

in his own favor. He has asserted that when the Premier solemnly told an hon. member that Pie-a-pot and Poundmaker and Big Bear and Strike-him-on-the-back would have votes, and allowed the statement to be put in *Hansard*, he was making a joke. The hon. gentleman has made many a joke on serious subjects. He has treated many of the best interests of the country as a huge joke, but we cannot let him off on a joke on this subject, for did he not propose an amendment to exclude these people, to exclude Poundmaker and Big Bear and Stab-him-under-the-ribs? If the wording of the Bill did not include them, why did he move an amendment to exclude them? He has shown, not only by his statement which is now said to have been a joke, but by the amendment which he certainly moved in earnest, that he intended to include these men, and if they had put off their rebellion until next year we would have had a rebellion of the hon. gentleman's constituents instead of a rebellion of homeless, wandering savages. I notice that hon. gentlemen are groaning. It must be described as a groan to make it parliamentary. No doubt they groan at this exposition of the hon. gentleman's policy. I am sure many of them who are making that peculiar noise are as much disgusted with that policy as I am myself; so, as they are not permitted to express their disgust by word of mouth, they express it by their heels. I am glad to find that it cannot be repressed, and that, if their condemnation cannot find issue by one extremity of the body, it finds expression at the other. The hon. member for Glengarry has said further, that it was the greatest tribute to the good management of the Indians, under present auspices, that they had treated their prisoners leniently. It certainly is a point to be scored in favor of those Indians, but it is only under present management that Canadian Indians under British rule have ever taken prisoners at all, or been in a position to treat citizens of Canada otherwise than leniently. After all the talk about the development of the Indian, even in Old Canada, I do not find that those best qualified to speak about his condition think him qualified for the franchise. I have said that the Indians on the Muncey reserve are among the most intelligent in Canada; that individuals among them were as intelligent and well educated as any white men; but I have also said frankly that I did not think them, as a body, in a fit condition to exercise the franchise. I find that the head of a great missionary institution among those Indians, which is subsidised by this Government, endorsed the view I have expressed. At a public meeting of the Methodist Conference in Chatham, I find the following took place, as reported in the *Globe*:—

"The greatest sensation yet produced during the present Conference was that occasioned by the Rev. Abel Edwards, of Muncey, in his address on the report of Principal Shepherd, of the Mount Elgin Industrial Institute. In the course of his remarks the reverend gentleman denounced, in strong language, the Franchise Bill, as one for which the Indians are neither qualified nor prepared. (Applause.) If enforced, he said, it would work great damage and produce no good results. (Cheers.) If the Government had, 20 years ago, extended the benefits of the common school system to the Indian, and enforced attendance thereat, the Indians might be in a better position to become enfranchised; but now they are not, and the prospects are they will not be for many years to come. He was greeted with prolonged applause throughout his address."

This was at a meeting of the Methodist Conference at Chatham, Ontario, on Saturday last. The report of Mr. Shepherd is not given here, but I judge, from this, that the reverend gentleman's address is in harmony with the tenor of that report. Now, Sir, if the Indians on that, which is one of the most advanced and progressive reserves in the country, who are so far developed as to have an Orange hall, are in this condition, what must be the case amongst other Indians, not so far advanced as they are in politics or education? The calm decision of public opinion, no doubt, will be that the Indian who is under

"a guiding hand," who is not a citizen, who is a child in a go-cart, who has no possibility of giving independent expression of his views, who cannot even have the franchise, unless the right hon. gentleman gives him a location ticket—an Indian, under these circumstances, is not a proper person to be entrusted with the franchise. This is altogether apart from his intelligence. I say if he was as wise as the Premier, as eloquent as the member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), and as scientific as the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), he would not be fit to have the franchise while he is situated as he is at present. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) asks that more than ordinary efforts should be made to ascertain whether the Indian who is to be put upon the list is really qualified under the terms of this Act. The white man is not in a position to have his vote put on the list by an agent who has control of him; white men cannot be put on in shoals by Indian agents, but the Indians can be. The revising barrister's oath, we are told, is a safeguard. What is his oath? To make up the voters' list according to the information in his possession. Will not the instructions of the Indian agent be information? Will not the information sent down to him, perhaps from Ottawa, be that which he will regard as the best kind of information? I say there is every reason for asking for more safeguards in the case of an Indian voter than in the case of a white voter, and for these reasons I am in favor of the amendment of my hon. friend from Brant

Mr. CAMPBELL (Renfrew). I was very sorry to hear my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) speak so disparagingly of our countrymen, and compare them to savage Indians of 150 years ago. He was mistaken. I am sure the Highlanders, for 400 or 500 years past, were not at all what he represented them to be. They were intelligent men, and the hon. gentleman ought to be ashamed to speak of them as he did. What excuse can he make to his constituents in Glengarry, when he returns to them, for what he has said about them to-day?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the amendment of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) ought to receive the assent of this House. It does not exhibit any party bias or leaning; it does not display the guiding hand of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and consequently we will probably have the opposition of those who follow the Superintendent General in this House. Now, Sir, the Liberal party in this country always endeavor, and have always endeavored, to elevate men, to lift them up, to make them better men, and to do what is best for the country. That has been their policy in the past. That has been the guiding policy of the Liberal party, to elevate the standard of morality, and to do what is best in the interest of the country. Now, Sir, the amendment that is proposed is of such a character that it commands the assent of every patriotic Canadian. It is quite plain that the purport of this Bill is that every tribal Indian located on a reserve is to have the franchise, is to be guided by the Superintendent General, to vote as he desires. I consider this an assumption of a power which no party should attempt to arrogate, in this age of the world. I consider that it is an immoral practice to resort to for the purpose of obtaining power and of securing a perpetuation of power. It matters not to me which party attempted to do a thing like that, I would condemn it; but I do not believe that the Opposition in this House would ever endeavor to keep themselves in power by any such means. The proposition of the hon. member for South Brant gives to the Indians who are possessed of the property qualification, the right to vote when they desire to vote, and imposes upon them the duties of citizens, and it is something that I hope will be upheld by this House. It is more preferable than giving all the Indians living on reserves a right to vote. I say such is a vicious proposition, and ought not to be sustained by this House. Why, Sir, the idea that