deferred until it has been submitted to them and approved at least by the members of the council.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): If that method were adopted we would have a very difficult time passing any legislation for the control and benefit of Indians. The Six Nations Indians are consulted on all matters that affect them personally, just as is the case with every other band. They are getting the same class of education, the same assistance from the government. I am not going to enter into an argument this afternoon with my hon, friend about the status of the Six Nations Indians although I do not agree with him at all. I simply say that they get exactly the same treatment under the Indian Act as any other Indian band in Canada receives. If my hon, friend contends that the Six Nations Indians have a right to be consulted about any amendment to the act and none of the other tribes has that right, I cannot agree with him. I want to say frankly to my hon, friend that these few amendments are all in the interests of the Indian and Indian education, and for the betterment of the social welfare of the Indians, and if they have to be delayed until all the Indian tribes and their councils are consulted, there will never be any legislation pass this house.

Mr. SMOKE: The minister does not get my point at all. It is only the Six Nations Indians that occupy that peculiar position. All the other Indians in the country were natives of this country as far back as we can go, but that is not the case with the Six Nations Indians. They came here under a treaty, and I do think that, as they have a council which deals with the administration of their own affairs, they ought to be consulted with regard to any legislation proposed by this parliament.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Under the section as it stands the Superintendent General can apply the whole or any part of the interest moneys of Indian children attending an industrial or boarding school to the maintenance of such school or to the maintenance of the children themselves. That is, it is optional with the superintendent general to apply the money to the maintenance either of the school or of the children. By the proposed amendment the minister is reducing his own powers; he is preventing himself from devoting that money to the maintenance of the school. Cases might arise where it would be desirable to devote part of the money to the maintenance of the school. What is the specific object in curtailing the minister's power in that respect?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I do not think that there is really very much need for the amendment, but the reason for it is that we no longer require these moneys for the maintenance of the schools because we have undertaken their construction and maintenance as government institutions for the religious organizations that are carrying on the teaching. That is not true with respect to the day schools, but a great number of them have been constructed by the government. The boarding schools, however, where the pupils are brought and kept for a period each year under the control of the principal of the school, are all now constructed and maintained by the government.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is the government running the boarding schools?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We construct and maintain them.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): And the day schools?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We furnish them, but are not responsible for their whole maintenance.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is the government actually conducting these boarding schools?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes, in the sense that we build and equip the schools, but the churches then take control of them, and we give them a per capita grant for each child. Formerly the churches built the schools and were doing practically all the work.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Is that per capita grant sufficient to pay all the teachers' salaries?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I doubt if it would be. It is a pretty expensive proposition carrying on a school in these northern territories. I could not answer that question definitely.

Mr. ADSHEAD: Do the churches contribute something?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): The churches have been contributing very generously for Indian work.

Mr. COOTE: Is it not a fact that the main purpose of that per capita grant is to provide for the maintenance of the child, for its food and clothing?

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. COOTE: So far as I am concerned I think that this particular amendment is quite in order. In my opinion the old act gave the minister more power than he should have had in fairness to the Indian.