

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, may I ask for further time when the House reconvenes at eight o'clock?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** I think there is agreement, Mr. Speaker.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was speaking at six o'clock, and when the Acting Speaker called it six o'clock it was suggested that my time had expired. I did not think my time had expired before six o'clock and I did not have the appropriate occasion, in any event, to ask the unanimous consent of the House for permission to continue.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member appreciates that the time is kept, on behalf of the Chair and of hon. members, by the table. The Acting Speaker was advised at the time that the hon. member's time had expired. The Chair will inquire whether there is unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue his remarks. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** There appears to be agreement.

**Mr. Horner (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kindness of the House in allowing me further time to speak about the proposed amendments to Bill C-191. Before six o'clock I had been dealing with the amendments of the hon. member for Skeena. Speaking as a white man representing the constituency of Crowfoot, I am disappointed that the House should consider at the same time both amendments proposed by the hon. member for Skeena.

The hon. member's first amendment suggests that two of the additional ad hoc members of the board shall be persons of native Indian origin. His second amendment suggests that two of the additional ad hoc members shall be persons who have served time in a penitentiary under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. I was most disappointed in noting that these two amendments are to be considered at the same time. The idea that Indian or, for that matter, Eskimo people—that is, native peoples—should be equated with somebody who has served in a penitentiary is a degrading idea. That is what I feel, as a member of parliament in Ottawa, representing the constituency to which Chief Crowfoot gave his name. My constituency is called after him.

I felt very humiliated, to say the least, when I found that these two amendments were to be considered at the same time and voted on together. I hope the House will not do that. I hope this House will consider the problems of

#### Parole Act

the native people and pay close attention to those problems. Their difficulties arise from the fact that they were the first Canadian citizens. Like it or not, they were the first citizens of Canada and we must acknowledge that fact. We cannot lump those people with other people in Canada who have been sentenced to incarceration in penitentiary.

I say, however, that the hon. member for Skeena has moved a worth-while amendment. Mr. Speaker, 2 per cent of Canadians are native peoples, yet of that 2 per cent, 25 per cent are in jail. As white men, no matter what our ethnic background may be, we must acknowledge that fact. We must ask ourselves, why is this so? We must examine the entire problem of the native peoples. Speaking as the member representing the constituency bearing the great name of Crowfoot, I say that the part Chief Crowfoot played in Canadian history has an important bearing on this issue. My constituency in southeastern Alberta is called Crowfoot as a result of the trust Chief Crowfoot placed in the white man in the early 1870s, and in 1877 and 1878. Because of the trust he placed in the white man, Chief Crowfoot said, as I pointed out before six o'clock and as I will repeat in order to imprint the words on members of the House and on Mr. Speaker, "There shall be peace."

● (2010)

He meant that there shall be trust and belief one in another; that is what he really meant. He said there shall be peace, but he meant there shall be trust. There shall be peace, there shall be trust, there shall be understanding; he said those words. He went on to say how long that trust and understanding would remain. He said it would remain as long as the rivers flow, the grass grows green and the sun shines. The rivers are still flowing, the sun is still shining and the grass will again be green in the spring. This is the early part of December and the grass is not green today. But he said those words in the sense that he was placing his trust in the white man for many years to come. He hoped his trust in the white man would be borne out. There was no question about his trust in the Indians. He had trust in them, even though most judges and magistrates might say the Indian had broken faith and had not adhered to the law. At that time Chief Crowfoot said, in effect, "Please believe that we will try to adhere to the white man's law."

I suggest that if hon. members read the book about Sitting Bull they will comprehend the difficulty of the Indian understanding the white man's law. Chief Sitting Bull had a great deal of difficulty understanding the difference between the American and the Canadian law. However, the Northwest Mounted Police explicitly explained the law to Sitting Bull. The Indian of that day accepted the law. Have we understood the explanation of that law? Therein lies the problem. It is easy for normal white men to conceive the law. They do not understand the difficulty. To equate it very simply, 25 per cent of the Indian and native people have run afoul of the law, in spite of the fact they represent only 2 per cent of the population of Canada. Have we sufficiently explained the law to them? I defy any member of this House of Commons to stand up and say we have explained it to them but they are ignorant and dumb and refuse to accept it. That is