

apply it to, it does seem to attach a condition to this privilege which we are trying to get him to accept. I do not think it is an argument which the Indian will understand and will be able to follow.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I do not think there is an Indian in the country who would not understand it. If he is married, has two or three children, and is earning more than \$3,000, he should not be in opposition to contributing to the maintenance and security of the state, if in return, he enjoys the benefits.

You are dealing with a class who pay income tax. But Indian families are large and exemptions are high. It is true that tax exemption may not always be on the generous level it is at the moment. That is only a matter of detail. But the number of Indians who are in receipt of income which would be taxable and who are not developed to the stage which you are trying to describe is very small.

Anybody who is in receipt of that income has the intelligence and the wisdom to understand why he should not have an exemption from a right which is held by all other Canadian citizens.

Mr. APPLEWHAITE: I think that Mr. Fulton has put forward the viewpoint as expressed by the Indians exactly as the Indians expressed it at their conference.

I think there is one rather bad omission in that argument. But whether or not the Indians in this country feel that they were guaranteed tax exemption in perpetuity, it seems to me that by the same provision they were denied the right to take part in the affairs of this country by means of the vote in perpetuity. I suggest that not only was tax exemption given as a compensation given for the loss of lands and so on, but it was also in part compensation for the refusal to allow them to take part in the government of the country. I think we should take that point into consideration.

There is one other thing which I should like to say and it is very much of a generality. In this day and age amongst non-Indians there is a great deal too much emphasis being placed upon "your rights" and "your privileges" and not enough upon "your responsibilities" and "your duties". If we are trying to educate the Indian to a position where we feel he will be a worthwhile voter and citizen of Canada then I suggest we do not follow that line too strongly.

The other question which is worrying me at the moment is while the Indian Act definitely applies to Indians and Indian affairs, the provision under which they vote does not come under the Indian Act. That comes under the Dominion Elections Act. Now what is the position between the two Acts if we drop subsection (2) of 86 without having some section of amendment in the Dominion Elections Act—

Mr. FULTON: Which is up for revision this year.

Mr. APPLEWHAITE: Yes.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: I went into that the other day in response to your suggestion or statement, and the positive statement that the waiver would act as a waiver of a taxation exemption must be contained in some section. It is not now in the Dominion Elections Act and logically and every other way, it should appear here in the section that grants taxation exemption.

Mr. APPLEWHAITE: Am I right then that in its present form the Dominion Elections Act provides for the signing of a waiver but there is not statutory authority which makes that waiver effective.

Hon. Mr. HARRIS: That is right. It provides for an Indian name being placed on the voters' list if he has signed a waiver but this is the section that then operates to waive the tax exemption.

Mr. BLACKMORE: For the record would the minister mind explaining for the benefit of the Indians who will be reading this just what is meant by the waiver? There will be Indians who will not know and would the minister mind explaining?