

Hon. Mr. PARENT: Are being paid presently.

Hon. Mr. BELAND: Are being paid presently—now.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Unless there is some assurance that this formality has been complied with, the Senate cannot proceed further with the Bill.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: If the honourable gentleman (Hon. Mr. Parent) has the right to do so, and is willing to give the House an undertaking that the fees will be paid, I will withdraw the objection.

Hon. Mr. PARENT: I take the responsibility of stating that the attorney for the promoters of the Bill has said that the money is to be paid to-day.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the honourable gentleman could go further than that, but it would hardly justify us in giving the Bill second reading.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: If assurance is given to the House in the proper form that the money has been paid, we can return to this matter later.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. I have no objection to that at all; but it would have to be the assurance of the honourable member.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Usually the giving of such assurance has been limited to the Clerk of the Senate.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: He says the fees have not been paid.

The motion for the second reading stands.

INDIAN BILL

THIRD READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the third reading of Bill 21, an Act to amend the Indian Act.

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: May I ask my right honourable friend whether he is sure that the Indians whom the Government proposes to enfranchise are really Canadian citizens? The reason for my question is that a few years ago a gentleman appeared at a meeting of the League of Nations at Geneva and, through one of the members of the League—it was Holland if I am not mistaken—lodged a protest on behalf of certain Indians whom he represented, stating that they were not citizens of Canada, but allies of Canada who had taken up residence in this country under certain conditions. The matter was of

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

such importance that the late Sir Lomer Gouin and I had a conference with the representative of the Indians, and I cabled to Canada for some assurance in regard to it. The reply I received was very short, namely, that there was no real foundation for the contention. As to the endeavour to enfranchise these Indians, will the objection be raised in some quarters that they are allies of Canada and not Canadian citizens?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The remarks of the right honourable senator refer to the Six Nations Indians. They have advanced the contention that they are a separate nation living within the borders of Canada under the terms of a treaty made between their sovereign authority and the sovereign authority of Canada. This contention was taken to the courts, but did not meet with much success. I fancy it is pretty apparent that you cannot have one nation within another, living on property which is subject to the suzerainty of the other. The judgment of the courts undoubtedly was sound, and I do not think the League of Nations regarded the contention very seriously. In the absence of the honourable senator from De Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) I do not like to speak too authoritatively of the action of the League of Nations, but I think I may say it would take many Leagues of Nations to make a separate nation of the Six Nations Indians.

While on my feet I may add to what I said yesterday regarding the position of the Indian who owns land within the borders of a reserve and who becomes enfranchised under the statute. The question was raised whether such a man could sell that land without restraint—whether he could sell it to a white man, and, if so, whether such white man could then live on the land within the confines of the reserve. I expressed yesterday the tentative view that this could be done; that the enfranchised Indian would be one hundred per cent a citizen of Canada, without any abbreviation, and that he could buy and sell the same as any other citizen of Canada. That view is correct: he can sell to a white man or to whomever he chooses. The property is absolutely his own.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Though I shall not contest the statement of my right honourable friend, I confess that it surprises me a little. I thought the reserves were maintained for the exclusive use and advantage of the Indians, and that no Indian could sell out to a white man. My right honourable friend makes the distinction that when the Indian who owns the property is enfranchised