

*Supply—Justice*

find that the police are accused of brutality. This to my mind is a complete distortion of what the situation is.

Although on reflection I think my hon. friend will realize that he made some fairly extreme statements, I am quite sure that he would not on reflection for a moment really suggest that merely because the feelings are intense the police should leave the scene. That would be a complete denial of their duty. If they are to carry out their duty, then unfortunately it does on occasion bring them in conflict with those who are carried away by the violence of their own feelings, understandable though it may be. In this case I can understand the reason for the intense feeling. But that does not alter the fact that the police still must discharge their duty, unpleasant and uncomfortable though it may be.

With respect to the Brantford situation, here again we have somewhat the same picture. There was extremely bad or bitter feelings between the hereditary Indians or those Indians who believe in the hereditary system and those who believe in the system of the elected council, and their supporters. In the course of this dispute the supporters of the hereditary chiefs took over the council house which contained a safe, valuable documents and other articles which were regarded as being of particular and peculiar value to the tribe concerned and to the organization concerned. This was done I believe three or four days before formal steps were taken to clear the building. In other words, you had a forcible taking of possession of property contrary to the law and you had demands made upon the elected chiefs to go in and open the safe and give up custody of these documents and threats that if these demands were not met, the safe would be carried off bodily, or in other words a theft would be committed. Thus you had, as I say, a violation of the law represented by the forcible taking of possession. But because we were dealing with Indians, because feelings were so intense, and it was desired not to aggravate them, with my concurrence the police were instructed not to take immediate action which ordinarily they should have taken, by force if necessary, to restore the property to its rightful owners. In other words, the police adapted their conduct and their operations to accommodate the view that by a show of restraint and patience it might be possible to bring the two sides together. This was continued for some days until, as I am informed, the indications became quite clear that further attempts would be made to take the law into their own hands by some of these people to an extent which simply could not be ignored. So it was decided that the necessary

[Mr. Fulton.]

steps had to be taken—after some days again—to bring to an end this defiance of the law represented by the forcible taking and retaining of possession of the council house; and the police were instructed to go in.

There were some 140 Indians physically present in the building determined to resist attempts of the police to have them vacate it. The police did not go in there determined to push them out forcibly or to push them around. They went in there issuing a lawful order to these people to vacate the building. They made it clear that if the building was not vacated, then, if necessary, such force as was necessary to be used would have to be used. Their order was defied. They did not make a sudden rush and go in with clubs swinging, knocking people on the head. My information is that they spent some time in asking them to leave peaceably. When they did not leave peaceably, then some of them at any rate joined arms and proceeded to move down the hall shouldering the Indians ahead of them. It is perfectly true—and it cannot be denied—that violence broke out. In other words, the police in the discharge of their duty were resisted by force and it is a fact that when lawful authority is resisted by force, then lawful authority is obliged to use such force as may be necessary to overcome that force.

But surely we should be realistic human beings and not lose our sense of proportion and suggest that because the police are resisted in the performance of their duty they have to go away and leave the lawbreakers in possession of the premises. Unfortunately a certain amount of force was necessary in order to carry out this eviction. But I have absolutely no evidence—in fact, all the evidence I have is to the contrary—that unnecessary force was used. Of course the police had expressions of discomfort on their faces. Does my hon. friend really imagine that they like having to eject people by force, particularly when some of those people happen to be women? Does my hon. friend not also realize that there are some people who recognize the fact that you can make more fuss out of it if you have a woman present than if you have not a woman present? I just ask that we keep a sense of proportion and recognize the fact that the job of law enforcement is not always a pleasant and glamorous one, that occasionally it has its unglamorous and unpleasant side but that really society is much better protected because there are honest and conscientious policemen who are prepared to discharge these unpleasant and unglamorous tasks as well