

Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories, or the District of Keewatin, except in so far as the said clauses are by proclamation of the Governor in Council from time to time extended to any band of Indians in any of the said Provinces or territories."

I have detailed to the House, what they can read for themselves, all the machinery which is applied to the enfranchising of the more advanced bands of Indians outside of the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia; yet the First Minister preceded the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act with the declaration that the Indians in British Columbia and Manitoba shall not even be allowed to apply for enfranchisement, so inferior were they; yet the same hon. gentleman now brings down a Bill to this House, to give those same Indians votes; and endeavors—would it be too strong to say—to smuggle it through the House; because the hon. member for Algoma does not understand its terms; because the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), an eminent legal gentleman, does not understand it; because the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) does not understand it; because other hon. gentlemen with whom I have conversed privately do not understand it. But there we have the declaration of the First Minister that these Indians will have votes under this Bill. As I said before, this term, enfranchising the Indians, is a misleading term; it is not the proper term to apply to the Bill before the House. The Bill before the House does not enfranchise the Indian. The Indian can be enfranchised only through the machinery provided in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act. The Bill of the hon. gentleman is simply to give a vote to the Indian; but, while giving him a vote, it leaves him in the same position of tutelage, a minor or ward of the Government, that he was in before the Bill was introduced. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is a gentleman of a great deal of intelligence, and I do not know whether he inspired the article or not, but the only paper that notices this question, the *Montreal Gazette*, falls into the same error as hon. gentlemen opposite. It says, referring to my argument:

"Upon the ground so clearly and forcibly defined by Mr. Paterson the Government has moved in to enfranchise the Indians and to confer upon them all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man."

This Bill does not do anything of the kind; it gives them the right to vote and nothing more. It does not give the Indian the right to hold his land and to dispose of it; it does not give them the right to leave the reserve for five years without forfeiting his claim to his portion of the land; it does not give him the right to sell his own produce; and he remains in precisely the same position, after you have given him the power to vote under this Bill, that he was in before. What sheer nonsense it is, and it shows how utterly hon. gentlemen opposite have failed to grasp the idea contained in this Bill when we find them making statements like that. What was it I said in reference to the enfranchising act when I spoke of the more liberal clauses that the hon. gentleman might avail himself of—not forcing the Indian, for I do not believe in forcing him, but giving him inducements to become enfranchised. I said:

"The whole Indian law discourages the assimilation of the whites and the Indians, and the solution of the Indian problem can only be found in wiping out the distinction which exists between the races. In giving the red man all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man, and entailing on him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges."

Is not that right? The ground I took then I take to-day. Give to him all the rights, lead him on to acquire all the rights and the privileges enjoyed by the white man, and entail on him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges. In other words, make the Indian a citizen as we are citizens; lead him on to acquire for himself the rights of citizenship. This Bill will not accomplish this. The only way in which it can be brought about is by the enfranchising clauses I have read in the Indian Act. Will the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, answer

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

me another question, as I hesitate to give my opinion, owing to my uninformed mind on these questions. Can the Indian serve upon a jury as other citizens can, even if this Bill passes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to say; but I do not know that there is any law in the Province of Ontario against it.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman hesitates to say; he says he does not know there is any law against it. I venture to give my opinion that the Indian cannot. I would ask the First Minister another question. Have the Government of this country the power to order out the Indians, say the Indians of the Six Nations, under arms? I know the Indians of the Six Nations volunteer very often to serve, but have the Government the power to order them out to do battle for their country, as they have the power to order out citizens?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they have.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman thinks so. He is not positive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot be as positive as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON. No, but you ought to be able to give a positive answer, as Superintendent-General of the Indians, and as the introducer of a Bill giving the Indians the right to vote. I say the Government have not the power, as I understand our treaty relations with the Indians, of ordering them out to do battle in defence of the country. The First Minister does not say the Government have the power. Do not you see at once that though hon. gentlemen opposite seek to give them the vote, the Indians have not the rights, responsibilities and privileges of other citizens? Yet the *Montreal Gazette* and hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if we were denying to the Indians their right and liberties. No; I say the solution of the Indian question is give the Indians a chance, the more advanced Indians, but it would be wrong to attempt to enfranchise them all at once. There is a vast difference in the estate and condition of many of the Indians intellectually, morally, financially, and in every way, as compared with the whites; but give to the advanced Indian a chance to rise; give him opportunities greater than are given to him in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act of raising himself to the same status as that occupied by ourselves. I repeat that giving him the right to vote does not give him one iota of liberty and privilege greater than he enjoys under the Indian Act. He will be still a ward of the Government, in a state of tutelage, his affairs will be managed and controlled by the Government just the same as before. That is the ground the Opposition take. The utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite show that they did not seize this question in its true import. What has been said here from the Opposition side is true. The First Minister has confirmed it when he said it was his intention openly, under this Act, that the tribal Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia as well as of the North-West Territories, when representation will be given to those Territories under the Bill the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce, should not be enfranchised, but be given the right to vote—for the two things are vastly different—and to send representatives here, and yet not be able to sell their own produce, make their own bargains, lease their own lands, much less sell them, unless authorised to do so by the Ottawa Government. Is it a safe, is it a proper thing, is it right for the committee to pass the Bill, now that they understand clearly from the mouth of the First Minister what the intention is, and now that they can reason out, from the statements he has made, what its effect will be? I have found to my satisfaction an