

Supply—Indian Affairs

Val d'Or. Could he tell us, at the same time, whether the Indians, individually or through their chiefs, have asked for that transfer or whether they have been consulted? In the latter case, how was it done and what was their reply? It would be interesting to know the answers to those questions.

[English]

Mr. Orange: I should like to begin my remarks, Mr. Chairman, by thanking the minister for his statement at the commencement of this discussion. He touched on three major areas of his department, national parks, Indian affairs and northern administration. In the few minutes allotted to him, as he stated, he was unable to deal with these subjects in the depth he would have liked. In my view the remarks he made regarding resource development in the Northwest Territories were amongst the most significant.

However, for the moment I should like to talk about Indian affairs. Earlier this week I had the opportunity of visiting the Canadian Indian pavilion at Expo '67. This pavilion, which was sponsored by the minister's department, was designed and developed by the Indian people themselves. I believe every Canadian who visits Expo should take the hour necessary to visit it. It tells completely the story of the Indian people and their association with the white man from the time the white man first came to this continent. The department provided the funds for the construction of the pavilion but told the Indian people, this is your pavilion and you tell us what you think it should be like.

I believe the most significant thing about the pavilion is the story it tells and the indication of a change in attitude toward the administration of Indian affairs because the government said, "We want you to do it." The story told is not necessarily a happy one. When you walk into the building you feel the bewilderment that the Indian people must have felt when they first encountered the white man on this continent. Then there is an indication of some semblance of hope that they could live with the white man. As the white man expanded westward there was a feeling of despair and frustration, and finally hate. We see the effect of the white man's institutions on the Indian people and their culture.

However, as you walk out you see the story of what is happening in terms of Indian education today. As you leave you feel that the Indian people believe this may be a time of change and the white man and his red-skin

brother may be able to live together on this continent. I was rather impressed upon reading some of the inscriptions on the walls of the building. In the early days the Indian people said:

We paid honour to the spirits in all living things by wasting nothing.

This is so symbolic of the culture of the Indian people. On the other hand, there were some words that were rather harsh and bitter, not the least of which were these:

Well into the twentieth century the welfare of the Indian was regarded as proper work for retired soldiers, many of whom were kindly and well intentioned but treated their charges like amiable, backward children.

● (3:30 p.m.)

I hope that this pavilion and the story it tells are an indication of a change of attitude, a change in approach on the part of individuals generally with respect to their relationship toward the Indian people. In this respect I should like to draw the attention of the committee for a moment treaties Nos. 8 and 11 which affect the Indians of the Northwest Territories, northern British Columbia, northern Alberta and northern Saskatchewan. These treaties were signed in the 1920's. Certain agreements were made between the Indian people and the Queen, including the disposition of certain lands to the Indian people. To this day these treaties have never been fulfilled in that the Indian people, who incidentally do not want to live on reserves in these areas, have never received compensation in lieu of the lands they were to receive.

At Inuvik last week I spoke with Mr. James Koe, a member of the Indian advisory committee, about treaties 8 and 11. Mr. Koe expressed to me a feeling of incredible confusion, distrust and lack of understanding regarding the position of the Indians with respect to these treaties. The treaties themselves were obviously written in a hurry by meandering bands of well intentioned civil servants who were sent to negotiate some form of arrangement with the Indian people.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What year were the treaties signed?

Mr. Orange: The treaties were signed in 1921. An example of the kind of confusion is that one of the terms in treaty 11 is the provision of \$3 worth of shells, nets and other paraphernalia needed for the Indian way of life. In 1921 this amount may have been significant. Today the Indian people are still receiving \$3 worth but instead of five or six