

*Supply—Citizenship and Immigration*

parliament many years ago it was taken away from them and that subsequently—

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** A characteristic distortion.

**Mr. Howard:** Let me tell my hon. friend that it was a Liberal government that took away the right of Indians to vote in the first place.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** It was the Liberals who gave it to them.

**Mr. Howard:** Was it? I do not want to get into a crossfire with the hon. member for Essex East about Indian affairs because I have very little respect for the Liberal party's approach to this matter. It is a pretty dark and black record.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I would not want to raise the matter.

**Mr. Howard:** My friend would not want to raise the matter because what I say applies to the party to which he belongs. Here is another distortion of fact in this document:

For the first time, a joint Senate-House of Commons committee on Indian affairs was appointed in May, 1959.

This is just not true; it was not the first time. In fact, on May 13, 1946 parliament passed a motion in substantially the same terms as the one passed recently setting up a joint Senate and House of Commons committee. The hon. member for Brant-Haldimand, the parliamentary secretary to the minister, was a member of that committee in 1946 and, if I am not mistaken, the present Minister of National Defence was also a member. In any event these two members of the house were members of the committee established in 1946; but our friend Mr. Grosart says that this did not happen. I do not want to go too far into this matter; I simply wanted to refer to it as a basis for something else.

I remember that a few years ago an Indian gentleman near Brantford accused the hon. lady of speaking with a forked tongue, and I say, of course, that that was incorrect. That was not in fact true, but I am inclined to think that "The Record Speaks" is a record that speaks with a forked tongue so far as these two matters are concerned.

This raises a question in my mind. For many years we have not been too faithful and trustworthy in our dealings with the Indian people. We have destroyed a great deal of the confidence they had in government and in non-Indians. I am sure there is a conscious effort now on the part of the government and every member of the house to bring back that mutual trust, respect and admiration, but the more incorrect distortions of facts such as are contained in "The Record

Speaks" are made, the more statements are made that are not in fact true, the more we are doing to destroy the attempt we are making to establish mutual trust and confidence. I am quite sure that if a native Indian were to look at this document and see these statements, which he knows are not true, he would say, "How can I trust this government on other matters in which there has to be trust?"

This is something that is going to become even more important because the fact that parliament has taken the commendable action of giving Indians the right to vote will mean that members of parliament and of political parties, if only for political reasons, will take a greater interest in these people simply because they are a group of voters, and will try to understand more fully the attitudes, feelings and problems of the Indian people. This is beneficial to that extent, and I think it will go a long way toward creating that mutual respect and trust which is so necessary in dealing with our native Indian people.

There are other obstacles which have to be overcome. Over quite a number of years a feeling of resentment against the Indian agent or Indian superintendent, as he is properly classified, has developed among the Indians. Many Indian people have looked upon the Indian agent in the past, and some still do, as a person who is there to prevent them obtaining justice with regard to their demands rather than for the purpose of helping them. They look upon many Indian agents as untrustworthy. It would almost seem as if the Indian is continually at war with the Indian agent with regard to many problems.

As I have said, this situation still exists. It is the result of a number of things, the first being our attitude and our actions toward these people in the past. Second, I think it reflects an attitude on the part of the administration which in itself is a reflection of the attitude of society toward our native Indian people. This situation unfortunately still exists although perhaps not to the same degree as a few years ago. There appears to be a bottleneck within the administration with respect to the flow of ideas concerning the problems of the Indians between parliament itself, the people generally, and the native Indian people.

The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and other cabinet ministers with jurisdiction over Indian affairs will change from time to time, but as long as we have Indian affairs under federal jurisdiction the administration will remain. It is the attitude of the administration which I think must be altered. As I say, I think the situation is perhaps less difficult than it was a few years ago. I may