

Then there is a resolution which is dated from Garden River, Ontario. It is in this form:

GARDEN RIVER, Ont.,
March 29, 1920.

To His Excellency,

The Duke of Devonshire,
Governor General of Canada,
Ottawa, Canada.

Sir, We beg leave to lay before Your Excellency the following resolution which was passed by the Ojibway tribe of Indians residing at Garden River, Ontario, convened at their council house, March 27, 1920:

Resolved, that this band of Ojibway tribe of Indians residing at Garden River Indian reservation, Ontario, do hereby place themselves on record as opposed to the enactment of the Indian Enfranchisement Act as contained in Bill No. 14, section one hundred and seven to one hundred and eleven, both inclusive, now before the present session of the House of Commons, because we firmly believe that it will not be conducive to the best interests of the Indians of Canada to have such a law at the present time, and condemn the action of the Government in placing this very important question, which concerns the very life of the Indian reserves, races, rights and privileges, before Parliament without the consent of the Indians in general.

We most earnestly appeal to your humanity, honour and duty to carefully consider our position at this time, and we hope and pray that Your Excellency will not fail to maintain the principles mentioned above.

There is another communication also from Sault Ste. Marie, but I need not trouble the committee with it at the moment.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 5—powers of Council to make by-laws:

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not read this Bill, but I understand that the Special Committee sat during nearly the whole of the session, and no doubt they heard a great volume of evidence. I understand that the Indian while he lives on the reserve has certain rights in certain properties. I would like to understand from the minister what happens to those property rights when he comes under the influence and operation of this legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he has had a location he gets his own land and his share of the common fund. Then, if there is any residue of the common land of the band he gets his proper proportion of that. It is merely a matter of taking the fraction; no one has more rights than another in the common land. So he gets his share of that; nothing is taken from him. In a word, the very same principle of the apportionment of land and moneys applies as applied in the

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

case of enfranchisements under the very dilatory clauses that were in the Act before. The principle of taking his share is just the same as before. I should say before I sit down that this committee and the House are certainly under a debt of gratitude to the Special Committee. I had no anticipation when the Special Committee was moved that the work would be so heavy. They had some seventeen sittings, many of them very lengthy, and the questions involved became more complex and difficult than I had expected. No praise can be too high of the earnestness and devotion with which the members of the committee applied themselves to their work.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know who are the members of the committee, but I do know the chairman, and I know enough of him and of his work to be confident that everything was exhaustively inquired into. But he is in the position of the man who comes after the feast. Yesterday we had a feast of praise of the chairman of another committee for his excellent work, and I suppose that is why we have been rather inclined to-day to forget to say something about the splendid work of the member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys). If I have sufficient confidence in the Bill to allow it to pass, it is because it went through the hon. gentleman's hands. I do not want to say anything about Indians. All I would say about an Indian in Nova Scotia is that he is an Indian. I hope that they have better Indians in the West.

Mr. PECK: In the event of an Indian leaving the reserve and becoming enfranchised, does he participate in any future benefits accruing to the reserve? For instance, in my county there is a reserve which is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars. The question of the Indian's participation in whatever residue there might be is a very important one, because it may influence his desire for enfranchisement. The point is especially important in respect to British Columbia, where the Indian reserves are of great value.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they are of great value, of course the Indian gets at the time of his enfranchisement his share of the common value. If on account of the discovery of a mine or something of that sort the property later turns out to be of much greater value, I would not think the Indian would be entitled to a share. On the other hand, if there is a reaction in values and