

*By Mr. Matthews:*

Q. A celebration of that kind would not be harmful at all?—A. No, there is nothing harmful about it. The R.C.M.P. are in attendance to prevent any liquor being introduced or anything that might cause any trouble.

*By the Chairman:*

Q. Shall we proceed? I think we had better dispense with questions so that we can get the presentation made.

The WITNESS: Now, the main conclusion that I would like to put before this committee, from the viewpoint of the department, is that all the Indians in Canada are treated as though they were under treaty, whether they are actually formally under treaty or not. The treaty idea, from that proclamation of 1763, has been the underlying basis of Indian policy, with this primary consideration, that Indians who have lands for their own use, that those lands should be inalienable, except by mutual consent of the Indians and the government; and that the Indians on those lands should be protected by the government, as a government responsibility, from trespass, exploitation, or molestation of any kind.

Then, from that basic idea of protected lands or areas, there follow the other services necessary to provide Indians with proper life on those reserves, sometimes specified in treaties and sometimes not, but always recognized, nevertheless, such as education, with a school system, a special school system for Indians—and you will hear about that later; health services about which you heard this morning; social services and protection, generally.

One item in this has rather a peculiar twist to it: that prohibition of the sale of liquor to Indians was part of the treaty, was written into most of the treaties, and was done so with the Indians' consent as well as the government's, and it became a governmental obligation to the Indians to maintain an Indian list, as it is commonly called. Now, that is something that most of the Indians, possibly, might think ought to be reviewed later; but nevertheless, they were a party to that condition, themselves, and very necessarily so, because the rum-seller along with the rapacious and unscrupulous trader—I do not mean that all traders are rapacious and unscrupulous—but it was usually the rapacious and unscrupulous trader who was a rum-seller as well—and the matter was connected with the whole life and well-being of the Indian as well as with his very existence and survival. So the wise leaders of the Indian people recognized and wanted the liquor provision to be put right into the treaty where it stands to-day.

Now, as I mentioned before, that treaty system has formed the basis of policy, the distinctive Anglo-approach to the Indian problem, not only in Canada but also in the United States; and the question arises as to how each country has worked it out relatively. Now, that, of course, is a matter for considerable argument and friendly comparison for mutual information and benefit; but I would think that it might be of interest for us to know what the United States government had to say officially on that subject.

A commissioner was appointed who made an official report. Perhaps I should not have said the United States government officially, but rather their official commissioner who investigated Indian affairs in Canada. It is the only case where such an investigation was made, and it happened back in 1915; but the conclusions that were drawn then have been reiterated very frequently since by the United States administrators and commentators. Mr. Chairman, do you think this would be of interest to the committee?

Mr. MacNICOL: Yes, indeed!

The CHAIRMAN: Have you more than one copy?