

might avail themselves, with the consent of the Superintendent General, of a simple form of municipal government. The Six Nation Indians, in March last, met and considered whether they should avail themselves of that privilege; and they decided they would not do so at the present time. I would be a recreant to their interest if I did not offer a proposal that would save them from questions arising between the whites and the Indians, by which the relations existing might be disturbed. Is it not possible that the Indians will never ask to be placed on the voters' list. If it be true, that is the strongest reason why their names should not be placed on the voters' list, contrary to their desire, why, in fact, they should be left to exercise their own judgment. And if Dr. Jones, the Credit Indians, or any other Indians, desire to avail themselves of that privilege, and assume all that it involves, voluntarily, all right. I do not oppose that, but I ask that the Indians themselves should be consenting parties.

Mr. McCALLUM. They will be consenting parties before they go to vote.

Mr. PATERSON. No; I tell the hon. gentleman that I believe, with reference to many of these Indians, unless their views have changed, as I knew them, such are their ideas of the peculiar relations which exist between them and the Government of this country that they will not vote, even if their names are put on the list, unless pressure is brought to bear on them. But they are compromised by their names being put there, and I ask that they should not be compromised. If it is simply an act of justice to the Indian, why go a step further, and allow the paid agent of the Government to put the Indian's name on the roll. I object to it; I think the Indians will object to it; I think the good sense of the committee will object to it, and I think my motion should be allowed to prevail.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not intend to delay the committee, but I wish to say a few words upon this question of granting the franchise to the Indian while he retains his tribal relation—not only granting the franchise to him but thrusting it upon him. I hold that the course taken by the Government in connection with the Indian clauses of this Bill is utterly indefensible. The hon. member for Monck says that the objection taken, that the Indian is not a taxpayer, is not a valid objection, because the Indian is a taxpayer by consuming goods subject to duty. I say that in the same sense every white man in the Dominion of Canada, of the full age of 21 years, is entitled to a vote, because he contributes to the revenue in the same way, and by this Bill you are discriminating against the white man and in favor of the Indian. The First Minister says it will not do to make distinctions and differences between Indians and the white men, in connection with the franchise, and that the Indians will consider this an affront. Well, as the hon. member for Brant has pointed out, we do make distinctions and differences in almost every paragraph of the legislation on the Statute Book of this country, relating to Indian affairs. We exempt the Indian from jury service, and from military service; and yet the Indian, living in the tribal relation, not liable to jury duty or military duty, the men of a tribe, of a distinct organisation, a *quasi* nationality within the bounds of this Dominion, is to have the franchise thrust upon them. Now, what are the antecedents of the Indian, if we treat the question ethnologically. How long is it since the ancestors of the Indians were barbarian. How far removed is he from the condition in which the red men of America were when this country was discovered by the Europeans? How far have they attained the position which men should attain before being entitled to the franchise. Sir, I wish to read one page from Francis Parkman's work on the Jesuits in North America, referring to the treatment of certain Jesuit

missionaries by a certain tribe, whose descendants it is proposed to enfranchise.

Mr. MACMASTER. What year?

Mr. CHARLTON. The year 1642.

Mr. MACMASTER. That's a long time ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some time ago, I admit, but at that time our ancestors were civilised; they were worthy of being entrusted with the franchise, and not only so, but our ancestors were worthy of that privilege a thousand years ago.

Mr. IVES. How long is it since they burnt witches in Massachusetts?

Mr. CHARLTON. They may have done so, but they did not commit the enormities which were committed by the least barbarous and least cruel of the Indian tribes on this continent not one hundred years ago. This extract refers to the capture of certain Jesuit missionaries by the Mohawk tribe at Three Rivers. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the work in question.) I do not claim that the Mohawks of to-day would practice the barbarities which were practised, in 1642 on the Jesuit fathers; but I do claim that it may be doubted whether people descended from the Mohawks, who were one of the most advanced of the Indian tribes, have attained that degree of advancement in civilisation which would fit them for the exercise of the franchise, and make them the peer of the Anglo-Saxons, and especially to warrant us in enfranchising them against their will. Many of these people are pagans to-day; they have their sun dances, their dog feasts, and their medicine feasts, and they indulge in various pagan rites, even in Ontario. The uniform usage in the United States with regard to the Indians is one that we may very well profit by. I believe that so long as the Indian retains his tribal relations he has no right to ask for enfranchisement, and the supposition may reasonably be, that he has no desire for it. Although the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has referred to the fact that the State of Mississippi admits the evidence of Indians, so far as I know, both by the law of the United States themselves and the law of every State; in that country, where there is universal suffrage, where the negro is enfranchised, the uniform custom is that the Indian, in order to become a citizen of the United States and to have the franchise, must cease to be a member of an Indian tribe, must assume all the duties of citizenship, must hold property in his own name, and must be liable to be sued. I believe that is a proper distinction to make, and I believe, if we enfranchise the Indians in Canada in advance of this surrender of their tribal relations, we shall be going too fast. The fitness of the Indian, or of any descendant of a barbarous tribe of people, for the franchise, should not, in my opinion, be too readily accepted or supposed. The Indian, at least, should be required to ask for the boon which it is proposed to give him. Contrary to the principles of sound policy, it has been decided that the tribal Indians, under certain circumstances, shall be invested with the franchise. What is the next step in this discussion? The next step is the proposition of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who has had us great experience in Indian affairs as any member in this House, who has lived from his boyhood in a riding where a great number of Indians are congregated. It is the motion of that gentleman, urged with an eloquent speech, that if we are to enfranchise the tribal Indians we ought to require them, at least, to ask for that privilege before we invest them with it. I hold that that is a reasonable proposition, and that it is a safeguard both of the rights of the people and of the Indians themselves. It is absurd to decide that the tribal Indians shall be invested with the franchise, and then deny the motion of my hon. friend, that as a preliminary they shall be required to ask that it shall be conferred