

frequently happens, there has been failure to complete the sale, there has been some doubt whether or not the department has taken all precautions necessary to validate the cancellation of the sale or lease. We are taking power to do so up to date.

With respect to enfranchisement, we have had some difficulty in connection with the amendment of 1920, and we propose to cure the difficulty that exists in connection with the enfranchisement provisions of the 1920 amendment to the Indian Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the disease, and what is the cure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The department has been enfranchising Indians under the provisions of section 122A as enacted by section 6, chapter 26, of the statutes of 1918, from the time it was enacted to the present time, on the assumption that this section was still in force. We are now advised that this section was rescinded by section 3, chapter 50 of the statutes of 1920. It is desired that the said section 122A shall be maintained and that anything done purporting to be under the provisions thereof shall be validated. There seems to be some doubt as to the amendment of 1920 as it affected the amendment of 1918 with respect to enfranchisement, and we propose curing that in the amendment contained in this bill. Those are the principal features of the bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does this propose to establish a claim of the provinces on certain Indian lands under certain conditions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend has reference to a bill that I introduced the other day ratifying the agreement between the Ontario government and the federal government.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Was that not withdrawn?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I reintroduced the bill and it will come up in due course.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is that in this bill?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of Philip R. Marshall Palmer.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Felix Simpson.—Mr. Ladner.

SALARIES OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): Is it the intention of the government to table the correspondence which has passed between the Audit Board, the Civil Service Commission and the government, with reference to the readjustment of salaries of postal employees?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: (Prime Minister): If any hon. member desires to have the correspondence tabled there is no objection to its being brought down. I assume it is my hon. friend's wish to see the correspondence and I undertake to see that it is tabled.

CONSULAR PRIVILEGES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have received from the Norwegian Consul General a communication which he has requested me to read to the House. It is as follows:

Montreal, June 10, 1924.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING,
Prime Minister,
Secretary of State for External Affairs,
Ottawa, Ont.

This morning's Gazette published a Canadian press telegram from Ottawa to the effect that a member of parliament asked you for a statement regarding the arrest of the Spanish consul in Montreal. In this interpellation reference was made to an alleged protest by me against my colleague's arrest and to my alleged use of the term "colony" in referring to the Dominion of Canada. Inasmuch as, from press reports, you seem to have accepted the statements of the member in his inquiry as true, I am compelled to correct mis-statements made in this connection. The Gazette on the 7th in a local article stated that I had "protested" and the paper used the word "colony." This article was published without my knowledge. No reporter of the Gazette nor of any other paper saw or interviewed me on this subject. I did not make a protest against the Spanish consul's arrest nor have I in this instance or on any other occasion referred to Canada as a "colony." I am too well informed to make that error. Although it is well established in international law that the archives and files of a foreign consulate are inviolable, I made no protest against the search of the Spanish consulate. I feel that it should be left to the Spanish government itself to take such steps in the matter as it deemed proper. My intervention in the case consisted of a visit to the Spanish consul at his request, as I am doyen of the consular corps in Montreal, and to an inquiry of the judge as to whether he was aware that Consul Maluquer is a Consul de Carriere. I also presented to the judge the Spanish consul's complaint against his treatment at the hands of the police. I am confident you will communicate the contents of this telegram to parliament and to the press.

L. AUBERT,
Norwegian Consul General.