

to the Ministers, except perhaps to the Catholic members. If I am informed correctly, it is very seldom some of the Ministers are ever seen in places of worship. This should not be so. If this country is to prosper and to be honored by Him who honors all nations who serve him, we should have respect to the ordinances of the Sabbath. I do not understand why the Government should have wasted one month at the opening of Parliament, and only kept the House sitting during 65 hours, if it is necessary to carry through a measure such as that now under discussion. Now, Sir, I have no interest in this squabble, for this reason: that the Government cannot enact a law, nor can they appoint a revising officer, that can make any change in the constituency I represent; and if they wiped the whole Liberal vote out of my county I am confident, and have the best reason to believe, that the Conservatives of that county would not send a man to this House to support the present Administration. I have received letters from my Conservative constituents, stating that they condemned the wasteful policy of the Government as well as the Liberals. There is in my county an earnest love of country. It has been said that some of the people of New Brunswick are annexationists, that they would like to see the Confederation, which we established in 1867, thrown to the winds. I can tell you, Sir, that if that feeling exists in my county, and it does to some extent, it is owing to the way in which the affairs of the country have been mismanaged. I have the best possible reason to believe that both Conservatives and Liberals in my county have no other intention than to build solidly and well the foundation laid in 1867; but, remember, if that foundation is shaken, if the structure is rent, it will be the fault of the gentlemen who have been governing this country for the last few years. I am surprised, in view of the way we have been treated, that the east and the west are not at each other's throats, as well as the Indians in the North-West. It is a matter of surprise to me, because our people have been dealt with most unjustly, the Government of this country have not kept their obligations with the people of the Maritime Provinces any more than they have with the Indians. Now, I think the Government ought to give us an adjournment so that we may be prepared to keep the approaching Sabbath day. Sir, we ought to have an adjournment so that we may be able to keep awake to-morrow when we go to church, so that we may be prepared to worship the Most High and not go to sleep in our pews. Well, in reference to enfranchising the Indians, I care very little about it. I am not particular whether you enfranchise all the men, women and children, so far as it will affect my county. What the people of my county want, both Tory and Liberal, is an economical Government. I would be in favor of universal suffrage if that system would elevate the character of our Government, morally and intellectually. I think when the Government wasted the first month of the Session and kept Parliament working only 65 hours, I think this is a criminal act. I do not know but that hon. gentlemen opposite should be indicted when the constitutions of hon. gentlemen are being broken down. It is an offense against the person, against every principle of right and justice.

Mr. FLEMING. I have not had an opportunity of expressing my views upon the question now before the Chair. The matter, however, is of such importance—it is so great an innovation upon the electoral franchise of the country, that I do not think I could justify myself before my constituents if I did not express my protest, and the reasons for my protest, against the proposed enfranchisement of the Indians of this country. If it was an enfranchisement of the Indians in the true sense of the word, in the sense known to the Indian Act, then there is no one who would give it a more hearty support than I would. But this is no enfranchisement of the Indians. The purpose

is not to emancipate the Indians from the disabilities under which they lie by the law of the land. The purpose is not to give them any rights they do not now enjoy as other free-born British subjects do. The purpose is not to put upon them the responsibilities of free-born British subjects. The purpose is not simply to give Indians votes. The purpose is to enable some one to vote in the Indian's name. The purpose is to enable those that control the Indians under the statute law of Parliament, by the Superintendent-General and his officers in the various constituencies, to strengthen the Government. That is the purpose, and that alone is the purpose of this Bill. The purpose is not only to do that, but to strike a blow at some hon. members sitting in this House. It is to enable the Government to take into their hands a number of votes of persons who are dependent upon and who are subject to their control, the votes not of free men but of those who are less than minors under them in the eyes of the law, who are under tutelage and who are under the guardianship and control of the First Minister, to use those votes in the different constituencies in order that some members now sitting here by the free votes of free born British people shall not be enabled to be returned to this House. We know that is the purpose. We have only to look to the past. We know that previous to the elections of 1882 a similar attempt was made to exclude hon. members now sitting in this House and others who were then sitting from the possibility of returning here as representatives of the people. We know that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was one of those struck at by that Act, who was singled out for the purpose of being excluded, if possible, from his place in Parliament. Is it because that hon. gentleman does not ornament this House? Is it because his talents are not creditable to this body? Is it because his character is such as to render it desirable that he should be excluded from this House? His character is such that he is held in high esteem not only by members of this side of the House but by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the general public, not only in his own Province but in the whole Dominion. It is not then because of his character that an attempt is made to exclude him. Is there any other reason why it was intended by the Gerrymander Act to deal a blow at the hon. member for South Brant. There is not a man in this House who dare rise and declare what was the true intent and purpose of that Act of 1882. But that Act failed in its operation. The hon. member had two townships with large Reform majorities taken away from his constituency and had a Tory township added. He was thus placed in the minority of several hundred votes; but the people of his constituency knew his worth too well, admired his talents too much, and possessed too much patriotism to allow him to be defeated. Hon. gentlemen opposite were thus disappointed in their purpose, and the hon. member for Brant sits here to represent a constituency that was gerrymandered by hon. gentlemen opposite an honor to the people who have honored him with their confidence. But he is not to escape. There is a large Indian reservation within the constituency which the hon. gentleman represents, and if hon. gentlemen opposite failed to carve up the constituency and cannot add a sufficient number of Tory townships, then there is another way by which they hope to effect their purpose, and it is by giving votes to the Indians on the reservation in that county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman himself wanted to have that done.

Mr. FLEMING. I will return to that point in a moment, and will show what the hon. gentleman said. The purpose of the Government is manifest. If it was to give men who are free a voice in the election of members there would be no objection raised. But it is not to give free men the franchise. The right hon. gentleman knows that if he had done