

a Government is going to create votes, is going to give the franchise to men whom it will force to vote for themselves, in order to keep themselves in power, appears to me to be a most cowardly thing. Although this measure has been long discussed, the full extent of its villany has not yet been disclosed. We are beginning to see the hidden hand, and great good is going to be done by the able discussion that has taken place, as it will serve to show the country the position which the Government have chosen to take in order to create votes to keep themselves in power. The idea of giving votes to men who are otherwise disqualified, who are not citizens, who cannot make a will without the assent of the Superintendent General, who do not pay taxes, is a preposterous one; and yet hon. gentlemen propose to give these men votes which will offset those of our citizens, an action which is an outrage and which the people will not stand. The observations made by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) I am here to oppose and resent. I have a noble band of Highland men dwelling in my riding, and they will not be satisfied if I do not resent the idea that their ancestors were savages, like Indians, a few short years ago. I deny it. The Highlanders showed intelligence and culture long anterior to that period; and I cannot understand how the First Minister, who is of Highland blood, should have allowed a prominent supporter to make that remark, without himself rising and correcting the misstatement. On behalf of the noble Highlanders I represent, I hurl back that accusation as one unworthy of any hon. member of this House, and I will not permit it to be made without resenting it as being an insult to the whole Highland race in Canada. I remember, a few years ago, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) made some statement, mild in comparison with that which the hon. member for Glengarry has made; and what was the result? That statement was published in my own constituency, in the Gaelic language—and it received the assent and support of the First Minister, and I believe of his Minister of the Interior (Sir David Macpherson) also. I do not know but that he is Minister yet—he is not here now; but I am sure after the determined resistance he made to the supposed slight cast by the hon. member for South Huron, he would not have consented to allow such a slander as that pronounced by the hon. member for Glengarry, to have passed without resenting it; and I repeat that I am surprised that the First Minister should have allowed a prominent supporter to have made such a charge against any class of the people of this country without resenting it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the proposition of the hon. member for Brant is a reasonable one. I agree with the First Minister that I am opposed to invidious distinctions. It has been said that the Indians should not be called upon to apply to the revising officer to be placed on the list. It must be remembered that the wage-earner has to make this application, and why should there be an invidious distinction between the Indian and the wage-earner in this respect? Why should the Indian be placed in a better position than the wage-earner? For while the Superintendent General will make application to have the Indians on a certain reservation placed on the voters' list, the wage-earners will have individually to spend their time in order to get their names put on the list. The hon. member for Glengarry stated that suggestions were invited by the First Minister from hon. members on this side of the House with a view to improve the Bill. The question of enfranchising tenant farmers' sons was urged from this side of the House, and was discussed. But the Bill is now almost through committee, and those persons will not be allowed to vote. The sons of manufacturers, who are tenants, are also excluded. Why should such men, who earn their daily wages, perform the duties of citizens, and volunteer to

Mr. LANDERKIN.

go out in defence of the country, be debarred the privilege of the franchise, while tribal Indians on reserves, who pay no taxes, are allowed the right to vote? It is an outrage on the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is no evil intent in enfranchising the Indians. There must be some special reasons, and the main reason is that hon. gentlemen opposite expect to obtain a political advantage. The hon. member for Glengarry has let the cat out of the bag. The Indians of the plains are not to be enfranchised, because they are opposed to the Government, while the Indians of the older Provinces, who are given the right to vote, are supposed to be in favor of the Government. If it were thought that they would vote against the Government, no doubt the Bill would yet be amended, and they would be struck out. This Indian clause is also an attempt to strike down some members of this House who have discharged nobly their duty as representatives of the people, who are respected by both sides, whose names will be handed down to future generations, as men who nobly did their duty on the floor of this House. There is no other object in adopting the Indian clause, because the Indians have not asked for it. They are going to be forced into harness; they are to be told, first, that they have votes, and if they do not record their votes they will be looked upon as opponents, and the result will be that they will be drawn up, as a band, and compelled to exercise the franchise in the interest of the Government. I say that the revising barrister provision of this Bill is bad enough; the Indian vote is worse, and the two together are sufficient to condemn the Government that introduced them, in the minds of every independent man in this country. I hope the day is not far distant when the people will open their eyes, when, in place of supporting legislation of this kind and allowing it to go unpunished, legislation which fetters their rights and liberties, they will rise up and condemn it. It is high time that the people woke up to the fact that their rights are being fettered and trampled upon. I say that every man on this side has a right to express his opinion candidly and forcibly on this question, and while we have a single son of a European race twenty-one years of age, who is not permitted to exercise the franchise, it is a gross insult that you should allow the Indian on the reserve the right to vote, while you deprive the sons of tenant farmers and the sons of tenant manufacturers from exercising their franchise. This shows, on the face of it, that there is an object in view. If the tenant farmers' sons could be gathered together on a reserve, in a group where they could be influenced to vote in favor of Government candidates, they would be enfranchised; but because they cannot be controlled like the Indians, they do not get votes. Mr. Chairman, I could not permit this thing to go through its last stage without entering my solemn protest against it.

Mr. MACMASTER. An attempt has been made by certain hon. gentlemen opposite to misrepresent my meaning, in the remarks which I made to the House to-night. I do not attach very great weight to those statements, because I think I can defend myself before any Highland audience in which I may have a chance to appear. While I described the state of savagery which existed in bygone years in Scotland, a fact which, historically speaking, cannot be doubted, I also pointed out the progressive development of the people of that country to one of the foremost nations in Europe, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), far from recognising such development in the remark he made, far from recognising that the Highland race to which I belong, and of which I am as proud as any hon. gentlemen in this House or outside of it—far from recognising the great progress they made, and that they are now one of the most cultivated nations on the earth, producing most eminent men in every walk of life, stig-