

in all other measures, think this Bill is anti-social and anti-Conservative; if the clergy pronounces against it, is not that a proof that its importance is such that the members should argue for or against it in the House? I believe that we could be more easily convinced than these gentlemen, if they give us good reasons in favor of the Bill. This measure is an innovation which uselessly changes an established state of things; which introduces in the electorate a new class of persons, and yet they will not deign to give us a word of explanation. One thing which shows that it is an innovation is, that the Indians who are not emancipated, as the negroes or white men, will have a right to vote, provided they submit to the conditions of the electoral law. Why should that difference be made in favor of the Indians? It is an injustice on the part of the Government. I believe I understand the reason of this—I may be mistaken—I believe I understand that the Government dare not to go back before their electors, and that they are compelled to create new voters for their own use. In the Bill which was introduced last year, it was proposed to manufacture new electors by means of the revisers. It was thought, at that time, that there might be danger to go before the people, and even before these electors which were to be manufactured by the revisers appointed by the Government. What are the Government doing to-day? They are calling the redmen to their aid. If the emancipated Indians were the only ones to be admitted to the right of suffrage, we could have nothing to say, for they ought to have the right to vote like ourselves. But why should we grant that right to those who are not emancipated, who have no right to hold property, who are under the paternal care of the Government, and fed by the Government? We are going to give the right to vote to persons who are to-day in arms against the country, who have rebelled against the country, and who are to-day killing our sons and our brothers. We are going to enfranchise people who are not civilised. I believe all these reasons are sufficient to compel us to oppose this measure. And it is bad policy on the part of the Government to keep us here, hour after hour, day after day, without having the right to adjourn, in order to force the adoption of this measure. If the Government adjourned this sitting to resume it on Monday, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that they would succeed in passing this measure. But do they think that we will give up the fulfilment of our duty? No, Mr. Chairman, if it is needed we will die at our post, we will do like the noble soldiers under Leonidas, who defended the pass of the Thermopylae, and who, notwithstanding the fact that Xerxes' army could crush them as to numbers, stood faithfully to their post. Well, we will do the same thing, and the public will give us the credit of doing it. But at the same time the party who is now in power and who wishes to pass such a measure will be called to account. All we ask is a fair, honest and enlightened discussion; a discussion which will lay this Bill, just as it is, before the people; for, Mr. Chairman, we must not conceal from ourselves the fact that it is proposed to give the right to vote to people who are not civilised and refuse it to those who are civilised. For instance, an honest person who owns a property valued only at \$149, an intelligent man, who works for the good of his country and to raise his family honestly, will not be entitled to vote. And yet this workingman, this intelligent man, when we have disturbances in the North-West, shoulders the musket to go and defend his country, and the right of suffrage will be denied to him. There is another numerous class of people in the Province of Quebec: the school teachers, who spend their lives in teaching and moralising the people; this Bill does not give them the right to vote, because their salary is not high enough. And yet this right is to be granted to an Indian, to a man who knows nothing about the principles of civil government; who cannot even be appointed municipal councillor; to a

Mr. AUGER.

person who cannot be a witness in court and who cannot own a cent's worth of property in his own name. Mr. Chairman, the more we think of this subject, the more we are anxious to know the reasons which may have induced the First Minister to comprise this class of people in his Bill. For these people were not included in the Bills which he introduced in this House in 1883 and 1884. Why did the First Minister include them in his Bill? There are many suppositions. Several hon. members to whom I have spoken of this, and who have Indians in their counties, seem to have found out the reason. It is even said on this point that if the Bill is passed, the election of the hon. member for Brant will be endangered, but I do not believe that. Therefore, I say, that if that right is granted to people who are not civilised, the public will take notice of it, and the civilised people will vote for those who have stood up for their interests. What would you say, Mr. Chairman, if a red-skin was in your place, or in the place of the Minister of Public Works, or in the place of the First Minister? If you give the right of suffrage to Indians, they may influence the election of members and cause laws to be passed which would shield them from punishment on account of their rebellion in the North-West. The motion of adjournment should be granted after this long sitting. We have done nothing during the first months of the Session, and now that it is drawing to an end, the Government bring down the Electoral Franchise Bill. We see in the newspapers that a measure concerning the Pacific Railway is to be submitted to us. We have before us a Bill on insolvency, and we are kept here losing our time and expending the public money. The Minister of Public Works laughs when I speak about public expenditure, but I fear that when he gives an account of his conduct to the people, he will not laugh quite so much. The public keeps his accounts; minor expenses are perhaps overlooked but the millions which the Government are spending uselessly are kept account of. I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to ask for an adjournment, because it is him I love best, and he appears to me to be willing to grant the motion. He is one of those who have ever been ready to do their duty; he is always ready to answer politely all questions that are put to him; in many respects he is very estimable; I know he belongs to a very good family; he is well-bred and I am sure that he will do the right thing for us. I do not agree with him on all questions, and on this question of electoral franchise I believe he is a little too radical, and that he is supporting a measure which is anti-social and anti-Conservative. If we adjourn now the Minister of Public Works will have time to reconsider the Bill, and he will probably see his way in advising the First Minister to amend it or withdraw it for the present Session, in order to secure the adoption of more important measures. I will not say any more for I think I see in the eyes of the Minister of Public Works that the motion of adjournment will be adopted, and with that hope I shall resume my seat.

Mr. IRVINE. It is the custom of this country to make a short day on Saturday in order to be prepared for Sabbath. It has been the custom of this House from its conception not to hold a session on Saturday. Why that rule has been departed from in the present case I fail to understand. During the first month this House sat only 65 hours; and now when three months have elapsed we are kept here day after day, and night after night. I cannot tell for what purpose. I feel very unwell. I cannot tell whether the reason of my feeling unwell is being kept here constantly day and night, but I find there are many other hon. members who are also unwell. When there are only 40 or 50 present out of 200 members of the House there is evidently something wrong. What applies to me with respect to keeping the Sabbath day does not, I fear, apply