

deserved things of the Indian character; but what is the answer to all that? The answer is, that his leader does not believe the Indian fit to be a citizen. He would not give to him the privileges he gives to the negro, privileges which have always been given to the negro, even when he came here as a fugitive from slavery, bearing all the degradation of slavery. Who are making invidious distinctions against the Indian? Is it we, who wish to make him a citizen? Or they, who treat him worse than the negro escaped from slavery? It is unfair, unjust, unparliamentary, in view of the facts, to try to stir up prejudice against hon. gentlemen on this side amongst those people whom the right hon. gentleman wishes to have the vote. It is not we who want to keep them in degradation. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McMaster) charged us with the desire to keep the Indians in "perpetual degradation and savagery." Have not Liberal Governments shown themselves as willing to allow Indians to become citizens as any Conservative Government? Have not the Liberal party agreed to the proposition that Indians might become citizens? But what we object to is, not the admission of the Indian to citizenship, but the admission of the Indian, while he is not a citizen, to rights which are the property of citizens and of citizens only. There is another argument. The hon. member for Glengarry says the Indians' property is theirs. It is not the property of any of those individual Indians who are going to vote upon it. Why cannot they sell it, if it is their property? was asked of the hon. gentleman, and he replied: Because the best wisdom of this House has decided that the Indians' property shall be taken care of in a particular way, that it should be in the guardianship of the Government, and managed for him, as the property of other minors is managed. Here is the answer to his own statement. The property is not the Indian's, in the ordinary sense of the word. The tribal Indian is a mere user of the property while he is allowed to use it by the Indian agent. He cannot even hold his location without the consent of the Indian agent, and it comes to this, that the Indian cannot have that location which is to qualify him for a vote, except by consent of the agent of the Superintendent General. The wisdom of the House is acknowledged by the hon. member for Glengarry, which has decided that the Indians are not fit to own property. Now, he tells us that the property is theirs. He knows they cannot sell it; he knows they cannot sell the produce of their farm in the way an ordinary person can, but he seems to think the Indian should have something of value to sell, and now he proposes to give him something to sell, and his leader proposes to give him something to sell, and that something is the franchise. There is progressive development for you! The Indian has got along in the world; but it is certainly a new way to begin by giving him, in the first place, that valuable commodity which is generally supposed to be the last reward of thrift and industry, the highest crown of citizenship, the greatest right of freedom—the franchise. I am surprised to hear such an argument from a gentleman who is generally so clear in his views as the hon. member for Glengarry; but my surprise at his urging that argument is lessened when I find one other extraordinary statement he has made. When I find him telling this House that the Highlanders of Scotland, 150 years ago, the heroes of whom Scott has written in prose and poetry, whose names are household names over the civilised world, the synonyms of heroism, of everything glorious, of valor and remarkable intelligence, were savages, I am astonished at nothing he can say. I have known a great many Scotchmen. I represent a constituency composed almost as largely of Scotchmen as the constituency of Glengarry, and I cannot believe, even on his word, the word of a Highlander, the representative of a peculiarly highland constituency, that his ancestors, 150 years ago, were savages. I know what is in them; I know what they would be, even without the education and privi-

Mr. CASEY.

leges they have at the present day, and I know that they would not be savages in the sense the Indian is a savage. It is an insult to any one having any Scotch blood in his veins to say that the people of that country, 150 years ago, were savages. Did they scalp women and children? Did they murder priests, and cut them into small pieces? Is that the kind of people who inhabited the Highlands 150 years ago? I think not; but that is the kind of savages we are discussing now; and when the hon. gentleman said the Highlanders were savages, we know he was comparing them with the Indians of 1640, with the Indians of old times in Canada, with the Indian of to-day, on the far western plains. The object of the hon. gentleman in making this assertion is not far to seek. He, no doubt, intended to show what the Indian was capable of in the way of development. He said the Indian has not got very far yet, to be sure, but there is no knowing what he may come to. Why, my ancestors, 150 years ago, were savages, says he, yet here am I to-day! One hundred and fifty years from to-day the Indian may become a Q.C., a member of Parliament, a representative of a Highland constituency! The argument does seem to have force when put in that way, but the deduction he drew from it did not amount to a great deal. He said the Highlanders were never civilised until their tribal system was broken up by British arms. Does he propose forcibly to break up the tribal system of the Indians? Is he going to send soldiery into the Indian reserves and forcibly break up the Indian tribal system, in order that they may become civilised? I do not think that is his proposal. If not, the argument goes for nothing. At any rate, although the tribal system was not broken up at the time he speaks of, among the Highlanders, the Highlander of that day, who was as independent a man as walked on the face of the earth, possessed the very essence of independence and self-government and was far from being in the same position as the Indian on the reserve. Where was the "guiding hand" that ruled the Highlander of 150 years ago? Where was the guiding hand that Rob Roy submitted to? Was there a General Superintendent of Indian Affairs over the Highlander of 150 years ago? I think, if there had been, the "guiding hand" would have become paralysed before it had guided my hon. friend's ancestors very long. There is no parallel between the cases. The Highlander of that day had everything to qualify him for the franchise, except the education and the training which his descendants now possess. He had the personal independence, the fealty to his chieftain, the intense patriotism, the love of country which fitted him for self-government. Can it be pretended that the tribal Indian has the same qualifications now, even after generations of training? Even my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), with the opinion he holds of his ancestors, will not maintain that. But to come down from these high and lofty topics to consider more closely the position of the Indian, leaving the high-flown comparisons that have been indulged in, in what position does the Indian stand to-day? The leader of the House said early in this debate that he is an ally; he does not know whether he is fully a British subject, and therefore liable to military service. Are we going to give votes to all our allies? When England and France were allies the French did not exercise the franchise in England nor the English in France. If he treats them as allies he cannot give them the franchise; if they are not allies, but subjects, they should be citizens.

Mr. SPROULE. If the French allies had been citizens they would have had votes.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; and if our Indian allies became citizens they would have votes. We have asked to have them made citizens, but without success. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has urged, in defence of the Premier, what that gentleman has not urged