

Mr. GRAY: The minister or the Superintendent General. That is what I object to very, very seriously.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member has also stated that no reasons have been given to the committee as to why this action has been taken. I have endeavoured to give to the committee on one or two occasions at least my own personal feelings in the matter, and I would refer the hon. member to Hansard of February 21, when I spoke as follows:

Through the years the Canadian people have recognized their responsibilities for the welfare of the Indians of this country. In furtherance of that recognition they have spent vast sums of money in order to raise the status of the Indian. In cooperation with the churches they have established a very comprehensive educational system comprising both residential and day schools. They have also provided medical and hospitalization services for the Indian and have spent large sums of money, notably in the west, in order to make the Indian self supporting upon our agricultural lands. This constant endeavour throughout the years to raise the status of the Indian has been for what purpose? What has been the ultimate object in view in the expenditure of these moneys and the providing of these services for the Indian? It has been to raise the Indian to full status where he can take his place as a citizen of Canada. I believe this policy is the correct one but so far we have failed to take that final step which, in my opinion, should be taken, namely, to make the Indian a full citizen of this country when he has obtained that degree of advancement which entitles him to the full responsibilities and privileges of citizenship.

Those were the reasons I gave to the committee on that occasion. I am still of the same opinion, namely, that Canada has spent large sums of money for the advancement of the Indians, and again I ask: For what purpose, if not for the purpose of raising the Indian to the full status of citizenship? When he has attained that status in my opinion he should accept the responsibilities and privileges of a Canadian citizen.

Mr. ELLIOTT: I believe the minister is entirely mistaken as to his views concerning the relationships hitherto existing between the government and the Indians. His views concerning the treatment they have received are contrary to the actual relationships which have existed for generations between the crown and the Indians. I have received a protest from the Indians of the Chippewa band of the Thames who are strongly opposed to any form of compulsory enfranchisement of Indians. I believe they are preparing a petition to be presented to the government, in which they will object strenuously to any change in the rights which through certain treaties they have enjoyed through the years. Then I have from

the Stregis Indians of Quebec the following telegram:

The Stregis Indians strongly protest against amending the compulsory enfranchisement to Indian Act due to conditions on the reservation, lack of work, lack of education, therefore not able to be self supporting and government would be breaking the faith of our Indian treaty.

This is signed by the Stregis Indians of Quebec. Then I have an appeal from the Caughnawaga Indians. Apparently they seem to believe they have treaties about which the minister does not know.

Mr. McDADE: Is not the hon. member referring to the St. Regis Indians? He has named them the Stregis Indians.

Mr. ELLIOTT: The word on the telegram is Stregis; I assume it should be St. Regis. May I direct the attention of the committee to what the Indians on the Caughnawaga reserve say:

We the councillors of the Caughnawaga reserve, assembled in council this twenty-fifth day of February, 1933, do beg to approach you relative to the passing and adoption by the House of Commons making it compulsory for the Indians of Canada to be enfranchised.

It would be severe calamity to our Indians at this present time should we be compelled to follow the laws of the white man in that we were not given the advantages of seriously studying and comprehending the difficult problems and laws of the British commonwealth.

In dealing with those treaties between Great Britain and the United States wherein the independence of the Indians of the Six Nations, both Great Britain and the United States have confessed that the Six Nations were an independent people. The Supreme courts of both countries furthermore recognized those treaties as inviolable.

In the life of Sir Frederick Haldimand, the question of the sovereignty of the Indians was very embarrassing, in that it would have been impossible on any theory of the laws of the nations for Great Britain or the United States to establish a prerogative in themselves to enforce the laws of the white man upon owners of this country.

In dealing with the Jay Treaty of Amity, Mallory p. 590 in 1794 the rights of the Indians was recognized. Moreover the language used there treated those tribes as being outside the circle of British subjects in relation to citizenship and sovereignty.

To make this admission still stronger that article was amplified by amendment of 1796 Mallory, p. 607 . . .

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member is quoting Malloy; will he tell the committee who the commentator is?

Mr. ELLIOTT: I assume the book will be in the Department of Indian Affairs.

Mr. MURPHY: What authority is Malloy? Is he a member of the judiciary?