

lands. Serious difficulties have already arisen where outside persons have got on the reserves in the eastern provinces. There should be some qualification of those powers given the superintendent general. I do not think any person who is not a member of the band, should be allowed to occupy land on an Indian reserve. I submit that, however, for the consideration of the committee.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Is the superintendent general the Minister of the Interior?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Yes.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Then I do not see the same objection that I otherwise would have to this clause.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—The remarks of the hon. gentleman from Halifax are evidence that he has not given much study to the settlement upon these reserves. If he will some Saturday, when I have time, come with me to the Bay of Quinté I will take him to an Indian reserve where he will find two-thirds of the lessees of Indian lands are white men.

Hon. Mr. POWER—It is a great abuse.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No, because if that were not the case the lands would be lying waste and the Indians would not receive the benefit which arises from the rents paid for those lands. There is a very large reserve in the township of Tyendinga, and that is an illustration of the whole, so far as Ontario is concerned. There are many Indians occupied in stores and shops. I know of one who is book-keeper of the great firm of the Rathbun Co., which is one of the largest lumbering firms in Canada. Other Indians have their allotments of land—it applies as much to them as it could to any Indian who forms part of the band. The gentleman to whom I have referred as being a book-keeper in the Rathbun Co. is an educated man—a gentleman in every sense of the word. He does not think proper to live upon his land, but he goes into a lumbering establishment and occupies the same position there that a white man would as book-keeper of the establishment. If my hon. friend's views were carried out, this Indian's land could not be leased or rented for his benefit,

unless it were done for the purposes that are defined in the old act where Indians are engaged in occupations which interfere with their cultivation of the land. These words are struck out of the amended Act and enable the superintendent general to lease property such as that to which I have called the attention of the House for the advantage of a man who may be occupied in pursuits outside of the reserve. The state of affairs to which my hon. friend objects has existed ever since the law has been on the statute-book. The clauses to which he refers makes provision that you cannot dispose of or lease those lands without the consent of the band, but this takes power to enable the superintendent general, in cases such as that to which I have referred, to lease the land of the Indian for his benefit. Otherwise it could not be done. That is really the only change in the law. I am quite sure if my hon. friend were acquainted with the practical working of it, he would withdraw his objection.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER—Does the hon. gentleman say that this law does not take away the right of the band to consent? Does it require in every case the consent of the band?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No not for the individual, nor did the old law. If you wanted to lease a farm, or a portion of a reserve which belonged to an individual Indian who did not live upon the reserve but earned his living otherwise, under the law as it stands on the statute-book you could only lease it under such circumstances as are specified in the law. The provision of the new law is that you could lease it for the benefit of the person who owns the land without the consent of the band.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER—And without his consent?

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Oh no, not at all. Under no law could you take a man's property and lease it without his consent.

Hon. Mr. BERNIER—As this clause reads it would appear to be so.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—That is provided for in other clauses. The amendment simply amounts to this, that the