

ter and his servants, and the hon. gentleman knows that the small majority he got at the last election is of such a doubtful character that he urged the First Minister to give votes to these Indians, hoping they will send him back, and hence he laughs.

Mr. WHITE. I got elected to this House independently of the First Minister and independently of the hon. member for East York, and I can get elected to-morrow independently of them.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman will be sure of being elected when he gets the Indian vote, and that makes him laugh.

Mr. WHITE. Cannot I laugh?

Mr. FLEMING. Yes, the hon. gentleman has good reason to laugh, though his laugh is not as musical as some I have heard.

Mr. WHITE. You would give a good many dollars if you could laugh as heartily as I can.

Mr. FLEMING. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to know the difference between enfranchising the Indians under the Indian Act, and making them voters under the present Bill. Why are the words "including Indians" put in this paragraph of the interpretation clause? Why are they necessary? The First Minister asked facetiously the other night: Is not an Indian a person? But if an Indian were a person in the eye of the law, these words would not be necessary, for, under the Indian Act, an Indian is "a male of Indian blood reputed to belong to a particular band." It defines a person to be "an individual other than an Indian," hence the necessity for the First Minister to include the Indian specifically. The word "person" includes colored men, it includes Englishmen, Irishmen, Germans and other classes, but it does not include Indians, and hence the wording of this paragraph. These bands are settled on reservations in different parts of the Dominion. The First Minister said the other night in reply to a question, that certainly it was intended to give the right to vote to Indians on reservations, and he said it was intended also to give the Indians in Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, the right to vote. He was asked if Poundmaker and Pie-a-Pot would be included in this Bill, and he said: Certainly they would, and he volunteered the information that Scratch-him-on-the-back would also be included. Is the country ready to adopt so radical a change as that in the electoral law? When the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill on previous occasions he did not include such a proposition; this is the first time he ventures to propose that the Indians under his own control shall have votes. Why has he introduced it this year? Is it not because since that time there is a tide bearing against the hon. gentleman and his party, from one end of this Dominion to the other, that will sweep them at the polls, if the free voice of the people is allowed to express itself—will sweep them from the power which they have been exercising for years to the detriment of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. What evidence is there of that?

Mr. FLEMING. No more evidence is needed than the proposal included in this Bill to give votes to those Indians who are under the hon. gentleman's control and tutelage. The hon. gentleman tells us he intends that the Bill shall include Poundmaker, and Yellow Quill, and Pie-a-pot, and all these other worthies who are now exciting the admiration of the free people of this country! Are the people of this country prepared for such an innovation on the law, that the controlling influence in many of the constituencies shall be in the hands of the Indians subject to the control of the First Minister? A more monstrous proposition was never made to any Parliament, and the party must be hard driven who have to take such a position. Enfranchise Poundmaker, whose hands are reeking with the blood of our

free people in the North-West! Enfranchise Pie-a-pot, whose band are now threatening to scalp the white settlers in the neighborhood of Qu'Appelle! There is no language that we can possibly use, Parliamentary or otherwise, which will properly characterise the infamy of such a proposition. The hon. gentleman said he was only following Mr. Mowat, and that hon. gentlemen on this side are admirers of Mr. Mowat. When he said that we on this side admire Mr. Mowat, he spoke the truth, although he speaks it rarely. But the hon. gentleman, in saying that he followed in the steps of Mr. Mowat, is not correct. We admire and respect Mr. Mowat; we know his ability, and we know his knowledge of constitutional law from several cases which have occurred in recent years. By his law he gave those Indians who are free men the right to exercise the franchise, and if the right hon. gentleman had declared that he would have accepted Mr. Mowat's Bill, there would be no discussion; or if he had accepted the measure proposed by the hon. member for Algoma, in the direction of Mr. Mowat's Bill, there would have been no discussion on this subject. But the hon. gentleman does not intend to follow Mr. Mowat because he is incapable of following him, because his purposes are not the same as those of Mr. Mowat, because he does not intend to include merely the free Indians, but the thousands of Indians who are scattered over this Dominion, who are subject to his control, who have not the rights or liberties or the liabilities of free born people—these are the reasons that we are here protesting against such a measure as this. The hon. gentleman says the country will hold us responsible for the obstruction we are offering. Well, Sir, I am prepared in my constituency to assume all the responsibility of obstructing such an infamous proposition. The people in the country will say that we would be justified in anything we can do, in order to retain the franchise in the hands of those who are free to exercise it; they will justify us if we stand here all summer, day and night, in resisting the hon. gentleman's attempt to stifle free discussion in this House. The people of this country who have sons and daughters and brothers and sisters scattered over the North-West subject to the rage of Poundmaker, whom the hon. gentleman intends to enfranchise; subject to the terror of Pie-a-Pot, to whom he intends to give a vote—I say the people of this country will praise the patriotic band who are determined to resist this attempt on the part of the Government. I would have felt myself recreant to the duty I owe my constituents and my country, I would have gone from this city ashamed of myself if I had not raised my voice against so monstrous a proposition as that. The hon. gentleman says he is following Mr. Mowat. If he had followed Mr. Mowat's advice during the last few years, he would have occupied a higher position in the estimation of the people of this country than he does to-day. If he would follow Mr. Mowat in enfranchising free Indians, he would have received the support instead of the condemnation of this side of the House. I have said that hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand the difference between an enfranchised Indian and one to whom the right to vote is given. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not read the Indian Act. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) the other night, in reading the extract from the speech of my hon. friend from South Brant in 1880, to which I have referred, fell into that error. He knew nothing whatever of the subject he was attempting to discuss and to become witty upon; and the hon. gentlemen about him who were applauding did not know what they were applauding, or they would not have made such a public exhibition of their ignorance. An enfranchised Indian is one who has the rights of citizenship conferred upon him, and is no longer subject to the tutelage of the Superintendent-General; but it is not upon the free and responsible Indian that the vote is intended to be conferred by this Bill. The purpose