

are a number of reasons for that. First of all, I do not think any solutions were possible in all these years that the white people were telling the Indians what the answers were. I think what Mr. Dinsdale said about Manitoba is 100 per cent true.

I have been at those conferences right from the beginning and I remember that at the beginning, as Mr. Dinsdale said, it was very hard to get the Indians to say two words. Now they are properly telling the white people who helped organize those conferences: "You stay home and let us organize the conferences because they are our conferences." Now the Indians—and that is not just in Manitoba but it is everywhere in Canada—the Indians are beginning to speak up for themselves. If you have ideas for answers you can begin to work out solutions.

The other thing is that I do think we have a great deal more information about what to do than we had in the past. I do not suppose any member here has had a chance to read the Hawthorn Report in detail yet, but I looked at it very quickly and I agree with some of it, such as the idea that the Indian Affairs Department should be the—I forget the exact word they used—but should be the activator of channelling the Indian protests.

I am very sceptical about that because it always seemed to me that the Indian Affairs Department was the reverse of the activator. It was the agency that kept the Indians quiet. We are getting a great deal of detailed information and detailed planning on what to do and I think—of course, I am an optimist—we are on the threshold of being able to begin to solve the problems of the Indian people in Canada.

We Members of Parliament we do not have the job that the Indian Affairs Department has with administration; we do not have the job the government has of putting up the money, but if we could get the Committee functioning very quickly so that we could have enough meetings and have them spaced out in time so that we could attend—we should not have them at the end of the session when you need running shoes to run from one Committee meeting to another—I think we could do the job and I think this is one practical thing we could do right now.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not object to what you are saying but I think that we ought to be doing something concrete about the visits we have already taken. I think that we should call before this Committee the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, for example, to find out why the claims against the St. Lawrence Seaway in respect of land that was taken or despoiled, for example, in the St. Regis reserve, have not been settled. I think that this is the kind of constructive thing that this Committee should be doing. We should be seeking, in my opinion, for solutions rather than seeking out the problems that we know exist. We know what the problems are but we are not doing a single thing to try and bring a solution to them. It is no use getting up in the House of Commons and yelling about the problems when no one is prepared to sit down and talk about the solutions.

Mr. DINSDALE: Mr. Chairman, I think the Committee agrees with you on this. I would suggest that we do have a formal motion—and I would be happy to