

We will have a little give and take on this matter. I do not know, from past procedure in Parliament, whether we would be warranted in anticipating much of the "give" on their part unless we had something a little more definite with reference to what it was to be. I am afraid their division with us would be something like the division of the man who was all the time quarrelling with his family, and who, one day, surprised his neighbors by saying that the quarrel had ceased, and that he had settled the matter satisfactorily now, because he had divided the house with his family. They asked him: How he had managed that? "O!" he says, "I gave the family the outside of the house, and I took the inside." Now I think that is about the way hon. gentlemen opposite would do in this give and take business. They would be willing to take the inside of the House and give us the outside—give it to us willingly, there is no doubt about that; because they understand that the Bill will do that for them, and that is the design of it. They mean to get us out. We have succeeded in getting back here in spite of them, under very difficult circumstances—many members of the Opposition; and now they design to make it still more difficult; they design by their Bill to secure for themselves almost the entire representation in this House for the Conservative party. Sir, we want something a little more definite about that give and take, before we could have very much faith in their offer. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read you a comment from the *Montreal Gazette* with reference to the Bill before the House. I propose to answer that, and in the answers I shall give, you will see our reasons why the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk should prevail. The *Montreal Gazette*, I quote the article from another paper—but no doubt it is correctly given—says:

"There are three principal objections urged by the Opposition against the measure: first, that it enfranchises the Indians of the plains; secondly, that it contracts the suffrage, taking the country over; thirdly, that it gives over absolutely the preparation of the voters' lists to the henchmen of the Government of the day; and we are bound to say that, if these objections were well taken, the measure would deserve to be rejected by Parliament."

As to the first question: That it enfranchises the Indians of the plains, if it is true, what will hon. gentlemen do with the definite statement made from his place by the First Minister when he said the Bill would enfranchise the Indians of the plains; when he said, in answer to a direct question put to him, that it would enfranchise Poundmaker and Big Bear. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, if it is not true, how was it that the First Minister, in reply to a direct question I put to him on Monday last as to whether it would enfranchise the tribal Indians, he replied, to the amazement of many of his followers, that it did if they had the same property qualifications. It is a mere technicality to say that the North-West is not represented in this House. The North-West is to be represented. At all events, the Indians on the plains of Manitoba, dwelling on their reserves, ignorant and besotted as they are described by many, are, under the provisions of this Bill, enfranchised—that is, if you may so degrade the word; they are given the same privilege as the white man who has the responsibilities of manhood upon him. If the First Minister has subsequently, when he found himself sorely pressed, announced that he would exempt British Columbia and Manitoba from the operations of this Bill when he came to the clauses, that statement proves that under the Bill they are not exempt. They are there, and the *Montreal Gazette* can make up its mind that the Bill gives the vote to Indians on the plain. This statement has been made by the First Minister; hon. gentlemen opposite have heard it from his own lips; they can read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has given a challenge that no hon. gentleman can deny that the decision of this House as regards this Bill has been to enfranchise the

Indians of the plains. That may be so; but I do not so understand it. I understand that what was done in relation to the interpretation clauses was to make a declaration in regard to the Indian that he was a person; but the House has yet to declare when it comes to the section dealing with the question whether they will enfranchise the Indians of the plains. If they enfranchise the Indians of the plains or anywhere else unless qualified as white men are qualified either by intelligence or property it will meet with my hostility, and I do not believe this House will do it.

Mr. PATERSON. I am very glad to hear it but the hon. gentleman did not catch the statement I had made. My statement was that they were enfranchised under the Bill as drawn. With the great influence of the hon. gentleman and his independent position, and with the influence of supporters of the Government who may hesitate to accept such a proposition now that it has been pointed out may lead to some change; but the very fact that any exemption needs to be put into the Bill shows it is not there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. If hon. members utter tones of derision they are deriding the explicit statements of the leader of the Government. We now come to the next point: That it contracts the suffrage, taking the country over. That has been abundantly proved by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. No one can controvert the statement. Does any one deny that this Bill contracts the franchise in British Columbia, where there is manhood suffrage, or in Prince Edward Island, when members who support the Government are moving and supporting an amendment declaring that the Act does injustice to them? The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) and other speakers have abundantly proved that in Ontario it will not give the suffrage to thousands who are enfranchised under the Act passed by the Mowat Government. In Nova Scotia I am told it will contract the franchise. In New Brunswick it is claimed that the Bill will contract it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON. It is very well for hon. gentlemen to say no, but let them rise and show in what particulars our statements are wrong. In the Province of Quebec the franchise is not contracted. With respect to the third proposition, which runs as follows: That it gives over absolutely the preparation of the voters' lists to the henchmen of the Government of the day. I do not use the term "henchmen;" I do not know what the connection may be. No one can deny that the clause with respect to revising barristers hands over the power to make and revise the lists to nominees of the Government. I have conclusively proved the truth of the three propositions set out in the *Gazette*, and therefore I am justified in opposing this Bill, for the editor himself says that we are bound to say that, if those objections are well taken, the measure deserves to be rejected by Parliament. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny that the Bill as drawn, without considering amendments that may have been suggested in caucus, will enfranchise tribal Indians. They cannot deny that the suffrage is contracted in Ontario, that it is contracted in Prince Edward Island, in British Columbia, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, and in Manitoba if they can. Until they do maintain their case we hold that our case has been proved by the statements and facts which have been elicited by hon. gentlemen on this side. With regard to the revising barrister, I would like to see a man on that side bold enough to say that the control of the list is not handed over to these gentlemen. Their newspapers, which do not feel the same responsibility that is felt by members of Parliament, may say so, but I do not think any hon. member will venture upon such a statement. I do not know what changes may be made, but changes