

*Supply—Northern Affairs*

In the very interesting remarks and answers the minister made, he overlooked answering a question that had to do with the very important Indian shrine in Saskatchewan that so many Indians are concerned about. I wonder, would he be good enough to give the committee some information about that.

**Mr. Laing:** I apologize to the hon. member for Moose Mountain. I might mention that the Historical Sites and Monuments Board took this matter up. The board is doing a very great job for Canada. It came to the conclusion that while this rock was extremely important to the Indian people it did not fall into the category of being of national historic importance. It would therefore be very difficult for our department to do anything about preserving the rock.

Questions have been addressed to the ministry from the other side of the house, answers have been given, and discussions have been held. I think there is a proposal by P.F.R.A. to move the rock, or a section thereof. Whether this is satisfactory to the Indian people I do not know, but in light of the report given to me by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What was the purport of the report?

**Mr. Laing:** Answering the right hon. gentleman's question, the report said that this rock was not of national historic importance.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I see.

**Mr. Laing:** I am not master of the national Historic Sites and Monuments Board. I say again that that body is doing a very great service for Canada. Because of the report, I think it would be difficult for my department to do anything.

In answer to the question posed by the hon. member for Moose Mountain, I shall make it a point to discuss this matter again with the Minister of Agriculture, because questions about this matter have been addressed to him to see what can be done under P.F.R.A. I believe that P.F.R.A. officials have indicated that they are prepared to move the stone, or part thereof. I do not know whether consultations have been held with the Indian people as to the propriety of dividing the stone, but I shall inquire.

Answering the hon. member for Skeena, I must tell him that we are giving a great deal

[Mr. Southam.]

of attention to evolving some means of establishing protection for Indian artistic productions. I think we were fortunate in that respect, in preserving Eskimo art work. That will be much more difficult in respect of Indian productions because as the hon. member knows we are starting from a long way back. This matter is being seriously discussed at the present time and we hope to come up with something which will establish in the minds of the public, including buyers, the fact that the articles produced are genuine Indian articles. Protecting such artistic productions with a brand name, or with another designation, if you like, would be very well worth while from the point of view of the productions.

The hon. member spoke of the British Columbia Indian Reserves Mineral Resources Act. I think he was unhappy when his private bill was talked out. I believe he knows why that was done. I wanted to discuss the matter with the government of British Columbia. The act in question seems to be one of the least productive ever undertaken by a national government because, on looking at the matter, I determined that at one time we had collected \$17, and in another year had collected \$6 as our 50 per cent.

The hon. member will be glad to know that one group of Indians, who were approached by a mining company in British Columbia because the mining company wanted to go on the Indian reserve to look under the ground, decided that if the mining company could do it they could do it themselves. They are forming a mining company of their own. This is the type of thing that ought to be encouraged in Canada. If we do that, some of our troubles at least in respect of our Indian peoples—if they can be said to be troubles—will be over.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Chairman, not very much time is left and I wish to make some observations. One has to do with the game regulations with respect to Indians. On more than one occasion I acted for Indians when they were prosecuted for hunting, but I was unsuccessful. The Court of Appeal held as far back as 1934 in the province of Saskatchewan that hunting on a forest reserve was hunting on occupied land, and that the treaty of 1834 which stated that the Indians could hunt on unoccupied land means that there had been in contemplation the setting up of forest reserves in the generations ahead. Therefore