantage of its going through a country that is not excelled by any part of the North-West, and with a subsidy of 6,000 acres per mile, at $1 per acre, the company have not been able to secure capital for the construction of that railway. Surely there has been no question of a monopoly clause to prevent that.

Mr. WATSON. Yes, there has. The Emerson and North-Western Railway was a connection of the Manitoba and North-Western at St. Vincent.

Mr. WHITE. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Emerson and North-Western Railway was a connection, possibly; but the hon. gentleman will not pretend to tell me that a road running through that country to Prince Albert, and ultimately farther westward, does not go through a country that ought to be able to sustain a railway. If the hon. gentleman pretends to say that that road could only be constructed on condition that the trade of that whole country should be made tributary to American railways, to American merchants, forwarders and business men, instead of being tributary to Canadian railways and Canadian business men, he will find no man in Canada, having business interests in the country, who will agree with him. That railway, if built, will develop the most important part of the country, and I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the policy which is now proposed, wisely supplementing, as it does, the policy by which the Canadian Pacific Railway has been so successfully carried almost to completion, will secure for that north-western country a prosperity such as none of us, a few years ago, ventured to hope would dawn upon it at so early a date.

Mr. MITCHELL. I regret I was not in the House at the commencement of the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I am not quite sure to what extent he challenged the statements which I appear to have made some years ago, in the discussion of his Bill. But I understood him to ask me, amongst other gentlemen who

spoke on the Bill referred to, when it was under discussion here, whether I held the same views to-day that I did then. Sir, I have referred to the report of the speech made by myself on that occasion. I have read it over carefully, and there is not a single statement in that speech, made in 1878, that I am not prepared to-day to endorse, and at the same time to sustain the Bill before the House. Sir, what was the position assumed by the hon. gentleman on that occasion, in introducing his Bill? It was for the wholesale distribution of the lands in the North-West into vast monopolies, nominally for the purpose of building railways, but which, practically, would not have built one. Sir, he endeavored to create the idea that the $10,000 worth of land per mile which he proposed to give would build a railway at that time. Why, Sir, it would not have begun to build railways; it has not begun to build railways to-day, as we have found from experience. The hon. gentleman challenges the statements I made on that occasion, and I answered him in this way:

"He did not know what the opinions of gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec might be, nor did he care. He had one thing to do, and that was his duty. His duty in this case he conceived to be to call the attention of Parliament to the proposed spoliation of western land. It would be unjust to the other Provinces to pass an Act like this, which would enable railway speculators and companies to absorb three-fourths of the whole western territory—that territory on which they hoped to construct the great Canadian Pacific road. He yielded to no one in the desire to benefit the North-West, but he certainly could not approve of an Act such as that now before the House. He could not believe in a scheme which would enable speculators to absorb millions of acres of land, with which it was hoped the country might be recouped for the money it was now spending in opening up that great territory. They had a right to expect something better from the Government than that. If the Administration really desired to open up the country, by all means let them do so; but why should they, by legislation of this kind, embarrass the resources of the country in a way which could never be retrieved."

Then, Sir, I went on to say:

"Let him state the practical objections to the Bill. He believed that under this Bill any number of speculators might, by complying with certain requirements, construct from one to twenty railways, thus absorbing hundreds of thousands of acres of land. When the Grand Trunk Railway Company came, the other day, asking the privilege to connect with several other railways, and when the Canada Southern Railway came asking privileges—what did his hon. friend from Chateauguay say? No man guarded the liberties, rights and privileges more than he, where enormous powers were asked; and when these two railways came before the House, none were more careful of their privileges, or more zealous than his hon. friend. He (Mr. Mitchell) was very much pleased to see the great amount of caution the hon. member exhibited in endeavoring to prevent the railway companies getting the powers for general purposes which they sought."

The late member for Chateauguay, Mr. Holton, said, on that occasion:

"Let us give them what is absolutely necessary for the purpose. Whenever they want anything further in the way of legislation let them come and ask it, and if it is right we will give it them."

Now, Sir, the point I make in the matter is this: that while he proposed to give this enormous wholesale grant, extending over the whole territory, giving them at one fell swoop possession of the whole north-western country, which we had bought and paid for with the people's money, I was not opposed, and I never have been opposed, and I am not opposed now, to giving proper and substantial aid to any necessary railway that it is desired to construct in that north-western country. The point taken by the late lamented member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) on the occasion to which I refer was this: that if railway companies come to this Parliament seeking aid, we should consider every application upon its merits, but not give it general powers to absorb other railways, which system has been the curse of this country—and we have an illustration of that in the monster corporation, the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The policy which this House ought to have pursued, the policy which this Government should pursue, is, that whenever applications are made for aid from the public funds to build a railway, this Parliament should consider each individual case on its merits, and deal with it; do as you are doing with the company under consideration in this House; take up each of these Bills and discuss them upon the merits; and if the railway is entitled to aid, if the location is satisfactory, and if the railway is to give facilities to the population and a large measure of accommodation to the public, then let us give that company such aid as is necessary. But do not let us do what the hon. member for Bothwell asked us to do by his Bill, and pass a measure to lay the whole country under contribution to a band of railway speculators. Sir, I will read a little more of the speech to which my hon. friend has chosen to refer, and which he challenged at the time:

"He should have said to them: 'You are going to make thousands of miles of railway under that Bill, if there is land enough; you are going to let the whole of that territory be absorbed by private speculators.' As his hon. friend from Marquette had said, two lines of railway were certainly needed."

That gentleman was not the present member for Marquette, but the present Judge Ryan. Is there anything to indicate that my opinions have changed? Is there any portion of the speech which negatives the idea that I have been in favor of rendering aid, all necessary aid, to railways in the North-West. The hon. gentleman nods his head, implying yes. I challenge him to point out in what respect I held opinions then that I do not entertain now, and I will prove to him that my opinions now are consistent with my speech in 1878, and I may say that I will support this measure. The hon. gentleman again shakes his head. I will read some extracts from my speech in that year, and I will ask him to point out any portions of it that are inconsistent with my position to-day:

"Well, if application were made to that House for the necessary thousands of acres for the construction of these roads, he would be ready to give all possible aid; but a Bill like this, which gave power to private speculators to absorb the whole territory, was one of the most outrageous measures he had ever heard come before Parliament. He was astonished that the hon Minister of the Interior should have dared to propound a scheme of this character, so extreme in its powers. A greater injustice to the other parts of the Dominion than the measure proposed no man could conceive. He was not going to take up the time of the House very long in discussing this matter, but he wished to call the attention of hon. members representing the Eastern Provinces of Canada to the increased taxation which would be placed upon their districts by the proposed measure. While he approved of money being expended for the opening up and improvement of Manitoba, he was not prepared to give up that magnificent country to private individuals, for party purposes and for party plunder. He would tell hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that while he was prepared to entertain any fair and just claim which might be made, he would not submit to any such scheme of spoliation in the North-West as that which was intended. Throughout the whole Dominion, every scheme should be dealt with on its own merits, and if it was found that the one or two railways referred to by the hon. member for Marquette were really required, he would be willing that the House should grant a charter for the undertakings, besides giving subsidies in money or land to secure them. He would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider the proposition he had just made, and then say whether they would take upon themselves the responsibility of this measure when they went back to their constituents next summer. The Minister of the Interior had said, had hon. members on the Opposition side looked unfavorably upon any railway connection with the American Republic; but hon. gentlemen opposite had always been anxious, not only to have railway connections with the United States, but to maintain business, social and national relations with those on the other side of the line. His hon. friend had done the members of the Opposition an injustice when he made that statement. If the hon. gentleman would withdraw his Bill, and introduce a special measure, giving powers to the two roads spoken of by the hon. member for Marquette, he would have his (Mr. Mitchell's) support. He would also agree to grant lands outside those lines, but he should certainly endeavor to record his vote against the Bill introduced by the Minister of the Interior. He (Mr. Mitchell) did not want to say one disrespectful word regarding the people of the North-West. He knew some of the difficulties and hardships they had endured in the settlement of that country; but they must not forget that only a few years had elapsed since they owned any part of that territory at all, it having previously been under the administration of the Hudson Bay Company. They must not forget that the immense territory outside Manitoba was the heritage of the people of the Dominion of Canada at large. If, on the other hand, they looked upon it as the property of Manitoba alone, then do not let them ask Parliament to impose laws on the other Provinces in order that money might be squandered in the construction of the so-called North-West route; if they claimed the whole territory to make their railroads, let them raise the money themselves and make the necessary improvements, and not ask the other portions of the Dominion, first to buy the country, then to spend millions in improvements, and

then find their lands given away. He wished to call attention to one or two sections of this Bill, which seemed to him as rather of an extraordinary character."

I then quoted the sections, and continued:

"That really provided for the giving away of the very lands required for the construction of the Pacific road, and that not more than nine-tenths—such was the enormous extent of the provision—should be paid out of the proceeds of land sales till the road was in operation. Now, what did that mean? It meant that those lands were considered of sufficient value to pay for the construction of these roads. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan), speaking of the progress made by railroads in Illinois, said that the road was finished and paid for while one-half of the lands were left to the credit of the road. Parliament ought not therefore, to give away that valuable land in Manitoba in so reckless a manner."

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan) corrected me, and I went on to explain:

"But, if this Bill came into operation, if the hon. gentleman was able to induce this House to pass it, and he (Mr. Mitchell) was afraid that he would, he had seen such a subservient following, all this would be changed. There was in that Bill the germs of the absorption of the whole North-West country, and they would not have a twentieth part left wherewith to build their Pacific Railway. The result would be, that the land having been absorbed, the railway would not be built. What would the Eastern Provinces say to such a measure? Would his hon. friends on the other side say they could justify such a course to their constituents; that their constituents would appreciate a measure like this, committing an act of spoliation over the entire country? Who had contributed to the purchase of that country; who had paid the Hudson Bay Company for it? The people. But they paid the money to have the country opened up and developed, and not to be given away in this wholesale manner. If the lands of the North-West were to be used in building railroads, and he approved of such a policy, then this section of Canada was entitled to a fair share thereof for their local railroads, such, for example, as the Miramichi Valley road. The people of old Canada bought the North-West and were taxed to pay to improve it, and they had a right to appropriate a share of the lands to promote the construction of roads in the East as well as in the West."

The hon. gentleman has challenged me in regard to the statements I made seven years ago, when speaking on the subject of North-West railways. He has asked me if I am still of the same opinion to-day as I was then, and he has challenged several other hon. gentlemen in like manner. They can speak for themselves. For myself, I tell the hon. gentleman that I am now, as I was then, in favor of the principles contained in this Bill, and for the reasons I gave on that occasion; that I am to day in favor of granting all necessary aid to the development of the North-West; that I was an advocate of the purchase of the country, that I was one of those who aided in securing it, and I have always been ready to give my vote to projects for opening up the North-West. The hon. gentleman should not have challenged my opinion, as stated here, and not have attempted to convey the impression that the sentiments I expressed in that speech were sentiments which would tend to retard the progress of the country, or that I refused to give aid, such as is sought for by the Bill now under consideration. I think I have said sufficient on that point to satisfy the hon. gentleman. I did not intend to be drawn into any discussion on this matter to-night, nor would I have been drawn into it, except for the remarks of the hon. member for Bothwell. But while the remarks of that hon. member were thoroughly respectful and proper, and such as any hon. member had a right to use, I must confess that the remarks of another hon. gentleman were not, in my opinion, exactly of the same character. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in dealing with this question, has chosen to drag into the discussion of it the whole policy and conduct of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He has chosen to speak of them in a manner—and it is not new to him—that is anything but creditable to a representative in Parliament. It is, perhaps, improprer to refer to what took place on a former occasion, and I am precluded from doing so; but the hon. gentleman's remarks to-night, in regard to those gentlemen, were only a little less virulent and a little less reprehensible than were the remarks made by him on an occasion last Session. The hon. gentleman has chosen to assail the conduct of the Government in granting the charter to the present Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He has ventured to assert that another company was prepared to have built the road for less money. Every man in this land knows how that second company was got up; that hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends outside of this House organised and got up that company. For what purpose? They would never have built a mile of the road, and when I challenged it as a bogus company—and I repeat that it was a bogus company—the hon. gentleman has cast in my teeth the fact that one of the men associated in that class of men came from my own county, and was, he said, a wealthy and respectable man. He referred to Mr. Alexander Gibson by name. Well, I have the greatest respect for that gentleman; he is one man—I do not know how many more were wealthy and respectable men—who would have tried to have carried out their engagements, but Mr. Gibson was a man of means and honesty, a man who would have tried to carry out any engagement into which he entered—and if they were all men of the energy and standing and means of Mr. Gibson, I would have had more faith in them. But I have reason to know more, perhaps, than hon. gentlemen think I know about it; and I have reason to know that that company was got up by that side of the House, and their friends outside of the House, for the very purpose of embarrassing the Government of the day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, yes. When the hon. gentleman challenges the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as a bogus company, he does not know that those gentlemen have spent millions of their own money.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is it?

Mr. MITCHELL. All over the line, extending from here to the Rocky Mountains. The hon. gentleman talks about them coming to this Parliament for aid. What is the cause of it? What has compelled them to come? Has it not been that they proceeded with the work in a manner far exceeding the expectations of gentlemen in this House or in the country, both in rapidity and character? Has it not been from the fact that the enterprise has been decried and run down, that their sincerity has been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite, by their friends outside and the press representing them. Is it not true that they have run down the credit of the country, that they have assailed the character of the North-West, that they have challenged its facilities for settlement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. That they have challenged the value of its lands?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. That they have challenged its future?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I say, yes. I say that their organ, to which the hon. gentleman referred, which they say has done to promote the settlement of that country than all the more Government organs put together, has done so. I do not know how much the Government organs have done, but I can refer to one very recent authority from the *Globe*, to show how much it has done, not to promote the settlement and character of the North West, but to decry and damage and slander it, and I will read it.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he did not write a series of letters from Dakota, puffing the territory of Dakota as a place for settlement, quite equal and superior to the North-West.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not, and the hon. gentleman can take my letters. I made a visit to the North-West; I never

visited the territory of Dakota and I knew nothing about it. I passed through Minnesota to the North-West, and I will let him refer to the pamphet—he will find it in the Library. It is true I wrote a series of letters which were subsequently thought worth being thrown together in pamphlet form, as my opinion of the North-West, and I tell him that that pamphlet contained my views of the North-West, and that those views have never been changed, and those views are, that it is one of the finest countries on the continent of America. That is what I said about it. I did not run down Minnesota or Dakota, or the other States; I did not feel that it would be my duty, or that it would be honest to do it. I have a great opinion of Dakota and Minnesota, but I have a much greater opinion of our own North-West Territories. I will read what this paper, which they say has done so much for the country, which has done more than all the organs of the Government put together, has said about the North-West. I know what its power has been. It is a paper which, from its former reputation and standing has exercised a great power, not only on this continent, but on the other, and it is referred to and read and utilised, and extracts quoted from it perhaps more than from any paper in British North America. And yet that paper will put these statements forward, not once but repeatedly, and in a manner which the hon. member for North Norfolk says does so much credit to the country. It is called "The Surprise Policy—Effect of rushing the construction of the Pacific—No settlers beyond Brandon—Not a house to be seen for hundreds of miles—Superiority of the Fleming route." I need not read the whole article, but I will read two short extracts, which will show the animus of the paper.

Mr. CHARLTON. Read the whole. No garbled extracts.

Mr. MITCHELL. You can read the balance, if you like

"From Moose Jaw to Calgary, 500 miles, the soil was hard clay, and appeared unfit for agricultural purposes. With the exception of those at Medicine Hat, there were no settlers along the line. The experimental farms of the Canadian Pacific Railway looked well, but this was due to entirely exceptional circumstances, chiefly the wet season, the like of which might not occur again for many years. Instead of building the line along with branch roads, so as to settle the old Province of Manitoba, it was rushed on with undue haste by imported labor, chiefly Americans and Mennonites, over this barren waste. Those who were employed on the road, which was constructed at the rate of from three to five miles per day, left as soon as it was built, and the country in these parts is wholly unsettled. This hurried building of the road was generally condemned by all parties in Winnipeg and to the west, irrespective of their political thought. There was no freight traffic on the line, save supplies for the road. The Mounted Police were doing a good work, but there was general dissatisfaction among the Indians, which was daily becoming more intense. All agree that the northern, or Fleming route, which Mr. Mackenzie proposed to follow, would have been of most advantage to the country. For hundreds of miles along the track there is not a house to be seen, and at stations where shops have been erected, they are now empty. Great complaints were being made by settlers in regard to the administration of affairs by the land board."

It is taken from a letter of Sheriff Sweetland, which the *Globe* parades and quotes from, with a view, I believe, to injure the country.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the date?

Mr. MITCHELL. August last. The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that the present Canadian Pacific Railway Company was a bogus company. Sir, could a bogus company have done what that company has done in the past five years? Did the most sanguine of us expect, five years ago, that we would be able to start from Halifax and go through British territory and land on the shores of the Pacific. Is there one of us expected that last summer we could have gone, as we did, from the western point of Lake Superior over our own road to the Selkirks? Is there one of us who imagined that to-day, when a crisis arose in the history of the country, which I regret, but which will not, I believe, be an unmixed evil, that we would be able to send our troops through a section of country which a short time before was a desert waste, a section of country most difficult to build a line through, in order to quell that rebellion. And to whom are we indebted for it? Are we indebted alone to the coffers of this country? No, Sir; not alone to that, but to the enterprise and zeal and perseverance and determination of the men who comprise that company, with the aid which a generous public has given to supplement their own means, which enabled them to build a road that is a credit to Canada and the country with which we are connected. I am surprised that the hon. member for Norfolk would dare to call a company of that kind a bogus company—a company which has performed such work, which has done such great public service, which has received the good opinion of the British Government, and, from the great work they have performed, is looked upon as having been the means of cementing the Empire, of strengthening it, and of giving facilities without which she might be in dire distress some day or other. I hope the hon. member will pause before using such language as he has used on this and on former occasions, with reference to the gentlemen composing that company, gentlemen who are honorable in every transaction of their lives, and who have shown an amount of enterprise creditable alike to Canada and themselves, and who are, to-day, as the hon. gentleman knows, largely out of pocket by the enterprise they have now carried nearly to completion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to one word of explanation. When the hon. gentleman asserted that the second syndicate was a bogus company, I said that if either of these companies could be called a bogus company it was the first, which had failed in the respects I stated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is a little pleasing to find members on the other side of the House rising, at this late day, to take part in public discussion. We have to congratulate ourselves that, at any rate, for one day, Canada has returned to a system of government conducted by open discussions in Parliament, instead of having its measures framed in secret caucus, and forced through Parliament by mere majorities. On this occasion hon. gentlemen opposite find themselves, as too often they find themselves, for their own comfort, in a rather humiliating position; and to-night their defence is the same as it is on all similar occasions. They, of course, are never wrong, never make any mistakes, and always bring forward their propositions at the right time; and if it be pointed out that their proposition is a little late in coming, or that they have failed in their duty in the past, they have the same answer to-night that they have on similar occasions—an answer which may, perhaps, be lacking in absolute accuracy, but which they do not fail to hurl across the floor, and which to them, seems to be a never unfailing answer: Oh, you are unpatriotic; you have decried your country; if the North-West has not been developed as it should be, it is not because the Government have failed in giving proper railway communication; it is because of the unpatriotic course gentlemen opposite, have taken, by their utterances and through their organs. Well, Sir, we have heard that time and again; the country has heard it, but only to treat it as we treat it on this side, with a feeling akin to contempt. The facts are too strong for hon. gentlemen opposite, and when, to-night, they attempt their usual answer, I think, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, they must be hard driven for an excuse. They blame us that the North-West Territories are not better developed, when we have before us for our consideration some resolutions designed for the benefit of that country; and if the resolutions, in the same direction, which were offered to this Parliament seven or eight years ago, had been carried out at that time, if they had not been burked by hon. gentlemen opposite, but had been carried into effect by them, when they came into power—if we shall have development

under this scheme now, what development might we not have had in the North-West under the scheme my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) propounded to this House in 1878. It was on the same line as the present scheme, with this exception, that it was surrounded with safeguards that would cause it to redound more to the interest of the country. Under the system of public grants of land which it contained, it would have resulted in colonisation roads being built throughout the North-West which would have become feeders to a great national highway, the property of the Dominion of Canada, and the profits of which would accrue to the Dominion; but all those advantages have been lost, and years after, when a scheme is propounded to rectify all the negligence hon. gentlemen have displayed during those years, we find ourselves, not in the same circumstances, for the roads to be constructed will be tributary and will be a source of profit to a company that has received resources from this country appalling in their extent. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), it seems to me, was hardly fair in dealing with the proposition of the hon. member for Bothwell, when he pointed out that his objection to that scheme was that under it huge colonisation companies would be able to grab immense tracts of territory without building a railway at all. Surely the hon. gentleman must have spoken without knowledge of the provisions of the Bill which my hon. friend from Bothwell proposed to place on the Statute Book. Let me read one of the conditions under which those companies would be incorporated:

"The Governor in Council may, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of any railway to be constructed under the provisions of this Act, reserve every alternate section of ungranted land by odd numbers, to the extent of 10 sections per mile, 5 sections per mile on each side of the line of the railway, exclusive of the sections which, under the Dominion Lands Act, may have been reserved as school sections or may have been allotted to the Hudson's Bay Company; and for any line or part of a line of railway, west of the 102nd meridian of west longitude, 12 sections per mile, and for any line of railway connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway and extending into the Peace River district, 20 sections per mile; and whenever 25 consecutive miles of any portion of any railway shall have been completed, equipped and in operation, the Governor in Council may convey to the company the land so reserved, or part thereof, along the said railway, so far as the same is completed, and for each consecutive 10 miles of the remainder of the railway the Governor in Council may, as the same may be completed, convey the lands so reserved along 9 miles thereof to the company."

Yet, with that provision in the Bill, my hon. friend from Northumberland saw the immense danger looming up. The colonisation companies could not get any land until 25 miles of railway were built and equipped; and yet, to make his position good, the hon. gentleman was driven to venture a statement so rash as that. Under the provisions of the Bill of the hon. member for Bothwell there need not be any land given to the company at all. The company had no control of the disposition of any land whatever, for a sub-section of the same section I have read reads thus:

"Should the Governor in Council deem it expedient, instead of conveying lands to the company, the company may be paid the moneys received from the sales of lands on the line of and within 6 miles of such railway, from time to time, until the company shall have received a sum not exceeding $10,000 per mile, after which the company's claims to any further aid from the sale of such lands shall cease."

If there was any danger at all, the power was reserved to the Governor in Council, without the consent of the company, to vary the provisions, and give it no land at all, but to sell the lands reserved and give to the company $10,000 a mile, and no more.

Mr. BOWELL. Would that be paid before 25 miles were built, or as it was built?

Mr. PATERSON. After, as I read it.

Mr. BOWELL. I refer to the sub-section. You point out that in one of the sections they shall have the land upon the completion of 25 miles.

Mr. PATERSON. If the Government take the alternative which they reserve to themselves, it is provided always that not more than 90 per cent. of the value of the actual work done shall be paid out of the proceeds of any of the land sales.

Mr. BOWELL. The question I ask is, whether the Governor in Council, if they adopted the alternative system of giving $10,000 a mile, could not pay it as the work progressed, whether the 25 miles were built or not?

Mr. PATERSON. Ninety per cent. of the work done was to be paid as the work progressed. I should judge so. It was also provided that no agreement made by the Government with any company shall be valid and binding until it shall have laid before the House for one month without being disapproved, unless specially approved by resolution. So that Parliament itself had the power to declare whether they would approve of any arrangement that might be made with the Government by any company. The Parliament was to be supreme in saying whether it would sanction the contract or not. We cannot, in face of the express declarations of the statute proposed by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), hear any more of the danger that we would have colonisation companies grabbing immense tracts of land, while they had not constructed any portion of the railway. That would have been simply impossible, under the provisions of the Act. If that Act had been carried out there would have been general railways constructed throughout that country, lines that were needed by the settlers, lines that were destined to open up the country and facilitate settlement. Who can tell what would have been accomplished in the seven years gone by, while this Government have been bending all their energies—to what? To the building of a great through line, neglecting the opening up of the country, for it is admitted by the very proposition before us that it is impossible to open up that country by the construction of a main line alone. The settlement of the great plains of the North-West require there should be branches running through the country. These would have given the people opportunities of colonising the country, settling upon the lands, they would have kept the settlers closer together than they have been by the steady, rapid construction of one main line, and I hold the introduction of this Bill is an acknowledgment on the part of the Government that this is the only way colonisation can be effected by the Government; yet they have allowed seven years to pass without bringing it into operation, while they have had the mature thought of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Mills) pointing in the same direction, and a statute on the Statute Book to guide them, if they were unable to produce one for themselves. Now, they propose, what? The lines contemplated by the late Government were colonisation lines, which would be feeders to the main line, and the line would have been a line owned by the Government, the profit of which would go to the Government; but now the profit of the lines will go to the coffers of a company already subsidised by vast sums of money and grants of land. But the question has taken a wide range. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) gave us to understand it was impossible for him to sit still, but that he must rise to point out how unpatriotic the Opposition had been with reference to the North-West country, and that any failure in the more rapid settlement of the country was due to the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side, and the arguments or statements that might have appeared in the press. He has shown that that country has not developed as it should have; he knows the people are not there that should be there; he knows that the hon. gentlemen alongside him have been in power, are now in power, charged with the duties of furthering the interests of the country. He recognises the fact that his own friends were in power when that development, which was naturally to be expected, has not taken place; he saw there must be a reason given for the failure, and he has

not the courage to lay the failure at the door of those responsible for it. He attempted to lay it upon hon. members on this side, because of their unpatriotic speeches. We have heard enough of that. In the first place, we say to hon. gentlemen opposite that we deny the statements they make—when they make statements with reference to that country being decried by the Opposition. We deny that. I have the right to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to come to the proof. Why do they rise, day after day, and venture to say—to make such statements, when they have been challenged for the proof, time and again, and do not offer any proof? Do they think that will redound to their credit? No; when they have been challenged, time and again, to produce proof as to the course they allege hon. gentlemen on this side have followed, let them, for the sake of their own honor, ever after hold their peace.

Mr. MITCHELL. I gave you a proof; I quoted your organ.

Mr. PATERSON. Was that the utterance of hon. gentlemen from this side?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is from your organ.

Mr. PATERSON. Did not the hon. gentleman state it was a descriptive letter, written by a certain gentleman and published in the newspaper?

Mr. MITCHELL. Published with display headings.

Mr. PATERSON. When the hon member for Northumberland gave a fair description, I will not say a rosy description, of some of the States of the neighboring Union, did anyone charge him with running down his own country, or charge the paper that published the letter with that, because they saw fit to give to the public the letter written by that gentleman? He was giving impressions of the country as they were formed by him. Should hon. gentlemen opposite charge upon members of this side utterances of this kind in newspapers, if they can find them? We ask them to make good their statements, when they dare to say the course of the Opposition has been unpatriotic, that the Opposition have manifested a desire to retard the progress of the country. They will attempt that task in vain. If I may be allowed to point to newspaper utterances, if I might be allowed to allude to organs of the party, do you not think I could read utterances from the most recognised organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, in which expressions, stronger than any that have been used by hon. gentlemen opposite, are used, in the direction of praising up some of the States of the Union, and by comparison show our North-West not to be equal to them. Can I not do that? Do hon. gentlemen opposite hold themselves responsible for it? What did the Toronto *Mail* say, only a very few months ago? I do not like this; I do not hold that the Conservative party or the members opposite are to be charged with uttering sentiments that are contained in the Toronto *Mail*. If we are to talk about organs, I suppose the hon gentlemen opposite will not dare to repudiate the Toronto *Mail* as their organ. It has made the political life of many hon. gentlemen opposite, and they will not dare to repudiate it. What did it say? In its issue of 27th February, 1885, is an article which is rather a mass of contradictions, for it is trying, like my hon. friends opposite, to lay the blame of the failure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company upon the Opposition, and it tries to work in its censure among that, and yet it has to admit facts, or what it thinks are facts, in reference to it, and so it is rather a jumble, but I will read what it says:

"Thus, the decrease in settlement in these American territories was 39·56 per cent., and in the Canadian North-West 39·92 per cent. Considering the start Minnesota and Dakota have had in the race, and the help they have received from the Opposition in the Dominion Parliament, and from the anti-immigration patriots in Manitoba, the wonder is not that our North-West should have suffered as much as they, but that it did not suffer more."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. MITCHELL. Are you not reading the wrong extract?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

"The effects of the boom—the headache after the debauch—must also be taken into account as a factor operating temporarily against Manitoba. Then, again, while the frost of September 7, 1883, did some damage throughout the American North-West, in Manitoba it wrought wholesale destruction."

That is from the Toronto *Mail*. Here is a little frost; it did some little damage in the north-western States, but in Manitoba it wrought wholesale destruction. Can the hon. gentleman point to a statement made in that direction in the article which he read, even from the *Globe*?

Mr. MITCHELL. The difference is this—in that case I suppose it was true; in the other case it was a lie.

Mr. PATERSON. Now the hon. member is running down his country. He is endorsing the statement that, when these people in Minnesota and Dakota have a frost it will do a little harm, and yet it will work wholesale destruction in our North-West.

Mr. MITCHELL. No one ever denies, I never denied, that there are frosts in the North-West. It is not a paradise, but it is a fine country.

Mr. PATERSON. He has said that this is a truth, that the frost which may work some little harm in Minnesota and Dakota will work wholesale destruction in our land, and I am not prepared to believe it, though the hon. gentleman says so. I believe the frost will affect them in Dakota to as great an extent as in our North-West; at least, I hope so, from a patriotic standpoint; but the hon. gentleman says so; he says that the *Mail* is correct, that our country is in that unhappy position, that a frost which will do some damage in the north-western States will work wholesale destruction even in Manitoba. Still further:

"And the panic that followed the cry that early frosts would always menace wheat inflicted grave injury on the country, which nothing but a series of good harvests can repair. These, in our opinion, are the true causes of the depression in the North-West. The Government, probably, did commit mistakes."

Is the article true in that respect, I wonder?

"Few men are infallible; but the marvellous energy they have displayed in developing that region, and the care they have taken in securing for the settler fair rates and free competition for his produce, stand out infinitely beyond the sum of their shortcomings. The *Globe* says, however, that the Ottawa people encouraged speculation, and instances the formation of hundreds of bubble colonisation companies, under the Dominion Land Act. No doubt, the colonisation companies have suffered. Many of them deserve to suffer. Their projectors attempted to make money without for working for it—an offence against the economies which is within a measurable distance of stealing. But the Government is is no way responsible for the collapse in that quarter."

Here is the colonisation company. My hon. friends saw great danger in the Bill of the hon. member for Bothwell; they said you would have land grabbed up by speculators without getting money for it. Here is a confession from their chief organ, that this Government chartered colonisation companies that got hold of immense tracts of land for the purposes of speculation, that never proposed to build a mile of railroad, that did not think of such a thing, but got the land for pure speculation; and, after they have chartered them, the chief organ of the Government is kind enough to say they were within a measurable distance of stealing; in other words, they were within a measurable distance of being thieves. Then we go further:

"It is only fair to add, however, that in all probability the Government now in power has taken too sanguine a view of the North-West development. It has been the habit, in making up caculations of future progress, to ignore the fact that Minnesota and Dakota offer to the poorer class of settlers advantages fully equal to those held out by Manitoba; while the western, south-western and southern States present to the well-to-do immigrant, who can afford to choose his climate, an infinite and incomparable variety of attractions."

There is the language of the *Mail* newspaper. You can do as well, Mr. intending immigrant, if you are a poor man,

in Dakota and Minnesota, as you will do in the North-West; but if you are a well-to-do immigrant, take notice of this, says the Toronto *Mail*, that the western, south-western and southern States present to people of your class an infinite, an incomparable variety of advantages. There is the statement of the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have the endorsation of one who was a member of that Government, and who would discharge the duties of one of the Departments of that Government, at all events, quite as efficiently as they are discharged by its present incumbent, and who says that that article is true.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. I did not say that the article was true. What I said was, that the portion of the article referring to the frosts in Manitoba, up to which point the hon. gentleman had read, was true. I am not responsible for the *Mail*. I am not going to defend the *Mail*. It is quite able to take care of itself, and its friends in the House are able to defend it. But I do not think it is doing justice to me, when I said that frosts occurred in Manitoba, which extended all over the country, to draw me into defending every statement which appears in the *Mail*. I did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON. I have no desire to draw the hon. gentleman into defending every statement, if he does not desire it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have an organ of my own, as you know.

Mr. PATERSON. But it is very natural that I should have referred to the hon. gentleman, when I was reading one article, and as I understood he endorsed it.

Mr. MITCHELL. It was; it was very natural for you to misrepresent.

Mr. PATERSON. So eager was he to interrupt me by stating that the article was the truth, while the article he has read from was a lie. I believed he intended to state that the article which I was reading was true, and that he was prepared to endorse every statement in it, and I think that is what every hon. gentleman in the House supposed. I am glad to hear that he does not endorse every statement contained in that article.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether the article says that frosts occur more frequently and more severely in the North-West than in Dakota, or that on that occasion the frost was more severe?

Mr. PATERSON. I read what it says, and hon. gentlemen opposite were quiet and heard what I read. I have no time, in the course of a speech, to go back and explain what it says. I ask, what are we to think of language such as that? I want to ask what you think of gentlemen opposite, who are prepared to rise and put themselves in the ridiculous position of reiterating charges against the Opposition, of decrying the country, and who produce no utterances of members of the Opposition, but, where they find that a correspondent, who is responsible for his own letter, describes what I presume he supposes to be the truth, in reference to the country, proclaim that this is with a view to decry the country, and that the newspaper which publishes the correspondence makes itself responsible for it all. This is not a correspondence, but an editorial of the *Mail* newspaper, an article written by the gentlemen who control it. We have again this statement. I think it was an article which appeared two or three days afterwards, which preceded an article in the Montreal *Gazette*, in which the Montreal *Gazette* said:

"Rumor has been busy for some weeks past with the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company is reported to be seeking further assistance from Parliament, to have incurred a floating liability of a considerable amount, and to have failed to raise a loan in the money market, and it is no longer a secret that these reports are substantially correct."

That was from the Montreal *Gazette*, to prepare Parliament for the new demand. Two or three days before that there appeared in the Toronto *Mail*, in the same direction, an article seeking to prepare the public mind for additional aid for the Canadian Pacific Railway, pointing out the reasons which would justify Parliament in doing so, as the writer evidently felt it was a very embarrassing position when the company came the third time to Parliament for aid. We find the following:—

"If our land subsidy of 25,000,000 acres be worth $2 an acre, the Northern Pacific lands must be worth much more. For while the population of the whole territory through which the Canadian Pacific runs, from Callander to the Pacific, does not, at this hour, exceed 200,000, the smaller and more compact region traversed by the Northern Pacific is comparatively well settled. * * * If it be said that the mountain section of the Northern Pacific was more costly than the mountain section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that in the case of the Canadian Paicfic the heavy work on the Pacific slope has been assumed by the Government, the answer is that the Northern Pacific had no rock division, 650 miles long, such as that which stretches in unbroken desolation between Port Arthur and Callander."

There is a description of that country, given by the *Mail* newspaper—the road was to run through 650 miles of rock, one unbroken, barren desolation—printed in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, who have the audacity to rise, time and again, to charge upon gentlemen on this side of the House that they decry their country, but who have always been utterly unable to produce the proof. In that article of the *Mail* was the justification of every word that ever fell from any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, when it admits that the Government made a mistake by over-estimating the value of the land, when it admits they made a mistake by not acting as reasonable men, instead of acting like men who have lost their heads, when they speak of that country. Sir, there never was a time when hon. gentlemen opposite were less justified in making the charges that they have made against us to-night in connection with the North-West, when we are considering proposals to build colonisation roads throughout that country, which hon. gentlemen on this of the House proposed to do in 1878, and which, if unfortunate circumstances had not deprived them of the reins of power, I have no doubt would have existed, to a very large extent, in great portions of that country at the present time, and instead of 200,000 people that the *Mail* said you had there now, you might have had over a million of people developing that country, these roads feeders to a road owned by the Government, and the proceeds and the profits accruing to the country instead of being lost to it. And now let me just refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to which these roads will be tributary. I would like to ask the hon. member for Northumberland one question—I do not know whether he will answer me or not. He stated that the second syndicate that offered to build this road was a bogus syndicate, and he justified that expression when he rose to make his speech, by declaring that he knew a good deal about this thing; he gave us to understand that he was sufficiently in the secrets of the gentlemen who comprised that second syndicate to know that he was warranted in his expression that it was a bogus syndicate. Well, now, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was sufficiently in the confidence of the gentlemen who composed that company to be able to say it was a bogus syndicate. But whether he was or not, hon. gentlemen in this House will not doubt that if the hon. member is not deep in the confidence of the second syndicate, he, at any rate, ought to be deep in the confidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate, from the manner in which he defends them on the floor of this House; and if he is deep in their confidence it would interest this House and this country if he would explain to us how it was that the Government of this country were made to give the bargain they did to the present Canadian Pacific Railway

Company. That is something this country would like to know—what secret power they had over the Government, that compelled them to their terms, what power they have over them now that makes them, when the company come a second time to demand aid—what power they have over them that has compelled them to give notice, the third time asking that their demand is to be agreed to. The hon. gentleman could interest the country if he would let us into that secrect, and if he would give us to understand how it is that when this Government, a few months before, asked Parliament to sanction a scheme whereby they would build all the roads that were to be built by this syndicate, and do it for $48,500,000. The hon. gentleman is aware of that. The hon. gentleman knows that about eight months before Sir Charles Tupper, in the name of the Queen, signed the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that same Sir Charles Tupper rose in his place in the House, as Minister of Railways, and asked Parliament to sanction a scheme for the country to build that road as a Government work, and gave to us the estimate of the cost of the construction of a portion of the work the syndicate were bound to do as $13,000,000 for the 1,000 miles from Selkirk to Jasper, $15,500,000 for the portion from Jasper to Kamloops, and $20,000,000 for the portion from Selkirk to Lake Nipissing—$48,500,000, the Minister of Railways told us, he could build these portions of the road for, and yet we have been told how that same Minister, who, eight months before, had stated that for $48,500,000 we could build the portions of the work they were to build, entered into a contract whereby the country gave to the company $25,000,000 in cash, 25,000,000 acres of land, agreed to finish 406 miles of road through a Rocky Mountain region, and that when built and handed over, it should be handed over to the company for ever. How the Government agreed further to build 90 miles, from Yale to Kamloops, the expense to be paid out of the public coffers, and when so built and paid for, to hand the work over as a free gift to the company. How they agreed, further, to build 125 miles, from Yale to Port Moody, to cost millions and millions more, to be paid out of the public treasury, and when built and completed, to be handed over for nothing to that company, to be theirs forever. How, in addition, the Government gave the company all those immunities and privileges they enjoy. How it was they placed on the Statute Book of Canada a clause which I venture to say has never before been found on a Statute Book of a free country, that the whole immense country lying in the North-West, the great heritage of the people of Canada, should be locked up and sealed for the use and benefit of that company for twenty years from the date of the contract. How, in addition, the company are exempted from taxation on their lands so long as they hold them, and are exempted, as regards the road bed and rolling stock, for all time, and have privileges and immunities which time would fail me to describe. The people would like to know what power the syndicate had over the Government to cause them to say that although they believed those portions of the road could be built for $48,500,000 they gave them the contract, the details of which I have indicated, signed.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I should like to know what is the question before the House at the present time, and whether the remarks of the hon. gentleman are in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the discussion on the Canadian Pacific Railway contract is not in order.

Mr. PATERSON. Might I ask you, in common fairness, to say that if I have been out of order I have only been out of order in replying to arguments offered by the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER. This discussion has been going on for some time. It was a great pity it was started at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. PATERSON. I thought I was not to blame for that.

Mr. SPEAKER. There will be another opportunity.

Mr. BOWELL. It is a pity you were stopped in your insinuations. It would be much better for you to make what charges you have to make against the Administration in a bold and manly way, and not make insinuations which I do not think you dare state.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the hon. gentleman to order. The hon. gentleman for Brant has made no insinuations. If any hon. member could speak plainly and boldly, that hon. gentleman has done so.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what the Minister means by insinuations. What does he mean?

Mr. SPEAKER. Address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. He has no right to make any such charge. I do not propose to submit to anything of the kind from any Minister. He may be a Minister to-day and not a Minister to-morrow. Governments composed of stronger material have been ejected from office by the voice of the people, and the same thing may happen again. The hon. gentleman must not attempt anything in the way of insult. That will not do.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. I consider it an insult. The answer will be given to him at another time. I cannot, I suppose, go on to speak with reference to what is termed the monopoly clause in that agreement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Discussion on the terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway charter is not strictly in order.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought that, probably, a reply would be allowed, and that I might allude to the matter as involved in a proposition to subsidise railways that will be feeders to the road that has absolute control of the outlet of the country.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion commenced and proceeded for some time. My attention has now been called to it, and it is my duty to enforce the regulations and orders of the House. I cannot allow the discussion to go on. It is not a question of my permission. My attention having been called to it by a member, I have to enforce the rules.

Mr. POPE. I should like the hon. gentleman to go on to the full extent.

Mr. SPEAKER. Not on this question.

Mr. PATERSON. I recognise, Mr. Speaker, that you have a duty to discharge to the House. I was simply going on to deal with one point. There will be another opportunity to do so, of which I shall avail myself. My justification for trespassing on the rules of order is found in the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite had travelled outside the record, and in answering them I was led to speak as I have done.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a personal explanation. The hon. gentleman has referred to myself in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway as its defender on the floor of this House. I am not the defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I never have been the defender of the Canadian Pacific Railway, except so far as I felt that justice demanded. I have supported and defended the Canadian Pacific Railway when I felt it was unjustly assailed, and because I believe the company are entitled to the confidence of the country and are doing well the work they have undertaken. I have also been asked to give some information as to how the company did this and obtained the other from the Government. I, like the hon. gentleman, am not in the confidence of the Government, and therefore it is out of my

power to offer any opinion. If I was to give my opinion, I would say that the Government made concessions to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company because they believed they were men of trust, wealth, ability, enterprise and zeal, and men who have the true interests of the country at heart, and they gave them such concessions as they thought necessary to enable the company to carry out the work they had undertaken.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee).

Mr. BLAKE. The general discussion having now closed, and it having continued longer than I had expected, I may say there are a large number of papers to be discussed in connection with the location. We have not yet dealt with a single application in detail, and I hope the hon. gentleman does not propose to proceed with the committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the committee rise and report progress.

Committee rose and reported progress.

GOVERNMENT LOAN.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed Resolution to authorize the raising by way of loan of such sum or sums of money, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of the Dominion and for the carrying on of the Public Works authorised by the Parliament of Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would the Minister of Customs state, in a general way, why he requires this resolution, and in particular is it required on the score of the arrangement which is now being, or has been lately carried out in London, with respect to the exchange of four for five per cents.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year, as the Minister of Customs knows, the sum of $22,084,000 was authorised to be borrowed by chap. 2 of last year's statutes. Then, in addition to that sum, $25,000,000, in round numbers, was authorised to be borrowed, about $20,000,000 of which appear to have been applicable to the new loan, so far as I understand the terms of the statute. That would make in all $42,000,000, or a little over, which we were authorised to borrow. This $30,000,000 would make $72,000,000 in all, if I am correct. And there were $25,000,000 borrowed last June, I think, or July, so that there would remain apparently the sum of about $47,000,000, if this resolution passes. I desire to know if that is the exact position?

Mr. BOWELL. Not according to the figures given me. By the statement placed in my hands, the present loan is to cover the following expenditures, or those which are likely to take place in a short time: loan and balance of land subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, $10,776,882; on capital expenditure as provided by the Estimates for 1884-85 and 1885-86, $10,579,663; railway subsidies under 46 Vic., chap. 25, and 47 Vic., chap. 8, $8,870,805; subsidy to the Montreal, St. John and Halifax railway, $170,000 for 15 years, making $2,550,000; ditto from Oxford Station of the Intercolonial Railway to Louisburgh, for 20 years, in all $150,000; estimated expenditure on North-West arising out of the present difficulties and losses which have occurred, and which no doubt to a very large extent will have to be paid, about $4,000,000. Of course that is only an approximate sum. We hope it may be less, but from the expenses which have occurred, it is to be feared that it may be at least that sum, if not more. That makes $36,370,545, less the unborrowed sums under the Statute, of $4,895,182, leaving a balance of $31,962,168. The hon. gentleman, as I understood, made the amount about $47,000,000, including the present loan of $30,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I made the sum total that you had authority to borrow, including these $30,000,000, apparently $72,000,000 altogether.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand you to say that $25,000,000 had been borrowed, which would make about $47,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If you get this grant which so far as I can make out from chap. 8, you will have power to borrow. The point to which I want to direct attention is this, that you had the right, as the hon. gentleman will see, under that statute, to borrow $22,000,000 under the ordinary Supply Bill. Then there was a special Act authorising the raising of five millions sterling, of which apparently three millions were for Canadian Pacific Railway service, and $2,000,000 for redemption of loans, of which it is stated about $1,000,000 was redeemed, and you are authorised to borrow money to replace that. That made available for this year's service, about $20,000,000 in addition to the $22,000,000. Of that $42,000,000, $25,000,000 were borrowed by Sir Leonard Tilley, last June, leaving $17,000,000 apparently available. Now, you propose to take $30,000,000 more, making $47,000,000.

Mr. BOWELL. I have not looked at that statute. Will the hon. gentleman say whether a portion of that sum was not power taken, in case of having to redeem those securities instead of converting and extending them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The phrase is as follows:—

"For the small loans maturing from time to time, within the ten years following the 1st day of January 1882, and which approximate the sum of £2,000,000 sterling, the Government should have the right to redeem the same by one issue of that amount within three years from the date last mentioned; and whereas some of the said small loans have been since redeemed, out of moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue of Canada."

You are allowed to re-borrow it again. In all, so far as I can ascertain, you had the right to borrow £64,000,000 sterling. The point I desire to ascertain is, whether I am correct in supposing that with this $30,000,000 you have the right to borrow in all $47,000,000.

Mr BOWELL: Not as I understand it. The figures placed in my hands indicate that we have under former loan Bill the power to borrow $4,785,000, which in addition to the $30,000,000, would make it in round numbers about $35,000,000. I asked the Department specially to inform me of the amount available under the former loan.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it give the reference to the Statute?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it simply says, less the amounts unborrowed. If hon. gentlemen desire that information before the Bill is finally passed, if they allow the resolution to pass, I will introduce it, and will look closely into the matter and give the House all the information I can obtain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that I am correct. I do not mean to say that the sum of $47,000,000, looking at the very large amount of our engagements, will be more than we shall require, but it will be as well to ascertain exactly what our position is. The hon. gentleman says nothing about floating debt in this memorandum; but I suppose this sum of $36,000,000 includes the floating debt.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no doubt that a number of the items to which I have referred would be covered by the floating debt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the $10,000,000 which forms the hon. gentleman's first item include the $5,000,000 proposed to be granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And the $10,579,000 which formed his second item, if I recollect aright, included the subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the sums to be paid on account of public works?

Mr. BOWELL. Principally, to be charged to capital, in the Estimates both of last year and the year to come.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that this sum of $8,770,000 represents the various liabilities for railway subsidies of a minor character.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. Under 46 Vict., chap. 25, there are $2,138,000 and $456,000, and under 47 Vict, chap. 9 there are $6,175,600, making a total of $8,770,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wanted to know that, because in the report of the Department of Finance I observe that these railway liabilities are put down at $6,176,400, not including $170,000 and $30,000 per annum guaranteed for fifteen years, and there appeared to be a discrepancy between this statement and that of the hon. gentleman. This $8,770,000 includes extra railway grants?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, but it does not include the $2,250,000 to the Halifax and St. John Short Line Road. I find the item under 47 Vict., chap. 8, very nearly corresponds with the figures the hon. gentleman has given. The $2,000,000 and the half million are under another statement, and may probably not be referred to in that statement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The $170,000 and the $30,000 per annum given for the construction of the line of railway to St. John and Halifax, and the line from Oxford Station on the Intercolonial Railway to Sydney or Louisburg—these, I presume, would cover the two other items to which the hon. gentleman referred. What are those two other items for?

Mr. BOWELL. They are provided for under 46 Vict., chap. 25.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Any way we understand according to the hon. gentleman's statement, that about $36,370,000 is the total sum that will require to be provided for.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, $36,857,000, deducting the $4,800,000 which we have authority to borrow.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Even then you will come a little short.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, we shall come short some $2,000,000, but $30,000,000 is all the Finance Minister in his cable from London said he would require. It may be possible that some of the subsidies given under the Acts to which I have referred, to railways, will not have to be paid.

Mr. BLAKE. I am unable to apprehend what the proposition is really before us from the explanations of the Minister of Customs. The Minister has given items amounting in all to $36,370,000, as the amount required, and he points out that he has authority to borrow nearly $5,000,000, making in round numbers $31,000,000, that is wanted. Of these various items, as well as I could understand his explanations, almost everything is yet to pay. The $11,766,000 for the Canadian Pacific Railway, he says, includes $5,000,000 of the new loan covered by the resolution on the table. The $5,766,000 which is the balance of that first item, is that money already paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway or the balance still due on the operations of last year?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. BOWELL. It is the balance that will have to be paid.

Mr. BLAKE. The first item that the hon. gentleman has given, the ten and three quarter millions is composed entirely of sums that have yet to be paid.

Mr. BOWELL. Not necessarily. It may be possible some of these have already been advanced out of the temporary loan, and will have to be recouped.

Mr. BLAKE. I hardly think so, because we have yet the sum of $5,000,000, for which there has been no authority at all, to advance yet, and the five and three quarter millions as the amount remaining due to the Canadian Pacific Railway on the subsidy and loan account, but not yet earned, so that it cannot have been paid. Therefore I get the ten and three quarter millions as sums which have to be paid. There is $10,579,000 for capital expenditure the hon. gentleman states of various kinds. Is that on Public Works?

Mr. BOWELL. The capital expenditure for 1885-6, as per Estimates, $4,237,400; in the Supply Bill and Estimates $600,000; 1884-5, to the end of the year, the Estimates are $13,079,000, the expenditure of which however has been $12,000,000, leaving $183,526 to provide for; 1884-5, as per Supply Bill, estimated at $5,558,737 which makes up the $10,579,663.

Mr. BLAKE. These are sums which are all yet to pay.

Mr. BOWELL. I think a portion of them have been paid out of the temporary loan which has been made; otherwise this statement would have said, to pay out of temporary loans which have been made.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the committee, in an important proposal of this kind, ought to have much fuller information than the officers of the Department have supplied the hon. gentleman with. Of course, we realise he is only acting temporarily in the discharge of the duties of an office to which he does not belong, and he is not expected to be so familiar with those things as the Minister who is absent, but we ought to have more than the hon. gentleman is able to give us before being asked to take this step. A very large proportion of this second item, $10,879,000, and of the third item, the subsidies to railways, is altogether yet to pay.

Mr. BOWELL. Some has already been paid.

Mr. BLAKE. What amount?

Mr. BOWELL. I know portions have been paid on appropriations for railways. They have passed the Council and have been paid, no doubt, out of the temporary loan.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, there is the railway of the Minister of Railways, $160,000, and that between Napanee and Tamworth.

Mr. BOWELL. Whose railway is that?

Mr. BLAKE. What they ordinarily call the Pope Line.

Mr. BOWELL. Not the Napanee and Tamworth.

Mr. BLAKE. I said "and the Napanee and Tamworth." I do not recollect any others. We ought to know how that stands. As far as I can remember from the Railway Subsidy account, there has not been much earned and consequently not much paid. Then you come to the capitalisation of the $170,000 a year and $30,000 a year, which are estimated together capitalised to $2,700,000. It seems a curious kind of husbandry to propose to advance this amount for the payment of a subsidy which is going to run over fifteen years. I do not think there is any rhyme or reason in

suggesting that we ought to borrow the gross sum which is to run over these fifteen years. Surely the hon. gentleman cannot intend to borrow a gross sum that he is going to pay by fifteen annual instalments. It would be very bad economy to borrow this money, and put it by to pay annual instalments for fifteen years, and therefore, I cannot see there is any justification in the hon. gentleman's proposal so far. As to the North West account, the bulk of the four millions is yet to pay; in fact all of it ought to be yet to pay, for the hon. gentleman has not yet brought down the special Bill we were told would be brought down to warrant the payment of the money. We ought to ascertain exactly what proportions of these items of $36,370,000 are really yet to pay, and what proportion has been paid out of the temporary loan. We know the temporary loans are very large, fifteen millions at least, and if $15,000,000 temporary loans require to be met, and if, in addition, the House really requires to provide for $36,000,000 it is obvious, as the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said, that $47,000,000 in all is the amount that requires to be provided for. If the great bulk of $36,000,000 is yet to pay, say $33,000,000 or $32,000,000, that with the $15,000,000 floating debt yet to be met makes $47,000,000 to meet, and the House proposes to provide for $47,000,000 with a loan of $30,000,000 and the unexhausted portion of the $4,785,000; or he will be short $11,500,000. I do not mean to say that is an accurate statement; I do not suppose it is, because the cablegram of the Finance Minister would seem to show a different state of things. If he would strike out that $2,250,000 and the $450,000 as we should, if we are reduced to that degree of penury that we cannot pay $30,000 a year out of our current expenses, the most he will want to borrow this year will be the first year's payment. He will not want to borrow for the payments of the years going on, the second, third, and fourth, and so on to the 15 years, and I think therefore we may fairly state an account a little more favorably as to the immediate pressing necessities of the Dominion than the hon. gentleman has stated. It seems to me a very large transaction, upon which the hon. gentleman ought to have received from the officers of the Department he is administering fuller and more detailed information before we were asked to go into committee upon it.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will observe from the statement I have made that they are not borrowing within some $2,000,000 of the total sum I have given him. Supposing you deduct that, it would leave the $30,000,000, and, with the sum unborrowed, about $5,000,000, about $35,000,000. The total sum, as I have already stated, is $1,962,000 more than we proposed to borrow, and, if the suggestion of the hon. gentleman were carried out to strike off the two items, it would be taking off about three quarters of a million.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will see how much there is yet to explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I see that. I will endeavor to obtain the information for the hon. gentleman before the Bill comes to the second reading.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will mention how it appears to me we stand, and this may perhaps assist the hon. gentleman a little in the investigation he is making. As I understand our position, it is somewhat thus:—we owe to-day $15,000,000 of floating debt. We propose to advance $5,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We owe for subsidies and balance of loan about, $6,000,000. Then the hon. gentleman wants $8,770,000 for these railway matters, and he estimates about $4,000,000 for the North-West, making in all a sum of about $38,770,000, that we require to borrow in order to make us clear, without adding anything for contingencies of any sort. I have not included in that the $2,000,000 or the $450,000 which represent the two annuities, so to speak, of $170,000 and $30,000. If I included the two millions and a half, it would run it up to forty-one millions and a quarter.

Mr. BOWELL. That leaves, deducting the $5,000,000 they have now the right to borrow, $33,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. $33,770,000, not including the $5,000,000 the Government propose to grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway and not including the two and a quarter millions and the $450,000. I think that represents the minimum amount we want to borrow, and, if that be the case, I presume that the Finance Minister proposes to borrow $30,000,000, and to renew a part of the floating debt. It would be as well, if the hon. gentleman can obtain the information, that he should be in a position to state to us at the next stage if I am correct in that supposition. Of course, it is true that a portion of that is not immediately due. I do not know, and I would like to know, how much of the $8,770,000 he expects to be called upon to pay.

M. BOWELL. I will try to ascertain that.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that, on a matter of so much consequence, the House is entitled to this information before taking any step at all. Here is an important matter, referring to the public expenses of the country. The hon. gentleman comes down with a proposition to authorise a loan which the Minister of Finance is about to float in England. We have a large floating debt and a large amount maturing. What the amount of our liabilities is, what amount the Government require, and what amount the Government are now authorised to obtain, no Minister is able to state. It does go a long way towards converting parliamentary proceedings into a farce to come down without any information, and ask the House to vote without any information at all. I am not finding fault with the Minister of Customs for not being familiar with the Department of Finance, but I say that the House of Commons, the representatives of the people of this country, the guardians of the pecuniary interests of the people of this country, so far as their public liabilities are concerned, would be very derelict in their duty if they took the first step in this matter without the information which no Minister is in a position to give at this moment. The Government ought not to press upon the House the consideration of a proposition which they are not in a position to consider, because the Government are not in a position to give the information to which Parliament is entitled. It has a tendency to lower this House in the estimation of the public. What will the people think of a House of Commons which is prepared to support a proposition the merits of which they know nothing about, and which the members of the Government present are unable to explain to the House? That is a humiliation to which the House ought not to be subjected, and the Government ought not to press this matter upon the attention of the House until they are prepared to give to the House the information which the House, as the trustees of the country, ought to have from them.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself it Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman what proportion of this whole amount is intended to be devoted to the payment of the floating debt of the Dominion?

Mr. BOWELL. I have already stated that I have no memorandum as to that, and I have informed the House that I was under the impression that some of the sums included in this have already been paid out of the floating debt. I have

also stated that before the next stage is taken I will endeavor to find out all the information.

Mr. BLAKE. It does seem to me that the House ought to be informed before it is asked to pass the resolution at this stage. The Minister himself acknowledges that. They are cardinal points. The resolution proposes a loan of no less than $30,000,000, a portion of which is to pay off the floating debt of the Dominion, and provide for certain other large expected expenses, some of which are already authorised by Parliament. It is, under the circumstances, putting the cart a little before the horse to ask Parliament to-night to give authority to borrow $5,000,000 to loan the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have lying on the table for six weeks past resolutions to authorise the loan of that amount to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and we are now asked to take the first step towards making that loan on this general stage. What seems to me material is that in this initiatory step of a transaction of such great magnitude, the House ought to get that information without which this committee stage is a perfect farce. What do we go into committee for? In order to obtain this information with that freedom of discussion which belongs to the committee stage, and having got this information at the first stage, and to be able to study the question and deal with it intelligently at the subsequent stages. The hon. gentleman says at a subsequent stage he will tell us all about it. But then we miss the opportunities to which I have referred. Extra stages are given in matters of this kind because it is felt the public interest requires there should be these extra stages, but these extra stages are perfectly useless if they are to be made mere formal stages, if the information intended to be given to them is postponed to a subsequent period. We had better alter our rule and not have an extra stage if we are not to have the benefit of it. The hon. gentleman ought to have given in the first place precisely the amount that it is intended to fund out of the floating debt of the Dominion. My hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has suggested it must be intended, as well as he can make out, to keep a portion of the present floating debt of the Dominion unfunded, to keep it in the shape of a floating debt. Well, we ought to know that. Is the whole amount of floating debt to be funded now or not? Then having learnt what amount of the floating debt is to be funded, we would very much like to know the rest of the transaction. The hon. gentleman has given us an aggregate of $36,370,000. With the exception of the first item and the fourth item, we are unable to tell how much represents floating debt and how much represents obligations yet to be incurred. It is important to know what the character of the obligations is, because it is clear with reference to $2,700,000 that there is no necessity to borrow at this time the bulk of that amount. I think it is equally clear that there is no present necessity to borrow for a considerable portion of the railway subsidies. I think that within the list of railway subsidies which the hon. gentleman is proposing to borrow for—if he intends to borrow for these railway subsidies—there are several of them which I fancy will lapse, several which will not be earned for a considerable time, and it becomes a question of policy whether Parliament should now grant authority to borrow for amounts which may never become due, and which if they do become due will become due probably at a very distant date. Then there is the question of policy with reference to borrowing for the war expenses in the North-West. The hon. gentleman ought to state his view on that subject. If the view of the Government is that the war expenses is to be made by permanent loan, let us understand that. We know an effort is to be made to meet that by some other way than by imposing a permanent debt upon the country. All these things are to be considered. Then I would like the hon. gentleman, on this stage as well, to state why it is proposed to borrow at this time at 4 per cent., the Finance Minister having made a little while ago a loan at 3½? Why revert to the 4 per cent.? And also will he inform us whether, from his advices from the Finance Minister, what is the prospectus or other preliminary arrangements for the loan and any other information about that loan—of course I do not mean confidential information that would affect the loan itself—but any information which consistently with the public interest he may give us? These are things we ought to have in committee in order that we may intelligently discuss the proposal, and I think it is hardly satisfactory to be told that at a subsequent stage we shall have that information which we ought to have now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman lays down very correctly the general rule that in matters of this kind when we go into committee it is for the purpose of having full discussion. Still, under the special circumstances of the case, and as the Finance Minister requests very strongly that this matter should be expedited in the interest of the loan, I hope the hon. gentleman will consent to this stage under the understanding that before another stage is taken, my hon. friend will give full information.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman will agree that at concurrence there shall be the same freedom of discussion as in committee, well and good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

M. BLAKE. This practice is getting a little too common. When we get that information from the hon. gentleman we shall have to deal with it on the spur of the moment, without that opportunity of testing it—I mean in no offensive sense—and of looking at the public records. Therefore I should not be disposed to accede to the hon. gentleman's request except for one observation, that he had advices from the Finance Minister that the public interest required expedition in this particular case. This is another instance in which we are obliged in the public interest to do something which we ought not to do in consequence of the derelicts of the Government.

M. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman asked why we should revert back to the 4 per cents. It does not follow that because power is taken to borrow at 4 per cent. you will necessarily give 4 per cent. The resolution passed authorising the last loan was in the same words, and we know the loan was placed in the market at 3½.

M. BLAKE. I was quite aware of that.

Mr. BOWELL. Then it could not be a reversal back to 4 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I am aware that the First Minister a few days ago converted twenty-five millions of our fives into fours, and I did not suppose he was going to engage in the see-saw operation of making a three and a half per cent. loan a few months ago, then making a four per cent loan and then a three and a half per cent. I did not impute that to the First Minister. It may be he is going to do so. I assume that he will borrow at four per cent., and I think I will be right.

Mr. BOWELL. That may be very witty, sarcastic and cutting, as no doubt it is intended to be. Loans, I take it for granted, though I have not had much experience in such matters, are regulated in a great measure by the money market of the old country, and there are periods in the money market of England when a loan can be effected at three and a quarter or three and a half per cent. better than a loan at four or four and a half per cent. can be effected at

another period. It depends altogether on the state of the market at the time the loan is placed on it whether the rate shall be three and a half, or four, hence the sarcasm of the hon. gentleman has no point, and even if the Finance Minister did effect a loan at 3½ it would not be a "see-saw operation," as the hon. gentleman should know, if he does not.

M. MILLS. The first Minister informs us that the Finance Minister is absent and that this matter is very pressing. It is not a very great while ago that the First Minister told us that, with a High Commissioner in England, it would be unnecessary for the Finance Minister to go to the old country in order to effect loans, and transact other business. Now we have a High Commissioner in England drawing a handsome salary, and we have the Finance Minister absent from Parliament and we are doing work in an unparliamentary way in consequence of his absence.

Resolution to be reported.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:35 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 11th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the net amount of the public debt of Canada on 31st May, 1885?

Mr. BOWELL. The net debt of Canada on 31st May, 1885, was $191,886,199.60.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the gross amount of the public debt of Canada on 31st May, 1885?

Mr. BOWELL. The gross amount of the public debt of Canada on 31st May, 1885, was $258,711,088.52.

GOVERNMENT NOTES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the amount of Government notes in circulation or in the hands of Canadian banks on 31st May, 1885, and the amount of gold held by the Government of Canada upon that date?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government notes in circulation or in the hands of the Canadian banks amounted to $14,998,315. The amount of specie held was $2,287,767.

FLOATING AND UNFUNDED DEBT OF CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the amount of the floating and unfunded debt of Canada on 31st, May 1885, and a list of temporary loans made by the Government, giving amounts, to whom payable and when payable?

Mr. BOWELL. The floating and unfunded debt of Canada on 31st, May 1885, was $62,214,635.50. The House will remember that upon previous occasions, when similar questions were asked, it was thought advisable, in the interest of the Dominion and in accordance with the wishes of the banks, that such enquiries should not be answered.

Mr. CHARLTON. That merely applied to the rate of interest. The Finance Minister has himself given such statements.

Mr. BLAKE. We have had more than one such statement submitted by the Finance Minister.

GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What sum or sums of money, of the loans negotiable by virtue of any Act of Parliament heretofore passed, authorising the Government of Canada, or the Governor in Council of Canada, to borrow money, remained unborrowed on 31st May 1885, without reference of transactions of the Finance Minister of Canada, since his recent arrival in London?

Mr. BOWELL. Four millions, eight hundred and ninety-five thousand, one hundred and eighty-one dollars and eighty-six cents.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the amount of deposits in the post office savings bank of Canada on 30th, April 1885, subject to payment on demand; and also the amount of deposits subject to notice of withdrawal, on the same date?

Mr. BOWELL. The Post Office Department states that this information cannot be given for three or four days, because the books have not been finally balanced for the month of May. The approximate balance of deposits payable on notice of withdrawal was $14,418,400. Outstanding cheques payable on demand amount to about $8,000,000.

Mr. CHARLTON. What I asked for was a statement up to 30th April. I previously asked for the amount up to 30th May, but I was told that it could not be furnished, and I therefore changed the date.

Mr. BOWELL. The notice I have is up to 30th May.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. Minister will furnish the information to-morrow.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

THE FIVE PER CENT. LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether any provision is made for the payment of a sinking fund upon the bonds to be given in exchange for the 5 per cent. loan which matures on the 1st of July next?

Mr. BOWELL. The sinking fund remains the same as at present, and there is no additional charge for stamps.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether any commission or allowance (other than the bonus of 1 per cent. offered to parties accepting the exchange) has been paid or agreed to be paid to any persons in connection with the exchange of 5 per cent. bonds for 4 per cents?

Mr. BOWELL. The only expenditure incurred other than the allowance of 1 per cent. is ¼ per cent. to brokers bringing in outstanding parcels.

PROOFS OF ENTRIES IN BOOKS OF ACCOUNT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 113) respecting proof of entries in books of accounts kept by officers of the Crown. He said: I propose to amend the Bill slightly in committee, so as to make it read more clearly. The remark was made, the other day, that this legislation would interfere with the rights of the Provinces, by dealing with matters of civil rights and procedure. I propose, however, that the Bill shall be so worded as to apply only to matters over which the Parliament of Canada has authority, and with this safeguard I do not think there should be any objection to it, any more than there was to the Bill, 44 Vic., chap. 28, in which a similar provision is

made as to certain proofs and notices, for the purpose of evidence.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. MILLS. I think we should have some further explanation with regard to the provisions of this Bill, and what the Government proposes to do under it. As I understand, this provision proposes to take into the hands of this Parliament the control of matters of procedure in civil cases as well as in criminal cases, in courts established by this Parliament. Under the 101st section of the British North America Act, if the Parliament of Canada were dissatisfied with the administration of the laws of Canada in the provincial courts, in addition to the establishment of a general court of appeal for the entire Dominion they might establish courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada. They might establish a bankruptcy court, or one having maritime jurisdiction, for the administration of the federal laws of this country, and where, in the practice prior to the Union, it has been usual to treat matters of procedure as matters of the law itself, as in the case of bankruptcy, it may deal with that subject also. That has been held by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, but by the 92nd section of the British North America Act among the matters within the exclusive powers of the Provincial Legislatures are:

"The administration of justice in the Province, including the constitution, maintenance and organisation of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts."

In the United States the circuit and district courts of the Federal Government that are established in the various States follow, in matters of procedure and practice, the procedure and practice adopted by the various States; and it seems, as far as one can gather from the provisions of the British North America Act, that it was intended that a similar practice should prevail in this country, and that everything relating to procedure and practice in civil matters should be regulated by the Provincial Legislatures. It is true, the Act says: "Procedure in civil matters in those courts," but I apprehend, on looking at the 101st section, that it was intended that the same practice should prevail in the federal courts, in so far as they are given original jurisdiction. Provision is made in section 101 for the constitution, maintenance and organisation, by the Parliament of Canada, of a general court of appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada; but nothing is said in this section, as is said in sub-section 14 of section 92, about regulating matters of procedure. It would, therefore, seem that it was not intended that that power should be conferred on this Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think the objection of my hon. friend can hold. If we were providing generally in this Bill for a mode of evidence in civil cases only, I could understand his objection; but he will see that we are limited in this power by 44 Victoria, chapter 28, to which I have referred, to courts established by the Parliament of Canada and such legal proceedings over which the Parliament of Canada has authority.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that section 92, sub-section 14, in addition to giving power to the Provincial Legislatures to establish and maintain provincial courts, gives them also power to regulate procedure in those courts; but in section 101 there is no corresponding power given to the Parliament of Canada to regulate procedure in the courts established under that section. If it is necessary to use the expression in the case of provincial courts, why not also in the case of federal courts?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very much afraid the argument is too fine for me. I see very well that by sub-section 14 of section 92, all matters concerning procedure in provincial courts have to be regulated by legislation coming from another Legislature than this. Section 101 of the Constitutional Act says:

"The Parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time provide for the constitution, maintenance and organisation of a general Court of Appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

I would add by this Bill, not only for the better administration of the laws of Canada, but that those laws should be on matters which could only be taken cognisance of by this Parliament, and when we provide for certain modes of proving documents that have to be produced in these courts, that is a matter we have a right to regulate. Though section 101 does not say that in the organisation of those courts, the laws of evidence or the procedure should be under the regulation of Parliament, that must necessarily be implied.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &c.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 143) respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers. He said: This Bill is to amend the Act passed in 1884 respecting the adulteration of food and drugs. It makes some slight alterations that are found necessary and desirable for the working of the Act. The principal amendment is to subject food and drugs for cattle, and fertilisers for manuring purposes, to the same analysis as food and drugs for human purposes. Fertilisers, in the interests of those who purchase them, should be subject to be analysed and put under the same regulations as articles mentioned in the Act of 1884.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is unfortunate the hon. gentleman should propose to press the second reading of a Bill of this description so shortly after it has come before the House. The Bill has gone through the Senate, and therefore has to go through its final stage here. It affects a number of trades, and some little time should be given to members for receiving communications from those who are interested in the measure, so that we may be able to thoroughly dispose of it and avoid the necessity of further amendment later. If I have persons engaged in any business in my constituency which would be affected by this measure, I deem it my duty to send them a copy of the Bill so as to receive their suggestions, but if the Bill is to go through now that will be entirely impracticable.

Mr. McLELAN. The Bill was before Parliament last year and considerably discussed. It has been before the Senate some time, and I think a knowledge of the amendments proposed has been communicated to all parties interested in the trade. As there is a sum of money to be provided for, we will have, before finally disposing of the Bill, to go into Committee the second time on the resolution, so that I think there is no undue haste in the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. The committee stage is the stage for discussion of this kind. The hon. gentleman says it was discussed last year. It did receive a certain amount of discussion, but it does not seem to have been perfectly understood—witness the present Bill.

Mr. MILLS. This Bill is one of the class which we have had before us this Session. There was the Sunday

Observance Bill, the Factory Bill and this Bill. It seems to me they all involve the same principle. It seems to me this is a matter relating to property and civil rights. You propose to establish certain police regulations; it is the manner in which the property shall be held, owned and disposed of. You have no more right to interfere with a sale of property of this sort, personal property, than with the sale and disposal of land or horses. Fraud, so far as fraud is liable to be committed, is to be prevented, but that is a part of the business of the Local Legislatures, in these matters; they are authorised, under our constitution, to make such penal regulations as may be necessary for the enforcement of their own laws. The penalty attached to the placing of a label falsely representing the weights or contents of a package is a police regulation. It is no portion of the criminal law. It is for the purpose of regulating the transfer of property of a certain kind from one party to another. It is an attempt to protect one party from fraud on the part of another, and a proposition to punish the guilty party for that offence. It is simply a police regulation, and it seems to me that it is not within the jurisdiction of this House, but clearly within the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Why does the hon. gentleman mix up food and fertilisers in the same Act?

Mr. McLELAN. Fertilisers are used to produce food.

Mr. BLAKE. A great many things are used to produce food.

Mr. McLELAN. We have to manufacture fertilisers and analyse them, and provide that farmers may not be robbed through the purchase of adulterated fertilisers.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to the principle of the Bill, but I object to mixing up my food with manure.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a connection between the two.

Mr. BLAKE. There are a great many things which are connected with one another in one sense, cause and effect and so forth, which, however, you do not mix together. The hon. gentleman can catch one of the most delicate fishes in the world, the brook trout, with a worm; he eats the trout and rejects the worm. Under these circumstances, I do not think the hon. gentleman has given any ground why we should mix up in the same Bill food and fertilisers. I do not think it is an instance of cleanly legislation.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like the hon. member to state wherein lies the necessity for this Bill. I understand it is subsidiary to the Bill passed last Session, and, so far as I have been able to compare them, the difference is very slight.

Mr. McLELAN. There are several minor differences which are shown in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the principle upon which the definition of agricultural fertilisers is based.

Mr. McLELAN, I do not know that there are any particular principles involved. The definition is taken in general terms from the Bill introduced by Mr. Ferguson, of Welland, respecting agricultural fertilisers.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very satisfactory to know that the hon. gentleman has adopted the definition of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) of the term "agricultural fertiliser," but I think it would be still more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would explain the grounds upon which that definition is adopted. It is very important to the general public that there should be a proper definition of agricultural fertilisers, and I think we ought to have some other assurance that this definition is correct, than that of the hon. member for Welland; we ought to have the assurance of the Government who is bringing forward this Bill as to the accuracy of the definition.

Mr. McLELAN. The definition has been submitted to the chief analyst and approved of by him as embracing all that is necessary to have placed in the Bill.

Mr. FISHER. In comparing these two Acts I find the definition is not the same. The definition in the Act now under consideration is that the word includes every substance composed of fertilising manure which is sold at more than $12 per ton, and which contains ammonia or its equivalent of nitrogen.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is twelve instead of ten in the amendment.

Mr. FISHER. It also includes potash instead of only ammonia or its equivalent of nitrogen or phosphoric acid.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The word "twelve" will be changed for ten, and the word "potash" will be taken away.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the definition of the hon. member for Welland is not accepted in its entirety as infallible.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Bill of the hon. member for Welland has been accepted by the Government and there will be some amendments made to it.

Mr. BLAKE. When I asked the Minister to explain the ground of this definition he told me it was the definition of the Bill of the hon. member for Welland. Then I pointed out that it would be more satisfactory if we had some additional ground for that definition, and the hon. gentleman answered that it had been concurred in by the chief analyst. Now, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) points out that the definition in the Bill of the hon. member for Welland, although accepted by the Government, differs from the definition as contained in this Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it does not.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, it does.

Mr. McLELAN. It differs as to the value.

Mr. BLAKE. It differs as to the ingredients, too.

Mr. McLELAN. As to only one.

Mr. BLAKE. Now we are told that these definitions are the same, and to have that persisted in, after the hon. member for Brome has read the clause, seems to me a little too much. The definition which the hon. gentleman says is the same is not a definition which declares that a fertiliser, to come within the Act, shall be sold at more than $12 a ton, when the definition in the Government Bill as to value is $10 a ton. The definition in the Act includes all fertilisers containing ammonia, or its equivalent of nitrogen, or potash, or phosphoric acid, and potash is left out altogether in this definition. These definitions therefore are not the same.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is so in the Bill of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said there would be an amendment to the Bill of the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is what I mean. It is not necessary to split hairs on so small a matter. The Bill of the Government will be amended in this respect and that is all. In respect to value we put ten in the place of twelve and take out the word "potash." When I passed the draft of the Bill about the adulteration of food to my hon. friend

he said it must necessarily be read in connection with the Bill which the Government have before the House. Then the hon. member, a little prematurely, asked what was the definition of fertiliser, and he was answered that the definition was the same as the definition in the Government Bill, but I forgot to say that the measure of the Government will be amended by changing the value from twelve to ten, and by taking out the word "potash." I may here mention that fertiliser in the Bill will not include all fertilisers sold. It is intended to ask that all those who want to have a certificate of inspection of commercial fertilisers will be obliged to give to the inspector of the Government a certificate of the manufacturer stating the ingredients of the fertiliser, and those ingredients will have to be of a certain quantity and value, otherwise that fertiliser will not be considered as a commercial fertiliser. Other fertilisers of the same quality might be sold, but not inspected. The Government does not intend to render inspection absolutely necessary, but those commercial fertilisers that will be sold as inspected will have to be of the grade and value mentioned.

Mr. FISHER. The necessity of having a preliminary discussion of the Bill before going into committee is evident. The Minister gave us an explanation which was erroneous. After some difficulty we have obtained an explanation which we can understand from the Secretary of State as regards this particular clause.

Mr. DAVIES. The Adulteration of Food Act was passed last year, and it extended simply to the food and drink of man. This year it is proposed to extend it to the food and drink of cattle as well. Has there been any information obtained by the Minister to lead him to make the change, or is it a mere experiment?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know that there have been any special representations; but a study of the general question led us to the conclusion that it is desirable to guard against fraud with respect to cattle food.

Mr. DAVIES. Has it been brought to the attention of the Department that cattle food is largely adulterated, or is it proposed to take action to provide against adulteration?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been very frequently stated by parties that cattle food is adulterated; but I do not think any analyses have been made.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any representations been received from authorised bodies, such as agricultural societies, which take an interest in these very essential and important matters; or have representations been received from analysts, because it is possible they might desire to enlarge the scope of their investigations?

Mr. McLELAN. I am informed that agricultural societies do not usually take cognisance of such a matter as this, and that they do not deal with such matters. At all events, we have not had any representation from any agricultural society.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it from the analysts?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman knows that for years both agriculturists and every person interested in this important branch of industy have been complaining of two things. First, that a great deal of the commercial or artificial fertilisers——

Mr. BLAKE. We are not talking about fertilisers but about food.

Mr. SPROULE. As one engaged in the selling of cattle I know that complaints are frequently made with respect to cattle food. Take oil cake; it is not what it purports to be, and much of it is practically worthless. In my county farmers constantly complain in regard to it, and many have abandoned the use of such foods, finding them of no value.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. DAVIES. The only question is whether it is adulterated food.

Mr. SPROULE. In regard to the oil cake, it often happens that the oil has been first abstracted through a process of heat and pressure; and this is sold as pure oil-cake when in reality it is only refuse.

Mr. FARROW. This is a subject of considerable importance to agriculturists. I have had a good deal of experience and have heard many suggestions in regard to it. These suggestions have come from practical agriculturists. They have also come from agricultural societies, both township and county. Our experience in this line is this: We have been using a great many of these foods, such as oil cake and cattle food, and we think they have not been doing the good to our stock that the vendors said they would do. There is a suspicion in the minds of agriculturists—I know it is so in my section of country—that they contain some worthless ingredients, and are not up to the mark. Farmers think it would be a very good thing if the Government would provide proper machinery to have those foods tested, so that a proper article shall be supplied, for which very high prices are charged. There is a large industry of this claas at Mitchell—I do not say they are turning out an inferior article—and a great many use the food. We have established a great many milk factories throughout our neighborhood. We have an establishment which manufactures over 100 tons of cheese a year. When the milk is carried to the factory the calves have to be fed on different foods, and we use oil cake and the foods mentioned in this Bill. We want to be sure we are buying a good article. That is the kernel of the whole thing. We, being simple agriculturists, cannot test these foods, and we want the Government to see that there is no fraud practised on the farmers. If this Bill will cover the point, the Government will be doing a wise thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I was quite sure that the Minister was wrong when he said this was not a subject with which agricultural societies as a general rule interfered.

Mr. McLELAN. I said they had not taken it up in any communication to the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said more than that. He said that agricultural societies did not generally deal with such matters. This matter is so vitally connected with agricultural operations, particularly in the Province of Ontario and in some of the other Provinces, I was quite sure those associations would have dealt with the subject if there was a grievance. My own information, derived from the newspapers, is that occasionally cattle foods are sold which do not contain quite so much nutritious element as they should do. With respect to the particular case of oil cake: it may be perhaps a little difficult to ascertain the precise line at which there may be said to be an absence of the nutritious element. Oil cake is the refuse after the oil for commercial purposes has been extracted. Complaints have been made that too much oil is taken out of the oil cake. And there is but little oil left in it. Whether it will be easy to draw the line in that regard, and determine whether enough oil has been left in the cake or not, I am afraid I cannot say, and I am afrad it will puzzle the analyst to determine. Of course, when you put in something else, which is either noxious or not useful and adds to the bulk, that is a different thing.

Mr. SPROULE. If the manufacturer is to take out a certain quantity of oil and no more, then it would be an easy matter for the analyst to determine whether there is the proper proportion.

Mr. BLAKE. Who is to decide?

Mr. SPROULE. The analyst, of course.

Mr. BLAKE. And what is the rate or proportion to be?

Mr. SPROULE. If the Government authorises a certain proportion, it would be easy for the analyst to determine whether the proportion is there or not.

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill makes no provision as to the percentage of oil which should remain, and the other Bill is about fertilisers and not food, and we must not mix them up too much.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The deterioration in the quality of the oil cake is largely due to the fact that recently very much improved methods have been discovered of extracting the oil from linseed, and of course the oil cake depreciates more in quality. And the more successful the manufacturer is in extracting the oil, the more inferior will be the quality of the refuse.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will find that section 19 fixes the limit as to the amount of oil it shall contain.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, as that applies only to compounds in which it may not be possible to be accurate in the ingredients to the last fraction, and therefore a certain limit of variability is fixed. It would not apply in a case of refuse upon the manufacture of linseed oil.

Mr. SPROULE. These cattle foods contain so much of different ingredients, such as corn meal, linseed cake, and so on. Now, if they contain too much of that which is comparatively useless and not enough of the more valuable ingredients, the quantities could be determined, and a percentage of oil could be ascertained as well.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not discussing anything but this question of oil cake, which, as I understand, is the refuse which is left in the operation of extracting the linseed oil, and what the manufacturer does is to extract as much oil as he can out of it. That is his trade, and what is left is sold to the farmers, and you are not going to pass a law that the manufacturer must not take as much oil out as he can. The farmer must know in this particular case that he gets only what the manufacturer is unable to extract, and if the methods of extraction are more perfect, the less oil is left.

Mr. FISHER. The same is true with reference to the refuse from flour. Some years ago bran was of great value as cattle food; but in consequence of the new process of extracting flour, what is left now is of very little value. I think, however, that adulteration by the introduction of buckwheat hulls, or other matter of that kind, could be provided against; but I cannot see how you can limit the quantity of oil to be extracted from the linseed.

Mr. McLELAN. In the case of adulterating these mixtures by buckwheat hulls, plaster of Paris, and other matters of that kind, the provision would apply.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, when he assumes that there is only the amount of oil left which cannot be extracted. It can be bought of different qualities, by paying different prices; and the question for the analyst would be, whether the percentage is present that is represented.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). What is known technically as cattle food, is a different preparation altogether from what is called oil cake, and I think it is in the case of those foods that the Bill will be valuable. There has been a great tendency of late years to use condiments or mixtures containing more or less stimulating ingredients, and these are fed in limited quantities along with other food, in fattening stock. These are capable of very much adulteration, because they are compounded with certain drugs which have a chemical effect on the cattle, and are much more valuable than the coarser ingredients of linseed cake, and other cheaper articles which give it bulk. While of course, the manufacturer will extract all the oil he can out of the linseed, there is no doubt the refuse can be made much less valuable by mixing inferior ingredients with it, and perhaps that kind of adulteration might be looked after.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman stated that this has been amended by the omission of that part which prescribes an intimation as to the component parts of the admixture. The trade objected to that, on the score that it involved the revealing of trade secrets, and it was deemed enough to say mixture. We know that a very large portion of these articles are mixtures under any circumstances, and the mere statement as to that class of them which are confessedly mixtures, that they are mixtures, would not reveal the existence of the evil which the Minister desires to avoid. Of course, when an article professes to be some one thing and not a mixture, then the announcement in a conspicuous place that it is a mixture, ought to indicate that it is an adulteration of some kind. I would like also to know whether the legislation we passed last year to require the statement of the component parts of an article was based on any precedent, or was original with ourselves.

Mr. McLELAN. Last year's legislation was our own; this year's legislation is founded on the English system.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the tariff of 1 per cent. been obtained from other legislation, or is it wholly experimental?

Mr. McLELAN. That is the percentage in the American Act on the same subject.

On section 3,

Mr. CASEY. With regard to persons appointed as analysts, I think there should be some limitation to persons possessing a medical degree or some degree in chemistry.

Mr. McLELAN. This is a re-enactment of the old Act.

Mr. CASEY. Whether it is new or old, I think some certificate should be required as to the analyst's knowledge of chemistry.

Mr. McLELAN. The clause provides that they must be persons possessing competent medical, chemical and microscopical knowledge, and that is only ascertained by the certificate they bear.

Mr. CASEY. That leaves the Minister to determine their competency.

Mr. FISHER. Is there any limit or guide as to the number of these analysts who may be appointed? If there is no such limit, I would like the hon. Minister to give us some information.

Mr. McLELAN. The number appointed is only limited by the wants of trade. They are provided in most of the commercial centres where business demands them.

Mr. CASEY. There is no limit in the Bill, but the Minister must surely know how many he intends to appoint.

Mr. McLELAN. There are eight now. It is not proposed at present to increase the number.

On section 6,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware whether any of the municipalities have availed themselves of the provisions of this statute and appointed an inspector.

Mr. McLELAN. None of them have taken action yet. But the matter has been discussed in several of them and is likely to be carried into effect.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Under the provisions of section 5, the Government seem to have the power to appoint their officers to do this duty, and in section 6 the power is given to councils. What object has the Government in taking power to do this, and at the same time giving the power to municipalities? Has the Government deputed any of its officers in the different divisions to perform the duties that are required under this Act?

Mr. McLELAN. The municipalities will appoint the officers.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the provision of the Act requires that the fines and penalties imposed shall go into the public treasury. The city, town, county or village will appoint the inspector. His salary will no doubt depend upon the fees collected. How is the payment of these inspectors to be provided for?

Mr. McLELAN. Section 4 provides that all penalties imposed and recovered by the inspector shall be paid into the revenue of the city, town, county or village, and be distributed in such manner as the council of such city, etc., may direct. No doubt the city or the municipality will therefore arrange to pay him for his services.

Mr. PATERSON. The civic council may appoint a man and declare that he shall have for payment such fees as are imposed, and he might make it troublesome to dealers in order to get all the fees he could. I do not wish to say anything against the Bill, for I believe it is in the right direction, but I merely point out a danger that might arise if the salary of the officer depends upon the collection of fees.

Mr. McLELAN. I presume each municipality will make such regulations as will meet the case. I do not think there is danger of the dealers being harassed under the operations of this Bill. The officer may get a percentage of the fees and penalties with a regular allowance.

Mr. PATERSON. According to sub-section 3, the inspector may prosecute "any persons manufacturing, selling, offering or exposing for sale" adulterated goods. The difficulty is this: The dealer buys the goods in good faith from the wholesale man who has bought them in good faith from the manufacturer. Sub-section 2, of section 23, provides that if the person accused proves he did not know of the article being adulterated and shows that he could not, with reasonable diligence, have acquired that knowledge, he will be only liable for the costs attending the prosecution. I think he should have recourse against the manufacturer for the costs, because the manufacturer could not fail to know in the first instance if the article was adulterated.

Mr. McLELAN. He would have that recourse in common law.

Mr. PATERSON. That would answer the purpose.

Mr. FISHER. There might be some trouble where the official was obliged to proceed immediately against the wholesaler, with whom the retailer had shown the fault to be.

Mr. CASEY. If the goods were imported by the retailer, in good faith, from outside the country, he would have no remedy.

Mr. FISHER. If the retailer imports from abroad, is he not to be responsible for the sale? We cannot get at the manufacturer, and I should suppose the importer from a foreign manufacturer would be held responsible for the adulteration.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know that the importer could always in fairness be held responsible. A punishment could be inflicted upon the fraudulent foreign manufacturer by providing that, when goods manufactured by a person outside of Canada have been shown to be adulterated, notice should be given to all Customs officials that the importation of that article was prohibited for the future.

Mr. FISHER. I emphatically differ with my hon. friend from Elgin. If the importer is allowed to bring in adulterated goods and sell them without being subject to a penalty, he will always be getting goods from the foreigner to the detriment of our own manufacturers.

Mr. McLELAN. I think that is provided for in clauses 20 and 21.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will not do to put down our own manufacturers at a disadvantage, and I hope the Secretary of State will bring his legal knowledge to bear on this matter so as to prevent any injury being done.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We could not prosecute people outside the country, but I think that a wholesale merchant importing from abroad, who is protected by the certificate of analysis which he receives, will have his remedy against the manufacturer from whom he imports.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the manufacturers of this country under their charge in one sense, and have done a good deal to protect them. Now, here is an opportunity where we can protect our manufacturers in a legitimate manner, an opportunity where protection is absolutely necessary. If we allow a wholesale dealer in this country to import from abroad a manufactured article and sell it, knowing that in doing so he is less liable to prosecution than if he buys the same article from a Canadian manufacturer, the wholesale dealer has an inducement to go abroad for that article, which might be adulterated. I think it is but just to our manufacturers that the wholesale dealer importing from abroad should be put on the same basis as the manufacturer in this country.

Mr. McLELAN. It is the intention of the Government to put that in the Bill. However, it is a matter about which I will have enquiry made, and see that it is put beyond doubt in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. There is no proviso here at all giving the retailer recourse against anybody. Clause 20 would apply practically, only to the retailer. Supposing a retailer here at Ottawa offered for sale a case which he had purchased from a wholesaler in Montreal. If the Government found that these goods which were in his possession were adulterated, they could be seized, but no penalty could be inflicted upon the wholesaler in Montreal who supplied him with the goods, unless somebody else took action against that wholesaler by having some goods in his possession inspected and proved to be adulterated. Sub-section 2, of clause 23, certainly seems to have absolved that retailer from all penalties when he can show that he did not know the article was adulterated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask the Secretary of State what he thinks with reference to sections 20 and 21, whether they are interfered with by the provision in sub-section 2 of section 23.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not taken special care of this Bill, and hence my reticence in speaking about it. But in the Bill of which I have charge, there is a similar clause which I think ought to be dropped altogether, as it would afford no protection. If the retail merchant sells an article at more than $10 a ton which does not contain, at the minimum, the ingredients mentioned in the Act, he cannot plead that he did not know it, because he is obliged to ascertain. He sells it at his own risk, and if he sells it he will be liable to prosecution and fine. In the Bill of which I have charge, before you sell you are obliged to show to the purchaser the certificate of analysis of the

article you are selling, and if the certificate proves to be wrong you are liable to fine.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see a difficulty which does not seem to be provided against. An inspector enters a retail store and finds an adulterated article, which he seizes, and certain penalties follow. Then we propose to relieve him from paying the penalty, and that he shall only pay the cost. If that were done, there would be relief to that extent for the retail merchant, but the retail merchant would not be likely to prosecute the wholesale man. Then the wholesale man may contend that he bought the article in good faith from the manufacturer, and perhaps he did, but nevertheless he would have to pay costs. The wholesale man would say to the manufacturer: The article I purchased from you has been proved to be adulterated. I showed I bought it in good faith, but nevertheless, I have to pay costs, and you will either have to pay me the costs or I will have to prosecute you for it. The person from whom he bought, knowing it to be adulterated, would quietly hand in the costs, and so there would be no punishment for adulteration. Here is obviously a difficulty which the Secretary of State does not seem to have provided against.

Mr. McLELAN. I will have the matter considered by legal minds in order to ascertain whether anything additional is required to effect the purpose we all have in view, before the final stage is taken.

On section 9,

Mr. CASEY. A schedule of the articles exempted should have been prepared and appended to the Bill. It is contrary to good practice and exact legislation to pass so many Bills as we do leaving schedules to be adopted by Order in Council. The officers of the Department do not know so much about the business of the country as do members of the House.

Mr. McLELAN. New articles are being constantly brought into use, and the schedule would have to be constantly amended.

Mr. CASEY. Of course specific articles could not be put in, but I think there might be such a classification of articles as would include them all, as, for example, hermetically sealed and opened. I did not object to the frequent amendment of the Bill, though perhaps some one else did; but if so, it arises from putting the Bill through in an imperfect form in the first instance.

On section 11,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That dispenses with giving notice to the person, as the old Act required. What was the reason for dropping it?

Mr. McLELAN. We intend that the local analyst shall not know whose goods he is analysing, and for that reason the notice has been dropped.

On section 12,

Mr. MILLS. This is determining a person's civil rights, not by an ordinary judicial tribunal, but by an irresponsible person.

Mr. CASEY. The chief analyst is appointed to exercise the functions of a judge, with a special scientific knowledge of the case, and I do not see why there should be any reference to the Minister, except to subject the Minister to a great amount of worry and solicitation by persons whose goods are condemned, and to put the Minister in a very invidious position.

Mr. McLELAN. Cases might arise in which the chief analyst on scientific principles might condemn a certain article, and subject the offender to very heavy penalties, while there might be mitigating circumstances which ought to be considered by the Minister.

Mr. CASEY. The remarks of the hon. gentleman only confirm my opinion as to the objectionable nature of this clause. This Bill provides for the case of certain mitigating circumstances, and there might be others put in the Bill if necessary. It is left in the other clauses of the Bill to the analyst to determine the facts, and to a court to determine whether the mitigating circumstances exist, but here an irresponsible party is empowered to take cognisance of mitigating circumstances not mentioned in the Bill. If there are mitigating circumstances they should not be left to the judgment of a political Minister, who is not himself an expert, but should be made part of the law. It will lead to all sorts of political and personal pressure being brought to bear on him, which if he resists will make him enemies, while, if he gives way to the pressure, he will be doing an injustice. I think this provision should be struck out of the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. I have no doubt it would contribute to the comfort and ease of the Minister not to have this appeal, but I think it is proper that there should be some final decision or else great hardship might be inflicted.

Mr. CASEY. Two analysts must have found the drug to be adulterated before the Minister can intervene, and how can a Minister who is not a chemist revise that decision? How could the Minister presume to revise his decision as to the purity of the drug? That is absurd—the Minister will not do so; he will simply say, the article being found to be adulterated, whether the penalties of the law should be inflicted on the person who manufactured or sold it.

Mr. DAVIES. I fail to understand the effect of section 12. Section 11 provides that when an analyst has analysed an article and declared it to be adulterated, his certificate may be given in evidence in a court of law on a prosecution for the recovery of the penalty, subject to the right of the party prosecuted to cross-examine him before that court. But by section 12, if an appeal is made to the chief analyst, and the chief analyst makes his decision, which is concurred in by the Minister, that decision is declared to be final, and there is no provision that the certificate of the chief analyst shall be brought in in evidence at all. I would like to know from some of the law advisers of the Government what is to be the effect of that provision.

Mr. BLAKE Perhaps the hon. Minister would state whether this clause is based on any English legislation.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware that it was taken from English legislation, but it was adopted by Parliament last Session. I suppose that the certificate of the chief analyst would stand in the same position as the certificate of the other analyst, and would be used in the same way in the prosecution. The word "final" in section 12 I take to mean that process by which the certificate is reached is final.

Mr. DAVIES. There is nothing which makes the certificate itself evidence. The decision may have to be proved otherwise.

Mr. CASEY. I think the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition, as to whether this proposal to make the decision of the chief analyst subject to the concurrence of the Minister was derived from English legislation, must have been rather satirical. I think it would be absurd to look into any statute of England, where legislation generally goes on the basis of common sense, for any such provision as this. This is a Bill practically to establish a court to try the purity of food offered for sale—a court of two grades, the analyst and the chief analyst. After these chemists have analysed the article and decided it to be pure or im-

pure, as the case may be, and have given their certificates to the Minister of Inland Revenue, all appearance of common sense vanishes from the Bill, and we are told that the Minister is to revise that decision and find out whether the article is chemically pure or not. Nothing can be more absurd or mischievous than to give a Minister power to cancel a certificate of adulteration made by the chief analyst. That is what he will be asked to do time and again; he will never be asked to cancel a certificate of purity; but when a certificate is given by the chief analyst that so and so's goods are adulterated, and that so and so will become liable to heavy penalties, the Minister is to take into account, as he says himself, the "mitigating circumstances," and by the light of these he is to decide, not whether the man should pay a penalty or not, but whether the article is pure or not. That is to be decided by the mitigating circumstances, and the only reason the Minister gives for this provision is that it was passed last Session. There were a great many bad precedents set by the legislation of last Session, and if this escaped attention at that time, that is no reason why it should escape now. The only effect of this section is to give the Minister power to let off persons who are certified by the two analysts to be liable to the penalty. If the Minister is weak, it will only defeat the ends of justice, and if he is strong, it will go far to defeat the Government. To avoid any such dilemma, I move:

That the words, "if concurred in by the Minister," be struck out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see that in the Act passed last Session, there was a sub-section to the clause providing:

"This section shall not have force or effect until a chief analyst is appointed, to whom an appeal under this section can be made."

That is not found in the present Act. I would take that as an indication that the chief analyst had either been appointed or was to be appointed after the 1st of July, when this comes into effect.

Mr. McLELAN. The chief analyst has been appointed.

Mr. PATERSON. The provision that the decision of the chief analyst, if concurred in by the Minister, shall be final, may give rise, it seems to me, to difficulty. I do not see why the words, "concurred in by the said Minister," should be there. The clause provides that the party proceeded against shall have the right of appealing from the decision of the first analyst to that of the chief analyst. If the two concur, I think the decision should be final, and in that respect this amendment has my support. If they do not concur, there might then be occasion for reference to the Minister.

Mr. DAVIES. That would be very improper. The question is simply whether the article is pure or impure. The first analyst says it is impure. From that decision you appeal to the chief analyst, and he either affirms or reverses it. In either event, it is not a fact of which the Minister has cognisance, for he is not an analyst. He ought not to have the power of reviewing the decision of the chief analyst. The amendment is a good one. The decision of the chief analyst should not be prejudiced by that of the Minister, who has not the means of knowledge on the subject, and the party against whom a decision may be given should not be allowed to escape through, perhaps, political influence.

Mr. McLELAN. Suppose that the first analyst declares that one of the ingredients is impure. The vendor takes exception to that and appeals to the chief analyst. He declares that the ingredient complained of is pure, but that some other ingredient is impure, and the article should therefore be condemned. There is a difference of opinion upon the different ingredients of the article. In that case the Minister would no doubt inform himself on the subject from competent people outside and give his decision. I am sure however the duty is not one that the Minister is anxious to have imposed on him, and I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue would be glad to be relieved from it.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. I suggest to the Minister that, if he intends this section to be workable, the certificate given by the chief analyst should be made evidence, which it is not now.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. CASEY. Is it contemplated to publish the names of the persons whose goods have been examined and found to be adulterated?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. CASEY. It is a question whether it would not be a part of the well deserved punishment of those who sell adulterated goods to have their names published, excluding the honestly ignorant retailer who is exempt from the other penalties of the Act, but referring to the wicked and mischievous fabricator of the adulterated goods.

Mr. McLELAN. We might insert "and the names of the vendors."

Mr. MILLS. It has been reported to me that a manufacturer of spice and coffee receives orders for packages of ground coffee at a price named which is less than the actual price of the unground coffee. It is known that chickory or roasted beans or peas must be put into the article, and it is manufactured to supply a demand. People know they are not getting a pure article. Everyone is informed of the fact, and one manufacturer in the city of London told me that, if he were to observe the law, he would have to close his establishment.

Mr. McLELAN. No, he would label it "coffee with bean mixture."

Mr. CASEY. I hope the amendment will exclude the name of anyone innocent of wilful adulteration under the Act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I hope the Minister will agree to that amendment. The names of innocent parties might be published to the world, and I cannot see that any benefit would accrue to the public from the adoption of such a change.

Mr. McLELAN. I will allow the clause to stand over, in order to see if the views of hon. gentlemen can be met.

Mr. DAVIES. I agree with the member for Elgin that the clause would be worthless unless the public were informed where they could find articles that were not adulterated. The object of the Act is to punish men who adulterate food, but we should be careful in punishing the guilty not to implicate an innocent man.

Mr. FISHER. I do not see how an innocent man can be hurt, because it is only when adulteration is found to exist that a report is made.

Mr. McLELAN. At present the names of the parties who have adulterated foods or drugs are published in the report.

On section 15,

Mr. MILLS. I am not going to detain the committee by arguing the question of jurisdiction, but that question does arise in many of these sections. There is nothing we are doing here to interfere with the manner in which a person deals with these particular articles, that would not apply to every other kind of property. We may say the agriculturist

shall only sow a particular kind of wheat, that he shall not engage in raising a particular breed of cattle, and that if he does he shall be liable to punishment; or, if he wishes to sell them, he shall bring them into market in a particular way. In all these cases we are interfering with the possession of property, with the manner in which it shall be held and disposed of. Now, I say in all these matters we are interfering with the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures in matters of property and civil rights. I defy any member of the committee to show in what respect the Local Legislatures shall have control over property and civil rights, if we have here power to do what we are undertaking to do in this matter. We are undertaking to say how property shall be held, and the condition on which it shall be offered for sale. We undertake to say whether certain kinds of property or products shall be mixed, and what sort of inspection they shall be subject to. I say these are all outside our jurisdiction. They are not within our functions, they are questions as to the possession of property, the protection of property, and the protection of the civil rights of the community. They are not matters as to the regulation of trade at all. They are not matters regulating commerce, but they are regulating the rights of property, the mode of its transfer, and the civil right of the party with whom the property holder for the time being undertakes to deal. It does seem to me we are wholly outside our jurisdiction; and no matter whether the legislation is wise or unwise, it is legislation that ought not to be undertaken by this Parliament, but by the Local Legislatures.

Mr. DAVIES. I have never been able myself to entertain any clear opinion as to what legislation is within the local jurisdiction or not, since the decision of the Privy Council in the case of Russell *vs.* The Queen. They based their decision on the right of this Parliament to enact the Scott Act on the ground it was comprised in the words "peace, order and good government of Canada." I think the question is, at any rate, debatable, and at first blush would commend itself to my mind as a matter that would be in the power of this Parliament to legislate upon in the direction of preventing the general adulteration of food, and would come within the words "peace, order and good government of Canada," as much as the liquor traffic—I should think so when taken in connection with the sub-section of section 91, Trade and Commerce. There is, of course, a great deal in what my hon. friend from Bothwell says; but since the decision of the Privy Council a wider opening has been given to the powers of this Parliament, and we base them to a large extent upon those words more than we did formerly. It does seem to me that it is for the good government of Canada that we should have the power to legislate against the adulteration of food. Of course, we all agree there is no more important subject than the prevention of the adulteration of food and drink, and it can hardly be contended that the prevention of adulteration is purely a civil right. I think it comes within the power of this Parliament.

Mr. McLELAN. I think when there is a difference of opinion on this question it is our duty in the meantime to see that the people are not being poisoned, and we ought not to wait until this question is settled. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), has just said that it is a matter of great moment that the food and drink of the people shall not be adulterated. I certainly think it is, and therefore I think we ought to go on and prevent that adulteration.

Mr. MILLS. I would just say in reply to my hon. friend from Queen's that the question of jurisdiction arises in every section of the Bill, and I do not think that the rule laid down by the Privy Council in The Queen *vs.* Russell, applies to this case.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has no right to discuss a constitutional question on the clauses of this Bill.

Mr. MILLS. I am discussing the question of jurisdiction, and it is pertinent on every clause. Now, in that case, the Privy Council said that the punishment of offences against the law with regard to the sale of liquor might come within the jurisdiction of the Provinces if it could be shown that the Provinces had jurisdiction over the subject matter; but unfortunately the parties who were engaged in arguing the case on behalf of the Provinces, did not seem to know that that would be a subject coming within provincial jurisdiction. If that fact had been shown it is clear from the observations made by the Lords of Council, they would have held that it was within provincial jurisdiction. If I had the case here I could read the particular words used by the Lords of Council to show that that was the view they held, and it was because the parties who appeared on behalf of the Provinces failed to show that the judgment was given as it was—at all events that is a somewhat different case from this. It was a question of police regulation throughout the entire Dominion. This is a question relating to property, it is an attempt to protect the purchaser against fraud on the part of the vendor. The relation between the vendor and purchaser is a civil right. This is not a measure for the preservation of peace and good order and good government, to prevent riots and bloodshed or the disturbance of the peace, but for the purpose of regulating the relations between vendor and purchaser, and is an attempt to protect the purchaser against fraud on the part of the vendor. That, I repeat, is purely a civil right and as such is within the jurisdiction of the Provinces.

On section 17,

Mr. CASEY. I think some provision should be inserted in this clause to provide that not more than a certain proportion of fusil oil should be put in whiskey. I desire to enquire whether the schedule covers all chemical ingredients that are put into whiskey.

Mr. McLELAN. Additions can be made to the schedule.

On section 19,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I want the Minister to consider this point. The object of the Bill is not absolutely to prevent persons selling articles composed in part of ingredients which lessen the value of what purports to be the main article. Take, for instance, the article of coffee. If chicory or some other foreign substance is found in it, it would be an adulterated article within the meaning of the Act. Well, if a person wanted a twenty cent coffee it would include a certain proportion of chicory, and what is to prevent the manufacturer from putting in a larger quantity and selling it at the same price? I think it might be arranged that there should be certain grades, as I believe there are in England, according to the quantity of the innocent foreign article introduced, and that the purchaser might be secured in not paying for a grade ranking higher than the actual quantity of the admixture would entitle it to rank—whether, in fact, it was an article largely adulterated or slightly adulterated.

Mr. McLELAN. I think section 19, prescribing the limits of variability, would meet the case, as it would provide for different standards. It provides also that where there are not existing standards, they may be prescribed by notice in the *Gazette*.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me that the language of the clause would hardly cover what I mean. I can understand that under that clause the Governor in Council might say that coffee must not be adulterated, say more than one-fourth. But what I mean is that the article shall be so labelled that the purchaser will know that he is buying not only adulterated coffee or confectionery but the

amount of the adulteration—the amount of the harmless foreign article which is included in it.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the point would be covered by stipulating that the person selling any of these mixtures should state on each package in what proportion the different ingredients are there.

Mr. WELLS. Suppose they are not in packages?

Mr. CASEY. Of course there would be some difficulty then.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think that it would be possible to carry out that idea without a great deal of trouble and expense to the dealer, in the way of stamping standards and so on. I think it would be better that such articles should be declared exempt from the Act unless they are labelled mixtures.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That would render the whole clause valueless.

Mr. CASEY. The whole Bill proceeds on the principle that the purchaser has a right to know what he is buying, and if he has that right with regard to simple substances, he surely has the same right to know the ingredients of mixtures. Now, a great majority of the articles sold are mixtures of non-hurtful substances—there are different grades of tea, coffee, and so on. I do not see any difficulty in providing that each package of a mixture should be labelled with a statement of the proportion in which the different articles enter into it. For instance, a pound of 20c. coffee mixture might be labelled three parts coffee, one part chicory. I think one-fourth or one-fifth would be a low enough standard, and it would not give too much work to the Department to make up these grades.

Mr. McLELAN. That would embarrass dealers very greatly. It would lead to endless trouble in labelling all the various grades of goods, although it might be in the interest of the public.

Mr. CASEY. If the grades were established, dealers would have sets of labels, such as coffee mixture No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, and so on. I do not think the amount of trouble to be undergone is any reason for shirking that trouble. If we are going to provide for the inspection of food at all, we must make it thorough, no matter what it costs.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It does seem to me that, without some condition of this kind, the whole usefulness of that part of the Act will be destroyed. It is important that when goods are put on the market the person purchasing them should know whether he is getting value for his money or not. We contemplate saying to the manufacturer: You shall have the opportunity of adulterating your goods, provided the adulteration is not injurious to health; but it reduces the value of the goods, and therefore we make it incumbent upon you, in proportion as you reduce the value, to state on your label the quantity of the foreign ingredient that you have introduced. For instance, if the article is coffee, let the manufacturer be required to label it "coffee mixture, three-fourths pure." If on an analysis it is found to contain more than one-fourth of the foreign ingredient, he shall be held to have violated the Act. This seems to me so important that I think an effort should be made to accomplish it; and in this way you will accomplish it without any hardship on the manufacturer, and you will do away with that competition which exists among the manufacturers, and which leads them to reduce the price of the article sold by increasing the quantity of the foreign substance in it. The tendency will also be to induce people to demand a pure article, which will be in the interest of both the trade and the consumer.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter will be considered by the House, and if it is the sense of the House that that should be adopted, and that it would not be too onerous to the trade to require the exact proportions of foreign substance to be specified, I have no objection to its being added to the Bill.

Mr. KRANZ. I believe that for practical purposes it is not necessary to distinguish the various grades of adulteration; we should only distinguish between pure goods and adulterated goods. We want our people to use pure goods; we want them to give them pure coffee; if they want to adulterate it they can do so for themselves; but if an article is adulterated, it is immaterial to know how far the adulteration has taken place.

Mr. MILLS. If we have power to deal with the subject at all, there can be no possible objection in requiring the quantity of the foreign ingredient to be indicated. For instance, a dealer in the country orders from a manufacturer of coffee so much ground coffee, worth so much; he wants to get an article suited to the demand; he knows that pure coffee cannot be obtained for the price he is willing to pay; he knows beforehand that it is adulterated, but it is important that the public at large should know. There can be no objection therefore that the manufacturers should mark on the packages the quantities in the mixture.

Mr. KRANZ. I think it would be very difficult to find out the extent of the adulteration.

On section 20,

Mr. CASEY. There is a provision in this section which may act harshly on the vendor. Articles of the same nature is rather a wide description. For instance, if a sample of adulterated coffee were found in a store, a strict construction of this clause would allow the excise to seize not only all the coffee adulterated but all the other coffee. The sample is subject to analysis; it may take some time before it will be analysed and in the meantime the vendor will be subject to the seizure.

Mr. McLELAN. We will insert the words "of the same kind and quality."

Mr. DAVIES. There will be some difficulty in carrying that out. The Minister might rather state with other articles of the same nature which belong to another person and which are found in the same place at another time. If a package is seized for analysis it may take some time before it is analysed, and when the excise officer went to seize the balance it might be sold or have been taken away; and to prevent the seizure of other coffee obtained since then, I would suggust that the words "which may have been in the place which at the time when the articles was seized," replace those in the Bill.

Mr. WILSON. How is the officer going to prove that the article was there at the time. It would be very difficult for him to prove that or for the vendor to prove it was not there. This will be thoroughly impracticable. While we are perfectly willing to provide that no article should be adulterated, we ought not to embarrass the trader, and I think we are throwing sufficient difficulties around him already, and ought not to place him in such a position when there is really no necessity for it.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resoved itself into Committee.

On section 22,

Mr. FISHER. Does the Minister intend to include the second sub section or not?

Mr. McLELAN. I propose to leave it in the Bill. I stated to the hon. gentleman before recess that I would get the opinion of the Minister of Justice on certain points raised by gentlemen opposite in connection with this subsection, and some other clauses.

On section 25,

Mr. FISHER. I think when it is specified that a person knowingly attaches the label, $5 is a very small bottom limit for the penalty.

Mr. McLELAN. It may be $50.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but it may be only $5. It seems to me $50 would not be too much.

Mr. McLELAN. Make it not less than $50 nor more than $200.

Mr. FISHER. I think that would be going a little too far in the other direction.

Mr. McLELAN. I propose that it should be "not exceeding $100 and not less than $20."

Mr. WILSON. I think that is a very large penalty. I think the clause as it stood answered all the purposes of the Act.

Amendmet agreed to; and committee arose and reported progress.

CULLING AND MEASURING TIMBER.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution (page 2419) to amend the Acts relating to the culling and measuring of timber in Ontario and Quebec.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McLELAN. In 1877 there was an amendment to the Act regulating the cullers, and provision was made for reducing the number, as it was found that the number was greater than the wants of the trade called for. At that time there were about sixty cullers on the list; that number was reduced, some of them were retired on annuities, and the number was fixed for square timber. It is still found that the number of licensed cullers is greater than the wants of the trade require. There are now 47 cullers, and it is proposed to reduce the number to 33 to be in active service, limiting the number of deal cullers to 12; and also it is proposed to retire certain of them on annuities. It has been found in practice that while some of them earn large amounts, others receive a very small income, owing to the mode in which dealers select their cullers. It is true that every culler who is licensed is compelled to take his turn in the office and to wait till his turn arrives. But merchants sometimes arrange so as to get the man they prefer by giving a small order to the man, for instance, who goes on to-day, and another small order to the man who is on to-morrow, and the day after their man would come on and they would give him a large order. And so it went on, and a few cullers earned a great deal while others earned a comparatively small amount. The average pay to cullers last year was over $800, and it is proposed to regulate their employment and to make a uniform salary of $700. The expenses connected with the office are proposed to be raised from the services performed and from timber fees to be regulated according to Order in Council, based upon the expenses which it is desired to cover. There has been in past years a considerable surplus, in consequence of which the fees were lowered, and it is proposed to give the Governor in Council power to change the fees from time to time in order to meet the expenditure that may be incurred, either in the payment of annuities, or of the salaries of the cullers, and the expenses of the office.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any communications been received from the trade in respect to this proposed change?

Mr. McLELAN. The lumber trade is not so much interested, perhaps, in this proposition as the cullers themselves. It is proposed to put them upon a more uniform basis whilst securing equal results.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the cullers are interested, but the trade is also, because I well remember when this subject was a burning subject, and when the present Auditor General, who represented a lumber constituency, and my hon. friend from the other riding of Renfrew (Mr. White), and several other hon. members, used to engage in considerable discussion, which culminated in the passing of the Act to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. It certainly was at that time considered an object of some consequence to the trade. Thb hon. gentleman has stated a plan by which the trade could obtain its favorite cullers from time to time, and he seems to point out some mischiefs which have resulted—that some of the cullers got too much and others too little; and he says it is proposed to regulate their employment by authorising the Governor in Council to provide for a mode in which the work shall be done. Of course, that may be a very important matter, a very serious matter, for the trade. The hon. gentleman proposes to retire a certain number of men who are at present on active service. How is it proposed that the requirements shall be effected? Does he propose to leave it to the Governor in Council to choose the persons who shall be retired? The result will be the addition of a very large sum to the annual charges in regard to which no services are to be rendered by the annuitants, and the charges will have to be increased. This reduction of staff is in consequence of the trade having decayed, and we must take care not to increase too largely the charges on a decaying trade. In that view the trade has a consideraele interest in the proposal of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McLELAN. Not quite so many as I have named will be retired. It is proposed to pay the cullers $700 per annum, whereas last year they received $800. The expenditure last year was not so large.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's calculations will not work out. Some of the cullers receive barely anything in fees, and these, I suppose, will be retired at $300 a year. Is it intended to pay each culler retained $700 whether he does much work or not?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. It is important that the House should know the amount of work performed by these men now, as compared with some years ago, and the number of them employed now, compared with formerly.

Mr. McLELAN. There was very much more work to do a number of years ago than there is now. At that time there were sixty cullers employed. In 1877 the number of square timber cullers was reduced to eighteen, but the number of the whole still remained over forty. It is now proposed to reduce the number to thirty-three, which is due to the reduction of the work required to be done and the circumstance that the trade has changed largely.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the surplus been pretty nearly exhausted?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, and it is under consideration whether the fees should not now be increased.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, if the surplus has been exhausted, the hon. gentleman ought to be prepared to give us figures

showing his whole scheme, and how it will balance the account. We know that a good deal of noise takes place when fees are raised, and quite lately the hon. gentleman has been beset by deputations asking that the canal tolls should be lowered. The same thing may happen if he proposes to raise these other fees.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it would be wise to put in the Bill any scheme of fees. It would be better to leave that in the hands of the Governor in Council to arrange as the requirements of the service demands.

Mr. BLAKE. I think so far as the public revenue is concerned it would be well that he should provide that these annuities should be provided out of the fees, and not made a charge on the consolidated revenue. In this way the accounts would have to be stated in a more thorough manner than has yet been done.

Mr. McLELAN. There is one difficulty connected with that, and that is, that though the account may not balance in a particular year, owing to the state of the trade, if two years were taken it might balance.

Mr. MILLS. What we are entitled to expect at the hands of the Government is a general statement, showing what amount has been received in fees, what the diminution has been, taking a series of years, and what is the probable amount of fees received under existing charges. We have had no estimate upon which an intelligent action can be taken.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give us a statement of the expenditures for 1878, 1879 and 1880.

Mr. McLELAN. In 1878 the expenditure was $49,940, in 1879, $44,670, and in 1880, $44,652.

Mr. VAIL. I understood the Minister to say that there are 47 cullers now employed.

Mr. McLELAN. Not quite 47. There will be a reduction in number.

Mr. BLAKE. The deficiency since 1879 has been about $65,000 as well as I can make it out. Can the hon. gentleman say how the account stands to-day, whether we are on the wrong side of the balance sheet or not?

Mr. McLELAN. We are on the wrong side. In 1879, we had a surplus of $50,000, which has gradually gone down until it is exhausted.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear that there must be a deficiency of $10,000 or $15,000 now. In 1884 the deficiency was about $11,000, so that it really becomes a serious matter. If the practical result of the hon. gentleman's change is a reduction in the expenditure, that would be so far satisfactory; but I think the state of things which has resulted in a chronic deficiency since the year 1879 is a state of things which renders it absolutely essential that he should give us some forecast of what the ultimate charges are to be. The hon. gentleman knows how long annuitants live, and I am afraid his experiments will hardly be satisfactory. I trust that at the next stage of the measure the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give us some fuller information as to how this scheme of his can be entertained without any serious loss or liability on the part of the public. The danger of making such an arrangement as has been made is pretty well demonstrated by the figures before us, and if we make a readjustment we should see that it is such as will lead in the future to the results which the hon. gentleman has depicted.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would like to ask the Minister what are the fees of culling staves and deals per hundred now in force.

Mr. BLAKE

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the scale of fees here. I will get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Committee rose and reported resolution.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILISERS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved the second reading of Bill (No. 122) respecting Agricultural Fertilisers. He said: I think it would be better to ask the House to go into committee before giving explanations, because the Bill is composed of so many little details that it might be more convenient to discuss it in committee. I will explain, however, that the Bill has for its object that every manufacturer and every importer of fertilisers—and by the word "fertilisers" all kinds of agricultural manure are not included, but only fertilisers which I think would be better called in this, as well as in the Act which the House has examined this afternoon, by the appellation of commercial fertilisers, that is to say fertilisers that are in trade—shall transmit to the Minister of Inland Revenue at a certain period of the year, and we say the month of January, and before offering for sale, a sample of such fertiliser, the quantity being 2 lbs., so as to be preserved in the Department for the purpose of comparison with any other sample that might afterwards be transmitted to the Department for comparison and for the different objects of the Bill. That transmission is to be made with an affidavit of the manufacturer or importer stating that the sample which he transmits to the Department is a fair sample of the article manufactured or sold. The second object of the Bill is that no commercial fertiliser be offered for sale unless a certificate of analysis of the same be openly and publicly printed or stamped or labelled on the package or bag or barrel, containing the said fertiliser, and, if the fertiliser is in bulk, that the certificate of analysis of the manufacturer be also delivered with the article when sold or offered for sale. You will see by this that the object at first is not to enforce an inspection, but to guarantee the public that the article which will be sold will be an article of which a sample is preserved under the custody of the authorities, and that the article sold is sold with that certificate testifying to the quality of the article, the correctness of which may always be decided by the analysts of the Department to which it belongs. The Bill goes further and says that, if the manufacturer or the importer or the retailer wishes to have a certificate of inspection from the inspector, he may have it, and then the inspector will attach to the package or the other covering of the fertiliser, not a certificate, but what is called the inspector's tag, that is, a label saying that the fertiliser has been submitted to inspection. That inspection, I must say, does not mean that what the inspector shall deliver on the label given by him will be another certificate of analysis by the Department, but only that the inspector has seen that the fertiliser sold contains, according to the analysis of the fertiliser, a certain quantity of ingredients which are presumed to be necessary to constitute a fertiliser under the terms of the Act, that is, a fertiliser at least of the commercial value of $10 a ton. The inspector shall not furnish that tag or label, or certify an inspection, unless the article he inspects is presumed to contain the quantity of ingredients which are mentioned in clause 11 of the Bill. Clause 12 mentions the penalties that will be imposed upon parties guilty of the following offences: First, offering for sale an article—and we must not forget that it is a fertiliser of a certain value, because the law does not want to prevent the importation of an article of lower value, bringing it nearer to the standard of ordinary manure—offering for sale any fertiliser unless every provision of the Act has been complied with, unless the article which is sold contains the ingredients which are mentioned in these certificates of analysis which the vendor is obliged to give to the purchaser, and that if the seller has asked for an inspector's certificate, the inspector's

certificate must be guaranteed by the certificate of analysis, and that the person giving to the inspector the certificate of analysis, whereas the article sold would not have the quantity of ingredients required, will also be exposed to a fine. The other clauses are for those who might force certificates or labels or tags, or who might apply to one quality of fertiliser the certificate belonging to another quality. In a word, the Act is limited to this: First the manufacturer or importer shall be obliged to transmit a sample of his merchandise to the Department of Inland Revenue, there to be submitted to analysis; the party selling a fertiliser is obliged to guarantee to the public purchasing the product that he sells, by a certificate of analysis that must be attached to the packages sold or given, when it is in bulk, that he must sell an article equivalent in quality to the certificate of analysis he is obliged to give; and, secondly, when anyone has put in trade an article which has been inspected, he may require from an inspector his certificate, and those not complying with the provisions of the law, or complying with it apparently but not really, will be subjected to the penalties mentioned in the Act.

Mr. FISHER. Before this Bill goes into committee, I would like to say a word or two about it. I think the Secretary of State is quite right in saying that the details of the Bill are such it would be better to discuss it in committee than on the second reading. At the same time, there are one or two things I would like to refer to. I think this Bill and that which we have discussed this afternoon with regard the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilisers are so intimately connected that it is a good thing they have come up on the same day and can be so closely compared. There are some parts of this Bill which I think are unnecessary, in view of the provisions contained in the Bill discussed this afternoon with regard to the penalties to which the Secretary of State has alluded. I find that the penalties under the two Bills, although they apply to the same offence, are not exactly the same, and I do not see why in one a different penalty should be attached to an action than that which is attached to the same action in the other. The Secretary of State has explained that the inspector shall obtain a certificate from the manufacturer, informing him, and supposed to inform the public through him, of what are the constituents of the agricultural fertilisers which are inspected, the inspector is then required to affix his tag to the package or sample, and it is suppose thereby he is adding to the information concerning that sample or package, but I find no provision in the Bill which insists upon the inspector obtaining an analysis of the article. I do not therefore see that there is any great advantage to be had in attaching this tag by the inspector. He is simply acting on the information supplied him by the manufacturer or dealer, and is obtaining no other information of his own. It seems to me therefore that this attachment of the tag of the inspector is really adding a fictitious value to the goods, and is perhaps assisting in a fraud more than guarding against a fraud. If in addition to the certificate of the analyst, which must be supplied by the manufacturer, the inspector himself were required to analyse the sample, his certificate or tag would be given a very great additional authority, but, under the present system, I do not see that it is any gain at all to the purchaser. I think, therefore, unless some provision to this effect is inserted, the provision of the Act in regard to adulteration of food and agricultural fertilisers, by which the vendor is obliged to put upon record a statement of the ingredients and the standard to which the article comes up, would be quite sufficient, and just such as much as is really done in this Bill. Merely drawing the attention of the Secretary of State and the House to these points, which are general in their scope, I will allow the motion to proceed and discuss the details of the Bill in committee.

Mr. LANGELIER. I approve entirely of the principle embodied in this Bill, which, if I remember aright, is the Bill that was suggested by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) some months ago, but I am afraid the 3rd clause of the Bill will not obtain the object in view, that of securing the sale of fertilisers of the proper strength. I am speaking from something which came under my notice when I was Commissioner of Crown Lands for Quebec. At that time there was a great, I might call it, fever for the manufacture of phosphates. Some very rich mines of phosphate had been found in the townships of Templeton, Portland, Wakefield, and some other townships in the Ottawa Valley. Our exporters of phosphate came to me and asked whether it could not be possible to have an inspection of the phosphate before it was exported, and the reason they gave was that they were being defrauded in England to a large extent. From the information they gave me this was the way they were defrauded at that time, and I suppose the same thing has gone on since. The phosphate was sold here at so much a ton, according to the amount of phosphorous or other fertilising substance it contained, but the phosphate sent to England, sold on those terms, was analysed. It was referred for analysis to a chemist, who was generally quite a scientific man, but of course he only tested the sample which was delivered to him. According to the test those phosphate manufacturers in Canada made here before exporting, the exported phosphate should have given say 80 or 90 per cent. of phosphorous, but the samples analysed in England were found to contain only 50 or 60 per cent. They thought at first there was ignorance or dishonesty on the part of the English analysts, but at last it was discovered that the English purchaser took the precaution to select the very worst samples, and submitted them to the analysts. In every lot of phosphate there are some lumps of inferior description, which would give 40 or 50 per cent. only of phosphorous, whereas the whole lot might contain an average of at least 80 or 85 per cent. The result of the whole lot being averaged on these inferior samples submitted to the analyst was that our exporters were defrauded to such an extent that they said it was perfectly impossible for them to compete with exporters from other countries, for instance Spain, unless an inspection was made by the Local Government in this country before the ore was actually exported to England.

Now, in section 3 of this Bill, the same danger is to be feared on the part of our exporters which has been realised in an inverse manner on the part of the foreign purchaser. The section provides that every manufacturer or importer of fertilisers for sale shall transmit to the Minister of Inland Revenue, each year, a fair average sample of the fertiliser manufactured or imported by him. Well, it is left to the manufacturer himself to determine the quality of the sample to be inspected. If in England the importer has been able to defraud our exporters by selecting the very worst sample, it will be very easy for our manufacturers—I do not say they will be dishonest enough to perjure themselves—but there will be great temptation to them to select a sample which will certainly be above the average. Averages are always very dangerous. I am afraid we will not obtain an average oath from the manufacturer, or an oath which will go very much above the average.

The best plan would be to have those phosphates inspected under the same rules which govern the inspection of other articles. I do not say that inspection should be compulsory, but provision should be made that whenever a purchaser of phosphates or of any other fertiliser desires it to be inspected, the inspection should be made by a Government officer,

and that the inspection should not be based upon those small samples which the manufacturers deliver once a year to the Minister of Inland Revenue. I agree with the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) that a great deal of fraud is committed against farmers by manufactures of so-called fertilisers, and the inspection is certainly very proper.

Mr. POPE. I am fully in accord with the hon. gentleman as to the frequency of the adulteration of fertilisers, but I cannot agree with him in some other of his remarks. Suppose you have 50 barrels of a fertiliser in a manure. You put that in a heap and divide it into quarters, then you quarter each one of those again. And so you go on until you get a quantity upon which you can make a proper essay. The thing the hon. gentleman speaks of could not happen in England. Now the course usually pursued in this country, the United States and England is this: I am going to send 100 barrels, say, of mineral to market. Following the course I have pointed out I make my essay, I reduce it down by mixing it up in the way I have described until I get it, perhaps, down to a shovel full, and with that I make my essay. This cargo is sent to the furnace or to the parties who buy it, and it goes through exactly the same process again. If the two essays differ 2 per cent, or whatever per cent is agreed upon, then the whole thing has to be gone over again. The one is a check upon the other. I do not know what it is proposed to do here, but if it is really intended to take out a lump here and a lump there, there is no certainty at all, and would not be a reliable assay.

Mr. LANGELIER. I do not want to be considered as charging the English purchasers of phosphate with intent to defraud. I was only repeating the representations that have been made to me; I know nothing personally about it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). There is no doubt that the question involved in this Bill is one of growing importance to the agriculturists of this country. In the older Provinces especially there will be each year a growing demand for these artificial fertilisers, and we ought to see, if possible, that the farmer receives fair value for the money he pays out for these artificial manures. From the very nature of the trade there are special facilities for adulteration on account of the small proportion, according to bulk, of the elements in the manure that are of special value to the farmer, and it is easy to add to this a larger quantity of an inferior grade. Though it increases the bulk it depreciates the value of the manure for agricultural purposes while it increases the profits to the manufacturers. The case referred to by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) is a fair illustration of the difficulty. The very circumstances of the business show that the fertilising value of phosphate direct from the mines must fluctuate according to the condition in which it comes from the mines. It does not strictly come within the range of the article spoken of by this Bill, for the reason that, while it is the basis of an agricultural fertiliser, it is not in a condition to be available, because experiments have shown that phosphates, when finely reduced and applied to the soil in their natural condition, are almost of no value. They are simply the basis from which a valuable portion of these artificial manures are produced, but before they are of practical value they require to be treated with sulphuric acid or some other strong preparation to put them in a soluble condition. The percentage of the valuable element in phosphate must vary very much according to the care exercised in taking it from the mine, for the reason that phosphate is found in veins running through rock which is useless for agricultural purposes, and just in proportion as the phosphate is separated from the rock will the analysis be high or low. I believe at present the best samples of phosphate vary from 80 to 83 per cent. of soluble elements. A very large proportion of the output of the mines will not analyse more than 60 or 65 per cent. It is clear that, so far as the farmers are concerned, phosphate analysing 80 per cent. is much more valuable than that analysing only 60 per cent. It seems, however, difficult to establish any basis of inspection for phosphate, except an inspection of each lot shipped. The crude phosphate is mainly shipped to Liverpool, Glasgow and Paris as ballast, it being mixed there with other ingredients and converted into superphosphate and sold to the farmers of the old world. With respect to the practical value of the artificial manures sold to farmers, it is an entirely different branch of the question, and it is involved in the Bill now under consideration. Those fertilisers vary very much in value according to the addition of inferior matter to bring up the bulk and weight. It is a matter of prime importance to the purchaser that they should have a certain fixed standard of valuable elements, which form a very small proportion of the weight of the article, because in a comparatively pure state they would kill growing crops. Only last Session a Bill on this subject, introduced by the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue), was passed. That Act only went into force on 1st June last, and it made provision that an analysis should be attached to each of the samples of artificial manures manufactured and placed on the market for sale. That is undoubtedly the direction in which we require to go. I desire to ask the Minister whether that Bill has been practically put into operation and whether it has been found effective; or whether the Government have simply assumed the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), forgetting that the Act to which I refer was placed on the Statute Book. I agree with the Minister in charge of the Bill that this is a matter of growing importance to agriculturists; but I should like to know in what respect the Bill of the hon. member for Richelieu, now on the Statute Book, has failed to accomplish the object sought to be attained.

Mr. MASSUE. In answer to the hon. member who has just sat down, I may say that the present Bill is far ahead of the one I proposed last year, because I had no means of asking the Minister to appoint inspectors. The Council of Agriculture of the Province of Quebec would have been very glad to induce the agricultural societies, thereby the farmers, to use for their crops the best of the fertilisers; but having no means of detecting the good from the poor qualities, the council did not dare to induce the farmers in using what it had no means to recommend; but with this Bill I think we will be sure of the qualities of the different kinds of fertilisers, and, in my opinion, the Bill stating that the inspection will be under the control of the Minister of Inland Revenue will be a great help to the farmer in securing a good article for him, and to the manufacturer, in obliging him to be up to the mark.

Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FISHER. Some little time ago, after the Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), when I said a few words in support of the principle of the Bill, I received a communication from one of the largest fertiliser manufacturers of this country, known as the Standard Fertiliser Chemical Co., in which they drew attention to several parts of the measure. I examined the Bill pretty carefully with reference to the Bill of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue) last year, and also with some reference to the Bill passed this afternoon. I find, Sir, that these manufacturers have come somewhat to the same conclusion that I had pretty nearly arrived at myself, which was, that the law of last year, and the Bill putting agricultural fertilisers in with human and cattle food, subject to the inspection of the Inland Revenue officers, there

was really little necessity for this Bill at all; that the fact that the fertilisers were subject to inspection would almost obviate the necessity of making a new law. The suggestion is that if the manufacturers of these fertilisers are obliged to put on the package a label stating the qualities and relative proportions of the ingredients of those fertilisers, and are subject to a penalty for the sale of fertilisers which do not contain the ingredients stated in the label, the desired object will be almost attained, especially if the officers of the Crown are given power to prosecute those individuals and to recover from them the penalties which are in this Bill of the Minister of Inland Revenue, called the Bill respecting the adulteration of foods, drugs, and agricultural fertilisers. Perhaps the Bill has already gone too far for the Minister to withdraw it, or to make such other provisions in the other Bill as would obviate the necessity for this measure, and as notwithstanding the disclaimer of the Minister of Agriculture there is no doubt this Bill is a Government measure, we can hardly expect this step to be taken. I understood that though the Bill was introduced by a private member, the First Minister promised to take it under his protection, an announcement of which I was very glad, because I believed then that the Bill was a necessity, and that such a Bill in the hands of a private member could not be carried into law this Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps some people are confusing this Bill with another, which may be called an extension of the Bill with regard to agricultural fertilisers. This Bill is expressly to prevent fraud in the sale of commercial fertilisers, and it provides for that in an ample and complete manner. No man can import or manufacture a fertiliser to be sold at $10 a ton or over without giving an analysis of it, and a sample of it to the Department to which it belongs. Everybody selling these fertilisers is obliged to give to the public a guarantee that a sample of what he sells is sent to the authorities, and that sample must be accompanied by the affidavit of the manufacturer or importer stating that it is a fair sample of what he sells. The second guarantee is that you cannot sell at retail or wholesale, or as a manufacturer, unless you give to the purchaser a statement of what it is composed of. The third guarantee is that if you sell an article which is under the grade that has been given to the public by a certificate of the analysis, if you sell an inferior article, you shall be liable to a fine. The Bill may appear rather rigorous but I do not think it will be found so in practice. When it is known that the proper authorities will be the guardians of the samples which will be analysed, there will be the greatest precaution against trying to defraud the public. I have also received some letters since I have had charge of this Bill, from manufacturers and agriculturalists saying that they feared that the inspection will be compulsory, that they thought it might impose a burden on the retailer, and that the cost of an article selling at $2 a ton might be increased by about $2 a ton, which would be a high percentage on the article sold. I shall proceed to the examination of the different clauses, and I repeat that the Bill is essentially one to prevent frauds by people selling commercial fertilisers.

On section 2,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. After the words "of this Act" strike out all the other words until the word "they" at the end of the line, and instead of "$12" insert "$10". Also in the fourth and fifth line strike out the words "or potash."

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would ask the hon. gentleman under what application this reduction in value is made from $12 to $10 a ton. I speak, of course, from my personal knowledge only, but with us in western Ontario, it is mostly the high priced super-phosphates that are offered on the market, for which we pay $30 to $40 per ton. We are not familiar with those low grades which are placed on the market at less than $10 per ton.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The demand was made by myself originally to the hon. member for Welland. I had occasion, when presiding over the Department of Agriculture in Quebec, to have imported some bi-phosphates which are made out of sea-weed, the refuse of fish and bones. These bi-phosphates were commercial fertilisers, and were sold at $10, and I wanted them to be embraced in this Bill. They were good fertilisers, but at the time they were imported, by some accident, they proved unequal to their reputation, and were to a certain extent a failure; and consequently agricultural societies lost faith in commercial fertilisers.

Mr. BAIN. I can understand how desirable it is to bring all these agricultural manures within the range of the Act. Certainly I do not object to the Minister changing the figure from $12 to $10 per ton; I was asking for information. I can understand a manure at $10 a ton being really cheaper to a farmer than another for which he pays $40 a ton, in its effects upon his crops. There is, however, this difficulty. If you apply the same test to both manures that is required of all the manures which are examined by a practical analyst, and which contain a certain proportion of ammonia, or its equivalent of nitrogen, there will be a great deal more of impure ingredients added to the high-priced manure, unless you have some process by which you can reach the manufacturer of it. It ought to be richer in ammonia and its equivalents which really form the value of those manures for growing plants. I think it desirable that the Bill should be brought to apply to as low-priced a manure as is offered to the farmer for those purposes. I believe that in the eastern Provinces there is a large quantity of that manure manufactured from fish or bones and other ingredients which are otherwise of very little value, and I agree with the Minister that it is desirable that all these things should be brought within the range of the Act.

On section 3,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose in the second line to insert the word "January;" in the third line, after the word "year," to add "person offering the said fertiliser for sale;" in the fourth line instead of "one pound," to insert "two pounds;" and in the fifth line after the words "fertiliser, manufactured or imported by him" to insert, "with the certificate of analysis of the same."

Mr. FISHER. Sometimes a manufacturer is asked to make up a special fertiliser by order; and I suppose by the section as amended, he would be obliged when he sent that order to send a jar at the same time to the Department.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This section, which appears to be a repetition of section 3, is not. During the course of the year, when an offence may be prosecuted, the inspector will have a right to ask for a second sample from the manufacturer.

Mr. FISHER. Since the hon. Minister has amended the third clause, so that a certificate of analysis has to be sent with the sample, it does not seem to be necessary that another sample should be sent, especially as section 3 requires the manufacturer to send a specimen of every kind of manure which he may manufacture. It seems to me the 5th clause is entirely unnecessary, and will only give the officers of the Department work that is not intended, as well as hamper the manufacturers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the intention, I dare say, of the Department every year to publish with the analysis a description of the different kinds of soil to which each fertiliser would especially apply. That I think would be a great

advantage to agriculturists, but I do not think that need be inserted in the Bill.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If the Department is pleased to furnish that information attached to the analysis of each sample, I have no doubt the proprietors of those manures will take special pleasure in publishing that in circulars for their customers.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree that that is a desirable thing to be done; but I am afraid that if it is put in the report of the Department of Inland Revenue many farmers will not see it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The intention is to put it on a little card along with the analysis for free distribution to the public.

Mr. CASEY. Why are all these samples to be sent to the chief analyst? I think it would be cheaper to allow them to be analysed by the local analyst.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As the hon. gentleman will see by section 7, there must be a number of references. When the inspector will give a certificate of inspection, he will give it with a certain number. That number will answer exactly to the number of the sample which has been taken by the inspector and sent to the chief analyst to be analysed. As to having the analysis made by substitutes, I suppose the Department might arrange that.

Mr. CASEY. This clause states positively they will be sent to the Minister of Inland Revenue for submission to the chief analyst.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Submitted to him for analysis, not necessarily analysis by him.

Mr. CASEY. These words mean the chief analyst is to analyse them. If the thing is to be submitted to the chief analyst for analysis, the intent is for an analysis by the chief analyst.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So much the better.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman gave his opinion a little while ago that it would probably be well to have that analysis made in many cases by local analysts.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said if thought proper it might be done.

Mr. CASEY. This clause does not give that power, and if the hon. gentleman wants to have liberty to have the analysis made by local analysts, the clause must be changed.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The analysis to be of value requires the stamp of some one whose reputation will give that analysis value. I think, on the whole, the chief analyst ought to exercise his own discretion; it should be done under his supervision, and he should be responsible.

On section 6,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the end of the first clause I want to add "if it is in bulk, the manufacturers certificate shall be produced, and a copy given to each purchaser," and instead of section 2, I would substitute this: "No fertiliser shall be sold or offered or exposed for sale, unless the certificate of the analyst and a sample of the same shall have been transmitted to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the provisions of the foregoing sections have been complied with."

Mr. FISHER. That is already in the Bill in the 3rd section. Every manufacturer is to forward a sample, together with the certificate, and it is not necessary to have another section to say that before he sells any he shall do so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This makes it clear. You shall not have the right to sell any of these articles until that has been done, and until you have complied with the foregoing clause. It looks like a repetition, but it is only an affirmation of the thing that is said.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should we re-affirm in one clause what is said in another?

Mr. CASEY. That is affirmed already, and no harm can be done by re-affirming it, but I do not see the necessity.

Mr. BLAKE. This Bill ought to be submitted for analysis. It is being adulterated by adding to the bulk without improving the strength.

Amendments agreed to.

On section 7,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I want to propose this amendment in the first line. After the word analysis, strike out the words "if he deems it advisable so to do," and after the word "shall," in the second line, add these words, "shall if requested to do so by the manufacturer or importer or person selling the same."

Mr. FISHER. Does this clause mean that the inspector shall not apply his tag unless requested by the vendor?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. And that when he does so place his tag, it is not necessary to show that any further analysis of the article has taken place, but simply the vendor's certificate?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. In that case, I do not see any good in the following four sections. The Minister stated that the Bill was for the purpose of seeing that a commercial fertiliser was not sold unless it came up to a certain standard. I pointed that we had accomplished, in the Bill respecting the adulteration of food, drugs and agricultural fertilisers, all that this Bill is going to accomplish. We provided that anyone selling an agricultural fertiliser may stamp thereon the ingredients of that fertiliser, and that if he sold it and it was analysed by the public analyst, at the request of anybody, the officers of the Department or anyone interested, and it was proved not to come up to the analysis stamped upon it, he should be subject to a penalty. That is all this Bill provides for, and I cannot see what object there can be in providing the same thing over again. This will practically be an impediment in the way of the manufacturer and the vendor. I am anxious that every safeguard should be given to the farmers to secure that they shall receive due value for their money, but I do not wish to throw unnecessary additional impediments in the way of the manufacturers or the vendors, because whatever expense they are put to will have to be paid by the person who uses the fertiliser.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have received representations not to force that inspection upon the retailer or the merchant. We do not force it, but there is no doubt that the certificate of inspection will add to the guarantee to the public in a certain measure, because, when that inspection is given, it will be a guarantee to the public that the inspector has taken a sample of the article, has numbered it and sent it to the chief analyst for analysis. I admit that perhaps it does not add so much as if the inspector was himself given the certificate of analysis of the chief analyst; but the expenditure, which my hon. friend is afraid of, would really be too large, if it was a necessity that the analysis should be made of every article sold. The guarantee exists in the fact that the analysis has been made somewhere, and that, if there is any complaint, that analysis, with the comparison of the sample that has been given to the Department, will be the best evidence that the fraud has been

committed, if there has been a fraud. I think that, as it is, we are preventing the useless expenditure of money, in case the public would be satisfied that the inspector has not given, as will be seen by clause 11, that certificate of inspection, except when he was convinced that the produce which is sold is one which contains the ingredients which give a certain standard to the fertiliser.

Mr. CASEY. I want to understand more clearly what the inspector's tag is to have upon it. Is it to be a statement, simply, that samples have been taken for analysis, and not that the analysis has been made?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not state that the analysis has been made.

Mr. CASEY. Or, if it has been made, what the result is?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It does not state the result.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see that there will be any good in that. I cannot see any force in the hon. gentleman's argument that that certificate will be any safeguard to the public. I admit that it might create a certain impression of safety in the public mind, and I fear that it would. Any official tag of this kind would be taken by the public, who were not thoroughly acquainted with the Act, to be a certificate that the fertiliser was all right, and would be accepted by them as a certificate of the genuineness of the article, which it is not, in any degree. I think, instead of providing a safeguard, it would be very apt to mislead the public, and to be the very reverse of a safeguard, to be an injury to them, by making them think the article had been analysed and found satisfactory, when it had not been analysed at all. I do not suppose the Minister had any other intention than to provide all the safeguards possible; but if he wishes to provide a real safeguard for the public, and to give a recommendation of meritorious articles of that kind, he should insist that the sample sent up by the inspectors should be analysed as soon as sent up, and that the result of the analysis should be printed or written on the tag given out by the inspector. I do not see that there would be much more expense in putting that on the tag than in putting something else; and as far as the analysis is concerned, there is no use in our having a chief analyst, and paying him fees, unless we get some work out of him. But even in that case, there is some risk of the public suffering, from the fact that a manufacturer of compounds of this kind cannot be expected to have a perfectly uniform sample throughout the season; and although the sample examined by the chief analyst might be all right, a subsequent sample might be worse, without any corrupt intention on the part of the manufacturer. If a detailed certificate were given as to the goodness of the first sample, the customer might take that as meaning that he had a right to expect the rest as equally good. But there is no safeguard in the mere statement that samples have been sent up for analysis.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There would be this safeguard, at all events, that it would complete the chain of evidence against fraud. And there is the farther protection that the inspector, seeing this is produced, and that it bears the same number as the sample which has been sent off for analysis, it is not to be presumed that after the chief analyst has analysed a fertiliser and having the certificate of the manufacturer, as against his own experience, would allow the inspector to give a certificate to that article, unless the analysis of the chief analyst coincided with the certificate given by the manufacturer. But there is something in my hon. friend's suggestion, and I will see that an amendment is put in the Bill, that immediately after the analysis the inspector shall be supplied with a copy and attach it to his tag.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not intend that the inspector shall put the tag on until after the analysis has been made and found satisfactory.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think, after the analysis, the inspector should be informed that he should not give a certificate.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be very likely to mislead the public if there was an official announcement of this character, unless in cases where there has been a satisfactory inspection. If the public find there has been an inspection they will not scrutinise its results very closely. If there is some reason why any certificate should be given before analysis, the tag ought to contain a distinct statement that it is not upon analysis, or that it is not upon inspection—something that would show to the public that it was not intended to do that. When we consider the number of misleading advertisements, and how easily the public is gulled with illusory trade marks, we at once see how valuable such a tag might be in the case of a low grade.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that in France very severe laws have been passed against adulteration, and still the manufacturers have been successful in evading them, to some extent. I think that suggestion of my hon. friend should be adopted, that is to say, that after a certain standard for certain fertilisers has been given by the chief analyst, the inspector should be supplied with a copy of the analysis, and then a person selling under that certificate would be exposed to the rigors of the law if the article did not contain that certificate.

Mr. BAIN. The protection to the purchasers of manure is the fact that the analysis of the test sample that has been supplied to the Inland Revenue Department is the basis upon which we assume that all these grades shall be tried; and if, at a subsequent date, a farmer purchased a sample of this manure and found that it did not test equivalent to that sample under which he had received a certificate from the Department, I should think he was open to the penalties provided by this Act. There is another difficulty. This Act applies to manure worth only $10 a ton. Now, the first question a farmer asks is: Will this thing pay? If there is to be an analysis again, if there is to be a supervision of these goods introduced in bulk, and if they are to be sub-divided—and I think it will be found that the great bulk of these manures have to be sub-divided, either into sacks or barrels—it will almost necessitate that each one of these samples will require tags attached to them if the inspection is going to be of value. A dealer may bring in a couple of car loads, perhaps 25 tons, but most men will only purchase in quantities of, say, one ton. The result will be that this inspection and these certificates and tags, to be of value, would need to be applicable to this whole consignment, divided into quantities. Now here is a large field for the dishonest dealer. It is the easiest thing in the world to mix into these agricultural manures a certain quantity of worthless raw material that will add both to the bulk and weight, and until it is applied to the crops and its quality is known, the farmer has no alternative and no redress. I think it is a matter to be considered, before you provide for this inspector's certificate to be attached to the samples, whether it would be worth the cost involved, because if the inspection is made and tags have to be furnished for these articles it will all cost money, and it must be added to the price of the fertiliser. The great protection under this Bill to the purchaser is the fact that the dealer has to furnish to the Department a test sample, which must contain a certain percentage of these valuable ingredients, and a farmer, by preserving the sample he has purchased from the retail agent, and having it analysed again, shows that it does not grade up to that standard could then prosecute the dealer for fraud—if such be the case. There, it seems to me, is the place where you can catch the dishonest manufacturer.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the view of the hon. Minister, the 3rd section, which provides for sending a sample to the chief analyst for analysis, ought to go a little further, or

another section should be added, to the effect that the chief analyst should immediately analyse that and show that it agrees with the certificate of the analyst which the manufacturer himself has had, and then when the inspector is informed of that he will be able immediately, before his own sample has been sent to the inspector, to apply his tag, with the analysis upon it, and thereby give the official stamp. I do not think it is at all wise that the inspector should be allowed to put his tag or official stamp upon a package before he has obtained official recognition of the analysis of that. No doubt, if the tag was attached the majority of farmers would suppose the analysis was a correct one. The manufacturers will have to have constant communication with the inspector. That officer will have to constantly visit the manufactories as special compounds are being placed on the market.

Mr. JENKINS. The committee should bear in mind, in discussing this question, that the manufacture of fertilisers is a business largely open to fraud. I have spent many years in testing manures, and my experience has been an unfortunate one. I do not think I have obtained a cent's worth for all the money I have invested. The proposed tag will not be of much value in detecting bad manure. On the contrary, it may be made use of by a manufacturer, if he is inclined to swindle, to help him in doing so, and we should hesitate before we place an additional means of swindling in the hands of the manufacturer. I should be sorry to say that all the manufacturers of fertilisers are swindlers; but, so far as my experience goes, the majority are in great haste to get rich, and are not very particular as to the means, and, as a rule, they endeavor to get rich at the expense of the farmers. We should therefore be very careful before we place any additional means in the hands of the manufacturers to swindle the farmers. I do not see my way clear as regards this tag. It may be detached, and made use of by a manufacturer to get rid of an inferior article at the price of a prime article. It is a very difficult subject, and the farmer will have more protection from the act that an analysis is deposited with the chief analyst, and if the sample sold does not correspond with that analysis, the vendor is open to prosecution. That is sufficient protection to the farmer, and I believe it will be a greater protection than if we applied any tag.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There will not be great temptation to place a tag on an inferior article, because the person doing so will be liable to a fine of $500. The tag will be very useful as a link in the chain of evidence to convict the person who endeavored to defraud the public by selling an inferior article.

Mr. FISHER. Then the tag is a mere voluntary arrangement on the part of the seller?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. And the manufacturer has to send a sample to the Department, whether he likes it or not?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

On section 11,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move that the minimum be reduced to 5 per cent. on soluble phosphoric acid, and that, instead of 10 per cent., 8 per cent. be inserted.

Mr. BAIN. Will that not make the inspection valueless, as regards high-priced manures?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If a man manufactures a high-priced fertiliser, a sample must be sent to the Department, and he must sell according to the analysis; but the inspector shall not be allowed to place his tag and certificate upon any product which shall not come up to the minimum grade.

Mr. FISHER. Has the Department received any information from experts in these matters, as to whether $10 per ton will coincide as a standard of value with the standard of quality fixed in the Bill?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have taken these figures from the hon. gentleman who presented the Bill, but who, I am sorry to say, is not here to-night. We will not, however, ask concurrence before the hon. gentleman has arrived, when a better explanation may be given. I understand, however, from the head of the Department, that he supposes this figure will cover it.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I would suggest that they obtain through the Department some information directly from the experts in these matters, because the Bill will be valueless unless this percentage is fair and equitable as between the farmers and the manufacturer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may say that the information from the Department has come from the experience and legislation in over half a dozen of the United States, where the greatest attention has been given to these matters.

Mr. FISHER. There is another point mentioned in the letter from the manufacturing firm to which I have already referred, and that is, as to the necessity of allowing a certain margin, if it should happen, that by reason of age the compound phosphates should become resolved into insoluble phosphoric acid. I think it would be desirable that the date of the analysis should be stated in the certificate of analysis, and that some allowance of that kind should be made, in case the compound reverts to its insoluble form.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have received some information on that point, but it is one that I can leave to the hon. member for Welland, as he is going to submit an amendment, providing for 5 per cent. soluble sulphuric acid against 2 per cent. reverted.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The margin left is, I am afraid, a very small one.

Mr. CASEY. Some of these manures are not permanent compounds, but will spoil by keeping, and it stands to reason that if they should spoil by keeping they should not be sold as of the same value as before. The manure may retain its value, though it reverts to its insoluble form, which may not be of any great value, unless some new chemical compound is formed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Finely ground phosphates, which some consider not so valuable, because the soluble phosphate acid does not appear, are, by others, considered very valuable manures, because the effect is produced afterwards, though it is not visible at the time.

Mr. CASEY. The purchaser ought to know that it will only become valuable after it has been in the ground for some time.

On section 12,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the fourth line, after the word "package," I wish to add "bag or barrel," and then, in the next line, after the word "inspector," add "to accompany the bill of inspection of such inspector." On the 26th line of the page, after the words "preceding section," I wish to add "or who sells, or offers, or exposes for sale, any fertiliser which does not contain the percentage of constituents mentioned in the manufacturer's certificate accompanying the same."

Mr. CASEY. Is not this covered by the words from the 19th line down to the 24th line.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Bill originally made the inspection obligatory; now it is only permissive.

Mr. CASEY. I think the amendment should say: in the case of goods that are not subject to inspection.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). It would not apply, in any case, to any of those goods put on the market. We are applying a minimum basis, but a manufacturer furnishes a higher grade to the Department, and he allows the saleable article to be a lower grade. It seems to me the words in the clause are necessary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If a person sells an article for $40 a ton, I want him to be obliged to give what he says he is giving.

Mr. CASEY. With the Minister's explanation, I agree that the words are necessary; but I think the cases of those who have to submit to inspection are covered by the words used before, and these words are intended to apply to goods not sold at all.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether there is to be any penalty imposed on the manufacturer who adulterates? This clause provides for the person who sells; perhaps it includes the manufacturer.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the manufacturer keeps the article for himself, there is no great danger to anybody. He will have punishment enough.

On section 13,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would propose that the penalty be made $500 instead of $100.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know why a person who attaches a tag to a package it is not meant for should not be placed in the same position as a person who forges or utters a certificate. His crime might be made a misdemeanor, the same as the other, so that the second sub-section might be struck out.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first sub-section relates to a misdemeanor, because it is forgery of public writings, and we attach the same penalty to it as exists in the cases of forgery of that description. I think the fine provided in the second sub-section is punishment enough for the offence.

Mr. CASEY. Should not imprisonment be added, in case of inability to pay the fine?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think my hon. friend is right, we should add, "and in default of payment, imprisonment for a term not exceeding 12 months."

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If all these penalties are to go into the public revenue it strikes me that a farmer who purchases an inferior manure and is defrauded ought to have recourse for damages.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is provided for by common law.

On section 14,

Mr. CASEY. Does the Act permit any person but the inspector to institute a prosecution?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Any person can prosecute when there is a penalty imposed. Any person may be the complainant.

Mr. CASEY. But when the Act specially states that a particular person may prosecute, that would shut out any other person.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would move to strike out the clause. It might look as if we wanted to prevent any other person from prosecuting.

Motion agreed to.

On section 15,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to strike out the words after the word "shall" to the word "to," and make the section read: "All penalties recovered under this Act shall form part of the Consolidated Fund of Canada."

Amendment agreed to.

On section 16,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose the following amendment: "All the provisions of the Adulteration of Food Act, of 1884, or, in the event of a repeal thereof, of any Act substituted therefor during the present Session."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I hope the Minister will try, on the third reading, to give us the information he promised.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; and I shall have to find a clause for the prosecution and recovery of the penalties.

Bill reported.

Amendments read the first and second times, and concurred in.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider certain resolutions (p. 2440) to authorise grants of Dominion lands to certain railways in the North-West.

On resolution 1 (North-Western Coal and Navigation Railway Company),

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I explained yesterday the object of this resolution. I think the papers were laid before the House some time ago, showing the different phases through which the negotiations between that company and the Government went. In the case of that company, as well as the other companies, the terms under which certain arrangements were made between them and the Government for lands in aid of the construction of this line had to be changed, from time to time, until the 17th January, 1885, when an Order in Council was passed, providing that, subject to the approval of Parliament, the reserve of land made by the Order in Council of September, 1884, should be increasd to 3,840 acres per mile, from Medicine Hat to the coal lands of the company on Belly River. The company will pay 10 cents per acre for the survey and other incidental expenses. The condition of this grant is that the line will be completed by the month of August next. I understand that this condition will be fulfilled. The railway is being pushed with vigor, and if anything should occur to delay it, it would be only on account of the troubles which have existed in the North-West; but I understand that there is very little chance of any delay taking place. The line is now pushed with great vigor, and will give access to these lands, which promise to give good coal, not only to the railways, but also to the settlers in that neighborhood, and further east and west.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is a matter of regret that the Orders in Council and other papers connected with these various grants should not have been printed and laid on the Table some time ago. The papers themselves have been laid on the Table time enough, but it is obvious that those members who have not had the opportunity of reading the papers in the manuscript form in which they came down, and the number of these is naturally very limited, have not had any means of ascertaining the particulars. I would ask the hon. gentleman one question of a general nature, and applicable to the whole of the resolutions, whether it is proposed, in the Bill to be founded upon these resolutions, that the grants should be stated to be in the terms and conditions in the Order in Council submitted to Parliament in each case, or whether it is intended to give the Governor in Council an absolute power to grant these lands, irrespective of any terms and conditions whatever?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention is to draw the Bill in such a way as to conform to the conditions of the Order in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, the hon. gentleman will observe that the first Orders in Council have been changed.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course; I mean the last orders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention that it should be so. If there were any reason afterwards to vary those Orders, of course we would have to come to Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. That answer is quite satisfactory, and is just in accordance with what I should have thought reasonable. This case happens to be one which does not furnish an exposition of so many phases of the different policies of the Government as some of the others which come on later, because, if I rightly understand, the first application in the case of this particular railway was as late as the 13th September, 1883. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I find some difficulty, from the papers in this case, which he will agree with me is rather a special case, both as to the gauge of the railway and as to some other circumstances, I do not find sufficient information to enable me to apprehend whether the land through which this railway passes for the 110 miles is deemed by the Government to be agricultural land. I rather gather that the main object, of course a very important object, which the Government expects to serve by the prosecution of this railway, is the coal supply; and I was anxious to know whether it is the expectation of the Government that agricultural settlements will be formed along the line of this railway, as in the case of the other railways.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the land may be expected to be of the ordinary character of agricultural land in the North-West?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. The first application is of 13th September 1883, from Sir Alexander Galt, who refers in that to the letter which, so far as I can judge, is not brought down, of the 22nd of June previous, but who makes a statement of a personal examination of the territory over which is is proposed the line shall pass. In that he states that he had the advantage of Langdon & Sheppard, contractors, with whose names we are familiar, upon the subject of a practical route, and that the firm expressed their willingness to contract for the railway, and their engineer is now making a thorough examination of the entire route with this view. Then he states:

"The coal from the Lethbridge mines has been thoroughly tested by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and pronounced suitable. Subject to the construction of the railway, I have agreed with them for the supply of all the coal they require at Medicine Hat, for $5 per ton."

So that, then, the notion was that this road would be completed by the 1st of September, 1884, and Sir Alexander Galt was able to secure a contract from the Canadian Pacific Railway for 20,000 tons, as a minimum, a year, at a fair price for the company's interests as mine owners. Then, other promises are made:

"The Canadian Pacific Railway also promised every assistance in their power in the construction and working of the line."

So that he secured from the Canadian Pacific Railway their favorable offices for the construction and also the working of the line. Then, Sir A. T. Galt proceeds to say:

"To enable the railway to be built within the next twelve months, which is in every respect to be desired, it is necessary that the funds be provided this winter and the steel rails and ties procured before spring."

And he points out some of the difficulties in the way of obtaining an incorporation in time to go on with the work, and of the particular method of escaping from those difficulties, with which it is not necessary to trouble the committee. Then he proceeds to point out:

"To enable me, therefore, to obtain the approval of the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company to such an extension of their operations and responsibilities, it has become absolutely necessary to obtain an early decision of the Government as to the assistance they are willing to grant to the undertaking."

Then, further on:

"The privilege of purchasing 6,400 acres, to be taken from the vacant suitable agricultural land, at $1 per acre, with expense of survey added, subject to such conditions as may be determined by the Government. The privilege of immediately selecting as part of the foregoing land the quantity not exceeding 15,000 acres of what are understood to be coal lands, the present land now in occupation of the company, under Order in Council or by departmental authority, to be considered as part of the said 15,000 acres."

He asks, also:

"The free admission of the steel rails and other materials for construction."

And he points out:

"The public grounds upon which I venture to submit this application are—

"That the construction of the railway guarantees to the entire country, as far east Winnipeg, a regular and ample supply of excellent fuel, at a moderate cost, as it can be delivered in Winnipeg at about $10 per ton.

"That it establishes the important fact in relation to the future working of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that its entire consumption of fuel can be provided at the central point of Medicine Hat at the low price of $5 per ton.

"That it affords the important McLeod district railway facilities which cannot be otherwise obtained; and also will bring to the Canadian Pacific Railway the cattle and mining traffic of northern Montana.

"That the development of a large mining industry by the company will require, on their part, the most strenuous efforts to promote the early settlement of their lands hereby applied for, also of the whole district.

"That without the railway no sales of public lands on any extensive scale can be effected, and that those conveyed to the company will realise the full price of such lands under the present regulations earlier than in any other mode; if this railway be not completed within two years from the first of September, of this year, this application to be void."

He does say one thing that is rather peculiar:

"I propose that the ordinary agricultural lands should be taken along the line of railway in alternative townships, where found suitable for settlement, and that the surplus be selected from any unappropriated lands south of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, and west of Medicine Hat, the operation of the homestead law not to apply to the townships or blocks chosen."

Then, I want to call the attention of the committee, at this stage, to the fact to which I have referred—and it seems to me to be one of considerable importance, in dealing with the application—the fact, namely, that this proposal to grant a concession, not merely of alternate sections on the line of a projected railway, but also of a quantity of land in bulk at the terminus of that railway, a quantity of coal lands. The Order in Council of the 19th of October, 1883, is accompanied by a plan which shows the terminus of the railway at the coal lands, and which shows a comparatively moderate quantity of coal lands, which are already in the possession of the company itself. But they ask for, and this plan shows, a very large block of land, comprising, I think, some 16 sections in all, of coal lands surrounding their township, a parallelogram surrounding their terminus. They, therefore, obtain an immense area of coal lands, and all those which were in the immediate vicinity of the terminus of the railway, which terminus itself was chosen from its being presumably in the centre of vast mines. This initiated an application by Lethbridge and others for certain mining lands, which we discussed some years ago in Parliament, and I then suggested the danger that might arise from an exceptionally large grant of coal area to one individual. Well, these areas, which are larger than those ordinarily granted by the Government, are now to be supplemented by others, making the whole area, I think,

something like five times as large as the original grant. I think it is very important, with respect to the future of the country, that we should remember what we are doing when we are dealing with this company, which is at once a mining company and a railway company. We have got to consider whether we are not practically establishing a monopoly in the coal supply, so far as regards a coal supply from that region. The ordinary rules, of course, as to the regulation of freights and fares, do not apply. They furnish no protection whatever in this case, because the protection in shipping by the ordinary rules, as to rates and fares, the power of the Governor in Council to regulate them, and the provision that they will be equal for other persons and goods, under like circumstances, travelling a like distance, do not in the least degree apply to the case of a company which is itself a large owner of mines, as between itself and the public. This company is the mine owner itself and is also the railway owner. It charges itself no frieght for carrying its own coal over its own railway, and therefore you cannot make any arrangement that will protect the public, in the sense that the public may be supplied by other mine owners in the same neighborhood carrying their coal over the railway on as advantageous terms as the coal of this particular company. That is really, to my mind, a very important consideration. We do not want to give the public domain to assist in increasing the value of a coal concession, unless we are able to guarantee to the country at large the prospect that there will be a large development of coal mines by others, and they will have a fair chance at that development. You depress that chance when you combine the mine owner and the railway owner in one hand, and thus accomplish the result I have indicated, namely, that there can be no competition on the part of the outside proprietors of coal areas with the proprietors of the enormous block of land surrounded by the railway, for they, themselves, as owners of the railway, with which they can make their own terms as to the carrying of their own coal, will secure entire control of the market. This is a consideration which, it seems to me, deserves the attention of the Government, and upon which we should have an explanation of their policy. I need hardly repeat my general observations, that I am making no opposition to the grant in aid of any of these railways, not even this one; but this one involves special considerations, and whether the hon. gentleman may attach more or less weight to that suggestion, it is a matter deserving of attention, as we are making the first concession of this particular character. The first proposition I have, is, therefore, that the owners of a large coal area, and one of the conditions of the grant is a very large enlargement of that coal area, I think amounting to 10,000 additional acres, besides the coal lands of which they are now absolute proprietors—I find the conjunction of the coal mine owner and the owner of the coal railway is, under these circumstances, not an encouragement, but a check upon the development of other coal areas, while competition with coal mining companies is of the last consequence to the future of the North-West. Take, for example, the very statement Sir Alexander Galt makes. He states that coal will be supplied at the central point, after being carried 110 miles, at $5 per ton. I do not know exactly what the quality of the coal is, how it compares with best heat-producing locomotive coal. It is very gratifying, however, to know that the coal is useful and available, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's engines will be able to burn it profitably; but there are various grades of coal, and I do not know this particular grade. But $5 for coal only 110 miles from the mine is certainly not a very low price, and as that is stated to be a wonderful price, it seems to me all the more important that we should consider what encouragement we are going to give to parties competing to reduce that price to the lowest possible limit. I have on more than one occasion declared that there was no subject that more deserved our attention than the question of dealing with the coal supply of the North-West, and I have ventured to express, in this House, on more than one occasion, the opinion that we should not, by any action of ours, place too large coal areas in one hand, or grant great powers to one corporation. I say, if you look at the coal supply of this continent, and consider what is to be ascertained upon the subject, you will find that the price of coal is, in the first instance, the cost of getting the coal to bank and a very small margin besides. Those are the elements, putting aside questions of combinations between coal and transport companies, and I must remind the committee that we are not without the light of experience on this subject, and that the people of the United States have experienced very great difficulty and disadvantage from the great power that enormous corporations in their great coal supply regions have obtained through the aggregated powers of ownership of immense coal areas, and of being the transportation company besides. We know what has been done by the Reading Coal and Iron Company, and other corporations similarly circumstanced. The price of coal, I say, is to be ascertained by the price of cutting the coal and getting it to bank, and a small fractional sum, a certain number of cents per ton, added; and the price of coal to the consumer, under normal conditions, depends on those figures and the cost of transportation. Those elements, when there are only 110 miles of railway to be traversed, do not seem to me fairly to be met, and there does not seem to be any very great boon conferred on the public by placing the price of this coal at $5 per ton. The price will, of course, be a great deal more elsewhere. By the terms of construction I am sorry to say the cost of the coal will be added to unnecessarily, because the railway is not of the Canadian Pacific Railway gauge, and therefore, when it is proposed to transport coal to other parts of the North-West, every shipment will involve a transfer at the terminus of the company's railway from one set of cars to another. That is a matter very much to be regretted. I do not now blame the Government because they have acceeded to the company's proposition, which is to a narrow gauge road; but in considering the benefits to the North-West, so far as it will be dependent upon this railway and coal supply, it is an unfortunate fact that upon every ton of coal that is to reach the general public over the Canadian Pacific Railway there should be a break of gauge at that terminus, Those considerations demand, I think, some examination before we shall pledge ourselves to the principle of giving very favorable concessions to a coal and railway company, in the shape of coal lands and agricultural lands, without providing some exceptional power, on our own part, to remedy the inevitable monopoly which, I have pointed out, goes with its construction, and securing to the public the benefit of competition in the supply of fuel. Then the Order in Council which was passed first upon this subject was passed upon a memorandum of the Minister of Interior, dated the 8th October, 1880, in which he recited the letter of Sir Alexander Galt, to which I have referred, and the privileges which he asked for. He asks for 15,000 acres of coal lands at the terminus of the road, and:

"That the Government shall forthwith reserve from sale and settlement, to be sold to the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, limited, or to the proposed Alberta Railway and Coal Company, at the time and on the terms and conditions hereinafter stated, 3,840 acres of land per mile, for the whole lenth of the line, from Medicine Hat to the coal banks, the reserve to commence at the point where the line intersects the southerly limit of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt and to consist of the odd-numbered sections at the disposal of the Government in the townships along the line of railway, for a distance of six miles on each side thereof, &c. * * * And that the Government shall further reserve for the company, forthwith, 10,000 acres of coal lands, in one equilateral block, at the western terminus of the line."

Then it was proposed:

"That upon the completion by the company of the whole of the line, the same being adequately equipped and running, the company be allowed to purchase from the lands reserved for that purpose 3,840 acres per mile of the railway, at the rate of $1 per acre, and the cost of survey (nothwithstanding the provisions of the Order in Council of the 4th June, 1883, fixing the price of such lands at $1 50 per acre) and 10,000 acres, or such less quantity as the company, after examination, may select, of coal lands at the western terminus of the line, at the rate of $10 per acre.

Now, I have twice asked the First Minister to bring down that Order in Council of the 4th of June, 1883. I saw it when these papers first came down, and it seemed to me that it was of importance, in considering the policy of the Government, that we should have it; but it has not been supplied. I asked the Minister of Public Works to take note that this Order in Council refers to a general Order in Council of the 4th June, 1883, fixing the lands at $1.50 per acre, and that we should have that Order in Council before proceeding to a further stage of the resolution. Then, Sir, as to the provision of 10,000 acres at the western terminus. The Government was alive, at that time, to the importance of reserving, as far as possible, the mining rights at the terminus, and this is a very praiseworthy precaution on their part, which I am endeavoring to make as effectual as possible. Then, before the patent is issued the lands are to be paid for in cash, at the rates mentioned, that is, $1, and the survey price, and the whole line is to be constructed and equipped within two years from the 1st September, 1883. At that time the Government did not acquiesce that this grant was made without reference to the proposition that it should be a narrow gauge road, because the whole condition of the Order is that the standard of construction shall be the same as that of the Canadian Pacific Railway I think, Sir, it is very unfortunate that it was thought necessary to depart from that gauge, because the question—upon the statement the hon. gentleman made to me just now, that they considered these to be agriculture lands, and that they expected a large settlement in that district of county and along the line of railway—involves, of course, the consideration of the general settlement of the country; and what I have said with reference to the cost of transport of coal, dealing, first of all, with that question, applies, of course, to every pound of grain and every head of cattle that goes out, and every pound of comsumable that comes into that territory over the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or of this railway. And if it were at all possible, even to-day, I beg the Government to take into further consideration whether it is not practicable to arrange that the railway shall be of the same gauge, so that we may have a standard gauge for that part of the country. I very well remember the old battle of the gauges, though I was not then in public life. I remember when we had a national gauge in the Province of Canada, and the Minister of Public Works, I dare say, recollects that in the Parliament of the old Province of Canada, it was thought very important that we should not adopt the American gauge. In fact, it was the inception of the policy which has broken out in late years in other directions—the policy of isolation. I remember the battle of the gauges coming out, later on, in the peninsula, in the Province of Ontario, under the Administration of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, when he declined to permit a railway to be constructed in the Province of Ontario on the American gauge, because he thought it was not fit. He thought we should keep our own gauge, though that railway was expected to exist by traffic from each side of the line. We know the loss, the harm, the difficulty which arose. I recollect the breaking out of the same feud here. I recollect the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and the gauge proposed for that road; and the same difficulties with reference to that question of gauge as with reference to the question of steel and iron. Now, we have settled down to the notion that it is of the first consequence that there should be uniformity of gauge, and if you are dealing with an important district in the North-West, not merely with reference to coal, but also with reference to agriculture, it is extremely important that we should consider the question of gauge. We, in the Province of Ontario, were persuaded to adopt the principle of the narrow gauge some few years ago, on the theory of certain enthusiastic railway projectors, who said they were going to give us efficient and cheap lines of railway in that way. It was found that that line of railway was not much cheaper, and, as a practical result, not much cheapness resulted from it, though I am prepared to admit that there are some remarkable instances in the north-western States of the United States of wonderfully cheap railways built on the narrow gauge. But there are also some remarkable instances in those States of very cheap railways built on the standard gauge, in the last two or three years. If the hon. gentleman looks at the reports of certain railways there, he will find that they have been built for $6,000, $7,000, or $9,000 per mile. Now, when we can find ordinary gauge railways built for these figures, I look with very great regret upon the introduction of the principle of breaking gauge in that great country, whose distances are so enormous, whose remotness from the seaboard is one of its main difficulties, and with reference to which, therefore, anything that can block or obstruct transport and increase cost is matter of the extremest moment. An Order in Council was passed on the 19th of October, which gives the right to grant 3,840 acres a mile, at $1 an acre cash, and the cost of survey, as the aid thought of at that time for this railway, the land to be taken from the odd-numbered sections. Then there is a report of the Committee of Council on the 27th of September, 1884:

"The Minister submits that he has received a communication from Sir Alexander Galt, stating that the company have failed to raise the capital necessary for the construction of the railway, and representing that in the present state of the British money market the privilege accorded to them of purchasing 3,840 acres of land per mile, at $1 per acre, and the cost of survey, is no aid to the company in their financial negotiations, but, on the contrary, if accepted, would be a positive burden, inasmuch as the capital necessary to pay for the land would have to be raised in addition to that required for the construction of the railway, and he (Sir Alexander Galt) therefore asks that the company may be allowed to surrender one-half the allotment of land along the line of railway, and that the other half be granted to them at the cost of survey only."

There you have the proposal made, as late as the 27th of September last, not that 3,840 acres should be granted, at $1 per acre, but that one-half of that quantity should be given free:

"The Minister observes that Sir Alexander Galt states that if his application be granted, he will obtain the capital necessary to construct the line; that indeed a considerable portion of the amount has been promised to him by leading capitalists, and he has no doubt he will be able to obtain the balance that the company propose to reduce the gauge of the railway to 3 feet."

There you have a statement, as late as the 27th of September last, by Sir Alexander Galt, that if 1,920 acres are given free he will be able to raise capital, and that indeed a large proportion has been promised. The Minister says:

"The Minister attaches great importance to the opening and working of the coal fields on the Belly River and the cheap transport of their product, which, in his opinion, would tend greatly to reduce the price of fuel to the settlers along the whole length of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

There, you see, the Minister and I are entirely at one, not merely as to the importance of opening up the Lethbridge mine, but the coal fields along the Bow and Belly Rivers. What I am anxious for is, that we should not make such provisions as will prevent competition between this company and other coal mine owners, but that we shall accomplish the result which the Minister looks for. The Minister adds:

"He is further of opinion that it is not unreasonable to suppose that for the 1,920 acres of land per mile, proposed to be surrendered by the company, assuming it to be open for settlement by the projected railway, the Government would receive as much as they would have received for the 3,840 acres of land per mile allotted to the company at the price at which the company had the privilege of purchasing it. The

enhancement in the value of the land in the whole district traversed by the railway could not fail to be important."

The Minister's notion, as late as September last, was that he would get as much for the 1,920 acres as would have been got for the whole 3,840 acres, because the 9,120 acres would be worth $2 an acre, and he thinks no pecuniary loss would result from granting 1,920 acres free. Upon that the Minister says:

"The Minister of the Interior, after giving the question full consideration, recommends that the application of Sir Alexander Galt, on behalf of the Alberta Railway and Coal Company, be granted, and the price of the land be reduced to 10 cents per acre, on the following conditions: That the reserve of land along the line of railway, ordered to be made under the Order in Council above recited, be reduced one-half, viz., to 1,920 acres per mile, for the whole length of the line, from Medicine Hat to the coal banks, a distance of about 110 miles; that the gauge of the railway may be reduced to 3 feet, on condition that the railway and its equipment shall, at all times, be sufficient to afford prompt transport for the passengers and freight of the district; that the sale of land herein recommended to be made to the company shall depend upon the necessary capital being assured and the line being put under contract, both to the satisfaction of the Government, before the 1st day of December, in default of which the Order to be made upon this recommendation to be null and void."

Mark, Sir, that this Order in Council, made in September, was upon the condition that the capital should be raised and the line put under contract on the 1st of December last. Then an Order, it is not material to read, as to the name of the company to which the grant should be made, was passed. Then, on the 9th of January, 1865, comes another memorandum, which is the present governing Order in Council:

"The Minister submits a statement of the former Order of the 27th of September, 1884, and a communication from the company, of the 27th of October last, attached to this Order, and covering a copy of the contract entered into by the company for the construction of the line, and asking that the grant be increased to 6,400 acres per mile, being an increase of 4,480 acres per mile, on the ground that that quantity has been granted to other companies."

Now, you will observe that this company had asked the Government, in June, to give it 1,920 acres free, in addition to its concession of 10,000 acres of coal lands, and leave to build a narrow gauge railway. That the Government had agreed to that, and that Sir Alexander Galt had said, on behalf of the company, that upon that concession he had the promise to and no doubt would raise the whole of the capital. You may observe that in October the company enclosed to the Government a copy of the contract which they had already made for the execution of the line; so that they had actually arranged, under the Order in Council in June, and actually raised their capital and made their contract for the construction of their line; and having made their arrangements, they then come to the Government and ask the Government —for what? To give them 6,400 acres of land per mile. And on what ground? Not on the ground that they had found themselves disappointed in their expectations, which is the ground the First Minister gave, in answer to my objections the other evening, not on the ground that they found, after trial, that the promises they had made could not be carried out, but on the ground that, although they had found those terms sufficient, although they had raised their capital, although they had entered into the contract, it was right that they should get 6,400 acres per mile, because other companies, quite differently circumstanced, as I shall show you when we come to deal with them, and offering different facilities, were going to get a grant of 6,400 acres per mile. Mark you, that is the ground on which Sir Alexander Galt, on behalf of this North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, asked that the grant should be increased to him. Because the other companies got more, he asked that his company should get more. Now, the Government gave more to the others because they found it essential to the construction of their lines; they gave as little as they thought was essential to the construction of those lines. That you find from the papers in connection with the other applications, and from the statement of the First Minister, on the motion to go into committee. He stated that the grant was regulated by this consideration: This is as little as we can get the lines built with, and we have given no more away than was necessary to accomplish the public purpose. That is a very good statement of the case, but it is a statement of the case that does not apply to this grant, this additional grant of 1,920 acres, because, as I have said, and repeat, this company had promised, in June, that they could do the work, and had already done part of the work, and raised the capital necessary, upon the minor grant of 1,920 acres. In October they said they had done it, and they sent the evidence of that to the Government, and they accompanied that with a request for 6,400 acres, because they saw that other companies had got that amount:

"The Committee further asks that of this quantity 1,920 acres per mile be granted on condition that the narrow gauge line now under contract be completed on or before 1st September next, and that the remainder, 2,560 acres per mile, be reserved for future selection, conditional on the assimilation of the line to the standard gauge within seven years. The Minister observes that the North Western Coal and Navigation Company is the only railway company which has recently succeeded in raising capital for the prosecution of its undertaking and placed the same under contract."

There you see the further proof of my statement, which was sufficiently proved by the letter of Sir Alexander Galt. The Minister states, in his recommendation to the Council, that this company has raised its capital and placed its line under contract, and that he was informed by Sir Alexander Galt that the work of construction was actually in progress —the capital has been raised, the contract had been made:

"And that while the company, under the Order in Council granting the land, has until the 1st July, 1886, to complete the line, yet it would be possible, by incurring a large additional expense, to complete and open the same for traffic during the month of August next, and that the company is prepared to incur such additional expense, provided the land grant be increased by 1,920 acres per mile, as now applied for."

There is the statement. The company had one year more to build their line; they said, however, they were prepared to complete it by August next, but would have to incur large additional expense in doing so, and that if they got 1,920 acres per mile additional they would complete it in that time. That is the only condition proposed for this additional grant of 1,920 acres.

"The completion of this line will not only furnish railway facilities to the district extending from the Canadian Pacific Railway to within about 25 miles of Fort McLeod, a distance of 110 miles, but will also open communication with the coal fields on the Belly River, and if running in August next, will render a large additional supply of fuel for next winter's use along the whole line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as far east as Winnipeg. The Minister of the Interior is of opinion that to attain these objects it would be reasonable, and in the public interest, to restore to the company the full quantity of 3,840 acres of land per mile granted to it by Order in Council of the 19th October, 1883. That, subject to the approval of Parliament, the quantity of land granted to the company by the Order in Council of the 27th September last be increased to 3,840 acres per mile, for the whole distance on the Canadian Pacific Railway, at or near Medicine Hat, to the coal fields near the Belly River. That the company shall reimburse to the Government the cost of survey and incidental expenses. * * * The increase to be dependent upon the line being completed and running during the month of August."

That is the Order which was passed. Therefore, you find that while the arrangements have been made for the completion of the railway on a grant of 1,920 acres per mile, it it now arranged to pay them another 1,920 acres per mile, in order that the opening of the railway may be expedited a few months. That is a transaction which requires some explanation. I have heard from other sources, sources open to everybody, that this capital had been raised, that this line was being proceeded with, and I was very much surprised to find it was being proceeded with under terms such as these. The Minister, in September last, says: "I will make out of these lines $2 an acre." That is his own statement in these Orders in Council. There are 110 miles, and very nearly 200 acres to the mile, which would give

you 220,000, say 216,000 acres of land, which the Minister, in September, valued at $2. That would be $420,000 put in cash, and that is what the Minister has given, according to his own estimates of value, in Septem ber, in order that the railway might be completed a few months earlier than otherwise it might have been. If it be a prudent thing, I must say it does now so strike me. I must, therefore, ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works to give some explanations to the committee of the two main points to which I have referred: first, the junction of the coal and navigation company to the railway company, and the arrangements made to secure to the country the benefit of competition; secondly, the question of the gauge of the railway; and thirdly, the additional grant given for the inadequate result of expediting its completion a few months.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This application of this company was the first of the kind, and the Government thought that the importance of opening up these mining lands, these coal lands, and obtaining a large supply of coal for the railways as well as for the settlers, was a very great advantage, and that the Government should help the company in opening those mines and producing the result which was intended by the building of this road. The hon. gentleman pointed out that from the 1st of June, 1883, to the end of January, 1885, there have been different changes with reference to the land grants and the conditions that were given to this company. That is perfectly correct; these changes have taken place. They have taken place with regard to this company as they have with regard to all the other companies that are mentioned in these resolutions before the committee, and the reason of that is obvious to those who have had time to look over the papers which have been laid before the House. The object was, in the first instance, to encourage the opening of those roads. That has been the constant object of the Government, and, unfortunately, the conditions that were thought, in the beginning, to be sufficient to obtain that result, have failed. The companies have been unable to obtain the capital necessary, and the Government have been called upon to aid them, in order to raise the necessary capital. In the case of this coal company, the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company, there have been changes two or three times. The hon. gentleman shows that, in the second change, we reduced the amount of 3,840 acres to 1,920 acres, the company declaring that, instead of it being a boon to them to purchase these lands it would really be a ruin to them, and that, instead of that, they should have a gift of those lands, on the same footing as we promised lands to other companies, subject to the consent of Parliament. True, that company made arrangements for the building of the road, and the hon. gentleman says the contract was signed and the construction was on the way. I have not the papers here, but I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has quoted those papers correctly. Taking that as a basis, I must say that the question put by the hon. gentleman is a fair one, to know why, when this railway company has already raised the capital, or a certain amount of the capital, to build their road, we were induced to increase the grant from 1,920 acres to 3,840 acres. The amount of land, as the hon. gentlemen will observe, which the company, in the last instance, asked the Government to grant them, was 6,400 acres, the same as the other companies have obtained, subject to the approval of Parliament. The Government did not think they should grant the company 6,400 acres a mile, but they reverted to the first grant of 3,840 acres of land, which had been fixed by a previous Order in Council, but following it with the same condition which had been imposed by the Order in Council of the 27th September, 1884, which gave the land to the company subject to the payment by them of the cost of the survey, and so on, to the extent of 10 cents an acre. The Government thought that, under the circumstances, should they grant this additional amount of 1,920 acres, this might be granted on account of the curtailing of the delay in opening the road. We thought that, by reducing the time one year, it was of very great importance to the North-West, to the settlers, to all parties, and for the future of that country, to obtain the opening of these mines and the bringing of the coal out on the railway to be sold, as mentioned in the statement made by Sir Alexander Galt, that that should be done as soon as possible. We thought it was of such importance to have this coal brought out in the month of August this year, instead of waiting another year, that we did not hesitate to decide that we would grant—not the 6,400 acres, but the same amount of land which was fixed by the Order in Council of the 19th October, 1883. I still believe that the Government were right in doing this; though it is a sacrifice of land, in a certain way, it is an investment which was an important one, because this was the first railway of the kind that had obtained money with the aid of lands from the Government. We thought that, the object being not only to open a section of the country, but to open the mines—to bring a large quantity of fuel from them, and furnish that at a comparatively low price, it was a matter of very grave importance; and, besides that, this should be done immediately instead of waiting another year. That is why we granted these lands, and I think the Government were perfectly right in doing so. The hon. gentleman seems to be alarmed about the quantity of land which has been granted, and he asks whether it is not to be a monopoly in this case, and if other companies or individuals would be deprived of opening mines and competing for the market there. The hon. gentleman may be sure that the Government have no such intention. The Government gave these privileges, and asks the sanction of Parliament for the purpose—not of giving these people an absolute and exclusive right to the mines there, but in order to begin by opening these lands. The hon. gentleman may have thought 10,000 acres of land at the terminus of the road to be a large area. It is a large area, but it is not too large an area, when you consider that these corporators had to raise the amount of money, not for the purpose of opening up that country for settlement. That was not their object. Their real object was to go to the coal mines and get the coal out. It was a speculation, and a proper one, on their part, and the Government thought they should help that speculation in the interest of the North West, in the interest of the settlers; but nothing prevents any other company obtaining lands in that region. I understand, by the surveys that have been made, that the coal lands extend over a very large area of that Territory. They are not confined to this comparatively small area of 10,000 acres, but there are hundreds of thousands of acres of good coal lands, and therefore there will be a healthy competition between the companies. If the hon. gentleman looks at the map he will see that these lands are accessible, not only by this road, but that they can be reached easily from other points on the Pacific Railway. In this case the railway goes 110 miles to Medicine Hat. There are other points not so far east, but a little more in a north-westerly direction. The road would probably be shorter, and they could obtain an outlet for their mines in that direction. Of course, the hon. gentleman will see that this corporation, being the first in the field, has an advantage over others. And that immense Territory, where we expect such a large population, and with the Territories being opened in other directions by these other three railways that are to be opened up, will be in want of coal; the market for coal will be increasing every day, as the population increases, and therefore one mine will not be sufficient. Several mines will be required to furnish fuel for that coun-

try, and therefore I do not think there need be any apprehension of a want of healthy competition in the coal trade in the North-West. For the coal lands the Government have charged $10 an acre, and that price was mentioned, if I mistake not, in Parliament, before this Session, and the documents were laid before Parliament. It was well known that that price had been fixed for these lands. I have no doubt that any other company that would apply to the Department of the Interior for coal lands would be treated in the same way as this company has been treated. The hon. gentleman has also spoken of the narrow gauge, and he thinks it is to be regretted that this railway has not the present standard gauge of the country. Well, perhaps it is so, but the building of a narrow gauge road will produce, at all events, for the present, the effect the company designed to obtain in opening up that country. The hon. gentleman says it will be increasing the cost to handle the coal at the junction of the two railways. Well, I suppose the company found that they could not raise sufficient money to build a broad gauge railway, that is, a railway with the present gauge of all the railways in Canada, and they had to limit themselves to a narrow gauge road. But this railway is not, after all, a very long one—only 110 miles, and when you consider the extent of country, I have no doubt that that exception to the gauge of the other railways in the North-West will be lost sight of when the country is being opened on all sides. I admit, with the hon. gentleman, that the standard gauge of the country for railways should be, as far as possible, adhered to. I think it is in the interests of the country that it should be so, and it will be better that our railways should have that gauge. In the case of two long railways, the South-Western and Manitoba and the North-Western, I think the hon. gentleman will see that the gauge has been adhered to, and that we may expect the benefit of that gauge in respect to these two railways. About the lands on the line of railway, I stated to the hon. gentleman that these lands were considered agricultural more than coal lands, and the reason of the Government believing so was, that if these lands had been really coal lands the company building this railway would not have built a road 110 miles——

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say agricultural more than coal lands; I wanted to know whether they were coal lands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But I am explaining that we believe these lands are agricultural rather than coal lands, for the reason that the company, instead of trying to procure their coal nearer to the Pacific Railway, have gone a distance of 110 miles to secure coal for many years past. I repeat that we, as a Government, believe that it is of the greatest importance that in the first attempt to open up these coal lands in the North-West we should give an advantage to the company making that attempt, and put it on such a footing that the coal may be brought out as easily as possible. I do not know whether I have answered all the objections and observations of the hon. gentleman about this road, but I have endeavored to do so. Of course, the hon. gentleman knows that this is not exactly a matter which comes under my special care in the Department of Public Works; nevertheless, I have done my best to answer his questions, and I hope that if he is not perfectly satisfied with my observations he will, at all events, be satisfied that the Government desire to encourage the opening of these mines as soon as possible, in order to benefit the railways as well as the settlers of the North-West.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I wish to refer to one statetement made by the leader of the Opposition, which, owing to that country being purely a prairie country, might be misleading. He stated that Sir A. T. Galt had made a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway for a certain quantity of coal, at $5 per ton. I know nothing of the contract, nor why such a bargain was made, but if it is true, I consider it a pretty soft bargain.

Mr. BLAKE. It is made, and for five years.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in the interest of the settlers that I rose to my feet, because I know, as a matter of fact, all along the railway you can get coal for $2 a ton, at almost any place as far as Calgary. From Fort MacLeod, over the line of railway south, and through the whole country, I do not know any district where scarcely 20 miles would have to be traversed where a settler could not procure coal with his own cart. I desire to prevent a misleading estimate being placed upon the value of fuel in that country. Why they have come 110 miles, I do not know; but I know that the same coal deposit extends 25 or 30 miles west of Medicine Hat, and borings have since been made by the railway company, I understand, with good results. I know that in the Bow River district there is a belt of coal showing outcrops a mile and a-half or two miles wide and 5½ to 7 feet thick, and better coal than at the coal banks.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will be able to inform us the cost of putting coal on bank.

Mr. FERGUSON. I happened to be there during the time of the coal strike in Pennsylvania. I met a representative of the miners, and he said he would be prepared to put coal on bank at Medicine Hat for $1.10 per ton.

Mr. BLAKE. That strikes me as about the figure which I possess. The figures vary a little in Ohio and Pennsylvania, but that is about the average. The hon. gentleman knows the price at which coal is carried on the Intercolonial to western points, namely, ½ of a cent per ton per mile for the long haul. The short haul is, of course, higher, for the shorter the haul the greater the cost per mile. The ordinary charge on the western line, when there is no strike and when the haul is a comparatively short one, say between the Suspension Bridge and Toronto, is 1 cent per net ton per mile, which is a very high and remunerative rate. Take, then, $1.10 for transportation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Fifty cents.

Mr. BLAKE. I will take the liberal price of 1 cent per ton per mile, which gives $1.10 for transport. The cost of putting coal on bank I place at $1.10 per ton. I add 50 cents for royalty; and that is a very handsome thing, for if 100,000 tons are raised, there will $50,000 per annum simply for being proprietor of the coal lands. The enormous area of coal lands which this company will possess, 12,000 or 15,000 acres, will supply all the north-western country for a long time to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite will be surprised to find the quantity of coal in an acre of land. The company charge $5 per ton to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or 100 per cent. profit. That is a bargain they have made. You may estimate what they are going to charge to settlers from that figure, for Sir Alexander Galt tells us, as an inducement to this arrangement, that the moderate price of $5 has been made by him. At the terms stated, a contract has been made to supply the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with a minimum quantity of 20,000 a year, for five years, for their own consumption. It is, as the hon. gentleman has said, a pretty soft thing. I do not care for that, for I think the pioneer enterprise should be treated liberally.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was not the point I made. What I wanted to show was the cost at which coal could be produced.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that; but the Government have proposed this grant with the notion that coal would come from the Lethbridge mines, and that it is therefore necessary to build the proposed railway of 110 miles to

reach the coal. But if you can get coal 25 miles from Medicine Hat, you had better build a broad gauge road over those 25 miles, which will cost us no more, and will give connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. That, I say, will not cost us more, and it will be infinitely better for the North-West. The hon. gentleman has said there is a better seam there than at the Lethbridge mines.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is under the line.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway do not need this supply, and the whole basis on which the grant is asked falls to the ground, and the road now under consideration becomes simply an agricultural railway. I am, however, unable to deal with the matter upon that theory. I have not the hon. gentleman's facts, which he has no doubt communicated to hon. gentlemen near him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have not.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is too reticent. Suppose the hon. gentleman is not quite correct in his assertion that coal can be got everywhere. We know that a certain quality can be got in many quarters; coal which would serve the settler can be got on his own farm; but as to the high and comparatively high qualities, I am not prepared to say how far they are disseminated. But I hope the hon. gentleman's statement is quite correct. My point, which the Minister of Public Works has not attempted to meet, is as to the necessity of making a special provision to ensure competition, because it is not enough to tell us that another railway can be built. Another railway, I dare say, will be built in other parts of the country; but surely it is better, when we are making so considerable a grant—I believe the hon. gentleman has said it is a prairie country, and a road can therefore very easily be built—to take some step that the conjunctive position of coal miner and railway owner shall not prevent other coal miners in the neighborhood, naturally tributary to the railway, getting their coal transported on terms which will enable them to compete in the market. You will not get competition unless there is the advantage of fair terms offered. If the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, that there is fine coal on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Medicine Hat, there is not very much use in bringing coal from the Lethbridge mines, a distance of 110 miles. If that be so, the whole basis on which this application is made falls to the ground, and it is unnecessary to grant a large area of coal lands to aid the company, and save $400,000. If the statement of the hon. member be true we must alter the proverb about carrying coal to Newcastle, and say, it is like carrying coal to Medicine Hat. This is really a serious subject. In asking assent to this grant on the theory that the coal supplies for particular sections of the country, ay, and as far down as Winnipeg, is to come from the Lethbridge mines, and if it is to be supplied at Winnipeg at the moderate price of $10 a ton, as stated in the memorandum, I think we had better consider whether we cannot get it supplied at Winnipeg a little cheaper. I am anxious, before we get to the subsequent stages of the Bill, that the hon. gentleman should consider whether he will not make arrrangements by which this railway may be used on moderate terms for getting coal from other mines as well as giving us competition. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me when he supposed I asked whether these lands were agricultural or coal lands. I asked him if they were agricultural lands, though I was of the opinion that the company would not haul the coal 110 miles if they could get it at the shorter distance; but the hon. member for Leeds tells us that that is not the company's view; that although there is better coal near the terminus, they do propose to haul it the greater distance. But, being under that impression, which I shared with the Minister of Public Works, I did not ask whether it was coal or agricultural land, but I asked, rather, whether it was agricultural land, as I thought it might be waste land or ranching land, or something of that kind. Well, the hon. gentleman says it was very little to give this additional grant of land. Now, I do not know what the nature of this contract is. It is not laid before us, and as it is annexed to the letter of Sir Alexander Galt, which was submitted to the Government on the 27th of October, I think the hon. gentleman should feel no difficulty in laying it on the Table.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will bring it down.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know that we will be much the wiser when we get that contract, because the curse of these railway arrangements is watered stock, excessive bonds, and enormous costs, which swallow up the advantage to the public of the bonuses they give. The First Minister, when answering me the other day, adverted to the enormous shrinkage of American railway securities, which, of course, re-acted upon the minds of English capitalists with reference to these securities here. There has been that srinkage, but it was not due to the inflation which preceded it, but because there has been that which I can call nothing else than a fraudulent system of making a false nominal capital in the construction of railways in the United States. In the two years preceding the last three years, when the great depression commenced, the increase in the nominal capital in stock and bonds of the railways of the United States was, in round figures, about $2,000,000,000, and a liberal estimate made by experts of the sum of money exponded, and which was represented by that $2,000,000,000 was $1,050,000,000, so that there had been spent, wisely or unwisely, $1,050,000,000 of capital stock and bonds representing that $2,000,000,000, or about $2 for every one actually spent, and an unhappy public in the United States, in England, in Belgium, in Germany, very largely, was gulled into taking these figures as representing value and expenditure. The result was that when the period of depression and railway competition came, the period at which the inflated charge could not be maintained, the bottom dropped out of the concern. But if anybody will examine the trunk lines, if he will look at the values even of a large portion of the railway property of the United States, enormously depressed as it is, if he will look at the mileage value to-day, and will ascertain what the roads will cost to build to-day, he will find that in many cases the prices at which they are held, and which are supposed to be ruinous prices, are greater than the actual cost of building them to-day. I make that observation because I think it is a question that we should consider. We have had the same thing introduced here on a small scale in the provincial railways and on an enormous scale in the transcontinental railways. We have given subsidies in Ontario to railway after railway, and though they have largely been built by the municipalities and the Government, yet they have been bonded for amounts which represent more than the whole cost of construction, and the public is taxed to pay tolls on more than the whole cost of construction yearly, although the greater part of the cost of construction was a free gift. I feel, therefore, that it is important for us to consider, on entering on this policy of giving large and liberal grants to these roads in the North West—and I think we ought to give pretty large grants—we should consider what that cost is at the bottom price. We should know, in some measure, what the real value of construction is, that we may see what we are doing for the company and for the public. I do not want that the public should practically pay the cost of building the railway, and that the private corporations should obtain a large profit on the whole cost. We want that those with whom it is a speculation, in a certain sense, who have advanced a certain portion of the money, should get a

liberal return on the investment, but that they should not get a large profit on all we gave them as well as upon their own adventure. This road is one presumably over a prairie country, built in a cheap fashion, a narrow gauge fashion, and I take the Minister's estimate of $2 per acre, which I find would approximate nearly $8,000 a mile, taking his valuation of the land, irrespective of the coal lands concession. I do not remember whether the Order in Council fixes the price of the coal lands, but I do remember that the policy of the Government with reference to the coal lands has been limited areas to each person. They feel the importance of some concessions being made in order to give free competition, as far as possible, and therefore this is a very considerable departure from that arrangement. I do not quarrel so much with a pretty large concession of the coal lands, if we had a security that that did not involve a practical monopoly in the conjoint control of the railway and the mines.

Mr. FERGUSON. You cannot corner the coal lands.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say not, but you can corner the transport. I shall not protract the discussion just now. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will agree that the question is one of very great importance, that it is of an importance, in my opinion, far transcending the area of the grant. I think the question of gauge and the question of the accessibility of the public to the coal supply—unless it is wherever you stick a pick in, as the hon. member for Leeds puts it—are questions of magnitude far exceeding the question of a few thousand acres of land. I shall not to-night renew my suggestion, which is one of general application, as to the condition of the land being open for settlement at a fixed maximum price, although I intend that the discussion shall be renewed on that point at a subsequent stage of the measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. The land of that region is both good agricultural land and coal land. There are a couple of hundred feet on the surface which is a fair basis for agriculture; but there is such a large area of that agricultural land between there and the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and the water and timber supply are so deficient, that it will be many years before there will be many settlers along that road. Therefore, I think the estimate of $2 an acre—not disparaging the value of the land, but because there is a surplus—is entirely too high.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I only took the Minister's statement, made on the 27th September, 1884. I have no means of knowing the value of the land; but if it be a fact, as the hon. gentleman says, that there is a deficiency in the water supply, if it will be many years before the land will be settled, and if the coal areas are so great, I am afraid Sir Alexander Galt will not make much money out of his enterprise.

Mr. ROSS. I agree entirely with the hon. member for West Durham in opposing the narrow gauge. I think this road should be built on the ordinary gauge, as it is not at all as important for the coal as it is as a colonisation road to open up the country. I think it is as important to the coal people themselves as to the settlers that the road should be of the ordinary gauge, because they will experience a great deal of trouble in transferring the coal from the narrow gauge cars to those of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That country is largely a grazing country, and if the range people are going to use this road for the shipment of cattle it should be of the ordinary gauge, because they would rather drive their cattle the whole distance to the Pacific Railway than to carry them on this railway and then tranship them. I do not believe in narrow gauges at all, except, perhaps, in a country which is so much broken up that a road of the ordinary gauge would cost very much more and the terminus be on the sea-board. But in a prairie country I do not think it is at all necessary. I think it would be better for the Government to increase the grant, if necessary, in order to have a wide gauge. With reference to the coal lands, I agree with the hon. member for Leeds, to some extent. There is a difference, however, between the coal at the Lethbridge mines and that at Medicine Hat.

Mr. FERGUSON. The coal in that country seems to be disposed in three belts—one cutting the boundary line south of Fort MacLeod, running along the Belly River to the Lethbridge mines, and cutting the Bow River at Grass Island. That is, except the coal in the pots found in the mountains, the best coal in the North-West. The next best coal is that of the belt running from Medicine Hat to the Red Deer River. The next is the Souris coal, which will not bear transport. The Lethbridge coal is the best coal we have in the west.

Mr. ROSS. I now agree with the hon. gentleman in his description of the coal belts, and also as to the superiority of the Lethbridge coal; its advantage is, that it is more highly bituminised than the coal of Medicine Hat, and that is the reason I suppose why the Pacific Railway Company have made the contract with the Lethbridge mine for its supply. The Medicine Hat coal is good enough for household purposes; but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have just as good coal as the Lethbridge coal, in my opinion, on their own railway, near Crowfoot; it is of the same quality as the Lethbridge coal; and why this road should be built, merely to get coal out, I do not understand. I also agree with the hon. member for Leeds as to the vast quantities of coal in that country. The whole country is one vast coal bed, and the fact that coal is under a man's section does not add one dollar to the value of the land. There are from 5,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons of coal under one section of land, and we have thousands upon thousands of those sections.

Mr. FERGUSON. And good wheat land, at the same time.

Mr. ROSS. There is no doubt about that. The reason one man's coal section is worth more than another is its proximity to the railway, or the fact that a ravine runs through it, which enables you to get out the coal more easily than you could do on the level prairie. I do not anticipate that there will be any difference made in the cost of coal by this road running into the Lethbridge mines, because there is so much coal in the country. If this railway were the only railway running through the coal lands I could see the force of the remarks of the hon. member for West Durham; but as the Canadian Pacific Railway runs through the same seam, and opens up the same coal belt, I do not anticipate any change in the cost of coal to the country or any danger of monopoly. The Medicine Hat mines alone can supply all the coal the country will require for many years to come, except for steam purposes; they have supplied coal to Winnipeg during the past winter at $7 a ton. The man in charge of those mines informed me that it cost about $1.80 a ton to get out the coal, but that they intended to reduce the cost to $1.50, and hoped to ultimately get it below that. At the Lethbridge mines the cost of getting the coal out is $2 a ton, but there were special reasons for the cost; after they opened the mines up more fully, they expected to get it out at $1.50 a ton. With regard to the advisability of having the ordinary guage, I agree with the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I have had occasion to give some little consideration to this question of coal in the North-West, but on one question I do not agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). He states his information is that the Crowfoot coal is equal in quality to the coal of the Lethbridge mine. My information is that it is not quite as good; that the Lethbridge, or the Galt coal, is the best bituminous coal, or quasi-bituminous coal,

yet discovered in the North-West, and that the Lethbridge coal is better than the Medicine Hat coal. All can be used on the railway, but of course only in proportion to the carboniferous qualities. I saw recently in the office of Mr. Van Horne, in Montreal, four samples, one of Pennsylvania or Ohio coal, one of the Galt coal, one of the Crowfoot coal, and one of the Medicine Hat coal, which had all been exposed for several weeks, if not months, to the heat from a radiator in his room, with the view of testing the different qualities of the different coal; and you could tell, from the extent to which the square blocks had cracked, their relative combustible qualities, and there was no doubt that the Medicine Hat coal was not as good as the Crowfoot coal, that the Crowfoot coal was not as good as the Lethbridge or Galt coal, and that the Letbridge coal was not as good as the Eastern coal. As to the diffrence between narrow gauge and the ordinary gauge, I entirely agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Ross). I think it is a mistake that the Galt Company have commenced the construction of a narrow gauge road. It would be much more satisfactory if the Government had required the road to be constructed on the ordinary gauge, even if it had involved the granting of an additional subsidy in the way of land to that company for that purpose. I presume, however, the capitalists interested in the company felt they had to cut their garment according to their cloth, and could only build such a road as their financial resources would enable them to do, supplemented by the Government subsidy. There is no question that an ordinary gauge road would be infinitely more useful to the country. The hon. member for Durham will recollect the discussion which took place some years ago in the Ontario Legislature, when it was decided, with reference to several roads, that a narrow gauge road suited their purpose, and possibly no other could be constructed at the time. Experience has since shown that narrow gauge roads could be widened to the ordinary gauge, and no doubt, in a few years, as the North-West develops, the company will widen the present narrow gauge to the ordinary standard road. However, it is a case of half a loaf better than none at all. I think a narrow gauge road will be of some advantage to the country, though an ordinary gauge road would be of much more advantage to it. But if the resources of the company are only sufficient to build a narrow gauge road, by all means let us have that first, and if the resources of the country, later, justify additional expense, no doubt we will have that road widened to the ordinary gauge.

Mr. SPROULE. It is well that the Government should come to the assistance of parties who are endeavoring to build roads which will be of great importance to the settlers, and no doubt very useful to the country; but from the experience that I have had in connection with narrow-gauge roads, I think it would be a very great mistake for the Government to give one acre of land to assist any company in building a narrow gauge road. No sooner are these roads built than it is found impossible to get up the necessary speed on them; the engine has not sufficient power, and as the gauge does not agree with other roads, everything has to be transhipped, including coal, the handling of which will entail an additional cost of from 50 to 75 cents per ton. To make the road effectual at all, the gauge must be widened the same engines cannot then be used, the rolling stock will have to be transformed and renewed at considerable expense, and the expense of changing, in fact, will be almost equal to half the cost of building the road. It was proposed at one time that a narrow gauge road would be more suitable to our country than a broad gauge, because the grades were heavy and the curves were short; but after the road was built it was found that, on account of the grades, more powerful engines were required and a broader gauge road. The road was widened, and though the curves are sharp, the track not having been changed, there is not as much difficulty experienced as was experienced on the old narrow gauge road. Our experience is, that a broad gauge road could have been built for nearly the same money as a narrow gauge one and perform double the service. Everything that has to be transferred from one road to another creates a large additional expense, that must be taken out of the profits of those who use the road.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the hon. Minister who has charge of the Bill (Sir Hector Langevin) that it is of greater importance that coal should be got and delivered to settlers and to the railways as cheap as possible, and as good as can be had. I do not agree with the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson), who stated that coal at Medicine Hat was as good as that in the Lethbridge coal mine.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not say so. I am satisfied, from my own observations, as well as the experience of railway men, that it is not as good.

Mr. WATSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I believe it to be of the greatest importance that the best coal to be found in that country should be procured to the settler as cheap as possible. I agree with the First Minister, as far as he stated that any company that undertakes to get out the coal ought to be encouraged. At the same time, in aiding an enterprise of this kind, we ought to have in view what the possible result will be. Under the present proposal, there is danger of a monopoly of the best coal, that of the Lethbridge mine, being created, by the granting of large grants of land for the construction of a narrow gauge line of railway, of which the mining company shall have sole control, and can impose what rates they please for the carrying of coal to the Canadian Pacific Railway. From information I have from the foreman who works in the Medicine Hat mine the cost of putting out coal at the Medicine Hat mine; is $1.25 per ton. The freight from Medicine Hat to Winnipeg, 660 miles, is $4 per ton. That makes $5.25 a ton for the coal delivered at the railway station in Winnipeg. It costs on an average, 75 cents a ton to deliver it round the city, making $6 in all. The price of coal in Winnipeg is from $7 to $7.50 per ton, leaving a net profit of $1 or $1.50 per ton.

Mr. FERGUSON. Last year it was put in the yards by contract at $7.

Mr. WATSON. The quality of the coal delivered in Winnipeg at $7 or $7.50 per ton is about a due proportion to American coal, for which we pay $11 a ton. I believe the Lethbridge coal is much better than Medicine Hat, although we have not had an opportunity to test it yet in the stoves in the West, because most of the coal delivered in the cities and towns has been the Medicine Hat coal. I believe the coal from this Galt mine is very superior coal, superior to that now in use.

Mr. BOWELL. By American coal, I suppose you mean the anthracite or hard coal.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; it is the hard coal. It is sold at $11 per ton, and it is just about as cheap to buy the one as the other. One ton of the American coal is equal to a ton and a-half from Medicine Hat. By being exposed to the air, the Medicine Hat coal pulverises very soon. I think, if this grant is to be made to this railway, the Government ought to reserve certain rights, as to the freight rates, and that any coal tendered by other parties should be carried by this new railway at a certain rate. If not, and coal of the same quality cannot be found within 110 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will certainly create a monopoly, because no other company can build a competing line without receiving a grant. I agree with hon. gentlemen who have spoken against a narrow gauge road. I believe it is a bad thing to allow any company to build a

road on to which you cannot run a car from the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If you are shipping stock, you would not be bothered with the transhipment, for the sake of 110 miles. You would rather drive. The road is, consequently, worthless for carrying stock. If the country is as good as the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) says, for settlement—I have not seen it myself, but he has—we ought to have a broad gauge road, for the narrow gauge road would be of little or no use, because of the transhipment required. My principal objection would be to giving this grant to any company, without reserving restrictions as to the control the Government would have over the road. They should compel it to carry freight for other companies who might wish to open up mines in that country, and should be restricted to say 1 cent a ton per mile, or something of that kind, and any reasonable amount of coal tendered to the company should be freighted within a reasonable time. If that provision was put in, I think it would be very good, and would be in the interests of the whole settlers of the North-West, who wish to receive cheap coal, and it would be in the interest of the Government to make that one of the conditions. But I would much rather see a broad gauge. The cost between a narrow gauge and a broad gauge road is not a great deal on 110 miles, and it would be a road good for all purposes, and if the mines be opened up there, and the coal is so much better than the Medicine Hat coal, a road would have lots of work to do, and would pay in carrying coal, because we can hardly estimate the amount of coal that will be required for consumption in the prairie sections of the West. A broad gauge road should be built, and if the coal is what it it is said to be, and I believe it is, it would pay any company, as a railway enterprise, leaving out the coal interests altogether. I believe there will be roads built in that country, and if that road has the carrying of the coal, and also of the merchandise into the country and the grain out of it, it ought to pay well.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). A monopoly of coal in that country is simply out of the question. Coal is so abundant there, underlying the whole country, certainly from Medicine Hat westward, that it is impossible that at any period of time a monopoly could be established. As to the quality of the Galt coal and the Medicine Hat coal, I have had the opportunity of comparing the analysis of the two coals, and I have arrived at the conclusion, after consulting a person skilled in the business, that the difference of freight, the cost of carriage to the Canadian Pacific Railway, of the Galt coal, a distance of 110 miles from Medicine Hat, or where they are to strike the railway, was hardly equal to the difference in value; in other words, that the Medicine Hat coal, at the price for which it is put on board the cars at Medicine Hat, is as valuable and as cheap as the Galt coal. In other words, the cost of freight was equal to the difference in the quality of the two coals. The cost of freight for 110 miles, and the cost of the construction of the railway, was a very considerable item. Then, when you get to Medicine Hat you must remember it has to be carried on the Canadian Pacific Railway, thence to the point of consumption, Winnipeg or Portage la Prairie, or any other point. The Canadian Pacific Railway has the power, by its control of the rates, to put on a position of equality all the coal dealers or producers in all that country, and I believe they have not only done so, but have graduated their rates in such a way as to put the eastern and western coal producers on an equality at Winnipeg—the eastern coming from Port Arthur, some 400 odd miles, to Winnipeg, and the Medicine Hat or other western producers, with 600 or 700 or 800 miles to carry the coal. They have the power of graduating their rates, so as to put the two competitors for the traffic on an equal basis at a common point, and they have framed a tariff, based upon a determination to keep the eastern and western men in competition, so that the settlers along the line and the people of Winnipeg should get the coal at the lowest possible rate. Their interest and the interest of the people is the same. Of course, they want to get as high a price as they reasonably can for carrying coal, but they have made a tariff, which carries it at a very reasonable compensation to them, and graduated it so that neither the western producers nor the eastern producers derive any advantage. The fear of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Watson), that the granting of this subsidy to the Galt company might give them a dangerous monopoly is, I am quite sure, entirley unfounded. There is not only the bituminous coal to be taken into account, but there is also the valuable anthracite coal found in the Rocky Mountains, of far superior quality to the bituminous coal, and useful for certain purposes, where the other cannot be used. This anthracite coal is of a very high quality, equal to the best Pennsylvania anthracite, and will, no doubt, shortly come into general use in the North-West. So I think we need have no fear about the most ample and reasonable cheap coal supplies of the North-West.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman has exactly stated the reason why I fear this road has a monopoly. He says the Canadian Pacific Railway have power to treat the coal merchants as they see fit. Knowing that we have but one railway in the North-West, and in view of the monopoly given it, I object to giving the same privilege to any other road. The hon. gentleman knows that the owners of this coal mine alongside the Galt mine, with just as good coal, cannot get a cent for it, because they have no railway, except the Canadian Pacific Railway, which charges such rates that you cannot afford to ship it. People who made a rush for coal lands in the North-West some time ago imagined they had a fortune when they got a quarter or half section of coal land, but when they desired to realise they found that it was not worth anything to them. The country is covered with coal, but as it is a question of freight, there is no encouragement for any company in attempting to work a mine. This company will certainly use this road to their own advantage, and we cannot blame them. If it were a private enterprise, receiving no aid from the Government, it might be well enough to let them go on and build a road at their own expense, but the country is building this road, and we ought to see that the people derive some advantage from it. It will be the Galt company who will derive advantage from this road, and not the consumer of coal, and that is the reason why the Government ought to preserve the right to compel this company to carry coal for other companies at a certain rate per mile. When this Government gives a charter to any company to build a railway bridge they provide that other companies shall have running powers over that bridge; and in the same way, when we grant aid to a railway, we should provide that the company be compelled to carry freight at a certain rate.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). The difficulty apprehended by the hon. member for Marquette, I think, is completely covered by the control the Government will have over the freight rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That company being disposed to operate the road in the interests of the people, as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) says, they will necessarily prevent any short line like that putting on exhorbitant rates. But they have power to prevent the Galt road or any other similarly situated road from taking advantage of the public, even on the quality of the coal; for my contention is, notwithstanding the statement as to the relative values of coal by the member for North Victoria, that the coal of the Lethbridge mine is the best. He cited an instance where he saw coal in the railway office at Montreal, but I think he misapprehended the statement

of the manager. He saw this specimen, and if I recollect aright—and my own judgment leads me to believe that my recollection of the statement made by the manager is correct—the sample taken from their own pit on the Crowfoot Creek Valley, which I contend is the same coal as the Lethbridge coal, was, in the manager's judgment, equal, and he seemed inclined to give it preference—perhaps because it was his own coal—but I contend it was precisely of the same character and of equal quality with the Lethbridge coal, and that belt of coal now is known to be from 15 to 25 miles wide, where the railway runs across it, and where it can be tapped at every point. So, if the Canadian Pacific Railway is disposed to operate in the interests of the settler in that country for cheap coal, there is no fear to be apprehended from the Galt mine or any other mine.

Mr. WATSON. No; because they have it in their power to charge the Galt mine what they see fit.

Mr. FERGUSON. But they have unlimited control, so that no possible monopoly can exist in coal in that district

Mr. WATSON. It is not on coal; it is on freight.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think it is a great mistake to build narrow gauge roads. I have had some experience building a road down in New Brunswick, and although a narrow gauge was fixed by the engineers, I opposed it myself, as one of the directors of the road. We have now a uniform gauge all over the country, of 4 feet 8½ inches, which, I think, is the proper gauge; and whatever company is building this road, they are making a great mistake in building a narrow gauge road. If it is to be built through a prairie country it will cost very little more to build a broad gauge than a narrow gauge road of 3½ feet. The only extra cost there would be is in the iron—the difference between the cost of a 40 or 45-pound rail, which we had at that time, and a 56 or 60-pound rail. That is where the difference of expense comes in, and beyond that the expense will be very trifling. It seems to be the opinion of hon. gentlemen here that this is to be, principally, a coal road, and if you transport this coal down to the Canadian Pacific Railway, on a narrow gauge road, and then tranship it, there will be great loss, both in shrinkage and breakage, sufficient, I believe, to counterbalance, in three or four years' time, all the difference in the expense of building a broad gauge over a narrow gauge road.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister of Public Works seems to be almost alone in the defence of the gauge of this road. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) said he had found that the difference in quality between the Medicine Hat coal and the Lethbridge coal was such that it was about equalised by the extra cost of freight from the Lethbridge Mine. May that be about 1 cent a pound?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I do not recollect the precise figures. I consulted a gentleman about it, who, after considering it from a business point of view, arrived at the conclusion that the difference in the cost of freight was about equalled by the difference in quality.

Mr. BLAKE. One cent per ton per mile is a pretty high figure, even for a short haul. Under a contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the coal company will receive $3.90 per ton at bank. Hon. gentlemen do not suppose that coal worked on Canadian Pacific Railway land at Medicine Hat will cost that sum: it will probably cost $1.10 per ton. So, the difference of cost must be very great, if the contract be at all correct. This question of monopoly comes up immediately on the conflicting statements made. The general consensus of opinion, I think, from those who have spoken, is that the Lethbridge coal is the most valuable coal. Of course, if they have an advantage in that particular locality and in that particular vein—I do not speak only of the coal owned by this company—equal to $2 or $3 per ton, it is quite clear that that gives them a command of the market, with respect to the coal in that region, within a similar haul to market.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). At the time the contract was made the Canadian Pacific Railway had not discovered the coal at Medicine Hat.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There are other circumstances that may mean a good deal.

Mr. BLAKE. I admit that the hon. gentleman's observation means much and may mean more.

Mr. CAMERON. It may be in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they should not be bound to one particular mine or one particular source of supply. My information as to the difference in value of the coal was for ordinary domestic use. It was not for railway use, and a coal that may be perfectly good for ordinary domestic use may not be suitable for railway and steam purposes, unless it were mixed with other coal, or the furnaces altered to suit it.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. gentleman's observation. I say his observation means a good deal and may mean a good deal more. The hon. gentleman has also pointed out the great benefactor and providence that can make all these things right; he says the Canadian Pacific Railway can fix it up. Already it has shown its power of regulating the commercial affairs of the North-West, by regulating the cost of coal and provoking a healthy competition between the coal traffic of the East and the West, and it can make arrangements between parties on equal terms. I recollect something of the grinding monopoly that prevailed in Winnipeg and Port Arthur during one winter. I remember the cost of coal in Winnipeg when one firm had the whole supply. The great power which a railway company possesses may not always be exercised so beneficially as the hon. gentleman suggests. That was a proof of the difficulty. I am not so clear as to the hon. gentleman's statements as to the prices—I do not know exactly how it works out; but the practical result is, that coal is sent to Winnipeg from Medicine Hat at $7 per ton, and competes with hard coal at $11 per ton. Sir Alexander Galt states, as one of the great benefits to be derived from the proposed railway, that he will be able to supply coal at Winnipeg at $10 per ton. I do not know whether it would be able to hold the market at that price. It is quite possible that while coal from Medicine Hat is being supplied at $7, Sir Alexander Galt's coal might realise $10, and still hold the market. If that be so, if there is a difference in the value of the coal of from $1 to $1.50, then it is of the greatest consequence that we should see that the railway competition is assured. It is important that we should see that the best domestic coal in the North-West is not practically in the hands of one company. I think the Minister will admit that this is a subject of very great consequence; and I hope, at a further stage of the Bill, we shall have some information upon these points we have been considering, and probably some practical information with respect to the relative values of the coal may be obtained from some of the Departments. If it be a fact that there is almost equally good coal scattered all over the country, the argument that there is no danger of monopoly is a sound argument. But if the Lethbridge coal is worth even $1 per ton more than the general run of coal, it is of great advantage, and it is of the utmost importance that the power of distributing that coal should not rest entirely in the hands of one company, but in the hands of all who may mine it,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have taken a note of the observations of the hon. member for West Durham, and of some other hon. members. I could not be expected to give all the information asked. I will take care to have the information desired furnished, as far as possible, at the next stage of the measure, and I have also taken a note of the papers which the hon. member wishes to have brought down to complete the papers already before the House.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:45 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 12th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

FRANCHISE PETITIONS.

Mr. McNEILL. I think it is due to myself and to the House that I should say just a word with respect to the petition which has just been read from Wiarton. It will be in the recollection of the House that a short time ago a petition was presented from Wiarton against the Franchise Bill, which petition purported to be signed by a number of Conservatives. At that time I ventured to say that those signatures had been obtained by misrepresentation of a gross kind. I have, since that time, been obliged to go home on pressing private business, and I had an opportunity of learning something with respect to that petition and the manner in which signatures were obtained to it. In the first place, a number of signatures, which profess to be the signatures of Conservatives, were not those of Conservatives. I desire that the House should understand exactly what the feeling of the people up there is with regard to this matter. I think there are some five Conservatives in Wiarton who do not approve altogether of this Bill as it now stands. I think there are five who would like to see the clause with respect to Indians amended in such a way that an Indian who is able to vote should also be liable to be sued. There is not, however, I think, one—perhaps there may be one, but I think not—who objects to the principle of the Bill, the principle that this Dominion Parliament should regulate the franchise for the Dominion. Those gentlemen who have signed the petition which I presented the other day, in order to have their names removed from the original petition, signed it because they say they signed the original petition on the understanding—at all events, they were given to understand so by the gentleman who went round with the petition—that every adult male Indian in the Dominion was to have a vote, irrespective of any property qualification whatever, whereas no white man could vote without a property qualification. Now, Sir, I venture to repeat what I stated on the floor of this House before, that those names were obtained by gross misrepresentation. I say that misrepresentation more gross than that it would be very difficult to imagine. No such proposition, as hon. gentlemen on both sides know perfectly well, was ever made. I should be glad if I could stop here, but I am obliged to go a little further. There was a document presented to this House by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), which purported to be signed by Conservatives who had signed the original petition, and it was for the purpose of sustaining that petition. Now, I have got to say that the names upon this document were not all names of Conservatives. One gentleman who signed that document refused to sign it as a Conservative at all, though he was requested to do so, and it was then suggested to him—he having refused to sign it as a Conservative—that he should write the word "ditto" after his name, to mislead this honorable House, and lead hon. gentlemen to believe that he signed the document as a Conservative. This gentleman, who is one of the most respectable and respected Reformers in Wiarton, refused to be a party to such gross conduct; he refused to sign the document as a Conservative, or to put the word "ditto" after his name, and he alleges that he wrote the word "Grit" after his name. That is so, of course, but what is opposite to the name now I confess I am unable to say. It looks like two "d's;" at all events, the reporters of *Hansard* and the reporters of the *Globe* have had this document, I think, and they assumed that the document was signed by him as a Conservative, through the mark which is now after his name. The persons who obtained this signature have treated it as the signature of a Conservative; they have placed commas under it and after the names following, for the express purpose of leading the House to believe that he signed as a Conservative. I venture to say that a grosser fraud could not be attempted to be palmed off upon this honorable House. But I have to go further. I say that on the original petition there is to be found the name of George Kidd, merchant; and I have to say that Mr. Kidd did not sign that petition at all, that he authorised no one to sign it for him, that he was in ignorance that his name appeared on the petition for days afterwards, that he was informed accidentally that his name appeared upon it, and that he objected to having his name upon it at all. I will read the statutory declaration made by Mr. Kidd with reference to this matter:

"COUNTY OF BRUCE, } I, George Kidd, of the village of Wiarton, in the
"*To Wit:* } county of Bruce, merchant, do solemnly declare:

"1. That I did not sign any petition against or condemnatory of the proposed Franchise Bill now under consideration by the House of Commons of Canada.

"2. That some time during the latter part of last month I was informed by a resident of the said village that my name appeared amongst the signatures appended to a certain petition purporting to have been signed by persons residing in the said village against the said Franchise Bill, and I say that up to that time I was quite unaware that my name appeared amongst the said signatures, and I further say that I did not, at any time, either directly or indirectly, or in any manner whatsoever, authorise any one to sign the said petition for me or on my behalf.

"3. That one Alexander A. Campbell, of the said village, druggist's clerk, came to me some time last month and presented the document, read, as I am informed and believe, by Mr. Edgar, M.P., in the House of Commons, and negatived the use of fraud or misrepresentation in the obtaining of signatures to the said petition, to me for signature, and said Campbell then said to me that he had been accused of forgery in connection with the obtaining of the said signatures, and asked me to sign the said document, and I declined to do so, telling said Campbell, at the same time, that my name had been placed on said petition without any authority and without my knowledge.

"4. That I never was, at any time, and I am not now, opposed to the passage of the said Bill.

"And I make this solemn declaration, &c.

"GEO. S. KIDD."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that if it were necessary that I should do so, I am prepared to prove that some signatures were obtained to another petition against the Franchise Bill, from another part of my constituency, by gross misrepresentation also; and that it was endeavored to induce other Conservatives to sign that petition by making use of similar gross misrepresentation. But I do not wish to multiply words upon this subject. The indisputable and disreputable facts speak for themselves much more powerfully than I can do. I do not wish to ask this honorable House to resort to that process which would be necessary in order to inflict

upon the person who has treated the House with such gross contempt the punishment such conduct deserves; but I hope it will be understood, in future, that if anyone is guilty of such conduct the House will resort to such means as will make the recurrence of such conduct in the last degree improbable. I think the right of petition is a most valuable privilege—but, unfortunately, petitions are rapidly falling into disrepute, and it behooves us, as guardians of the public interest, to endeavor, in every way that we can, to surround that valuable privilege with safeguards. I venture to think that if we do not do so the value of that privilege will disappear very soon.

Mr. EDGAR. Rather a broad discussion has been opened up by the observations of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. As he has referred to me in connection with the presenting of some petitions, I would like to say, with regard to the third and last petition, which has come from the same gentlemen, that I have a letter in my hand which I received yesterday or the day before from Mr. Campbell, of Wiarton, who sent me down the petition originally, about which all this fuss has taken place. Mr. Campbell says that the hon. member for North Bruce was in his county working up this matter himself, and he goes on to say:

"I have been told that there are a few names on that said petition"——

He refers to the last one—the last recantation of the hon. gentleman's friends——

"who had signed that declaration which I got up, and the names of those parties are respectively E. A. Pennock, John West, and Thomas Vogan. I took the trouble in calling on the above parties, and was astonished to find that they did not know what they were signing. I asked Mr. Pennock did he know what was written on that petition. He said positively he did not. I then next called on Mr. West, and I have witness to this. He said that he could not tell what was on that paper, but he understood that it was something about Crocker Indians, and I signed it. Lastly I called on Thomas Vogan. I have witness to this. He said he signed it on condition, and if there is no written conditions attached opposite his name, it is valueless. He said I signed it on these conditions. If the heading of your petition says that all Indians in the Province of Quebec and Ontario shall have votes, qualified as white men are, and so soon as they are enfranchised, that they shall be liable for any debt they may contract and separate themselves from the tribe, and are in every respect as white men and not minors, then I will sign your petition."

Now, there is one substantial point arrived at, so far as I can see, and only one, because these gentlemen are as willing to sign one petition as another, apparently, and the point is this: My hon. friend admits that ten Conservatives in the village of Wiarton are not satisfied with the Franchise Bill.

Mr. McNEILL. I have not done anything of the kind.

Mr. EDGAR. I think the hon. gentleman said five of one kind and five of another kind of Conservatives.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not. I can twice say five without meaning ten.

Mr. EDGAR. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Perhaps he only said five of one kind.

Mr. McNEILL. Five.

Mr. EDGAR. There is another fact the hon. gentleman has admitted, that is, that some persons represented they were Conservatives and are now Reformers. I dare say that is the case, as it is in other places besides Wiarton. However, I gave the hon. gentleman the paper he has taken up to his county. He has thoroughly investigated it, and I was very sure when I presented it that it would be investigated. I am very glad that it has been, as I do not wish to present anything to this House that is not genuine; and if any mistakes have been made, I am as glad to have them corrected as the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. McNEILL. I only wish to say, in reply to what the hon. gentleman has said, that any person who would obtain the name I have referred to on this confirmatory document, and would allow that name to appear as having been signed as a Conservative, when it was signed to that document as a Grit name, and who would also have Mr. Kidd's name placed on the original petition without Mr. Kidd's knowledge, is perfectly capable of writing such a letter as the hon. gentleman has read.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) can give us something with reference to the way in which Mr. Kidd's name was obtained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This matter must be thoroughly understood. I know Mr. George Kidd and Mr. Joseph Kidd, two of the most respectable men in Canada. Mr. Kidd has solemnly declared, in a paper which is equivalent to his affidavit, that his name was forged, that he never signed the petition and did not know it was in circulation, and only heard of it accidentally. He also says that this Mr. Campbell, whose letter has just been read, tried to coax him to sign a subsequent petition.

Mr. EDGAR. I believe it is important that this matter should be understood, and I believe the hon. member for South Grey has some information upon it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some few days ago I received a letter from a respectable gentleman living at Wiarton, who has given me the privilege of reading the letter, which will throw some light on this very obscure question. It is very desirable that the House should be placed in possession of the facts, so as to be able to decide whether these gentlemen have been taken in in connection with these petitions. This gentleman says:

"I beg to advise you that the local celebrities who have interested themselves in making light of the petition and alleging fraud as the prime factor in the securing of names, are employés of the Dominion Government, placed in position through Mr. McNeill's influence, and are well paid for their allegiance to the Tory party; and they are straining every nerve to whip the Conservatives, who dared to act for themselves, into line, and have tried to get them to sign another document retracting what they have done."

Further he says:

"One point he will no doubt bring up is the name of George Kidd, by forgery, producing an affidavit from Kidd as evidence. Please note, Kidd is on the petition, not on the declaration that followed it. His name was signed by his book-keeper, to whom Campbell presented it"——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear me, and you may laugh afterwards. He who laughs last, laughs best——

"and he assured Campbell he had perfect right and authority to do so, that he signed Kidd's name to other petitions, and he had always recognised it as done by himself."

There is another little matter which it is, perhaps, just as well to understand:

"He may also advance that some so-called Conservatives are Reformers, but entered as Tories on the list. It is not true. There may be one or two of Independent ideas, but they have Conservative leanings, and have always been treated by us as of that persuasion. One man says he signed the petition as a Grit, meaning he was a Grit in being opposed to the Franchise Bill; but he signed the declaration afterwards as a Liberal-Conservative, which he is."

Further on he says:

"They have catechised the signers thoroughly and have tried to so represent the Bill, and the stand they have taken in thinking for themselves, that they may have caused one or two weak-kneed individuals to acknowledge themselves "Darwin's missing link" or anything else, if it will please Mr. McNeill; but those who have stamina enough to assert their manhood, have not been workable in his hands, and a general retraction cannot be obtained."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask that letter to be laid on the Table. I think the House has a right to it, and must insist on it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have laid that portion of the letter on the Table that I intend to lay. It is a letter I had authority to read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The name I am at liberty to give if it is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary. The writer says:

"I suppose there will be no need of giving my name. You are aware of that; but do not let a charge of cowardice keep it back."

I have read the clauses which bear on this important matter of the poor innocent Conservatives of Wiarton who were deluded into signing a petition. I was told by another gentleman that anybody who lived within a few miles of an Indian reservation would have no difficulty in getting names to a petition of this kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have only one thing to say more. The right of petition and the protection of Parliament against fraudulent petitions is of the utmost importance to this House. The hon. gentleman has read a letter, and has not given the name; but he has made himself responsible, in some degree, for the respectability of that letter.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, that letter states distinctly that the bookeeper of Mr. Kidd, stated that he had full authority from his master to sign that petition. Mr. Kidd has sworn that he gave no authority, and did not know anything about the petition. Now, Sir, it is necessary to protect the right of petition, and after the statement of the hon. gentleman, it will be my duty to take steps to bring this same bookeeper before the House.

Mr. McNEILL. It has been alleged that the gentlemen who got up this petition, which I presented, were employés of the Government. That is quite untrue, it was a medical gentleman who obtained the signatures.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is he not now in the employ of the Government?

Mr. McNEILL. Not that I know of.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is he not the medical man to the Indians up there? Of course he is.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has reminded me of a fact which, in itself, was so insignificant that I had forgotten it; and further, that gentleman has frequently expressed his intention of giving up that place, because it was valueless to him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I call on the hon. gentleman to retract his first statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless there is a personal explanation, I cannot allow the rules of debate to be transgressed by hon. gentlemen by speaking so often. The House is in full possession of the facts. The hon. gentleman has admitted that he had forgotten the fact.

THE STAFF OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to submit for the consideration of the House a series of resolutions accompanied by certain schedules adopted by the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons, providing for the better qualification and arrangement of the salaries and staff of the House.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that on Monday the House will resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions regarding the immigration of Chinamen.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, ETC.—REMUNERATION TO ANALYSTS.

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

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may cause such remuneration as he deems proper to be paid to the analysts to be appointed under the Bill now before the House, intituled: "An Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers;" and such remuneration, whether by fees or salary, or partly in one way and partly in the other, may be paid to such analysts out of any sums voted by Parliament for the purposes of the Act.

HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF THREE RIVERS—GOVERNMENT LOAN.

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

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may authorise the raising by way of loan, in the manner prescribed by the Act 35 Vic., chap. 6, as amended by 38 Vic, chap. 4, of a sum of money not exceeding eighty-two thousand dollars, at a rate of interest not exceeding four per cent. per annum, and to advance out of the sum so raised to the Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers, on their bonds as such, bearing interest at four per centum per annum, and being a first charge on their income from tolls and other revenues, such sum of money as may be required to redeem the outstanding debentures of the commissioners and interest accrued thereon, and for the payments to be made on account of their works now under contract; such advances to be made under the approval of the Governor in Council, on the report of the Minister of Public Works.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the papers which were laid on the Table yesterday bearing on the North-West troubles all the papers which the Government intend to submit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, there are some additional papers being prepared and some daily arriving, which will be laid on the Table as they are ready from time to time.

HEALTH OF THE FINANCE MINISTER.

Mr. McGREEVY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government whether there is any truth in the rumor—and, I am sure, the country will be delighted if it be true—that the Government have information as to the improved health of the Finance Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad to say the rumor is true. A successful operation has been performed, and he has been relieved of the stone; and he is most likely to be restored to perfect health.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 113) respecting proofs of entries in books of accounts kept by officers of the Crown.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Bill (No. 122) respecting agricultural fertilisers.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House again resolved itself into committee on resolutions (p. 2440) to authorise grants of Dominion lands to railway companies in the North-West.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 2 (Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company).

Mr. HESSON. Carried.

Mr. BLAKE. No; not yet. The hon. member for North Perth is very anxious to have this carried without knowing anything about the matter. I would ask whether the hon. member has read any of the papers upon the subject of this railway? I thought not. I agree with the hon. gentleman, however, that this resolution should prevail, but I have arrived at that conclusion from a perusal of the papers, and

I think it ought not to be carried without some discussion and without some further information. Of course, the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who has arrived at the conclusion that this resolution should be carried, does not need any further information, but I think the other members of the committee are entitled to some further information on the subject.

Mr. HESSON. You spoke yesterday for an hour and a-half upon it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman thinks I spoke yesterday upon the subject of the Manitoba South-Western Railway. I was not fortunate enough to convey to the hon. gentleman the subject upon which I was speaking, but he is mistaken. I did not say one word about the Manitoba South-Western Railway, nor did I touch upon the resolution now proposed to the committee.

Mr. HESSON. You spoke generally on the resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I did not speak generally on the resolutions. I spoke upon the resolution which was passed through the committee last night, and upon it alone, and I did not speak upon any other topic embraced in these resolutions.

Mr. McCALLUM. Speak now then.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I intend to speak now. The original resolutions with reference to the Manitoba South-Western Railway were of a character very different as to dates and circumstances from those one would be led to believe from the statement of the First Minister when he answered me in the general remarks I made upon the occasion of the motion to go into committee. The hon. gentleman stated that the original proposals on the subject of aid to branch railways in the North-West were made at a time when everything was *couleur de rose*, when the boom was on, when it was supposed that there was a very large profit to be had in lands, and that the difficulties which had supervened since that time and the changed policy of the Government were due to the falling out of the bottom of the boom, to an altered condition of things in that respect. That may be the case with reference to some, or to one, of the branch railway projects in the North-West, but it is certainly not the case with reference to the Manitoba South-Western Railway, because the proposal with reference to it was made as early as December, 1879, and that was anterior to the period at which the boom had been fostered under the impulses of hon. gentlemen. On the 1st December, 1879, I find Mr. Schultz, the present Senator Schultz, applies for the privilege of a land grand of six miles on each side, purchasing it at $1 an acre. At that time, the policy had been inaugurated by hon. gentlemen of the establishment of belts of railway land for 100 miles, I think, on each side of the Pacific Railway; and the fifth belt, being a belt of fifty miles, was on sale at $1 an acre, payable 10 per cent. down, and the balance in nine annual instalments. On the 26th January, 1880, Senator Schultz applies for leave to buy 30,000 acres in belt E, on behalf of the company; but, between the prime meridian and the 14th township, he finds the land had been taken up by those speculators to whom the hon. gentleman's policy at that time gave favorable opportunities of acquiring lands, not under conditions of settlement, by paying a sum of 10c. an acre on account of them, and therefore he points out that he is desirous to select the land in the townships west of the 14th township, and wants to deposit the cash in advance even of the opportunity of selection. On the 19th February, 1880, he asks to buy in belt E, in the two ranges west of the existing survey, and of which survey returns are now being made, and offers at once to deposit $3,000, being the cash instalment on those lands; and, on the 28th April, 1880, he asks to be allowed to buy the 2,500, or if possible, 3,000, acres a mile along the line of the extension chartered that Session, and declares that, when the Government indicates the quantity of land they will allow, the company will show the exact location. That was the condition of things, briefly stated, so far as appears from this correspondence, with reference to the Manitoba South-Western Railway, up to the period at which the Deputy Minister reported to Council upon the general question of what the railway policy of the Government should be in this regard. That report was made on the 22nd June, 1880, and it reports an application made by the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company to buy railway lands near their line at $1 an acre. It reports that the officer has given much consideration to the question. The statement made is:

"The undersigned has given much consideration to the subject of affording direct encouragement to companies willing to undertake the construction of second class or colonisation railways throughout the North-West Territories, by making a sale of lands along the line of such railway, at such a price as would afford a fair margin of profit to the company upon the sale of such land by it on the building of the railway being assessed; and he is of opinion, as regards the application in question, that the terms hereinafter suggested are such as will commend themselves as in the public interest, besides which he is given to understand by Mr. William Bannerman, M.P., acting on behalf of the railway company mentioned, that the same will be acceptable to the company. The undersigned therefore recommends the following to the favorable consideration of the Council:

"1. That the gauge, grades, plans and location of said road shall be submitted for the approval of the Government.

"2 That, upon the Government being satisfied that said company will build the railway, the company may purchase all the railway lands for six miles on each side of the line for a distance of 50 miles along the line at the rate of $1 per acre for such lands.

"3. The quantity of land which the company will be permitted to purchase, as above, per mile, to be 3,840 acres.

"4. The company to pay in cash for such lands at the time of purchase.

"5. The company to reimburse the Government the cost of survey of the lands purchased by it, the average rate to be obtained by averaging the cost of survey of the several townships on each side of the line of railway for each 50 miles independently.

"6. The company to build such 50 miles of its road within one year after the Canadian Pacific Railway shall have been completed to the proposed point of junction of the company's line with the said railway.

"7. On completion of the 50 miles in accordance with the next preceding paragraph, the company to be allowed to purchase the railway lands within the said belt of six miles for a second stretch of 50 miles along the line."

And so on, on the understanding that 50 miles a year at least shall be completed. The provision is made that the purchase of railway lands along the first 50 miles will commence at the outer limit of the five mile belt along the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is to say, the company will not be allowed to purchase any railway lands in the five mile belt. Then,

"In the event of the company not building a given 50 miles in any one year, the Government to have the right to cancel this agreement so far as relates to the portion of such 50 miles not completed."

Then there is a provision for the case of squatters, and for organisation, and then the officer recommends:

"That the above provision be extended to the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company, also chartered during the recent Session of Parliament. An application of a similar nature to that made on behalf of the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company having been preferred by Dr. Schultz, M.P., as representing the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company, the undersigned recommends that the same be dealt with on the same basis hereinafter proposed, the only exception being:

"(*a*) That the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company will be required to have 50 miles of its road in operation in the course of the year 1881; and

"(*b*) That the sale of lands along this company's line at $1 per acre shall commence from the westerly limit of the Province of Manitoba."

That was the proposal which the officer made and that proposal was submitted by the direction of Council to two Ministers, the Minister of the Interior—the present First Minister—and the Minister of Railways, and they, on the 26th June, report upon it as follows:—

"The undersigned, to whom this subject of sale or disposition of lands in the North-West in aid of colonisation railways has been referred, beg leave to report that they concur in the recommendation of the Deputy Minister of the Interior and submit the same for the favorable consideration of Council."

And upon that, the Council ordered that. Now, the hon. gentleman, alluding to the fact which is now too well known, which he acknowledged to be well known, that the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Company is at present owned and controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway, answered my statement with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's relations to the branch lines of the North-West, by saying that it was quite true that that company did contemplate building branch lines, but that it was also absolutely necessary they should build the main line of their railway before they built the branch lines, and that therefore their operations in the way of branch line building were necessarily deferred. Such was not the statement made upon the occasion of the debate upon the Canadian Pacific Railway; such was not the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself. Their policy was to build branch lines before they had completed their main line through the entire portion of the prairie section up to the Rocky Mountains. On the 4th September, 1881, a meeting of the board of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was held at Winnipeg, and the results of the meeting were published. That was not the earliest statement of theirs, because, even before that, they had made an application to the Government to reserve lands along—I cannot exactly remember the mileage, but I think some 1,200 or 1,500 miles of branch railways which they had projected and had sent in an approximate location of these lines with a view to the reservation of lands, and had indicated their intention to go on with them. On the 4th September, 1881, certain resolutions were reached by the board and were published in the newspapers:

"1. To proceed with line to Calgary.

"2. To build line from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, direct Location at once.

"3. South-west branch line, Winnipeg to Pembina Mountains, located. Immediate construction ordered.

"4. Branch line resolved on to be called the Assiniboine Branch, leaving main line about 20 miles east of Brandon, going north-west towards Little Saskatchewan, Fort Ellice, Riding Mountain and Touchwood Hills. Location and survey ordered immediately.

"5. Branch line determined to be constructed from Grand Forks of the Qu'Appelle, north-westerly, passing to the southward of Battleford, to be called a Saskatchewan Branch. Resolved to proceed at once with survey and location, with a view to immediate construction.

"6. Also decided to construct a branch to be called the Souris Branch, to commence near Brandon, going south-westerly in the direction of Souris River and Turtle Mountain District, to within 24 miles of the international boundary, then westward to the 104th meridian, parallel to boundary; immediate survey and location ordered.

Now, Sir, that was the formal decision of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to the immediate operations in the way of constructing branch lines, which it gave to the public on the 4th September, 1881. We are now very nearly arrived at September, 1885, and I point to the fact that the company, at a time when it was not proposed to construct the main line from Callander to the Pacific Ocean in a period short of ten years from the giving of the contract in 1880, were contemplating, and wisely contemplating, if their contemplation was serious, if they really intended what they proposed, the immediate construction of branch lines through the Province of Manitoba to the North-West Territory—I say, Sir, that that policy, if that was their policy, was altered afterwards, and altered upon arrangements made between them and the Administration of the day by which they determined to employ such portion of their resources as were to remain after the purchase of eastern extensions and the application of a lot of money, another transaction to which I will not at present allude—I say to put all their remaining resources into the immediate construction and completion of the main line from ocean to ocean, to the prejudice of the scheme of branch lines. Now the consequence of that policy, and that change of policy, were extremely serious to the North-West. Numbers of settlers came into that country and located in various parts, upon the strength, first of all, of the original location of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the way of the Yellow Head Pass, and afterwards upon the knowledge that a line pretty much upon that location from the point of junction with a more southerly route of the main line, was projected by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the south of Manitoba, upon the faith of the proposals, the arrangements, the charter for this Manitoba Southern Colonisation Company that we now have before us, and afterwards for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's rival proposal for a south-eastern road of its own. But these expectations which were raised by the Manitoba South-Eastern arrangements, and by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's proposals, were all, so far as they involved an extended area of branch line construction in the North-West, doomed to disappointment. They were not carried out, and the result was, not merely that the development of the country was checked and thwarted, but that a serious wrong was done to a large number of persons who settled upon the solo ground and expectation of those announced and published policies being carried out in accordance with the announcements, and who found themselves disappointed, who found themselves injured, who found themselves unable to obtain that settlement in their immediate neighborhood which they had expected, and who found it almost hopeless to raise grain upon their farms, because they could not dispose of it, and could not get to market the grain they had. And that was the condition of things which could not but redound unfavorably to the prospects of the country, redound more unfavorably than if there had been no settlement in that particular locality with such results. I have time and again stated to the House that in my opinion the most satisfactory evidence which you can offer to the world and upon which you can hope to get a settlement there is the statement of those who are there as to the results of their going in; and when you find statements made by the settlers of disappointment, of its being useless for them to continue to raise grain, such statements as then were made with reference to that most favorably circumstanced portion of our North-West domain, the southern and south-western part of Manitoba, you find not merely that there is no development, but that there is a check to development which it requires years to get over. Now, I make these observations because Parliament is now for the first time face to face with the proposals made to Parliament for the development of the North-West by railways, which has been done hitherto by Executive action, because we have not hitherto had the parliamentary proposals made and submitted for our consideration as legislators. I signalise the unfortunate results which have already taken place from Executive action of one kind or another as indicating the importance of these matters, which are vital to that country, being submitted, upon some intelligible and well considered plan, to the consideration of the people's representatives, a settled policy based upon such plan being adopted here instead of the course being pursued, which was pursued, of Executive action, under wide and general parliamentary powers, and, I regret to say, rash, vacillating, ill-considered, unhappy Executive action, as has been demonstrated from these papers. Now, Sir, we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company came out as a rival to the Manitoba South-Western. The hon. gentleman said it was not hostile to the Manitoba South-Western. Does the hon. gentleman remember the history of the bonus that the people of Winnipeg were about to vote to the Manitoba South-Western Railway? Does he remember the sudden visit by a special train from St. Paul of the authorities of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the town of Winnipeg to prevent that bonus of $200,000 being granted? Does he remember that their influence resulted in that bonus not being granted? And

does he remember that that was immediately followed by an application from themselves that they should have that bonus with reference to certain conditions which they intended to fulfil to the people of Winnipeg if they would give $200,000 of their money in addition to their published subsidies, and which otherwise they would not fulfil? There was, I maintain, a condition of marked hostility on the part of that railway company to the Manitoba South-Western, a condition of marked hostility which, followed up, aided and abetted as it was by the Government, resulted in a thwarting of that scheme in those early days when, but for that course, it would have been completed long ago, to the great advantage of the locality which it was particularly designed to serve, and of the whole Province of Manitoba and of Canada at large. I have pointed out to you that, as early as 1879 and 1880, Dr. Schultz, the original applicant and representative of the company, was pressing to be allowed to buy some land. His demand was reasonable. He wanted to buy land on the same terms as the public were allowed to buy it, without any condition of settlement, to the extent of 3,800 acres per mile. He pointed out that speculators were getting in before him, that they were buying the land and paying 10c. per acre down, that the land, the value of which was going to be enhanced by the railway, was being bought up by speculators, and he asked the Government to be allowed to deposit $3,000 to secure the odd sections along the line, so that the company might have the benefit instead of speculators. But he found difficulties and delays in obtaining concessions of this kind, which resulted, of course, in creating difficulties for the company. Then the Government came, in June, 1880, to the general conclusion to which I have already referred. And then commences a correspondence as to the station grounds and as to the timber, and some difficulty existed with respect to the station grounds and the timber to be used for the construction of the railway. On 24th September, 1880, Dr. Schultz writes as to the purchase of railway lands. He says the company will very early be in a position to complete 100 miles west from Winnipeg, and he points out that the quantity will be 2,768,000 acres, and they will be prepared to pay therefor shortly by the close of the current year. That is the close of 1880. He asks whether the Government is in a position to carry out their arrangement. He then, on 27th September, 1880, writes to the Government again with respect to Victoria Park, a property which the railway company desires to acquire some rights over as a station ground and so forth in Winnipeg; and he also mentions that negotiations with a London syndicate, to which he alluded in a former letter, are about being closed. On 24th September, 1880, he applies for liberty to purchase Government lands between Winnipeg and Rock Lake for five miles on each side of the railway; and he states then that the contract has been let, and the company is anxious to complete the purchase at once. On 13th August, 1880, the Minister of Public Works who was then acting Minister of Railways wrote to Dr. Schultz, stating that the letter with map of the location from Winnipeg to Rock Lake was received. He points out that under the Order in Council the location with plans would be required, but he says: "I may say, however, having mentioned the matter to several of my colleagues, I am under the impression that a general description of either of those lines would be acceptable to the Government." Then on October 6th, 1880, the secretary of the company telegraphs to say that a map showing the location will be sent to the Department at the earliest moment; and the Deputy Minister replied on the same day that it was important they should know at once the probable time that the maps would arrive. On October 14th Young says the exact location will be sent, and the map is in the office of the Minister of Railways. He points out that the outlines of the country are broken and it would take some time to obtain a minute survey. I need hardly say, Mr. Chairman, that the main point to be decided at that time, it appearing that the road was practicable, was, that general location would be acceptable. Upon that the Minister of Public Works has decided that either of the two general lines that were laid down on the map of the territory would be acceptable to the Government. Then Young declares on 4th November, 1880, that a verbal assurance had been given by the Government, he understood in London, to Madison & Co. for the lands, 3,840 acres per mile for that part constructed in Manitoba; that the contract for the construction of 119 miles was made; and he asks whether the double belt is to begin at the western limit of Manitoba. The committee will see that it was arranged from the beginning that the company should get the land grant outside of the western limit of old Manitoba inasmuch as a large portion was to be earned inside Manitoba and it was necessary there should be a double belt in order to enable the company to obtain the land grant for the mileage inside of the portion of the territory and outside the Province; and the secretary asks whether the double belt is to commence at the western limit. All this was going on with the apparent acceptance of the Government of the project, the Government acceeding to the views of the company; but a change took place very soon afterwards, not long after the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was let. Up to a period shortly after the letting of that contract there seems to be no difficulty in regard to the Manitoba South-Western Colonisation Railway Company; but very soon afterwards it appeared that the Canadian Pacific Railway was desirous of crushing out the company in one way or other, and then difficulties occurred, resulting in a postponement, an apparently indefinite postponement, of the work. On 4th November, 1880, the secretary wrote to the Government that the company is now able to go on rapidly, and he sent in evidence the mortgage trust deed to trustees to secure, by a mortgage of the enterprise, the repayment of the bonds which were to be executed for the construction of the road. I may say, however, that a copy of the deed just referred to in this correspondence is not brought down with the papers, and I think it should have been. He also encloses a contract for 119 miles of railway, and he states that the work is going on and that several miles are graded. That is as long ago as 4th November, 1880. He adverts to the fact that passenger and freight stations which were being built in Winnipeg, under arrangements with the municipality, were nearly completed, and arrangements as to the right of way were being pushed. On the following day, 5th November, 1880, Young refers to Dr. Schultz's letter of 24th September, and says the board are now prepared to buy, according to the arrangement of 23rd June, 1880, 3,840 acres per mile for 50 miles and pay $1 per acre cash for it. Then you find almost immediately the first evidence of conflict. In November, 1880, the Crown timber agent writes that conflicts have occurred between the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Manitoba South-Western, each claiming to take timber off the same land, and he wants to know what is to be done to settle the difficulty; and some instructions are given him upon the subject. On 29th November, 1880, the secretary telegraphs to Mr. Dennis that the location and grades will be furnished in a few days, and he asks whether Scoble's report, which had been sent the secretary from Dennis, had been received. On the 27th he asks him to open Scoble's report. That report was sent on 24th December, 1880, by Scoble to Dennis, and it is brought down in the papers. It gave a very full report of the character of the country traversed upon this location and the practicability of the location he arrived at. On the 14th of December, 1880,

Mr. Young writes to Mr. Dennis, sending the plan of location prepared by Mr. Scoble, and on the 17th January, 1881, Mr. Dennis reports the map of the lands, on which is shown to the east of the limit, between the 23rd and 24th ranges, the lands which would fall to the Manitoba South Western Colonisation Railway at the rate of 3,840 acres per mile, and to the west of the limit, between the 23rd and 24th ranges, the sections which would fall to the company at the rate of 6,000 acres to the mile. He reports that a promise had been made to Dr. Schultz that the sale of 3,840 acres per mile to the company should be considered as for the whole line, and that the company should take the acreage representing the mileage within the Province at some point further west; and he adverts to a letter which he had written, by authority, to Dr. Schultz at the time when Mr. Codd, the company's agent, was going to England to make financial arrangements. He says that the question was then whether the Minister would allow the company to commence at the existing western boundary of the Province of Manitoba, at the rate of 6,000 per mile, and permit them to acquire the additional acreage elsewhere, or whether he would restrict them to the existing arrangement. There you find the actual arrangement of the map showing the Manitoba South-Western land, and we find that such a map was actually issued from the Department. We know that it went to a limited extent into circulation, and having gone into circulation it was recalled, and recalled because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had decided to build a line over this same territory, and they wanted to get hold of these lands, and thus it was that the thwarting process went on. Then, on the 15th March, 1881, the First Minister refers to an Order in Council of 1880 and to an application made by the Manitoba South-Western to increase their acreage to 6,400, and he proposes the cancellation of the former Order in Council, and that the company should be allowed 6,400 acres per mile of their line from Winnipeg to a point in the vicinity of the Roche Percée on the Souris River; that the lands to be sold to the company—the estimated length of the railway being 312 miles—comprising in all 1,996,800 acres were to be disposed of in two separate transactions—3,840 acres on the western boundary of the Province to the termination of the railway. The company were to pay one-third of the purchase money in cash, and the balance in two equal instalments, and the order was made accordingly. Then we find that Dr. Schultz asks for the privilege of payment in ten annual instalments, and that it should be deemed necessary to alter the usual conditions of sales by the Government, no greater change would be made than the payment on one-fifth in cash and the remainder in four annual instalments with interest. This he says would leave the company free to push their work rapidly with their present financial arrangements, and enable them to build the road faster. On the 13th June, 1881, an Order in Council was passed reserving some of the lands. In October, 1881, there appears to have been a location for 58 miles laid before the Government. But a difficulty existed in the city of Winnipeg. The location crossed the track of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and that company objected—I am not in a position to say, unreasonably—perhaps it was not unreasonable—I know nothing about it—but, in consequence of the location of the road at the commencement, the whole location was disapproved. An amended location was put in, on the 3rd November, 1881, and after correspondence and interviews with Mr. William Macdougall, Q.C., as agent of the company, arrangements were made by which at a cost to the company of $100,000, for the work they had uselessly done on the other location, the location was changed, and this location was agreed upon. Now there is the state of things as it existed at that time. Then other influences came into play to which the hon. gentleman alluded. He said there was an unhappy dispute on the board—a difficulty which obstructed things. Well, of course, we know something of that, and what was the real reason at the bottom of that difficulty? There were two rival parties wanting to get control of the railway, one being the greater interest, and the other the original promoters or those who were acting in their interest, and there was difficulty about that. Now, as long ago as 1871, according to this return, settlers came into one of the counties in the region which was to be traversed, or partly served, by this railway, and in 1880 they gave a bonus of $100,000 on certain conditions as to location, and there are petitions and prayers for consideration by the ratepayers of that municipality as to what should be done, as there were with reference to another county at a later date. Ultimately it was made plain that the company had been unable to obtain approval of its grant. The location was approved for 58 miles, but they never were able to get a declaration from the Government that the grant was made. They struggled on, and they managed to complete the 58 miles, but finding a dead weight of pressure upon them which they could not get off, finding that they could not get the lands for the further construction of the road approved, finding that they could not make progress, that in fact the greater power was hostile to them and could prevail over them at headquarters, they ultimately sold out, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company acquired control of the enterprise. In the meantime the Canadian Pacific Railway had itself started an enterprise designed to serve—though not exactly in the same line all through, but designed in its prolongation to serve the same country—its south-western branch. On the 8th of May, 1884, the great railway company having got control of the small one, proposals are made for extensions of accommodation, and here we get a condition made with reference to this railway that is not made with reference to any of the other railways and to which I call the particular attention of the committee, as requiring explanation. It is universally conceded, I believe, that the territory of South-Western Manitoba is on the whole, one of the most favorable sections of country in the North-West, and the proposal which was made when the enterprise got into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was that the land grant should consist of lands all fairly fit for settlement. The general Order in Council had not been of that character. The grants to none of the other railways at any time proposed, were of that character. All the grants, so far as I know, have been on the lands as they came in the five mile belt on each side, or the six mile belt, as the case might be. That has been the universal practice also with reference to the United States subsidies to railways, so far as I know. The railway company took the good and the bad, the rough and the smooth; it took its chances with the Government and the country, and that was the policy of the Government with reference to all railways except the Canadian Pacific Railway itself, to whom it had given the right that these lands should be fairly fit for settlement. But so soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had adopted this child, they made the same demand in favor of the infant that they had made for themselves, and that demand the Government conceded that the land grant to them should be exclusively of land fit for settlement, although that proposal is not made with reference to the others. The proposal was made as I have said, on the 8th May, 1884, providing that the time shall be extended for the payment of the 960,000 acres of land which is to be fairly fit for settlement. On the 25th of April, 1884, the new organisation, under the auspices of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, communicates to the Government that they have been unable to make the necessary financial arrangements to enable them to pro-

ceed with the construction of the road, on the existing arrangement, and they ask for a modification with a view to strengthen their financial position, and that instead of paying for the lands in advance the payment shall be postponed until the company are required to give title to settlers or purchasers. In all 960,000 acres, to be paid for as they are sold by the company. On the 30th of April the Government passed an Order in Council agreeing to the condition that the lands shall be paid for by the company as they are sold within the limit of seven years; so that the company would have that period within which to sell its lands and pay the money to the Government. It provides also that the lands should be fairly fit for settlement. The argument of the company was: 58 miles of the road are constructed; they were constructed by the old company without the benefit of a land grant, though with the promise of a land grant; we now require that you will give us 6,400 acres for the whole distance at $1 an acre and the price of survey, and a latitude of payment, and upon these terms we agree to go on. But, subsequently, they declare that a new arrangement will have to be made. On the 27th of September, 1884, Mr. Van Horne, the president of the company, writes that notwithstanding the advantages accorded to them, they found it impossible to procure the necessary means for the construction of the railway; and he says:

"As to the question of modifying the manner in which the Government should assist the company in order to ensure the construction of an additional 100 miles of railway during the next season, the board consider that that result could only be made certain by a free grant of the lands applicable to the line already constructed, and the substitution of a subsidy in money for a grant of land, say in the proportion of $1 per acre, in respect of the road to be constructed."

Their statement is: You must give us a free grant of 6,400 acres a mile for the 58 miles already built, although they were built under no such promise, but under the promise of a sale at $1 an acre, and for the rest you must give us a money bonus of $6,400 a mile for every mile we build. They say:

"This would be much less than the value of the lands themselves: but statements from Canada, disseminated broadcast through the Empire, though probably not here implicitly believed, necessarily destroy their value as a security; and the sum mentioned, which represents less than half the value of the lands, would be more effectual in furthering the construction of the railway than a free grant of the lands themselves. With such a subvention in money the company would undertake to complete the required 100 miles during the season of 1885. But I have further to state that if the Government could make a free grant of the whole of the lands, applicable to the entire line constructed and to be constructed, of a quality suitable for settlement, and accessible to railway communication, the company would make a further effort this autumn to raise the necessary funds for proceeding with the railway; and though not sanguine of the result, they would use every means in their power to attain that object."

There is the statement of Mr. Van Horne, the president of the company. He says: We will assure you that we will make a further effort this autumn to raise the necessary funds for proceeding with the railway if you give us 6,400 acres a mile free for the 58 miles already built, and $6,400 in cash per mile for the 100 miles we are to build; but if you will not do that, if you will give us 6,400 acres a mile for what is built as well as for what is to be built, although not sanguine of the result, we shall make an endeavor this fall to go on with the work. Upon that the Minister of the Interior reports, recommending to Council the proposal. He points out the circumstances that there are many settlers in Southern Manitoba and their condition; he points out the modification of the grant, and he recommends that 6,400 acres per mile of land fairly fit for settlement be given for the whole line; but he also points out, which was no doubt the fact, that the practical result of that operation was to give 6,400 miles of land fit for settlement along the line of railway as a bonus for what had been constructed. That is equivalent to 50 per cent. more than 6,400 acres per mile for what is to be built or 9,600 acres per mile for the line still to be constructed. Having so decided, as the Council approved of the proposal of the Minister, on the 7th of October, 1884, Mr. Drinkwater, Secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company writes that Mr. Stephen had left for England, and wanted an investigation of the lands to be made so that it might be ascertained what lands were fairly fit for settlement, and so that lands enough might be taken up. There is an arrangement made, therefore, for an examination of the lands by a board appointed, so that it may be specified what lands belong to the company. I think under these circumstances, when the company itself declares that with 9,600 acres a mile of land fairly fit for settlement along their whole railway, freely given as a subsidy, they will strive, although not sanguine of success, to make arrangements with capitalists in England last fall, when you find the papers disclose that the land was taken up in order to carry out these arrangements, when you find the statement that Mr. Stephen went to England in the fall, and was dealing with this question, it is extraordinary that the Government before coming down this Session to propose this free grant of 9,600 acres a mile for the line to be built, should not have obtained some further evidence of the results of those negotiations last fall. All the evidence we have is the statement of Mr. Van Horne, that they did not succeed. I think we ought to have some other information. We know there have been negotiations, but what they have been we do not know. We know there have been negotiations with the people in that territory for a long time. There was a deputation from the settlers sent to Ottawa, and that deputation met the Minister of Railways and made a proposal that some 25 or 30 miles of the original Manitoba South-Western Railway should be built, and that the rest of the mileage to be constructed should belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway South-Western; and it is reported in the newspapers that Mr. Stephen wrote a letter that he had no objection to that arrangement provided the Canadian Pacific Railway South-Western received a proportion of the land grant, and that he believed the bonus or subsidy could be changed, but about that we have no information. The people of southern Manitoba have been greatly disappointed by the failure of the construction of either of these railways and disappointed by the action of the Government in withdrawing from homestead and pre-emption a vast block of their territory at a moment's notice, and then offering it for sale without conditions of settlement. They have been exposed to many disappointments. I think it is the duty of Parliament when a proposal is made for at length realising those expectations which, since the year 1879, they have been indulging in, at length realising that hope deferred which has made their hearts sick so long—it is the duty of Parliament to ask the Ministry of the day for such proofs as they have, and, if they have not, for the reason why they have not obtained such proofs of the stability and soundness of the present plan, and more particularly when the only evidence the Administration lays before us is the statement of the president of the company that he is not at all sanguine that he will be able to succeed on the proposal under discussion. I ask therefore for information, and shall rejoice to know if the Government has received formal assurances from the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Manitoba and South-Western that they are prepared to succeed. I am not sure about it, because there is one other piece of evidence, and that is the letter of Mr. Stephen, laid on the Table and bearing date 18th March, in which he says, on condition of the Government acceding to the large proposals he laid before them in that letter, and which the Government did not accede to, the company would be able, he believed, to make arrangements for the completion of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway which is so much

wanted. Therefore, according to Mr. Stephen's view on the 18th March, they required greater financial backing, some other arrangement than the free grant of land which was proposed in October, 1884, and which is now proposed to us to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway to assure us the Manitoba and South-Western road will be built, because, Mr. Stephen says, if you make this large financial arrangement proposed, I think I can say the Manitoba and South-Western would be built. That shows that, in his opinion, on the 18th March, it required a greater prop than the hon. gentleman's proposal, and it would not stand alone. I am very sorry to think not, because the Manitoba and South-Western is not an expensive line to build. It is true it is not an absolutely prairie line, true, if you read the report of Mr. Schofield, there is a good deal of broken land, but, upon the whole, it is not an expensive line to build, and we know how cheap all railway construction and material have been for some time past. We know that the last two years have been the cheapest years for railway construction known in the history of America. Therefore, to say that a free grant of 9,600 acres of land, every acre of it fairly fit for settlement, along the line of the South-Western and Manitoba road, is not sufficient financial backing to enable the railway to be constructed, is something which surprises me to find stated by Mr. Stephen in his letter. We ought to grapple with the question. I am very much disposed to the view that in this question of branch line generally we should have proof that the proposal is adequate to the object in view, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree that the history I have given and the statements I have read of the president of the Manitoba South-Western Road and the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway upon the prospects are such as to justify me in asking further information on that subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The speech of the hon. gentleman certainly contains an interesting history of the events connected with the commencement of the Manitoba South-Western Railway, and of the various attempts of the Government to aid in its early construction, but I do not see it is particularly relevant to the motion before the Chair, which is to authorise the Government to make particular grants of land to this in common with other railways. The hon. gentleman, however, has made a microscopic review of all the Orders in Council, of all the papers that were laid on the Table. Many things have happened since the first discussion of this subject, since the first communication with the gentlemen of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway Company, which was promoted by Senator Schultz. At that time, in 1879, Senator Schultz made the statement, I believe, that with the assistance given him he could build the road. He was however disappointed, and again and again applications were made to the Government for extended powers, and assistance and aid. Dr. Schultz, no doubt, truly believed he had made arrangements with certain brokers in England, certain money brokers, Mason & Co., and perhaps also in New York, for the construction of the road. As events proved, he was however mistaken in all this. Neither his correspondents in New York nor his correspondents in London could materially help him. He was disappointed in what were, I dare say, his reasonable expectations, that he would receive the necessary funds to proceed with the railway. It is quite true there was at first great difference of opinion as to the character of the north-western road under that charter. It was known that a great many American speculators took an interest in the line. It was believed, in the old country especially, and believed generally, that the efforts to build a line on condition of getting certain grants of land were made in concert with certain railway influences, railway enterprises in the United States, which were hostile to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That conviction was strengthened by various circumstances which have sprung up from time to time, and there was a strong opinion, in which I myself for a time shared, that this was going to be used for the purpose of strangling the Canadian enterprise. In that suspicion, no doubt, the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway strongly participated, very naturally, because they believed that influence was going to be used for the purpose of strangling the Canadian enterprise. Then the hon. gentleman says truly that I omitted, in making my remarks the other night, to say that there had been early a hostile feeling in that regard. No doubt there was, but it was not material to the argument, nor is it material now. The hon. gentleman quoted the prospectus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in September, 1881, in which they declared it was their intention to build a series of branch lines. We must look back to the general inflation in 1881 as in 1879 and 1880, which existed all over this country with respect to railway construction—an inflation so great that it has caused all the subsequent depression and stringency in railway operations on this continent. It has operated against the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it has operated against every other railway enterprise, whether in the hands of Dr. Schultz, or Mr. Stephen, or Mr. Andrew Allan or anybody else. At that time, in 1881, the company believed they would have no difficulty in building the main line, and they were naturally desirous to have as many feeders to the main line as possible. It was their interest, it was also their duty to those who had invested in the company as well as themselves, to encourage the laying out of main lines, and they laid down a very inviting programme as to the best mode of opening up the best sections of the country by building branch lines; but they knew perfectly well, and we knew perfectly well, that no portion of the funds from the proceeds of land grants or no portion of the money subsidy, $25,000,000, could be appropriated to any one of these lines. The whole proceeds of the subsidy and the sale of lands must be and could only be expended on the main line. So, therefore, when the Canadian Pacific Railway Company published to the country that they intended to complete a number of branch lines, they could only have meant, and the country could only have understood, that, with their influence and with the feasibility and the advantage of these lines, and the prospect of a profit, they would be able to obtain the confidence and support of capitalists in Europe to enable them to complete these branch lines. Nobody could have supposed for a moment that any portion of the subsidy to build the main line would be appropriated to the building of the branch lines. We know perfectly well how completely that favorable picture faded, we know the dissolving view that took place in consequence of this reaction and in consequence of this railway depression. There had arisen, as we all know, in England the most violent, the most unprecedented opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the English market. No effort was spared to decry the railway, to destroy its prospects, and, in order to do so, to decry the value of the country, the state of the country, the fertility of the country, the climate of the country. It was attacked in every possible way by the Grand Trunk interest in England. That proved to be a very formidable opponent, in consequence of the ramification of the immense quantity of stock and bonds held in the English market, the number of persons, from the poor man who had a bond for $100, up to the millionaire, who were all interested; and the whole stock exchange had been using the different securities of the Grand Trunk as a permanent means of speculation and of gambling, the whole of the stock exchange and all the vast proprietary of the Grand Trunk worked against this Canadian Pacific Railway, aided by the strongest representations and misrepresentations from the United States and from the various railways running parallel, through the

United States, with the Canadian Pacific Railway, aided, I must say, by the unpatriotic efforts made from Canada, which were quoted largely as being evidence that could not be controverted, that could not be disputed, that the line would never pay, that a great portion of the country through which the Canadian Pacific Railway passed was worthless for agricultural purposes. All these representations, these unpatriotic representations which were used unscrupulously, and exaggerated by the American influences —for there was not an expression, sometimes an honest, true expression of the opinion of a Canadian gentleman, whether mistaken or unmistaken, adverse to that county, but was republished, sent to England, exaggerated, used with the most malignant purpose, with a view to destroy the prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the great North-West of Canada—all these things combined together, the influence of the great proprietary of the Grand Trunk and the whole of the stock exchange in England, almost as one man, and the influence of the rival Pacific railways crossing the continent, who feared the superiority of the Canadian Pacific Railway when it was finished, and the attacks which were made and quoted from Canada, operated to destroy the fair prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to destroy its credit and its prestige. It was driven off the British exchange; no bond could be sold in England; it could not be quoted in the exchange lists in England; and it is wonderful that, under all these adverse influences, under all these fierce, malignant and persistent attacks, that railroad should have, by the energy of those who control its destinies, approch now to completion, and if they have not been able to carry out all that they promised and all their expectations, it is no fault of theirs. Certainly, it will be admitted by friend or by foe of that enterprise, or of the gentlemen who control it, that, whatever may be said of them, though they may be called extravagant or rash, they cannot be called weak men or timid men. They have acted with an enthusiam unparalleled in the history of railway enterprise, and they have pushed that enterprise through at an enormous sacrifice to themselves, and with the utter want of the expected hope, the reasonable hope that we, the people of Canada, as well as they, the railway managers, entertained that, with such a promising enterprise, with such a magnificent country to go through, and with the very liberal and generous aid that Parliament has given them, that road would have been built and there would have been a rush of investors to invest in that great road, and that there would also have been a strong desire to invest in the various branches running through magnificent countries, connecting with that road and acting as feeders to it, growing with its growth, strengthening with its strength, giving and receiving strength, and at the same time settling that country. All these fair promises were crushed, all these expectations failed, because of these hostile influences, hostile influences that men in Canada will regret, and which the gamblers on the stock exchange, who have been endeavoring to ruin this enterprise will feel as a disappointment and a regret that, instead of speculating and swopping jack-knives in the way of bad securities with the Grand Trunk, they had not, like sensible men and honest money brokers, had faith in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and applied their ingenuity and their funds to its support. The hon. gentleman says that the company ought to have built their railway across the prairie, and that the expectation was—if I remember his words, though I do not remember his language exactly —that the company ought to have built the railway across the prairies, and then to have devoted their energies to the building of the branch lines. I know that has been always the policy of the hon. gentleman; I know he always denounced the building of the railway to the north of Lake Superior, and always oppose the extension through the sea of mountains into British Columbia; I know that he was always anxious to confine the road to running across the prairie. What would have been the fate of Canada, what would have been the value of that railway to Canada as a Canadian enterprise, if it had not been for the construction of the Lake Superior Railway? We would have built a railway across the prairie to run down and connect at all convenient points with the United States system of railways, and all the commerce extending from the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains would have been carried along the Pacific Railway, and safely delivered at some point upon it, Brandon, or Portage la Prairie, or Winnipeg, and then it would have gone by the United States, and all the money of the Canadas, and all the burden of taxation that we have willingly encountered and accepted, would have been applied for the settlement of that particular country certainly, but also to carry off all the trade of that country to the United States. I will say that I know that originally the individual opinions of some of the contractors of the Canadian Pacific Railway were that it was a great task that we were forcing upon them to build the Lake Superior branch. I am at liberty to say that Mr. George Stephen at first thought that might be postponed, but he has said to me that he is now convinced that my obstinacy, as he calls it, in insisting upon the building of the Lake Superior branch, was the salvation of that railway. It would not be anything like what he knows it will be now. If that portion of the railway had not been built it would not have been a Canadian railway, it would not have served to carry off the grain trade of the North-West through the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to Montreal; it would have been simply an adjunct feeding the American railways. And, Sir, what is the case now? That railway being under one management, having one set of servants, having one description of cars, having the whole road from ocean to ocean under one management, can carry at half-price—aye, I may almost say, at quarter price—and without loss, the products of the North-West to Montreal; whereas the other railways not one of which has control from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and all of which are obliged to pull, with two or three, or four railways, are obliged to make local and disadvantageous arrangements in order to have control, or anything like control, of the traffic across the continent. This single road, under a single management, must and will compete successfully over all other railways across this continent. I will not now allude to the political consequences, and the advantages of building that road. Late events have shown us that we are made one people by that road, that that iron link has bound us together in such a way that we stand superior to most of the shafts of ill-fortune, that we can now assemble together, at every point which may be assailed, or may be in danger, the whole physical forces of Canada by means of that great artery, against any foreign foe or any internal insurrection or outbreak. The hon. gentleman says that the Government has been rash, vacillating and unhappy in their railway policy. Those expressions are very strong, the expletives are very good in their way, but they are rather inconsistent. Vacillating policy is not generally a rash policy. Now, our policy has not been rash, nor yet has it been vacillating. The hon. gentleman used the expression that we were very rash, and at the same time he said we were rather too slow in the arrangements made, in the granting of these various applications of the Manitoba and South-Western Railway. We proceeded cautiously, but we proceeded steadily, and there was no vacillation in any way. We tried to encourage all these different railways in the hands of different promoters, to the utmost extent that we safely could. We granted what they wanted, and, as I said the other day, it would be a profligate waste of the public lands and the public moneys if we granted more than they themselves said they required. When the companies, full of hope in the

then circumstances of the English market, applied for 3,820 acres at $1 an acre, we said: Yes, you shall have it. They said then that 3,820 acres a mile would be sufficient, but they came afterwards and said: We find this will not help us; we have gone into the market but we cannot, on this security, raise the money. They asked us to give them more, and we gave them more at their request. They asked for an extension of time for the payment of the $1 an acre and we gave them what they asked. This was not rashness, and this, at the same time, was not vacillation. To be sure, we became more liberal in our grants; when they showed us proof that our previous grants were insufficient, we granted them what they wanted. Mr. Chairman, I am free to say with the hon. gentleman, this Government is not sanguine of the speedy success of all these railways. Why, Sir, we have had several of them—we have had the Souris road, we have had the North-Western road, we have had the South-Western road, and others roads, still paper roads—we have had them before us, and we have encouraged them all. We have looked at the list of those who promoted these railway enterprises, and we know they are respectable men, we know they are not mere shysters, to use the Americanism, but that they are men, some with more and some with less, means, but all men of character, and all, we believe, with an earnest desire not only to enter into a legitimate and profitable enterprise, but to carry out the enterprise in good faith. But we know they have not greatly succeeded yet, except the North-Western, which, perhaps has been the most successful. Now, Sir, with respect to Mr. Van Horne's statement that he is not sanguine. Mr. Chairman, he could not be sanguine when the Canadian Pacific Railway had been driven out of the market, both in New York and in London, from the various influences that I have mentioned. But, Sir, as there was a time of inflation, and as there has since been a time of depression, I am glad to see that there is a break in the cloud, I am glad to see the blue sky is appearing again; and I do believe that in the early future the Canadian investments which have been hitherto so depressed are going to take a legitimate position, warranted by their real permanent value, going to take a safe and satisfactory position in the English market. The hon. gentleman says that we are now brought face to face for the first time with these grants. Of course we are, because the application is to give our land. The Government have no power to give away lands, the Government must come to Parliament for power to give away lands. All the previous action has been Executive action, but it has been within the strict lines of the empowering clauses of the various Acts on the Statute Book. The original Dominion Lands Act provides that the land shall be offered at $1 an acre. We insist upon $1 an acre, we hold to that; and as we were obliged to sell to anybody and everybody under the original Act at $1 an acre, that being the original provision of the Dominion Act, and that being the normal price of the land, we could have no hesitation, when we were selling to other persons for settlement at $1 an acre in granting it to railway companies who promised, as a condition of getting the land at $1 an acre, to build a railway which would make those lands valuable. We did that readily whenever we were satisfied of the responsibility of parties applying. Hitherto the enterprises have not proceeded far; yet we hear now that the times are getting better; we see that the Manitoba and North-Western is going on with the road; we see that the railway running from Regina to Long Lake is now in actual progress; and we hope and believe that in consequence of the better times, the South-Western will be completed. It is true that we cannot prophesy, but I hope and believe that if the relief is granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which they have sought, and which is now before Parliament, that will of itself lead to the completion of the road and its complete success; and the marvellous progress of its traffic in its incomplete state will give it such a credit in the market, will give it such a new start, that it will rise superior to the opposition which has so long depressed its energies in England and elsewhere, and that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other enterprises will have a fair field in the English market. Meanwhile I would say that this grant will, I have no doubt, be given as it ought to be given. The hon. gentleman at the end of his long speech said that he did not oppose it.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; then all that remains for me to say is, that I fancy it will receive, having his sanction, the unanimous approval of the House. The speech of the hon. gentleman was an attack upon the land policy of the Government. From my general recollection of the facts—not having recently perused the papers so closely and so anxiously as the hon. gentleman, I cannot give them line by line—but from my general recollection I am perfectly sure that throughout the whole of our transactions with these railway companies the Government have not any one single thing to regret. I do not admit, as I do not see, they have made one single mistake. I say they have from the beginning met the reasonable requirements of all the different railway enterprises, and when circumstances became more adverse, and as the clouds over the different enterprises grew more dark and dense, and there was necessity for the companies to apply for additional assistance, the Government granted them additional assistance, and we come now to Parliament and ask it to sanction that assistance. And I believe, after many days and many disappointments, and after some injury to particular individuals, no doubt, to particular settlers, who believed, as everyone believed, that those railways would have made better progress—notwithstanding all these facts, these railways will now take a new life, and we hope to see that country ere long covered with railways which are maintained, and which could not be maintained but for the action of the Government, with the assent of Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman does really believe that neither he nor his Government has anything to regret in the course they have pursued, more especially towards those unfortunate persons settled in the particular district which this projected railway is intended to serve, all I can say is that his conscience must have been seared with a red hot iron. It has happened to me and to other members of this House to have travelled, years ago, through that district, an exceedingly fertile district, I do not say the best in the North-West and in all Manitoba, but one which may compete with any district there. And to those who traversed that country five or six years ago, and who recollect what promises were then held out, what steps were taken by those unfortunate settlers and by their representatives to secure railway communication, who know how they have been frustrated as the hon. gentleman even to-day has to admit, largely by the direct action of the Government and by causes to which the hon. gentleman has rather alluded than recited in full—I say anybody who recalls the position in 1879, 1880 and 1881 and who knows anything of the present condition of those settlers, and that not only those settlers but all Canada suffered in consequence of the policy of the Government, must have been as much astonished as I and a good many other hon. members were when the First Minister declared that the Government had nothing to regret in connection with their railway policy in the North-West, and more especially in connection with the railway policy in south-western Manitoba. Why, I myself, and I dare say other hon. members were present, remember perfectly—it was before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was in

existence, before a contract was given out—that we had the extraordinary spectacle of a deputation from south-western Manitoba coming down to this Parliament, and asking for leave to construct a railway at their own expense to enable them to cultivate their lands at a profit and settle them with Canadians. They made that application to the present Government. They were refused by Government, and I am bound in justice to Sir Charles Tupper to say that he took the opportunity of expressing his extreme regret at being obliged to refuse them, and, if my memory serves me, he also declared that the Government would make it their special object (this was, we must remember, in the early part of 1880) to take care that, although the Government were obliged for reasons of State policy to refuse to those people the right to construct that railway at that time, they would see that at a very early period they were supplied with railway facilities and railway communication. Since that time five years have come and gone, and those unfortunate people for all practical intents and purposes are no nearer having railway communication, are no better supplied with railways than they were in 1880. And yet the First Minister tells us that he has nothing to regret and his Government have nothing to regret in connection with their conduct towards the South-Western Railway. However, I shall have a word or two to say on that point later on. I desire more particularly at this moment to call attention to some of the extraordinary statements which the First Minister has just made in regard to the total discomfiture which his policy has met with and to the total discomfiture which the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway has met at the hands of capitalists all over the world. The First Minister was perfectly correct in saying that the magnificent promises which were held out in 1879, and on which, as the House knows, the Government built so much, and in consequence of which the Government induced Parliament to entrust to them and to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company such huge subsidies as I venture to say were never given to any other railway under the sun—have been unfulfilled. It is perfectly true that not one of the promises made by the First Minister and his Government has been realised in a single particular; that all expectations which they held out to the people of the country as to the settlement of the North-West have been falsified; that all expectations held out to the people of this country for the relief of their finances, which would arise from the sales of land which were to be made in the North-West, have been likewise falsified; that Canada to-day is burdened to an extraordinary degree in consequence of the profuse and lavish expenditures which between them the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been guilty of, and for which up to this day nothing that at all approaches to a decent account or to a fair honest statement as between the company and the nation has yet been submitted to us. If it were indeed the case, as the First Minister alleges, that the whole world had entered into a conspiracy against the present Government of Canada and against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and that in consequence of this hostility, this unprovoked hostility, that magnificent and patriotic dream which danced before the mind of the hon. gentleman had failed of fulfilment, then I could understand the justice of the plea which the First Minister has now addressed, somewhat unnecessarily and somewhat irrelevantly, in opposition to the indictment of his policy on this particular question which my hon. friend has preferred. But, Sir, as he has chosen to take that line, as he has chosen to tell us that all these difficulties have arisen from the extraordinary and unprovoked opposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to Canada, which existed as he says in London, in New York, and elsewhere, I desire to take this opportunity, in reply to the First Minister, of calling attention to the reasons why this hostility, if it did exist, had arisen. And Sir, in the first place I may say as respects the whole policy of the Government, I take issue with it from the commencement. I say there never was and never could be a greater mistake than to hand over one quarter of a continent—because practically that is what we did—to the clutches of one gigantic corporation, to give to a monopoly such privileges and powers as those against which we have so often protested in this House. Now, the difficulties the company have encountered result mainly from three fatal errors on their part. First of all, they grasped at a great deal too much. I believe that had they confined themselves to their legitimate enterprise, had they contented themselves with constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway from the point at which it was originally intended to start to the Ocean, and at the same time carried out the policy which they themselves avowed to be their policy, of settling up Manitoba and the adjacent parts of the North-West; if they had constructed a reasonable number of branch lines, we, to-day, instead of seeing 200,000 people scattered thinly over a line of 1,200 miles, would have had a compact, strong, and prosperous Province, with probably its three quarters of a million, in the immediate vicinity of the old Province of Manitoba, and the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been on the high road to thorough success. And what was the course which that company, aided and abetted by the present Government of Canada, saw fit to pursue? Instead of confining themselves to what the hon. gentleman has nightly called the huge and gigantic task which lay which before them, is it not known to every member of the House and every man of intelligence in the country, that the very first thing that these gentlemen did was to plunge into wholly unnecessary and uncalled for railway enterprises all over the remaining portion of Canada; to divert to those enterprises the funds which would have enabled them to bring their legitimate enterprise to a prosperous and a profitable conclusion. That is the cause why the engagements made by them have been broken, why after receiving such enormous grants and subsidies as they did receive, they returned to us last year for a nominal loan, but a real gift of $30,000,000, and that is why to-day, on this table there are propositions for setting aside the security which we were told last year was a security of the first order, and for granting more millions and more millions and additional subsidies and grants, either to the Canadian Pacific Railway directly or to branches and side roads in which that road takes an interest. And that is the reason why the whole progress of the North West has been starved, why it is impossible to construct branch lines; that is the reason why they have most needlessly drawn upon them, to their own great injury and the great injury of Canadian credit, the hostility of the Grand Trunk and its friends, which the hon. Minister says, whether truly or not he knows best, rendered it impossible to place a bond of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the Stock Exchange of London. Sir, so far from that hostility being unprovoked, I say that no one could well have gone further out of the way to invite hostility than these gentlemen. I say in the broad sense—though individual sections may have benefited by it—that nothing was more injudicious, unwise, or unstatesmanlike than to encourage a company, which had engagements infinitely more weighty than it was likely to discharge, infinitely more than it has discharged or can discharge, to engage in hostility with what the hon. gentleman described as one of the most powerful corporations in England, at any rate as regards its effect on the London Stock Exchange. Now, it is not my present purpose to say anything about the hostility between those two companies. let them fight it out as they see fit between themselves. But I say the Government which encouraged this company

in engaging in a great variety of operations, the tendency of which was to withdraw funds which otherwise would have been available for the construction of branch lines and the completion of the Railway is not entitled to come here and talk as if this was an inexplicable conspiracy on the part of the English capitalists and the capitalists of the world against a road which otherwise might have been a magnificent success. Sir, the Government had before them in 1880 a very plain course. Had they chosen to have taken proper precautions for the construction of that line, to seeing that that line when constructed whether by themselves or by the company, should be placed under such restrictions that men forming companies to construct other lines in other parts of the North-West, would have been safe in dealing with them, then the natural result which has followed in many other portions of North America, would have followed there. Other capitalists would have been ready to come forward, ready to construct those independent lines; the North-West would have been filled up with people and we would have had to-day a populous compact and powerful province, probably three quarters of a million strong, from the trade and commerce of which the Canadian Pacific Railway and what is more than that, the people of Canada would have derived immense profits, and by aid of which trade they would no doubt have no difficulty in floating their securities in England and elsewhere. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that in addition to the hostility of the Grand Trunk Railway, they had to contend with the unpatriotic representations of hon. gentlemen opposite—because that was what he meant, though he hardly dared to say so. Sir, that is not true. No hon. gentleman on this side has decried the North-West, no hon. gentleman on this side would decry the North-West; no hon. gentleman on this side has the smallest intention of decrying the North-West. I admit, I have always admitted, that the future of Canada is bound up with the successful settlement of that country, but what we do oppose and denounce, is the unpatriotic and unstatesmanlike conduct which has turned all these many opportunities which the hon. gentleman depicted just now, rather into sources of injury and waste, of extravagance and mismanagement, than of any benefit to the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman tells us that whatever else we may or may not say about the Canadian Pacific Railway, we must admire the wonderful energy with which they have pushed the road. Well, Sir, they have displayed considerable energy in pushing that road. But when I am called upon to admire their wonderful energy, to give credit to them for the way in which that road has been pushed, I call to mind at whose cost that energy has been displayed, out of whose pocket and with whose money that work has been done. I say that if that road was fairly valued from end to end, I for my part do not believe, and I will not believe until I can get infinitely better proof than any yet submitted by the Government to the country—I believe that the money which we have given would have been amply sufficient, and more than sufficient, to do everything that has been done on the line proper of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Callender to Port Moody. Sir, we have given these men, besides building 700 miles of road, $25,000,000, then $10,000,000, the proceeds of our own lands, then a loan of $30,000,000, and now we are asked for a loan of $5,000,000—in all, roughly speaking, $70,000,000 have been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of a work which the late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, over and over again, in the hearing of members of this House, told us could be constructed for $48,000,000. I am not going, as I said, to anticipate the discussion, which will probably have to be gone into in detail, as to how this money has been employed, or what there is to show for it; but I do protest against the First Minister claiming credit for these gentlemen, as if great sacrifices had been made and great cost incurred by them in the construction of this line. That remains to be proved. It may be that in their subsidiary enterprises they have risked and lost much; but I do say that the aid which has been given for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the people of Canada has been enough to discharge every reasonable expense which had to be incurred for that line; and the onus rests first on those gentlemen who declared that those portions of the railway could be constructed for something like $20,000,000 less than has been actually expended, to show how it is that the company have contrived to spend what appears to me to be a sum vastly in excess of the legitimate cost of such a work in the various sections which were confided to their charge. With respect to the Manitoba and South-Western Railway, as the hon. gentleman knows, there has been a large settlement existing in the country specially interested in that road as far back as 1879. That was a settlement of the very best class. It was composed of Canadian settlers from the most prosperous parts of Ontario, who brought with them very considerable amounts of capital, and it only required a railroad to have brought tens of thousands—I might almost say hundreds of thousands—of people into that region, who would to-day, had the Government done its duty, have been prosperous settlers. If the hon. gentleman wants to know where those people who would have settled there have gone, I would recommend him to go, or to send some trusty agent, to the northern portion of the State of Dakota and there he will find a Canadian settlement, which, had it been planted on the northern side of the boundary line, would have added enormously to the wealth and the prosperity of that country. It is not merely the loss of population which we have to deplore; but the hon. gentleman knows that where you find a very large number of people from a particular section of country settling in the United States, the tendency is to create a constant drain. These people inform their friends, and send for their acquaintances and relatives, and the thing goes on. Therefore it is, as I conceive, in a high degree the duty of the Government, when they find the people of Canada desirous of settling in this quarter, to take steps to open up the country in the only way in which it can be done—by the construction of a railroad; and my hon. friend is perfectly justified in calling on the Government to say whether, in proposing this vote to the Manitoba South Western Railway Company—which neither he nor anybody on this side, so far as I understand, intends to oppose—they have taken due precautions to secure the construction of this road. Nothing could be worse than to set apart large tracts of land without knowing whether or not they will be utilised in a short space of time. Nothing could be more unwise or unpatriotic than for the Government to put 600,000 or 700,000 acres—much more, several millions of acres—into a reservation which they allow no man to settle in or meddle with, and wait, perhaps three, four or five years, before the expectations which are now held out by these companies are fulfilled. When you bear in mind that it was largely due to the action of the Government themselves that those people were disappointed in regard to the construction of a railway—because the Government refused to allow them to secure the construction of a railway at their own cost—in the case of this particular railway the Government are doubly and trebly bound to see to it that the expectations likely to be raised by their action are not again disappointed. Upon that point I speak with knowledge. I have several correspondents in that district, and I have seen several of the persons who have settled there, and they are all agreed on this point, that if they do not speedily obtain a railway, the settlers who have remained there so long, under great discouragements, are likely to abandon Manitoba altogether; and I

need not point out to the House that settlers who go to any particular part of Manitoba and afterwards abandon it necessarily exercise a most prejudicial influence on the future settlement of the country. I have always believed myself that a prosperous settler is the only immigration agent of real value. We all know it is the experience of all North America, that when men prosper in a particular locality there is is not the slightest difficulty in inducing a large immigration there; and that those people would prosper I have not the slightest doubt if this road and other roads proposed to be constructed in other localities should be put into active operation; but without them it is utterly impossible to encourage any further settlement or to meet the practical difficulties which always encounter pioneers. There is another point to which I desire to call the hon. gentleman's attention, to which he alluded the other evening. I had occasion, in the course of a speech I made last year at Winnipeg, to say, speaking for myself, that I entirely approved of the idea then afloat in the North-West that the Government should make free grants of land to those roads. I approved of it then, and I approve of it now; but I also thought, looking at the whole condition of the country, that the Government, if they relaxed their claim on the road, ought to take precautions to see that those lands were not locked up for any considerable period of time. I do not agree with the First Minister in saying that by placing a moderate price on those lands, you would be likely to materially diminish the value of your gift. It may be true, with regard to special localities along the line of railway, that the Government would desire to make moderate reservations to create towns and villages; that is not a point I desire to dwell upon now; but if you fix a moderate price under which any *bona fide* settler may go in and take up land I believe the company would be able to do just as well with the free grant he proposes to give them; and by that means a very great and serious danger to the future of the country would be avoided. I had communication myself with some gentlemen concerned in these roads, and they assured me—I cannot say whether or not they have changed their minds since—that there would be no objection on their part to some fixed maximum price being settled by the Government. The hon. gentleman, of course, having very recently communicated with them, may be in a position to say that their views have altered on that point; but when you recollect that he proposed to give these companies 6,400 acres a mile, and that the roads cannot be particularly expensive in construction, I think that the House will see that no very serious injury could be done to their prospects by fixing some price at which settlers could depend on being able to obtain possession of those lands. I believe that that policy will be in the interests of the railways themselves, as I am quite sure it would be in the interest of the country at large; and that is one of those points on which I think the Government will not act wisely if they refuse to make such a concession, which, as the hon. gentleman well knows, has been loudly demanded in Manitoba and other parts of the North-West Territories. In any case, I believe that although very late, although after sustaining very great loss, it is almost aboslutely necessary for us to secure the construction of branch lines in that country. I believe that had that been done, as I hold the Government ought to have made a point of seeing that it was done, four or five years ago, the population of that country would have been trebled and quadrupled, and I have no doubt the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway would have been enormously improved. Still, it is better to do it even at this very late day than to let that country remain practically locked up, as it has been; but the Government to-day should not make those grants until they are well assured that prompt steps will be taken to give these people railway communication.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a short limit to the grants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know there is a short limit to the grant, but we all know that when that short limit expires, particularly in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, immense pressure is likely to be put on the Government, if it does not suit the convenience of the company to build within the time agreed, to extend the time. It will be extended, very probably, for another short period, and then for another, and then another, and so on. I attach exceedingly little importance to a time limit in dealings between the Government and a corporation in such extremely close relations with it as the Canadian Pacific Railway; I think that something more than that is required in order to insure completion, and I have no doubt that, unless the hon. gentleman does secure completion, very great and permanent evil will be wrought through the whole country in the North-West. We have practically invested one hundred millions of the money of the people of Canada in this enterprise, and it is quite clear that unless we succeed, and succeed very shortly, in throwing a very considerable population into the North-West, that that sum, and the interest we will have to pay for it, will constitute a tremendons millstone around the neck of the whole Dominion. I believe that, at last, the Government are making an endeavor to take some steps that will partly remedy the mischiefs their negligence has caused. I have always affirmed, if you grant monopoly powers to a great trunk railway, you, of necessity, take away from private individuals the power of constructing any branch lines, because, unless under the most extraordinary circumstances, it is very clear that no man or no corporation will ever put their earnings wholly and completely at the power of a huge corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway. That would be, in almost any case I can conceive, the necessary consequence of building a line of railway from some point in our own territory to some point along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Every one knows what the policy of great railway corporations has been in the past, and will be in the future, towards all these short and subsidiary lines. Unless they are owned by influential members of the corporation, they will be treated as sponges and squeezed to the very last drop; they will be allowed to make only the lowest profit that will keep their roads running, and the invariable result is that the settlers for whose benefit they are to be constructed, the district they profess to serve, will have to pay two rates, one to the branch or subsidiary railway, and the other to the main line. This has been the experience of the past, and will be that of the future. Had the First Minister taken the opportunity to acquaint himself personally with the position and the needs of that country, he would have long since seen the terrible mistake that he had made in giving this great corporation such absolute and uncontrolled powers, and I do not believe the North-West will prosper as it should until these monopoly clauses, at any rate, are blotted off our Statute Book.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not aware that any hon. gentleman on this side has expressed any desire to oppose the resolutions now before the House. There is no reason why we should. Those resolutions embody the policy of the Liberal party in regard to the construction of railways in the North West for the last ten years. It was the policy of the late Government that branch railways, opening up that vast section of the country, should be subsidised, from time to time, by the Government, and with that object in view, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when Minister of the Interior, introduced a Bill into Parliament, the object of which was that large and liberal grants would be made for the purpose of aiding the construction of branch railways. What we complain of, and what we have a right

to complain of, is what the people of the North-West, especially the people in south-western Manitoba complain of, that the hon. gentleman has neglected so long to discharge the duties he ought to have discharged years ago. In his report to the Governor in Council, the hon. gentleman admits that a large number of settlers made their homes in south-western Manitoba upon the assurance that the Government of the country would open up that region within a reasonable time, by the construction of railways. The Minister of the Interior so states in his minute to the Governor in Council. We know quite well that the people in south-western Manitoba for years had every reason to expect that reasonable assistance would be given by the Government for the purpose of constructing a railway opening up that vast fertile region. Up to this hour the people of South-Western Manitoba have not been so accommodated. I know that a large number of the people from the counties of Huron and Perth settled in south-western Manitoba upon the assurance that after a short period of their settlement the country would be opened up by railway communication. I venture to say had hon. gentlemen opposite not so hampered the Winnipeg and South-Western Railway, that railway would have been constructed out to Clear Water Lake long ago. What the Government now propose to do ought to have been done years ago.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Why did not you do it?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There was then no settlement of the country. You have been seven years on the Treasury benches, doing absolutely nothing to open up that country for settlement. If we had continued to occupy the seats which hon. gentlemen opposite have so unworthily occupied for years, branch lines in the North-West would have been constructed long ago. But the Government of the day have not been alive to the duty that devolved upon them; otherwise they would have assisted to build the South-Western Railway in the way they now propose to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway to build it. But hon. gentlemen opposite, by their sympathy, aid and assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so hampered the Winnipeg and South-Western Railway that the latter was never able to extend their line beyond 58 miles of Winnipeg. What has been the result of this policy? It is apparent to everybody in the country that of the large number of immigrants settled in south-western Manitoba, 50 per cent., I venture to say, have left the country. Why have they left the country?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). No, they have not.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman says no. I make no statement on the floor of Parliament that I am not prepared to prove, and I am prepared to prove it from the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the organ published in the city of Winnipeg. I say, without fear of successful contradiction—the hon. gentleman may shake his wise head, but he will not venture to contradict the statement—that owing to the apathy, the indifference, the carelessness, the criminal neglect of hon. gentlemen opposite, in not opening up the country as they ought to have done, to the large number of settlers in that part of the country, they have left it within the last few years. The hon. gentleman says it is not so. I suppose that he, who follows his leader so faithfully, will accept the statement of the Winnipeg *Times*, a paper published in the interests of the Government, a paper which reflects the views of the Government, and which would say nothing against the Government unless driven to do so, by patriotic motives. The hon. gentleman knows, if he has taken the trouble to examine the files of the Winnipeg *Times*, that two years ago it drew the attention of the Government to the way in which settlers in the North-West, and especially in south-western Manitoba, were treated by the Government. Not once or twice, but over and over again, it drew the attention of the Government, and especially of the Minister of the Interior, the man charged with the administration of public affairs in that country, to the unfortunate position in which those settlers were placed by the policy of the Government, not only their land policy, but the other portions of their policy, to which I do not at present propose to direct my attention. He will find, in the Winnipeg *Times* of the 17th May, 1883, an editorial article containing the following statement:—

"On the lands sold south of the railway belt there are scores of squatters who, at this moment, are planting their crops in blissful ignorance of this fact, that some speculator will soon own their farms and the labo rspent on them. It is true the Department professed, some time ago that compensation for disturbances would be given to those squatters who had made improvements, the compensation to be determined by a Government valuator; that as a matter of fact, the buyers at the sale buy not only the land but the improvements; and even within the mile belt the Government will find it a difficult matter to inspect the farms sold and appraise the improvements. South of the belt, this will be utterly impossible. Then all, looking at its pecuniary results, is a failure. To reserve a vast quantity of land in the market at a time when money is exceedingly tight and the richest speculators poor, was madness. It is reasonably safe to say that Commissioner Walsh did not advise the step. It was no doubt taken in pursuance of that incomprehensible policy which the Department has adopted at that suggestion of ignorant or interested friends. But the failure of the sale, in a pecuniary sense, is a small matter compared with the evils it is bringing to the country. A squatter who has gone in upon land, now being sold, and ploughed and sown it, will think himself justified in holding it against all-comers, and his neighbors will think so, too.

"Mr. Metcalf, of Kingston, has an easy task in selling the land, pocketing the commission, but the Department will find, when it comes to evict the squatter, that human nature in the North-West is much the same as in Ireland. If we cannot prevail against the Government and the speculator, the squatter can, at least, leave the country with a curse."

That is the language of the Winnipeg *Times*, with reference to the land policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You were one of the speculators at the time spoken of.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I bought my land and paid for it second hand. I bought nothing from the Government of this country, except what I bought from this Government. I bought the larger portion of my land from a late Minister of the Crown, whose sons were allowed to speculate in Government land at the rate of about $1 an acre.

Mr. WHITE. Like other speculators.

Mr. CAMERON. That is not the way in which you got your timber limits or your coal mines.

Mr. WHITE. I got my timber limit more honorably than that.

Mr. CAMERON. I say the Government have so hampered the settlers in the North-West, and especially in south-western Manitoba, that very many of them have become dissatisfied and disgusted with the treatment they have received, and a large number have left the country. They have left it with regret; but, as the editor of the *Times* says, they have left it with a curse, not upon the country, but upon the outrageous and scandalous policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, which drove them out of the country.

Mr. WHITE. It was speculators like you that drove them away.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. CAMERON. If the Government had pursued a proper policy—if they had, three or four years ago, done what they are doing now, that portion of the Province of Manitoba would be settled by a large number of prosperous, industrious and valuable settlers.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say one word.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Never mind; he is only earning another timber limit.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Casey would be better off to-day if your road had been built.

Mr. CAMERON. On the faith of an Order in Council declaring the whole of the odd-numbered sections south of the 24 mile belt open for sale, a large number of settlers went to south-western Manitoba, especially from the Province of Ontario, and settled there. You are aware that, in the eyes of many who have visited all portions of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the south-western portion of Manitoba is considered to be the garden of Manitoba and the whole North-West. Relying upon the Order in Council, knowing the character of the soil, and the climate in south-western Manitoba, a large portion of the settlers located upon the lands, and how have these men been treated by the Government? Have their claims been recognised? Have they been enabled to obtain their patents? Has the Government treated them as it ought to treat settlers who are prepared to encounter, and who do encounter, all the difficulties of settlement in a new country 50 or 60 miles from the nearest railway accommodation? I hold in my hand a letter written by a resident of the county of Huron, who, with his two sons, emigrated to the North-West, and located upon land, a portion of which was located upon on the faith of this Order in Council.

Mr. FARROW. What year did he locate there?

Mr. CAMERON. Three years ago. I think my hon. friend opposite has some interest in this matter, too, and I hope he will give his honest convictions upon this subject.

Mr. FARROW. I will.

Mr. CAMERON. This gentleman writes me a letter. I will give his name; it is no secret. It is a communication addressed to me as a member of Parliament, and if time had permitted, I intended to call attention to it in another way. He is Mr. George McKenzie, lately a resident of the town of Wingham——

Mr. FARROW. I know him.

Mr. CAMERON. And formerly a resident in my town. He says:

"In the year 1881 there was an Order in Council fixing the price of odd-numbered sections south of the 24-mile belt at $2 and $2.50 an acre. There were a great many settled on those sections, believing they would get the first chance to purchase, so soon as the agent got instructions to sell. Such instructions never came. There are many settlers who have been on their lands three years and have got no title. Let us see how they used the settlers. I will give you one case. One John Robertson settled on section 33, 5, 19. He broke, back-set and prepared for crop 80 acres, also built a house 25 by 34, two stories high, frame, and made other improvements amounting in all to about $2,500.

"There was an inspector sent to the country who pretended to be in the interest of the settler, but, to our sorrow, he turned out not to be so. He put $8 an acre on the half section that Mr. Robertson improved, and $5 on the other half. They notified him to attend the sale at Winnipeg and he would get the first chance at the upset price; but if he did not attend it would be sold to the highest bidder. He foolishly accepted their terms and made two payments, and then was forced to abandon the place, which is now growing up in weeds and likely to become a curse to the settlers. However, that won't matter much, as I do not think there will be one left in two years but will curse the Government and leave the country as he did. You need not be afraid to mention these facts, as I am prepared to prove every word. My own case, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, is similar to others."

Now, this man does not leave the country on account of the climate; he does not leave the country on account of the soil.

Mr. FARROW. I want to ask who notified them to go and buy land?

Mr. CAMERON. He says, the inspector.

Mr. FARROW. Was it the Hudson Bay Company, or was it the Government, or was it the Canadian Pacific Company?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). He says it was the inspector who was sent there. We know they had land to sell at Winnipeg. If the hon. gentleman had read the article from the *Times* he would know more about it. I say these men did not leave the country on account of the soil or the climate. Mr. McKenzie goes on to declare:

"There is no finer climate for growing grain and stock-raising under the sun. I have 245 acres under crop. My boys do all the work, within themselves, and they have taken care of their own stock. Where is the country where two boys could handle this amount of crops? Notwithstanding this, we have turned our last furrow in this country, and we intend to allow the land to grow up with weeds, as many hundreds will do in southern Manitoba."

I say that letters of that kind, coming to members of Parliament from men who have been in that country and intending to make it their permanent home, exhibit an extraordinary condition of affairs. These men do not complain unless there is some ground of complaint. They went there with a view of living there, and they find that owing to the policy of the Government, owing to the want of railway communication, owing to the land policy, owing to the difficulty of getting their titles recognised and ultimately getting their patents, many men have done as Mr. Robertson and Mr. McKenzie have done, and have left the country never to return there again. Now I say that hon. gentlemen opposite, in dealing with this question, ought to be careful that the rights of the settlers upon these odd-numbered sections are protected. I apprehend that this road, extending to White Water Lake, will pass through a region of country that was opened up under the Order in Council to which I have alluded, and will pass through a country many of the odd-numbered sections of which have been settled upon and improved. Now, before this land is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway the Government should be careful that every safeguard is thrown about the rights of the settlers and that their present position is made safe.

Mr. BOWELL. Was that letter written by George McKenzie?

Mr. CAMERON. Yes. The letter says he has left Manitoba, and he intends to let his farm grow up to weeds, as Mr. Robertson's was allowed to do. More than that: he says he is prepared to prove before a committee every statement that he has made. Sir, the hon. gentleman went further than discussing the policy of this resolution. He told us that the member for the west riding gave us a microscopical and interesting history of the difficulties and trials the South-Western Railway had to encounter. The hon. gentleman himself gave us a microscopical, but not a very interesting, history of the difficulties and trials the Canadian Pacific Railway had to encounter in the financial world. He told us, that owing to the combinations between the American railway owners and capitalists, and those interested in the progress of the Western States, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and that, further, owing to the unpatriotic utterances of Canadians, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was not able to complete its financial transactions. If there were unpatriotic utterances by Canadians they were from hon. gentlemen opposite. I challenge any hon. member opposite to quote one word from the Liberal press of Canada depreciating either the climate or the soil of the North-West. I challenge them to quote one utterance of any Liberal member of Parliament that ever depreciated the soil or climate of that country. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that sitting upon this side of the House, in view of our duties and responsibilities to the country, we have occasionally been obliged to criticise, and to criticise sharply and severely, the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to Manitoba and the North-West. We had occasion to point out, more than once, that their policy was fatal to the peace, and progress, and prosperity of that country; and I ask you, Sir, if our protests have

not been fully justified by subsequent events? Have we not seen the North-West council, the only representative body in the whole North-West Territories, protesting, year after year, against the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to their railway policy, and their trade policy, as injurious and detrimental to the peace, the progress and the prosperity of the North-West Territory. Have we not seen, in the press of hon. gentlemen opposite, for two or three years back, the clearest possible utterances of their antagonism to the policy to which the hon. gentleman committed this country? Sir, if hon. gentlemen will refer to the meetings of the Board of Trade, in the year 1883, in the town of Winnipeg, they will find that the warmest supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, politically, declared, at a public meeting assembled to consider the grievances of Manitoba and the North-West, that the policy of this Government was not in the interests of that country. Do the hon. gentlemen not know that at Moose Jaw, upon this line of railway, two years ago, there was a meeting of Conservatives, who protested, in the strongest possible language, against the land policy, the railway policy, and the trade policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? Do they not know that even this year there have been remonstrances innumerable coming from every part of Manitoba and the North-West Territory against the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it any wonder, then, in view of those protests from the supporters and friends of the Government in that country, that the financial operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be hampered? Sir, I say that no man in Canada to-day ever did so much to discredit the North-West Territory as the First Minister of this Dominion. I take up the hon. gentleman's own reports for the last three years, and out of his own mouth and the mouth of his officials in the North-West Territory it is capable of the clearest demonstration that the hon. gentleman, in his reports, has so decried that country that no farmer from England or from the continent of Europe would ever think of settling north of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if he had taken the trouble to read the hon. gentleman's own reports. What has the hon. gentleman been telling us during the last four years? It is possible that the First Minister, like the Minister of Militia, has not read his own reports; but, if the hon. gentleman has not read them, he ought to have read them, and he ought not to have allowed those statements to have gone abroad, not only to the people of this country, but to the people of the old world, and to emigrants who are seeking homes in our North-West Territories. If those who are opposed to the progress and prosperity of our North-West, if those who wish to cripple the energies of our people and desire that our North-West shall not be opened up, wanted an argument—if our American friends across the line, who have their own north-western States to open up, desired an argument to prevent settlers going to the Canadian North-West, the most potent argument they could find would be found in the hon. gentleman's own reports during the last four years. He has been telling the people, solemnly, in the Blue Books submitted to Parliament, over and over again, not one year, or two years, or three years, but four years, not on one page, or in one report, but in innumerable reports, that wheat cannot be grown north of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He has been pro claiming in the Blue Books—and the page and words of the hon. gentleman I have under my hand—that the crops in such and such a locality were all destroyed, owing to frost, in July and August—that the wheat crop was a failure, owing to the early frosts. Not only the hon. gentleman's understrappers but the hon. gentleman himself, with the responsibility of a Minister of the Crown resting upon him, not heavily, because the hon. gentleman never allows official responsibility to rest heavily on his shoulders, nevertheless, on the responsibility of a Minister, has declared that the North-West, that portion of the Dominion of which we think so much, is utterly unfit for agricultural settlers, who are leaving the old country in the hope of finding homes on the prairies of the west. The hon. gentleman told us, in his report, that in August, 1883, the crops of the Sarcees at Fish Creek were cut down by July frosts; that the crops of the Blackfeet band were destroyed, owing to summer frosts; that the crops at the following instruction farms had been badly injured by summer frosts: Way-way-see-cappo, Birdtail Creek; the Gambler, Cote, Fort Pelly; Mus-cow-pe-tung, Qu'Appelle; Day Star, Touchwood Hills; Mosquito, Eagle Hills; Poundmaker, Assiniboines; Blackfeet, Pheasant Reserve; Old Man. Yet the hon. gentleman has charged hon. members on this side of the House with endeavoring to injure the North-West and prevent settlement, when the hon. gentleman himself has published, in his Blue Book, more than enough to destroy the reputation of any country as to soil and climate. In the hon. gentleman's last report similar statements are contained. In his report of 1884 the hon. gentleman himself, not his agents, speaking of the heavy frosts on the morning of 1st July, says: At Way-way-see-cappo's band reserve, "Heavy frost on the morning of 1st July cut down all the potatoes." At Kee-see-kouse's reserve, "The frosts struck their potatoes in July." White Cap's reserve, "Summer frosts destroyed their crops." New Pheasant's band, "Crops destroyed by August frost." Lean Man's reserve, "Crops destroyed by August frost." Thunder Child's reserve, "Crops destroyed by August frost."

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It is not pleasant to offer remarks with respect to personal affairs; but as I have endeavored to steer clear of all matters of personal benefit to myself, I wish to make a few statements, and if the hon. gentleman doubts them, we had better have a committee of investigation. The hon. gentleman has, in fact, asked for a committee. The hon. gentleman has said I have a timber limit, and that I am working for another timber limit. The hon. gentleman's statement is not true. I have not got a timber limit, and I am not working for another one. I applied for a timber limit in the North-West, the same as any other person did. I paid the Government $250 for it. I spent nine weeks in going there, but I could not reach it. I spent $500 in going there. I have surrendered the limit to the Government, and have not therefore now got it. I see the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) smiles. He has been in the House a good while, and he has not known me to be connected with anything improper, and he will not charge me with telling anything that is untrue. I say I have surrendered that limit to the Government. I think I have done nothing wrong. The limit cost me $750, and I have not got it to-day. Hon. gentlemen who twit me with having a timber limit say what is not correct and what is not true. I wish that to be thoroughly and distinctly understood. That is my position, so far as timber limits are concerned. The Government have received my $250. Let hon. gentlemen go and examine the books and they will find such is the case; they have the money and I have a receipt. They have got the timber limit back, after I have spent money in buying it, and have spent nine weeks of my time in respect of it. Did I make anything in speculating in timber limits in the North-West? But what is said about the hon. gentleman? He bought land in southern Manitoba. I have been told by gentlemen from that section of the country that the road now built 50 miles is not paying running expenses. I do not say that is true or untrue, but I heard so. The hon. gentleman from Huron (Mr. Cameron) bought land for $1 per acre in southern Manitoba, and sold it to an hon. member of this House, or to a syndicate, at $10 an acre. He is the gentleman who has speculated; he is the man who has made the money; and yet he is the party who stands up and put his hand on his heart

and speak as sanctimonious as a Christian in denouncing others. His bank account shows well; I wish I had speculated as he has done—it would be a good thing for me. An hon. gentleman in this House has been mentioned in the press in a way I am sorry to see, owing to the transaction of the member for West Huron and the gentleman in front of him. I have never been accused of anything of that kind; I have never in my speculations to put any one in the courts, to show why he did not meet his engagements. He says, so far as the Government is concerned, that the Government has not done their duty to the North-West. I contend they have, and that there is no people in the known world who have been so well treated as the people of the North-West. They have got every favor from the people of the older parts of country, and I believe they ought to be satisfied. As to the dissatisfaction in that country, I believe there is no tariff that has done so much to produce dissatisfaction as the speculators—the men who have gone up to lend money, the men who get hold of the settlers' patents. I will be bound to say to-day, that two-thirds of the titles in that country are not in the hands of the settlers, because the speculators have got them. How much of the half-breed scrip has been left in the hands of the half-breeds? Half of it has been bought by speculators like the hon. gentleman, yet he talks in a sanctimonious and an apparently honest way about corruption, and in his heart he knows that he has speculated himself, and to his own advantage. He says the policy of the Government has hurt the settlers, and he refers, I suppose, to agricultural implements. Well, Sir, to-day, in Winnipeg, you can buy agricultural implements as cheap as you can in Ottawa, than you could two years ago. I will be bound to say that you can buy articles manufactured in Brantford as cheap in Winnipeg as you can in Brantford, with a difference for freight, and 4 or 5 per cent. extra. I contend that the Government have done everything they could to build up that country, and particularly southern Manitoba. There is no hon. gentleman in this House, hardly, but has friends and relatives in southern Manitoba, and we are all anxious to see the road built and to give it every assistance we can. I only rose to say, that with regard to this timber limit that I have not go it, that it is not in my possession, that the Government have it, and that, whatever money has been lost in connection with it, has been lost by myself.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Huron said that the First Minister decried the country, with regard to the frosts and the quality of the soil, and now the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) decries his timber limits, and says that they are not worth $250, and that he had to give it back.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I said nothing of the kind. I said that, so far as the limit was concerned, which they said showed that I had speculated with the Government, that sooner than be twitted about it I had surrendered it. I said nothing about the timber or the land. I am as anxious as you are about the prosperity of the country, and if you rose to make that statement you rose to make a statement which is not true.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think anybody would wish the hon. gentleman to be deprived of his timber limit after he got it. He should have stuck to it when he got it, perhaps as a favor, as he might as well have kept the game as he gets the blame. I may say that I, along with those who have spoken on this side, am in favor of every encouragement the Government may see fit to give to this railway, as I believe no road is more needed in that country. I believe that if the Government had done its duty, the Manitoba South-Western Railway would have been built years ago, and that hundreds of dissatisfied people who went across the boundary line from southern Manitoba would have been in the country to-day. I believe that road would have been built had it not been for the action of hon. gentlemen opposite in aiding the Canadian Pacific Railway to choke off that project. The First Minister stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway found that there were fears that some American capitalists were interested in the Manitoba South-Western, and that they also feared that that road might come to be a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore he went on to justify the action of the Government in not encouraging that road as much as they should have done. That road was surveyed, in 1879-80, for 285 miles, and the lotation for 51 miles was approved of. Those 51 miles were built within one year, and plans were laid before the Minister of Railways for the rest of the road, but he would not approve of them, and consequently the company could not go on. While this was going on, a little double shuffle took place, which ended in the company, owing, I believe, to some men interested in a rival company, not being allowed to go on with their work. There was some delay took place, during which the Canadian Pacific Railway surveyed their line through southern Manitoba, practically shutting off the other road. The First Minister stated that he gloried in the fact that the railways in that country were under the control of one company. The other day, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) spoke of the trunk lines of the country in these words:

"Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to show that the policy of the Government has prevented the construction of branch lines. Well, how is it that this very scheme is now proposed at the request of those branch line companies? Do hon. gentlemen opposite suppose that those companies do not look after their own interests? Do they think those companies forget that there is only one trunk line of railway in Manitoba and the North-West Territory? Do they forget that the branch lines will necessarily have to make freight arrangements with the trunk line? They know, as well as we do, that such is the case; and yet, notwithstanding, it must be admitted that the branch lines know their own interests a little better than hon. gentlemen oppisite."

Now, I believe that is the great reason why branch lines have not been built. If the Government would grant charters to other companies, who would build independent lines, we would have railway facilities without land grants from this Dominion. But, as hon. gentlemen know, the the charters in that Province have been disallowed, for fear there would be competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In my opinion, the policy of the late Mackenzie Administration for building railways in that country, was the true policy, and I believe if it had been carried out we would have had railway communication across the prairies long before the Canadian Pacific Railway will have it. As for the need of a railroad in southern Manitoba, it cannot be over-estimated. Settlers who, to my own knowledge, went in there four or five years ago, with the expectation of having railway communication in a short time, broke up large tracts of land and sowed their grain, and have had their grain lying in their granaries ever since, and it is worthless without railway communication. Last year these farmers either left the country or simply rested on their oars, in the hope of getting railway communication. A deputation from southern Manitoba, consisting of Mr. Rogers and Mr. McKay, visited Ottawa and waited on the Government, and also on the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities; and they returned under the impression that such aid would be given to railway companies as would secure railway communication this season. They also received a letter from Mr. Stephen, saying that if certain concessions were given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they would agree to build this road. I believe this deputation wished to have a portion of the old South-Western and a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway South-Western built. Hon. gentlemen probably know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have built 100 miles of their south-western line from Winnipeg, and that 51 miles of the Manitoba South-Western are built. I would like to know whether this grant is intended for the old Manitoba South-Western or

for the Canadian Pacific Railway South-Western. It is very necessary that we should have some information on this point. During the discussion that took place last night on the road to be built from Medicine Hat to the Galt coal mines, the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) used the same arguments as the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). He stated that, having only one railway in that country, it practically governed the price of coal to the consumer; and yet, with such arguments coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, they insist on retaining this power of monopoly in the Province of Manitoba. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) has stated that there are no people in the Dominion of Canada who have been used as the people of Manitoba. He is perfectly right; I do not think any other people in this Dominion have been deprived of the right to build railways in their own Province. I know, for a fact, that the Emerson and Northwestern Railway, which was disallowed, would have been built. Although it had no land grant, 15 miles of that road had been graded, and it would have been a competing line with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WHITE. Your leader disallowed two Bills. He said there was no use of any Government or any company undertaking to build the Canadian Pacific Railway unless they projected the traffic, and he disallowed both Bills or defeated them in committee. The hon. member for West Durham knows that to be true.

Mr. WATSON. I had some experience of that kind of action with a Bill I introduced this Session, for the purpose of incorporating a railway to connect with other lines, to open up valuable timber limits and to obtain closer communication with the Lake of the Woods. I had reason to believe that that Bill would pass. The House had assurances from the Minister of Railways, a little over a year ago, that such Bills would be allowed to pass the House; and resting on that assurance, I introduced that Bill, and was very much disappointed, as were the people interested in it, at that charter not being granted. You cannot expect any men to undertake the construction of a branch line of railway if they have to make terms with the line with which they expect to compete. That is the way people feel in the North-West. However, as it is the policy of hon. gentleman opposite not to allow competition, I suppose we shall have to submit quietly, for a time; but there is a great deal of dissatisfaction in the country. Not only the Liberal press, but the Conservative press of Manitoba, has, at different times, denounced both the land and railway policies of this Government; still, the Government will not yield to the requirements of the people of that country. The hon. First Minister stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could not be expected to build branch lines, because the resolutions passed a little over a year ago, granting $30,000,000 to them, would not allow them to spend one dollar of that money on branch lines. I voted against those resolutions at the time, and I claimed that it was more important that a portion of that money should be devoted to the construction of branch lines than that it should be devoted wholly to the construction of the main line. The money spent has not yet been enough to complete the main line, as the company are about to ask Parliament for further aid. The cost of, perhaps, one mile of the road north of Lake Superior, would build ten miles in the prairie country, which would be of infinitely greater value to the country, as a whole and to the settlers of Manitoba. However, I have certainly no objection to the Government granting most liberal aid to the construction of any branch lines in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. FARROW. I desire to say a few words on this resolution, knowing something about southern Manitoba, and the character and circumstances of the settlers there. As the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has stated, a great many of them have gone from Huron and Bruce and the adjacent county of Perth. I have a great many relatives there myself. I visited that country in 1880, and I saw the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and also the hon. member for West Huron, there at the same time.

Mr. WHITE. Both speculating?

Mr. FARROW. I believe they engaged legitimately in speculation. I was a poor man, and had no money for speculation myself. I think their speculations were legitimate; all I think they were wrong in, was in blaming the Government for not building a railway to enhance the value of their speculation. My hon. friend from Hastings is more modest. He has got a timber limit, but he is not blaming the Government for not building a railway to it. I think there is; I say that their speculations were legitimate. I do not blame them. If I had money, I would have speculated in the same way; the speculations were open to any man. I am in accord with this resolution. A great deal has been said about grievances in the North-West. I believe I receive as many letters from southern Manitoba as any hon. gentleman, for many of my own constituents in the east riding of Huron have gone there, with many of whom I am intimately acquainted. I know Mr. George McKenzie very well, and Mr. John Robertson, and I am very sorry that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has, I will not say intentionally, misrepresented their cases, but I will touch upon that a little later. I have asked these men, personally, I have asked them by letter, what grievances they have, and they said they have no grievance, as regards the price of agricultural implements, for they can buy them there cheaper than they could in Ontario, but they have a grievance, and that is the want of a railway. I have come in contact with them, as they have visited my place on short visits, and I said to them: You have only been out there since 1879 or 1880, but when did you come into the county of Huron? They said: We came there in 1856, when it was all bush; and I asked them: How did you struggle on without a railway for twenty-five years? And yet you complain because you have not a railway out there, although that country has not been opened up for five years? They could not answer me. Why did not you rebel against the Government of Ontario, I said, when you were twenty-five years without a railway? Oh, they answered, we are differently situated now. I know one man who has gone there from my neighborhood, three years ago, and he had 2,500 bushels No. 2 spring wheat in his granary, and it is there to-day.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it there?

Mr. FARROW. I am going to tell you. He said: I have a team worth $500, but if I take the team to carry the grain to Brandon it would kill the team, and rather than lose the team I would let the grain rot in my barn. The great cry out there is for a railway, and I am glad by these resolutions they are going to get it. But I want to know whether this will build the railway, and will it be built now. These are the two great points: Will this grant of 6,400 acres per mile——

Mr. BLAKE. It is 9,600 acres.

Mr. FARROW. Well, if it is 9,600 acres it will more than build any road through there. If I had the capital, I would, from the knowledge I have of that country, take that land to-morrow and build the road, and equip and run it, inside of a year. There is no question about these men wanting a railway and they must have it. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is almost equal to any task. I have met him on political platforms, and some times he thought it convenient to keep away, but he is equal to any

occasion; he can make black appear white or white black. Did he not say that George Mackenzie had left the country.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, and never returned.

Mr. FARROW. George Mackenzie has a very fine property in southern Manitoba and he has erected on it a fine building, and has returned to his business in Goderich, as a hardware merchant. I know of a man who was out there for a year; he broke up a small portion of land, some 60 acres, and has rented that clearance for $180 a year, and returned home to Ontario.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). He has not gone to the States.

Mr. FARROW. I will deal with this matter. I know most of those people in southern Manitoba. My friend, Mr. Robertson, is what I call a noted character; he is a relative of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), a cousin of his, and I know of two boys who went there, one of whom unfortunately got an odd number and the other an even number. I suggested: Why did you not both get on an even-numbered section; did you not know the odd-numbered sections are set apart for the railway? But they wanted to be together. One of these boys has made $2,500 worth of improvements on his property, and I would advise the Government that these men who went there as early as 1881, and many of them sold good places in Ontario and put their money into the country, and have borne the heat and the burden of the day, should have their lands at a reasonable figure. I say that the Government, in making this grant, should see that those settlers will have the lands at a reasonable figure. One dollar an acre has been mentioned, and I think ti is plenty for these men to pay. They have been the pioneers, the men who have set a good example, who have shown that this is a country flowing with milk and honey, so far as grain-raising is concerned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The grain must be in the milk.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it is the man who is in the milk.

Mr. FARROW. I know that some of these men have raised 30 to 40 bushels of spring wheat to the acre, and 40 bushels of barley, and 80 bushels of oats; and really these crops are something tremendous, compared with the yield we get in even some of the best parts of Ontario. I was going to say that I hoped the Government will make strong and fast terms with the Canada Pacific Railway, or whatever company is going to get this land. I believe the want of a railway is the only grievance these people have. That is all they have represented to me. As to the hon. member for West Huron saying that 50 per cent. of the people had left the country, I am in a position to say that is a very extraordinary statement. I have made it my business to ask different parties with whom I have come in contact, both personally and by letter, and they have told me that in their special neighborhood, inside ranges 19 to 25, west of the prime meridian, in the Turtle Mountain district, very few have left the country, but the great grievance is the railway. I am very glad this resolution has come down. I am glad it is so liberal. I know there is enough in it to build the railway. If I were a capitalist, I would be glad to take the land and build a first-class road, and I do not see why the money cannot be raised to build such a road. I believe it can be raised, and if the Government stick to the company, no doubt it will be built. The settlers have only this grievance, and if it is built, there will be a happy southern Manitoba.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure the hon. gentlemen, whom the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Farrow) supports, will have listened, with interest and attention, to some of the observations he made, and which, if he will permit me to say so, strongly supported some of the arguments I have been presenting, in the effort to persuade the committee that there were questions to be considered in reference to this resolution. In the first place, the hon. member for Huron said the grievance was the railway, and that was the only grievance, and he pointed out that it was rather an unreasonable grievance. He pointed out that, when he and others went into Huron, they struggled for twenty-five years in the bush without a railway. No doubt they did, but the railway era, the railway age, came on, and those who left a country which had railway accommodation and went into the North-West, in the expectation that they would have railway accommodation there, under the pledges and promises that railways would permeate that country, who were told that in modern times immigration is to be aided by the railway being ahead of the immigrant, and who found that the great distances they were from the market so materially affected the price of their grain that it was absolutely vital to them to get a railway, might naturally be very much aggrieved if they were kept five years waiting for a railway, after they were promised it, more than the settlers in Huron would be, who went in there 25 years before, without the promise of a railway, and when there was but little railway accommodation in the country at all But that has nothing to do with the question before us. We are not discussing the conditions under which the old settlers went into the country, but we are discussing the present railway policy in the North-West. We are considering the present by the light of the past, and it is the admitted policy of Canada that the North-West, if it is to prosper, is to have local railways. Therefore, there is no use in discussing the question as the hon. member for Huron did in that part of his argument. He said they were unreasonable in expecting railways. I say they were reasonable; I say that for them the railway was a reasonable and necessary expectation; I say, that without that expectation and without the promise and the public pledge made by persons in whom they had reason to confide, that there would be railways built there, many of them would not have gone; we would not have had them in there, and you will not get more in, except upon the expectation and pledge of railway development. Then he says he wants to see that the railway will be assured, though he thinks they are unreasonable in complaining that they have been without the railway for five years, when they were twenty-five years in Huron without one. He admits that it is a necessity, not only for them, but also to ensure settlement, and he says it is wanted surely and speedily. Well, I am with him in that, and my doubt is, that the hon. gentleman, whose knowledge of railway building I do not dispute, whose capacity to value lands I do not deny, whose power to judge of the availability of a railway grant I do not at all depreciate, is, unfortunately, at issue with Mr. Van Horne and with Mr. Stephen on the subject. I have read the statement of Mr. Van Horne, in September last, that if he got the free grant of land he was not at all sanguine that he would be able to build this line. He says: I will try to build it, but I am not sanguine. Mr. Stephen went to England, as I find from these papers, to see if he could obtain the capital, and I find no report from him, and no report from Mr. Van Horne that he had obtained it. I find that in September this took place, and now, in the month of June, I find no information that the effort which was made last fall to get English capital on the basis of this land grant is successful. I would explain to the hon. gentleman how it comes to be 9,600 acres a mile. There was an original grant of 6,400 acres a mile, at $1 an acre, and there were 50 miles built under that. The company has 100 miles to build. The Government has agreed to give 6,400 a mile for that 100 miles, and on the construction of that 100 miles to give 6,400 acres a mile for the 50 miles that they have constructed. That makes about 9,600 acres a mile for the construction of the 100 miles, besides the 50

miles already built. The hon. gentleman says this grant will build a first-class railway, but Mr. Van Horne is not sanguine as to its being built. On the 18th March, I find Mr. Stephen saying to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister laying the letter on the Table about a month ago, that if he gets all he asks from Government and from Parliament, which he does not get, because the proposals made by the Government are different from what Mr. Stephen asks, he will undertake to build the Manitoba South-Western. It is clear that he had not got, on the 18th March, an independent basis upon which he could build the Manitoba South-Western, but if you pour into the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the resources I ask, he says, I will agree to build the Manitoba South-Western. That is the evidence, and in connection with the hon. gentleman, I raise my humble voice to demand such reasonable assurance, based upon the statements of Mr. Van Horne and Mr. Stephen, and of the two corporations, that we are to get the railway surely, as I agree with him we ought to get it, with this grant. For, what are the prospects of the North-West at large? What can we honestly say about the prospects of the North-West at large, if, in an old settled, a fertile, a favored section of the country, a free grant of 9,600 acres a mile, along the line of the railway, and every acre to be fairly fit for settlement, is not sufficient encouragement to enable you to build a railway in that part? If that cannot be done, what is the future of the North-West?

Mr. FARROW. It can be done.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it can be done, but those who ask for the aid say they doubt it. The hon. gentleman adverted to another thing, to the low price of lands which he thought ought to exist for the settlers, and he pointed out difficulties that had ensued by reason of these men taking up odd and even sections. What was more natural in that country than that men should desire to be near one another? That men of the same family or of the same neighborhood should feel, when they were going into remote country, almost alone, without the advantages of schools or churches and without that usual admixture that they had in the happy county of Huron, as it has been in these later days, with its villages, with its schools, with its churches, with its railways, and so forth, that they should cling to the notion: Well, at any rate, we, old friend, old ally, old neighbor in the bush, brother, cousin, father, will stick together. I feel for those who took the risk of settling on an odd section to get near their brother on the even section, and I always felt that reserving large blocks, under the system of alternate sections, in advance of a railway, in a fertile country, was one, unless there were circumstances to enable individuals to settle together, which would give rise to great difficulties. I want something to be done in connection with this which will ensure that the same difficulties shall not subsist along the line of the Manitoba South-Western and these other roads. The Government are going to give the free grant along the line of these railways, so far as they are unsettled. I want to be assured that the odd sections may be purchased at a reasonable price, so that those people may settle together, and I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that that is reasonable. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is reasonable. Now, Sir, I do not intend to enter into the argument of the First Minister. He gave us a very admirable discourse, delivered with great power of voice, great freedom of utterance, great eloquence, and some latitude of statement, upon the subject of a Canadian Pacific Railway. He argued as to the prospects of that road, as to the position of that road, as to the difficulties of that road, in a manner which, I think, deserves, as it has received, some and sufficient dissection from my hon. friend from Huron. He pointed out the depreciating process that had gone on in many respects with reference to the prospects of the road, as he said, from a hostile press in Canada, and which had been repeated and exaggerated in England. I need not to-day, I suppose, tell this House what I have frequently told it before, of my opinions as to the nature of the contract, and the prospects of the Canadian Pacific Railway under this contract. They have been frequently stated, and I abide by them still, as the condition of things at the time they were uttered. Last Session and the Session before I was obliged to point out how these prospects had been clouded and, to some extent, marred, by what I thought was the mistaken policy of the Government and the policy of the railway company together. But the hon. gentleman adverted to the policy of which I spoke—a policy of vigorous action in the prairie, and cautious and tentative action with reference to the ends of the line, and he denounced that as a policy unworthy of a statesman, and that statement is cheered on the other side of the House. He also objected to my saying that the policy of the Government had been vascillating, rash and inconsistent. Well, now, does the hon. gentleman recollect what his colleague, the Minister of the Interior, thought of his policy in the year 1873? Does he recollect the view that he took as to the Canadian Pacific Railway policy at that time? Does he recollect the published letters that he wrote with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway policy? Why, Sir, he very much dissented from the policy of the hon. gentleman. I have here an article from the Montreal *Gazette*, of 12th July, 1873, an editorial article, speaking of the views of Senator McPherson, in the following language:—

"The question of policy could not be affected by the fact of whether he (Macpherson) was president, or Sir Hugh Allan president, of the company to construct the railway; and we have here another illustration of Mr. Macpherson's disingenuousness in the whole matter. So long as he thought there was any chance of securing for himself the chief position in connection with the company, he steadfastly advocated the construction of the railway by means of a company. The very moment that he found that his own vanity was not to be ministered unto, that instant he threw what influence he had possessed—which, thank God, is not very great—in obstructing the enterprise which he professed to desire to promote, and into urging a policy which he did not for a moment think of while the thinking of it might have secured its adoption. The letter will not certainly add much to the personal or public character of Senator Macpherson, while it will expose to the world the motives which govern his extraordinary conduct in the Senate during the last Session of Parliament, and will render harmless any further efforts that he may may make in the same direction.

There was the view of a Conservative newspaper on the subject of Senator Macpherson's views, the gentleman who is now Minister of Interior, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company policy of the Government in 1873. Now, I come down to the year 1877, when Senator Macpherson had become reconciled to the hon. gentleman, and sustained him in the Senate; and what did he think about the Pacific policy then? Why, Sir, I have here a pamphlet which was circulated by hon. gentlemen opposite by tens of thousands in the year 1878, and was, in fact, their platform at that election. They have even boasted that it was the means by which they largely carried the country, and the Senator was rewarded shortly afterwards by a seat in the Cabinet for his exertions during that campaign. What did he say, in the year 1877, upon that subject?

"Then, with respect to the main line, the Government saw fit to commence it on the section between Thunder Bay—or, rather, between Fort William, on the banks of the Kaministiquia, six or eight miles from Thunder Bay, on Lake Superior—and the Red River, a distance of 410 miles, through a wilderness, no part of which, worth mentioning, according to the testimony of Mr. Sandford Fleming, Chief Engineer of the railway, is fit for settlment. Mr. Fleming's evidence upon the subject is in full accord with that of all other persons who have visited the region. It abounds in small lakes, quagmires and rock. Through a considerable part of the country the construction of the railway will be difficult and costly, there being much rock cutting and some tunnelling. When finished it will only be a summer road, open for five months in the year, and run at an enormous loss to the country. Long before it is finished the American line from Duluth to Pembina, on the frontier of Manitoba, is certain to be completed, and will be open *via* St. Paul all the year around."

There, Sir, when an honest effort was being made to construct that line, which was material, in order to give connection between the great North-West and the Canadian seaboard, in order to enable the people, in the season of emigration, to go to the North-West by our own lines, through our own country, from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, and in order to enable the grain to come down to Port Arthur and through the lakes to Montreal, that was the statement which the hon. gentleman sent out to the country, endorsed by their *imprimatur*, written by the man whom they afterwards rewarded, by taking him into the Cabinet, as to the prudence of the expenditure for completing that link in the through line. How good does that look for the great national enterprise? How good does that look for the encouragement of a through line, for the Canadian Pacific Railway to represent to the people that it was an injurious and improper thing to build that link from Port Arthur to Winnipeg? But the hon. gentleman has complained of my policy—which he has not accurately stated. I never proposed to Parliament, nor to any portion of the people, that the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a through line, should be abandoned. I declared that the ends of it should be postponed, and that the centre was the part which demanded our first, our earliest, our most active exertions; and in that view I think I shall be found to be sustained by more than the opinions which I have read. I have shown you that Senator Macpherson was largely of that view in the pamphlet from which I have read to you, in the year 1877, as to the construction of the piece from Port Arthur to Winnipeg.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee on resolutions respecting land grants to North-West railways.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. When you left the Chair, Sir, I was pointing out that the policy which the Liberal party had advocated, with respect to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was a policy which was not confined to them exclusively. But others, besides themselves, had entertained those reasonable views, and I had promised to give you some proof of that statement. I had referred to the utterances of a distinguished member of the present Cabinet at an earlier period in the history of the Canadian Pacific Railway discussion, namely, in the year 1873. But I pass to a later era, to the period of 1877 and of 1878, when Mr. Mackenzie's policy had been inaugurated, and when both parties were preparing for the struggle which was to take place in 1878, and I ask, what was the policy, at that time, of many distinguished persons, who now, and of late years, have decried the policy which I have alluded to as a sound one, in language something like that which the First Minister employed this afternoon, decrying it and denouncing it as an unreasonable and insensate, mean and contracted policy. Allow me to read a few words which were spoken in 1877:

"But surely the whole expenditure between Lake Superior and the Red River is premature and unwise. That section of the railway will cost not less than twenty millions of dollars; the interest will be one million of dollars a year, and with the loss of working the road (which I shall not venture to estimate), will amount to an enormous sum to be borne by the tax-payers of this Dominion. I may say my own opinion has always been that we should have been content, for a time, to use the United States lines for our all-rail route to Manitoba, and begin our Pacific Railway at Pembina, thence to Winnipeg, and on through Manitoba and the North-West, combining with its construction a comprehensive and attractive scheme of immigration, under which immigrants would be assured of employment and land—employment first, and land afterwards."

Mr. BLAKE.

I hear some hon. gentleman cheer that anti-national sentiment, that unpatriotic sentiment, that United States sentiment, and I might almost say, that annexation sentiment. The words I am reading are the words of Senator Macpherson.

Mr. McCALLUM. You followed in the same channel.

Mr. BLAKE. I was a little before him.

Mr. McCALLUM. And you followed him.

Mr. BLAKE. I am following him now with a sharp stick:

"The lands retained by the Government in the North-West, owing to the settlement of adjoining lands, would have been enhanced in value, and their sale would have provided funds to aid in extending the railway, as required, without over-burdening the Dominion exchequer. In this way the Canadian Pacific Railway, east of the Rocky Mountains, could have been built as fast as required, for very little money, and our prairie country would have become quickly peopled. A similar course, as far as adaptable to British Columbia, might have been pursued in that Province; and when the Government decided to build the road as a public work, no reasonable objection could be urged against this policy. Had it been followed, the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would have been more prosperous than it is to-day. We should have been free from the heavy engagements that weigh upon us, and free, also, from the financial peril that stares us in the face—imminent if not inevitable. Our expenditure, to this time, upon the railway, would have been comparatively small, and would increase only as might be convenient, for it would be subject to our own control. As it is, the outlay in connection with the Pacific Railway to 30th June, 1876, (according to the Public Accounts), amounts to the large sum of $6,254,280."

With those words, expressive of his policy, with those remonstrances against an enormous and inordinate expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway, with those alarms and apprehensions of the consequences to this Dominion of expending money at so rapid a rate, did Senator Macpherson address the electors of Canada, prior to the general elections of 1878; and with these views distributed broadcast throughout the country did the Conservative party endeavor to succeed, and they did succeed, in carrying the popular vote, so far as the Canadian Pacific Railway policy was concerned. It was the common policy, at that time, of both parties, not to increase the taxes of this country or its burdens, in order to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, as I have shown, the Minister of the Interior pointed out that $6,250,000 was a very large expenditure, and that the hon. member for East York was going too fast and too far in incurring that expenditure in building the road, from a financial point of view. In his view we ought to limit that expenditure; we ought to proceed, with respect to the ends of the roads, cautiously; we ought to develop the country and ought to make a backbone for the road; we ought to attend to that, in the first instance; and in that view I heartily concur; for, as I have said, it was my view before the hon. gentleman expressed it, and it has continued to be my view since. But since that time, how have those alarms and apprehensions been realised in his practice and in the practice of the Government. We have taken, in increased and added taxes, $20,000,000 to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, according to the hon. gentleman's policy, and we have borrowed or are borrowing or engaging for close upon $100,000,000 for their Canadian Pacific Railway policy. Contrast that state of things with the state of things which the Minister of Interior deplored as being calculated to produce serious results to the Dominion, when the hon. Senator felt so keenly about $6,250,000 having been expended during many years on the Canadian Pacific Railway;—when he felt so much what is a trifle more than a year's interest on the sum for which we stand at present engaged to pay, or have actually paid, in respect of that enterprise. It is all very well for the First Minister to talk of depression in American railway securities being the reason of the depression; but the cause, and the main cause, of the depression in Canada, to-day, is his policy, and it is very largely due to the Canadian Pacific Railway policy itself,

to a policy which abstracted from the Custom house $20,000,000 to build that road, collecting nearly $30,000,000 out the pockets of the people, and taxing our credit and borrowing powers to a very heavy extent, for almost uncounted millions more. Then, the First Minister presented to Parliament an account of the prospects of the railway in his own exuberant style. I think no greater harm can be done to Canada, so far as its interests are bound up in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to the Canadian Pacific Railway itself, than are such statements as the First Minister made this afternoon. When you find an hon. gentleman occupying the responsible position of First Minister of Canada deliberately declaring, on the floor of Parliament, that the position of that enterprise is such that it will be able to carry freight from one side of the continent to the other, at one-quarter the rates at which other systems of through lines carry freight, you have a statement made which every man, in the slightest degree familiar with the subject, knows to be wholly unfounded, which will be laughed at in railway circles, from one end of the country to the other, if they think it worth while to take notice of it at all. The hon. gentleman knows very little about it, if he really believes that the Canadian Pacific Railway system, in consequence of its being one corporation, from ocean to ocean—but it is not so, and the hon. gentleman's proposal will not make it one corporation—will have the effect of enabling it to save three-quarters of the cost of carrying freight. The arrangements made for carrying throught freight over the various systems, between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, are very complete. At this moment, and for some months past, I have myself seen public advertisements offering to carry freight from an Atlantic port to port Victoria, in British Columbia, ocean freight, European freight of any class, at $2.10 per 100 pounds; and to tell us that the Canadian Pacific Railway can afford to carry that freight for one-fourth of $2.10 per 100 pounds, is to say something which nobody, who has given half-an-hour's attention to the subject, would regard as other than perfectly preposterous. The truth is, that these systems of railway, as to their arrangements for carrying through freight, are involved in little more expense than a uniform system. When a difficulty occurs, of course there may be some hitch in, the whole chain of communication; but so long as the communication lasts, the arrangements are such as to involve very little advantage in that regard. The hon. gentleman gave us, Sir, a very highly-colored account of what the results of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be. He stated that its prospects were of the brightest character, and he has complained of us for doing it an injustice, for decrying those prospects. Well, I have said, and I repeat, that I will invite any person who challenges my statements with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, its contract or its prospects, to point out the speech of which he complains, the language of which he complains, and I will have something to say to him. As to general statements, like those of the hon. gentleman, of course there is no answer to be given, because, in their generalisation, they are not capable of attack. Let us hear the particulars, if the hon. gentleman alluded to me. But I admit that there have been statements made which would be calculated to affect the Canadian Pacific Railway in a different sense from the hon. gentleman's speech of this afternoon. There have been some statements made which, I suppose, the hon. gentleman will denounce as inaccurate, untrue and unpatriotic. For instance, a statement of this kind :

"I do not hesitate to say that the tariff which is now on the Table of the House cannot pay the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and will not pay them, for a considerable number of years. It would be impossible, until a large number of people go into that country, to construct a tariff which would pay them; because the climatic difficulties are such, that I have no hesitation in saying the cost of hauling per ton per mile would be four or five times as great in the North-West, in the present sparsely condition of the country, and the small amount of traffic, as it would be on the Grand Trunk Railway, with the enormous amount of traffic which, I am glad to say, it is carrying and the milder climate in which it operates."

Now, that is terrible language to use. Is it right to declare that it would cost four or five times as much to carry traffic on the Canadian Pacific Railway as it would to carry it on the Grand Trunk?—to declare that neither the tariff of tolls which is on the Table, nor any which can be constructed, will pay the Canadian Pacific Railway for a number of years? Do you mean to say that that is going to be the condition of the enterprise? The hon. gentleman may well denounce the person using that language, but in doing so he will denounce one of his colleagues, Sir Charles Tupper, who spoke those words, when standing beside where he now sits, on the 4th of May, 1883, just two years ago. These are the denunciations, and let the hon. gentleman settle his account with his Minister of the Interior, with his High Commissioner, before he comes forward to render an account to the members of the Liberal party. I have no intention of engaging in a general Canadian Pacific Railway debate, upon which we will, perhaps, have a good deal to say when the hon. gentleman's proposal comes down. I would not have touched the matter, but for the hon. gentleman's own statement and attack, which merited just this much reply.

On resolution 3, (Manitoba and North Western Railway Company),

Mr. EDGAR. Are we to hear, from the hon. Minister of Public Works, any particulars about this very important grant, a grant of about 3,000,000 acres of land?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I thought I had already given, on the introduction of the resolutions the other evening, the explanations I had to give about this grant. I stated that the company had already built 78 miles, which have been worked for a year or two; that there were 50 miles beyond that under construction, with a location of 75 miles over and above that distance, which has been approved by the Government, and that the balance of the charter, after that distance, was 250 miles, forming 443 miles, which will bring the road from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert. Hon. gentlemen will see the importance of the railway if they refer to the map. From Portage la Prairie to Minnedosa, and thence to Prince Albert, as a rule, it passes through a very fine country. A large number of people have settled there; but, as in the case of the Manitoba South-Western, they require a railway, in order that they may bring their produce to market. Under these circumstances, the Government have come to the determination to make this grant, subject to the approval of Parliament, from Portage la Prairie to the crossing of the South Saskatchewan, 23 miles from Prince Albert. When they reach that point we have no doubt they will reach the Prince Albert settlement, which, I hope, by that time, will be a very quiet and prosperous settlement. That distance of 430 miles, with the 23 miles to Prince Albert, makes up 453 miles. The land will amount, in round numbers, to two millions and three-quarters acres. The company will have to pay, also, ten cents per acre for surveys and other expenses connected with that portion of the administration of the Department. The land grant consists of the odd-numbered sections at the disposal of the Governement, and the tracts are indicated on the map. They are bound to complete a portion of the road year by year, in order to be entitled to the grant. And the whole grant is paid in the same way as the grant to the Pacific Railway—as the road is being built, and as it is reported to be built, in accordance with the contract, by the Chief Engineer of the Department.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether, for that portion of the road already built, the Government intend to grant the land *pro rata* per mile for the whole distance at once, or for short distances. How is

the land grant to be distributed over the 78 miles already built?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. So far as I can recollect, the quantity of land appropriated for those 78 miles will be allotted to the company on the remainder of the road as it is built.

Mr. EDGAR. I have looked at the Order in Council, and the exact provisions of it in this case are, that for the portion that is completed, the 512,000 acres are to be apportioned over the remaining 350 miles, which makes the grant 7,863 acres a mile from the present point to which the railway is finished to the South Saskatchewan, and that acreage is to be conveyed to the company as each 25 miles of the railway are finished. Now, I do not rise at all to object to the Government making this grant. I am very much more disposed to complain because the Government did not make a sufficient grant before now to bring about the completion of this very important line of railway, and I am anxious to see that the grant they are giving now will accomplish that end. This line is a special one; it is not only a large railway in itself—430 miles in length, from Portage la Prarie to the South Saskatchewan—but it traverses the route which was laid out for the Pacific Railway by the present Government; and when it was publicly announced as the route of the great trans-continental highway, settlers flocked in large numbers into that district, and they have been very much disappointed, and have suffered greatly from the absence of the railway communication which they had been led to expect. For that reason, among others, the Government should have taken care that the grants they have made to assist that railway for several years past bore fruit, which they did not. If the Government had taken care that this important line of railway had been constructed within a reasonable time after the route of the Pacific Railway was changed, there would have been very much less discontent in the neighborhood of the South Saskatchewan and Prince Albert than has been lately developed. One of the minor causes which have led to the recent rebellion—the dissatisfaction of the settlers with the lack of communication with the outside world—would have been largely removed; and with a railway in operation to the Saskatchewan, at Prince Albert, an outbreak would have been very easily suppressed. That those settlers have reason to complain is very evident from the papers which have been laid before the House. As long ago as 1881, when this company first applied to the Government for assistance, that fact was represented. The memorial of the company said:

"The line adopted by the Portage, Western and North-Western Railway Company is one which was early occupied by settlers, in the expectation they were led to indulge in by maps issued by the Government and the earlier reports of the Engineer-in-Chief of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and years of deep disappointment followed, and only now removed when, after the Canadian Pacific Railway Company decided on carrying their main line so far to the south, the Portage, Western and North-Western Railway Company undertook to meet their wants, believing they could do so in full harmony with the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the views of the Government."

Now, that was not only represented by the company, but it was represented to the Government on several occasions by representative men in the North-West. The warden of the county of Westbourne, Major Boulton, represented to the Government, personally, and also by memorandum, the same circumstance, and pressed it upon the attention of the Government. What did the Government do? They passed an Order in Council, in 1881, granting 3,840 acres a mile for this road, with the promise that when it was half finished they might give them some more. Then the company went on struggling for a while, and were able to do nothing with that assistance. A new organisation was formed, in December, 1882, composed of the late Sir Hugh Allan and his partners, Governor Dewdney, and a number of other very strong men, who informed the Government that they had undertaken the work; and with a great flourish of trumptes they said that if it were made clear in the Order in Council that they were to receive 6,400 acres a mile on the whole distance, as far as the South Saskatchewan, they would certainly be able to complete the work. I think the Government might have been justified in believing they would. But they did not. After a great deal of delay, from the year 1879, when the company was first incorporated, until 1883, they had only succeeded in building 78 miles out of 430, and I am sure it must have been very gratifying to the First Minister, on that occasion, to receive a telegram from the Premier of Manitoba, as I see by the papers he did, congratulating him on the magnificent feat which had been accomplished by the Government of having 80 miles of this railway constructed after the company had been incorporated for four years. The one thing which the settlers required was a railway, because they had been induced to go there far in advance of settlement, and were disappointed as to the line of railway. To show how earnestly they had this object in view, they had given bonuses for the construction of a line. One bonus was given by the town of Portage la Prairie, to the extent of $100,000, and the county of Westbourne gave a bonus of $75,000. There were many other things which they represented most earnestly to the Government. They represented that when the new company had obtained control of the charter they were trying to get some more bonuses out of them by changing the route. If the Minister would look among the papers he would find several representations by the Warden (Mr. Boulton), and others, strongly urging upon Government to use their power of fixing the location of this railway at the mouth of the Shell River, and not allowing the company to coerce the settlers into giving them bonuses by threatening to take another route. I would like to ascertain from the First Minister whether he has complied with the views of those settlers or not. I will refer him to one of the many communications upon that question, a communication from Mr. Boulton, the Warden of Russell county. He writes from Ottawa to the Minister of Interior, evidently not having been able to obtain an interview, regretting that he been unable to ascertain the conclusion the Government had come to, and urging on the Government to locate the route by the mouth of Shell River, the one recommended in Mr. Marcus Smith's report, as otherwise bonuses would be exacted from the people which they could not afford to pay. That was written as far back as the 10th March, 1883. It will be very satisfactory for the House to know whether the Government has protected the interests of the people in that matter of fixing the mouth of the Shell River as the route for the railway. The railway was originally chartered to Prince Albert, which is distant about 450 miles from the Portage. Among the correspondence, there is a letter from the secretary of the company to the Government, in which he says, if the Government desire it, the company will forego the privilege of going the whole way to Prince Albert, and will only go to the south branch, which is 20 miles nearer than Prince Albert. I would like information as to how it is proposed the other 20 miles will be built, or why it is the desire of the Government, as expressed in this letter, that the company should abandon the line 20 miles between Prince Albert and the South Saskatchewan. I would like to know what assurances the Government have that this subsidy will ensure the construction of the road. Among the papers, I cannot see any assurance of that kind. One of the conditions of the Order in Council is that the company shall construct at least 100 miles each year; that they shall first construct an additional 100 miles to the 80 miles, before the 1st October of this year, 1885; that they shall construct 100 miles each year after that. I do not see that the company have accepted that condition at all, or that they say that they are able to do it or hope to do it. They speak of

finishing 50 miles by 1st of October, 1885, and 50 miles a year after. It would be a pity that the House should not know what assurance, at least, the Government got from the company, even if the assurance was not a guarantee that this subsidy will finish the line. In setting apart the land grants for this company the land was specified in two schedules—one schedule, "A," out of which they were to get the 2,700,000 acres in the odd sections, and provision was made that in case of deficiency in that they were to make good the deficiency out of schedule "B;" if the land was found to be unfit for settlement in schedule "A," they were allowed to take it out of the other schedule. I do not know if the Government has any information from the surveys, or from other sources, as to the quantities of land in the general grant that are likely to be unfit for settlement, because we know that that is a new condition entirely introduced in the grant. When the companies were supposed to be assisted by the offer to sell to them, at $1 an acre, certain lands, they were not allowed to examine them and reject those not fairly fit for settlement. Now, by the subsidies in this case, amounting to 7,863 acres a mile, they have the option of claiming what portion is not fairly fit for settlement, and then they have the right to fall back upon the land set out in schedule "B." Has the Government any information as to what portion of these lands in schedule "B" are likely to be called for by the company. I see that a quarter of a million is set apart there in addition to the two and a quarter millions set apart in schedule "A;" and it is a pity to lock up such a large number of townships as will be locked up in this way, if it can be avoided, and the Government can release them for settlement.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The first question the hon. gentleman puts, I understand, is whether the Government have any assurance or moral conviction that this grant will be sufficient to secure the building of the road. We have, in this case, what we have in other cases, the knowledge that the company have asked for this, and that we have given what we thought might do. After conferring with the company, we think they may raise the capital and build the road, and therefore we have come to Parliament in order that this grant may be assented to. It is true that that quantity of land is reserved, but it is impossible to say whether it will be absolutely required or not; it depends altogether on the execution of the contract by the company. It is true that it may keep that land without being used for two, three or four years; but it is worth while to run that small risk in order to have the road built. It is the same thing as when we were asked, in reference to the other road, whether it would not be proper to have a security on the land. Either we want to have the road built or we do not. If we do, we must try to put as few conditions as possible, so that the promoters of the undertaking may raise the money on the land. If we put conditions which will weigh on these lands, which will not leave them free, the result will be that the money will not be raised, and these companies will come to us again, and say: We cannot raise the necessary funds, and we ask you to do more. I think, under the circumstances, the land will be sufficient, if we are to take for granted what these companies represent to us, and I have no doubt that, when they make these representations, they are convinced that they will be able to extend their road and build it, at all events, a sufficient distance to warrant the grant of land or porportion of the grant of land that we are asking this committee to sanction. The hon. gentleman asks us what about the other end of the road, the 20 last miles. The company have undertaken to build their road to the South Saskatchewan. To Prince Albert is 20 miles further, but I have no doubt that, when the road is built to that extent, the company will feel themselves bound, or perhaps the Prince Albert people themselves will find it to their interest to join together and to get some capitalists to join them, to build the 20 miles to extend the road to their town. If we can obtain with this grant the extension of this Manitoba and North-Western Railway from Minnedosa to the South Saskatchewan River, we will have done very well, and it will be time enough then to see to the building of the last 20 miles.

Mr. EDGAR. I am not complaining that the Government is not putting sufficiently onerous conditions upon the railway company. I am complaining that I fear the Government, in this Order in Council, have imposed conditions upon the company which are too onerous, according to their own showing, for them to carry out. In this very document, in the Order in Council, the condition on which, in section 8, this grant is given, is that the company shall complete, adequately equip and have running, not less than 100 miles of the railway, in addition to the 80 miles now in operation, not later than the 1st October next, and thereafter, by the 1st October in each year, shall complete 100 additional miles in consecutive order, until the whole line is completed, from Portage la Prairie to the South Saskatchewan, and time is made of the essence of the agreement, and the grant may be forfeited if it is not carried out. In this document the application of the company is recited, and the secretary says that he has no doubt the money will be obtained to complete the road at the rate of not less than 50 miles per annum after this year, so that in this very Order in Council in which the application of the company is recited, the company say they think they can complete it at not less than 50 miles per annum after this year, and the secretary goes on to say that the railway is now in operation for 50 miles, but the grading of 50 additional miles is being proceeded with, and that such 50 miles will be completed by the 1st October next, in time for the transport of the crops of 1885, provided the concessions now asked from the Government are granted. What does the Government do for the company? They ask for bread and the Government give them a stone. They are given the number of acres asked for, but when they say they can only see their way to complete 50 miles by the 1st October and 50 miles in each year thereafter, the Government impose a condition, which is inexplicable to me, that they shall build 100 miles by the 1st October, and 100 miles in each year thereafter; otherwise, time being of the essence of the agreement, the grant may be forfeited. I complain that the Government have put the company in a position which they do not pretend they can carry out, and I ask if that is a reasonable way to treat a company, and if that is the way a road can be built. There may be some other communications, but I can hardly think the Government would have introduced this communication into their Order in Council if they have received an offer to build 100 miles this year, in time to take out the crop of 1885, and 100 miles each year thereafter. It makes it a farce if they cannot do this, because they are not to get any grant immediately for the 80 miles they have finished.

Mr. WATSON. This is possibly the most important road embraced in this series of resolutions. This road runs through a section of country which has been opened up for a number of years, and which is possibly more in need of a railway, and has been longer expecting a railway, than any other section in Manitoba. This road traverses the section of country whereon the original Canadian Pacific Railway was located. In 1879 and 1880 settlers located along that line of survey, expecting that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be built on that line. They have been waiting there, expecting a railway, for the last seven or eight years, and farmers who went from Ontario with a fair amount of means have exhausted their means in patiently waiting. It is of the greatest importance that every liberality should

be shown to this company, who have exhibited so much push and energy in constructing the 78 miles already. It has been truly said by the Minister who has charge of the Bill that this section of the country is one of the best for general farming purposes throughout the whole North-West. It is eminently fitted for farming, for grain and stock-raising, and has a fair supply of timber for fuel and building purposes, and has also fine water. I believe the section of country that this road will traverse for 400 miles, from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert, is one of the best sections of country in the North-West for settlers; and if such aid can be granted to this company as will enable them to build a road within a short period, I have no doubt it will lead to a large influx of settlers; and those who are already settled there, and have been patiently waiting for railway communication, will be greatly rejoiced. On account of the want of railway facilities the settlers there have been reduced to somewhat straitened circumstances. They have confidence in the country and in its future, and are only waiting for a railway. As has been stated by hon. gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House, I think the Government ought to exercise more control as to the location of this line of railway. It is a common saying that railway companies, as well as other corporations, have no souls, and it is well known that railway companies will bleed a municipality all they can, and drag the location of a road from one side to the other, for the purpose of obtaining bonuses from the municipalities. In the county of Russell there has been a fight over the bonus question, and I believe the county has offered a bonus. The same fight has taken place in the county of Shoal Lake, as the First Minister is doubtless aware, as to the location of the railway. At Birtle, a nice, smart little town, there was a good deal of anxiety about the location of the railway. The company stated they were going to run some miles north, and by that means induce the people of Birtle to take upon themselves the burden of granting a bonus of, I think, $30,000, in order to get the railway to run into their town. The town of Minnedosa, of only a few hundred of a population, has given a bonus of $30,000 to this company; the municipality of Westbourne has given $75,000, and the town of Portage la Prairie, $100,000. Now, it is to be regretted that these new municipalities, as yet poor and sparsely settled, comparatively, should be compelled to burden themselves with taxation in order to obtain railway facilities. If there is one section of the country in the North-West where the settlers should have a railway, without being obliged to pay large bonuses, it is the section which this road is to traverse. It was the original line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the people settled there expecting, the road would be built on that line. But the present syndicate saw fit to deflect the road south, and consequently these settlers were disappointed. But they are the pioneers of the country, and I think the suggestion laid before the House by Major Boulton, as warden of Russell, and other gentlemen from the western section of the country, should be heeded, and the Government should say where the road is to be located. It should be located, as near as possible, on the old line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as that line has been surveyed and approved by the Government engineer, and consequently must be a favorable one. The Local Legislature of Manitoba, last Session, passed an Act whereby they intended to aid local railways. It is the intention of the Provincial Government, on account of the depression in the value of land, to issue provincial bonds to the extent of $1 per acre for the land grants given by this Government to aid the construction of railways. It is supposed that this will aid the companies in building the roads. The Government will issue provincial bonds and take land grants as security at the rate of $1 an acre. This road has now been in operation, as far as Minnedosa, for about two years, and it has done a great deal of good. The hon. gentleman who has charge of those resolutions says that the company intend to build 100 miles of that road this year, I believe that the greatest distance they intend to build is to Birtle, somewhere about 60 miles. I was a little surprised to hear the statement made by the Minister who has charge of this Bill, to the effect that the land already earned by the construction of 78 miles was to be distributed over the whole length of the line, from Portage la Prairie to Prince Albert. I was under the impression that the company could not succeed in going ahead with that road this year, unless they got that land grant on some 100 miles of the road, or, in other words, that when the road was built 100 miles farther they should receive the full land grant on the 178 miles. It would be wrong to allow the company to get off any easier than the Government can help, but whatever is done by the Government, they ought to try to ensure the construction of this road for, at least, 100 miles, at the earliest possible moment, because the settlers are there and are getting tired of waiting. Any person having visited that country a few years ago and visiting it now must be struck with the improvements that have been made, and the increased attractions for settlers which it now offers. I am glad to see that the Government is giving such a liberal land grant towards the construction of this road, and I hope they will do everything in their power to secure its construction as soon as possible.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Unless the Government have information that we have not, it occurs to me that the points taken by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) are worthy of careful consideration. I have travelled over that line of road and know something about it. The land in the vicinity of Minnedosa presents all the qualities of a fine farming country, and an inspection of the work of the company convinced me that they were endeavoring to push the work through as rapidly as possible, and of the necessity of pushing through rapidly there can be no doubt. I hold in my hand a letter from a gentleman who went from my riding and who lives about 60 miles beyond Minnedosa, a gentleman with whom I have for many years been well acquainted, and whose statements I can rely upon most thoroughly. He has been a resident there for six years. He went into that country with a considerable amount of means, with several grown up sons, and with high expectations. As long ago as four or five years, I heard from him that his crop was, I think, between 2,000 and 3,000 bushels. But he complains most bitterly now, and speaks as a man almost discouraged. He says it is not on account of the soil, not on account of the climate, which are good though at times too highly colored, but on account of the lack of railway facilities, of which he complains. His observation during six years has been that the crops are generally good, and have suffered but once from frost. He says the difficulty is that they have no market, and wheat is consequently of little value. He gives instances in which, as he expresses it, a man wanting a grist could get it at 30 cents a bushel. He has known it to be offered at 25 cents, without finding a buyer. He speaks, also, of the disadvantage of the alternate section plan; and one of the results of my observations in that country, after spending a month there, was that one of the greatest discouragements was that it is still the "great lone land."

Mr. TROW. It is gratifying to know that the Government has decided to grant this aid. I have travelled from one end of the line to the other. The first portion of the road was certainly a great boon to Minnedosa, and has been of great practical use to settlers on both sides of the line. From Minnedosa to Birtle, a distance of some 65 miles, the section of country is pretty well settled, more particularly around Shoal Lake. Birtle is quite an old settlement; it

was settled many years ago, and probably the best tract of land in Manitoba, to my knowledge, with the exception of a section round Portage la Prairie, is Silver Creek and Shell River district. These are very large settlements, with very extensive improvements, and they lie some 30 or 40 miles from Birtle. From there to the mouth of Shell River there is the best agricultural section in the North-West. I think it is superior to southern Manitoba. From Shell River district to the Touchwood Hills, a distance of 150 miles, a portion of the land is not so well adapted for agricultural purposes, and the whole route, from Ellice, or the mouth of Shell River, to Carrot River, near the terminus of the line, the land is not adapted for farming purposes on the whole. But the Shell River district, embracing an area of probably two or three good counties, is superior to anything I have seen, and is well settled, by people principally from Ontario. The proposed railway will be a great boon to that district, because I know that two years ago the grain grown by settlers there was valueless. It will not pay to team it to Brandon, which is nearly 100 miles distant, and the farmers are so much discouraged that they do not even take their grain to market. Many settlers have had grain stored for years; and there is no encouragement to them to make improvements, in consequence of the want of railway facilities.

Mr. WATSON. I would remind the Minister of Public Works that on the land granted I believe, after the original grant to the company, there are quite a number of settlers on the odd sections in the vicinity of Shell River and Russell. It would be well that it should be provided that settlers on odd-numbered sections should be allowed to retain their lands at very moderate prices. The company have had a man round, with a view to effect a settlement with the settlers; whether this settlement has been effected or not, I do not know; but it would be well for the Government to see to it that the settlers on the odd-numbered sections should be dealt with very leniently by the company.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust, before the subsidy is handed over to the Canadian Pacific Railway or other railway company which is to get it, the Government will take care to make provision that *bonâ fide* settlers who have located on the land will not be interfered with. I do not know whether the Government propose to give the odd numbered sections in the townships or every alternate township; but it is of the utmost consequence for the welfare of the country that the interest of actual settlers who have gone there and made improvements should not be disturbed by the railway company. I therefore trust the Minister of Public Works, who has visited the country himself, and knows something of the wants of the settlers and the hardships they have to undergo, will take care that ample protection is given in this respect. I had not the pleasure of hearing the remarks of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow), and I can only refer to his speech from hearsay. I understand that he said that Mr. Mackenzie, whose name was attached to a letter, a portion of which I read to the House, was a hardware merchant who had gone to the North-West, who had subsequently leased his land and returned to business. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The Mr. Mackenzie to whom I referred never was a hardware merchant, and is not so now. There is a Mr. Mackenzie living in my town who is a hardware merchant, who went to the North-West, who leased his land and returned to the town, but the Mr. Mackenzie whose letter I read was not that Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. FARROW. All I have to say is, that there is a Mr. Mackenzie, at Goderich, who went to the North-West and succeeded there. He has a very valuable farm in southern Manitoba and very fine buildings on it. He resided there two or three years—he never gave up business in Goderich —and he rented his land and came back to live in Goderich. It must be a brother that the hon. member refers to, and I think he had a brother there. It is very strange that one should succeed in southern Manitoba and the other could not live there.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no difficulty about it. One brother homesteaded his land. The brother whose letter I read purchased a large portion of land under the Order in Council which enabled parties to purchase land south of the 24-mile belt at $2 per acre.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot allow this resolution to pass until the Minister of Public Works has informed the committee with respect to these points that have been raised. Does the hon. gentleman intend to give this subsidy to the company, and make it a condition of the grant that they shall build 100 miles before the 1st October and 100 miles every year afterwards?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to ask the committee to pass the items, and upon concurrence I will be able to give an explanation of that point.

Mr. EDGAR. If they find that they cannot do 100 miles, let them do 50. I also drew the attention of the Minister to the fact that in several places, in the papers before the House, there are very urgent representations about the route of this railway. These petitions give numerous reasons why they appeal to the Government to have the old route maintained. I dare say that this has been done, and that the Government will find that they carried out the views of the settlers and others. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works will bring down information on that point as well as on the other.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The road from Portage la Prairie to Minnedosa is built, and 50 miles beyond that are under contract. Then there are 75 miles beyond that, the location of which was approved by the Government, and I see by the location of the line, as it appears on the map, that the 50 miles now being built pass at Shoal Lake, so that the hon. gentleman will see that the object of those petitions appears to have been carried out. However, I will make further enquiries.

Mr. ROSS. I think there must be some mistake about the 100 miles, because I had a conversation with Mr. Brydges the other day, when he was here, and he informed me then that the condition was that 50 miles should be built this year, and he said the company were going to build 50 miles.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is what I stated. I think there is another Order, changing this, and making it 50 instead of 100 miles.

On resolution 4 (Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I explained this the other day. The Order in Council of the 30th December, 1884, grants this quantity of land, subject to the approval of Parliament, from Regina to Long Lake, a distance of 20 miles. The land is to be selected from the odd-numbered sections, on condition that the line shall be completed by the 1st of October, 1885, with a steamboat suitable for the service on Long Lake, to be running by the 1st of May, 1886, the company to be permitted to obtain a conveyance of 50,000 acres at $2 per acre, on depositing $100,000 by the 21st of March. I see, by a memorandum sent me to-day, that $50,000 have been paid into the Receiver General on behalf of the company, and are now held in suspense account. The object of that was that those advancing money, that is, those purchasing land, wanted to be sure that the money would be applied in that way.

Mr. EDGAR. I see by the Order in Council that a contract was to be submitted to the Government before the 1st of May, 1885, satisfying them that the line would be

completed, and satisfying them, I suppose, that the steamboat will be built before the 1st of October. I see that some additional pressure has been used on the Ministry with regard to this subject, and that Mr. John A. Mackenzie, of Sarnia, makes a very touching appeal to them, to which I have no doubt they gave proper attention, as he is a gentleman they would like to oblige.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The contract has been submitted to the Department, and the company have already begun some operations, in the way of importing horses, and so on. The hon. gentleman must see that owing to the delay in obtaining this vote the Government may have to extend the time on the other end, if the company have been delayed in their operations.

Mr. EDGAR. I think, by the papers, that they were quite willing to take the risk, when the Government passed the Order in Council, and the Order in Council was passed on the 30th of December.

Mr. McLELAN. The arrangement was that on the deposit of the money they were to receive lands at $2 an acre; therefore, if the route were not followed, or if the contract failed in any way, the Government would have sold so much land there at $2 per acre. I may say that the contract for the grading has been let, as well as the contract for the delivery of the rails.

Mr. EDGAR. What about the steamboat?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not aware as to the contract for that.

On resolution 5,

Mr. EDGAR. Are the incidental expenses and the cost of survey both included in the 10 cents per acre?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Resolutions to be reported.

HALIFAX HARBOR MASTER.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (p. 2421) to amend the Acts respecting the appointment of a harbor master at the port of Halifax. He said: The object of this resolution is to increase the amount allowed to the harbor master of Halifax from $1,600 to $1,800. The returns of entries at the port of Halifax have about doubled within the last sixteen or seventeen years. In the year 1881 the collections were reduced somewhat by the exemption of coasting vessels from the payment of harbor dues. The expenses of the officer in connection with his office, for rent, boat hire, etc., amount to $600 or $800 a year, which leaves him only from $800 to $900 as a clear salary. Looking at the large increase of labor which he has to perform, it is proposed that his allowance, which is to cover all these expenses, shall be increased to $1,800. It is also proposed to establish a summary mode of procedure before magistrates, for enforcing the orders of the harbor master for the better regulation of the harbor. It is found, in practice, that he has great difficulty at present in enforcing his orders, as captains and others who wilfully disobey his orders are able to leave with their vessels before he can proceed against them in the courts.

Mr. VAIL. Where is this increased amount to come from? Is the fund sufficient to pay it, or is it to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund?

Mr. McLELAN. There is nothing chargeable on the consolidated revenue. The rule is, that where fees are imposed the harbor master collects them, and he is allowed a certain percentage out of what he collects, and the balance goes into the Treasury. In this case, we fix the limit of what he shall receive at $1,800. If he only collects $1,500 that is all he receives; if he collects $1,900, he receives $1,800, and the remaining $100 goes into the Treasury.

Mr. VAIL. Would the ultimate result of this be to increase the tax on shipping?

Mr. McLELAN. No; we do not increase the fees.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman give the information as to the fees received by the harbor master at Halifax each year, so that we may know whether they are much in excess of the $1,800 proposed to be given him? If the hon. gentleman has statistics showing the nature of the increase which the hon. the Minister has referred to as the duties of the harbor master, it would be interesting information.

Mr. McLELAN. In 1881, $1,849.50 were the receipts, of which $249.50 were paid into the Treasury. In that year an Act was passed exempting coasting vessels from the payment of fees, but that did not diminish the labors of the harbor master. The tonnage of the port is yearly increasing. During the past ten or fifteen years the tonnage of the port of Halifax has doubled. Although we have exempted small vessels from the payment of fees there is still the same labor required in regulating them, and as the number of vessels increases the accommodation at the wharves becomes more limited and the harbor master has more labor to perform.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIES. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why Halifax is singled out for an increase in the fees of the harbor master. If the general shipping of the port has increased, why does not the increase become general all over the maritime ports? I do not understand, from his explanation, that any increased duties have been cast upon the port officer. He did not explain at all what the receipts were during the last two or three years.

Mr. McLELAN. It would keep the House too long to find out the reasons why there has not been the same increase in all the ports as in Halifax. In all the ports the increase has been large, but at others the shipping has remained stationary. The shipping of the port of Halifax, for a number of years back, has been increasing, so that it is almost double to-day what it was some years ago, and as the number of vessels entering the port and seeking wharfage accommodation increases, the labors of the harbor master correspondingly increase. The exemption of coasting vessels from the coasting fees did not diminish his labor, but rendered the fees less in proportion to the labors done.

Mr. DAVIES. The statement of the hon. Minister is, I presume, based upon the examination by him of tables. He has given a statement of the amounts received for 1881 and the amount paid by the harbor master into the general revenue, after deducting his fees, but he has not given statements of what amounts were received since 1881. I would like, also, if he would put the House in possession of the figures on which he bases his statement that the shipping at the port of Halifax has largely increased.

Mr. McLELAN. I have not the volume here, but know it is a fact. In 1881 the amount received for fees was $1,849; in 1882 it was $1,629, or $200 less, on account of the exemption of coasting vessels, and in 1883 it was $1,647. I have not the other years, because the memorandum I have is one prepared last year, when I purposed to introduce the Bill.

Mr. DALY. That is an increase, in 1883, over 1882, of $18.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman stated the number of vessels had largely increased.

M. McLELAN. I said the tonnage.

Mr. VAIL. That is accounted for by the arrival of large steamers which stopped to get coal. These steamers do not give the harbor masters any trouble at all; they go to their agents, who have large wharves, and the harbor master has no trouble at all with them. Consequently, the increase of tonnage does not add to his duties. I have no objection to his receiving a fair salary, but I am a little afraid that in the future, if the receipts do not amount to a sufficient sum to pay the harbor master, the dues on vessels will be increased. They may be subject to a tonnage charge, from which they have been relieved. I cannot see that the harbor master's duties have been increased in the last two or three years.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not think the member for Digby (Mr. Vail) has any right to assume that this will lead to these duties being reimposed. I am sure the Government see the necessity, as well as some hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, of keeping these fees and all other charges upon shipping coming into our ports as low as they possibly can. Some hon. gentlemen who are not acquainted with the facts may think that $1,600 is an ample salary for the harbor master, but he pays all his expenses out of that, including boat hire and office hire, and it is not sufficient to remunerate him for the work he has to do. I think the harbor master has more trouble with vessels calling for coal than with ordinary vessels. The captains are sometimes very difficult to handle, and cases have arisen which show the necessity for some more summary means of enforcing the law.

Mr. DAVIES. It is not a question whether $1,600 is sufficient pay or not. If the amounts received by the harbor masters in the different harbors of the Dominion are not sufficient, that is a reason for considering the whole question of an increase to their pay all round; but I asked why the harbor master of Halifax was singled out for this increase. If there had been an abnormal increase in the shipping coming into that port there would be no more to say. The hon. member for Digby has explained that the tonnage has increased, but that is owing to an exceptional cause—the arrival of large iron ocean steamships; and if the number of vessels has decreased, the work of the harbor master has decreased, and I think the committee have a right to the information which the Minister is not in a position to give. He has stated that there was an increase of $16 in one year, but he will not contend that that is a justification for increasing the salary of the harbor master $200.

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that almost every harbor in the Dominion has its own regulations, and that in most cases the Act relating to the harbor fixes the maximum sum which we can pay the harbor master. The Act respecting the harbor master of Halifax limits the amount we can pay him to $1,600. The work performed by the harbor master of Halifax, and the expenses incurred by him for boat hire and office hire, and in various ways, in preserving order among the shipping in that port, justifies the Government in giving him $1,800, provided he collects the sum. The tonnage in the port of Halifax has largely increased and is still increasing, and in 1831, previous to the abolition of harbor dues upon coasting vessels in that harbor, $1,847 was collected, out of which the harbor master received $1,600 and paid over $247. He has been complaining, and showing that his expenses were very large, that his duties required the whole of his time, and were sometimes very difficult to perform, and presented such a case that I think he is entitled to receive $1,800, provided the shipping of the port furnishes fees sufficient to meet that sum. In fixing the salary of any harbor master we name the amount he should receive out of the fees collected, and in many cases we have authority to vary that from time to time, and increase it if we find the labors have increased. Halifax is singled out because the Act defines $1,600 as the maximum the harbor master can receive, and I ask the House to allow me, if the money is collected—and if it is collected, there is labor in connection with the collection—to pay him $1,800.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister says that in some years the amount collected has exceeded the harbor master's salary. What has become of the excess?

Mr. McLELAN. It was paid into the Treasury.

Mr. VAIL. It would be very unfair, if the amount received in fees fell short of the amount fixed for the labor master's salary, to refuse to give him the amount, when there is a sum standing to the credit of that fund in the Treasury.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is determined to go one better.

Mr. DAVIES. The reason given by the Minister of Marine for increasing the salary of the harbor master at Halifax would apply to every other harbor master in the Dominion. The Minister has not shown that there has been an increase in the special work at that particular office, and if you increase his salary without showing any special reason, how can you withhold an increase of salary from all the other harbor masters? I do not say that this man is not entitled to an increase, because I do not know the facts, and the Minister does not seem to know them, and until the House is put in possession of the facts we ought not to vote the money. If it is voted, the result will be that the increase given to this harbor master must be given to every other harbor master in the country.

Mr. PAINT. Why should it interest the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) so much? We know very well that the harbor of Charlottetown is frozen over six months in the year, while the harbor of Halifax is open twelve months, and has a great deal more shipping, both in winter and summer.

Mr. DAVIES. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman has only just made that discovery. Did not that exist some years ago, when you fixed the salary at $1,600. The reasons of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) are, perhaps, little better than the reason given by the Minister.

Resolution to be reported.

THE GOVERNMENT LOAN.

Mr. BOWELL, in moving that the report of the Committee of the Whole be received, on resolution to authorise the raising, by way of loan, of such sum or sums of money as may be required for the purpose of the floating indebtedness of the Dominion, and for carrying on the public works authorised by the Parliament of Canada, said: In answer to the question put by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to the powers to loan which he said still apparently existed, and which might be considered available as per the Supply Bill of last year. It will be seen that most of the items have been taken for specific purposes, and they are balances of the loans which were formally authorised for the purposes indicated in the Supply Bill, and consequently not available, the most of them, not being for the purposes for which the present loan is asked. There is, for instance, for the Intercolonial Railway, about $2,500,000; opening communication and administration of the government of the North-West, $1,460,000; improving the

River St. Lawrence, $2,680,000; Quebec harbor, $1,825,000; Quebec graving dock $600,000; the Canadian Pacific Railway, $4,866,000, and the item for general purposes of being for savings banks withdrawals, Dominion stock redeemed, sterling bonds redeemed, etc., making a total, in round numbers, of $22,080,000. I may also mention that these loans were available when the Finance Minister asked for his last loan, and I presume, therefore, he did not consider that they were available for the purposes for which he required that loan, as they are not available, I take it, except in a few small sums, for the purposes for which the present loan is asked. After investigating more closely the purposes to which the present loan is to be applied, I find from that the statement placed in my hands the last time the question was before the House, while partially accurate in itself, was not as clear as it ought to have been. The statement I desire to lay before the House now will be more satisfactory, and it is this: to cover the temporary loan made, both in Canada and in London, is $15,819,000, for capital expenditure, as per Estimates and Supplementary Estimates, 1883-84-85, $6,699,000. The amount that will be required to pay the expenses of putting down the insurrection of the North-West and for losses which we shall have to meet, I fear will be about $4,000,000. Of course, as I before stated, this $4,000,000 is, to a certain extent, guess work, as it is utterly impossible to say whether it will all be required, and perhaps we may, though I hope not, require a little more. Then the present loan proposed to be given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, $5,000,000, and subsidies, $750,000. Then the probable expenditure on railway subsidies, as indicated in the other statements, $2,500,000, making a total of $35,049,000. Now, if the House should not grant the $5,000,000 proposed to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to assist them to complete their road, the amount would be about $30,000,000 to be covered by the loan. But if that advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should be authorised, then the amount that will require to be covered will be $35,049,000. The amount given to me as available under the late loan that still remains unborrowed, is $4,800,000, or about $5,000,000. This is the purpose for which the loan is now required. In regard to the $15,000,000, some of the items formerly given in the more detailed statement, I may mention have been paid. The hon. member for West Durham asked the question as to the probable amount that will be required for the payments on the railway subsidies which have already been voted by this House. I am unable to say how much of those subsidies will have to be paid. As the hon. gentleman knows, it will depend, in a great measure, upon the ability of the different railway companies to which we are paying those subsidies to go on with the work. There may possibly be required but $1,000,000 or probably the $2,500,000, or not half that amount. Some of the enterprises are likely to lapse, while others will be carried through, and it is impossible, under the circumstances, to give even an approximate estimate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the details of the capital expenditure as per Estimates and Supplementary Estimates for 1884-85 and 1885-86, those amounts aggregating roughly $7,000,000? There is, independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, about $2,360,000 asked for 1885-86, and about $4,000,000 asked for 1884-85, approximately, independent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I conclude that a very large portion of that has been paid.

Mr. BOWELL. Some of it. There will be Supplementary Estimates coming down for 1884-85, up to 30th June, in which the hon. gentleman will find other sums which that is proposed to cover. I am not able to give the different items just now.

Mr. BOWELL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The amount is considerably larger than I should have anticipated.

Mr. BOWELL. This statement agrees precisely with the statement I made last night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The $7,000,000 is not put in any part of the temporary loan, as I understand?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That would involve additional Supplementary Estimates, to the amount of some $3,000,000. This last item of probable expenditure on account of railway subsidies, under 46 and 47 Victoria, is what the hon. gentleman expects to expend out of the $8,700,000 of which he spoke the other day.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the sum given me. It may reach that, and it may exceed it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This sum, then, of $35,000,000, as we have it here, would appear not to include the proposed loan of $5,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; it is there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Canadian Railway land and subsidy—is it part of that?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. The $5,000,000 covers what is termed the amount of loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway; and the other amount is for subsidies earned or to be earned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman includes in the sum of $6,979,000 what is still due to the Canadian Pacific Railway on subsidy account——

Mr. BOWELL. I was in error in stating that the amount included the $5,000,000 proposed to be loaned. It does not. The $5,000,000 odd is to cover loan and subsidy already granted by Parliament.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, speaking in round numbers, what is required to be borrowed now, in order to put us quite clear, would amount to $40,000,000.

Mr. BOWELL. That is including the $5,000,000, in case it should be voted.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is in addition to the $25,000,000 refunded the other day, making in all about $65,000,000. So far as I can judge, that would cause an increase in the amount of interest to be paid of not less than $400,000 or $500,000. Has the hon. gentleman any information on that point?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to answer that, because the Estimates and Supplementary Estimates have not yet been laid before the House. I might mention, for the information of the House, that if the $5,000,000 which it is proposed to advance to the Canada Pacific Railway be granted by Parliament, it will be paid in Exchequer bills, to be covered at the expiration of the loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGAT. Those Exchequer bills, as is the custom in England, will bear interest—4 per cent., or what rate?

Mr. BOWELL. They will bear interest at 4 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You propose to issue them for one year?

Mr. BOWELL. For one year; that is the time of the loan.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. One year is a little long for Exchequer bills. That amount you calculate to be repaid by the Canada Pacific Railway at the expiration of that time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Positively.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Without fail?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Without fail.

Mr. BLAKE. We are going to give our note to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for a loan.

Mr. BOWELL. The Premier says he will endorse it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman thinks he settles the payment when he gives an Exchequer bill for it. This is a style of financing on which we are now entering for the first time, in order to assist the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand, then, that the whole of the existing floating debt is intended to be paid off—$16,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. BOWELL. It is intended to pay it off.

Mr. BLAKE. There might be some further detail of the amount of two and a-half millions which the hon. gentleman conjectures is the amount which will be required in respect to the railway grants. It seems to me to be a very small proportion to calculate upon, considering the large sum of railway grants which we have voted and are voting.

Mr. BOWELL. This is the proportion, under the Railway Subsidies Act. It is hoped that the revenue will justify us in doing what has been done in past years, that we will, in fact, be able to pay these subsidies out of revenue. And if the revenue will justify the payment of all these grants annually, I take it for granted that they will be so paid. But, under the circumstances, it is deemed advisable to ask for a sufficient amount to cover these grants in case it is required. The hon. gentleman knows that in the past three or four years many of the subsidies which have been granted to the different railways have been paid out of the annual surplus.

Mr. BLAKE. My question was rather in an opposite sense from that which the hon. gentleman has suggested. I understood him to be asking for enough, in his view, to cover railway subsidies, assuming that he would not be able to pay them out of Consolidated Revenue Fund, and on that assumption it seemed to me to be rather a small amount to demand for that purpose. I was anxious to learn what was the detail upon which he bases this calculation, to which of these roads, and to what amount does he expect to have to pay it.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot inform the House upon that point, because it is almost impossible to say which roads will go on. Experience has taught us that all these roads will not be built, but it is deemed advisable to provide a sufficient sum to cover all the claims which are likely to be asked for and earned. As the hon. gentleman very properly said the other night, some of these subsidies run over a number of years, and under the circumstances, it may not be necessary to take a sum to cover all, as all will not fall due for some years to come. It is believed, however, that this sum will be sufficient to cover all demands which may be made, perhaps, for two years, because they have a certain time in which to commence operations, and a certain time to complete, and they are not entitled to receive these grants until certain work has been performed.

Mr. BLAKE. It is in effect a conjectural estimate.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; it is.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it include the additional sums in the resolutions on the Table, notice of which was given the other day?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; that sum includes all these roads that it may be supposed will ask the Government to pay them any portion of these subsidies. There are good hopes that the road, from River Ouelle or River du Loup to Edmonton, to make connection with the New Brunswick system, may possibly go on. I think there is every probability——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A certainty.

Mr. BOWELL. The Premier says a certainty that this road will go on, which will form one that will make a claim upon us.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman seems disposed to apply the prospective surplus to the payment of railway subsidies, and the diminution of the amount charged, which otherwise would be created a permanent charge, had he not better—perhaps it is a hypothetical discussion, upon which it is not worth while to waste much time—but had he not better apply the surplus to the payment of the war debts.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, when the accounts are balanced, I do not think it will make much difference where it goes—to the war or to the railway. We hope the war debt will not absorb the whole $4,000,000; and if not, of course it will not be used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Speaking roughly, as I understand, the total amount that they required to add to our debt within the last twelve months will be about $65,000,000, irrespective of the $25,000,000 which have just been refunded by exchange.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose that will be the effect of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And that would leave us still, if I correctly apprehended the hon. gentleman's statement the other evening, $5,000,000 unborrowed, after allowing for the Exchequer bills and this loan of $30,000,000, which would leave us, roughly speaking, a liability of about $6,250,000 for these miscellaneous railways, which may or may not become due within the next two or three years.

Mr. BOWELL. That is about the position.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that does not include the capitalisation of the grants for $170,000 and $30,000, which would amount to a couple of millions more.

Mr. BOWELL. To $2,550,000.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to this Exchequer bill operation, is it expected that we shall raise the money ourselves in cash, and hand it over, or that we shall give them our notes?

Mr. BOWELL. We give them the bills and they raise the money themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. And the Canadian Pacific Railway will themselves finance the Exchequer bills of Canada?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I assume that some care will be taken not to allow any discredit to be cast on the general credit of Canada, by allowing those bills, under any circumstances, to be parted with below par, or so nearly at par that it would be equivalent thereto. It would be rather a serious reflection upon us if our Exchequer bills should be, by any unlucky chance, disposed of for the emergencies of a railway at a rate below par; and I call the attention of the Government to that, because nobody can exactly tell what may be done with them after we are through with them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Without going into particulars, I may say that these bills will not be allowed to float in the market, but will be kept intact until restored to the Government.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) to authorise the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman include in that Bill provision for the two votes of credit for war purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it does not include them. It only covers the $30,000,000 we propose to borrow.

Mr. BLAKE. They must be put in a Bill. The hon. gentleman knows what was done in England with Mr. Gladstone's Bill for the recent vote of credid, and it will be impossible to get these sums through the regular Supply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember the hon. gentleman asked the Minister of Militia the question, whether he intended to introduce a Bill, and he said yes. I supposed the intention was to put the amounts in the Appropriation Bill; but I do not know but it would do very well to put these two sums in this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps it might complicate the loan transaction to introduce them in this Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. I have the other Bill ready.

Bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, and read the third time and passed.

CONSOLIDATED INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 2421) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883. He said: The amendments we propose to ask the House to make are comparatively few. It is considered advisable, for the sake of convenience, to dispense with the marks that have hitherto been required to be placed on boxes of cigars that have been warehoused. The previous Act charged the duty on the weight of cigars as well as on the number. It is proposed to amend that, as we charge the duty on the number of cigars, requiring that the number shall be marked on the outside of the box, so that the clearances from the warehouses can be made much more conveniently than before. In order to prevent the unlawful sale of malt as well as spirits, it is proposed to apply all the regulations hitherto applied to spirits to malt. Section "*c*" provides for preventing fraud by the use of packages that have already been used. The old Act simply declares that the vendor shall see that the old stamps upon the package shall be obliterated; we propose that it shall be the business of the vendor of the contents to see that the stamps shall be obliterated before the packages pass from his control. Paragraph "*d*" relates to the enforcement of penalties. In paragraph "*e*" it is proposed to allow an abatement of duty on spirits for shrinkage by evaporation, allowing the Governor in Council to impose an additional duty of 5 cents a gallon on spirits, and prohibiting spirits being entered for consumption before a specified time after manufacture. It is found that by retention of spirits there is an evaporation. It is proposed that the Department, under Order in Council, shall be permitted to have these spirits, after manufacture and distillation, tested, and the duty fixed; then, at a certain period afterwards, they shall be tested again and allowance made for evaporation in quantity and strength. This is the system followed in England and the United States. It is proposed to fix the maximum percentage of reduction that may be made, under Order of the Governor in Council, not exceeding 6 per cent. the first year, 4 per cent. the second year, 2 per cent. the third year, and 2 per cent. the following year, up to seven years in all. The keeping of whiskey unused for a certain time will improve its condition, and renders it less injurious to the health, and with that careful consideration for the health of the community which this Department has always manifested, it is intended that the whiskey will be purified by age, as far as possible, and in that view it is proposed to provide that after the 1st July, 1887, no spirits shall be removed from the warehouse for sale until they are one year old, and after the 1st of July, 1890, none shall be removed unless two years old.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that, also, English or American legislation?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to say that it is English legislation, but in some cases we are in advance of English legislation, and if we can improve the quality of the liquor it will be a benefit to the community.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to accept the opinion of a good judge of whiskey.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to say whether I am a good judge or not, but the opinion of the hon. gentleman can be given of this. It is claimed to be the effect of age that improves whiskey, whatever it may do with other things. As the allowance of a reduction for evaporation would result in a loss of revenue, it is proposed to impose 5 cents a gallon additional duty to compensate for that, so that the improvement by age may not be at the expense of the revenue. We propose to allow an increase in the number of sizes in which tobacco may be packed. We propose to allow manufacturers to use 10, 25, 35, 45, 60, 100, 110 pound packages. The present regulations prevent the manufacturer from having in the show room a sufficient number of packages for the inspection of customers; we propose to allow him to cut open a larger number, stamped and duty paid. We propose to reduce the number of cigars that may be entered for ex-warehouse; under the present law the number of cigars that may be entered at one time is specified, and it is proposed, now that the duty is increased, to reduce that number.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As regards the minor features of this Bill, probably they had better be discussed in committee, where we can debate them in a more conversational fashion than we can now, but this clause "*e*," allowing the Governor in Council to impose an additional duty of 5 cents on each gallon of spirits, has either, designedly or accidentally, been used for the purpose of borrowing a very considerable amount of revenue from next year for the benefit of this year. Whatever construction may be put upon it inside the House, or in the Department, it appears that the trade have looked upon this as a statement absolutely that the Governor in Council would, at pleasure, impose an additional duty of 5 cents, and have, consequently, ex-warehoused, everything they possibly could and paid it in. That may be very convenient, but it is a very questionable piece of financiering. It is not very desirable to borrow, in the eleventh month—because I see these resolutions were introduced on the 7th May—a million from the natural revenue of 1886 and put it into the year 1885, and it is very likely to cause very considerable further injury to the public credit, and to the revenue, a little later on. As the hon. gentleman has explained it, the matter is not quite so objectionable as it looked at first, because, undoubtedly, the permission to the Governor in Council to impose a duty at any moment to be selected by themselves is one I should feel disposed to oppose to the uttermost, unless very strong reason was given for it. It is very inconvenient, and it opens a very serious door to possible fraud. In any case, there is very little doubt, as I said, that about a million dollars have been taken out of the revenue of next year and put to the credit of this; and this description of practically cooking our accounts is not likely to improve our credit anywhere. This has been done once or twice before, and in the whole of the accounts which have been submitted to us this year it is tolerably clear that a good deal of pains have been taken to cook them. Items, like the items for receipts on account of public lands, have been placed, or are to be placed, to the credit of our ordinary revenue, while the charges for those same public lands are charged to capital account. Now, that kind of thing does not help Canadian credit, either at home or abroad; and I do not think the result of this particular experiment—even if it does, to some extent, help our credit this year—is likely to be particularly useful to the state of our revenue next year.

It seems to me that these resolutions ought not to have been placed on the Notice Paper a whole month and more before the time came for putting them into law. It has never, heretofore, been our practice to give notice of changes in the revenue to the trade for a period of something like five weeks and more in advance of the time when they can possibly come into effect, and I think the practice is exceedingly objectionable.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not suppose that could have been the effect upon the manufacturers, to induce them to take these goods from bond, because of so small a duty as 5 cents, when there will be connected with it a rebate for evaporation caused by age to the amount of the percentage I have named.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be that the Department was very much disappointed and the Government very much grieved when they found over $900,000 of an excess of Excise revenue received in the last month over the corresponding month of the preceding year. It is possible that they felt alarmed at these results of their action, and that they did not at all contemplate them; but, if so, it must have been because they were very short-sighted, because the trade has taken a different view. Else, how does the hon. gentleman account for the very large excess in the receipts of the Inland Revenue Department in that month? It was not the passing of the Temperance Act in a great many counties that did it. What cause is it attributable to, except the hon. gentleman's notice? It seems to me a most objectionable thing to have put this notice upon the Paper in this way. The presumed rule of Government with reference to tariff changes, in the Excise, particularly, is that they are brought forward without prior notice of any kind, that the previous negotiations and discussions are conducted in the highest confidence; the telegraph wires are taken possession of, as a rule, in order that there may be no chance to affect the revenue injuriously by the intended alteration, and that there may not be that speculation and those possible advantages obtained by individuals which would accrue if such proposals were placed upon the Paper.

Mr. McLELAN. There could be no gain to the manufacturer, because, in connection with this 5 cent duty, there is a rebate.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be that the manufacturers are very stupid. I believe they generally are. They are not acute persons at all; they do not know their business very well; the hon. gentleman finds it difficult to persuade them to pay all the revenue they owe, and he does not find it necessary to have gaugers and detective officers to secure the transaction of business in proper time; they are an innocent, soft, stupid, dull class of the community, who, doubtless, did not appreciate the hon. gentleman's resolutions, and consequently took a large quantity of spirits out of bond and paid a large sum into the revenue. That is the story the hon. gentleman wishes the House to believe. I do not very well know what the object of the hon. gentleman was, or of his colleague, whose place he so well fills upon this occasion, in bringing forward this resolution, in the shape of giving this notice and leaving it upon the Paper for a long time, nor do I know what the object of the Government was in bringing forward this notice in the way in which it is brought forward, asking that the Governor in Council may be permitted to impose this duty. I certainly object entirely to entrusting the Governor in Council with power to increase the charges upon the people. The character of the charge is a matter of indifference; the principle is that which is involved. The hon. gentleman may say this is not really going to be an increase, because, upon the average, it will be a decrease; but that is no matter. His proper duty to Parliament was to have prepared his plan, and, if his plan involved an increase of duty in the first instance, in respect of which there was to be a rebate in respect of this allowance for evaporation and the loss of alcoholic properties, to have brought down the whole plan. We are determined that we will make these allowances. We are determined that we will increase this duty. We take parliamentary authority for increasing the duty and making the allowances, for it is Parliament that must increase the duty in this as in all other cases. It is not the Governor in Council who is to be entrusted with the power of increasing a duty. Therefore, in point of form, and apart, altogether, from the question of policy, I object to the form of this resolution, and maintain that it must be so moulded as shall make the Act which creates a greater charge upon the people the Act of the Legislature and not the will of the Executive. Now, with reference to the hon. gentleman's particular proposal: Of course, we have one great advantage in the absence of the Minister of Inland Revenue and in the presence of the hon. gentleman in his place. We have an hon. gentleman who is able to speak to us with knowledge, skill and experience, on the subject matter of the resolution, who is able to explain to us the degree of strength which these spirits will lose from being kept in the depository of the bonded warehouse or of the manufacturer, instead of going to their ultimate and unfortunate destination, the stomach of the people. I say, we have the advantage of having the hon. gentleman's statement, which has been clear, distinct and intelligible, as to the operation of this, as to the greater salubrity, the greater healthfulness of his proposed mode of drinking whiskey. I see he likes his whiskey old. I dare say he is quite right. I have seen some advertisements in the newspapers, in which the advantages of old whiskey are highly lauded, and I dare say the hon. gentleman is quite correct. Now he says that the Government is so anxious for the welfare of the population that from sanitary considerations, the same high views which have induced them to propose measures to prevent the adulteration of food, drinks and manures, induced them to propose to render whiskey a more healthful and satisfactory drink for our consumption. The statement of the hon. gentleman is that it is proposed to make allowances of 6 per cent. for the first year and 4 per cent. for the second year, and that no whiskey shall be sold after a certain time. This would make the maximum allowance of 10 per cent. for the two years. The hon. gentleman is adding 5 per cent.—I think the duty at present is $1—he is adding 5 per cent. to the duty. The allowance, at the end of two years, is to be 6 per cent., and at the end of one year, 4 per cent. You get a reduction of 10 per cent. and an increase of 5, so that you make a loss of 5 per cent., according to the hon. gentleman's statement, if the whiskey is sold at the earliest period at which it is proposed, after 1890, that the whiskey shall be capable of sale at all. So that the proposition is in effect for a reduction of the duty on whiskey instead of an increase. Of course the whiskey will probably cost the public as much, because a few years holding involves interest, warehousing, etc. I presume it is to be kept in a bonded warehouse, and therefore the duty will not be paid until the end of two years. The result will be that the public may pay nearly as much, but as far as the revenue is concerned, it is clear it will not be so effectually provided for by the spirit duty under these arrangements, when it assumes its regular form, as it is under the existing plan.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There can be no doubt from this resolution having been placed on the Notice Paper for so long a time, it has had the result of greatly augmenting the receipts of the Dominion for the present year at the expense of the revenue for the next year. Whether designed or not, it has accomplished the gathering in to

the public Treasury during this year, of about a million of money that would not have come into it, in the regular course of trade, until the next year. It is not usual to give notice of changes whereby the revenue may be affected, as has already been pointed out. When the Minister put this notice on the Paper we were engaged in discussing a measure which necessitated several weeks' discussion, and he must have known that all other business must stand until that Bill had been put through committee. Now, as he must have known that, the putting this resolution upon the Paper does seem, upon the face of it, designed by hon. gentlemen opposite to bring into the public revenues a million dollars this year which will be that much towards balancing the accounts of the Dominion, if it does not enable the Government to show a surplus. The Acting Minister of Inland Revenue says no; there could have been no design of that kind, because the manufacturer would have no object, because he proposed to allow him a rebate, by way of evaporation, while he proposed in this notice to charge him 5 cents a gallon additional by proclamation of the Governor in Council; and he would not at all be alarmed by that because the same notice tells him that we intend to make an allowance of a certain percentage for evaporation, and therefore it does not inrease the duty upon spirits at all, because the extra 5 cents he will have to pay will be more than counterbalanced by the amount of the percentage that would be allowed him for evaporation. I dare say this notice, if it had contained only those two clauses, would not have resulted in the extra million of revenue coming in, but the Minister has put in another little notice, and it was that which led to the additional million, and it is this:

"For allowing the Governor in Council to impose an additional duty of 5 cents on each gallon of spirits, and for prohibiting spirits being entered for consumption before a specified time after manufacture."

This, it was, that led the manufacturer to take his liquor out of bond. If he had an intimation that he would be allowed to remove any of it from bond or put any of it in the market for two years from the present time, he would want to avail himself of the privilege of disposing of it now. If the Minister of Customs can say it was not so, I shall stand corrected, but he cannot deny that the result has been to add a million additional to the revenue, which we should not otherwise have had. That has come no, doubt, largely from spirits. As a result of the Government leaving this notice on the Paper, they have obtained $1,000,000 more revenue than might have been expected during the fiscal year, and that amount properly belongs to the next fiscal year.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not propose to discuss the matter now, or refer to the chivalrous impulse which induced the hon. member for West Durham to attack a Minister not in his place, which he does not find it a very safe thing to do when that Minister is in his place. What I desire to point out is this: Hon. gentlemen will remember that after the troubles broke out in the North-West there was a popular impression in the public mind that an increase of duties would be necessary in order to obtain increased revenue. Even in the matter of that, there was a very considerable movement in the large marts, such as Toronto and Montreal, on the part of merchants, who believed that the Government would be compelled to increase the duties in order to meet the necessary expenditure. It will be found that this was the motive, and not anything in the resolution, which the hon. gentleman says is something to make a deduction on one side and an increase on the other, and which induced the distillers to pay a large amount of revenue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That might be true, with respect to such an article as tea, of which there was not a great stock in the country at that time, and which had to be brought some distance. It could not occur in regard to an article that was in bonded warehouses at the time, and could be removed at the shortest possible notice. The notice has been on the Paper nearly six weeks, and the distillers took the precaution to remove their goods.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committe.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. During what period has this increase of the revenue taken place?

Mr. McLELAN. I understand that the increase took place during three weeks. It was not only on spirits, but there was a large increase on tobacco. A large proportion of the spirit was old whiskey, which is less injurious than new spirit.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has given us to understand that the object the Government had in view was that old spirits should be used, which are more healthy.

Mr. McLELAN. I said it was less injurious.

Mr. PATERSON. The result of the action taken was that 1,000,000 gallons more of whiskey was let loose on the people, to the great injury of their health. In that case alone, there was ground for complaint against the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. I should much regret if that quantity of new spirits had been sent among the people, but hon. gentlemen opposite know it could not be manufactured in the time. In this temperance age it could not be supposed that 1,000,000 gallons of spirits could be consumed within the period in question.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, what a mistake the distillers made, in paying this extra amount of money into the Dominion Treasury.

Mr. BLAKE. The mistake was, to suppose that the distillers would take out the old whiskey and leave in the new, for old whiskey could be taken out after the hon. gentleman's order had been passed.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman knows it is impossible for 1,000,000 gallons of new whiskey to be made in the time. A large proportion of that taken out was old.

Mr. CASEY. That depends on what you call new whiskey. If you only include whiskey made within a month or so it would be impossible, but if you include all that was made within the year, I think it is very possible that they should have 1,000,000 gallons of it on hand. On the other hand, I do not think that the manufacturers would be foolish enough to take out any old whiskey at all, even at the end of the first year. Taking the rebate and the increase together, they give at the end of the first year a bonus of 1 per cent. to the distiller; at the end of 2 years, 5 per cent.; at the end of 3 years, 8 per cent.; at the end of 4 years, 10 per cent.; until, at the end of 7 years, there is a total bonus of 16 per cent. given to the manufacturer. A man would be very foolish to take out 7-year old whiskey when, a short time afterwards, he might get it out for 16 cents less per gallon than he can now, and the chances are that it is new whiskey alone which was taken out. The Minister has not given us any other means of accounting for the great increase in the consumption of whiskey. The hon. member for Cardwell has given an explanation, drawn from the war in the North-West and the apprehensions of an increased duty, but that explanation was rather raw, and I think we may leave it in bond for the present. Is it in consequence of the great temperance boom in the country? Is it because the Scott Act went into force in so many counties in the month of May? I do not think the strongest opponent of the Scott

Act would say that is the reason. There is nothing in the special or general circumstances of the country which will account for it, so you must come to the conclusion that it was the hon. gentleman's resolutions that did the mischief. Though the circulation of so much raw whiskey may do harm to the people, it may do good to the Government, by saving them from having a deficit for this year and next year too, just as in the case of the extra revenue brought in by the adoption of the National Policy. The Finance Minister claimed the revenues paid in anticipation of the adoption of that policy for the year 1879, and claimed them the next year, as well, because, he said, they belonged to that year, and had been forestalled the year before. The plan is certainly a very ingenious one, and does great credit to the hon. Minister who devised it, whether it was the Acting Minister or the *de jure* Minister. It was very clever, and no doubt it meets with the hearty approval of the Minister of Finance, who will know so well how to make use of it.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. member for Elgin has pointed out, this notice to the manufacturers of whiskey was drawn with great care and caution, as certain circumstances would induce the manufacturers of whiskey to believe that they would save money by leaving the whiskey in bond. The hon. gentleman prescribed the amount of the charge he was about to impose on whiskey, and he gave them other particulars, but what was to be done in the case of whiskey which was kept in bond for age, was left out. If he had disclosed the whole plan, it is possible that certain unexpected results would have taken place. These persons, however, being in ignorance of how soon he might propose to prohibit the ex-warehousing their stuff, and not being aware what the allowance was going to be, they adopted what they thought was the prudent step of taking out their whiskey. With the hon. gentleman's strong temperance views, I have no doubt he is rather glad that he has played them a pretty smart trick; he thinks it is a clear gain, and if their bank accounts are much depleted, if, like an even more respectable corporation, they have to use Exchequer bills, and put them in the hands of the banks, he will say, at any rate, that the Dominion of Canada may as well get an extra share of these unhallowed gains. I dare say that is his feeling, but whether it is participated in by his colleagues, whether the First Minister equally rejoices in the game which has been played on the manufacturers of spirits, I do not know. I do not know what the feelings of the member for London are on this subject. We know it is not the drink he is particularly interested in, but still, no doubt, he has a kind of fellow feeling for his other friends, the manufacturers of spirits, as all the Ministers, no doubt, have for Senator Smith, their colleague in the Government. Whether these manufacturers feel equally pleased at the turn of affairs which has taken place by the notice to the trade I cannot say, but I have no doubt that, as for the hon. gentleman himself, he feels rejoiced at having had a chance to spoil the Egyptians.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it the intention, in the Bill, to fix the schedule of abatement, or to leave that to the Governor in Council?

Mr. McLELAN. That is to be provided in the Bill.

Mr. PATERSON. If 5 per cent. is the basis of that, why not make a statutory declaration of that as well?

Mr. McLELAN. That would involve our going into Committee of Ways and Means, but we may have an opportunity before the Bill passes through.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that I do not think the Bill will go through very rapidly if this is left to the Governor in Council. The hon. gentleman had better face the difficulty now.

Mr. PATERSON. If the Government had not determined upon what would be a fair abatement for shrinkage, there might be a shadow of reason for asking that they should have the power to do that by Order in Council, and, as a consequence, that the increase of duty might be left in the hands of the Governor in Council; but the Government having determined on the abatement that was to be made, I see no reason why the Governor in Council should have anything to do with it. If one is determined, the other should be determined.

Mr. McLELAN. I will move that the resolution be amended in that respect.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the proper way would be to leave that out altogether, and bring a resolution into the Committee of Ways and Means to provide for that duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course, it does not follow that these reductions will be made. These percentages are maximums, and the reductions will depend altogether on the evaporation that takes place during the time.

Mr. McLELAN. I move that the words, "for allowing the Governor in Council to impose an additional duty of 5 cents on each gallon of spirits," be omitted.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the next stage of the Bill, I hope the hon. gentleman will give us the date at which the bulk of that money came in, now that the clause which brought it in has been struck out.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Do the returns made to the Government show the date when the liquor was placed in bond?

Mr. McLELAN. They do.

Mr. PATERSON. Then, I think it would be well, when the other information is being brought, that the Minister should also give us the date at which the liquor was put in bond and taken out. That will enable us to realise whether it was old or new whiskey, and what damage was done to the community.

Mr. McLELAN. It would be too bad if it was old whiskey.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the whole thing will be complete if he brings the resolutions of thanks of the distillers.

Amendment agreed to, and resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) to amend the Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 15th June, 1885.

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

PRAYERS.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. JAMIESON asked, Is the Government prepared to name a day for the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 92) "An Act further to amend 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' and 'The Liquor License Act, 1883?'"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Having ascertained from the hon. gentleman that he is desirous that the matter should be disposed of quickly, and as I am informed that some of those who are in favor of the amendments are also anxious to have it disposed of, I would suggest to the House the expediency of allowing this matter to be fully discussed on Thursday, if that will suit hon. gentlemen.

Mr. BLAKE. Had it not better be made an Order for that day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps that would be better.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Government had better put a notice on the Paper to that effect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well.

SALE OR SETTLEMENT OF LANDS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CAMERON, Huron) asked, Was there any Order in Council passed in 1880, 1881 or 1882, respecting the sale or settlement of land south of the twenty-four mile belt reserved to Canadian Pacific Railway, in Manitoba and the North-West Territories? If so—1. When was the Order passed; 2. What were the terms of sale or settlement; 3. What was the price fixed for odd-numbered sections; 4. What were the terms of such Order?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes. (1.) The date of the Order in Council was the 5th July, 1882, but it was not enforced until the 1st September following, and therefore did not affect settlement made during that season. (2.) The lands affected by the Order in Council—namely, the even-numbered sections between the southern limit of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt and the international boundary—were to be offered for sale by public auction, at an upset price of not less than $2.50 per acre, and any of such lands disposed of while the Order was in operation were disposed of in this manner. (3.) The odd-numbered sections between the southerly limit of the railway belt and the international boundary were not sold at any price, but were reserved for the purpose of aiding in the construction of colonisation railways. (4.) The Order in Council will be brought down.

RAILWAY SYSTEM OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. STAIRS asked, Has the Government received from any person or persons any proposal for the consolidation and completion of the railway system of Nova Scotia; and if so, what steps do they intend to take respecting it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has received such an application, and it is now under the consideration of the Government.

TEMPORARY LOANS TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, The total amount of temporary loans obtained by the Government from banks or other sources in Canada, Great Britain, the United States or elsewhere, on the 31st May, 1885, and at that date unpaid; but not including savings bank deposits or Dominion notes in circulation; the date and amount of each loan, from what source obtained, and when payable?

Mr. BOWELL. The temporary loans on the 31st of May, 1885, in Canada, were $4,400,000, and in England, $11,419,067.23. The other information asked for in the question is such, as was stated in the House when asked for before, as it is not deemed, in the interest of the country, should be answered, on the ground that the banks, particularly in England, object to their transactions of this kind being made public.

Mr. JAMIESON.

SUPERANNUATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of collector of Inland Revenue, filled by G. C. Longley, collector, who was superannuated during the last year, has been filled? If so, how, by promotion or new appointment, name and salary allowed, and date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? Who is performing the duties at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. McLELAN. The position of collector, which became vacant by the superannuation of the late G. C. Longley, has been filled by the appointment of John Dumbrille, of Maitland, by Order in Council of 16th April, 1885, at a salary of $1,400 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of first-class clerk, filled by C. McCarthy, Public Works Department, who was superannuated the last year, has been filled? If so, how, by promotion or otherwise, name and what salary, also date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? Who performs the duties at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This office has not yet been filled. The duties are performed by several officers of the Department, who draw their ordinary salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of chief clerk, Secretary of State Department, filled by W. H. Jones, who was superannuated during the last year, has been filled? If so, how, by promotion or otherwise? If filled, by whom, salary and date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who performs the duties of the position at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The vacancy has not been filled and will not be filled, and the duties are performed by other officers of the Department, without additional salary.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office filled by N. McLeod (Indian Affairs), who was superannuated last year, has been filled? If so, by promotion or otherwise, name and salary allowed, and date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who performs the duties of the office at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The office of Indian agent at Fort Macleod, formerly held by Norman Macleod, who was on sick leave for some time previous to his retirement, was filled, by the transfer, in January, 1882, of Mr. C. E. Denny, Indian agent at Fort Walsh, to Fort Macleod, at the same salary received by him at Fort Walsh, namely, $1,200 per annum. Mr. Denny subsequently resigned, and was succeeded, on the 10th of March, 1884, by Mr. W. B. Pocklington, who had been Indian sub-agent at the Blackfeet Crossing. Mr. Pocklington's promotion was by Order in Council of the 6th of September, 1884, and he received the same salary as his predecessor, Mr. Denny.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of chief clerk, Department of Interior, filled by A. Russell, who was superannuated last year, has been filled? If so, by promotion or otherwise, and name, salary and date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who performs the duties of the office at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; it has been filled by the promotion of Mr. William M. Goodeve, who was next to Mr. Russell in rank in the Patenting Branch of the Department. Mr. Goodeve passed the promotion examination prescribed by the Civil Service Act, and received his appointment as chief clerk of the Patents Branch of the Department from the 1st January last, at the salary of $1,800 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of Surveyor General, filled by L. Russell, Department of the Interior, who was superannuated last year, has been filled? If so, by promotion or otherwise, name, salary allowed and date of appointment? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who is performing the duties of the office at present and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, it has been filled by the promotion of Mr. Edouard Deville, who as chief inspector of surveys, was next to Mr. Lindsay Russell in rank in the Surveys Branch of the Department of the Interior. Mr. Deville's appointment as Surveyor General dates from the 1st January last, and his salary is $3,200 per annum.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office filled by G. Grant, as second-class clerk of Militia and Defence, who was superannuated last year, has been filled? If so, by promotion or otherwise, and name and salary? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who performs the duties of the office at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. CARON. Major Wainwright has been appointed by promotion to fill the vacancy created by the retirement of Lieut.-Col. Grant, at the minimum salary of second-class clerks, namely, $1,100. Major Wainwright has been removed since to the Adjutant General's office, and it is intended to appoint another clerk in his place. At present the duties are performed temporarily by the other officers of the Department, who are not receiving extra salary or per diem allowance.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the office of Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue, filled by D. Lindsay, who was superannuated last year, has been filled? If so, how, by new appointment or promotion, name the salary allowed? If not filled, is it the intention of the Government to fill it? And who is performing the duties of the office at present, and what salary or per diem allowance is paid?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Lindsay's vacancy has not been filled up to the present. Mr. J. S. Clute, Collector of Customs at New Westminster, B.C., is performing the work, and receives a 5 per cent. commission on all Excise duties he collects, and $100 per annum for performing the duties of surveying the malt houses and breweries.

EXCISE REVENUE—MAY 1884 AND 1885.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, How much of the revenue from Excise received during the month of May, 1885, was obtained from spirits and how much from tobacco, respectively? 2. How much from spirits and tobacco, respectively, in May, 1884?

Mr. BOWELL. Spirits, May, 1884, $280,217.65; spirits, May, 1885, $1,140,973.62; tobacco and cigars, 1884, $141-035.13; tobacco and cigars, 1885, $208,532.86.

PUBLIC SERVICE—STATISTICS.

Mr. TASSE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reorganise the system of statistics and to publish each year a volume containing a statistical summary in relation to the working of the several branches of the public service?

Mr. POPE. The Government has that matter under consideration.

ADMINISTRATION OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. CARON moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor General to appoint in the manner provided by the fifth section of the North-West Territories Act, 1880, an additional member of the Council for the said Territories, and an additional stipendiary magistrate in the manner provided by the seventy-fourth section of the said Act, and for the purposes mentioned in the said Act.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Minister of the Interior may, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, make such arrangements with the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba as seem reasonable as to the compensation to be made by Canada to that Province for the care and maintenance of persons detained in the Selkirk lunatic asylum, or in any temporary asylum in the said Province.

Motion agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolutions:—

It shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to grant the further subsidies hereinafter mentioned towards the construction of the railways hereinafter described; that is to say:

For a railway from a point on the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup or Rivière Ouelle in the Province of Quebec, to Edmunston in the Province of New Brunswick, a subsidy not exceeding $2,800 per mile for 75 miles, and $6,000 per mile for 8 miles, not exceeding in the whole $258,000. The said subsidy to be in addition to the subsidy authorised to be granted in aid of the construction of the said railway, by the Act 45 Vic., cap. 14, constituting with the subsidy so authorised, a subsidy not exceeding in the whole $498,000. The said subsidy to be granted to the said railway upon the terms and conditions specified in the said Act.

Also for a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, *via* Sherbrooke, Moosehead, Lake Mettawamkeag, Harvey, Fredericton and Salisbury, a subsidy not exceeding $80,000 per annum for twenty years, forming in the whole, together with the subsidy authorised by the Act 47 Vic., cap. 8, a subsidy not exceeding $250,000 per annum, the whole of which shall be paid in aid of the construction of such line for a period of twenty years, or a guarantee of a like sum for a like period as interest on the bonds of the company undertaking the work.

The said last mentioned subsidy to be so granted upon the terms and conditions specified in the said last mentioned Act in respect of the subsidy thereby authorised in aid of the said line of railway.

And whereas it is essential in the interest of Canada, generally, as well as of the Province of Quebec, that free access to the port of Quebec be obtained by the Canadian Pacific Railway as contemplated by the said last mentioned Act, and such access has not been obtained, and it is necessary to make further provision for the purpose of procuring such access; therefore it is hereby resolved as follows:

The Governor in Council may grant a further subsidy to aid in procuring free access as hereinafter described for the trains and traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, or from some other point on the said railway to be selected by the company, to the harbor of Quebec, in such manner as shall be approved by the Governor in Council, to wit: An additional subsidy not exceeding $340,000, constituting together with the subsidy authorised by the said last mentioned Act to aid in procuring the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec; and the subsidy also thereby authorised to aid in constructing a line connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway at Jacques Cartier Junction with the North Shore Railway, which subsidies shall be applicable to the said first mentioned purpose: a sum not exceeding in the whole the sum of $1,500,000.

But if the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company fail within the period of two months from the passing of an Act based on these resolutions to obtain such access to the harbor of Quebec, either by purchasing or obtaining control of the said North Shore Railway, or by making with the owners of the said railway such arrangements, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, as will enable the said company to obtain such access thereto, and allow the trains thereof to pass as freely to and from the said harbor as if the said railway formed part of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; then and thereupon sections 4, 5 and 6 of the said Act shall come into force and be acted upon in accordance with their terms.

That in so far as any further authority is required to enable the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to carry out the provisions of the said 4th, 5th and 6th sections of the said Act, 47 Victoria, cap. 8, as hereby modified, the said company be authorised and empowered to do with the authority of the shareholders, evidenced as provided by their charter, all matters and things that may be necessary or expedient in the carrying out of any arrangement herein contemplated, including the leasing in perpetuity of a second line of railway between Montreal and Quebec, the application of the rental to be agreed upon in the lease thereof to the payment of the interest on the bonds or stock of any company to be formed for constructing such second line, and the use of such subsidy in whole or in part as a provision for interest or dividends upon the cost of such construction or otherwise as may be found expedient in making the financial arrangements for meeting such cost; and that such authority in all the foregoing respects as may be needed

by the Company to be incorporated under the said Act be also granted to such company by the terms of its charter.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BOWELL moved the following resolution:—

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending 30th June, 1885, the sum of $1,700,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of Canada.

Mr. MILLS. It would be reasonable that the Minister should give the House further information with regard to the expenditure connected with this military expedition and the suppression of the rebellion. The hon. gentleman knows that his colleague (Mr. Caron) asked the House for a vote of $700,000 in the first instance, and then for $1,000,000. Now it is proposed to carry through an Act to grant this amount of $1,700,000. We know from the information of the hon. Minister of Customs that this will not by any means be all the expenditure that will be required in connection with the matter, and the Government may be in a position to give the House more definite information than they could when this vote was formerly asked.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not anticipate a detailed statement of expense would be asked for at this stage. The arrangement was, when the first vote was taken, that a Bill should be introduced to cover the amount, and after the second resolution was passed asking for an additional million, I promised to bring in a Bill, and have done so.

Mr. CARON. I am not in a position to give any further information to the hon. gentleman to-day, but I received a very heavy looking parcel from the Hudson Bay Company, containing vouchers and estimates, on Friday night. The officers of the Department have been kept very busy ever since investigating that, and within two or three days I hope to be able to lay before the House the information which the hon. gentleman is anxious to get, and which I am very anxious indeed to bring down.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the best way will be to get the information before we take committee on the Bill.

Resoluton to be reported.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL. Before moving the third reading of this Bill (No. 20) to modify the application of the Consolidated Insurance Act of 1877, I may say that there have been grave doubts expressed as to the right of this Parliament to exercise the powers given under the 7th section, and, as that doubt exists, I will move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to Committee of the Whole to strike out the 7th section, and to add in the 8th clause the word "registered" after the word "licensed" in the 19th line. It is contended by many gentlemen that that is a question exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures and not within the purview of the Dominion Parliament. In looking over the decision in the case to which my attention was called, I do not find that the Privy Council gave any positive opinion on that question; but, rather than have any doubt or any further debate upon it, I think it is advisable to strike out that clause.

Mr. IVES. I do not quite understand whether the Minister takes the responsibility of giving it as his opinion that this clause which he proposes to strike out is *ultra vires* of this Parliament. He says that a number of gentlemen, whether members of this House or not he did not state, but I presume they are members of this House, have doubts about the power of Parliament to enact this section. I would like to know, if that particular section is not within our power, how these other sections which refer to what may be endorsed on the policy and what the policy shall contain and shall not contain can in common sense come within the power of this Parliament. If we have any power at all over an insurance company that we incorporate, to fix the terms upon which they shall do business with the public, and the public shall do business with them, I am at a loss to know how we should not have the power to enact this seventh section. This is a very important question. I do not see how we can go into committee and strike out the clause without knowing the view of the Government in reference to the other parts of the Bill. The hon. Minister refers to the case of Parsons and the Queen. As I read the decision of the Privy Council in that case, so far from deciding that we have not the power in this matter, it abstains from deciding that matter altogether, and so far as you can draw from it the opinion of the court, it was that we had the power, and that the powers of the Local Government and of the Dominion in reference to a matter of this kind were concurrent. The only point in the case that I can find out is that conditions affixed by the Local Legislature as to insurance companies doing business within their Province were held to be within the powers of the Local Legislature. The Legislature of Ontario passed an Act which prescribed uniform conditions to be inserted in the policies of fire insurance companies doing business within the Province. The Privy Council held that that was within the powers of the Legislature of Ontario, but they expressly say that they refrain from giving any opinion with reference to the point which the hon. Minister proposes to assume has been decided against the powers of the Parliament of Canada. If we do not defend our own rights, prerogatives and privileges, it is hardly to be expected that the Local Legislatures will do it for us, and it is going a long way to acknowledge that we have not the power which we have over and over again assumed, namely, to enact this clause, not because the Minister of Justice or the Government say we have not the power, but because some one says we have not the power, or that there is a doubt about it. If we have not the power in regard to the 7th section, we cannot have it in regard to several other sections. This Bill is far from commending itself to a large number of the members of this House, though I do not say the majority. It went before the committee and was discussed for weeks, and this particular condition in section 7 was adopted as a sort of compromise, and to propose to strike it out now and so to emasculate the Bill seems to me almost a breach of faith to those members of the committee who consented to the Bill in that form. I trust the Minister will reconsider his inclination to strike out this clause. The other day the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) was not satisfied with the clause, and held that information given in answer to questions should not invalidate the policy, unless it was fraudulently given. Now, what will he and others who think with him say if the whole clause is struck out and the Bill is deprived of that provision entirely?

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be unfortunate to make any material alteration in this Bill before the third reading without some preliminary notice. I do not profess to understand the merits of the controversy which took place at such length and earnestness before the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, but the Bill was ultimately settled, as the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has said, as a sort of compromise, and this clause was

the result of that compromise. I think at the third reading it would be but reasonable not to make a change such as this. I do not at all dispute the propriety of the hon. gentleman's proposed change. But as we have got a thin House just now, and this measure has excited a great deal of interest among the members, and as you have got a clause which, as it now appears, was the subject of an adjustment, we ought not to eliminate it without giving some degree of notice, and I would suggest to the Minister to postpone the debate upon this amendment until to-morrow.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objections that the debate should be adjourned, and there will be of course no objections to other amendments.

Mr. BLAKE moved that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RAILWAYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the resolutions affirming the expediency of authorising the Governor in Council to grant lands to certain companies in the North-West, be now read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. Upon a former debate with reference to the first resolution, a good deal of exception was taken to some points which the hon. gentleman will remember, with reference to the question of the coal supply, and that of the narrow gauge railway, and there was a well nigh unanimous expression of opinion on the part of all those who participated in the discussion, that it was regretable that the railway should be on the proposed gauge. Upon that occasion my hon. friend said he had taken note of the various points that were raised, and would subsequently give some information to the House upon them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman spoke of the relative quality of the coal. I am not prepared to answer that; I have not the information. I know that the company is now working at the Galt mine, at the end of the railway. When first opened that was considered the best coal, but I understand that other coal as good as that has been found farther west; in fact, it seems that the farther west you go towards the mountains the coal improves. If the Medicine Hat coal had been considered as good as this, I have no doubt the company that is formed would not have built a railway 110 miles long in order to obtain that coal. But what shows that the coal of that mine is better than the coal at Medicine Hat and the coal between the Medicine Hat and the Galt mine, is this: That the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who must know what is in their interest, have made a large contract for five years with this company for their coal, which is considered the best yet found. True, it is stated that coal of good quality can also be found at the crossing, but these mines have not been worked. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the gauge of the railway, and there did not seem to be any difference of opinion amongst the members of the House about the propriety of having the ordinary standard gauge of the country applied to these branch railways. Well, the fact is I believe the Government were of that opinion themselves; but when this company applied for aid for their railway they were pressed very much by the Minister to adopt the standard gauge of the country instead of the narrow gauge, and the answer was positive that the capitalists who were ready to put their money into a narrow gauge railway, were not disposed to put it into a broad gauge railway, even with the increased subsidy in land that the Government were disposed to offer them. Under these circumstances we thought that we might ask Parliament to sanction this narrow gauge railway and obtain the coal as soon as possible from that mine. It is now stated that a large area of country there is a coal country, according to the surveys made in that region. As this is the first company that has proposed to go into the working of coal mines to that extent, as we thought it would be the beginning of work in those mines, and as these capitalists were investing their capital there—on a land basis, if you choose—nevertheless, they were investing their money there, we thought it would induce others to do the same later on. But coal is not confined to this region of 10,000 acres; I have no doubt that, as my hon. friend indicated the other day, there is a long seam of coal extending from the frontier towards the north and north-west across the railway, and that many other companies will go into the coal mining. It may be said that other companies will have less trouble and expense in working those mines than this one. Well, of course, it will be the business of the company that is now asking for this aid, to see whether it would pay them, whether they would have to work the coal that way, or reduce the price of coal. I have no doubt that competition will bring down the price of coal. I remember the time when coal was very high at Winnipeg and in Manitoba generally, and if people had then been told that the time was not far distant when they would be able to obtain coal for $6.50, they would have been very much pleased, even when they were paying $10. If the Government could have arranged for the company to build the road with broad gauge the Government would have much preferred it; but this was found impossible under the circumstances, and weighing all the circumstances we thought it better to accept the proposal and have the narrow gauge.

Mr. EDGAR. With respect to the resolution granting land to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, the Minister will remember it was pointed out that the Government had imposed a condition upon the railway company that they should build 100 miles before the 1st October of this year, and 100 miles, at least, during each subsequent year, otherwise the grant would be forfeited; that is to say, that the company would not receive a single acre unless they built 100 miles this year. The Order in Council itself showed that they only expected to build 50 miles by the 1st of October, and 50 miles each year hereafter. It will be necessary either for the Government to show that the company has made a mistake in their calculation, and give some other assurance, or reduce the number of miles to be built each year to 50.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I stated the other evening, when we were considering this subject, that I thought we had passed an Order in Council since 1st October, the terms of which would agree with the wishes expressed by some hon. members, and that the length of line to be built was reduced from 100 miles to 50 during each period. I have obtained a copy of the Order in Council, which is dated 6th May, 1885. I need not read the petition of the company, but I will give the decision of Council:

"The Minister, believing that it is of great importance to the settlement and development of the district to be traversed by the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, that the extension of the line should be proceeded with, and being very anxious to facilitate the financial operations of the company, so as to enable them to prosecute the work with despatch and vigor, being satisfied also of the *bonâ fide* intention of the company to complete the line as rapidly as their resources will permit, and further, with a view to furnishing employment to those settlers who will be unable to follow agricultural pursuits during the present year, recommends that the Order in Council of the 4th October last be amended in the following particulars, namely:—

"First.—That the mileage to be constructed annually be reduced from 100 miles to 50 miles.

"Second.—That the company be conceded the right to the conveyance at the rate of 6,000 acres per mile, as each section of 10 miles is completed, during the construction of the next fifty miles of railway, of 300,000 acres of the 512,000 acres earned on the 80 miles of constructed road, on reimbursing the Government therefor at the rate of 10 cents per acre, as provided in the Order in Council of the 4th of October last, and on the understanding that the remaining 212,000 acres should be retained by the Government, subject to a charge of $1.06 per acre, as a

guarantee for the completion of the said 50 miles by the 1st day of October next, and also as a guarantee for the further construction of the line, until the same is completed, equipped and running to the west bank of the Assiniboine river, being not less than 100 miles from Minnedosa, when the company shall have the right to the conveyance of the said 212,000 acres, upon reimbursing the Government the amount of 10 cents per acre.

"Third.—That the land grant upon the extension of the line from Minnedosa, the point to which it is now completed, about 80 miles from Portage la Prairie, at the rate of 6,400 acres per mile be conveyed, to the company, when applied for by them, on the completion of each section of 10 miles, upon their reimbursing the Government the amount of 10 cents per acre.

"Fourth.—That in the event of the company desiring to obtain the right to a conveyance of the 212,000 acres to be retained by the Government, or any portion thereof, before the completion of the line to the west bank of the Assiniboine River, they be accorded such right upon first depositing with the Receiver General of the Dominion not less than $1.06 per acre of the said 212,000 acres, or any portion of the same, the money so deposited to be repaid to the company with interest at the rate of 4 per cent. per annum, less the amount of 10 cents per acre, when the whole line is completed, equipped and running from Portage la Prairie to the west bank of the Assiniboine River.

"The Minister further recommends that the provisions of the Order in Council of the 4th October last, except in so far as the same are expressly modified by this minute, be and remain in full force."

Mr. BLAKE. Then the company will receive 11,520 acres per mile for the 100 miles now completed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Resolutions concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) authorising the granting of certain subsidies of land for the construction of railways therein mentioned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HARBOR MASTER AT HALIFAX.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the resolution respecting the appointment of a harbor master at the port of Halifax be read the second time.

Motion agreed to.

On motion that the resolution be concurred in,

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to point out that the statement made the other day by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the increased business consequent on the increased tonnage at the port was not exactly accurate. I find that in 1882 the tonnage was 601,000; in 1884, 565,000, or an actual decrease of 35,000 tons. I do not object to the amount of salary, but I desire to correct the statement made by the Minister.

Mr. McLELAN. My statement was, that going back for a number of years that was the general effect, though, of course, there may be some years in which there was a falling off.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 148) to amend the Act respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master for Halifax.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANNED GOODS.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 142) respecting Canned Goods.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIES. This would appear to apply to goods going abroad as well as to those sold in Canada for consumption. If so, that was not what was explained to be the intention of the Minister last year.

Mr. McLELAN. This would cover all goods sold in Canada, whether for consumption or otherwise.

Mr. BLAKE. That is certainly contrary to the policy stated last year.

Mr. McLELAN. I believe the general impression of the House last year was that it should be confined to goods sold in Canada, but I suppose it would do no harm if these labels were put on goods for exportation as well.

Mr. BLAKE. They might do that for themselves.

Mr. McLELAN. I would move that after the word "Canada," in the 9th line, the words "except for exportation," be inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. That will read very queerly. It will read "sold, or offered for sale in Canada, for exportation, after the first day of January." Better say "offered for sale in Canada for consumption therein." Then, is it intended to apply to imported goods sold in Canada?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Because it does.

Mr. STAIRS. I think lower down it excepts certain classes of foreign goods.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a Governor in Council clause—we do not take much stock in that. It would be additional prohibtion in reference to all goods manufactured abroad which might be brought into Canada for sale.

Mr. McLELAN. Let it read, "except in the case of goods packed in Canada previous to the passing of this Act."

Mr. BLAKE. That will not do. That leaves it still quite open. That would extend to goods packed abroad and sold or offered for sale in Canada.

Mr. McLELAN. Add, after "Canada," the words "for consumption therein."

Mr. BLAKE. That is worse and worse. That would prohibit the case not merely of goods packed in Canada but packed outside.

Mr. McLELAN. Those goods are expressly exempted by the Act.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the 6th clause only applies to a particular class of goods, namely, those of a description not put up in Canada at all. We put up in Canada goods of a character similar to those put elsewhere, such as lobsters, corn, and a good many kinds of fruit, and this clause does not extend to them at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. "Except in the case of goods packed previously to the passing of this Act, every package of canned goods packed in Canada and sold or offered for sale in Canada for consumption therein, after the 1st day of January, 1886."

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that this Bill is *ultra vires*. It is not simply a regulation of trade; it is an interference with the right of property and of civil rights. If the hon. gentleman can go so far as to say how certain kinds of property shall be prepared for market, he may do so with reference to every kind of property. He might interfere with the production of stock; he might say what kind of cattle, horses or sheep the farmer shall produce, or what kind of fruits he shall raise, how the fruits shall be picked and prepared and packed for market, as well as provide how this particular kind of fruit shall be prepared. There is a difference of degree, but no difference in kind or principle. If we go on legislating in this way with regard to personal property, simply because personal property may become an article of merchandise, what remains to the Local Legislature under the head of property and civil rights? Civil rights are rights regulated by law, about which there are certain rules of order established. Any right on which you legis-

late is a civil right, and simply because it may be an article of merchandise, you cannot make that regulation under the assumption of regulating trade. This is not a regulation of trade at all in any sense. You are undertaking to say what shall be done in order that property may be preserved from destruction, or that the purchaser may be protected from fraud on the part of the vendor. All that has to do with the ownership of property and with its transfer. Now the transfer of property, its purchase or sale, is a matter relating to property and civil rights, not a matter relating to commerce. The law of customs, or what we understand by the expression, is wholly different. We undertake to say how trade shall be carried on with a foreign state; we may establish certain laws of quarantine; we may state what taxation it may be subject to; we may make regulations of this sort under the head of regulating trade, but the provisions of this Bill are civil regulations, the regulations of civil rights and of relations between the vendor and the purchaser, and it seems to me there is no difference in making these provisions and going a step further, stating that a certain kind of property cannot be held, or that certain regulations must be complied with before the owner of certain property can part with it. Now whether he will part with it by law, whether he may assign it in a particular way, whether he will make a written or a verbal contract with regard to it, how and upon what condition it shall be delivered, what shall be the relations between the vendor and the purchaser, are all civil relations and belong to the Local Legislatures, and are not matters with which we have anything to do.

On sub-section 3, section 2,

Mr. BLAKE. You will observe the clause as it stands makes it an offence, in case the retail vendor should sell, although there has been originally this stamp which is required printed legibly, but which from the accidents of handling, of transport or wear and tear, it has become illegible. That seems to be going rather a long way.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the stamp has become illegible, the vendor can easily have that rectified.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the real object the hon. gentleman has in view? I can understand the object for passing an Act for the adulteration of food, for it furnishes protection to the public, but it seems to me this is a vicious interference with trade without any direct ostensible object that warrants the interference. What especial object is there in putting some illegible mark upon the package?

Mr. McLELAN. To establish the character of the goods that may be offered for sale; the name and the address will be a guarantee to some extent.

Mr. BLAKE. In so far as the clause proposes to provide for making the word "soaked" on goods which are prepared from dried materials, there is, of course, a possible advantage in it, although my opinion is against the clause even so; but that is only a small restriction. As to the rest of the clause, it is, in my opinion, but a survival of an abortive effort to do something which was attempted to be done without success. If I rightly understand the moving cause of the legislation originally, it was an intention to compel the date to be put on, with a view to let the public know whether they were getting fresh canned stuff or not. That has been abandoned, and I think, when you do not compel the date to be put on, you are really, in regard to all these matters to which the word "soak" does not apply, passing a law that no canned goods shall be sold without the name and address of the packer legibly placed thereon without sufficient reason. Let us trust to the people themselves. Those who want to make a reputation will put their names and addresses legibly on their goods.

Mr. McLELAN. Manufacturers of almost every description of goods, manufacturers of hoes, and scythes, and agricultural implements, put their own names on the best qualities, and on the inferior qualities put some other name. It is therefore desirable to provide that the manufacturer shall put his own name on these goods.

Mr. BLAKE. The provision in the Bill originally introduced that a man should be compelled to put the date on these cans was abandoned. Now we are face to face with an interference with the operations of trade. The hon. gentleman drew his illustration from other classes of goods than canned goods, and he thereby admitted the same principle would apply. He says that agricultural implements, hoes, scythes and so forth, are marked with one name for the first class of goods, and with other names for the second class. Are we going to stop that? Why should we confine this to canned goods? Why should we allow people to put false names on the second and third class descriptions of hoes, and scythes and shovels?

Mr. McLELAN. You can discover the quality of those better than you can of what is contained in a can.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, people cannot be so easily cheated. But, if the hon. gentleman wishes to protect the buyers of canned goods, why should he not protect the buyers of other goods. He will find it extremely difficult in this age of the world, I am sorry to say, to prevent inferior qualities being put on the market, and that is really the object of the clause as it now stands. I think the clause will not meet the object. Many houses do business under more than one name. I think the hon. gentleman is entering into a very unwise course which will not protect the public, while it will hamper the trade. It is better that the public should learn to respect the label that is put upon the goods by experience.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The great object is to hold somebody responsible. You must have some name on the goods in order to know whom to proceed against. If the goods are worthless, there is no means of ascertaining that, except by opening the can. There ought therefore to be some person responsible, either the wholesale dealer or the dealer who puts these goods on the market. I remember an Arctic expedition being frustrated and some lives lost because a quantity of these goods were obtained which were worthless, and they did not know who should be prosecuted.

Mr. BLAKE. This is a new reason. The Minister in charge of the Bill says it is to prevent inferiority of quality. The First Minister says it is to prosecute those who sell goods which are absolutely bad.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is one reason.

Mr. BLAKE. That is misleading. Various questions arise as to the degree of inferiority. I may be a retail dealer and may buy from a first-class house articles which are represented to be all right, I may mark them with my own name in good faith, I cannot open the goods as that would spoil them, but I have taken every precaution, and they turn out to be bad. Am I to be criminally liable for that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The person who sells the goods will not put his name on them if he finds the person who bought them in the orignal package has his name on. But if they are put in the market without any name on, he puts on his name at his peril.

Mr. BLAKE. This statute does not impose upon a person a new penalty by virtue of his having put his name on the goods. All this statute does is to say that certain consequences shall follow if he does not put his name on. He buys goods from a high class house and he takes every precaution except that of opening the goods, and the law,

providing the goods shall have upon them either the name of the house or his own name, would not reach this case at all. Then there is the case of impairment of the goods, which have got into a state of decay which makes them dangerous to health, although they were thoroughly well put up. If you bought them originally with all due precautions, and then you sell them to the public, I apprehend you are not criminally liable unless there be some special law to make you so. You are liable by a penalty if you do not put your name on, but you are not liable for the bad quality of goods if you do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause does not say that a party shall be liable for the inferiority of the article. The object of having the name on is to aid in getting at the party.

Mr. DAVIES. Putting on the name of the man who sells does not make him in any sense liable whether the article turns out good or bad. John Smith keeping a grocery in Ottawa, sells goods brought from the Maritime Provinces. The goods bear the name in ink "John Smith, Ottawa." He sells those goods, and he relieves himself from any penalty under this Act. The object, I think, the Minister may have had in view was to prevent a man from putting the wrong name on. If that is so, you have a law already upon the Statute Book which makes it a misdemeanor for a man to use another man's trade mark.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Act certainly does not say that the penalty is for the goods being bad, but it says the party's name must be on the article. The general law of the land provides that parties selling goods prejudicial to health, or are fraudulently put up, are liable to be indicted at common law. But this is merely for the purpose of identifying the party, and then he would be made liable under the general criminal law.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman surely does not contend that a man who sells goods in a can hermetically sealed, and he has no means of ascertaining whether the contents are pure or impure, is liable to criminal prosecution because the goods afterwards turned out to be impure. There must be knowledge, or the means of knowledge, before you can prosecute him successfully.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; and this gives us the means of identifying him.

Mr. McLELAN. If John Smith had put up a can of peas, for instance, the color of which was gone, and if he put in deleterious substances to restore the color to the peas, and put his name upon the can, you would have a means of prosecuting him for the adulteration of food.

Mr. FAIRBANK. We have not heard why that portion of the proposed legislation which would really be a protection to the consumer has been abandoned, namely, the date. It is well known that the quality of canned goods depends very much upon the date at which they are put up. The date would be a positive protection against fraud to the consumer. Suppose you buy a can of goods which turned out to be bad, and you seek a remedy against the person selling them, the person would say: Those goods were good when I put them up; if they are bad now, it is not my fault. There would be no means of reaching him because the can lacked the date.

Mr. MILLS. This Bill is a good illustration of a Department in search of employment. We have the Department of Inland Revenue introducing this measure to the House. The functions of that Department relate to the excise law. We had the distilleries and breweries interfered with and regulated to a certain extent in order that the Government might protect itself against frauds on the revenue. Those regulations were all subordinate to the proper enforcement

of the revenue law, and not for the purpose of interfering with the trade. The interference with or regulation of trade necessarily arose from the necessity of the Government in dealing with the subject of revenue. This interference which in those two branches of business arose not because the Government had any right to interfere with the industrial pursuits but solely because it was a necessary interference in order to protect the revenue against fraud. This interference which in those cases was necessary has been extended to almost every industry, and the same rules which the necessities of the revenue imposed on the Government in regard to distillers and brewers have been applied to almost every other business. The First Minister told us that one of the principal grounds of this action was that it was necessary as part of the criminal law and in order to be able to identify criminals, so that if poisonous goods were purchased the party from whom they were purchased might be known. This law goes further than merely taking precautions against crime. We learn from the British North American Act that Local Legislatures have power to impose such penalties as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of their own laws, and we are told by the Privy Council in an important judgment that we are to look at the principal matter of the Act in order to determine the question of jurisdiction, because if the principal matter falls under the rule of Local Legislatures the punishment necessary to enforce the laws belongs to the Local Legislatures and must be enacted by them. We look at the nature of the Act to see whether jurisdiction belongs to this Parliament or not. The First Minister talks about parties marking goods. A man may mark his goods in a particular way, and he gets a property in the trade mark. Is that obtained from legislation here or legislation in the Provinces? The very same rule which would give him a property in a mark put on goods also gives to the Legislature where regulations similar to what we propose here to adopt should have originated if they are to exist at all. We might have the same regulations imposed with respect to the products on a farm. Take a farmer engaged extensively in raising cattle, he might go into manufacturing canned beef upon his estate. What right would this Parliament have to interfere with the manner in which he puts up his goods for market, any more than with the manner in which he may carry his grain or fruit to market? Anything of that kind relating to the products of the farm or factory are matters relating to his property and civil rights, and are determined and regulated by the Province to which he belongs. It is a regulation made as in incident to property, and it applies just as much to a case of property that might be transferred from father to son and disposed of by gift as to property disposed of by contract. We have no right to interfere with one more than the other. The law of contract is regulated by the laws of the Province where the contract was made or where the goods were manufactured and sold; and when the goods are transported into another portion of the Dominion or to a foreign country we make regulations in regard to them; but in regard to the production and sale by one party to another, that is a civil right under the control of the Legislatures. The Legislatures in some of the Provinces have recently adopted regulations to secure the manufacture of a better article of butter, just as a few years ago they adopted similar measures to secure a better article of cheese. The regulations we propose to enact are regulations of a similar sort. We are interfering with the functions of the Local Legislature in this particular. The First Minister has said that if an article is poisonous the party may be prosecuted under the general law, and it is important he should be identified. But he has committed a crime, and the principal act falls clearly within the domain of the criminal law. That is not the case in regard to this subject under consideration. The manner in which a man may can the product

of his farm or fisheries is an innocent act in itself. Any regulation is for the purpose of enhancing the value of the property and promoting the well-being of the country, and is not in itself criminal and cannot be brought within the jurisdiction of this Parliament by providing that unless the goods are put up in a particular way the act shall be treated as an offence. The rule laid down by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which I have cited, is perfectly clear and is a common sense one. You cannot exercise your jurisdiction and exercise a criminal jurisdiction as an incident to the power that belongs to a Local Legislature. It is for that Legislature to enforce its own regulations and to impose the necessary penalties to secure the observance of its own law. This Bill is altogether beyond our jurisdiction.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know so much as to the power of this Legislature to deal with the question, as does the hon. member for Bothwell; but this Bill has very little power in it. It is a Bill with a great many provisions, supposed to remedy an evil, that persons sell goods which have been kept so long a time that the acid has acted on the tin, and thereby the health of the persons consuming the goods has been endangered. We would have been glad, when the Minister was moving in that direction, if he did not interfere with the trade too much, if he could have found a remedy, but I suppose from the changes in the Bill he has found it impracticable, or at least he hesitated about giving it effect at that time. I would not like to say anything offensive, but it does look to me like a farce to put this law on the Statute Book, because it accomplishes nothing. The goods cannot be traced, as the packer might have an irresponsible agent whose name he might put on the goods if they were inferior in quality. This man might cease to be employed by the packing company before anything could be done in the way of enforcing the law. There is no necessity for having a law requiring a man to put his name on the goods. The trade will regulate that, as all manufacturers will be anxious to get a good name for their own goods, and there would be no use of a retailer dealing in goods except of brands with which the public were conversant. I think that especially if there is any difficulty about our interfering in a sphere which does not belong to us, it is hardly worth while dealing with the matter in this way, seeing that it practically will accomplish nothing.

Mr. McLELAN. We prevent a false date being put upon the goods, which I think is very important. It sometimes happens that a new date is put on old goods.

Mr. DAVIES. In your resolution of last Session you contend that there were two essential things which should be marked on the can, in order that the public might be protected; one was the date when the can was sealed, and the other was the weight. Now, you propose to repeal both, and what do you propose in lieu of them? I would like to know what information the Department has to give the House to justify this change.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the date comes up not on this but on a subsequent clause.

Mr. DAVIES. We are now discussing the penalty which should be put on any man selling goods without having the name of the packer or the dealer on the can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is passed.

Mr. DAVIES. Now, you are going to fix the penalty, and I contend that the offence is not one which justifies the imposition of a penalty, as it secures nothing to the public.

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me that there is some discrimination against our own people in this measure. The scope of the measure is limited to Canadian manufactured goods, and I understand that the reason assigned was that we could not control the manufacturers of foreign goods. Quite so; but we can affect the goods which are endeavored to be imported into Canada, and why should we allow foreign goods to come in without an endorsement of their character to displace our own goods? In fact, you are not placing the restrictions on them which you now propose to place on our own goods. If it is possible to see that the vendor of manufactured articles in Canada shall be bound to put his own name on the goods, why cannot you require that that shall be done, whether he is selling goods manufactured in Canada or out of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister perhaps fancies that the foreign manufacturer never puts on a false name, or sells inferior goods, but by experience, he finds that his own countrymen require greater restrictions.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot admit the soundness of that view. I hope the committee will not impose a penalty on the dealer in Canadian manufactured goods that they do not intend to impose on the dealer in foreign manufactured goods.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has not seen some amendments that were made in the 2nd clause that will require also an amendment in the 5th clause. To meet the views the hon. gentleman has expressed, the 5th clause can be so amended as to bring in all imported goods.

Mr. BLAKE. The 2nd clause has been amended so as to leave out imported goods. Surely the hon. gentleman does not propose, when he gets to the 5th clause, to reverse the operation and put them in again?

Mr. McLELAN. The 2nd clause has been amended so as to leave out the goods for exportation.

Ma. BLAKE. It is true, the 2nd clause omits Canadian manufactured goods intended for exportation, but it does not operate upon foreign manufactured goods imported into Canada for sale in Canada. It applies to Canadian goods for consumption in Canada. It is only persons sending goods from our country who are exposed to these penalties.

Mr. McLELAN. Having made that amendment in the 2nd clause, it will be necessary in the 5th clause to include all imported goods.

Mr. DAVIES. Had my hon. friend from North York been in at an earlier period, he would have learned that the object of this section is only to put information in the hands of some person to enable him to prosecute the person who has done wrong.

Mr. MULOCK. I am unable to see on what principle the Minister proposes to place restrictions upon the sale of goods manufactured in our own country and not put similar restrictions on goods manufactured abroad. Surely we have more reason to trust our own manufacturers than foreign manufacturers. Under this Bill a penalty is proposed to be put on the vendor of goods manufactured in the Dominion if he does not put his name on the package. What is the reason for this? Is it not that the purchaser shall have some means of tracing back the package of goods to its source? Why have you not the same restrictions in regard to foreign manufactured goods?

Mr. BLAKE. According to the First Minister's explanation, the object is to secure evidence against persons who may have been guilty of an offence against the criminal law, and we could not convict the foreigner who put up goods in Cuba or the United States. It is only Canadians who are exposed to this.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we have to look at the object of the Bill, which is not to punish any person, but rather to secure a good article.

Mr. McLELAN. Certainly it is not the intention to discriminate against our own packers, but we made an amend-

ment in the 2nd clause by inserting the words, "packed in Canada," which rendered an amendment necessary in the 5th clause; but if those words were struck out, I think that would meet the whole case, without amending the 5th clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is wiping out an amendment that was solemnly adopted by the committee a little while ago. It is very irregular.

Mr. McLELAN. It reads better.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says it reads better that way. Of course he has the partiality of a parent for its offspring. The hon. gentleman stated that he did not want the clause to be applied to goods that were manufactured abroad, but only to goods manufactured in Canada. I do not know whether he has truly mastered the clause or not.

Mr. McLELAN. I stated that it was not intended to apply to goods manufactured for exportation, but to apply to almost any goods sold for home consumption.

Mr. BLAKE. I pointed out, when the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) referred to the 5th section, that it was inapplicable to the object. The hon. gentleman said the intention was it should not extend to goods packed abroad. Now he proposes to make the Bill apply to goods packed abroad. He had better take the measure into further consideration, and finally decide upon the policy of the Government. Only last year the Government introduced a Bill which they now propose to repeal, with reference to names. It does not appear there is any decided intention on the part of the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. I stated it would not apply to foreign goods not put up in Canada, but to all goods put up in Canada, although not imported, this Act should apply.

On section 3,

Mr. VAIL. It is a great mistake to pass this clause, in view of the one passed last year. What people wanted to guard against is being cheated as to weight. The clause last year was much more satisfactory.

Mr. STAIRS. The objection against the clause last year is that it was found impossible to carry it out. It is impossible to pack canned goods hermetically in such a way that the weight can be absolutely decided. The present clause is very much more in accordance with English practice, and meets the difficulties of the case.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman will see that to a very large extent the matter will settle itself. Three per cent. is allowed which is quite enough to cover evaporation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the weight is not marked on the cans, the party will buy without regard to the weight.

Mr. VAIL. The goods are sold in packages supposed to contain 1 lb., and the purchaser never thinks of asking that it may be weighed, he may lose a couple of ounces on each package. The parties have guaranteed that the full weight is in each package, and the public may be deceived in that way.

Mr. STAIRS. There cannot be any fraud in regard to the weight, because no weight need be put on. There is another point. It is understood that this does not apply to goods for export, but it will be impossible for large packers to distinguish between the goods they pack for export and those they pack for home consumption, especially in the case of lobsters in the busy season. If the law makes them strict enough to comply with the English law on the subject, that should be sufficient for us.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that this is a transcript of the English law?

Mr. STAIRS. It contains about the same provision.

Mr. DAVIES. I think there is a difference. Last year we provided that every hermetically sealed can should have the weight marked upon it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was deliberately abandoned.

Mr. DAVIES. That is what I complain of. The member for Halifax says it is because it is impossible to have the weight put upon it. I thought at the time it was an injudicious clause, which would operate injuriously upon lobster packers especially. Now you come in with a new clause which is very little less objectionable. You do not give any guarantee to the purchaser that, when he purchases a pound package of goods, he is going to get a pound, and you do not punish the man who has a package marked a pound which does not contain a pound. A grocer in Ottawa may sell a package of canned goods in which there is only half a pound of fruit or meat, and he is not liable, because the clause only says that the person who places it in the package is liable, so the object is not attained at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The party who placed the label on can be prosecuted.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes, if he is the packer, and places the wrong label upon the package.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The person who places the label on it is liable to be prosecuted if he states a false weight. Then the person who sells it is liable, if he sells a package as being of a certain weight which is not of that weight, and the purchaser can recover from him the difference in the value.

Mr. DAVIES. Is there anything in the Act which indicates that he can do that? The Act does not assist him, if half a pound is sold to him when it should be a pound.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But the *crico mali* can be punished.

Mr. DAVIES. If he can be found.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, if he cannot be found or dies or has nothing, it is different, but this section punishes anyone who puts a false weight on the can.

Mr. DAVIES. You are punishing the wrong man. It should be the man who sells half a pound for a pound, knowing that it is not. It may be some third party who puts on the label. The original packer may have sold the goods to a broker.

On section 4,

Mr. FAIRBANK. The question has not yet been answered why we are abandoning that particular feature of the Bill in which the purchaser was most interested. The value of these goods depends more upon their age than upon anything else, and many persons have been injured and have even lost their lives by using goods which have been kept too long. Why was this abandoned?

Mr. McLELAN. After consultation with the trade, with those who sell and with those who pack, we considered that this was as far as it was desirable to go. False dates are often put upon packages, and sometimes false weights. This was an advance which we thought was sufficient to take at the present time, to prevent false weights or dates being put upon the packages. It is not proposed to go beyond that now.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I cannot understand how a false date can be placed upon a can. The date is first stamped into

the can, and no date can be put on again, and surely the manufacturer will not date his packages years ahead.

Mr. DAVIES. The Minister sees that this section is open to the same objection I raised to the other. You do not propose to make a man who knowingly sells a package containing a false date, liable at all, but you propose to let him go scott free. The packer need not put the date on; some intermediate person may put on the date, and he would be the person liable. But the seller who knowingly sells an article with a false date on it, you propose to let off scott free, and some imaginary man is to be prosecuted.

Mr. McLELAN. The only case in which a false date is likely to be put on is where the manufacturer has a large stock of goods unsold that he has had on hand for years, and he puts on fresh labels with false dates; or the retail dealer who has carried a large stock of canned goods over from year to year, who finds them a little out of date, and he puts on a fresh date. These parties would be liable in a case of this kind.

Mr. DAVIES. It does not throw the onus upon the retail dealer, then, of making any enquiries about the date at all. He may sell with impunity goods which he knows to bear false dates.

Mr. VAIL. An importer can import goods from the United States under this Bill upon which a false date has been put and can sell them in this country, and the only recourse you would have would be to go to the foreign merchant. The seller is not liable at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the Minister considered whether it would be safe to go so far as to prohibit putting a new label on a package? You can about as effectually deceive the public by putting on a new label as by any other means, as the new label might cover the old one altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. Suppose a fine, large, fresh label was put on in inviting colors, with the words "fresh packed."

Mr. McLELAN. If that falsely represents the date he can be punished. Suppose a man has goods packed five years ago and he puts on a new label to-day, saying they were fresh packed; that would be false representation.

On section 5,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is it proposed to give the Governor in Council some authority in this matter?

Mr. McLELAN. It is difficult to find what line of goods may be packed in Canada three months hence, or years hence. There may be a description of goods that are not now packed in Canada, but three months hence somebody may start a new industry in those goods.

Mr. BLAKE. If the intention is that the Act shall only apply to goods of those descriptions which are not put up in Canada at the present time, it is not necessary to give the Governor in Council any authority at all. All you have got to say is: The foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to foreign goods of a description not put up in Canada. The moment goods of that description are put up in Canada, then it applies to foreign goods.

Mr. McLELAN. It is better to have them defined—what particular line of goods this Act shall apply to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Suppose a particular description of goods has not yet been packed in can at all, and a person commences to engage in the industry of canning those goods; this is for the purpose of informing the public that this description of goods is now being packed in can, that this business has become a Canadian industry.

Mr. BLAKE. The power of the Governor in Council is to except out of the operation of the Act some goods which are not put up in can, but if any are put up in can they are to have no control at all. If the hon. gentleman wants to exercise still further grand-motherly control over the operations of trade, he will have to extend the powers of the Governor in Council still farther than he proposes to do here.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope this clause will be dropped altogether, for the reason that there is only one obligation imposed upon persons, either for putting up canned goods or dealing with them, and that is the obligation to put the name of the maker, or the packer, or the dealer, upon the goods. If they put anything on the cans that turns out to be incorrect, the parties should all be subject to a penalty. That being the case I cannot quite understand why foreign goods, even though not put up in Canada, should not be subject to the same obligation. If a dealer chooses to bring in foreign goods and take the responsibility of selling them and places his name on the goods, then he fulfills the obligation required under section 2. As to the placing of the weight or any other mark on the packages it does not appear that there should be any exemption given to foreign goods. The clause seems to be unnecessary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). To say that the provision shall not apply to foreign goods, even though not put up in Canada, in certainly a dangerous provision. Why should not a provision with respect to placing the date on the package not apply to goods put up in the United States.

Mr. McLELAN. I beg to move that the second clause be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. Why is the section which was deemed so important last Session now proposed to be struck out?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been found in practice that great inconvenience arises on account of packers being compelled to carry out its provisions. The larger proportion of the canned goods of Canada are exported. It is therefore proposed to repeal the section in question.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Act only came into operation on 1st June, there cannot have been much practical experience. I know there was a little interview between the head or deputy head and the packers, and it was intimated that the officers of the Department would wink at the default of the packers in not placing the weight on packages. This change is made, no doubt, on the remonstrance of the trade. What is important is that in legislation of this kind the Government should obtain the views of men of practical experience before they propose legislation. It is not to be expected that the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Acting Minister, unless he happens to be a merchant or engaged in that particular line, should know about such matters, and we are all aware of the earnest desire of permanent heads to increase the importance of their office and find more kingdoms to conquer. Time and again we have proposals made to the House, which are at the time defended as being in the public interest, and the Bill is amended or repealed next Session.

Mr. McLELAN. Last Session a clause was appended to the Weights and Measures Act to enforce the placing of the weight on cans. It was not in the original Bill as it came from the Department, but was the suggestion of an hon. member which met with the acceptance of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman may be right; but my impression was that the idea originated with the Government and was a Government proposal. At all events it was a suggestion adopted by the Government.

Mr. McLELAN. It was not the suggestion of the Government, but it was the opinion of the House, and the Government are always ready to adopt what appears to be the views of a majority of the House.

Mr. DAVIES. My recollection is directly opposed to the statement of the Minister. I spoke very strongly against the clause. It has been declared that it is not necessary to put the weight or date on the cans, but there must be a name, and it may not be the name of the original packer, but of any vendor who chooses to sell the goods. Very well. In another section he provides that it is not necessary to put the date or the weight on, but if anybody does put a date or a weight on the label, he shall be liable if he puts a wrong one. The man who sells a package without a date or weight, and knowingly does so, goes scot free; he wilfully deceives the persons who purchase from him; and then you put on penalties and you have not provided any mode of recovery.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Interpretation Act provides for that.

Mr. DAVIES. You can recover by a very expensive mode. You are driven to a *qui tam* action, a civil action in the name of the Queen, in the Province in which the offence was committed, and there is no summary procedure as there is in most penalties of this kind. I suggest, in view of these considerations, whether it is worth while to bother with the Bill at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I find by page 1,242 of *Hansard* of last year that in place of the clause struck out, the Minister of Inland Revenue accepted an amendment moved by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), though I was mistaken in saying that he himself moved it. The Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"Since the introduction of this Bill, I have received several communications complaining of frauds in connection with the sale of canned fruit and vegetables, owing to cans professing to contain 3 lbs., actually containing only perhaps 2 or 2½ lbs., and cans professing to contain 2 lbs. containing perhaps only 1½ lbs.; and it has been suggested, in order to meet such cases, that all hermetically sealed packages should contain as much as they profess, for the security of the public. I have no objection to accepting this amendment as clause 10 instead of the one which has been struck out."

I asked the hon. gentleman whether the complaints to which he referred were made with reference to home manufactured goods or to imported goods? He said:

"Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the complaints are more on account of imported goods than the home manufactured.

"Mr. BLAKE. Is it the home manufacturers who are making the complaints?

"Mr. COSTIGAN. No; the complaints come from persons who are not interested in the manufacture of these goods at all. If the clause should affect goods for exportation, the wording of it might be changed.

Then, I suggested that he had better not include in the operation of the clause, goods for exportation without careful consideration. Then the Minister of Inland Revenue proposed to amend the clause by adding the words "not to affect such goods for exportation." Then after some conversation the First Minister said:

"I should be sorry to see any alterations in this clause which would render it inapplicable to the export trade. The alteration proposed is simply this, that we should insist on full and correct measure being given to our own people, but be free, if so inclined, to injure the foreign purchaser. The effect of such a course is evident from the English trade with China where English goods have been almost driven out of the market in consequence of the untrue, to use the least offensive word, marks on goods to China."

The Minister of Inland Revenue said:

"I do not think there will be much difficulty in carrying this out. It will be easy to ascertain the weight of the packages which are made of certain regular sizes, and the dealers in foreign markets will have more confidence in trading with this country when they know to a certainty they will receive the full measure as stamped on the packages.'

Then Mr. Weldon suggested that the matter had better stand over, in order to have the Bill re-printed as it was a very important matter to the canning industry in the Lower Provinces. That was not accepted and the amendment came on. Then, on the order for the third reading, the Minister of Inland Revenue moved the discharge of the order, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole, and proceeded to provide that the addition to the clause which was made in committee, should not go into force until the first of January. He said:

"I am informed by telegraph that several manufacturing firms have on hand a supply of cans for the year's operation, and it might be inconvenient to put this clause into operation at once. Another question has arisen with regard to this interpretation of the labelling or marking and I think the word "permanently" should be struck out so that manufacturers can either stamp the cans or label them."

The word "permanently" was accordingly struck out. So you see the amount of consideration and information which the Government obtained with reference to the clause which they now propose to repeal. Although I was mistaken in saying that the Minister of Inland Revenue proposed the amendment, it is quite clear that there was some talk of an arrangement—I do not say an improper one—under which consultation might be had with some of his supporters, and one of his supporters moved the clause and he agreed to accept it, and the Government therefore, took the responsibility. What I say is, that it is quite impossible to expect a House like this to deal with the subject intelligently, unless there is an opportunity of communicating with the trade, and it is the duty of the Government, before accepting the responsibility for an amendment of this kind, to have such communication, in order that we may be fairly assured that we are going in the right direction. It is quite clear that that precaution has not been taken.

Mr. STAIRS. I think that possibly the amendment was accepted without due consideration, and it was found afterwards impossible to carry it out. For the reasons I have already explained, in this case it would be much better to adopt the English practice. One of the difficulties in applying it to goods for export was the very strong penalties imposed in England, which rendered it impossible for our lobster packers and others to send their goods to England, for if there was the difference of an ounce or the fraction of an ounce, the exporter would be liable to get into trouble. I am very glad indeed that the Government have seen fit to amend this provision. I feel sure that the matter will settle itself so that the public will know that they are buying by the can, and no harm can be done in this way.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that the fourth section be amended before the third reading. I do not think that any person who puts a false date on should be liable unless he also offers the package for sale. A case of that kind might happen by accident, but if not offered for sale I do not think there should be a penalty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It should not happen.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a possibility.

Mr. MILLS. How are the penalties to be collected?

Mr. DAVIES. If the penalties are worth imposing at all, they are worth collecting. Does the Minister intend to say that if a man wants to sue for $2 he will have to sue by *qui tam* action in one of the Superior Courts, and that one dollar shall go to the Consolidated Revenue and the other to the informer? Where are the costs to come from?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not think there will be much danger of any penalties accruing through this section, because you will notice by the first section that this Act will only apply to goods which are hermetically sealed. It is not the can that is to be hermetically sealed, but the goods that are put into the can.

Bill reported.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, &c.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 143) respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers.

(In the Committee.)

On section 13,

Mr. McLELAN. The question arose whether it should not be made compulsory for the Minister to report the names of the vendors of articles which had been analysed and found to be adulterated. This is done in practice, all the names being published in the annual report of the Minister; and I propose to provide that the names of the vendors shall be printed and laid before Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be much more important to have the names of the manufacturers? What we want to know is, who is making bad goods.

Mr. McLELAN. We may add the words "and the manufacturers when known."

Mr. DAVIES. The word vendor would not apply to a person from whom the articles were obtained if they were not sold. Would it not be better to say "the vendor or person from whom the sample is obtained." For instance, the analyst goes to a shop to examine coffee, and gets a sample, but he does not buy it.

Mr. McLELAN. He purchases a sample and divides it into three parts, if that can be done; and if that cannot be done, he purchases three samples.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty is that this clause seems to make a distinction between two kinds of acquisition. The 7th clause says that the officer may "procure" samples. The clause seems to consider that that is not a purchase, and if not a purchase not a sale. And if not a sale, there is no vendor.

Mr. McLELAN. In that case, it would be as well to put in the words the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) suggests, "or the persons from whom obtained."

Bill reported.

REMUNERATION OF PUBLIC ANALYSTS.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution (p. 2497) to provide for the remuneration of analysts to be appointed under the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs and Agricultural Fertilisers."

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I entirely object to this mode of providing for charges upon the public Treasury and the remuneration of officers. I maintain it to be the duty of the Government to decide, before they come down to Parliament, what the proper remuneration is to be, and the method of that remuneration. It does not do to tell us, as we are so often told: we cannot make up our mind yet, but we will make it up in the recess, after we have got rid of you. I maintain it to be their duty to ascertain beforehand, to make those enquiries beforehand, which they have got to make some time—because a decision has to be reached on this subject some time or other—and to bring down the results of those enquiries and ask us to assent to them. Parliamentary supervision over the public charge, over the expenses of the Treasury, is, by these means, entirely destroyed. We have no means of judging what the Bill is going to involve; we have no idea of what the charge upon the trade of the country is to be, or of what the charge upon the public revenue is to be. We are told the Governor in Council will see to all that. I say the legislation that is to be brought down to Parliament ought to be brought down after the Government have made those investigations that were required to be made as regards the money cost which the Bill is to involve, and we ought to know what the estimate cost shall be. But to pass a Bill in this way, with this clause, is to pass it blindfolded as to the expense. Then the salaries ought to be fixed by the Act for other reasons. It is expedient that Parliament should consider whether these salaries are just or not; but we have no statement in this Bill limiting the number of analysts, we have no statement limiting the fees, or any salary that may be paid. We are authorising the Government to do whatever they will in the matter of money. It does seem to me the resolution is objectionable on principle in the last degree, and I do trust the hon. gentleman will do, what in the earlier and better days of this Government, they were accustomed to do, namely, consider what salaries or remuneration it is proper to affix to this office, and let us know, and let us consider and decide whether it is right or not, and take the view of Parliament as to the proposition and insert that in the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. The principle the hon. gentleman has laid down is, in general terms, a sound one, and it would be wise to fix the salary, in every case, if possible. But in respect to the chief analyst, the House sees that it is possible and quite probable that he may be residing in a place where he can act as local analyst and receive part of his remuneration by fees, and it will only require an additional amount to be paid by the Government to make up a reasonable salary for him. It is proposed to provide, under this resolution, that Parliament shall be consulted from year to year, and informed of the amount of that salary. It is possible that the chief analyst may be located where his business will grow upon him, from year to year, to such an extent that he will not be able to act as local analyst, and will require to receive the whole of his salary from the Government; so the House will see there is a difficulty in fixing the amount and putting it in the Bill. What we propose to do is, if possible, to employ the chief analyst as a local analyst, and dispense with the appointment of local analysts, and in that case the chief analyst will receive fees, apart from his salary, and Government will only require to supplement those fees by a sum sufficient to make altogether a reasonable salary.

Mr. BLAKE. The defence is illusory. If it is possible that the chief analyst may be appointed local analyst, it is easy to fix the salary in the two cases, to say that the chief analyst, if he be not a local analyst, is to receive his whole remuneration from the Government, and that it shall be so much, but in case he is also to receive the appointment of local analyst, his salary shall be so much less, and then we will know. We have been told that the salary is to be paid out of a vote by Parliament; but what is the use of discussing the question of salary after an Order in Council has been passed fixing the salary? It is well known that the House always pays it after the Government have fixed the amount. What we want is to know the sum beforehand, and that Parliament shall have an opportunity of fixing it at the proper time.

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

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BLAKE. I find in the revised edition of the *Hansard*, of the 8th inst., I am made to say that the Highlanders of 150 years ago stole cattle. The words are: "They stole cattle." I wish to say that I never used those words at all; that no such reference appears in the original *Hansard*; that those words have been interpolated, although they were never uttered by me. I do not understand that

the rules of the House upon the revision of the *Debates* permit members to interject observations of other hon. members when they do not appear in the original report. It seems rather an unreasonable thing that words can be put into the mouth of an hon. member which he never spoke. I shall ask the members of the committee on *Debates* to see that those words are expunged from the sheet, which, I fancy, must be still in type, or whether it is in type or not, because I do not desire that such an interjection should appear for all time to come in the official *Debates* without any authority from me or from the reporters. I did make an interjection on that occasion. What I said was this: The hon. member has been speaking of the progress of development, and when the hon. gentleman in part of his speech announced the progress of his own ancestors 150 years ago, I said progressive development. Those words were the words I used. It was a compliment to the hon. gentleman, not a reflection on his ancestors—of whom the worst thing I know is that they were responsible for begetting the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman is quite correct in saying that he did not make use of the expression to which he has referred. I was listening very attentively to the debate, and can say that expression was made use of. I do not think the hon. gentleman used it.

Mr. BLAKE. I said, progressive development.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not denying what the hon. gentleman has just said. The expression was used from the other side by some hon. member; but by whom I am not prepared to say.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot tell whether it was used or not; I did not use it.

Mr. BOWELL. It was used by the other side.

Mr. MITCHELL. In the absence of the hon. gentleman referred to, I must say that I do not think the course pursued by the hon. gentleman who has just given this explanation is a very fair one, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) not being in his place. His concluding remarks certainly are very insulting.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I say the hon. gentleman's remarks are very insulting. They are not fair to the hon. gentleman who is absent. I think if that hon. gentleman were present, perhaps the hon. gentleman would not be so ready to utter those expressions. To say the least, it is in very bad taste, in the absence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macmaster), to use such a remark as that the worst thing I know of the hon. gentleman's ancestors is their begetting him.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not wish to lose a moment in making this explanation, and I see that the press of hon. gentlemen opposite have already alluded to this statement, this alleged statement made by me. I did not wish to lose a moment, because I did not wish it to appear in the permanent edition of the *Debates*. I do not think the statement I made just now—a jocose observation—is an insult at all, or any reflection. I said that was the worst thing I knew of the hon. gentleman's ancestors, of whom I had been speaking as a remarkable instance of the progress of development. I was pointing out how his ancestors had developed from the time when they stole cattle, and I said the worst thing I knew about them was their begetting him. That is not an insult to him or to them.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has a very extraordinary way of being jocose—he has an elephantine way of displaying his jocularity. I must repeat that I think it was very improper for the hon. gentleman to make such observations in the absence of the hon. member.

Mr. BLAKE.

REMUNERATION OF PUBLIC ANALYSTS.

House again resolved itself into Committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting remuneration of Analysts.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. At six o'clock I was pointing out that the general rule adopted was one which the hon. gentleman did not favor. The hon. gentleman said it was difficult to fix the salary on this occasion, because the analyst might be in such a position as to receive fees. I have pointed out that the statement was at variance with the custom and wholesome practice. I also desire to make the observation that it is no satisfaction to us to know that the money is afterwards to be voted by Parliament, because if we give authority to the Governor in Council to fix the salary, and an officer is appointed under this authority, we know that the money will be voted. The duty of Parliament is to know beforehand what the cost to the country will be, and therefore I press the necessity of maintaining and adhering to the wholesome and customary rule of fixing the salaries in the clause.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many analysts are to be appointed under this Act?

Mr. McLELAN. Eight.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us an estimate of the number of officers created by the Government during the recent Session?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understood the other night that the Minister stated that the chief analyst had been appointed. If that is the case, I would ask his name and his salary.

Mr. McLELAN. He will get $2,000 from the Department of Inland Revenue, and he will be paid $800 for certain services in connection with the Department of Customs in analysing articles imported.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he to be paid extra for that?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, $800; the $2,000 to be made up by fees or salary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who is to act as local analyst in the city in which the chief analyst lives?

Mr. McLELAN. He may himself.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has not that been determined upon?

Mr. McLELAN. No; and that is the reason the salary is not fixed, because he may not be appointed as local analyst, and he may receive part of his salary from local fees, the balance to be provided by the Department coming down to the House and asking for a vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Supposing there is an appeal taken from his decision as local analyst to the chief analyst, how will the hon. gentleman manage in that case?

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose he will not act in that case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there any objection to mentioning his name?

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Sugden Evans is the gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. Can there be any difficulty in stating the salary in the Bill. Seeing that the whole arrangement is made, what difficulty can there be in drawing a clause which will cover the salary and how it is to be paid?

Mr. McLELAN. The trouble is, that the local fees may vary from time to time, so that we could not put any fixed supplementary amount in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The remuneration is to be $2,800, and of that the country is to pay certainly $800, through the Customs Department, and also the difference between $2,000

and the amount he may receive from fees from year to year. Why not draw a clause to that effect, and then Parliament could be asked to agree to that proposition. At present, Parliament is asked to assent to the proposition that the Governor in Council may do what they please. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given any reason for departing from the wholesome and customary rule.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Can the hon. gentleman state where the analysts are to be stationed ?

Mr. McLELAN. I cannot. The third clause provides that districts may be laid out, with such limits as may be assigned to them by the Governor in Council. These districts may vary.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many altogether ?

Mr. McLELAN. Eight in all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What will be the probable cost of analysis in those eight districts ?

Mr. McLELAN. The local analysts are to be paid by fees.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Collected from the people ?

Mr. McLELAN. They are to be paid by fees in proportion to the amount of work they perform, and the salary will be paid from a sum provided for that purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. They are to be paid by the public, then.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The money clause of the Bill says they are to be paid partly by salary and partly by fees, and I had supposed that was the intention of the Government. I was about to ask if the Government had arrived at the stated sum they were to be paid.

Mr. McLELAN. They are to be paid by fees, and these may be supplemented by a charge. It is provided that we can make up their salary to a reasonable amount according to the amount of fees they collect.

Mr. MILLS. Is there any maximum sum fixed as the salary of the other analysts ?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MILLS. There is no particular sum yet determined upon ?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. MILLS. Have the Government made enquiries as to the fees to be charged, and for what purposes they are to be charged ? I suppose they have some idea of the materials that will require analysis. The whole subject has no doubt been enquired into by the Department and information obtained before this subject was introduced at all; and I think the committee are entitled to the information on which the Government are proceeding.

Mr. McLELAN. This system has been in operation for a number of years, under fees fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS. What sum have the Government heretofore received from fees ?

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared at present to state the amount of fees.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended to depart from the scale and mode of remuneration of the analysts at present ?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no intention to make a change. Of course, the matter is open to change by Order in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said, as I understood, that the existing analysts were paid fees, partly from the Government and partly from individuals. It is now proposed to pay them partly by salary from the Government and partly by fees from individuals. It is important that we should know what that salary is to be, because there are seven of them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know what the probable cost of this Bill is going to be. I think we have a right to know that before it passes. This Session, a great many new offices have been created, involving a very heavy outlay on the people.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman is speaking as if we were adopting a new system entirely. The only change is the appointment of the chief analyst. There was provision in the old Bill for the appointment of a chief analyst by Order in Council, and under that a chief analyst was appointed six or eight months ago, and he works for the Department of Customs as well as for the Department of Inland Revenue. For the present, he is at Ottawa. His salary has been paid during that time, and this clause provides for its payment. There is really no new office created, and no increase involved by the Bill caused by the Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am aware that this is not a new Bill; but I am asking the probable cost of this one. We have created a great many new offices, and the country wants to know what they are going to cost, how the money is to be expended and what is the necessity of the increased expenditure ?

Mr. McLELAN. We are not asking any increased expenditure. The chief analyst now receives a salary of $2,800, of which $2,000 is chargeable to the Inland Revenue Department and $800 to the Department of Customs. This is not a provision for a new expenditure; it is only a repetition of a clause in the old Act.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the hon. Minister say what objection there is to stating the salary in this Bill, since it has been distinctly arranged ? Why not follow the old custom, whenever offices are created in the Civil Service ?

Mr. McLELAN. This is an office requiring a great deal of technical skill and knowledge, and it was under exceptional circumstances that this gentleman was obtained for the sum stated.

Mr. MILLS. Where is he from ?

Mr. McLELAN. He is from Montreal. It may be, in the demand for gentlemen of his exceptional qualifications, that $2,800 may not be sufficient to retain him; or he may be, by accident or other circumstances, removed, and it may not be possible by any sum we may fix now to obtain a man with the necessary qualifications to discharge the delicate duties of that position. There has been so little experience had in the matter that it is better to leave the fixing of the salary to the Governor in Council.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the reason assigned by the Minister is a wholly unsound one, and I am satisfied that a fuller enquiry on his part will convince him that there is no dearth whatever of persons qualified to fill this office. What are the qualifications required in a public analyst ? A knowledge of theoretical and practical chemistry, principally organic chemistry; and it is idle to say that there is any probability of there being any dearth of material of that kind. In England there are more persons qualified to do this class of work than there are positions for them; Germany is turning out far more chemists than can be utilised; and in our own Dominion there are institutions turning out excellent men every day. I know the qualifications of the public analyst of the Province of Ontario, and the duties he performs are just such as are proposed to be assigned to the chief analyst here; and I know very well that when he applied for that office, he only obtained it after the keenest competition among a great many very qualified men; and it is idle to tell us there is any dearth of men fit to fill the office. I say that the salary proposed to be given to this officer is far in excess of the salary paid to-day, and which has been for years paid

by the Province of Ontario. I do not know what duties you are going to assign to this gentleman in connection with the Department of Inland Revenue, but I suppose they will be in some proportion to the salary. If I heard aright, the hon. the Minister says the salary will be $2,800 a year, $800 of which are to be chargeable against the Customs Department and the other $2,000 are to be charged in respect of his duties as public analyist. Then, I suppose that as public analyst his duties will represent about two-thirds of all his duties, if they are to be in proportion to the salary attached to that branch of his services. I can tell the hon. gentleman that the duties assignable to the public analyst for the Province of Ontario are not sufficient to occupy one-tenth of his time; in fact, so little of his time is required as public analyst that he discharges, besides, very high duties in connection with the public service, as professor in a school. I think that the Minister has not given that full attention to this question it is entitled to receive. There is no necessity, in my opinion, for creating an office to be filled solely by an analyst, nor can there be any justification for the statement made by the Minister that he is obliged to give a special salary in this particular case, on the ground that the number of persons qualified to fill the position is limited.

Mr. MILLS. I think that the House is entitled to more information than the Minister is disposed to give. What is now proposed shows the impropriety of proceeding in this way. What the Minister proposes to do is, that the House shall abandon its duty and hand over to the Government, for the time being, the regulation of the amount of the charge to be imposed on the public revenue. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I read the resolution: "That the Governor in Council may cause such remuneration as he deems proper to be paid to the analysts, and such remuneration, whether by fees or salary, or partly in one way or partly in another, may be paid to such analysts out of such sums voted for Parliament for the purposes of the Act." Now, the hon. gentleman may see that whether the Government will pay these parties, other than the chief analyst, more than the the amount they receive for fees, is entirely left to the Government itself. What the Government should do is give to the House the information it has, and make a proposition to the House as to what amount it thinks reasonable to pay. Then it will be for the House to determine whether it will grant the amount the Government asks or not. It does not matter whether the payment be by fees or in some other way; the charge is a charge upon the people, and it will be possible for the Government to make these fees a part of the public revenues and to fix the amount of salary, if they think proper. What the Government should do is to inform the House as to the amount already paid, the amount that is derived from these fees, and give some information as to the duties these men will have to discharge, how much of their time their duties will occupy, and how much they are likely to receive for the year. The hon. gentleman has told us, so far as the chief analyst is concerned, that he is to receive a fixed sum of $2,800 per year. If he does not receive this sum by fees, then the deficiency, whatever it may be, must be made up out of the ordinary revenue. Now, I say that is not sufficient. The Ministers should inform this House generally with regard to the proposition they submit to Parliament; they should make themselves conversant with the measure they propose to ask Parliament to sanction. This has not been done. If it has been done, the hon. gentleman has not been frank with the committee in not imparting to it the information he possesses; and if he has not the necessary information, he should not ask us to proceed until he has obtained it; he should tell us what he expects to derive from these fees, the amount of salary he expects those parties will receive for the year. If he does not do that, he has no right to ask us for this money, and the committee will be derelict in its duty if it should give the power this Government asks us to place at its disposal.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What are the qualifications of the chief analyst? Who has been appointed? Is he a druggist and chemist?

Mr. BOWELL. He is a druggist, a chemist and a doctor.

Mr. McLELAN. It is well known to all the public, except the hon. gentleman, that he is a leading chemist, and well fitted for the situation. He has been secured at this salary. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says I have not informed the House of the position of affairs. I think I have stated clearly and frankly it is proposed to pay this gentleman $2,800, and I further stated that, year by year, the Government will have to come to Parliament for the money to pay his salary, and all the expenses in connection with the office. It will then be in the power of Parliament to demand the fullest explanations of every dollar that may be asked for.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like the hon. member to explain the qualifications this gentleman possesses for the office.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman, from his profession, ought to know what are the requisite qualifications the public analyst at the head of the service requires.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite well understand that; but what I want to know is, what are the qualifications possessed by this gentleman? What degree does he hold? Is he merely a practical druggist? What is he? I am asking something quite proper. I have heard he is a druggist, but I have heard of other druggists, whose names are much more familiar than his, not only in Montreal, but in Ontario. I am asking a proper question, and I think the Minister should give a proper answer.

Mr. McLELAN. He is a doctor of medicine, and has given special study to the science of chemistry, and is recognised as an authority.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have the other analysts any fees to collect from their office? Is there a salary to be fixed for them? I am not asking this in a factious or captious spirit at all. I want to find out, because I think the time has arrived when we should put a stop to the multiplication of offices.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not a multiplication of offices. The practice that has obtained in the past is this, speaking particularly of the Customs Department: When it is necessary to ascertain the components parts of an article imported, which the officers at the different ports are not able to decide, for instance, quack medicines and other articles, which are composed of different ingredients—some are 50 per cent. *ad valorem*, others are $1.90 per gallon—we send them to an analyst, and, after he reports, the duty is fixed in accordance with the report he makes. He then renders his account for the work done for the Department, and we pay it. As far as Mr. Evans is concerned, during the eight months he has been at headquarters we have saved more than the amount we formerly paid at the different ports of the Dominion. In Montreal in particular, we were constantly referring to Mr. Evans or to Mr. Edwards, or to some other eminent chemist in that city, to report on these matters. In Toronto, and particularly in Halifax, and in all the large ports in the Dominion, it was continually necessary to refer questions in dispute between the importers and the officers of the Department, to eminent chemists, in order to ascertain the

correct duty at which these articles should be entered. After the Bill was passed last Session, giving the Government power to appoint a chief analyst, having his headquarters in Ottawa, it was decided that he should receive $2,000 per annum from the Inland Revenue Department and $300 from the Customs Department. That $800 is taken from the appropriation voted for the board of appraisers and the detective service. Mr. Evans occupied a position at the head of his profession as a chemist and analyst in the city of Montreal, and came with the very highest recommendations to the Government, and the Minister of Inland Revenue selected him as having the best qualifications of any who made application. Whether the salary is too large for a gentleman of that character and his eminent abilities, is for the House to decide. It is very difficult to find a man in whom the Government can place implicit confidence, particularly for the work he has to perform, unless they pay him well for it. His own income as a druggist was such—as my hon. friend says, he was carrying on a large business in Montreal—that he could not be induced to accept the situation here unless he was given the salary which he has obtained; and, judging from the services he has rendered to the Customs Department, I can assure the House that, judging more particularly from a pecuniary standpoint, it has been a saving.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then, if he takes the place of the board of appraisers, I should like to know if their services have been dispensed with?

Mr. BOWELL. I am surprised at the—I will not say the absurd—question the hon. gentleman has asked. I said nothing about his taking the place of the board of appraisers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not seem to draw the distinction—perhaps, because he does not know—between the board of appraisers at headquarters, and the appraisers who are appointed at each port in the Dominion. I was speaking of the appraisers in the different ports where entries are made of all the different articles which are brought into this country, and where disputes arise with the importers. I was not speaking of the board of appraisers here, at headquarters.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you not say so before?

Mr. BOWELL. I did say so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No.

Mr. BOWELL. I must apologise to the hon. gentleman for being so stupid. I thought I was sufficiently plain in my statement, and I only regret that I was unable to make the hon. gentleman understand it. The board of appraisers here, I must tell the hon. gentleman, are not chemists. Their knowledge relates more especially to dry goods, and hardware, and groceries, and matters of that kind. If I proposed to add a chemist to the board, the hon. gentleman might complain of the extra expense.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will not object to any expense required for the public service of this country. I cannot understand ——

Mr. BOWELL. I believe that.

Mr. LANDERKIN—why so many additional officers have to be created in this present Session, when our expenses are becoming alarmingly great. We have added, I should think, nearly 1,000 new officers during the present Session, and we have increased the salaries of those officers to an amount which cannot be less than $1,000,000.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, say two.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Probably I am lower than it really is. We have all the officers who are established under the Franchise Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is bearing upon it. Then we have the additional Librarian. Then the Postmaster General applied to have superintendents appointed for the mail carrying service, and we have an additional officer of this House, and additional officers elsewhere, and I cannot understand how it is that the public service did not require these officers until the present Session, when the needs of the country are greater than they ever were before. I am in earnest in saying that it is about time that the Government should be given to understand that we will not submit to the multiplication of offices which is placing such a heavy burden on the people of this country. Whether my protest is valid or not, I will omit no opportunity of protesting against the unnecessary and reckless increase of the expenditure in order to maintain friends and favorites of the Government in places.

Mr. MILLS. The Government have already analytical chemists in their service, those connected with the geological branch, and the assay department. No doubt these men, with high scientific attainments, and with all the appliances for analysis, could give to the Government all the assistance they require, with a very small additional compensation. It seems to me that the appropriations which the Government ask are unnecessary, and that the power is an improper one to seek—when the information which the House is entitled to, at the hands of the Administration, is not given. We have the Ministers coming down, day after day, confessing that they are unable to give the House that information which it is entitled to possess, and which it would be derelict in its duty to the Government if it failed to demand, before agreeing to the resolution which the Government has submitted. The analytical chemists in the geological service could act for the other Departments of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says no; I say yes; and I say that, if an enquiry was permitted, we could show that that is the case. The very same kind of analysis required from the analyst the Government propose to appoint is that which has to be carried on in analysing minerals, which these men are obliged to test in the Geological Department. The Minister has not given the information which we ought to have. What fees have been collected during the past twelve months for work of this kind? How much have the Government paid; what fees have they charged? What work has been done by those whom they employed to make these analyses heretofore? We are entitled to know what work these men will be called upon to discharge, how long they will be employed, whether their whole time, or what portion of their time, is likely to be occupied. We are entitled to the fullest possible information, and yet we have a Government, professing to be statesmen of superior capacity, who show themselves to be notoriously unacquainted with every proposition they submit to Parliament for its consideration. Before another step is taken the hon. gentleman ought to impart to the committee the information which we are entitled to receive from him. If the people's representatives have one duty paramount over all others, it is to control the public expenditure, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall abandon that control and leave it entirely in the hands of an Administration that has increased the cost of the Government of this country at the rate of over a million a year. Before these gentlemen came into power they complained of their predecessors' extravagance, who governed the country at a cost of twenty-three and a half millions a year, while our annual expenditure has now reached the sum of thirty-five millions a year. And here we have another proposition to increase the expenditure.

Why, these gentlemen have not the courage of their convictions. They will not come down to the House and tell the people what additional burden they propose to put upon the country. They are afraid they would so alarm their friends behind them that they would not have the courage to support them in the present condition of the public revenue. Yet they propose to ask us to vote this money blindfolded, to put into their hands the control of the public funds of the country, so far as it may be necessary to satisfy those whom they propose to appoint to these offices. I say these appointments are unnecessery, that the Government have now at their disposal men capable of making these analyses for a very small additional charge to the country. But they wish to satisfy a certain number of friends, and the whole Bill bears upon its face the marks of a job.

Mr. McLELAN. Then the job was commenced in 1875, and the hon. gentleman is responsible for initiating it. A Bill was passed by the hon. gentleman, in 1875, with this very same clause, with this very same provision. All that we have added to it was done last year, when Parliament was asked to provide for a chief analyst, and the House re-enacted the clause which the hon. gentleman and his Government put in the Bill in 1875, and which has been in operation up to the present time. We proposed no change last year in the mode of operation from what the hon. gentleman provided for in 1875. But last year, after due consideration and discussion of this matter, the House agreed to provide for a chief analyst, and to provide for him in the same mode that the hon. gentlemen opposite had provided for the local analysts they had appointed, and to pay him in the same manner. There has been no provision for new offices, and no arrangement to create a job. If there be any jobbery at all, it was initiated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and continued by them during the time they held office.

Mr. MILLS. It is being initiated now.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not a new thing. The whole Act is being reconsidered and re-enacted, and we are not asking you to go one step farther than the old Act provided.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not got the old Act before me, but I was under the impression that the fixing and giving a salary to the analyst was a new feature in the Bill.

Mr. McLELAN. Section 4 of the old Act reads:

"The Governor in Council may cause such remuneration to be paid to such analysts as he may deem proper, and such remuneration, whether by fees or salaries, or in part by both, may be paid to them out of any sum voted by Parliament for the purposes of this Act."

The only word that we have added is the word "chief."

Mr. MULOCK. I have already asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what objection there was to setting forth in this resolution the outside salary that this officer was to receive. He gave a certain answer, which I think does not supply a reason, and I would ask him now, whether, in view of the farther discussion and light that has been thrown upon this point, he is now willing to put in the Bill the outside salary of this office.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think it would be well to fix a salary in the Bill, because it might be impossible for us to obtain the services of a competent man to discharge the important duties of analyst for a sum we might now name. But the House have it in their hands to control, because we have to come down every year and ask whatever sum the Governor in Council may think well to fix. When the Estimates are before the House the fullest information will be given, and all details will be submitted to Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman has stated that the chief analyst and the analysts are not to be paid any salary at all, but are to be paid entirely by fees.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. Then he says that the chief analyst is to be paid a fixed salary, but the sub-analysts are to be paid by fees. If they are to be entirely paid by fees, why do you provide that they are to be paid otherwise than by fees in the resolution?

Mr. McLELAN. They are to be paid for the work they do for the Department, by a scale of fees fixed by the Governor in Council. Suppose a person goes into a district and purchases some goods to be submitted for analysis. He gets the report of the analyst upon it, and pays him a certain fee for that service.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister has stated that the class of person required to fill this office efficiently is so limited that there is considerable risk of his being unable to fill the office from time to time; in other words, that he is to arrange the salary to suit the applicant himself—that the applicant is to fix the salary, and not the employer. That is a statement which, I venture to say, public opinion will not endorse.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has there been any salary paid to any analyst, quite apart from fees, hitherto?

Mr. McLELAN. No; not yet.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is not this Bill, then, new in that respect?

Mr. McLELAN. The matter has not yet received the consideration of the Government. It is possible it may do so hereafter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The country has a right to know what the charges are that are going to be imposed. In view of the fact that the Act has been on the Statute Book a long time, and that it is now proposed to pay the officers salaries instead of fees, the Minister should be able to say what is the maximum amount of salary intended to be paid. The hon. gentleman is proposing to fix the salaries, by Order in Council, of seven officers.

Mr. McLELAN. We have not arranged that they will be paid permanent salaries.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is so stated in the Act.

Mr. McLELAN. They may or may not be so paid. If one of the local analysts has much work thrown upon him by the Government, it may be better to pay him a round sum rather than fees.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On looking back at the Act of 1874, passed on 26th May, 1874, an Act intituled: "An Act to impose license duties on compounders of spirits; to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, and to prevent the adulteration of food, drink and drugs." The 14th clause provides:

"The Governor may appoint in each Inland Revenue division one or more persons possessing competent medical, chemical and microscopical knowledge, as analysts of food, drink and drugs, purchased, sold or offered for sale within such division, and may cause such remuneration to be paid to such analysts as he may deem proper."

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many public analysts have been appointed since that Act was passed?

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the citing of a bad Act justifies this measure. Moreover, I believe the Government that passed that Act are not now in power, and I dare say that the measure was a measure which induced the public to change the Government. At all events, I was not a member of the Government or of the House at the time, and I repudiate any responsibility for any measure prior to my accession to this House.

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot see that the Act quoted is a precedent. When the legislation was initiated the Government could not be aware as to what the duties of the officers would be, and that would afford very good justification for

leaving the amount of salary in abeyance. Eleven years have passed, and the Government have had experience as to the duties of those officers. The remuneration of the analysts should depend on the character of the work they have to perform, and on the quantity of work. We have been waiting to know what duties they discharge and what fees have been received.

Mr. McLELAN. These officers are paid by fees for work done, and the results of their labors have been published in the Blue Books from year to year.

Mr. DAVIES. Can you give any approximate idea of the fees received by them?

Mr. McLELAN. When we come down to ask the money vote, we shall be able to give some information on that point.

Mr. MILLS. The proper time to give that information is now, when the subject is being considered in committee. Why has not the Government submitted a specific sum? The Act has now been in force eleven years, and the First Minister has read a provision from it. The Government passed it as a tentative measure, they not possessing all necessary information. Information has been collected during the last eleven years. Now, they propose to provide for the appointment of a certain number of analysts; they know what duties they are to discharge and what fees they are to be paid, and I say the Minister ought to be in a position to give the House information on this subject, and without that information he has no right to expect the committee to vote for these resolutions. We have a right to know why we are not called upon to vote a specific sum. The hon. gentleman proposes to fix the salary of one party, but he does not fix the salaries of the rest. What compensation are they to receive? If the fees are enough for the others, why does he not pay the chief analyst by fees, and fees alone? I say we are entitled to information on this subject, which the Minister has not given to us.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Bothwell is not in harmony with his leader, because just before six o'clock the leader of the Opposition stated that he had always condemned the principle of putting in the hands of the Governor in Council the power of appointing men, and saying what salaries they should receive. The hon. gentleman says that when the party is proposed, the Government should also submit to the House the amount of salary. Now, the hon. gentleman is one of the parties that initiated that law; yet he and his leader are two of the strongest to condemn it in this House, and other members on that side are supporting him, and they appear to debate it with that kind of viciousness which is one of the characteristics of the worst kind of opposition, an opposition without any special object in the way of serving the country or doing any good. When it was recognised by some hon. gentlemen on that side that the Bill had been initiated by that party, they very quietly sat down and said no more.

Mr. MILLS. It may be impudent on the part of any hon. gentleman to ask that information should be given to the House; the hon. gentleman who has just spoken may be ready to take a leap in the dark, when necessary, but there are some hon. members here who do not propose to follow his example. Here is an Act which has been in operation for eleven years; the Government know what has been done under that Act; they have been administering it for the greater portion of that time; they have the necessary data, and we ask simply that the House shall be given that information which the Government has in its possession, and we say that having that information, if they chose to take the trouble of mastering the details, they are in a position to propose a specific sum instead of an indefinite resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Bothwell, and most hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question, have discussed it from the supposed standpoint that an officer was to be appointed in each of the seven districts into which it is proposed to divide the Dominion for this particular purpose. Now, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has explained the question to the House, has stated the facts over and over again. He has stated that it is not proposed to make any new appointements, and that the law in the past has provided for the appointment of analysts in different sections of the Dominion. Those analysts exist to-day; they are appointed to-day. I call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell to the gentleman who occupies that position in the city of London, and whose qualifications for the work he will not dispute.

Mr. MILLS. A very competent man.

Mr. BOWELL. We may desire an article analysed in the western section—take tea dust, for example; I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman remembers that a large quantity of that article was stopped a short time ago, on account of its supposed deleterious character. A sample of it was sent to Mr. Saunders, of London, to analyse, with the request that he would report to the Department the particular ingredients of which that so-called tea was composed, and what foreign matter it contained which made it unhealthy to the people. He made that report, for which he made a specific charge. That charge was paid out of the general revenue, and if he is not asked to do any more work in twelve months, he gets no more pay. That is Mr. Saunders' position, and that is the position of every analyst in the Dominion to-day. But, after some years' experience, it was thought that a large sum might be saved by having a man possessing superior qualifications, located at headquarters, at Ottawa, receiving a certain salary, so that, in cases similar to the one to which I have referred—instead of sending to Mr. Edwards, of Montreal, or Mr. Saunders, of London—I send the sample to Mr. Evans, in the Inland Revenue Department, who would tell me of what it was composed, and whether it came within the meaning of the Act for the protection of the people, in providing them with healthy food. Now, I called the attention of the committee, a few moments ago, to the fact that in my own Department I know that the amount we are paying through the Board of Customs has been more than saved since Mr. Evans has been here; and I am convinced that instead of this being an increase of expenditure in this particular labor, throughout the Dominion, it will be a saving to the revenue. The hon. member for Brant said that this clause was imperative; that the word "shall" was used, implying that he must receive a certain salary. Now, I have read the clause through, and I cannot find the word "shall," from beginning to end. It is as permissive as it can be written. If these men were to be paid by specific fees, those fees would be paid out of consolidated revenue. In the Customs Department it is charged to contingencies at the different ports where these questions arise, and it is reported every month to the Department under that head. There is no question that the information which the hon. member for Bothwell asks can be obtained, but it would require an investigation of the whole contingencies account for the past year. I do not say that the House should not receive that information, but I can assure the House that, so far as the Customs Department is concerned, it will be a saving to the general revenue for the whole Dominion, rather than an extra expenditure; and I am quite sure that so far as the Inland Revenue Department is concerned, the same result will follow, from the fact that the gentleman who is at headquarters at Ottawa will perform the labor which has been done in the past by the different local analysts in the different cities, such as Charlottetown, Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Hamilton or London, because

in all these large ports we have occasionally, and continually, in fact, to keep referring questions of this kind to this particular class of officers, so that the House may be under no misapprehension as to the expenditure which is to be incurred by the passage of this Act. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that we should use the officers of the Geological Department. Most of these gentlemen are fully employed in the particular work which they have to perform. Questions come up in my Department with reference to the geology of the country; such questions, in fact, often do rise; certain parties claim that a particular kind of clay should be treated as foreign, that asbestos does not exist here, that another mineral does not exist here, and so on, and applications are made to place such articles on the free list. When I require information of that kind, I send samples to the Geological Department, asking for a report, so that the Government may be in a position to come to a correct decision as to whether a certain and particular article should be placed on the free list or be made dutiable. In that way the Geological Department has been utilised. But as to its being utilised in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell, I am satisfied, if he were on this side of the House, he would not attempt it, and if he did he would not succeed.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). While the hon. Minister is correct in stating that the word "shall" is not here, according to the interpretation of the First Minister, the word "may" has the full force and effect in the statute that the word "shall" would have. There is no doubt that the word "may" is permissive as between fees and salary; but we have been informed by the Minister in charge of the Bill that he proposes to pay the chief analyst partly by salary and partly by fees, and it was but a fair inference that he intended to pursue the same course with regard to the other analyst; and what we, on this side of the House, have been endeavoring to find out is, what the maximum amount of salary to be given was. When the Minister has told us that he has not made up his mind to give them any salary, but may allow them to go on and be paid by fees, we cannot expect him to give us any information on that point; but if he intended to put them partly under salary, the same as the chief analyst, Parliament was entitled to know that amount.

Mr. VAIL. I observe, in the report of the Inland Revenue Department, that the vote for the adulteration of food last year was $12,000 and the expenditure $11,780. I notice in the details that the London man, for instance, received in fees $1,366, a retaining allowance of $200, and $100 for rent. It appears to me the hon. Minister might have taken these figures, and told us whether he intended to change these salaries, or what he has done with the appropriation of $12,000; and whether the fees are paid into the consolidated fund, or what is done with them. I think the hon. Minister might have given us this information in a few words.

Mr. McLELAN. I presumed that the hon. gentleman had that information before him. The Order in Council fixing the scale of fees has been before the House for some time.

Mr. VAIL. In Halifax $1,468 are down for fees; $200 as a retaining allowance, and $100 for rent.

Mr. McLELAN. The $1,468 are paid out of the $12,000.

Mr. VAIL. Then, I take it for granted that the fees go into the consolidated fund.

Mr. McLELAN. We pay the analyst fees for whatever he does for the Department.

Mr. VAIL. Then, the salary might have been fixed, because the books show what he has been paid.

Mr. BOWELL. No. A special amount of work might be thrown on the officer in one year, under this scale of fees, and the next year he might not be paid one-third of the amount. If he is only called upon to make one analysis during the year, we only pay him for that analysis $8, or $10, or $20, as the case may be.

Mr. WILSON. I think the first suggestion was only a reasonable one. It is very easy for us to say that the salary of the chief analyst should be fixed, and that it should not be left to the Governor in Council at any future time to increase it. The reason offered by the Minister, that we might not be able to keep the present man or to get another for $2,800, will hardly convince this committee. Judging from the duties he has performed, it is quite evident that the Government are aware what the compensation should be; and if circumstances should arise, rendering it impossible to keep him, it will be a very easy matter to obtain an equally efficient man from some of the educational institutions in the country. The duties are not onerous or difficult, and we ought to stipulate in the Bill what the salary is to be, so that we shall know what we have to pay. The principle of government by Order in Council is a dangerous one, and should not be recognised by this House, except in cases of extreme necessity; and before this Bill passes, I think we ought to insist that the salary of the chief analyst should be fixed in it. Reference was made to the fact that the Act was passed when our friends were in power. That was a long time ago. The circumstances then and the circumstances now are very different. You know definitely now what the duties of those officers are. Then it was a new measure, and we could not say what their duties would be. Having had the experience of eleven years, you ought to be in a position to say what the services of those analysts are worth, and more especially what the services of the chief analyst are worth. By leaving it in doubt, and implying that on account of the great importance of his duties you may have to pay more, you place a chief analyst in the position of being warranted in applying for an increased salary. The Government ought to make up their minds what the position is worth, before they submit a proposition to the committee.

Resolution to be reported.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT, 1874.

Mr. McLELAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 135) further to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and Acts amending the same. He said: The changes are comparitively few, and relate chiefly to the inspection of fish, hides and grain. Hitherto, the inspection was, under certain circumstances, compulsory. Under the old Act, when any district desired to bring that Act into force, it made application to the Government, and inspectors were appointed, and in all the districts which were embraced in the application the Government inspection then became compulsory. As regards pork, beef, butter and flour, the inspection was voluntary, and under this system there were less complaints than under the compulsory system. It is proposed now that the inspection system shall be voluntary in every case.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIES. I did not understand the Minister to explain the meaning of the first section:

"The Governor in Council may appoint a chief inspector of any of the articles hereinbefore enumerated, who shall hold office during pleasure, and shall perform the duties hereinafter assigned to him."

The Act of last year did not contemplate the appointment of a chief inspector. This is to be a new appointment, with a proportionate salary, and we ought to be told what necessity there is for this appointment. What has transpired to justify it? What are the duties to be discharged? What is the salary to be given, and out of what fund will it come?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not proposed we will pay him a salary. He shall be paid by fees. The different Boards of Trade have asked that an inspector shall be appointed mainly for the inspection of grain, and it is proposed to appoint an inspector who shall have a general oversight, if this uniform system is put in force.

Mr. DAVIES. The Act of last year provided that there should be inspectors appointed, from time to time, in the several cities named in the Act, and they should inspect, not only grain, but flour, meal, pork, etc. You propose to amend that by authorising the Governor in Council to appoint a chief inspector of all the articles. Where is he to reside?

Mr. McLELAN. It is mainly called for with respect to grain. The chief inspector of grain will be appointed in the west, and a chief inspector of fish and other articles may be appointed in another district, probably the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the Minister contemplate the possible appointment of seven inspectors?

Mr. McLELAN. The Bill says, of any of the articles.

Mr. DAVIES. I should like to know where the chief inspector, say, of beef and pork, or of fish, is to reside, and what are to be his duties, as distinct from those of the ordinary inspector?

Mr. McLELAN. If there is no necessity for either of these chief inspectors, none will be appointed. I think, however, a chief inspector of grain will be found necessary to go from place to place and see that the inspection is uniform. The services of chief inspectors are to be paid for by fees from the vendors or the persons requiring the inspection.

Mr. DAVIES. Then the Government have not received any information which will justify them in supposing that a chief inspector of any article will be required? It is merely an experimental measure.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; we have received representations from the Boards of Trade of Toronto and Montreal, asking for the appointment of an inspector of grain.

Mr. DAVIES. Have the Government determined to act upon those representations?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. Have the Government decided what the fees are to be?

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will find that in the Act.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not see it.

Mr. BLAKE. It is rather a large thing, our territory being so vast, to talk of one chief inspector for the Dominion of Canada, and if he is to be called upon by individuals to inspect, from time to time, in different parts of the country, it will involve large travelling expenses and very heavy costs in that way. Is it intended that the travelling expenses shall be paid, as well as the fees, by the people who call upon him to inspect, or by the Dominion?

Mr. McLELAN. The 6th and 7th sub-sections of section 11 provide for that.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see that this is going to be very workable. The applications which the hon. gentleman speaks of from the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Toronto for the appointment of a chief inspector of grain may be a justification for that appointment, but they do not seem to me to be a justification for appointing six other chief inspectors of different articles. The hon. gentleman says they may or may not be appointed, but I think the Government ought to have decided whether the trade required the appointments, and should not come to us upon speculation. Why should we be asked to give the Government the authority to appoint these officers when the Government have not themselves determined that it is fitting that they should be appointed. The first thing for the Government to do is to decide that this is fitting to be done; the second is to ask us to legislate on the subject, and the third is to give us the information in their possession, and ask us, upon that information, to concur in their conclusion.

Mr. McLELAN. The present law states that there shall be no inspection in any district unless it is ordered by the Governor in Council, and gives the Governor in Council power to declare that there shall be inspectors appointed in any district they deem fit. Now, this is going a very little beyond that. As soon as one of these inspectors is appointed for a district, then inspection becomes compulsory in that district. It goes beyond the power we are asking for in this Bill. We are not asking the House to go so far now, but all we do here is to provide that when a chief inspector of grain for the west is asked for by one of the great cities, like Toronto and Montreal, he is to be appointed. I omitted to mention that representations have been made from the city of Halifax for the appointment of a chief inspector of fish there; and it may be that other districts may think it desirable, in the interests of trade, to have an inspector. It may be necessary, in the interests of trade, that a fish inspector should be appointed in one district, or an inspector of flour in another district, so that there may be uniformity in the inspection of all that is brought into the market.

Mr. BLAKE. The principle of inspection proceeded on the notion that it was desirable there should be a process by which, when a locality desired the creation of an inspection district, it should make its representation to the Government, and upon this representation the Government would create an inspection district. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes here to establish a chief inspector for the whole Dominion in each of the seven different classes of articles.

Mr. McLELAN. Oh, no; not for each inspection district.

Mr. BLAKE. For how large a district?

Mr. McLELAN. We do not fix the area. The inspection will practically be for different articles of the same line in each locality—for instance, for grain and flour in the west, and for fish in the east.

Mr. BLAKE. But they grow grain in the east as well as in the west, and they catch fish in the west as well as in the east; but this question is not to be determined by the separate wishes of only two localities in the Dominion, but by a general apprehension of what the interests of the whole Dominion require. I say that upon such a question the Government's first business is to make up its mind what the interests of the country require, and then ask us to legislate upon such information as it may bring before us. This proposition is simply a delegation of our legislative powers to the Governor in Council.

Mr. McLELAN. Not to so great an extent as in the old Act.

Mr. BLAKE. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not say that an inspector, for instance, of fish, should be appointed upon the representation of any one locality ; but if representation is made from a number of districts, asking for a chief inspector of fish, it will be the duty of the Government to yield to those representations, and make the appointments, to meet the wants of trade.

Mr. BLAKE. I say that as soon as these representations get strong enough, and the Government has determined that it is expedient, in the public interest, to appoint a chief inspector, then they should come down here and ask authority, and show a reason for asking us to give them authority; but to give them this authority now is to bargain away our own power to decide in these matters. There is a constant course, on the part of the Government, of taking power after power, and of depriving Parliament of its legislative functions, in order to accumulate them in the hands of the Government of the day. The Government of the day says: We have no proof that the public interests of this country require the appointment of a chief inspector in any one of these articles, but it may be so in the future, and we ask you to surrender your legislative functions, and to allow us to make the appointment if we think it is expedient.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to appoint deputy inspectors under the chief inspector in each Province?

Mr. McLELAN. The deputy inspectors are already provided for under the old Act, and this is only providing that a chief inspector may be appointed for any of these articles that are now in the Bill.

Mr. WATSON. I am aware that there are not inspectors at prominent towns in Manitoba, where wheat is brought. There are troubles about the grading, and this has especially been the case at Port Arthur, where the grading has not given entire satisfaction.

Mr. McLELAN. Inspectors will be appointed at those districts where the trade requires them. It has been the practice, whenever a locality required an inspector, that an appointment be made.

Mr. WATSON. The Minister who introduced the Bill is, no doubt, well aware that the inspection at Port Arthur has not given satisfaction to the people of Manitoba. Wheat was sold at a certain price for a certain grade, the farmer selling it on the understanding that it would grade No. 1 and No. 2 hard. When it reached Port Arthur it was graded away down, and consequently the farmers received, in some cases, 10 cents per bushel less than the price they had expected to receive when they delivered it to the buyers.

Mr. McLELAN. That has been provided at page 5. Inspectors and chief inspectors will agree upon standards, and see that the grading is uniform at the different points.

Mr. WATSON. I see, at page 5, there are a number of classifications of wheat. Under those classifications the same trouble will exist in the future as has existed in the past, unless they are changed.

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIES. There is here an entire reversal of the Government's policy since last year. The Act last year expressly provided that the inspector and deputy inspectors should not have any interest, direct or indirect, in the articles inspected. It is now proposed to be provided that the inspector may be a dealer in the article inspected.

Mr. McLELAN. The first reason of the change is because the inspection is not compulsory. The second is, that the Bill provides that the deputy inspectors shall be responsible to the inspector, and when a deputy inspector inspects his own goods he must brand them with his own name, and the words "inspector and owner." In regard to fish, it has been found, in many cases, almost impossible to obtain inspectors who were not engaged in the business.

Mr. BLAKE. I have heard some reason of this kind given, but it does not answer the question to say the Act is not compulsory. It is presumed to be a great advantage to the trade to have an inspection. The deputy inspector may grade the fish of his rivals too low or grade his own fish too high. As to the suggestion that a deputy inspector should mark his own goods with his own name, as inspector and owner, the proposition is almost ludicrous.

Mr. STAIRS. In some cases it has been found absolutely necessary to have such a provision in the Act to secure any inspection whatever. It happens, at some of the fishing villages, to be impossible to get any one who understands the inspection of fish, unless you take a man who is engaged in the business of catching and curing fish. None of the difficulties suggested by the hon. gentleman can arise. A man who is not in the trade is just as likely to grade fish too high or too low as is an inspector, who, at the same time, is engaged in the business of catching and curing fish. The present provision has the advantage that it is honest. All the community will know that the deputy inspector can catch and cure fish himself; and if dealers were to find that the deputy inspector graded their fish too low, they would not go to him again. As to the inspector's own fish, it would soon be found whether he graded them too high or not, and if he did grade them too high, he would find difficulty in disposing of them.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, every fisherman should be an inspector of fish, and brand them "inspector and owner."

Mr. STAIRS. The hon. gentleman has just stated what is the only thing in fish inspection that amounts to anything, that the very best safeguard is for a man who packs them to try and make his own reputation for the brand. Fish exported are generally sold on the reputation of those who put them up. If you rely on the owner, I believe it is just as good as to rely on the inspector.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has delivered a very good argument in favor of not having an inspection of fish.

Mr. McLELAN. The chief inspector of fish for a locality is not expected to deal in the article himself, although his deputies, who are responsible to him, may do so. There are to be no deputy inspectors of grain, and none of the inspectors are allowed to deal in the article, for the reason that grain, after it is once mixed, cannot be identified.

Mr. WATSON. The chief inspector appoints the deputy inspectors?

Mr. McLELAN. There are no deputy inspectors appointed for grain, and the same power that appoints those officers, say, at Winnipeg, appoints them at Brandon or other places.

On section 7,

Mr. DAVIES. By the Act of last year the classification of the articles was provided for by Parliament. Now, you propose that the Governor in Council may modify the inspection. You propose that the Governor in Council may change that from time to time. We wish to know why the Governor in Council should take that power.

Mr. McLELAN. It is possible that the necessity may arise, in the interest of trade, for modifying the classification without waiting for the meeting of Parliament to get power to do so. Last year a difficulty arose with respect to the classification of Manitoba wheat; there was no

power under the Act to classify it or to fix the standard as high as the wheat would bear, and consequently injustice was done to the trade of Manitoba. I think it is desirable, in the interest of the producer, that this power should be given to the Governor in Council.

Mr. WATSON. I think, if every member will pay attention to his duty in this House, in looking after this Bill, it ought to be made so perfect that it would not require to be changed in one year. It is of the greatest importance, when we once establish a grade of wheat, that it should not be changed, so that the buyer, when he buys a certain grade of wheat, may know what kind of wheat he is getting. Of course, there have been mistakes in the past, owing to the absence of grades for Manitoba wheat; but so far as that article is concerned, I think we can perfect this Bill so that it will not require any changing.

Mr. McLELAN. I admit that no change should be made in this matter unless on the strongest representations and under the most urgent necessity; but from the experience we have had it is possible that an emergency may arise, when, in the interest of trade generally, there should be some modification. I am not wedded to this clause, and, in fact, hardly desire, personally myself, that this responsibility should be thrown on the Governor in Council. It was placed here for the consideration of the House. If it is the wish of the House that it should remain there, I am content; if it is the general wish of the House that it should be struck out, I am willing that that should be done.

On section 8,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think this differs from the resolution. The wording of the resolution was to the effect that a chief inspector of the seven classes of articles might be appointed, who should have power to decide disputes between inspectors and others, in regard to articles inspected. I approve of the change here, but in the previous discussion I pointed out how difficult it would be to refer matters to these inspectors. For instance, an inspector of leather and hides might be appointed, living at Halifax; and instead of having a dispute referred to him, it would be better to retain the old machinery of Boards of Trade in cities where they exist, and three disinterested persons appointed by magistrates in other districts. I see that the Bill retains this power, and yet provides for the chief inspector. Therefore, the question occurs, what particular need is there for this chief inspector?

Mr. McLELAN. An expert must be appointed. Especially in the article of grain, the chief inspector will be called on to decide disputes, instead of the old machinery being acted upon.

Mr. DAVIES. The idea of the Bill seems to be a very fair one, that in case of disputes between an inspector and the party owning the article inspected, a justice of the peace will have power to appoint three parties to settle the dispute; but no machinery is provided in the Act for bringing the owner before the justice of the peace. The summons is to issue, in the first place, to three persons, of skill and integrity. I think provision should be made for summoning the owner before the justice of the peace to appoint arbitrators, and then failing that, power should be given to the justice of the peace to appoint them.

Mr. McLELAN. Sub-section 2 of section 11 provides for that. One shall be named by the inspector or deputy inspector, another by the owner or possessor of the article in question, and a third by the justice of the peace, who, failing the attendance of either of the parties in dispute, may name a party for him.

Mr. DAVIES. The whole difficulty can be seen on reading the words "failing the attendance of the parties in dispute, shall name a person for him." How is he to know? When? Where? Supposing the inspector differs with the owner of some grain, and applies to a justice of the peace for arbitrators to be appointed, how is the owner to know he is to appoint an arbitrator, and when?

Mr. McLELAN. The second clause of section 11 provides that when any difference arises between the inspector or deputy inspector, and the owner or possessor of any article inspected, with regard to the quality or grade of the article, such dispute shall be referred to particular arbitrators. That is provided for in the old Act. Now, you provide a new board. I am not objecting to the mode, which, I think, is a very good one, but I submit that the machinery is not framed so as to enable a justice of the peace to carry out the provisions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What I wanted to bring before the Minister is this. He said it was desirable to appoint a chief inspector for grain, as he would have more authority. This is to provide for the appointment of a chief inspector for different articles; one for flour and meal alone, another for wheat, another for grain, another one for beef and pork, another for pickled fish and fish oil, another for butter, another for leather and rawhides. You appoint seven different sub-inspectors. The question is, whether there is necessity for that, when we do not make it imperative for the chief inspector to settle all disputes. We are adopting the machinery of the old Act, availing ourselves of the Boards of Trade in cities, and of the services of magistrates in calling in three different parties to settle disputes. Is it likely they will appoint chief inspectors?

Mr. McLELAN. I think not, except in the case of grain. I thought it would be advisable, in the interest of the trade, to have a chief inspector, well up in the business, who would instruct the various local inspectors and decide upon standards.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is of grain alone.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is he to be salaried?

Mr. McLELAN. No. The dealers in grain may call him in to decide a dispute, and if they employ him they will pay him. It makes no charge on the revenue of the country.

On section 11,

Mr. WATSON. The first three grades, on page 5, I think, will be quite satisfactory, although there may be some chance for dissatisfaction. For instance, No. 1 will be extra Manitoba hard wheat, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and composed of at least 85 per cent. of red fife wheat, grown in Manitoba or the North-West Territories of Canada. The other 15 per cent. might be wheat very objectionable to the millers and dealers, such as goose wheat. With reference to the other grades, I think the classification might be made more simple. Instead of having Nos. 1, 2, 3 northern spring wheat, you might make it simply Nos. 1, 2, 3 spring wheat. Take No. 1 northern spring wheat, not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and composed of at least 50 per cent. of red fife wheat, grown in Manitoba or the North West Territories; the balance might be goose wheat, or some other very objectionable wheat.

Mr. McLELAN. On page 7 it is provided:

"Any mixture of rice wheat, otherwise known as "goose" or "California" wheat, or of red chaf wheat, with other descriptions of wheat, shall exclude the parcel from regular inspection."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. gentleman has availed himself of the judgment of grain men in this?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes; the members of the Boards of Trade were consulted, and a great deal of care has been exercised in the preparation of this measure.

Mr. WATSON. Since the resolution was passed, upon which this Bill is framed, I have made enquiries from wheat dealers in Manitoba, and have received a number of letters. They are perfectly satisfied with the three first grades for Manitoba hard wheat. I understand that all the grades, except the last, on page 5, are intended for Manitoba wheat. If that is the case, I would propose to strike out or to change No. 1 Canada hard wheat, and to strike out No. 2 Canada hard wheat altogether, and to strike out No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 northern spring wheat, and instead of those grades I would suggest that there should be No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3 spring wheat:

No 1 Manitoba spring wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 85 per cent. of hard wheat grown in Manitoba or the North-West Territories of Canada.

That will provide for hard wheat of either white fife or red fife wheat. We have a grade of wheat that no provision is made for at all in this Bill, a grade of white fife wheat, which is bought by the millers and dealers in Manitoba at about the same price as the red fife wheat, and is of a superior quality to any other wheat grown in Canada, with the exception of red fife. This should be simplified to No. 1, 2 and 3 Manitoba spring wheat. No. 3 Manitoba spring wheat would cover all mixtures:

No. 3 Manitoba spring wheat shall comprise all wheat fit for warehousing, not good enough to be graded as No. 2, weighing not less than 56 pounds to the bushel.

This would give general satisfaction in Manitoba. I have considerable knowledge of handling wheat myself, and the Farmers' Union, who, though some people think they go outside of their jurisdiction occasionally, should be recognised in connection with the grading and handling of wheat, recommend these changes. There is the extra hard wheat, and the No. 1 hard wheat should be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and composed of 85 per cent. of fife wheat; No. 2 Manitoba hard wheat should be fairly well cleaned, with 58 pounds to the bushel, and 85 per cent. of red fife wheat. Those grades, with three grades of spring wheat, would cover all the grades out there. I have had representations from the west that other grades should be added, two grades for Manitoba hard white fife wheat, which is recommended highly by the Board of Agriculture in Manitoba, as well as by the Farmers' Union, and which ripens about a week earlier than the red fife wheat and yields fully as well. If it is a good quality of wheat, the Government ought to encourage it, by making a special grade for it. I move that these two grades be added to this Bill:

Manitoba No. 1 hard white fife wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of not less than 85 per cent. of hard white fife wheat, grown in Manitoba or the North-West Territory of Canada;

Manitoba No. 2 hard white wheat shall be sound and reasonably cleaned, weighing not less than 58 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 85 per cent. of hard white fife wheat grown in Manitoba or the North-West Territory of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not know whether my hon. friend thinks the whole country is contained in Manitoba. Did the Minister state that all the grades on page 5 referred to Manitoba?

Mr. McLELAN. We want to provide for other portions of Canada, but we give Manitoba the honor of heading the list. There is a good deal of wheat in the west which will require grading as well as Manitoba wheat, and we have provided for it. I think that, considering the care and attention which has been bestowed upon this, and the information which has been gathered from the various Boards of Trade throughout Canada and the North-West Territories, the various grades have been made with as careful consideration for the requirements of the business as would be possible. If you amend the Bill in one particular you may damage it in some others, and if, in any case, this grading should be found insufficient in practice, we have asked the House to give us the power to amend these special cases in some slight degree. I think the hon. gentleman cannot do better than to allow the classification we have made to stand for the present, until we see the result in practice.

Mr. WATSON. There could be no objections to entering these grades of white fife wheat. They cannot interfere with any of the other grades or classification.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a great mistake to make so many different grades of wheat. I have often heard complaints by the farmers that there were so many grades of wheat they did not know what the value of their wheat was. There are fifteen different grades here in spring wheat, and now you propose to add two more. Another thing is, that it encourages a grade for every distinct kind of grain which may be grown. I think there is no difficulty at all in classifying those different kinds of grain under some of the grades already mentioned. If I were to urge anything at all, it would be to diminish instead of increasing the number. It leaves you with scarcely any knowledge of the value of your wheat in the outside market. If you look at the prices of wheat in Chicago, Montreal or England, they are so mixed up in the grading that you cannot tell what is the value of your own wheat.

Mr. FARROW. I rather like the classification that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has proposed, as to first, second and third. But I think that in Manitoba it would require an extra class than his first class, because he proposed 15 per cent. mixture in the first class grade of spring wheat. Now, to my own knowledge, they grow a class of wheat there without any mixture.

Mr. WATSON. That is provided for—the Manitoba extra.

Mr. FARROW. I agree with the simple classification of first, second and third, and an extra class, and I thought that was the Bill. I agree with my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), that the fewer the classes and the less complication you can have, the better. Farmers will understand what they are doing, and buyers will understand what they are doing, and it would simplify the thing very much.

Mr. WATSON. I quite agree with both hon. gentlemen who have spoken. The information I have from Manitoba asks that the grading of wheat be simplified. There are so many grades in this Bill, and different mixtures, that it is almost impossible to tell what grade of wheat a man is selling. The first three grades are all right, one to be composed of red fife wheat and the other two grades are to have 85 per cent. red fife. There is a difference between the first and second of 2 pounds to the bushel, which is quite reasonable. Then the other grades of northern spring wheat, I understand they refer to Manitoba. I do not understand that, as a rule, Manitoba wheat will be mixed with Ontario wheat. It is well know that we grow a superior grade of wheat in Manitoba, and we get an extra price for it. Manitoba wheat on the market in Ontario is worth about 5 per cent. a bushel more than any other wheat grown in Ontario, and it is for the protection of the grades of Manitoba wheat that I would ask to have these changes made. I am sure the proposed system will be very unsatisfactory to buyers, because they would not know what the wheat was mixed with, one half Manitoba wheat, or not. The classification for spring wheat grown in Ontario comes at the bottom of the page—"Spring wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel." I should put on those spring wheat grades the numbers 1, 2 and 3; after

the No. 3 Manitoba hard, I should put Manitoba spring No. 2, and No. 3 Manitoba spring wheat. No. 1 would provide for grain that might be fixed after white fife and after red fife. No. 2 would be the same quality of wheat, but 2 pounds lighter on the bushel. No. 3 would be of wheat not fit to be classed as No. 2. I think it would simplify the grading of wheat and would give better satisfaction to both the buyer and the seller. A merchant in Ontario buys wheat in Ontario according to a certain grade, but he will not know, by this description of wheat, what he is getting. It might be 50 per cent. of one kind of wheat and 50 per cent. of another very inferior quality.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Watson) is thoroughly qualified to speak of Manitoba wheat, but his judgment, as I understand it, is not that of the Board of Trade of Winnipeg. No. 1 Canada hard wheat and No. 2 have been put in here, I presume, with a view to getting uniformity of grade between Manitoba wheat and the wheat grown in Ontario and other parts. Of course there is some strong fife wheat grown in parts of Ontario yet. There may be no objection to putting in these two qualities to cover the white wheat, perhaps, in Manitoba.

Mr. HESSON. I would not change the classification made here. I made enquiry of some gentlemen who have been dealing in grain for many years, what they thought of the present classification of grains, so far as Ontario productions are concerned, and they expressed themselves as quite satisfied with the grading, as not only adapted to the Canada hard white, but also for the fife wheat. As to the Manitoba product, I think the market is thoroughly satisfied with the provisions there. First, the extra Manitoba hard, which is a red fife, and the first and second qualities following, No. 1 Manitoba hard, also the red fife, and No. 2 Manitoba hard. It provides for a better quality of wheat, known as the red fife and Manitoba hard. Now, of the other two classifications, No. 1 Canada hard, I presume, would apply to almost any wheat, because it does not say it shall be red, or white, or fife. But there is a class that provides for it, called goose wheat, a mixture; consequently, I think, these two gradings for Canada hard would apply to Ontario and Manitoba for any class of wheat that is not set out as either red or white. I should not change it for the reason that, so far as I have been able to ascertain, after having submitted the matter to a good judge, I thought it a very good classification. The hon. member for Marquette's suggestion would simply add to the present wording the words "hard fife wheat."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. member for Marquette wants to cover hard white wheat.

Mr. McLELAN. In the correspondence and consultation with various Boards of Trade the reasons given for this grading and classification were that it might be used in comparison with the grading of wheat on the other side of the line. No. 1 Canada hard requires 85 per cent. of hard wheat, either white or red. I think it will be in the interest of the trade to adopt the classification as submitted.

Mr. WATSON. I have no objection to the first clause. I was proposing to insert Manitoba hard wheat in it; that is the only change I suggested. There is another classification which, I suppose, refers to spring wheat grown in Ontario. I understood that most of the classes were intended for Manitoba wheat. I suggest that to insert first, second and third Manitoba spring wheat will cover the whole grading more simply. The hon. member for North Perth has said this covers all the wheat in Manitoba. It does not cover the hard white fife wheat. I think that is grown nowhere else, except in Manitoba. We grow it there, and are entitled to a special grade for it. Our white fife wheat is very much superior to the Canada hard wheat of Ontario, and we should have all the benefit we are entitled to, by giving the hard wheat of Manitoba special classification.

Mr. McLELAN. We have done pretty well for Manitoba in these provisions. Manitoba is distinctly brought out in six grades; and there are two grades in which Manitoba wheat can be mixed with Canada hard wheat. There are other places in the Dominion where wheat is grown, besides Manitoba; and we want to publish the fact that we can grow elsewhere good hard wheat, whether white or red.

Mr. WATSON. I do not see any objection to inserting Manitoba hard white wheat. It cannot interfere with the grades of Ontario or other Provinces. With all due respect to the Board of Trade of Winnipeg, it is right to say that Winnipeg handles probably less grain than any town of 200 or 300 inhabitants in the North-West. There are very few markets along the line of railways that do not handle more wheat than does Winnipeg. There is not, in that city, a puplic warehouse for the handling of grain. With all due respect to the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and any information furnished by it, I consider the sources from which I have derived my information more competent to judge as to what grades should be adopted even than the Winnipeg Board of Trade. I feel satisfied, however, that that Board of Trade will be in accord with the grading I have proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Marquette is entirely wrong. While, no doubt, not much wheat is brought into Winnipeg, the buyers largely go out from there. I think it will be a great mistake to increase the number of grades. You have six out of fifteen applying to Manitoba. What does grading mean? It means giving a value to wheat in certain localities. People in the general markets know very little about what wheat is worth in other parts of the country. Although equally good samples of wheat are grown in other parts of the country, there is no index as to its value. In my opinion, there are already too many varieties of wheat graded, and too many for Manitoba. I consulted several wheat buyers, and that was the complaint they made. It is impossible for farmers to know what their wheat is worth, according to the large number of grades quoted. Another objection raised was that the grading is given for wheat raised in circumscribed areas. If possible, the grades should be made to apply all over the country. We have a very fine hard spring wheat raised in our part of the country, white wheat and red fife. I do not know why they should not be graded as high as Manitoba wheat.

Mr. WATSON. Why, then, is Manitoba wheat, worth 10 cents more per bushel?

Mr. SPROULE. Manitoba wheat does not bring 5 cents a bushel more than the wheat to which I am referring. We are living on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Manitoba wheat was brought down last fall and ground there, and it sold at only 2 cents more than the wheat raised in our part of the country. Therefore, it should not be made a separate and distinct class.

Mr. WATSON. I object to the remarks of the hon. gentleman, as all grain dealers know that Manitoba hard wheat is worth 10 cents more per bushel than is any wheat grown in Ontario. Under the new system of milling, the miller cannot make a high grade of patent flour without Manitoba hard wheat. I am sure that the hon. gentleman is wrong. Manitoba white wheat may not have been sold at more than 5 cents more than Ontario wheat, but perhaps it was a poor grade; but Manitoba hard wheat, weighing 60 pounds to the bushel, is worth 10 cents more to the miller in Ontario, to make patent flour, than any wheat grown in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. No; it is not.

Mr. WATSON. I know it is.

Mr. SPROULE. That is your opinion.

Mr. WATSON. I know it is the fact.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. WATSON. It is borne out by the facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I know it is not, in my part of the country.

Mr. WATSON. It is known all over the world, almost, that Manitoba grows better wheat than anywhere in the world, and that it is worth 5 cents a bushel more than Ontario wheat. I am in favor of simplifying the classification of grain, and if the Minister will accept my suggestion it will have that effect. I do not understand that dealers will buy half cargoes of Manitoba wheat and mix it with Ontario, and then sell it as No. 1, or No. 2 northern. I think consignments from the North-West will be sold at Manitoba if it comes from Manitoba, and that is the reason why the Manitoba people insist on special grades for their own wheat, because it commands a higher price than Ontario. We do not want it mixed with Ontario wheat, as it will probably injure the character of the North-West as a wheat growing country.

Mr. McLELAN. We have given you five special grades.

Mr. WATSON. I do not see the force of the hon. gentleman's explanation, because hon. gentlemen in this House claim that No. 1 or No. 2 northern may be half Ontario and half Manitoba. That is not a Manitoba grade, and what we want is a pure Manitoba grade.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman say that white fife wheat is as good as red fife? I am speaking of Manitoba.

Mr. WATSON. In my opinion it is not quite as good, but many buyers and millers appreciate it just as highly, and give the same price for it. It is a fine wheat, recommended to be grown by the Board of Agriculture for Manitoba, as it ripens a week earlier, which is an important thing, especially for grain which is sown late in the season.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not think that because the Board of Agriculture have been trying it as an experiment we should adopt that as a grade. We should fix a grade that is accepted by the trade. We have given you extra Manitoba hard, No. 1 Manitoba hard, and No. 2 Manitoba hard. Those grades are known, and will be carried out under that name. We have given you five special grades, three of which are wholly Manitoba, and the others 50 per cent., and surely the hon. gentleman should not object to that much of an admixture.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). If I understand, in the grading of this northern spring wheat there must be a large quantity of Manitoba wheat grown which does not go into either. It says it shall be 50 per cent. of red fife wheat, but there are considerable quantities of wheat grown in Manitoba and brought to Ontario which will not grade as red fife, and still comes from that country. But Manitoba having had its innings, I would draw attention to one or two matters affecting other portions of the Dominion. If you come to grading winter wheat, you find that No. 1 white winter wheat is put at 61 pounds to the bushel, which is a fancy grade, as Manitoba spring wheat No. 1 is only required to weigh 60 pounds to the bushel. I think every farmer in the House will bear me out in saying that for No. 1 wheat, in the western Provinces, it is a very fair article which will stand 60 pounds to the bushel, and to put No. 1 at 61 pounds will exclude the great bulk of white wheat grown in the western Provinces. The extra grade of 62 pounds will be so extremely limited that while it may be quoted on the market very little wheat will come up to this standard. Again, if you look lower down, you will find that No. 1 red is only required to weigh 62 pounds, while every farmer knows that reds are at least 2 pounds heavier than whites. Then mixed winter wheat, red and white, is required to weigh 62 pounds. I would like to know the source from which those grades were made, because I think it will be found in practice that the great bulk of our white winter wheat, instead of grading No. 1, will be graded No. 2, which is down to 59, and that I conceive is unfair. I think No. 1 white winter should be placed no higher than this much famed No. 1 Manitoba hard, which is only required to go 60 pounds.

Mr. McLELAN. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that this provides for the Imperial bushel, while the Winchester bushel, which is what has usually been used as a standard, has been on the scale of the Winchester measure.

Mr. BAIN. But you would apply the same bushel to both grains.

Mr. McLELAN. No. If it is the Winchester measure there is quite a difference in it, and 62 pounds by the Imperial bushel would only be about 60 pounds by the Winchester measure.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). The hon. Minister has misapprehended me. No. 1 Manitoba wheat is only required to stand 60 pounds to the bushel, while No. 1 white winter has to stand 61; and I suppose both are to be measured by the same bushel. Mixed winter wheat is open to the same objection. You require mixed winter wheat to weigh as much as pure red wheat, whereas, every farmer knows that pure red is a heavier wheat than white wheat.

Mr. McLELAN. No. 1 red winter wheat is to weigh 62 pounds to the bushel, the same as extra white winter wheat. I am told that winter wheat is heavier than spring wheat, as a rule.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I was desirous of finding out from the Minister who supplied him with that information, for certainly he did not get it from the man who grew the wheat. I have grown both red and white wheat, ever since I can remember, and I think I can claim the right to speak with reference to the growth of wheat in western Ontario, and I think every miller will bear me out in saying that, as an average, there are generally 2 pounds difference in weight between the same quality of red and white winter wheat. The real difficulty will be, if this grading remains, that the great bulk of our white wheat grown in western Ontario, instead of grading No. 1, will be graded No. 2, and will be placed at 59 pounds to the bushel, which will be an unjust grade. I think it should be placed at 60 pounds to be placed on a fair level with the other grades.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say, for the information of the hon. gentleman, that the opinion of the Toronto Board of Trade was taken on this matter, and if the hon. gentleman, being a practical farmer, says that a grade of 61 pounds to the bushel for No. 1 white winter wheat would exclude a great deal of the wheat that would otherwise pass as No. 1, and that 60 pounds would be a high enough standard, we may venture to make that change.

Mr. WATSON. In that case, would it not be well to make No. 2 58 pounds?

Mr. McLELAN. Very well; we shall do that.

Mr. WATSON. The Bill does not provide for the weight of oats.

Mr. McLELAN. I think that is provided for in another Act.

Mr. WATSON. You might have oats that were clean and free from dirt that would not weigh 34 pounds to the bushel. I think it should be provided that they should

weigh 34 pounds We have heard members advocate in this House that 32 pounds should be fixed as the standard.

Mr. McNEILL. If they are clean and plump, and free from dirt, I think they will weigh 34 pounds.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

THREE RIVERS' HARBOR COMMISSIONERS' LOAN.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House go into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution (p. 2497) to provide for the raising, by way of loan, of a sum of money to be advanced to the harbor commissioners of Three Rivers to redeem the outstanding debentures of the commissioners, the interest accrued thereon and payment to be made on account of their works now under contract. He said: The resolution is to enable a sum of money to be borrowed to assist the harbor commissioners of Three Rivers to complete the works they have already commenced. Under the present Act, 45 Vic., chap. 52, the commissioners have the power to borrow $300,000, at an interest of 6 per cent., for the purpose of carrying on harbor improvements in that city. They have already borrowed $63,600, and issued bonds at 6 per cent. for that amount, and they require $18,400 to complete the works, making a total of $82,000. The present resolution provides that the Government may borrow the $82,000, bearing an interest of 4 per cent., in order to redeem the $63,600 of debentures now bearing 6 per cent. interest, and to loan the harbor commissioners the balance of $18,400, to enable them to complete the works. This sum of $82,000 is to be secured by bonds of the harbor commissioners upon the works in that city, being the first charge on all the revenues they may derive from the construction of those works. The object is to enable the commissioners to complete the harbor improvements, and to pay 4 per cent. interest upon the money instead of 6 per cent. A clause in the Bill will provides for the redemption of the 6 per cent.'s, giving a certain time for persons either to exchange them for the 4 per cent.'s or to take the money in lieu thereof.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was this money advanced by private parties?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; I so understand it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it overdue now.

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If not, how do you propose to induce them to exchange 6 per cent.'s for 4 per cent.'s?

Mr. BOWELL. I said it would be optional for them to accept the money on the face of the bond, with the interest at 6 per cent., or to exchange for 4's, if they desire. The Bill will provide for the bondholders to come and take their money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understand they are debentures. You cannot call them in before they are due, or is it that they prefer the Government security to the harbor commissioners'?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose everyone would prefer that, but the whole question is one of interest. The harbor commissioners could not pay 6 per cent. of the amount and pay their expenses, and therefore they have asked to be put on the same footing, in that respect, as the Montreal harbor commissioners and the Quebec harbor commissioners. They will have quite enough to pay the 4 per cent., and a small sinking fund, and their ordinary expenses. Those debenture holders will feel that it is to their interest either to take the 4 per cent. of the Government or to receive their money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will, no doubt, if they are not quite satisfied as to the security; but if they were satisfied as to the security, I do not know that they would take 4 per cent. instead of 6.

Mr. LANGELIER. What is the nature of the works that it is contemplated to construct with this money.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The amount that has been expended and the amount to be expended, the $18,000, is for constructing a pier at deep water, in order that the lumber which comes from the St. Maurice and the Ottawa, may be shipped there at deep water. Since those wharves have been built the trade has largely increased; but the intention is, that in accordance with the Act of incorporation, they will not be allowed to continue the work until the trade has sufficiently increased to produce a large surplus over and above the present expenses; therefore, they must wait until that trade increases before we can allow them to proceed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would enquire of the Minister of Public Works, after the statement of the Minister of Customs, that $300,000 was authorised, whether the Government had an option in the matter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that this $84,000 is all that will be advanced to them, unless the Government is satisfied there is general need for it, and that the revenues are ample.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; so the law provides. I think $63,000 is expended and the balance is to complete the contract.

Mr. DAVIES. What is the income from toll, which is to be the security for the payment?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. About $6,000. They have quite enough to pay 4 per cent. and their expenses, and will have a surplus.

Mr. DAVIES. Is this to be a first charge on the revenue and before the expenses?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; before anything else.

Mr. DAVIES. What length of time has been mentioned in the bond for the re-payment of the money?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the ordinary figure is twenty years, but we may make it shorter. It will be in the Bill.

Resolution to be reported.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a proposed resoultion (p. 2420) respecting a provisional contract entered into between Mr. Andrew Allan and the Postmaster-General of Canada, for a weekly service of ocean mail steamers.

Mr. CARLING. The object of the resolution is to extend the contract to Andrew Allan for five years, from April last, and that the standard tonnage of the vessels shall be that of the contract now in existence. Another alteration is that the company shall carry the mails on their steamers running from Montreal to Glasgow, and also on their vessels from Halifax to Newfoundland and Liverpool, and shall also carry the mails free of charge. The chief object is to extend the contract for five years, as it has been in previous contracts, and to allow them to build larger vessels and to dispose of those of smaller tonnage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of the contract?

Mr. CARLING. £500 per trip, the same as the previous contract, and $126,533 is the total amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister will recollect that at the time the previous contract was renewed some objection was taken to renewing it for so long a time as five years. There was an expression of opinion on both sides of the House that it might be expedient to renew these contracts from year to year, at any rate, not so long a period as five years. Although I am bound to say that the Allan line has been a very good line, and well conducted, still I think, at this time, five years is rather a long period to renew a contract with any particular line, and, to some extent, a little unfair to the other lines, which may become competing lines, and might reasonably expect that they should be allowed to tender for it at a shorter interval than five years. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been some feeling in mercantile circles on the subject, and it seems reasonable that we should not tie ourselves up for a considerable period by a special contract, without there being apparent any very strong reasons therefor. There was good reason, no doubt, in former days, when there was practically only this one line, but it does not appear quite so clear at present, that we ought to give the contract to any particular company for five years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that the St. Lawrence line has to fight a hard battle with the New York and Boston lines, especially with the New York companies. In order to enable them to retain their position, they are anxious to build larger vessels; but to enable them to do that with prudence, they would like to have a contract for five years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Postmaster General did not state that fact, that in this next contract special terms had been made to secure a higher rate of speed and increased size of vessel. The hon. gentleman supposed the Allan company would do that, but I understood from him that it was a one-sided contract. If the company are prepared to undertake to build a larger vessels and run them at a high rate of speed, then there would be force in the argument used by the First Minister. But that was not stated to the House as a part of the bargain with the Allan company for a renewal of the contract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the Postmaster-General stated that the vessels were to be larger.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He left that for the company to determine.

Mr. CARLING. It is in the contract.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are going to get larger vessels, and, of course, they will have greater speed, for it would be a losing game to have crawlers.

Mr. LANGELIER. Unless the company undertake to provide new and larger steamers, there is no advantage in giving the contract for more than one year. The First Minister is perfectly correct in his statement, that the St. Lawrence lines have a severe battle to fight with the lines going to New York and other American ports. That applies not only to the Allan line but the other lines. The Dominion line has shown a good deal of enterprise and has built fine steamers. It is important that the Government should take such action that the Allan line is not placed in a position to make an unfair competition with other lines not subsidised by the Government. It is within the knowledge of some hon. members that the Dominion line has got some fine steamers—not the whole fleet—but some steamers as fine as the best of the Allan line. The *Vancouver* is as fine a vessel as is to be found on the St. Lawrence, and is as fast as the *Parisian*, which is considered the best of the Allan line. This spring, as we all know from the papers, so soon as the Allan line heard that the Dominion line intended to send the *Vancouver* on a particular date, they advertised that whatever that date might be, they, the Allan company, would send the *Parisian*. If that system is to be pursued, the public will suffer. We have to compete with the American lines, and the better and quicker our steamers are, the greater is the chance to secure a number of passengers. If there were several fast and fine steamers we would have more chance in the competition. If the Allan line sends the *Parisian*, which is the best steamer they possess, to compete with the steamers of the American lines, on the same day as the *Vancouver* sails, it is a disadvantage to the St. Lawrence route, for we have the two finest steamers leaving on one Saturday, and the following Saturday we have only fourth-class steamers, as we have seen during the season. Although the Allan line is, as a general rule, a very good one, yet, with the exception of the *Parisian*, it possesses no steamer to compete with the vessels of the Guion, White Star, or the new steamers of the Cunard line. That is to say, that the *Vancouver* and the *Parisian* are the only steamers coming to the St. Lawrence which are acknowledged to be in a position to compete with steamers sailing to American ports. Some provision should be put in the contract, giving power to the Postmaster-General to decide as to the particular steamers that are to be sent with the mails at different dates, in order to prevent the unfair competition of which I have spoken.

Mr. McNEILL. The Government should bring pressure to bear on the Allan line, to prevent their unfairly endeavoring to run other vessels off the route. No doubt, it would be of greater service to the public if the *Vancouver*, in place of sailing on the same day as the *Parisian*, were to sail two weeks afterwards.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be convenient, when resolutions specifically refer to Orders in Council, that printed copies of such Orders be placed in the hands of members. It is not possible for us, at a moment's notice, when a resolution of this kind is put in our hands, to ferret out, from the manuscripts, which have probably lain three, or four, or five months on the Table of the House, the information we require. Has the hon. gentleman the Order in Council?

Mr. CARLING. I have a copy of the contract, which I will show the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No tenders have been asked for, I suppose?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say if any provision was made in the contract with reference to the new and improved vessels, which were spoken of as one of the inducements for giving this large subsidy. I think we should be guaranteed that within a reasonable time after entering into the contract the company should place larger, better and more improved steamships on the route. We know that while some of the Allan boats are good boats, and well provided, others are very inferior, and these latter should be replaced by new and improved ones.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This contract appears to be substantially the same as the one which has subsisted for the last twenty or twenty-five years, the standard of size and power being the steamer *Sardinian*. I do not think the *Sardinian*, although a very good boat for times

gone-by would now be considered a first-class vessel. The outward passage from Liverpool is not to exceed fourteen days, and the homeward passage thirteen days, on the average, which is certainly not a very high rate of speed. It appears to me that by the contract, although it may be that the Messrs. Allan may find it to their interest to give us larger vessels and higher rates of speed, there is nothing to compel them to do so. The obligation is all on our side; we have to find the money, and they are to perform the service to-day much as they used to do. I notice, however, that the Governor in Council is to fix the time of the departure of the steamers. It appears to me that, before we reach another stage, this contract would warrant a further examination, and that we should have the Order in Council as well as the contract.

Mr. CARLING. I might say that the standard is to be the *Sardinian*. The standard of the present contract is 3,440, while the *Sardinian* is 4,640, and it is the intention of the company to contract for larger steamers, the tonnage of which is not to be less than 5,000. The company are negotiating now, and are determined to put on a better class of steamers.

Mr. DAVIES. As I understand, there is no provision that the boats shall be first-class, but merely a voluntary statement by the company that they intend to be so.

Mr. CARLING. By the contract they are bound to increase the tonnage to the standard of the *Sardinian*.

Mr. LANGELIER. There are some of these large steamers which have been cut in two, and an addition of some 60 or 70 feet made to them, but they are much too slow, as they have the same engines they had before they were enlarged. They may have 2,000 more, and still they may not be sufficient for that service. The system in the United States is to give short contracts to the best lines, and this system has been very successful. In England the Government has ceased to give permanent contracts, and they give the service to the most rapid steamers. There is no question that this contract gives a certaim amount of prestige to the company, and it should be well deserved. When a company is advertised as being the mail line, people who do not know the various lines naturally believe that it is superior to any other line. I think we should not give such encouragement to a line that does not deserve it. I do not wish to say anything against the Allan line; it is a very good line, I admit, and if it was only to compete against the American lines I would say this arrangement was very well, but we must not forget that this subsidy may be used against other local lines, which deserve as much encouragement from us as the Allan line. I spoke of the Dominion line, but there may be other lines established within the next four or five years, and within five years I have no doubt we shall see on the St. Lawrence much better ships than we have just now, and we should try to encourage them.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it is to be regretted that the Postmaster General did not require better steamers than this contract calls for. While, ten or twelve years ago, thirteen or fourteen days would not be considered a long passage across the Atlantic, it is now an enormously long time. So many improvements have been made that New York vessels cross sometimes in six and a-half days. Eight days is considered a long passage, and nine a very long passage; and yet all we ask is that they shall cross in fourteen days. And when we are bound up to that arrangement for five years, it seems to me there is some remissness in the matter. I think this contract is a little more important than the committee are aware of.

Mr. CARLING. I think the Allan Company have given general satisfaction to the public; I know that they have given entire satisfaction to the Post Office Department; and, although the time fixed in the contract is thirteen or fourteen days, as a general rule they make the passage in nine days, and sometimes less, and in this contract they guarantee to make the standard of tonnage higher than it was before—to increase it from 3,440 tons to 4,650 tons.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true; but it does not entirely answer the question whether the Postmaster General, under existing circumstances, ought not to have had recourse to a tender. Other things being equal, I would myself be disposed to give the preference to an old established line like the Allan line, and all the Postmaster General has said is true, that they have given satisfaction. But it must be remembered that they have received a considerable amount of public money. Their original contract was, I think, $430,000; for many years they received $216,000; and now they have $126,000, which is the interest, at 5 per cent., on $2,500,000; and I suppose $400,000 or $500,000 would about represent the cost of one of the finest vessels. It is a matter of very great importance to us that the Canadian line, which is considerably shorter than the New York line, should be efficiently supplied with ships. We might establish a passage of six days with ease, I should think, from such a point as Rivière du Loup, which is about 400 or 500 ocean miles nearer to Liverpool than New York; and when New York vessels are making the distance in seven days habitually, it is not too much for us to expect that corresponding speed, at any rate during the summer, should be attained by Canadian lines. There is nothing in this contract to indicate that the company are to be bound, and it is quite clear that the other lines have had no show. The Minister has not attempted to enquire whether the Dominion line or any of the lines now being established were prepared to compete with the conditions he has proposed for the Allan line. It may be that they would not be able to perform the service, but it appears to me that the time has come when they ought to have the chance, or that we should not give the contract for five years at a time.

Mr. LANGELIER. There are two clauses in the contract that seem to be curiously worded—clauses 4 and 5.

Mr. CARLING. There is no change. The only change is to substitute Andrew Allan for Hugh Allan.

Mr. LANGELIER. Still, the contract leaves it free to the company to stop either at Quebec or Montreal. Under it the steamers might pass in front of Quebec, without stopping. They may not do it, but the contract allows them to do it. It is actually being done by some other companies—the Beaver line, for instance, which constantly passes Quebec and goes direct to Montreal.

Mr. CARLING. The contract is not at all changed.

Mr. LANGELIER. There was no reason to make that change a few years ago, because it was not thought that a steamer would pass by Quebec without stopping, but that is now actually happening. Some goods intended for Quebec are actually being carried first to Montreal by the Beaver line. It would be much to be regretted that our mails should pass to Montreal and come back to Quebec again. I cannot understand the Postmaster General consenting to that.

Mr. DAVIES. What was the date of the contract?

Mr. CARLING. 1882.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that he has really secured something better in this contract when he put in the *Sardinian* as a standard, her tonnage being larger than that of other vessels; but although the tonnage standard has been increased, no effort has been made to secure an increased speed. The same standard as that of twenty years ago, fourteen days, is still

retained. It is, I may say, a misfortune that we have not a clause in the contract stipulating for quicker passages, when entering into a contract for five years, which is no small matter, when we consider the improvements in steam navigation that are being made every year.

Mr. McNEILL. If the Government take care that the fast vessels of the other lines are not shadowed by the fast vessels of the Allan line, the contract is all right. The natural competition among the different lines competing for traffic across the Atlantic will give us a fast vessel. The Allans cannot afford to let any company outstrip them, either in appointment, size or speed.

Mr. DAVIES. They do.

Mr. McNEILL. I think not. The Allan line is at present as good as any other Canadian line. The *Parisian* is at least as good as the *Vancouver*. I am satisfied that if a fair competition is allowed among the different lines, so far as this difficulty is concerned, it will right itself. What I object to is that fair competition does not exist now. The Allan line has an advantage, by reason of its contract with the Government, and takes advantage of it to deal unfairly with their competitors.

Mr. DAVIES. Their competitors are handicapped $126,000 a year.

Mr. McNEILL. The Allans are taking an unfair advantage, and the Government should take care to prevent that, as far as possible. I understood from the remarks of the hon. member for Huron there was a provision in the contract enabling the Government to prevent any such unfair dealing on the part of the Allans—that the Government could arrange the days on which the vessels sailed.

Mr. DAVIES. Not particular vessels.

Mr. McNEILL. They can so arrange the days that they will not compete with the days of sailing of other vessels. On those grounds, the thing will work right in the long run.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman does not think that, in order to carry out this principle, the Government should have asked for tenders from the other companies?

Mr. McNEILL. There is a great deal of force in that, but, at the same time, there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman himself said a short time ago—that is, that an old company, such as the Allans, which has done so much service to this country, should be dealt with differently.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not say differently. I said, other things being equal.

Mr. McNEILL. I think it is only right they should get a certain preference, although I think the time must come when that must stop. In the meantime, I do not think we have much to complain of in that, though I think we have very much to complain of in the course the Allan line adopts with reference to other lines. That should be put an end to.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not agree at all with the hon. gentleman, that because the Allan line carried out their contract fairly, and were well paid for it, we should now give them $126,000 a year for mail service without calling for tenders. I am sorry the matter came up so late, as I would have liked to have had an expression of the opinion of the House on this point. It is against the interests of the country that other lines should be so handicapped. If they are driven off the field in consequence, what would the hon. gentleman have to say? My hon. friend is a political optimist. He thinks everything will be done all right. If his view is correct, there is no necessity for a contract at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must correct my hon. friend on one point. What I said was, that I thought the Allan Company should not get the contract without competition, but if other things were equal, and they were willing to do the work as cheaply as other people, there might then be fair ground for giving them the preference, always provided tenders were had. While they have served the country, they have received many millions of public money for the services rendered.

Resolution to be reported.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1 a.m., Tuesday.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1885.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., Moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys, Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

DIVISIONS—*Continued.*

*For Repairs and Working Expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."