

progress should be reported, and he says we had no right to suggest it. The hon. gentleman also said, and we know it, that there were other opportunities for resuming discussion. Of course there were. But the hon. gentleman said we had no right to make a suggestion of that kind, no right to make a stipulation of that kind. But the hon. gentleman says, a little later: This is not a fit time to have the discussion at all, but upon the enacting clauses; therefore an opportunity would have arisen for us, if the discussion had then been closed, to resume it upon the enacting clauses. Then the hon. gentleman says: The question only is whether an Indian is a person. The hon. gentleman was asked, at the very opening of this discussion, whether he intended, as, by the introduction of the word "Indian" in that clause, coupled with the other clauses, would appear to be the result of his Bill, to give the vote to the tribal Indian living on his reserve, by virtue of his location ticket; and he said yes, that was his object. And because that was his object and intention, my hon. friend from Bothwell put the amendment in your hands, limiting the class of Indians who were to be entitled to the franchise—not with reference to their other qualifications, not with reference to their occupation of lands, and so on, but with reference to their being qualified citizens, enfranchised persons, like the rest of the male population of the country. That was the object and that has been the issue; and the hon. gentleman still, by his observation and attitude while I speak, shows that he understands that is the issue. That is what we are fighting about. We have been fighting for this long time upon the question whether an Indian, under his control, his ward, an Indian to whom he can give or refuse the right to vote, or take it away—whether that man shall be enfranchised by his Bill. That is the question which we have been fighting about. Then the hon. gentleman says it was only for fear of a doubt, for fear of a confusion that might arise in an uninformed mind, a futile doubt, he says, a doubt that no one ought to have considered, that he put it in; but he stated that he was taking a leaf out of Mr. Mowat's book in putting it in, not that it was because of a doubt, but that it was because Mr. Mowat had enfranchised the Indian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he did. He said he was humbly following in Mr. Mowat's footsteps. So the hon. gentleman gives different versions as to his motives and his objects, and his intent, upon different occasions. Then he said it was and afterthought which made him put it in; that he had not intended at first to put it in. What created the afterthought? We heard the reason the other day—Mr. Mowat's Act; that is what created the afterthought. Then he said the long discussion was misplaced. I say it was not misplaced, having regard to his declaration. The moment we found that the hon. gentleman's intent and the object of the Act with that word in was to produce that result, our right was to discuss it. It is upon the declaratory clause, the dictionary clause, the interpretation clause, that we have settled the great question of woman franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; by his request. He requested that the principle of woman franchise should be discussed upon the interpretation clause, but he says it is improper to discuss the question whether Indians should be admitted to the franchise on the interpretation clause. The woman can be disposed of at that stage, but the Indian is a subject too dignified to be dealt with in that way. The hon. gentleman says it is a criminal waste of time to weary out the majority. How could the minority, one to two, particularly while we were doing all the fighting and hon. gentlemen were doing all the sitting and the sleeping, weary out the majority? The notion is ridiculous. We have contended that it was their duty to bring this measure forward for discussion early in the Session, and to bring it into committee early in

the Session, to give us time to discuss it, with intervals for consideration, with reasonable adjournments for rest, with opportunity to get the feeling of the country upon it, to adopt the very view which I read from the hon. gentleman's speech in 1867 or 1868, that a reform Bill would be properly the work of an entire Session; and yet we know that the Bill was moved to be put into committee on the 25th day of April, within four days of the expiration of the three months which the hon. gentleman has frequently stated would be the normal time of a complete Session, with five-sixths of the Estimates to be attended to, with Ways and Means to be attended to, with the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions to be attended to, with the Chinese Restriction Bill to be attended to, with the consolidation of statutes to be attended to, with the Court of Claims Bill to be attended to, with the Insolvency Bill to be attended to, with the North-West affairs to be attended to, with the finances of the country, in their present grave position, to be attended to; and three days afterwards he told us that we were to sit day in and day out to the exclusion of all other business, until this Bill was passed through the House. The hon. gentleman proposed to do that by virtue of a process of sitting to most unreasonable hours, and it is as a protest against that measure of discussion, which is unfair to the minority, unreasonable to the country, and unapt for the proper discussion of a question, that we have acted. He says it is a part of our tactics to weary him out. I deny it. I agree with him that, if that were a part of our tactics, it would be a base and unworthy method. I agree with him that, if, which I deny, that was any part of our tactics, it would be futile. He has every facility for resting, and we are glad to know that he has been resting, so that he is ready, as we are quite ready, if necessary, to go on next week.

Mr. BOWELL. He did not take any more rest than you did.

Mr. BLAKE. I said so, and I think the hon. gentleman was quite right. I am not going to infringe upon the hour, upon the stroke of which we have arrived. I say that was no part of our tactics, but that our course was to insist upon liberty of discussion, to insist upon popular rights, to insist upon the rights of Parliament, to insist upon our right to have free, full and ample discussion, which, at this time and under the circumstances and conditions which the hon. gentleman desires to impose upon us, as to the discussion of the Franchise Bill, he has rendered and is rendering absolutely impossible.

Motion that the committee rise and report progress (Mr. Paterson, Brant) agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12, midnight (Saturday, 2nd May.)

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th May, 1885.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, in view of the fact that notice has been given of resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, that certain infor-