

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

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

Mr. PATERSON. He has not the responsibility.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The *Globe* also declared in favor of the revising barrister, but, in the event of his not being appointed, thought it was advisable that the registrar of the county, or the county attorney, or the sheriff, should be appointed. Hon. gentlemen opposite say this Bill interferes with provincial rights. Was there anything said about provincial rights in 1870? Not one word. Though it was the same Bill, the same clauses, everything identical, except the clause providing commissioner; instead of revising barrister; not one voice was raised on behalf of provincial rights. Again they say, this Bill is not asked for by the public. The best argument in reply to that statement is the instance quoted by the hon.

Mr. RYKERT.

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

Mr. VAIL. Ten days short of three months.

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