

up to the revising officer and ask to be put on the roll; they want to go even further, and compel the Indian to give proof of his qualification. We must treat fairly the Indian, politically, and if he is entitled to vote, as is a white man, we must give him the vote; and if, having come from the degraded condition which he occupied in 1642, referred to by the hon. member for North Norfolk, the Indian lives peaceably and quietly on his reserve, in a fixed location, which is practically the Indian's, and of which he has a much better tenure than that of a tenant, and has made improvements to the value of \$150, he is justly entitled to vote, and I believe the country will sustain his obtaining it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have been accused most unjustly and unreasonably, on various occasions, of casting reflections on the Highlanders of this country. I need not say that nothing would be further from my desire than to cast any aspersions on a gallant race, among whom, I am happy to say, I numbered then, and I have numbered since, a great many personal friends and excellent supporters. Nothing that I have said, I must observe, has at all equalled the reflections thrown on those gallant men by the hon. gentleman, who claims descent from them, and who has told us that 150 years ago the Highlanders were savages, that 150 years ago the grandfather of the hon. gentleman he spoke of so much was a savage. If I had said so the whole vials of wrath of hon. gentlemen opposite would have been poured out, and deputations would have come up from Glengarry. It would have been safer for me to have fallen into the hands of Pie-a-pot or Big Bear than into the hands of the constituents of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman was good enough to tell us that among other claims the Indians, whom we proposed to enfranchise, had upon us, was this, that they had, in times gone by, been allies of Great Britain on many a field and in many a conflict in this country. He was good enough to tell us that one of Lord Chatham's proudest boasts was that he had converted the so called savage propensities of his Highland ancestors to good use and turned them into some of the most gallant soldiers that Great Britain ever possessed. But he might have told us also that in all Lord Chatham's flights of eloquence there is not one more famous or more deservedly famous than those words in which he rebukes the folly and wickedness of the then British Government in launching their Indian allies upon men who formerly had been British subjects. I recommend the hon. gentleman to study once again the all but dying speech of Lord Chatham, in which he declared that if he had been an American instead of being an Englishman he would never have laid down his arms as long as the savages and foreigners were allied with British subjects in the endeavor to subdue the Americans.

Mr. MACMASTER. The hon. gentleman is doing an injustice to Lord Chatham. He did not quote his words correctly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. His language is on record, and no condemnation could be stronger or more just than that which Lord Chatham launched against Lord North and his colleagues for their gross violation of all propriety, of all sense of Christian honor, when they loosed the savages of the border settlements upon those who had been British subjects, acts condemned equally strongly, as I well know, by many of the U. E. Loyalists, whom those same men had driven to take refuge in this country. I speak of what I know, because I have seen, in the old records which still remain, very strong condemnation of the British Government in making use of Indian modes of warfare and Indian allies to subdue that revolt.

Mr. MACMASTER. We are not justifying those atrocities in order to prove the right of the Indian to vote.

Mr. MACMASTER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the hon. gentleman is not justifying the atrocities which were then committed on the revolted colonists of North America. He is occupying himself in justifying an attempt to commit other atrocities in this country, under the guise and color of law, which, in the ideas of all right-minded persons, are even worse, are even likely to produce greater ultimate injuries to this community, than the atrocities condemned by Lord Chatham. But I am glad there are some points in which we can agree with the hon. gentleman. He tells us there is no doubt there is a hand that guides these Indians, and that is the hand of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. We do not doubt that in the least. We know perfectly well—my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Paterson) will know to his cost, I am afraid, whose is the hand—from whose hand the weapon comes which is destined to strike him out of the place which he has so long and honorably filled in this House. Still, I am inclined to think that, as my hon. friend has already baffled the efforts of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs in another way, he may still prove himself more than a match for all attempts made by Act of Parliament to turn my hon. friend out of the Parliament of Canada. Now, what does my hon. friend propose by the amendment? And let me say here, again, that there is no member of the Reform party in Canada who objects to Indians, as Indians, exercising the franchise. They are perfectly willing to sustain and support the hon. gentleman in any measure which he chooses to introduce for the purpose of giving votes to Indians who are governed by the same laws, who are subject to the same conditions as their white countrymen. Let every Indian who is willing to submit himself to white laws as unreservedly as the white man have the franchise, if he possesses the proper qualification which is required from the white man in order to give him the franchise. But we object that while, for all other purposes, for all ordinary purposes of life, you treat the Indian as a child, for the purpose of giving votes to the Superintendent General he is to be treated as a fully grown man and as a rational creature. You will not allow an Indian to make a will, to sell a piece of property, to treat of his own affairs, in the way that you permit an ordinary white man; you treat him as a minor, as a ward; you subject him to all manner of restrictions, except only when you want to get his vote in particular localities, for the purpose of discomfiting certain particular members of Parliament or strengthening the seats of other members of Parliament. Those are the conditions on which the Indian becomes a fully grown and rational man, while for all other purposes he remains a child, under the tutelage and protection of the Superintendent General. By-the-bye, I may call the attention of the hon. gentleman from Glengarry to this fact, that in all his speech, from beginning to end, I did not observe that he said one word on the amendment now before the House. Now, what is that amendment? It simply asks that the Indian should, of his own free will and motion, come forward and ask for a vote. Is that too hard a condition? Is it too much to ask that before the Indian shall vote he shall ask for the right to vote?

Mr. MACMASTER. He will do that at the polls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What petitions have we had from Indians asking for the franchise? There may be a letter or two from particular friends of the Superintendent General, but outside of that we certainly have had no evidence. We have no evidence in the various voluminous reports submitted to us by the Superintendent General, or in the voluminous reports made by his agents at various times, which, so far as they make any allusion to the question at all, go to prove that, in the opinion of the Superintendent General and his officers, the Indians, so far from desiring to have the franchise, are not fit and do not want to be trusted with even the control of their own municipal affairs. What