

are not their own masters, who are under the control of the Government, who have not the civil rights, liberties and obligations of other citizens, shall also have the vote, and for that reason he puts in those words. The Indian Act defines what an Indian is.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Does that apply to anything but the operation of that Act?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. LANDRY. If our law should say that a person that would kill his fellow man was guilty of murder, and an Indian did that, would he not be guilty of murder?

Mr. PATERSON. This Act is not to be inconsistent with any other Act; that is expressly provided.

Mr. LANDRY. That interpretation is for that Act only.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me take the member for Kent on his own ground. Let the First Minister simply adopt the view of the hon. member, and all he has to do is to strike out of this clause the words, "including an Indian." My hon. friend says Indians are included under the term "person." Then leave out those words, and the whole matter is disposed of. That is all I want, and all the Liberal members have been contending for. But the hon. gentleman will find that the First Minister is not willing to drop those two words, because, if he did, the unenfranchised Indians could not avail themselves of the provisions of the Bill which is now passing through the House. I think the hon. gentleman must admit that there is reason why this question should be more fully discussed, so that members of the committee who are not as intelligent or as well versed in law as the hon. gentleman himself, may have the means of ascertaining precisely what the full scope, meaning and intent of the paragraph under discussion is. I will assume no superior knowledge, but I have felt bound to give special attention to the laws relating to Indians, because 3,000 of the race dwell in the riding I represent, 3,000 people who have my hearty best wishes, and of whom I can say that the dearest desire of my heart is that they may be elevated to a higher plane than they occupy now, and that they may be entitled to all the rights and liberties given to every other citizen here. Acting with such feelings, I have, from my first entrance into Parliament, given great attention to the Indian Act and all that it means and comprehends. For that reason I make this explanation, so that the committee may be willing to accord to me probably a greater knowledge than is possessed by other members who, having no Indians within the bounds of their constituencies, have only listened to debates and have not cared to thoroughly understand it. What is the position of Indians in this country? It is said sometimes they are the original owners of the soil. That is true, with respect to our North-West Indians and to Indians in many of the Provinces. It is not true with respect to all Indians in this country. The Indians that dwell within the bounds of my own riding are not the original owners of the soil of Canada. During the revolutionary war they were true to Great Britain and fought in defence of the British Crown, and when they found themselves, at the termination of the war, deprived of the reserves they held in the neighboring Republic, the British Government gave them a tract of land, six miles wide, on both sides of the Grand River, from its source to its mouth. From time to time they have surrendered portions, which have been sold to settlers and the money formed into a fund, which the Government administers. That fund amounts to something like \$800,000, which the Government has invested, the proceeds of which are paid to the Indians semi-annually. They reside on a portion of the reserve. Therefore, you have Indians here under two different sets of circumstances. But in each case, whether they came here from the United States, as

those Indians did, or whether, as is the case with Indians in the North-West and in other parts of the country, they are the original inhabitants of Canada, they occupy a different position to other persons who come into this country or are born here. The former are citizens; the latter are outside of citizenship. A negro or a German may come to Canada and become a citizen, on taking the oath of allegiance, and can manage his own affairs. But the Indian is not allowed to manage his own affairs. Indian lands are held in common and the land is under control of the Government. Any citizen can buy and sell freely. The Indians in some Provinces are not allowed to do so, and they have no title to the land. When the Indian question came up for discussion in 1880, and when the First Minister introduced his Bill, I made a speech, an extract of which has been read to the House. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), evidently laboring under the same idea as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), thought that my utterances in 1880 were different from those I addressed the other night on the present Bill. That arose from a misapprehension, and the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken. On the former, the Minister was introducing a Bill which contained an enfranchising clause, giving the Indians the right to enfranchisement, and on that Bill I made the remarks quoted. Those were the sentiments I held at that time, and those are the sentiments I hold now. They grow stronger, and I declare that the only solution of the Indian question on this continent is: So soon as possible to lead the Indians up to, not attempt to drive them (for Parliament should force no measure on the Indians), but lead them up to a desire to assume all the responsibilities and claim all the rights of other men. I was pointing out to the First Minister on that occasion that instead of making the enfranchising clauses easier, so that Indians might more readily avail themselves of them and thus become citizens of this Dominion and exercise the same right, the hon. gentlemen was restricting those rights and making it more difficult for them to become citizens. I hold that position now. A great deal of misapprehension has arisen from the terms used during this debate. It has been stated that it was not a right thing to enfranchise Indians, as the First Minister proposed to do in this Bill. That is not a correct expression, with respect to the operation of this Bill. It does not enfranchise the Indians—remember that. The Bill of the First Minister has nothing to do with the enfranchisement of Indians. They are entirely different from all other classes. When we bring in a class that has not hitherto enjoyed the suffrage, we say that such a class is enfranchised. So they are, because they possessed before all the rights, privileges and responsibilities of other citizens, except that one right to vote. But, with the Indians, it is entirely different. You may give them the vote, but you do not necessarily enfranchise them. If this Bill passes, the Indians will have the right to vote, but they will not be enfranchised. They are Indians still. They are under the same absolute control of the Government as they were before. The same Indian laws apply to them. If they leave their reserves, and go to another country, and remain there for five years, they have no further rights to their reserves, and will no longer share in the annuity money. If this Bill passes, the Indians of Manitoba are committing a criminal offense, even if they sell the produce they grow, unless it is in conformity with the rules made for their guidance by the Department of the First Minister. If that law passes, if any man purchases goods from an Indian in Manitoba, he is liable to a penalty of \$100, when the Indian has a vote, just as much as he was when he had no vote. The Indian is not enfranchised by giving him a vote. Lead the Indian up to a desire for enfranchisement, and make it easy for him to obtain enfranchisement, and the rights and liberties possessed by other citizens of this country. I shall not read the enfranchising clause of the