

of the world, and we comfort our conscience with the practical thought that we have occupied these wide domains for the ultimate good of their original inhabitants.

Again every person born in Canada is a Canadian citizen, and a subject of the Crown. It is not conceivable as practicable that there can be even quasi-sovereignty of peoples living with us and among us and not of us. It is acknowledged that there are certain municipal laws and regulations which affect the liberty and independence of the Indians and which must be obeyed. Municipal law of whatever nature derives its authority from the Crown through the Provinces or in another wider sense from the Crown of the Dominion. Any rights and usages of the Indians that they enjoy on their reservations in the way of internal regulations are in their nature municipal and not sovereign, and not included in the law of nations, but opposed to it. Therefore, we may dismiss the contentions of the Six Nations Indians as untenable and the principle involved as unworkable, if for no other reason. If the Indians were segregated on an island wholly by themselves and were capable of self government and self-sustaining in all respects as are the people of the Isle of Man, for instance, their claims for a degree of local self-government enjoyed by the latter would be on a different basis. They would still, however, be Canadian citizens, and under Canadian sovereignty. It was claimed by certain persons who appeared before the Committee that they represented all the Indians of Canada, and if certain rights were not recognized it would have a bad effect and set a bad precedent throughout Canada. To the boundary of British Columbia all the Indians have been settled by treaty and all such issues as land titles and sovereignty are as extinct as the dodo. Outside of the Six Nations the tribes are not interested and are giving no

trouble on that score. British Columbia Indians are on a little different basis and I propose to deal with them in a separate article.

The report of the Committee, which is likely to become one of the standing committees of the House, has in the main supported the Department of Indian Affairs in its policy in the past and in its aims for the future. It has not recognized the claims of the Six Nations, nor has it given countenance to the demands of those representing the Indians of British Columbia. It supports the position of the Department in respect of provision for enfranchisement, not all at once, of course, but as speedily as is practicable, and also in respect of compulsory education. Obviously, the sooner the Indians cease to be wards of the Nation and become full-fledged citizens of the Dominion the better. Many of them, possibly the great majority, may object, because the responsibility which goes with it has its drawbacks for people unused to exercise it. It is the fear of the novice in swimming or attempting any new physical feat. Education is the training for the exercise of that responsibility. Voluntary education has not been a success taking the Indian population as a whole.

Compulsory education with them, it will have to be conceded at the outset, will be attended with many difficulties, especially in the West, where the reservations are usually remote from settlement, and will involve largely increased expenditure on the part of the Government. In the West, particularly, missions conducted by the churches—Roman Catholic, English Church, Methodist and Presbyterian—have had to do almost altogether with the education of the Indian children, and while much good has been done as a restraining influence, it has not been wholly a success. It has been, for one thing, a source of much trouble and vexation for the department, through the rivalry, per-