

described by the hon. gentleman. I am not going to gainsay that fact at all ; I am not personally acquainted with that subject, but I know in our own province the Indians are very different indeed to the Ontario Indians as described by the hon. gentleman. I have been brought in contact with Indians in Prince Edward Island officially in the course of my political life, and I know they were always a source of the greatest anxiety to the Government. We always felt that the treatment of the Indians was a chronic trouble, that with the best intentions our views were almost invariably defeated. The Aborigines Protection Society of London had purchased an island for those people. Before that we had nothing in the shape of a reserve on Prince Edward Island, but when this society became aware of their position they purchased an island off the north shore of Prince Edward Island, and it was vested in the Lieutenant Governor and President of Executive Council as Trustees. It was the intention and wish of the Government and Legislature of that Province for years to induce men to do what the hon. gentleman says the Indian of Canada has done. I am speaking now of events which occurred years ago, and I am sorry to admit that our efforts have been so comparatively unsuccessful, for I fear it is the case in the Island Province that there are very few if any Indians to whom it would be justifiable to commit so important a trust as the elective franchise. For myself I may say that I have known but one in that province whom I should consider competent to exercise this privilege. Nevertheless, I do think that the statement which the hon. gentleman made is highly interesting and at the proper time and place it might be put to an exceedingly useful purpose. I wish to refer to an episode in this debate in which Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone's names were introduced in connection with the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa. I think some misapprehension prevails there. My hon. friend, if I am not mistaken, in speaking of Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone, referred not to the revising officer but to the redistribution Bill, and if I mistake not also I had called the hon. gentleman's attention to the subject not many days before, contrasting the happy way in which

the English Government and Parliament had carried into effect a gigantic redistribution Bill, with what is known in Canada as the gerrymandering Bill. Here in Canada, Ontario became entitled to, I think, four additional members, and in order to find them suitable constituencies the whole province was cut up and broken into shreds, and a very bad impression was raised throughout the Dominion that all this had been done with an object. It is not the time or place to debate that at present ; I simply want to put this matter on its right footing. The hon. gentleman referred to the action of the Imperial Parliament and Government upon this question, and I will read a few lines which show the kind of spirit in which that re-adjustment was carried out in the old country and what the rival parties thought of the manner in which it had been done. On June 9th, the *Times* wrote upon it in this manner, referring to the opinion expressed the day before by Lord Salisbury. The *Times* says :—

“ It would be unjust to attribute the comparatively easy passage of the Bill through both Houses of Parliament solely to the agreement arrived at beforehand between the leaders of the two great parties. This agreement applied only to principles, and the Bill is essentially a matter of detail. For the adjustment of these details with skill, impartiality and success, infinite credit is due to the members of the boundary Commission, to whose labors a high tribute was justly paid by Lord Salisbury yesterday. ‘ He never knew a public body,’ he said, ‘ which performed so difficult a task in so short a time and with such general satisfaction ;’ and this judgment will be endorsed by all competent politicians without distinction of party.”

Now, I think it must be admitted that we did not conduct these affairs in Canada with the same spirit of fairness and success in which a much larger undertaking was conducted in Great Britain. This is a point which I wish to bring to the notice of the House and explain the position which was taken by my hon. friend, a position which I think is unassailable. I have heretofore been speaking principally of remarks which occurred in the course of this debate. I wish to make a few remarks now with reference to the position of Prince Edward Island as to this measure. It is well known to this House—the House indeed has reason to know—that the Island has enjoyed for a number of years a