

Parole Act

what a lot of the government's proponents are thinking. I defy any member of the cabinet to stand up and say that. They may couch their words in different language, but that is what they are thinking.

I go back to the time when there was peace on the prairies. That was because Chief Crowfoot put his trust in the white man. He said the white man understands there shall be peace, and the Indian would accept the white man's justice which was laid down clearly and unequivocally. Have we deteriorated from the position which the Northwest Mounted Police took in the late 1800s and early 1900s? You do not have to read much history to determine that question. We have deteriorated from the position laid down by Colonel Walsh when he talked with Chief Sitting Bull. Some members may doubt what I say. If so, I suggest they read the book "Across the Medicine Line" by Turner. They will then understand that we have pulled the rug out from under the Indian trust which Chief Crowfoot placed in the Queen's system of justice.

The first amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena suggests that there be an ad hoc committee of ten members, two of whom shall be Indian or native people. Who in this House can oppose that? Would any cabinet minister oppose that? Nothing would give me more pleasure than to hear a cabinet minister stand up and say he was going to oppose it. I would want the country, particularly the Indians, to hear that. They would realize, not how the white man has broken faith with them but how the Liberal Party has broken faith with them. It is not the white man nor the Conservative Party that has broken faith with the trust Chief Crowfoot placed in the white man's Canada and the law of the Queen of England.

At that time the Queen of England was superior to all persons within this colony. We quite correctly divorced ourselves from the Queen in the sense of having our own rule. We divorced ourselves from what might be called colonial rule. However, we must still adhere to and believe in the basic foundation by which the Queen solved the disruption that could have occurred in this country. We must still believe in that solution. The Queen said there shall be justice and fair play among all people in Canada, that all people in Canada must be here and that justice must prevail.

The white man can no longer say that justice prevails when we have 25 per cent of the native and Indian peoples in our jails. We cannot say that the Queen's wishes or the wishes of the white man, when he signed the peace treaty with Chief Crowfoot, are being adhered to when 25 per cent or more of the native and Indian peoples, who represent 2 per cent of our population, are in our jails. This is an appalling failure by the white man in his understanding of the problems of the native people.

I will watch closely the vote on the first amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena. I had hoped these amendments would be voted on separately. As I say, it came as a great shock to me to find these two amendments lumped together, the first having to do with representation of the Indian people and the second dealing with representation on the board of people who have served time in institutions of correction.

[Mr. Horner (Crowfoot).]

● (2020)

Why should these two amendments be dealt with together? Is the hon. member who moved them saying, in allowing this procedure, that he lumps all the native people together with men and women who have served penitentiary sentences? I know that many of my constituents who live on reserves believe they are, in essence, serving a penitentiary term, but they don't like that thought and neither do their leaders. I do not accept it in any circumstances. These amendments should be voted on separately, if for no other reason than to clearly show the native people that they are not being dealt with on the basis of equality with people who have served a penitentiary term. The native people should be dealt with as the first citizens of Canada. They were here first, whether we like it or not, and we have occupied their land.

Chief Crowfoot was right when he said peace would be best for the Indian people. Chief Crowfoot said, and I paraphrase his words—let no man hold it against me, because I represent Chief Crowfoot in this House—that the Indians were prepared to sign a peace treaty valid as long as the river flows, the grass grows green and the sun shines, provided the white man was prepared to recognize that they enjoyed certain rights. Can we not accept the proposition that two of the native people should be members of the Parole Board, despite the fact that 25 per cent or more of the persons held in our penitentiaries are native or Metis people?

I will watch closely the manner in which this debate proceeds and I will take it upon myself to notify all of Chief Crowfoot's following, all the descendants of the Indian people whom Chief Crowfoot represented at the signing of the treaty, how the cabinet voted, how the Liberal Party voted on this issue. Is this a matter completely beyond the comprehension of most white men in the House of Commons? Are we not prepared to recognize the problems facing the Indian people? I say we would be wise to support the first amendment moved by the hon. member for Skeena.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to express appreciation to my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for moving these amendments on my behalf earlier today when Air Canada and I could not quite agree as to when I should get back to Ottawa.

I think, also, with respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner), I should say that while I welcome very much his endorsement of my motion—and hope that it passes—the grouping together at the report stage of various amendments into one item for the purpose of debate is a prerogative of Mr. Speaker under the rules. And that is what Mr. Speaker did: he brought the two motions together in one item as they were considered to be one motion for the purpose of debate. But when the vote takes place on them, they will be separate items. I want to get that point through to the hon. member for Crowfoot, and to others as well.

I am not the first to have thought of this idea of specifically selecting native Indian people to take a position on the Parole Board. I think it is regrettable that we should have to think in these terms, that we should need to select