

he did not do so I will not condemn him, or condemn him for any act, so long as it is right and just, for he will have my support as far as I can give it to him. The gentleman who is now revising barrister is deputy judge of the county from which I come. Last Parliament he occupied a seat in this House, but he has been appointed deputy judge by the Government, and also revising barrister, and it will be my duty to strengthen his hands in every way I can, so long as he deals justly, fairly and honestly between the parties. That is the position I take with regard to him. I do not assail him, but whoever took away the printing which legitimately belongs to the local press of the country shall have my condemnation; I shall not sit silent, without uttering my protest against what I consider a wrong done towards that portion of the press on account of the work it is doing. The local press are doing a great work in educating the people in many things, and supplying them with information upon matters which are of vast importance to them, and I would not sit silent and see the rights taken away from the local press and given to the hirelings I have mentioned.

Mr. ORTON. As the hon. gentleman has referred to the revising officer for North Wellington, I may state that I had it from his own lips that the reason he was compelled to have the printing done in Toronto was, simply, that there was no office in the county that was capable of getting out the list in time.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman if there were no papers in the riding he represents which were competent to print in time the lists for elections to the Provincial Legislature.

Mr. ORTON. I do not know anything about that, but the fact as to the Dominion franchise lists is as I have stated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have only to say that if there are not printers in the hon. gentleman's county capable of doing the work, there are in mine.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not intend to say anything on this question, but a remark made, no doubt inadvertently, by the hon. member for Lambton, necessitates my saying a word or two. That hon. gentleman stated that in the county of Brant the Indian agent had handed in the names of the Indians to the revising officers, and that he had enrolled them in that way. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, having heard that the Indians were enrolled, supposed that it was done in that way, but I think it is only just to the Indian agent to state that he had nothing whatever to do with it. As I understand it, the Indian agent has no power under the Act to hand in the names of Indian voters. I think it is contrary to the Act—at least it was intended to be, and I think we accomplished that intention. I should think that, if any Indian agent in other ridings—as I have heard it stated is the case—has handed in the names of Indians on his reserve and these names have been received by the revising officer, that agent, and the revising officer as well, have transcended their duties. The hon. member for Bothwell thinks not, and he is a legal gentleman, more capable of judging than I am; but I think it was the intention to prevent the Indian agent from interfering in that matter, either in the preparation of the lists or otherwise. The Indians on the Brant reservation have been enrolled, I believe, to the number of a great many hundreds, but I think it was done by the revising officer appointing a bailiff, who went down to the reserve and made a kind of assessment, thereupon placing them upon the list. If I were to judge of what was right and proper, my judgment being guided by the opinion of the First Minister himself in his declarations in Parliament last year, I would say that the revising officer had made a mistake. I do not wish, however, to impugn his

Mr. LANDERKIN.

motives, because I believe he desires to carry out what he believes to be the meaning of the Act, but it is one of the unfortunate things with regard to this Act that it has been so loosely framed that it is susceptible of many interpretations. While the case of the Indians in the county of Brant is, I believe, as I have stated, we see it reported by the newspapers from other places that the revising officer has gone to the municipality, has told the residents of the reserves that under certain conditions they can have their names enrolled if they desire, thus giving the Indians the option of having their names enrolled or not; and I believe that in every case in which that course has been pursued, the Indians have largely refused to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act, thus justifying the argument we used, last year, that the Indians were not themselves parties to the part which was being taken in regard to them. I should say, however, that those agents who had simply given the Indians permission to enroll themselves if they desired were correct. It will be remembered that I offered a motion during the debate, that no Indian should be enrolled except on his own application, and subsequently that he should not be enrolled without his consent, and that the First Minister having spoken adversely to my motion, I urged on him to give some attention to the question of how the Indians should be enrolled. I pointed out that on the reserve they had no assessment rolls, the rolls being the basis of the list in other cases. The First Minister, as I remember his reply, stated that the revising officer would proceed to the reserve and hold his little court—the fact of a man being an Indian making no difference in that respect—and that any Indian could apply personally or by agent and have his name placed on the list. Some of the revising officers have acted in that way, but as it was not incorporated in the law, the revising officer in the county of Brant did not so interpret his duty, and did not consult with the Indians or obtain their consent in any way, but he has simply made an assessment and placed them on the list. Without finding fault with him I would point out, as has already been pointed out, that if uniformity of franchise is the object—and we know how that was dwelt on by hon. gentlemen opposite—what a lack of uniformity there is in its provisions. Here we have had instances cited of parties, of whose right to vote there could be no question, who made application, who made the declarations and took all the steps required by the law, yet failed to have their names entered on the preliminary list; while in other cases parties who have not sought and do not desire to be placed on the voters' list, are placed on it without their consent. We are receiving evidences very early, as I was sure we should, of our unwisdom in dealing with this question. I am prepared to move, as soon as I can, for a resolution which I believe was unanimously adopted by the chiefs of the Six Nation Indians in council about two months ago, in which they declared that they did not want to have this Act applied to them at all. We have not yet been able to get a copy of that resolution. Upon application by a newspaper to the local superintendent of the band for a copy of the minute, he said he did not feel at liberty to give it without permission of the Department at Ottawa, but that he would write for that permission. Up to the present I am not aware that he has received it. I have, therefore, placed a motion on the Order paper with the view of obtaining it. Now, here is the application of the Act to parties who do not desire to be enrolled, who have actually protested against being placed on the list, and who, if my information be correct, are placed on it against their consent, while others who have enjoyed the rights of citizenship hitherto and are fully entitled to be enrolled, by some little quibble or objection of the revising officer are excluded from the preliminary list entirely. In the discussion which has taken place to-day, and in the numerous discussions which in this Session and in future