

for the Indian. He also suggests that more time is required for the study of this report. I too have every sympathy for the Indian, and although I am not a member of the committee I do not feel that it would be proper and wise to give this well-studied report a black eye by refusing to concur in it.

Some hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I know the details of the report less fully than does the honourable senator from Rigaud (Hon. Mr. Dupuis) and much less fully than those senators who attended the committee more faithfully than the honourable gentleman claims to have done. However, I see enough before me to cause me to refrain from opposing it. I see, for example, the recommendation that some statutory provision be made for the adequate care of aged, infirm or blind Indians, and in the meantime that rations to Indians be given in sufficient quantity and quality.

Hon. Mr. DUPUIS: Will the honourable senator allow me to ask a question? I do not want to be misinterpreted. I am not opposed to concurrence in the report; I merely reserve my decision. Suppose this report was concurred in today, would the legislation to which the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) is now referring, be passed before the end of the session?

Some hon. SENATORS: No.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. DUPUIS: Then nothing would be done this session.

Hon. Mr. ROEBUCK: I thought the honourable senator from Rigaud (Hon. Mr. Dupuis) was going to question the statement made in this paragraph, but he has not done that. If he had done so I would have asked him why he did not attend when the report was being studied by the committee and make the correction before the report was brought here. Evidently the honourable gentleman agrees with what I take to be the necessary implication of this paragraph, namely, that the infirm and blind Indians are not now receiving adequate care, and that rations given to Indians are not of sufficient quantity and quality.

I have referred to only one clause. There are too many for me to discuss them all, but I will not be a party to voting against a humanitarian document of this kind. I have every confidence in the sincerity of the members of the committee, and I know the care

with which they have carried on their extensive investigations. Therefore I am going to vote for concurrence in the report.

Hon. JACOB NICOL: Honourable senators, I had the honour of being a member of the joint committee during the session preceding this one, but I found the work so exacting that I could not give it the time that it required, and I asked to be relieved. It was my privilege to attend some of the committee's sittings, where I observed the thorough work that was done by my colleagues. They have carried on their work to the present time and made the report that is before us. From time to time I received reports of the committee's proceedings, as I presume all members of this house did. Sometimes I read those reports and sometimes I did not, but my failure to read any of them certainly will not justify a vote on my part for non-concurrence in the present report.

I think the members of the committee have done a wonderful job. I heard some of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, and they stressed the urgency for prompt action. As we know, the committee has sat during the last two sessions. It seems to me that to vote against concurrence in their report would be equivalent to criticizing the committee for the splendid work it has done.

As I asked to be relieved from membership on the committee because of not having sufficient time to give to the inquiry, I certainly could not do other than vote to have the report of my colleagues concurred in.

Hon. J. FREDERICK JOHNSTON: Honourable senators, I think all who were privileged to serve on this joint committee did not attend many of its sittings before coming to the conclusion that we, as Canadians, had neglected our wards, the Indians. To my mind, the work that has been done by the committee during the past two years should have been undertaken years ago.

Some hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON: Those who have followed the committee's proceedings will know something about the magnitude of the work that was undertaken. The report before us has been well thought out, by people capable of making a good report. Why should we move now that it be not concurred in? What the committee recommends is only what should have been done years ago by those who had the matter in hand. I suggest that refusal to accept the report at this time would be an affront to every member of the committee.

Hon. WILLIAM H. TAYLOR: Honourable senators,—