

matished them as still possessing the "predatory instincts," practically characterising them by that remark, as possessing the old instincts which they possessed when they were a savage race, and as carrying those instincts down to a later time. I repudiate here, as it has been repudiated elsewhere, the insinuation so made against the Highlanders; and I take it as a displacement of this debate for the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to stand up here and profess to vindicate the Highland character—to say, on behalf of the Highlanders in his constituency, that he dissented from the remark of the member for Glengarry against the Highland race. I made no such charge against the Highlanders. I spoke of the facts of history; I recognised the progress of that race, and I equally enter my dissent against the statement that their acts or conduct are characterised by the predatory instincts which may have characterised them in their early days.

Mr. CHARLTON. What the hon. gentleman did was to compare the Highlanders of 150 years ago with the Mohawks of 1642.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is false.

Mr. CHARLTON. He compared them with the savage Mohawks of the seventeenth century.

Mr. MACMASTER. I made no such statement.

Mr. MILLS. What the hon. gentleman did was to refer to a statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). The hon. member for North Norfolk had referred to the acts of the Mohawk Indians in 1642, and what the hon. gentleman did was to argue that the Mohawks of to-day were not to be judged by those of 1642. He said: Look at me; my ancestors were savage Highlanders 150 years ago. He described the Highlanders of 150 years ago, and he said if these savages produced such a splendid specimen of a man as the member for Glengarry, what may we expect will be the Mohawks of to-day. The Indians have been progressing for ninety years more than the Highlanders, and if I, in 150 years, have become such a splendid specimen of a man from the Highland race, what may we not expect from the voters of Brantford, whose ancestors committed the depredations in 1642. That was the argument of the hon. gentleman, and if it was more, he was simply arguing that the Highland race were a progressive race; that 150 years ago they were a nation of savages, and to-day they were able to produce such a splendid specimen—

Mr. MACMASTER. I ask the hon. gentleman, across this House, if I made any reference to myself or produced myself as a specimen?

Mr. DAWSON. I think it is unjust to press upon the hon. member for Glengarry remarks which he says were contrary to what he uttered, or to try to fasten upon him the assertion that he said anything derogatory of the Highlander. He is a Highlander himself, as I am, and speaking of the Highlanders, he spoke in a relative manner. The Mohawks have been run down as savages, but let me read to you what an American writer has said of their nation:

"The Confederacy of the Iroquois, or Five Nations (and which was known as the Confederacy of the Six Nations, after the Tuscaroras were admitted into the Union), might afford the subject of a historical sketch, in the hands of a master, replete with the deepest interest and curiosity. It was distinguished, from the time of the first discovery of the Hudson down to the war of 1756, for its power, policy, and martial spirit. At the close of the seventeenth century that Confederacy was computed to contain 10,000 fighting men. . . . The Five Nations, during the time of their ascendancy and glory, extended their dominion on every side, and levied tribute on distant tribes. They blockaded Quebec for several months, about the year 1660, with 700 warriors. The Mohawks were the terror and scourge of all the New England Indians, and those dwelling west of Connecticut river paid them tribute. They extended their conquest down the Hudson to Manhattan Island, and subdued the Carnese Indians on the west end of Long Island. The Iroquois pushed the conquest to Lake Huron, and

fought desparate actions with the Hurons and the Chippewas on the borders of Lake Superior."

They are described, still further, as extending their conquests up through Illinois and the plains of the West on the one side, and to the Atlantic coast and the Carolinas on the other. A race that could do such things cannot be considered a despicable one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with the extract that has been read. Anybody who has read the history of America knows that the Mohawks were the kingly tribe of this continent, and leaving that behind, I admit that they are now the most advanced Indians we have; but advanced as they are now, and warlike and brave as they have been before, the Superintendent General has his hand as firmly upon them as upon any other Indian in the land. His Indian law holds them under the same tutelage as any others; so that they cannot lease their own lands, even if they be educated men, sign contracts, or even make a will, but the Superintendent General can annul it, if he sees fit. The ground taken on this side of the House cannot be misunderstood. We say, give the Indians all the rights and liberties, and all the responsibilities of citizenship; but we say: Do not force them upon him—it is not wise. If the Mowak Indians prefers to maintain his connection with the tribes, it is his own choice; he feels happier there; and as long as he remains in that position do not try to force him out of it; and this proposition to force a vote upon him while he is in that position is a proposition which, I believe, he will repudiate; and in his interest, as well as for other reasons of another kind, referring to less advanced Indians, I have moved the resolution. It is evident, from the First Minister not having suggested any different way of obviating the difficulty, that he does not seem inclined to accept my proposition, and this committee is sufficient to vote it down. But I call his attention to this, that the other night, when I pointed out to him the difficulty of getting the Indians on the lists, and suggested that it would have to be done in a different manner from that adopted for white voters, owing to their having no assessment rolls, and when I pointed out that the only way to get the information would be through the paid agents of the Government, and that that would be a wrong and indecent thing to do, and asked the First Minister what plan he would propose, he said that he had not given the question consideration, but that he would do so, and asked me if I would put my opinions on paper, that they might be considered. That I have done; but I have been so unfortunate in the expression of my opinions there as not to have met the views of the First Minister. I therefore hold that if he allows this proposition to be voted down he is bound to find some solution of the difficulty that I desire my amendment to obviate, that is, that it would be an improper thing for the revising officer to take his list of voters on an Indian reservation from the Indian agent, under whom the Indians are, and who is under the control of the Superintendent General himself; and the only method I can see is for the revising officer to go down on the reservation and let every Indian who wants to be put on the list come to him and say so, the same as the wage-earner has to do. Some hon. gentlemen ask why I want the information to be given under oath. I want it to be given under oath, not so much because I want the Indian to be put under oath, but because, when the revising officer seeks testimony from others, it is under oath; and if the Indian agent's testimony is to be taken, I hold, from the peculiar position he occupies in relation to the Indians, that it should be taken under oath. But if there is any great objection to that, strike it out and leave the other part. The hon. First Minister must know that all Indians are not equally advanced. While it may be a proper thing to give many of them votes if they are full citizens, in even the most advanced bands there are many who are not