

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I also say that the hon. gentleman withdrew his remark as regards the Chairman; but he did not withdraw his remarks as regards hon. gentlemen opposite, and that he is not compelled to do.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the hon. member will be allowed to proceed with his speech, because if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in disturbing the proceedings of the committee we shall have to call in Mr. Speaker that order may be restored.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is very little use making a gentlemanly apology before some hon. gentlemen.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is another insult to the committee. The hon. gentleman intentionally insults hon. members.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I intend to insult no one. If there is anyone so ungentlemanly as not to understand my remarks I do not address them to him. Now, at Seven Islands agency 40 bushels of potatoes were sent to the Indians to sow. But they ate them, and said the Queen was very good to send them. (The hon. gentleman continued reading from the reports of different Indian agencies contained in the report to the Department.)

Mr. McCRAANEY. It is not very often I trouble the House, but this question is of such vast importance, that I feel it my duty to condemn the course of the Government in bringing down this measure at this late hour of the Session. This Session has now lasted over three months; we were here six weeks before anything was done, and all the business that has yet been done, could have been done in those six weeks. Now, Sir, the action of the First Minister in bringing down this measure was, to me, entirely a mystery during the whole of these three months. For my own part, I did not believe he would bring down this Bill at all, but he finally made up his mind to do so. The longer I look at this Bill, the more monstrous it appears to me. This Bill has a hundred sides to it, and every side of it is more infamous than the other. I think without any exception—and I have read considerable history of the civilised nations of the world—that there has not been a more infamous measure proposed in any civilised country for the last two hundred years. I have in my hand a cartoon of *Grip* which describes the situation exactly. It is entitled, "A bird's eye view." It says: "Why not have the revising barristers do the voting directly, not indirectly?" Above it is the First Minister with the words "Alexander III, revising barrister of Russia." Now, Sir, that is the effect of this measure. The First Minister is the revising barrister. Not a single gentleman opposite has attempted to defend this Bill. I have myself spoken to a number of intelligent supporters of the Government on this question, and not a single one of them has attempted to defend it. Why do they not defend it? If it is British justice, British fair play, why do they not get up like men and defend this Bill? They cannot defend it. It cannot be defended in this civilised country. Sir, I say myself, as an independent supporter of the Opposition, that if the hon. gentleman whom I support were to bring down a measure half as bad, half as vicious, I would walk out of this House, or walk over to the other side of the House. I would not be guilty of such a thing. Now, Sir, we have a passage in Scripture which speaks about a strong man armed; when one wants to spoil his goods he first binds the strong man, and then spoils his goods. Now this is what the Government are trying to do with regard to the Reform party. They are trying to tie the hands of the Reform party, and then telling them to go and fight. They are putting a rope around their necks, and then they are telling them to run. This is the inevitable effect of this Bill. I have had the honor of a seat in this House for some years; I was here during a

portion of the Administration of the Mackenzie Government. Although we have had some pretty bad measures brought down to the Parliament of this country during the last ten or fifteen years, yet I am free to say that, not excluding the Pacific Scandal, or the Gerrymander Bill of 1882, I think this Bill is without any exception the most infamous of the whole lot. I have seen the condition of the Indians in almost every State of the Union and in our North-West. To think that this Government ignores our noble young men and our intelligent women to give votes to dirty, filthy, lousy Indians is beyond my comprehension. I do not wish to say anything against intelligent and Christian Indians, of whom there are some, but I think hon. gentlemen opposite can have no conception of the degradation of the Indian's condition. This Bill is un-British, it is a step backward in our institutions. If such a Bill were introduced into the British House of Commons, the Government introducing it would be hurled from power. I say, and I say it advisedly, that large numbers of our intelligent young men have left this country because they were denied the franchise, on the grounds that they did not pay taxes; yet it is proposed to give Indians votes, although they do not pay taxes. The Government expend over \$1,200,000 a year on our Indians, to clothe and feed and look after them. There is another reason why the Government are anxious to push this Bill through. We have now five new Provinces in the North-West. The question of their representation has already been before the House, and it is probable those Provinces will shortly obtain representatives. If the Indians are permitted to use the franchise we shall be having some of their chiefs down here as members of this House. We shall have Poundmaker, Blue-Quill, Bob-Tail, and the rest of them. The whole thing is too ridiculous, and I hope the Government will at least see that the clause respecting Indians is struck out of the Bill. I desire to read an extract from a letter I have received from a lady on this franchise question. The lady writes:

"How any man can hesitate for one moment in making up his mind on this subject is more than I can understand, to think of such wretches as some of these scamps daring to get up and publicly question the ability of the woman of property to exercise the franchise, or expressing his doubt as to whether or not they would exercise it for the public good, while the fact is it is almost a profanity for some of them to mention the word woman. As well might a mud-puddle question the right or ability of pure water to cleanse or refresh and invigorate. As well might the vilest and most ignorant Hottentot or Indian question the ability or right of an Oxford professor to exercise personal liberty aright. Are my comparisons far fetched or unjust? I think not, considering the character of some of those fellows who so speak. Shame on them."

Those are the opinions of some of the ladies of the country. I concur in those opinions. I have witnessed the disgraceful feasts of Indians on the Pacific coast, no one can help but express abhorrence at them. Yet it is the intention of the Government to enfranchise those Indians. Until such times as Indians are free men they are like children. Who is the parent in their case? It is the First Minister. I do not say that this Government is worse than any other, but under any Government the Indians will be compelled to do what the Government pleases, or supplies will be stopped. It has been repeated time and again that this Government possesses the confidence of the people. If so why resort to such a dishonorable measure as this. Surely the Government do not want to remove the few remaining members on this side of the House—the members for Brant, Bothwell, Middlesex, and the rest. Yet this would seem to be the deliberate intention. The whole Bill is most unfair, most dishonorable. (The hon. gentleman read a number of sections from the Indian Act in order to show the extent to which they are under the control of the Superintendent-General.) I have only to say that I look upon this measure with the utmost horror. In all my experience I have never known any legislation so repugnant to my feel-