

at the point of the bayonet. If a white settlement comes near an Indian reserve the Indians immediately complain. They will not do as the whites do. The whites have a whole continent before them, and if they choose to go near an Indian reservation it is their business. If they find that an Indian passes at an inconvenient hour of the night and walks off with some of their fowls or property, we cannot help that, we cannot drive the Indian away. We are going to pursue the same policy that has been pursued upon these questions so successfully under the auspices of the British Government, and which has been continued ever since, of giving them a portion of the country. That same policy must be carried out. There is no new policy. We cannot drive the Indians to the north of the Saskatchewan. Why, they are too far north now. If they had been down along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway we would not have had so much trouble as we have had. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the forcible driving of the Indians to the north could not be accomplished without bloodshed, without breach of faith towards the Indians. And what would be the consequence? We would collect an immense army, a nation of hostile Indians to the north of the Saskatchewan, continually threatening our settlements and requiring something like a Chinese wall to keep out the barbarians. There is only one way—patience, patience, patience. We see what patience has done in the older Provinces. Look at the Province of Ontario. The Indian is still an Indian. His color is the same, but he is law-abiding, he is a peaceful man. There is no more danger of loaving property in the vicinity of an Indian settlement than there is in any white settlement in the Province of Ontario. In the course of ages—it is a slow process—they will be absorbed in the country. You must treat them, and our children, and our grand-children, and our great grand-children, must treat them in the same way, until, in the course of ages, they are absorbed in the general population.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the relations between the Government and the Indian population of the North-West, and he has discussed the suggestion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) of removing those Indians from the reservations in the vicinity of the railway to other portions of the country. I do not think that question is necessarily involved in the consideration of the measure before us. I do not propose to enter into the discussion of the question. The hon. gentleman, however, tells us that we see what the Indians of the older Provinces have become, and what we may expect to make of the Indians of the North-West Territory. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is referring to what the Indians are, or to what the Government propose to do for the Indians. The hon. gentleman has by perseverance and patience attempted to do something for the Indians; but whether it will be to the Indian's advantage I do not suppose it is necessary to discuss on this Bill. But the hon. gentleman has given a rather gloomy picture of some of the Indians of the North-West. He has described them as lazy, improvident, as a class who prefer to steal and plunder rather than work—in fact, as a class who will die sooner than do anything to earn food upon which they are to subsist. Whether it is a Christian rule to feed people who are able but unwilling to work, I do not know. There is a Scriptural injunction that those who will not work shall not eat; and I do not know whether the hon. gentleman regards that as a heterodox view of the Indian's position or not. The hon. gentleman's statement with respect to the Indians reminds me of a story told by a literary man of Washington in regard to some of the whites of the south, who were very much like the Indians the hon. gentleman has described. He told of a benevolent man, a planter, who was in the habit of providing a number of lazy fellows with food. At last he

became impatient and would do nothing more for them. There was one who was regarded by his neighbors as a nuisance, and he was put into a coffin to be buried alive. While the funeral procession passed him, he asked whether the man was going to be buried. The reply was: "Yes, he would not work; he had become such a nuisance that they were going to bury him." "I will give him a bag of corn if you will let him go," said the gentleman. Thereupon the fellow raised his head, and asked whether the corn was shelled. The gentleman replied, "No." "Then," said the man, "you may go on with the funeral." The hon. gentleman's description of the Indians in the North-West was very much like the description of those lazy fellows of the south. It would be advantageous to the Indians if the industrious were encouraged and those unwilling to work were left to the consequences of their indolence. I have no objection to the First Minister providing such a force as is necessary to keep those Indians in order. I am sufficiently in favor of the theory of the survival of the fittest that, if an Indian is industrious and is disposed to improve his position, I would afford him opportunities to do so that I would not force upon those who would starve sooner than work. But we shall have an opportunity of discussing that feature of the question on a fitting occasion, and I wish to refer for a moment to other observations made by the hon. gentleman. If the population settled along the boundaries of Southern Manitoba and the North-West Territories are cattle stealers on both sides of the border, I can understand how the hon. gentleman would not want to organize such population into a militia force and put arms in their hands. I could understand the exclamation of the Minister of Militia that we do not want to arm the population to shoot down our volunteers; that those are people who rather require to be governed than to assist in governing. But I cannot believe that the population of the North-West and of Southern Manitoba are of that predatory class described by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman must have been misinformed, and certainly before giving my support to a proposition founded upon an assumption of that kind I would like to see the evidence upon which it rests. I would like to see the correspondence between the Governments of the United States and of Canada, where the former has called upon the latter to keep their thieves on this side of the border. Daily and weekly correspondence, the hon. gentleman said, has passed with respect to the conduct of these people. The people who reside there are mainly from Ontario and the older Provinces, with a sprinkling from the old country; and I cannot believe they are of that predatory class to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If they are, the sooner we get rid of them the better. If they are, there is something radically wrong in the steps that have been taken by the Minister of Agriculture and by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has received so much active and persistent support from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), if the Government and the Company. Can it be that we have only succeeded in securing for that country a population with predatory instincts? The First Minister, before he submitted this proposition, ought to have laid on the Table of the House the astounding information he has given. It is rather extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should have found the population to be of that class, and that he should not have given to the House at an earlier period the information upon which he now asks Parliament to act. The hon. gentleman may be quite right in asking Parliament to sanction what he has undertaken. But he ought not to have asked Parliament to do so upon a statement casually made, because he did not make it at the introduction of the measure. He now asks the House to carry through this measure because a large number of the people of the North-West and Southern Manitoba are of such a