

VERBATIM REPORT
of
NATIONAL CONFERENCE
on
INDIAN ACT

April 28 - May 2, 1969

Holiday Inn, Ottawa

E78
.C2
N31
1969
c. 1

C.1

E-78.C2
N31
1969
C.1

Verbatim Report
of
National Conference
on
Indian Act
April 28 - May 2, 1969

Holiday Inn, Ottawa

Index

Page

Monday, April 28, 1969

Minister's welcoming address 1

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Open Sessions 41

Brief from National Indian Brotherhood 43

Mr. Conn's Address 61

Presentation from B.C. Organizations and Delegates 86

Wenesday, April 30, 1969

Presentation on Behalf of the United Interior
Tribes of B.C. 119

Resolution from Federation of Saskatchewan Indians 129

Thursday, May 1, 1969

Brief presented by Allen Lueck, Solicitor for
Saskatchewan Group 203

Additional provision to Resolution of
Saskatchewan Indians 235

Friday, May 2, 1969

25 - Point Position Paper read by Paul Reecke,
Solicitor for Squamish Band 276

Preamble to Saskatchewan Resolution 297

Attachments

	<u>Page</u>
Revised list of delegates	349
Brief from National Indian Brotherhood	352
Mr. Conn's Address	357
Presentation from B.C. Organizations and Delegates	363
Presentation on Behalf of the United Interior Tribes of B.C.	367
Resolution from Federation of Saskatchewan Indians	374
Brief presented by Allen Lueck, Solicitor for Saskatchewan Group	375
25 - Point Position Paper read by Paul Reecke, Solicitor for Squamish Band	380
Preamble to Saskatchewan Resolution	383

Monday, April 28, 1969,
Opening Session, 9:30.

Dave Courchene

May we have your attention now please.

First of all I would like to welcome you on behalf of the National Indian Brotherhood. Our president was unable to make it on account of problems that he had in the family. We will have a general meeting.

First of all I would like to introduce our Minister, Mr. Jean Chrétien, who is here with us this morning to welcome you and also the Minister without Portfolio Mr. Robert Andras. So without wasting their time we would like the Minister to say a few words.

Minister, Jean Chrétien

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Welcome to Ottawa. This is an important meeting. These talks have been valuable. I know many things now that I did not know before, things I never would have known if I had not attended your meetings and seen the reports of those sessions I could not attend.

I am now convinced that what is required are bold new initiatives, a break from the past. You have told me many things. You have said clearly that you are proud of your Indian heritage, a proud people who want to manage your own affairs. You have spoken plainly and your words have been heard. I am impressed and the Canadian people are impressed with the determination shown at meeting after meeting to break the bonds of the past, to deal with your own business and to throw off the shackles of paternalism.

Without anticipating what you will be saying at this meeting, I believe some things have become clear. You want action, not studies, reports or enquiries. The basis for action will have to rest on some fundamental principles which have emerged at your meetings.

Despite the fact that many Indian people have made, and are making a great contribution to Canadian life, barriers remain. Your people want the right to participate fully in the social, economic and political life of Canada. You want other Canadians to recognize the importance of your cultural diversity in the mosaic of Canadian life. You believe that services ought to be available on an equitable basis to all Canadians. You think those who are furthest behind in material things ought to have enriched services to help them catch up. You have said that your people's full participation will only follow redress of legitimate grievance. You believe that contracts once entered into ought to be honoured until they are either fulfilled, amended or commuted by mutual, free and willing consent.

You have asked for control of your lands and funds. You have said that no one should have restrictions placed on his property except those that are for the good of all. You have said that discrimination ought not to be embedded in laws. From hearing you I can now see that land is as important to your people as language is to French speaking Canadians.

These are the themes that have emerged from the meetings. The issues you have been discussing are very broad, very complex, very difficult. There are no easy answers, but choices must be made and made soon.

With this meeting the first round of discussions will be completed. Then we of the Government must make our choices. The next move will be for me and my colleagues in the Cabinet to look at what you have said and to respond. I hope to have a response for you in June. I hope to come back to you then with something for you to discuss, some proposals for coming to grips with the problems which have lain so heavily upon your people.

But you have come here to speak for yourselves, not to listen to me. This is

an Indian meeting, it is your meeting. We do not wish to interfere. It is preferable in many ways that the department stay out of your way. We want to be helpful and if we can provide a useful service, tell us. But unless there is something you specifically want, you won't hear from us.

The questions we face together are tough ones. Your words will affect the lives of the Indian people for many years. Your responsibility is great. The government wants to hear your views.

I am glad you all got here. Travelling is difficult these days. I wish you well in your deliberations.

My colleague and I will not be here at this meeting as long as you do not require our presence. I said in my presentation that it is your meeting, you will choose a Chairman and who will be with us all week for any kind of decision you want with us, but as I said it's going to be your meeting. You will discuss all the issues that you have in mind. It's the first occasion that you have which sends you from one point of the country with the other part of the country within the Indian community and I wish you good luck.

Guy Williams

Now they have asked me to explain you some technical problems both in English and in French. It's about the microphone. You have microphone and anyone who will speak will have to say his name because all your talk will be registered on tape. So don't forget that each time that you get the floor you have to say I am Daniel Vachon, de la province de Quebec or to say that I am James Gosnell of British Columbia because we want to know that and they don't recognize you, by perhaps a few days they will know each time who you are but the beginning they will not know and (b) you have a translation system and you have a number and you

have to show your number to the Chairman each time you want to talk. The number of your microphone. There is other numbers too on the table but it's for the same purposes, and this machine if you don't use it don't leave that open because you can have some noise coming out of it and interference.

Any of you have any problems there is a woman there who will be very happy to help you. They said that she's redhead.

Minister, Jean Chrétien

Now after the technical explanation, I turn over the meeting to the Vice-Chairman of the Canadian Indian Brotherhood and wish you very good luck in your deliberation and Mr. Andras and myself will leave right away and we will be back any time you feel that we should be around. Thank you and good luck.

Dave Courchene

On behalf of the National Indian Brotherhood, I would like to thank the Minister for his welcome to the gathering and I would like to ask Mr. Guy Williams from British Columbia to say a few words in regards to our President's situation.

Guy Williams

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, also the Minister Without Portfolio, Mr. Andras, we have a little joke here in British Columbia. When we have newly appointed Chief we used to refer to them as Chiefs without portfolio. I have serious information for you to make known to you ladies and gentlemen, the unfortunate and very tragic incident involving an accident to the family of Mr. Walter Dieter, the Chief of the National Indian Brotherhood of Canada, and who has attended every meeting of consultation across Canada in the past several months and he is one of us who has the privilege and pleasure, as he refers to a pleasure, of attending the meetings and getting to be real knowledgeable of affairs of our Indian people across Canada. I would like all of you to join with the chair and myself in

rising for one minute to express our condolences and sympathy to Walter Dieter's family, his youngest daughter was fatally injured Friday hit by a vehicle on a bicycle. So our friend and your friend, Mr. Dieter may not be here during this final consultation meeting. Will you rise with me and the Chair for a minute. Thank you.

Jack Shelton

For your benefit and to ensure the success of your meeting we have been in the background giving you support services in addition to the simultaneous translation and the translators. We will also provide tape recordings of the whole proceedings en francais et anglais for your benefit, if you wish to make use of this service. In addition to that, we have what we call verbatim reporters or word per word reporters, if you wish to use their services. These are outside people, a series of them working in a team at the first table right in front of me here and they will be listening to everything that's being said and putting it down word for word. In addition to that we have sitting behind them, if you wish again, a team of rapporteurs. Rapporteurs are there to give you the minutes of each meeting and they will work in series from the start with one being replaced by another that will be moved into another room where we have a number of departmental employees. A secretarial pool, working in this building will transcribe your tapes, the reports made by your verbatim reporters and also the minutes made by the departmental rapporteurs. In addition to this, to make sure that everything is on solid ground, if you wish, we also have what we call a further support and they are summary takers. There will be two or three of them sitting here with your permission to take a daily summation in capsule form of what has taken place. It will only be roughly four or five paragraphs or a page. Now there is a series or number of

hostesses that are organized and in the capable hands of Keith Miller and Morris Isaac and their purpose of course as you saw at registration time was to provide you with service. Anything that you would like; anything that you feel we might be able to provide you with, by all means, just contact them. Now, as far as your coffee breaks are concerned, I understand from the management that with about a 15 to 20 minute warning, they will have it provided right here on the site.

Guy Williams

Ladies and gentlemen maybe you would like to ask the gentleman some questions there in regard to what he just said.

Jack Shelton

I could add a bit to this, perhaps you were wondering what these other numbers are here for. The idea was to facilitate the handling for the verbatim reporters who are not familiar with names. In preference to using names they could use a code number but I don't think it will work too well because unless everybody is going to sit in the same spot throughout. We don't want to control that - it is entirely up to yourself. Okay.

Dave Courchene

Ladies and gentlemen as you know Walter is not going to be here with us for this week so we, as a delegation will have to get a chairman for our meeting, and I hope that we can decide this altogether. We know that we have a lot of work that we have to do within the next few days and hopefully we can unite ourselves as Indian delegates from across Canada. I would like, at this time to open it up to the floor to see who you would like to have as Chairman and probably as Acting Chairman. Mr. Courchene I nominate David Ahenakew.

Peter Dubois

Mr. Chairman with this tragedy of our National Leader puts us in a position to

maybe select an alternate. Now, I am not too sure whether the National Indian Brotherhood have named an alternate but I realize that Mr. Courchene is the Vice-President of the National Organization and he is a delegate of Manitoba. Now I wonder if there is an alternate besides Mr. Courchene who could represent the National Indian Brotherhood. This brings up another point that I have to present to the delegates here in regard to Saskatchewan. Realizing that Mr. Dieter was representing the National Indian Brotherhood at the time of the Consultation Conference, the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians did not have a delegate from the Provincial Consultation. So at this time, I would want to on behalf of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians nominate our new Chief Mr. David Ahenakew to be a delegate to this Conference if the delegates of this Conference will be kindly enough to grant it. Thank you.

Guy Williams

Ladies and gentlemen there has been two requests made there. One of them a nomination for Chairmanship and the second one as far as the number of delegates for the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. I was wondering if it would be possible first to clarify the Chairmanship and then we could carry on with the other question now.

Mr. McNab

Mr. Chairman, I think I'll withdraw that nomination that I nominate David there.

Peter Johnson

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be valuable that the Chairman be selected from the morning session. Leave the selecting of the Chairman for the duration of this Conference to another day until we get to know among ourselves, or until we know who we might be able to select to be a long-term Chairman for the duration of this Conference.

Guy Williams

Mr. Chairman I would like at this time - I am not going to move a motion - but, I would make an objection to you Mr. Chairman in view of the fact that this is a very historic meeting. The first historic meeting of its kind to be held in the capital city of Canada and I would suggest at this time, taking into consideration that this is a large country, I think this morning, we should decide on how we in this Consultation Meeting should arrange the matter of Chairmanship. My suggestion, ladies and gentlemen, is that we should not have a Chairman for the entire meeting but we should divide or make imaginary sections of the country that each Chairman possibly may do two days and the third chairman will do a day and a half. I think this will be fair to the east, fair to the central, and fair to the west and this is my suggestion Mr. Chairman. With your permission there could be further discussion on it and I think this carries merit. It will give responsibility and a matter of being participant in their part of this great country of ours. Thank you.

Dave Courchene

You have heard a number of suggestions. Any further suggestions?

Peter Nicholas

I think a further suggestion to what Guy just got done saying.

I'd like to nominate Dave Courchene for Chairman of today's meeting and that we move ahead after today to selecting regional Chairman. This is a good idea. But today I move that Dave Courchene from Manitoba be Chairman.

Peter Dubois

I would very much like to see Mr. Courchene chair this morning session or whatever session we decide on, but there may be an effectual point entering the picture. This will more or less tie Mr. Courchene down from presenting the

views of the people that he is representing. So I would maybe make a suggestion here at this time that we appoint someone who isn't a delegate and would be neutral to any of the matters that did arrive.

Speaker Unknown

I think that it is a good suggestion that the Saskatchewan delegate there made I would like to back it up because we have a lot of leadership here and I think as far as the tables are concerned that Mr. Courchene had his own commitments and his own delegates and why not use the Indian leaders that are here. I would certainly favour going along with that. You can tell it anyway you want; have one for each day, or any different areas, or anyway at all I wouldn't say anything about that but I think it is a very good idea.

Mr. Peter Kelly

It would seem to me that if Mr. Courchene is going to accept or not accept the Chairmanship it would be his prerogative to let us know what he thinks.

Dave Courchene

Well since you put the onus on me I would like to clarify that point. First of all I came here as a delegate for the province of Manitoba and I would like to have the opportunity to be able to present to the delegation the views of their particular problems. If I was Chairman I would not be able to do it. Although I realize the importance of this situation, I hope that you will see fit to be able to have as a Chairman probably the first recommendation that was made. I understand the gentleman, Mr. David Ahenakew, is not a delegate although he is a president of the organization of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians. Mr. Ahenakew probably could start off. Through the process we could, as was suggested, appoint other alternate chairmen so that all the country will be represented with both east

and west and the central and probably the northwest areas as well.

Harold Cardinal

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to support the idea of having as Chairman, people who are not officially delegates and for this purpose, I will be making nomination after, but first, I'd like to make a couple of statements. Alberta wishes to protest very strongly the arbitrary decision of the Department in trying to allot or select or limit the representation of the Indian delegation. Our people have elected six from Alberta. We have brought six, we are going to ask the meeting as the day goes on to officially recognize the six delegates from Alberta as representing the province of Alberta and I would suggest that this question of representation be discussed thoroughly before the day is over. I would then like to nominate as Chairman at least for today, Mr. George Manuel from British Columbia who is known to many of the leaders across the country. I think that we could get off to a fast start if we could settle the question of Chairmanship for today. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Ed Bellerose

I second that motion.

Will George Manuel be a Chairman?

What was your name please?

My name is Ed Bellerose, Alberta.

Guy Williams

Well we have two names on the floor now, Mr. David Ahenakew and Mr. George Manuel. How does the delegates feel? Do you want to vote secretly or do they want to pass the motion by raising hands?

Speaker Unknown

Mr. Chairman, Mr. McNab here withdrew the nomination for Dave Courchene.

Mr. Dave Courchene

Well Mr. Williams. We seem to have carried out our traditional rights this morning keeping very strictly on Indian time and we are losing a great deal of time. Support the idea or the motion, rather I'd like to withdraw that word idea. That the neutral or non-delegate or non-official delegate be the Chairman of this meeting. Although, I still feel strongly that there be rotation by areas who could be co-chairmans however, I support the idea of George Manuel who has been moved and seconded and I fully support the idea to get rolling and I speak for this motion. Thank you.

Any further questions to the motion.

Move by Harold Cardinal that George Manuel be the Chairman for the day seconded by Ed Bellerose, Alberta and the other nomination was withdrawn.

Mr. Guy Williams

I would like to put an amendment to that motion, the matter of one day be extended until such time that we decide if we are going to go by regions.

One day I think you will not even scratch the surface and will lose time by going into another discussion of present nominations for a Chairman tomorrow. So today we should try and finalize the matter of Chairmanship so we could proceed and progress with what these consultations means. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Dave Courchene

There was a motion raised by Harold Cardinal seconded by Ed Bellerose of Alberta who nominated George Manuel to be Chairman until such time as we decide to go by regions.

Any further questions on the motion.

Would we then have a vote for the motion. All those in favour please signify by raising their hands. Thank you. Those against. Unanimously carried. So

we will have George Manuel if he could come to the front here.

George Manuel

First of all I would like to thank all the delegates that are here for having the confidence in me to chair this meeting and because you have bestowed this confidence in me I certainly will try to live up to your trust. And thank you very very much; I know many of you, many of you are my friends and I want to clarify one position. Maybe there may be a doubt although it didn't show in the votes that was taken here by the delegates from all across Canada and Mr. Guy Williams pointed out that this is a very historical meeting for our native people of Canada. I have worked for Indian Affairs. I have been a community development worker out on Vancouver Island. And I want you to know that I have resigned from Indian Affairs completely and that now I'm working for an Indian organization full time. Thank you very much and with this I would like to mention that you have no agenda apparently and that there is no ground rules. These are two things that we have to seriously consider; we have no agenda so the agenda is entirely up to this assembly and also that we have no ground rules under which the meeting is to run. Thank you so I'll leave it up to the floor now to make the decisions on those two issues.

Guy Williams

Mr. Chairman, I think we have overlooked the matter of Co-Chairman which I think is necessary for today's session and I don't think I will be out of line with the thinking of the meeting, I nominate Dave Courchene to be the Co-Chairman until such time that we should go into region, I nominate Dave Courchene to be the Co-Chairman. I fully realize that Dave is a delegate, he may not have to fulfill his position at all, but, this is my expression Mr. Chairman.

George Manuel

Mr. Guy Williams from British Columbia has nominated Dave Courchene as the

Co-Chairman, what is your wish ladies and gentlemen? Dave has accepted the nomination for your information.

Harold Cardinal

I'd like to second that nomination, Mr. Chairman.

George Manuel

It's been regularly moved and seconded that Dave Courchene from Manitoba be the Co-Chairman. What is the wish to this assembly? Any remarks or comments now.

Andrew Nicholas

Going along with what Mr. Williams said before, concerning non-delegates, chairmanship and regional representation, I propose a motion, even though, I had suggested Dave for a Chairman; but since it was a feeling of non-delegate representation as Chairman I would suggest that Anthony Francis from New Brunswick a non-delegate be Co-Chairman. Thank you.

George Manuel

Mr. Nicholas, there's been a motion; Mr. Nicholas from the Maritimes, is proposing the motion, number 6.

Omer Peters

I think we should go back to Mr. Nicholas' suggestion or motion. I think that we would get to use some of the people that were here and I certainly go along with that from one coast to the other using alternatives. After all, this is a National organization, and in our Province too, we also have the Chief of the Six Nations Indian Reserve. Could we have a hand for Chief Isaac here please.

There is about ten thousand people there so we are very concerned and particularly to have some very good leaders from province to province the same way, so in that reason, I will back Andy and his suggestions.

George Manuel

Omer Peters from Ontario, also made his remarks against the motion; any further comments? Is there any further remarks?

Mr. Wallace LaBillois

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have clarified from Mr. Nicholas whether this was a motion nominating Anthony Francis?

George Manuel

No. The motion here that we are speaking on is the motion that is on the floor nominating Mr. Courchene.

Dave Courchene

Mr. Chairman, I would like to withdraw as acting Chairman because of the responsibility that I have for the Province of Manitoba. I think Mr. Omer Peters' view was well taken on our part and I think he has very valid recommendation that we do have somebody from the eastern side as well as the western side.

George Manuel

Since Dave Courchene has declined as Co-Chairman, is there any further motion then?

Philip Paul

Since it's taking so much time to deal with the chairmanship for just a day I was hoping to propose that we deal with the chairmanship of the meeting and

decide whether we are going to have a regional Chairman before we go any further. I think we should settle this particular question because it is getting to be a lengthy thing just for today. I think we should settle it once and for all whether we are going to have one Chairman or a Co-Chairman for the entire meeting or a regional representation.

George Manuel

Any further remarks?

Max Gros-Louis

I believe that Mr. Nicholas made a motion requesting that Mr. Francis be Vice-Chairman. Then if this motion has been made, I second the motion.

George Manuel

Is it the wish of the assembly to make a motion for a Co-Chairman?

Andrew Nicholas

I am going to make a motion supporting the regional representation for Co-Chairman for today. This is how this discussion begins and I mentioned a representative from the Maritimes, Anthony Francis. I so move that he will be co-chairing today. I feel that chairmanship should be as what Mr. Paul ask from Vancouver; that this same line of thinking be kept in line with regional representation. Anthony Francis.

George Manuel

Anthony Francis has been nominated by Mr. Nicholas of the Maritimes, is there a seconder for that?

Max Gros-Louis

I already seconded.

George Manuel

Oh! Fine, okay Max. You've heard the motion that has been regularly moved that Mr. Francis be the Co-Chairman. What is the wish of the assembly? Are you ready for the questions or are there any remarks? Question has been called. All those in favor raise your right hand. All those against. The motion has been carried. Now Mr. Francis may he come up here.

Anthony Francis

I just want to thank the people for electing me as the Co-Chairman for this assembly.

George Manuel

Now we shall proceed with the next item and that is either the ground rules or the agenda of the meeting.

Max Gros-Louis

I will suggest too. Will you please ask them to have it translated? Because there are some of the delegates that are going to talk only in French and I don't know if you understand French. No. you don't.

George Manuel

The suggestion has been made. Is there any of those earphone here? Can I get one from there?

George Manuel

First of all it has been suggested here that this assembly has its own impartial secretary. What is the wish of the assembly? Harold Cardinal goes along with that. Maybe if you just raise your hand. All those in favour of an impartial secretary. Anybody against. Carried. Now who do you wish to record the proceedings on behalf of the assembly here? Are there any suggestions? Is there

anybody here prepared to volunteer?

George Manuel

I wonder if I could ask Keith Miller if he thinks he can take the official duty as secretary or would that be too much to carry here?

What about Aline O'Bomsawine?

Is she around? She agreed to help out today. What is the wish of the assembly? All those in favor, all those in favor. Hey, second oh! I'm sorry. I we could find somebody, a girl here that can take the minutes. Let's operate in that fashion. And let us see if they are partial or impartial like from then on. Fine thank you.

Speaker Unknown

But I think Mr. Chairman we were advised that there would be minutes almost to the exact word, including a tape recorder and everything. The secretary that we should have would be our official appointed by the conference to keep track of what is going on.

George Manuel

What is the wish? The assembly wish that they should have a secretary. It is just a matter of suggesting who would assume this position.

Guy Williams

Mr. Chairman, this is a historical meeting. We must make every effort, Mr. Chairman, to have our records clear, so therefore, we must have an official secretary.

George Manuel

Have you got any recommendation Mr. Williams.

Guy Williams

I will take advantage of the suggestion of the chair ladies and gentlemen and

I would nominate my good friend here at the corner, Isaac Beaulieu. It is not a suggestion, it is a motion, Sir.

George Manuel

A motion has been made for Isaac Beaulieu to be the official secretary. Is there a seconder?

Andrew Nicholas

I'll second that.

George Manuel

It's been seconded by Mr. Nicholas from the Maritimes. Are you ready for the question. Question has been called. All those in favor? Against? Motion has been carried. Now what is the next item which you wish to proceed with.

Max Gros-Louis

We talked a while ago of having reporters and journalists. Wouldn't it be better to have a committee that would study what the journalists will print in the newspapers?

George Manuel

Your talking about a press committee. Max Gros-Louis has suggested that we should have a press committee who would record our press releases accurately according to this assembly. What is the wish of the floor?

Omer Peters

In the question of press releases I think we all had a little experience in these meetings and it seems, isn't the press in here now? I think usually they get a press release. You actually get not as good presses when you can't listen to the discussions. I think that in the meeting, when we met here before in Ottawa, we decided to open a meeting to the press and we got very good publicity on it. I think when we kind of close it off a little bit, they usually corner somebody that

maybe has different ideas that wasn't in the meeting. My idea is that it should be open. Let the press in. We don't have nothing to hide here. What we're saying is perfectly legal and we want it to be heard.

George Manuel

There are two opinions here. What is your wish, Mr. Courchene.

Dave Courchene

Mr. Chairman, I too would agree that we do need the press to make the Canadian public aware of the situations across Canada. I'm sure we are going to talk of a number of important situations as far as our Indian people is concerned. The only request that I would make is that the press identify themselves to the Chairman, to see that we know who they are. I think that the delegation should be open to the press.

Speaker Unknown

In addition to what Omer Peters pointed out I think that one of the functions of the committee is that they would serve to make an official statement by the delegation and not as a verbatim report by the press. I think we had a lot of bad experiences and good experiences with the press, so I think this should be taken into consideration.

George Manuel

Thank you. Mr. Guy Williams, British Columbia.

Guy Williams

In our experiences with the press, there has been times when they have been difficult and have overstepped the bounds of the requirements of the body at such a meeting as this. I do fully agree though that the press be present at, and have the freedom of this meeting, with one exception, Mr. Chairman; that when and if we

have a controversial issue among us that we will decide and I suggest that if that should arise then the meeting would immediately go into a committee as a whole in camera. A motion.

George Manuel

A motion has been made by Mr. Guy Williams that the press have the freedom to attend this assembly excepting if there is an in-camera meeting.

Peter Dubois

I second that motion of Mr. Williams.

George Manuel

Alright is there any further discussion? Question has been called, all those in favour? Against? Carried. Now No. 7.

Harold Cardinal

I would like to suggest that when this meeting does go, or if it goes into an in-camera session that all departmental officials representing the Department of Indian Affairs in any capacity be removed from the room.

George Manuel

You will make this a motion?

Harold Cardinal

Yes.

George Manuel

A motion has been made by Harold Cardinal that all Departmental officials representing the Department of Indian Affairs in any capacity be removed from the room during in-camera sessions. Seconded by Mr. Nicholas from the Maritimes.

Guy Williams

I'd like to be very clear on this motion Mr. Chairman on the matter of official

people from the Department of Indian Affairs. I agree the word camera takes care of that, but there is a bit of concern on my part Mr. Chairman. There are many observers here, from our people who may have travelled great distances and at their own expense. I think they still can observe if they so wish and if the meeting agrees. They must, we must ask them to act in terms of a camera meeting; that they do not expose the discussions outside of here. And I am very sympathetic with them. They have that interest at heart, that they are here as observers; particularly the younger people, who are here possibly for the first time. So I, my motion is that they be allowed to remain providing they have adhered to ground rules in the matter of camera sessions, Mr. Chairman.

George Manuel

Yes.

Peter Johnston

Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the previous speakers' comments up to a point. I think that if we get into the realm of accepting unofficial delegates at our meeting we are going to have to get into the question of who these people are. Are we going to allow Indian people here to observe our sessions or are we going to allow non-Indian people also.

George Manuel

Will you clarify that motion No. 4.

Guy Williams

But I thought I made myself very clear on the word in-camera or the phrase in-camera. It refers to those that are involved in the meeting which means Indian people, and this should be very clear, and I want it very clear. This does not involve non-Indians. So that Mr. Chairman, I want clear.

George Manuel

Thank you Mr. Williams.

Peter Dubois

I have seconded Mr. William's motion. In view of further discussions that took place after the seconding of the motion, I came to the conclusion that we are people who have maybe, the lack of knowledge in defining legal terms. We from Saskatchewan have brought our legal adviser along and this would be in a form of a request again to the delegation. Could have our Legal Adviser sit in-camera in the camera session with us?

George Manuel

Your Legal Adviser to sit in camera? This is sort of an amendment is it?

Peter Dubois

I would like to put it in the form of an amendment if this is agreeable to the assembly.

George Manuel

There has been no seconder to Mr. Guy Williams' motion.

Peter Dubois

I was the seconder to this motion.

George Manuel

I see, I see, I see, fine, O.K. Your a seconder, and also you make an amendment. That was carried, there has to be a new motion.

Harold Cardinal

I think there is a motion on the floor Mr. Chairman. Seconded by Mr. Nicholas that Indian Affairs officials, not Indian people, but people working with the

Department of Indian Affairs be removed from in-camera session. I wasn't referring to the Indian delegates who travelled the long distance to be here as observers.

George Manuel

This was a separate motion that was passed. It wasn't passed? O.K. Well, I'm sorry.

A motion is still on the floor with regards to removing Indian Affairs' officials from this room when there is an in-camera session. What do you wish for this? Are you ready for the question?

Speaker Unknown

Or any government official. Or any government official.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I can just verify Mr. Cardinal's motion. I do have girls taking minutes for me and I don't know whether they are from the Branch or not. You are not from the Indian Affairs Branch or not? No. You are not from the Indian Affairs Branch? No. Would they be part of this motion. It is a matter of convenience.

If you are not part of Indian Affairs that motion doesn't include you.

George Manuel

You have heard the motion. Could you read the motion again?

Motion by Mr. Harold Cardinal

If the meeting in-camera sessions are called, all Indian Affairs Branch staff, that's Indian Affairs Branch staff, be asked to go no matter what capacity they represent.

You have heard the motion. Any further discussions? Wilmer Nadjiwon?

Wilmer Nadjiwon. Yes, I'd like to clarify what you mean by Indian Affairs Officials. I do believe that there are a number of Indian people sitting here who are either at the present time or in the past, working for the Department of Indian Affairs. Does this include such a thing as a community Development Officer?

G. Manuel. Who was the mover of this?

H. Cardinal. Officials who are currently actively employed.

G. Manuel. You've heard the motion. Now what is your wish, gentlemen? Are you ready for the question? Question has been called. All those in favour raise your hand. All those against. I guess the motion has been carried. That takes care of your suggestion pretty well. The next item on the Agenda, gentlemen. Mr. Fred Gladstone, No. 8, Alberta.

Fred Gladstone. I'd like to congratulate the Assembly for their wise choice of chairman. I want to suggest that we get back to the Chairman because it seems like we'll be wasting time everyday if we have to get Regional Chairmen. So I would move that the present two chairmen are in the chair now be retained for the entire meeting. They're both from coast to coast so I don't think there's any conflict in between, I hope.

G. Manuel. Could you speak out a little louder Fred because they can't hear it at this end.

Fred Gladstone. I move we retain the two chairman for the entire meeting. Reasons are that I feel are that every time that we're going to nominate a chairman that we're going to be wasting a lot of time and I think they represent the country pretty well. They're both from coast to coast.

G. Manuel. Will you read that motion Mr. Beaulieu again?

Moved by Mr. Gladstone from Alberta that we keep the co-chairmen that we have presently because they represent pretty well the people from across the country, the entire nation, for the entire meeting. Is that right?

G. Manuel. You've heard the motion.

Philip Paul. I would like to second that motion.

G. Manuel. There's been a seconder to the motion. Regularly moved and seconded. Any further discussion on it?

Guy Williams. Mr. Chairman, now the picture has changed on account of that motion. I still maintain the idea, that this is a large country with a large number of Indian people. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, to enter an amendment to the motion that has been expressed that Mr. Francis become a joint-chairman. Five days is a long time for one chairman to take care of deliberations. Give equality on the chairmanship of the east and the west and the co-chairman to be from the central will serve the purpose that I had requested and suggested at the beginning.

G. Manuel. The mover has accepted the suggestion of Mr. Philip Paul. Is the seconder in agreement. Could you read the motion as it stands.

I. Beaulieu. Moved by Mr. Gladstone, Seconded by Mr. Philip Paul that we keep the co-chairman that we have for the entire meeting because they represent the Indian people from across the country. Amendment to the motion by Guy Williams. Mr. Francis to become joint-chairman of the assembly and that a third person be elected as co-chairman or that there be a , sorry excuse me, a third person be co-chairman, elected from the central region.

G. Manuel. Both the mover and the seconder are in agreement so we wouldn't have to vote on this separately. We'll vote on it as an entire motion. Are there any further discussions? If not, are you ready for the question?

Question has been called. All those in favour-against, carried. Now since this motion has gone through, could there be a motion to suggest the central representative to co-chair this assembly.

Speaker Unknown. I so move.

G. Manuel. Who do you suggest?

Speaker Unknown. I move that there be a third.

G. Manuel. It's already passed.

Speaker Unknown. I believe Omer Peters mentioned some people from Ontario and perhaps we could suggest those names which he mentioned before the meeting. Are you prepared to make a nomination, Chief Isaac?

George Manuel. Chief Isaac. Chief Isaac who?

Speaker Unknown. That's his name Chief Isaac.

G. Manuel. Mr. Omer Peters has nominated Chief Isaac from the Six Nations. Secunder Mr. LaBillois.

LaBillois. I second that motion.

G. Manuel. Mr. LaBillois has seconded that motion so it's been regularly moved and seconded that Mr. Isaac be co-chairman representing central Canada. Are you ready for the question? Or is there further discussion?

Mr. McNab. I'd like to make a further motion. Now we'll get into central Canada. I nominate Mr. J.B. Tootoosis from Saskatchewan to be co-chairman.

G. Manuel. There's a motion on the floor Mr. McNab and you can only talk on that motion. You can make that suggestion after the motion's cleared. Is there any further discussions?

Omer Peters. I went along this first election on the suggestion that this was going to be a regional thing. Now we also have Quebec here the Quebec province. I don't think Ontario should say, "well we're central we'll take this whole thing." I think there again that's the reason I like the regional thing. It gives each province a chance to get involved and although it does take time, it is important from the point of view of the people in the province and I think it is darn important.

G. Manuel. Thank you Mr. Omer Peters. There is a motion on the floor. If you would like to withdraw that motion and refer nominations. It seems there's three names here that have been suggested.

G. Manuel. Are you prepared to withdraw your motion?

Omer Peters. Yes I am prepared to withdraw it. I have given it consideration.

G. Manuel. Will the seconder withdraw his motion? Fine, the motion has been withdrawn so there is no motion on the floor. Are you prepared to make a motion that we have nominations.

Speaker Unknown. I vote there be nominations for the co-chairman.

G. Manuel. Is there a seconder for that? Seconded by Peter Kelly. It's been regularly moved and seconded. Question has been called. All those in favour. Carried. I don't think there's need to be a seconder for the nominations. If I'm wrong correct me.

G. Manuel. Now, a nomination has been made for Mr. Isaac by Omer Peters. A nomination has been made by Hilliard McNab.

Speaker Unknown. For Who?

G. Manuel. J.B. Tootosis. Now, who was the third? Who was the third that was nominated; it seems to me that there was a third.

Speaker Unknown. There was a discussion for a Quebec delegate to be nominated.

Andrew Delisle. ... generally known as the province of Quebec. I appreciate the statement made by Mr. Peters, but I think we would like to define as the central part of Canada starting from Ontario to Alberta, that area, and we are prepared to go along with anyone that the body selects because we feel that you have the wise and just decisions to make just as we have and we will have the fullest confidence in any chairman that is chosen.

G. Manuel. Thank you Mr. Delisle.

There has been two nominations, is there any further nominations? If there is no further nominations will somebody move nominations cease.

Wilmer Nadjiwon moves.

Seconder. Seconded by Fred Gladstone

All those in favour? Carried.

Now how do you wish to proceed with this election of the co-chairman by secret ballot or by a raise of hands.

Speaker Unknown. When there are two involved, Mr. Chairman, I don't think you have any choice but I think it must be a secret ballot.

G. Manuel. Everybody in favour of this?

Speaker Unknown. There is only two, isn't there Mr. Chairman. You said why not make it four then; you have set the four I think, I don't see why we have to.

G. Manuel. Are you all agreed for secret ballot?

Mr. McNab. Mr. Chairman, maybe we should have another suggestion. Mr. McNab from Saskatchewan.

No, I think earlier it was mentioned that maybe there should be rotation here and I think that these co-chairmen had two days apiece to even things up a bit wouldn't it.

G. Manuel. The motion has been passed that, you know, there be nominations for chairman.

Secret ballots, did you make motion.

Wilmer Nadjiwon. Moves by secret ballot. Seconded by Max Gros-Louis.

G. Manuel. Are you ready for the question.

Victor Adolph. I think, Mr. Chairman, since we have only two nominations, would it not be in order that if it is a pleasure of the delegation that we accept the two nominees as both co-chairmen. As you stated, and has been stated, that we are going to be in session for five days and I think we probably at some time or another, we should have this other co-chairman.

G. Manuel. Yes, there has been a motion and it was passed Victor that there be nominations to this.

G. Manuel. I didn't hear you Omer.

Omer Peters. Would it be possible to back up like we did before and just have the one motion?

G. Manuel. Will somebody make an amendment to that at the interest of Victor.

Victor Adolph. Yes, I will so amend that if it is the pleasure of the delegation that we accept these two nominees.

G. Manuel. It has been amended by Victor Adolph that the two people nominated for co-chairmen be accepted as co-chairmen for this assembly. Is there a seconder to that amendment? Philip Paul. Is there any further discussion?

If there is no further discussions are you ready for the question?

Question has been called. All those in favour? It's almost 12 o'clock gentlemen and we didn't have our coffee. Should we proceed to 12? What is the next item that you wish to discuss on the agenda?

Peter Dubois. Mr. Chairman, in view of our National leader not being present here, I did make a request to the delegates in respect to the delegation from Saskatchewan. As I said before the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians didn't have a representative at our consultation meeting. In view of the fact that we have had a change in leadership in the Federation of Saskatchewan since the consultation conference, I would like to make a direct request to the delegates here to have our present Chief who is David Ahenakew, if David Ahenakew will stand, be added to the official list of delegates that we have from Saskatchewan.

Speaker Unknown. Mr. Chairman, this has gone beyond the point of suggestions, I would suggest through you, Mr. Chairman, that there be a motion

G. Manuel. Before you make that motion I want to make one thing clear; that there are other delegates, not delegates, observers in the assembly, that are heads of other organizations and that also Mr. Cardinal over there has six members and some of them are not official delegates that as expressed the same.

H. Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, may I correct you, the six that we brought here are all official delegates. We haven't registered any four.

G. Manuel. I see, O.K.

A motion has been made by Peter Dubois that Dave Ahenakew be part and parcel of this assembly here as an official delegate. Is there a seconder to that?

G. Manuel. Paul Ahenakew seconded. It has been regularly moved and seconded. Is there any further discussions?

Wilmer Nadjiwon. Yes, clarification on that question. The Chief would represent the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians as their delegates.

G. Manuel. Is that clear Wilmer.

Wilmer Nadjiwon. That is just a clarification.

G. Manuel. The question has been clarified. Is there any further discussions or questions or are you ready for the question? The question has been called; all those in favour? Against? Carried. Now Dave I guess you can sit up as an official delegate of the federation of Saskatchewan Indians.

Harold Cardinal. I'd like to request this meeting to recognize the six delegates from Alberta as the official delegation representing that Province.

G. Manuel. That I thought you said they were official delegates?

H. Cardinal. We haven't registered any delegation as yet.

G. Manuel. Oh. A motion has been made by Harold Cardinal that the six delegates that they have, be registered as official delegates. Is there a seconder to that request?

No. 6 Ed. Bellerose seconds the motion.

Philip Paul. Could Mr. Cardinal please clarify the six delegates?

H. Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, at our consultation meeting in December of last year, the delegates representing all the reserves in the province of Alberta elected six to represent the Province at the National Consultation Meeting. The six delegates we have are: Mr. Clement Dore from southern Alberta, Mr. Fred Gladstone from southern Alberta, Mr. William Bull from central Alberta, Mr. Sam Currie from central Alberta, Mr. Ed Bellerose and myself for the northern portion of the Province. These were the six that were elected and to date we have refused to send in any four as representing Alberta because we do not have the authority to go against the wishes of our people.

G. Manuel. Does that clarify your question Mr. Paul. Now is there any further discussions or questions?

Wilmer Nadjiwon. How is this delegation based on population, is it based on area? You know there is population in Ontario, there is population in Quebec, there is north central and northern Quebec, north central and northern Ontario.

H. Cardinal. This is based on the three treaty groups in Alberta-Treaties 6, 7 and 8 which is southern, central and northern.

G. Manuel. Does that answer your question Mr. Nadjiwon?

Wilmer Nadjiwon. No, it doesn't answer it. We have many as observers who are from Ontario. Do we want them sitting at this table? This is the problem.

We have one man here, I could again present a fellow from a larger reserve. In the north we had six delegates which wanted to come, but I think however we have two right here. I was just wondering how far, you know, how this is going to be clarified. I'm not against Harold having representatives from Alberta, but I sure would like to see the province of Ontario have enough delegates too for population and this is what happened before. When we brought the schedule out we had to reschedule before and this is how we accepted it.

Harold Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, I think we are getting into a discussion that is not the doing of the Indian delegation or the Indian delegates to this meeting. We are not against the idea of proportionate representation; in fact we support this. I think we are going to suggest that the question of representation be decided by the Indians in their respective provinces. The decision to have four, four, not six delegates as decided by the Department, was done arbitrarily and without consultation. We cannot accept this position in Alberta. And we again request this meeting to accept the delegation from Alberta as they were elected at our Regional Consultation Meeting.

G. Manuel. Did No. 7 want to make a remark now. I mean No. 6.

Ed Bellerose. I will support what Harold has to say and since we are living in democracy my trip consists, because I was elected, not nominated. If Indian Affairs Branch wishes to choose only four out of the six, then none of us can represent the delegation, because their wish is that six people be representing from Alberta and that I strongly say, this is not the wishes of the delegates trying to bring ourselves in here.

Mr. Andrew Nicholas. I support the sentiment expressed by the Alberta delegation.

I also want to go on to support their condemning the preconceived delegates numbers by the Branch. In the Maritimes, I know they are going by numbers, but there are two provinces; Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island who are not represented. I feel that there should be strong feelings here for the provinces to stress regional representation. If we sit here and accept what the Department determined as delegates, then we are going along with the idea but basically we should oppose it and so therefore I respect the Alberta position and also the one expressed by Mr. Peters.

G. Manuel. Fine, thank you Mr. Nicholas. Could you read the motion again so the assembly will be informed what the motion is.

I. Beaulieu. Moved by Mr. Harold Cardinal and seconded by Mr. Ed. Bellerose. That the six Alberta delegates be recognized as official delegates to the conference.

Mr. Guy Williams. Well, part of the information, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be clear on this point because at the moment I'm not clear at all. The point I would like to get Mr. Chairman, is this assembly recognizing certain delegates from certain provinces. May I at this time, to further the point, name my good friend Dave Ahenakew. By this assembly nominating him and accepting him as an official delegate are we saying to the Department that they are going to be responsible for getting him here. I am not saying that I do now know whether Mr. Ahenakew or his organization were responsible for him being present and then there is the four, the figure for Alberta. Well then if we recognize them, will the Department of Indian Affairs be in a position to reimburse them or their organizations for getting here. And furthermore I would, now that the time is noon, I would also suggest Mr. Chairman and I have possibly no authority to make the suggestion, I certainly would like to get together with the British Columbia delegation and discuss this very important matter.

G. Manuel. Could you answer that Harold?

H. Cardinal. What has happened to date, we refused to send in any four names as official delegates and we have found our money to bring our six delegates here. If the meeting so desires here that any additional delegates be recognized as such that they be reimbursed by the Department. I cannot see how the Department can reject this since they say this, we heard the Minister say, that this was an Indian meeting, they were prepared to listen. But I would like to suggest one further point, Mr. Chairman, that possibly while this issue is being considered after or during the dinner hour, that after lunch we go to an in-camera session.

G. Manuel. Before Mr. Ahenakew speaks I want to remind this assembly for the records, that they want you to identify yourself before you speak.

Mr. Ahenakew Just clarifying Mr. William's story. My people have strongly demanded, the people of Saskatchewan, that I would be the chief spokesman for the Saskatchewan Delegation and the Saskatchewan organization have financed my trip to this assembly.

G. Manuel. Is this clear, Mr. Williams?

G. Williams. It is very clear to me now. Harold has clarified the position of his people. He also referred to them earlier as under the three different treaty areas or three treaties that involve certain peoples of Alberta. His position is very clear to me now. Again, Mr. Chairman, I suggest and request the British Columbia Delegates that we get together at noon possibly at one table and discuss some of the matters in reference to recognition of delegates that were not officially, official delegates at the beginning. We have 47,000 people in British Columbia and I think it will be for our benefit to get together.

G. Manuel. There is a motion on the floor, it has been regularly moved and seconded. Is there any further discussion or are you ready for the question or do you want to hear the motion again.

Mr. Ahenakew It kind of disturbs me to listen about, you know, how many delegates. I am hoping that this assembly is all assembled here for one purpose - to advance the opportunity for the Indian people. I hope it doesn't involve an opposition or several opposition groups to oppose one another. I hope this is not our purpose here. When the delegates have a vote, this is where the question will come up, will this vote be there strictly to oppose another section of the Indian.

Mr. Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, I would like to very clearly state the position of Alberta. We did not come here to oppose any part, any segment of the country. We are here to try and come and work out solutions so that we can try and come up with answers that will be in the best interest of our people whether they live in Alberta or any other part of the country.

G. Manuel. There is still a motion on the floor. What is your wish gentlemen do you want to proceed with further comments on it, discussions or do you want to hear the motions or are you ready for the question?

Max Gros-Louis. Mr. Chairman - (in French)

G. Manuel. Just wait a minute Max. O.K.

Mr. Max-Gros-Louis said Mr. Harold Cardinal stated that his group came here with no intention of opposition to anything that the assembly may be discussing, but what is his position regarding a controversial issue coming up and the vote has to be taken. Will his whole six delegates be voting or just four out of the six delegates.

H. Cardinal. If the delegation is accepted as such there will be six voting delegates and at the same time I think we stated our position that we are prepared to support the ideas that each of the provinces decide on the makeup of their representation.

G. Manuel. Is that clear to you Max?

Wallace LaBillois. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there is a motion on the floor and it is a very good motion I think, don't you think Mr. Chairman, that it would be in order to table this motion until after dinner so that the delegates can discuss this matter at noon-hour among themselves and quite possibly we could dispense with this motion right after and everyone would be a little more clear as to the intentions of the different delegates across the country and we could move on to other business.

G. Manuel. Is this a motion, Mr. LaBillois?

W. LaBillois. In view of the fact that it is a motion to table it, maybe would could table this, if this would be agreeable with Mr. Cardinal.

H. Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, Alberta would appreciate getting a clarification on this position as soon as it is possible because this will decide whether we stay at this meeting or not.

G. Manuel. The motion has been made and seconded. Just wait a minute till I clarify this motion.

Mr. LaBillois. I think that this should be tabled until after dinner.

G. Manuel. Is there a seconder to this?

James Gosnell. Did you want to say anything on the motion?

J. Gosnell. I was going to speak on the motion but realize that the matter has been tabled till after dinner then I will take the opportunity then.

G. Manuel. Fine. Thank you.

H. Cardinal. Mr. Chairman, I suggested earlier that we go into an in-camera session for the afternoon.

G. Manuel. There is a motion on the Floor that has been regularly moved and seconded that we table the Alberta Indian Association's motion to accept their six delegates as members of this assembly during the discussions and votes. What is your pleasure to the motion of Mr. LaBillois and Mr. Gosnell? Question has been called, all those in favour, raise your right hand. Opposed. Carried. Now Mr. Cardinal you mentioned that an in-camera session, go into session this afternoon. Is that a motion.

H. Cardinal. I would like to move it to that effect.

G. Manuel. Mr. Cardinal makes a motion that the afternoon session be in-camera session.

Seconded by Mr. Nicholas. Could you read the motion.

I. Beaulieu. Vote by Mr. Harold Cardinal, seconded by Mr. Nicholas that we go into camera session after dinner.

G. Manuel. You've heard the motion is there any further discussions or questions or are you ready for the question.

Question has been called. All those in favour? All against. Carried. Now what time should we convene for lunch now, is it your wish to convene for lunch now. 2 o'clock?

Speaker Unknown. I would suggest that we reconvene at 2 o'clock giving opportunity to different provincial sections to get together.

G. Manuel. Is that all in favour? 2 o'clock. Fine then this. Excuse me, just hold your seats. Mr. Courchene wants to say a few words.

D. Courchene. First of all I got a phone call from Mr. Walter Dieter and he will not be available for the rest of the week and I would like to make a suggestion to the delegation here that we send a telegram to Mr. Walter Dieter and his family and also the possibility of some donations possibly sending a wreath out. How do you people feel on this?

Mr. Nicholas. I support the idea and I suggest that the secretary send a wire to Mr. Dieter expressing our deep sympathy for him and his family in this tragic time and send the wreath on behalf of the delegation and then afterwards to ask for contributions from the delegation.

G. Manuel. Thank you Mr. Nicholas. There has been suggestions made here I don't think there is a need for a motion here. I think this is a moral obligation here on our part to our president who has worked very, very hard the past few months to coordinate a National Indian movement on behalf of our people. Now I want to remind you that we will reconvene at 2 o'clock and that the session this afternoon, will be an in-camera session so Indian Affairs will not be asked to come this afternoon until further notice of this assembly except the Indian people who have been suggested in the motion this morning can attend as observers that are not delegates. Now I would like to take the opportunity of appointing Mr. Courchene to send the telegram on our behalf. If it is O.K. with you. Is it O.K. with you? Good. Mr. Dave Courchene will send the telegram on our behalf to Mr. Walter Dieter and Mr. Ahenakew will do the collecting from the delegates for the wreath that was proposed by Mr. Courchene. The assembly stands adjourned until 2 O'clock.

Speaker Unknown. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest at this time that two co-chairmen in the afternoon session move up.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00.

Meeting went into in-camera session for the balance of the day.

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

In-Camera sessions from 9:30 to 11:00 when meeting was declared open.

G. Manuel: And I would ask the press here to be courteous with us in our deliberations and consider the public because we do need public support.

John Tootoosis:

G. Manuel: Identify yourself. Sit down John, otherwise they won't hear.

J. Tootoosis: What I would like to ah

G. Manuel: Sit down John.

J. Tootoosis: No. No. I'm standing. I think every delegate should stand up to be seen even by observers. When you talked the last couple of days we don't know sometimes who's talking. That's the reason why I get up myself. Right away up. This question has just come out. Our brother from Alberta. We have to speak to the government the way he spoke to us as brother to brother when he first came down to our continent. Peaceful and agreeing with us, letting him live with us as a brother. We took him as a brother by the hand. In our treaties it is even engraved in a silver medal, I have one of them at home. I didn't even take it along, it's too precious to me. I don't carry it around. To prove we took him as a brother. I sometimes think we took a heck of a brother the way we have been treated. Discriminated all these years. Now in this conference, first time a meeting across Canada, we are being left to talk here by ourselves without the Minister, or Government Officials and they don't mix up what they used to do in joint committee meetings which I have attended many times in Ottawa. Now we have ample time here I think every provincial representative should be called up to say what they stand for. They still stand for their own regional and treaty rights, rights being a native of this land. I think when we get to that point there is no objection; we co-operate and join hands together and fight together for our rights. Thank you.

G. Manuel. May I remind this assembly that I think there is no question. I think everybody has the same desire that their aboriginal rights be honoured. Now, if they have any aboriginal rights. I think treaty Indians have treaties that should be honoured. Now, I think the question and the issue here, and we should stick to the issue, is that the treaties and aboriginal rights be recognized in the Indian Act because this is the Indian Act discussions and I am just wondering if this isn't the line you are supposed to be discussing this issue on. O.K. Dave.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba. First of all I'd like to say that we have discussed quite a number of things the last couple of days, and we seem to be going in all directions. I think we have to come down to the basic principle of how we are going to unite and how we are going to submit to government. I had prepared a short paper and put it in the name of the national organization, I gave the copies to all the national or provincial organization leaders. Now, I would like to present this paper to the delegation and I would like to go over this paper with you. I think the principle of what we have been discussing is in this paper, and I think from there on we will have a sense of direction on what we are trying to achieve as representatives of Indian people. I would like to go over this paper with you.

Speaker Unknown. I'm wondering since this is a very important paper, extremely important, and I'm wondering whether we should wait for the Indian Affairs before this is brought out, as it is extremely important. I think that they should hear about this. Extremely important paper and this is my feelings.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba. Well it will be presented to the Minister anyway, if the delegation so wish. But I think we should have a clarification amongst ourselves, in the contents of the paper. I only have one left, so I will go over the paper with you and then we could tear it apart if you so wish, and add on or delete

or whatever we decide. I gave it to your leader there. I had fifty copies yesterday, I only have one left. I don't know where they have all gone. This copy is being xeroxed. Right, O.K.

Ed Bellerose, Alberta. I fully agree with the Saskatchewan delegation that before, because of the importance of our brief, I should say that we should hear people out. It may sound that we are little confusing here, but what I'm saying here is that more ideas be expressed on the table then final analysis of your paper will go through before presenting the proper brief from there. We cannot present proper brief to the Minister unless we hear definitely from most of the delegates that are willing to speak here now.

G. Manuel. I think the reason that Dave wants to present this paper is to give direction to the meeting. I think . . . and you can reject the whole content of his paper, I think it is just something to give an idea of how Manitoba feels in regards to aboriginal rights. I think I will permit Dave to go ahead with it. Go ahead Dave.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba. As I said earlier I put it in the name of the National Indian Brotherhood as a suggestion to the delegation.

The National Indian Brotherhood is concerned, deeply concerned, that the Indian Act consultations are not meeting the expectations of the Indian people of Canada. The Brotherhood submits that the method used does not realistically recognize the priorities for discussion as Indians see them.

It has been made abundantly clear, both by the consultations to date and through Indian meetings throughout the land, that the principle concerns of Indian people center around;

- A) Recognition of the treaties and the obligations imposed by same.

- B) Recognition of aboriginal rights.
- C) Reconciliation of injustices done by the imposition of restrictions on Indian hunting through the ratification of the Migratory Birds Convention Act and subsequent Federal and Provincial legislation.
- D) Claims Commission

It is our opinion that before meaningful consultation on amendments to the Indian Act can take place, these four items must be dealt with and a position of mutual understanding and commitment reached.

We would remind the Government that there were two signatures on the Treaties yours and ours. We further state that in the eyes of the Indian, the Treaties constitute solemn promises and in fact contractual obligations. Before the obligations undertaken by Treaty can be changed or compromised, it is essential that the agreement of both signators to the agreement accept such changes.

Changes have been made without consultation - the Government of Canada, representing one of the signators, has arbitrarily and autocratically ignored their obligation to the second party to the agreement (Indians) and continually compromised the position of Indians.

It is not important today to define specifically what the treaties say as measured by the significance of the language used. What is important is what the treaties intended to say and what each party understood them to mean. For the last century, the descriptions and definitions of intent and content, both legalistic and otherwise, have reflected your opinion and yours alone. Indians have not been given a reasonable opportunity to interpret their understanding of the intent in such a way that public policy could reflect an understanding of the Indian position.

We are not prepared at this meeting to debate this issue, nor the amendments to the Indian Act. We are prepared, however, to discuss with you a more realistic

basis for meaningful consultation.

To date the discussions have been heavily weighed in favour of the Government. You have the resources at your disposal to develop your position while we are hard pressed to develop and present our opinions. In the final analysis it will be your interpretation of what we want that will be reflected in the legislation you submit for our consideration.

We submit that this situation should be reversed. The new Indian Act could be our Magna Carta - its impact will be more closely felt by Indians than it will by Government. It can be our passport to equality and opportunity or it could be just another compromise solution to a long term problem.

The new Indian Act must reflect the real intent of the treaties, it must stipulate the Government's commitment to its obligations, it must provide the basis for equality and opportunity and it must reflect mutual trust and understanding.

To achieve this objective, the National Indian Brotherhood submits that Indian people, through their legitimate organizations, should be given the opportunity to consult meaningfully with Indians across Canada and to develop their own Indian Act for your consideration rather than vice versa.

To do this will require time, organization and finances. The National Indian Brotherhood feels that the commitment of all three are essential to the development of realistic legislation, and more important, a basis for mutual trust and understanding.

We would propose therefore that the Government of Canada, recognize the importance of the foregoing and that they commit to the process sufficient funds to accomplish the objective as outlined above.

It is further proposed that the National Indian Brotherhood establish a special committee for the purpose of consulting with Indian organizations across the country and prepare a draft Indian Act for the consideration of both Government and Indians.

To further assist in the project, the provincial organizations would establish committees to consult with and assist the national committee.

The national organization shall employ such advisors and consultants as required to accomplish their purpose. The provincial organizations will, within reasonable limits, employ such advisors and consultants as required to advise the national committee.

The cost of carrying out the program should be borne by the Government of Canada.

These are anticipated to be;

(A) National Committee

Committee travel and consultations	40,000.00
Provision for honorariums	20,000.00
Full-time secretary	12,000.00
Consultants and legal advisors (including travel)	<u>100,000.00</u>
TOTAL	\$172,000.00

(B) Provincial Committee

Committee travel consultation	15,000.00
Consultants and legal advisors (fees and expenses)	20,000.00
Provision for honorarium	<u>10,000.00</u>
TOTAL	\$45,000.00

Total cost anticipated

National committee	172,000.00
Provincial committees * 8 x \$45,000.00	<u>360,000.00</u>
	\$532,000.00

▲Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick combined - one committee in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and Northwest Territories.

The amounts indicated are approximations based on preliminary projections only. More detailed projections would require detailed examination.

For the benefit of those who are alarmed at such projections we would point out, that, this kind of an investment at this time should produce long term benefits and hopefully ensure that the process will not have to be repeated frequently during the next century.

The amounts, though significant, are in turn insignificant, when measured against increasing despair and frustration. No dollar value can be adequately established to relate to human poverty and suffering.

To the more pragmatic we would point out, that this proposal in terms of dollars and cents is truly insignificant, when measured against recent over-expenditures on the aircraft carrier Bonaventure. We would also submit that to Indian people, discussions of treaties, legislation, equal opportunity and amendments to the Indian Act are equal in importance to the B. and B. commission.

We trust that the Government of Canada will consider seriously this submission and that it will act responsibly in responding to our proposal.

Speaker Unknown. Say, why didn't you make this thing, why didn't you make this paper available to every delegate?

G. Manuel. We did. I have just instructed Beaulieu here to zerox a bunch and there will be some coming pretty soon. We gave your leader, ah Wilmer you had some copies yesterday.

For the record, I've been asked and I asked you time and time again to state your number and your name.

Peter Kelly, Northwestern Ontario. For your information. I'd like to make it particularly a little more clear that what is happening here is that the information that has been given for Southern Ontario does not necessarily go to Northern Ontario. I'd like to make it known for the record that every bit of information that goes to the Indian people goes directly to every delegation, it doesn't have to stop within a bottle neck. And that's why I said that we should have every bit of information. I don't need anyone from the south to tell me what is being read.

G. Manuel. Did you mention your name also?

Wilmer Nadjiwon, of the Union of Ontario Indians. I resent this without proper information. This paper was given to me at twelve o'clock last night. You were not available. You came in late, it still wasn't available. I have only one copy. I can't divide it. Now please before you make a rash statement . . .

G. Manuel. Could I interrupt, if there is any, you know, feelings among different delegates that they have something that they have which is an internal problem could they keep it to themselves and discuss this with themselves please.

Gus Gottfriedson, British Columbia. On the paper it says Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick and one committee in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec and the N.W.T. I think we left out the Yukon, I think this is part of Canada too.

G. Manuel. Is there no delegates here from the Yukon?

Peter Dubois from Saskatchewan. Mr. Elijah Smith, delegate from the Yukon,

approached me at coffee break and wanted me to relate to this conference that the matter of legal advice in regard to the Yukon area was left up to our national leader, Mr. Dieter, who unfortunately was unable to be here because of the circumstances which you have been made aware of. Mr. Smith, I suppose can speak for himself had relied on Mr. Dieter and the Legal Consultant that he had approached but without Mr. Dieter being here as well as his Legal Adviser, Mr. Smith had asked me to speak to you people in regards to aboriginal rights, that he would like to have recognized and their approach on this issue was never discussed. So I am happy the previous speaker has made mention of the Yukon area and as we continue in our deliberation I am sure that we will become aware of one another. This brings me back to the presentation here of our National Indian Brotherhood. I would like to, here at this time, endorse these recommendations in principle and maybe even go a little further to state that let us at this conference right some of the injustices that have been imposed upon our people in the past. Let this be our challenge to the Canadian Government to bring about a just society which our Prime Minister has spoken of.

G. Manuel. Thank you.

J. Tootosis, Saskatchewan. Now I want to supplement a statement Mr. Dubois has made. Now I have been to a Yukon meeting one time a few years ago and I have no doubt those tribes in Yukon & N.W.T. are not given the rights which we have been given. I think these people have the same rights as we have. N.W.T. and Yukon to choose anywhere they want to be not matter what's in there. What they are doing with the minerals on the ground in certain areas if they chose that place it is their right under aboriginal rights being the natives of that land. Now when we Indian people in areas that have made treaties with the Queen, we choose the place, we don't know what was in it. But we choose a place and that was it. That's our native land which unsundered to the Crown. We in the stages of eminent domain

in that piece of land which we choose to live there and surrender the rest. That's the last piece of land we own under the sun. Now I think the N.W.T. and Yukon should have that same right. Canadian Government give these people that right. Thank you.

G. Manuel. For the information of the assembly before I call on Andy I been both in the N.W.T. and the Yukon and in the Yukon they are not interested in having land, special reserves set aside for them. O.K. No. 12.

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. I would request that the paper read the Indians of Canada are deeply concerned and I would also request that

G. Manuel. Is this on Dave's paper?

A. Delisle
Right.

G. Manuel:
~~that your~~ talking about. Good.

A. Delisle:
~~aboriginal~~ rights also include acquired rights and rights that we will make for ourselves in the future, be included in

G. Manuel. Would you say that again Andy?

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. Is it in place of the National Indian Brotherhood is concerned." The Indian people in Canada represented by this delegation which is, I think, truly represented, are concerned. And the other question instead of speaking only to recognition of aboriginal right

G. Manuel. Could you slow down here. O.K.

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. It's hard to slow down when you are thinking in French, English and Indian

G. Manuel. O.K. fine, go ahead.

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. Recognition of aboriginal rights should also include acquired rights and rights which we will make for ourselves in the future. The reason why I mention this is that for instance my way of explanation of the situation in Cornwall which you have all heard about is the situation where there is need for people to make rights for themselves, If we call ourselves a democratic country and people are living in two provinces, the United States should be allowed to decide because they are one unique people and one united people to make rights for themselves.

G. Manuel. Is everybody in agreement with the amendment proposed by Quebec. It has been recorded here by the secretary. No, let me put it this way. Any objections? None then.

G. Williams. I have a point of information Mr. Chairman in regards to acquired rights.

G. Manuel. You want information on this from Andy?

G. Williams. Yes, on acquired rights.

G. Manuel. Could you explain that to Mr. Williams.

G. Williams. It's along the lines of British Columbia and I can't get definite explanation.

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. Thank you for asking for an explanation.

The government agencies tend to interpret aboriginal rights as being rights which people have, just as much as animals would have right to eat in the forest. An acquired right, I think, are rights which our people have made because they have been living on the land and they have found a way to live differently from anybody else. These rights that they make which are different from everybody else, should

be respected, and then you come into the rights which we will make in the future. I hope I clarified that point Mr. Williams.

G. Williams. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel. I've got quite a number of people who want to speak here that want to make one further point.

G. Williams. I think Mr. Delisle has a good point here. I wonder at this moment, Mr. Chairman, aboriginal rights, acquired rights and human rights, we could tell the people what Mr. Delisle said.

G. Manuel. Let's put it another way again, no objection. Anybody object to the new amendment Mr. Williams made. Since there is none, it is accepted. Now No. 6 first.

Eddie Bellerose from Driftpile. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind you that Hugh Conn is here for that motion I just made.

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick. It is a very well thought out submission, had some very good valid points for the people in New Brunswick. However, the suggestion by Mr. Delisle to point out that the delegates to the National Indian conference are concerned and also on

Speaker Unknown. I'm just wondering if I could intervene here since Hugh Conn is here and David told me that he's read this paper and get him to express his opinion on that and we will continue discussions from there.

G. Manuel. Is it alright with you too then?

Speaker Unknown. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear out Mr. Nicholas.

G. Manuel. O.K. fine.

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick. You see on Page 3, it suggest that "the National Indian Brotherhood submits that the Indian people should be given the opportunity", again this should be replaced by "the delegates of this National Indian Conference."

Speaker Unknown. Would it be through their National Committee?

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick. There are delegates here from every province, I believe, and the thing is that in setting up a special committee it will assure those people who aren't members of the National Indian Brotherhood representation on the committee.

G. Manuel. It's been recorded. Again I want to ask for that amendment. Is there any objection to that amendment.

Mona Jacobs. I would like to ask a question.

G. Manuel. In regard to this particular point?

Mona Jacobs, N.W.T. Yes. I was just wondering would you consider the National Indian Brotherhood looking after the administration of this program?

Andrew Nicholas. Yes this is what I was going to say. The delegation will go home. You have to have a functioning arm of something or somebody. If you leave it with your national organization to do the functioning part the involvement of the delegation will still be there but you will have something to function with.

G. Williams. One more suggestion Mr. Chairman. I think we should start up a committee to document and where necessary to change some wording. I heard along the way while it was being read and my glasses are in British Columbia. I have problems. There are reference in one or two places I believe to amendment of the Act.

I don't think that we are at a stage now that we are after an amendment. We are

now in consultation as fully informed. There will be a revision, rather than an amendment. Therefore, I suggest Mr. Chairman, that there be a committee to examine this document, make them change it where and if necessary and I want you to stress that point, where and if necessary. It may go, I think, it is right for a committee from each province to study it.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba. I was wondering in line to what the British Columbia delegation have stated. I was wondering if it would be possible to get the provincial organizational leaders together as a committee.

G. Manuel. Just wait a minute, before you made a motion. Is there a seconder to that motion that heads of organizations examine this for further discussion. Provincial leaders or organizations?

Max Gros-Louis. I'd like to have on that there paper here when we say . . .

G. Manuel. Now just wait a minute Max there is a motion on the floor and I want a seconder for it.

Max Gros-Louis. Well before that I think it's alright to talk about that we already put and we already forget Newfoundland.

G. Manuel. Yeah, we didn't know there was Indians there, we just found out yesterday.

Max Gros-Louis. If we are talking about the provincial committee, then we have to talk about Yukon and Newfoundland too. I like to see those two provinces included.

G. Manuel. I think through the committees this will be all worked out. Would somebody else make the motion. Mr. ah, No. 6.

E. Bellerose. I was just wondering if you wanted to second the motion.

G. Manuel. Do you want to second it?

E. Bellerose. No.

G. Manuel. Is there somebody who is prepared to second the motion?

Speaker Unknown. I second that motion realizing that I endorsed it in principle.

G. Manuel. There is a motion on the floor now and it's open for discussion.

Mona Jacobs, N.W.T. I was just wondering is it, do we have to have a committee on this or is it important enough for all of us to discuss it? I think it is very important because we are submitting this to the government and we should all have a chance to express our opinions on it.

G. Manuel. I'd like to remind this assembly the committee doesn't necessarily mean it's going to be kept or adopted. It can still be rejected. I think they just want to look at it and come back and make a recommendation with regards to what's incorporated in this paper.

Chief Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians. I would move that the previous motion be tabled until further discussion and enlightenment which would come from discussion. The assistance of Hugh Conn would be necessary before a committee could sit and look at this presentation. I think that some of our discussions would be around and our amendments will be around the knowledge that comes from consultation on these facts.

G. Manuel. There is a motion on the floor to table this motion.

Peter Dubois of Saskatchewan. I am in agreement with Wilmer's statement there with regard to Hugh Conn. But knowing Hugh Conn, it is quarter to twelve, and for the amount of knowledge that he has in regard to treaty and aboriginal rights, I think it would be very unfair to get him started and cut him off for lunch so I would like to speak in opposition to tabling the matter and we continue the discussion on the presentation we have before us.

G. Manuel. Yes.

Peter Johnston of

G. Manuel. Your number also.

No. 5, Peter Johnston, Cutler, Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I am still not in a position to take part in any discussions, because I still don't have this document before me.

No. 14

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick. We were just talking with Mr. Conn and of course he is not aware of the discussions to now. He wants to have an opportunity during lunch break to discuss this with the chairman and the co-chairman and other delegates to make a better presentation after lunch. Also while I have the floor here I think I'd second the motion if it has been made by Mr. Nadjiwon to table the motion regarding discussion by provincial delegates or provincial leaders on this, because some of the delegates haven't got it.

G. Manuel. We have ordered a whole bunch of copies and we hope we will get it by noon. I think it is in order now to call on Mr. Conn to be sitting up here with us since you made a motion that he should be part of the discussions. Would you come up here Mr. Conn and take your seat with our, with this assembly.

It has been regularly moved and seconded that we table the motion to have the heads of the provincial organization to discuss, examine this paper presented by Dave Courchene. It's in order to vote on it. So are you ready for the question. One motion tabled. Question has been called. All those in favour. Carried. Now the motion has been tabled. Two motions tabled now. I'm just wondering if it is in order to clear up this one motion that we tabled this morning before noon, and the motion was . . . Could you read this Mr. Secretary.

I. Beaulieu. Moved by Peter Dubois, seconded by David Ahenakew. Moved that we

approach the Minister for obtaining funds to pay the Legal Advisers.

G. Manuel. Let me remind the assembly that the Co-Chairman and the delegates accepted yesterday has already been passed that heads of different organizations which have had these extra delegates must approach the Minister. This is passed, but this one is a separate one. It is just for consultation to pay the Legal Advisers who are there and consultants and use these Legal Advisers and consultants for the whole assembly. If this is accepted then it belongs to the whole assembly, which means that any delegate from other provinces that don't have a legal adviser can use the Legal Adviser of Alberta, the Legal Adviser of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I just want to clarify this. Oh, and the Legal Adviser of Squamish Reserve. Sorry. Oh, and a consultant for Mr. Hugh Conn. Sorry. Now what is your wish gentlemen? A motion on the floor?

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, I think we should be a little more direct and I would suggest we change the word approach to make a request.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba. I had phoned the national president yesterday, and he informed me that there was \$2,000.00 available for legal advisers or consultants. I am sure that \$2,000.00 is going to be insufficient, and by carrying this motion we will be able to approach the government for additional funds, for our legal advisers and other consultants.

G. Manuel. There is a motion on the floor. Are you ready for the question?

I. Beaulieu. Moved that a committee be set up to meet and request the Minister for the purpose of obtaining funds to pay Legal Advisers and Consultants that accompany provincial or elective delegates to the conference and these Advisers be available to the assembly. That's the whole motion.

G. Manuel. You have heard the motion. Is there any further discussion? So are

you ready for the question. Point of clarification.

Mr. Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians. I would like to know whether the assembly adopts the principle that the three Legal Counsel now sitting with Hugh Conn would constitute the Legal Advisory for this assembly and its conference.

I just wondered, like I say clarification.

G. Manuel. Has your question been answered in your opinion. Mr. Nadjiwon.

Mr. Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians. I don't know.

G. Manuel. I mean has your question been answered in your opinion. Are you satisfied?

W. Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians. It's clarified to me, yes.

Andrew Delisle.

G. Manuel. Your number and name please.

Andrew Delisle, Caughnawaga. I would like to have the opportunity, if I may, to call our Legal Adviser if he is required if we feel our delegation requires our Legal Adviser and the costs are covered. It wasn't clear to me. I thought it was restricted to just the people that are here. I want to be sure that if we want ours he would be included.

G. Manuel. The resolution reads Advisers and Consultants that accompanied the provincial or elected delegates.

Are you ready for the question? Question has been called, all those in favour say aye or raise your hand. Raise your hands, it will be easier. All those against. Carried. Now it's five minutes to twelve, I don't think we can open any other subject so if it's O.K. with the delegates its in order to adjourn. O.K.

I would like the Alberta delegation, the British Columbia delegation and the

Maritimes delegation to come with me over in this corner, I think there is a
issue we will have to discuss. What time do you want to convene. Two o'clock.
O.K. we will re-convene again at 2 o'clock.

Tuesday, April 29, 1969
2:00 p.m.

- 60 -

G. Manuel: I declare this session open.

A. Delisle: I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if it would be possible since we have some people to do some work for us if we could not get two copies of our minutes in the French language. I ask this delegation, that the people, one of them beside me, it was only five years since he learned a second language and he is interested in knowing the second language happens to be French and he wants to know what is happening here and I would ask if we could get somebody to translate, as he is a representative of a large amount of people.

G. Manuel: Before we proceed any further, I want to remind you again to call your number and identify yourself for the record. Is that a motion Mr. Chief Delisle?

Chief Delisle: Yes.

G. Manuel: You heard Mr. Delisle's motion, is there a seconder to it? Identify yourself. Your number and your name.

Chief Gros-Louis, No. 13, Chief Max Gros-Louis: I second the motion.

G. Manuel: You've heard the motion. Does there need to be any discussion or are you ready for the question? All those in favour raise your hands. Those against? Carried. Now I would like to take the privilege to call on, and there is no need for introduction for Mr. Hugh Conn, as all of you know him. He has been around across the country for a number of years and worked in the past with Indian Affairs as Specialist in Treaties and aboriginal rights. He will tell you about this because he is more of an authority. To accommodate the question that was raised this morning by Mr. Guy Williams, he wanted to know the number of treaties there are in Canada, of recognized treaties and non-recognized treaties in the process of your address to the assembly, Mr. Conn could answer this question of Mr. Guy Williams. You now have the floor. Mr. Hugh Conn.

MR. CONN: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I would like to start with a note of apology, rather explanation, for my absence this morning as this is not usual with me. (Car trouble - paying ticket - no shaver).

This meeting has this in common with every one I have attended across Canada over the last three or four years. It is preoccupied with the question of Indian rights. This is the main preoccupation. There has been talk about aboriginal rights, treaty rights, acquired rights. Residual rights has not been used but this is a part of it.

I think that, perhaps, the most important aspect of the question is the matter of aboriginal rights but not in the narrow sense that the term is used so often today. To me these would be called residual rights, as rights to hunt and fish after treaty. But aboriginal rights in the true sense means the rights of Indians before Columbus got lost on the voyage of discovery and thought he was in India or before Jacques Cartier after sailing miles up the St. Lawrence River thought he was in China.

I am talking about before the white man got lost. At that time the Indians were equal, they all had equal rights. These rights may have varied in terms of land usage, but basically and fundamentally the Indians owned this continent lock, stock and barrel.

The problem that faces the Government representing you and me is "How and by what means did you acquire title to these lands"?

I am going to give a very quick resumé from coast to coast in order of discovery. The people will tell you that there are no treaties in the Maritime Provinces but this is just not so. As a matter of fact in the final analysis, the Treaties in the Maritime Provinces are the closest to real

treaties that we have. The same form as was used in the Maritimes with the Indians as was used by the British Crown in dealing with the other powers. For example, Indian treaties were Articles of Peace and Friendship while the Jay Treaty (Britain) (U.S.) was title Articles of amity, commerce and negotiation. Moving now to the Province of Quebec, a small, I mean very small area, approximately 1/4 or less of the land mass in Quebec was specifically exempted after the conquest by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 on the theory that France, with 200 years of occupation, must have extinguished the Indian title. If this was the case, the British could acquire title from the other power, it was sufficient for them that the French were in occupation of this part of Quebec, and Britain did not presume that it was necessary to deal with the aboriginal population. One must I think accept this as being perhaps a technical, but never the less valid, legal thinking at the time.

This does not explain how without any negotiation whatever, the boundaries of the Province of Quebec were extended in 1898 to James Bay with no provision however for you the Indian. In 1916 in the last Quebec Boundary Extension Act, Quebec was extended to the area which we now know with positive legislation. The Statute required-prescribed-when lands were required for settlement to deal with the Indians as in other areas of the country. The point in Quebec, then, is that this legislation, how come it has never been applied. At the same time on the opposite side of Hudson Bay the Province of Ontario was likewise extended and Ontario immediately lived up to this part of the commitment. This is one of the mysteries in Indian-Canadian legislation.

Moving over to Ontario, although Quebec lands had been set aside and exempted, Ontario did not have such exemption, so immediately after the American revolution

there was a wave of immigration into that part of Canada which lies just north of the St. Lawrence River. This, according to the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which reserved for Indians all of the lands outside the specified exemption in the Royal Proclamation as their hunting lands and set up machinery, which is observed to this day, for the extinguishment of this title. This was of immigration into Ontario necessitated that the Crown should purchase lands from them. This was a requirement of British Law. This proclamation is perhaps without a doubt the most important single enactment in the history of the Indian people. Some legal people will say that the Royal Proclamation of 1763 created the Indian title but this is just not so. The Indian title had existed from time immemorial. What the proclamation did was to recognize the Indian title, confirmed it and incorporated it in British Law.

We are not dealing with any one right. We are dealing with rights which were of concern to all Indians. Consequently, from this point on it behooves the Government of Canada, and we as white people, to show how that title was extinguished.

The southern part of Ontario, that the basic principle set out in the proclamations was that as lands were required for settlement. There was no question of having to go out - they were to be purchased. This led in the period of 1792 to 1840 to what I have, for want of a better term, called "the piecemeal surrender of Southern Ontario" and our close examination of these will show some very important discrepancies in the title.

The treaties in New Brunswick and in the Maritimes were treaties of Peace and Friendship.

The treaties in Southern Ontario - this phase of the operations were purely and simply land purchases. These were headed 'THIS INDENTURE made' (a certain date) just the same as if you get a deed from a certain municipality. This is the way it starts.

The next period then started in 1850. Minerals had been discovered on the north side of Lake Superior and Huron. The Red River Settlement was where Winnipeg is now and already Confederation between Upper Canada and the west was visualized in 1850. William Henry Robinson was given the chore of dealing with the Indians inhabiting the north shore of Lake Huron and Superior. This was the first treaty in the sense we know them now. You see these treaties bound and distributed by the Department. (In answer to Mr. Williams' question, there are some 240 land surrenders that I have been able to find as a matter of record.) The Robinson treaties were the first which dealt with, not with an individual Band or group, but with whole tribes of Indians.

CHAIRMAN: Are these 240 treaties the recognized treaties?

MR. CONN: The Robinson Treaty contained for the first time specific mention of residual rights, the rights which the Indians would retain to themselves. This was not confined to the Reserves but throughout the whole surrender and, of course, the principal one of these was the right to hunt, fish and trap. The changes made by the Government negotiators in these treaties started from this point are significant. The clause in the Robinson Treaties guaranteed Indians the full and free privilege of hunting, in essence, on all Crown lands.

The next step was the Stone Fort Treaties which covered the old Selkirk Settlement and part of southern Manitoba and here perhaps, it is significant that although in the negotiations leading up the treaty there was a great deal of

mention made of hunting and fishing rights. There is no provision for hunting, fishing and trapping in Treaties 1 or 2.

Treaty No. 3, Northwest Angle. This was the one that led to the famous headland to headland description.

Treaties Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7, cover roughly the southern part of the Prairies and all of this privilege was approved for them subject to such regulations as might be made by the Government of the Dominion of Canada. This in turn was followed by treaties 8 to 11, which provide the same rights but subject to regulations made by the Government of the country. In other words, free privileges of hunting, fishing, and trapping, whittled down to regulations by the Government.

Finally now we come to British Columbia and the Yukon, the area west of the Great Divide. A great deal has been made of the fact that there were no Canadian Settlements in the area at the time of the proclamation. This has been found by some jurists as being 'terra incognita' but this is by no means true. Drake was there 200 years before and claimed it as British territory; and before the conquest there was Captain Cooke's exploration. He, just about the time of the proclamation, was given the specific task of exploring the river now called the Columbia to determine if the Northwest Passage actually did exist and if it went through the Rocky Mountains. This was by no means unknown territory. In this I share the opinion of the very eminent jurist Mr. Justice Norris, that there was ample proof that the British knew of the British Columbia coast, of the river, of the people there, and intended that their title should also be confirmed under the Royal Proclamation.

This is a thumbnail sketch of Indians starting out, in the first early word of the Bible 'in the beginning'.

If we take a look, and this point was talked on yesterday, but in my opinion under emphasized, if we take a look at all of these differences, it is the white man who creates all these differences. Is anyone going to tell me that the treaties in the western Provinces and Northwest Territories were on the basis of negotiations when you only have to look at the penmanship of the original to know that they were written by skilled draftsmen here in the City of Ottawa. Negotiate, promise them anything you like but get their signatures.

This brings us up to the present time, to the revision of the Indian Act.

The aboriginal rights in terms of land title in British Columbia are in my opinion intact. They have never been touched. In the rest of the areas where treaties prevail, in many respects these treaties have been honoured more in the breach than in the observance. In Northern Quebec the Indian title is intact and in the Northern portion the Indian title is confirmed by concurrent legislation by the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Quebec. In the Maritime Provinces, again the aboriginal title is intact. These were articles of Friendship entered into in times of stress. The rest of the treaties were entered into during the time of the revolution or War of Independence; then everything is quiet; then comes the War of 1812 - and another treaty. In other words, everytime we were in danger we brown-nosed the Indian and as soon as the danger had passed, forgot about him.

At the present time there has been a great deal of discussion here. The object of the whole meeting is to consider what should go into the new Indian Act. The process of consultation is a result of a promise made by the Honourable Walter Harris when the present Act was inaugurated in 1951 - actually the process was in 1949. The Indians objected strenuously to many of the powers

conveyed on the Minister. They said to Mr. Harris, "As long as you are here Mr. Harris, we are not afraid; we trust you; but what is going to happen when you get a different portfolio or get out of politics?" Mr. Harris replied: "I will make a promise in all confidence on behalf of myself and the Government that if you go along with this Act as it is now, in ten years we will come back, meet with you and re-examine the whole thing." Now this is precisely what happened and within the ten years another joint committee of Parliament met and heard briefs from Indian groups and officials on the Indian treaties indicating that all was not well in this sector. This process is still going on.

In all of this, now here is my message, my suggestion to this group. In all of this, right from the outset, it was made abundantly clear to both the administration and the executive of the Government of Canada that the Indians were uniformly preoccupied with their rights, aboriginal rights, treaty rights, residual rights. This has been abundantly clear; not for six months, nor for a year, but for ten years. It has been abundantly clear to the Government of Canada that Indians are uniformly preoccupied with this and are not going to be put off with any vague assurances. The Courts of Canada have stated in a number of instances that the treaties with the Indians have been legislated out of existence. If so the question is, is the Government prepared now to legislate these treaties and the attendant rights back into existence or are they not? It seems to me that with this in mind the Indians are preoccupied; I might say almost to the point of obsession, with this one subject which is so well known to the Government. It seems to me that the Government should during these sessions be prepared to come forward with concrete legislation on this subject which they propose to put before Parliament and let you fellows have a look at it. Now, if it is not possible

to speak to the legislators then I suggest that this meeting through the medium of their legal advisors be prepared to put before the Government of Canada a concrete proposal and say "This is what we want by way of legislation to confirm our treaties."

GENTLEMEN, THIS IS MY MESSAGE.

G. Manuel: I'd like to ask David Courchene to thank the speaker.

D. Courchene: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, No. 20. Yes on behalf of the group I would like to thank you very much, Mr. Hugh Conn. As was stated here by the delegation I think we are finally coming to realize the importance of the situation that we are in as Indian representatives from across Canada. I hope the message that was given by Mr. Hugh Conn will be interpreted in the honesty and sincerity that it was given. We also hope that a government does commit, and I think this is an obligation we have as representatives, to have the government commit itself to do more research and to come up with a realistic Act, then we need people like this. I think it is quite clear to all of us that so far we are on the losing side again. We are back in 1951 method of government passing legislation. So I hope the message that was given by Mr. Hugh Conn will be considered very seriously by all the delegation and thank you again Mr. Hugh Conn.'

G. Manuel: Thank you Mr. Courchene. Now before any questions comes from this assembly a question has been raised with regards to having the speech by Mr. Hugh Conn typed word for word as is and be available to the delegates here as soon as possible. Now I wonder if somebody would make a motion.

Speaker Unknown: I'll move.

G. Manuel: You make a motion. Who seconds? Wilmer Nadjiwon seconds. Any discussions or are you ready for the question? Question? Question has been called. All those in favour? Carried. Now remember this is word for word as he said it.

Peter Kelly: It seems to me of all the discussions that have taken place to date and perhaps maybe with respect to the national unity, I wonder if it might be possible, and I am just throwing this out to the floor. In following with what

Mr. Conn has stated, I wonder if we might not ask the Minister to make his statement with respect to the Government's position respecting treaties, aboriginal rights, and residual rights. If we could have a statement made by the Minister respecting all that has been said to date on their position, so that we could analyze or we could say that we totally reject this sort of a thing. It seems to me that since the meeting as indicated by the Minister yesterday that the meeting was turned over to the Indian people, he is in effect saying and representing the opinion of the Canadian people. I wonder if we should hear their position first, so that we can start analyzing. Unless we know the position of the opposition, I don't think we can put forth our feelings on this. What does the delegation feel on this?

G. Manuel: I'd like to remind this assembly that this session is supposed to be discussions on the Indian Act and I think this assembly has to make a decision with regard to incorporating the residual rights, operational rights, treaty rights into the Indian Act. I think this is the question. Andrew Delisle?

A. Delisle: I just would. . .

G. Manuel: No. 12.

A. Delisle: No. 12. What is generally known as the Province of Quebec. I just wanted to make support, I think Mr. Kelly's statement, and I think the talk by Mr. Hugh Conn, with his consent, should be put down and sent to the Minister immediately, for his information so that when he comes we will be able to reply to him.

G. Manuel: No. 14.

Mr. Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick: Just towards the end of his address Mr. Conn suggested a rule for himself and the legal counsel. I think to reinforce the address that he gave should be accompanied by a draft from himself and the legal counsels

directing this to the Minister so that when he comes here that there will be very concrete reference to his terms of . . .

G. Manuel: Are you suggesting Mr. Nicholas that a meeting be held between Mr. Conn and all the legal advisers here to draft a paper for presentation to the assembly for approval to present to the Minister?

Mr. Nicholas: Exactly and I will make a motion to that.

H. Conn: Ah, Mr. Chairman. . .

G. Manuel: Your number Mr. Conn.

H. Conn: I haven't got one.

G. Manuel: Oh, No. 3.

H. Conn: It seems to me that since the purpose of this conference is to discuss the Indian Act, and since the Indian Act will be a new Act of the Parliament of Canada, which must be drafted by the Department of Justice for a submission to Parliament, that the initiative in this respect and the intent of the government should be enunciated by the Minister. Now in the end of the submission I suggested, and this I am going along with the proposal made by Mr. Nicholas, but as an ace in the hole. Not as a submission from this group. This is not the function as I see it of this group to draft legislation for the government of Canada. The initiative should come from them but in case they don't, you say well okay here's something we have in mind, put this in any kind of language that you like, but with the very able attorneys that I know are here and I can perhaps help them with some ideas, we should come up with a reasonably good suggestion for draft legislation. But again I am going to repeat, I am going to emphasize, as an ace in the hole it is not our function to draft the new Indian Act. We could have started five years ago and had it ready now.

G. Manuel: Before I ask for a seconder, I would like to hear No. 1 because he has been . . .

Peter Dubois, No. 1: I believe you are fast approaching a very crucial part of our conference. I noticed some of our delegates across the table from me here anxious to get up and speak on this matter, and after hearing what Mr. Conn has just said, previous to what I was going to mention I was going to come out with the same comments so it saves me speaking, but another point I wanted to bring out here at this time and this is in reference to Mr. Conn and the submission that he made to this Joint Committee of Parliament. What happened to this submission?

H. Conn: It was printed in the minutes of the proceedings in evidence of that Committee but the whole question was completely ignored in as far as the legislation was concerned and there was only an oblique reference to it in the report of the Committee.

G. Manuel: Is your question answered? No. 6 over there.

Speaker unknown: I'll table mine until after 7 speaks.

G. Manuel: I didn't hear you.

Speaker unknown: I'll table mine until after No. 7 speaks.

G. Manuel: 7, No. 7.

Harold Cardinal, Alberta.

G. Manuel: No. 6. Oh, No. 7 I'm sorry.

H. Cardinal: Chairman, my colleague from Saskatchewan indicated, I think we have reached a crucial stage in our own discussions here. And I would like to at this time put forward the position of Alberta on this question. We were asked to come

here to speak on the Indian Act. When we left Alberta, our people gave us clear instructions that the Indian Act was not the issue and that we should talk only of our rights, the rights that have been denied us in some shape or another for the last 100 years. We are not prepared to talk about the Indian Act because the Act is only a symptom of deeper problems that exist. The paternalism, the restrictions and, as my colleague from Manitoba so eloquently put it in December, the spiritual base in Rhodesia, this is the symptom that arises out of disregard for our rights and the administrators of this Act have personified it. We want to go into a discussion and we want to follow the last suggestion of Mr. Conn where we take the initiative ourselves, even if it takes us two years to propose on a national basis legislation that will guarantee our rights; to ask for the resources so that we can accomplish this, so that we can take on the type of resource people that we need. We are in no hurry to get the Indian Act changed. We have lived with it since 1951 and our people have lived with it for many years before. It would be well worth our time if it took us two years to just leave the Act as is until we have legislation guaranteeing our rights. The speech or the welcoming statement by the Minister was outstanding only in the aspects that it totally ignored or it totally failed to give any indication on what the intention of the government is, and as far as the basic concern of our people - the treaty rights. This is why we are prepared to support the paper presented by Manitoba asking for resources so that we can start in co-operation with Indians across the country to work on legislation to present something concrete to the Government of Canada and say this is what we want, even if it takes us two years.

It is time that we took a stand, it is time that we told the government that we do not come here to sing a tune that they want to hear, because we believe in Alberta that the consultation process is not for us to come and say to the government what

they want to hear, but for us to tell them what our people want. Mr. Conn put into perspective the consultation process that has taken place for the last 20 years and with this perspective much clearer than it was, as far as I am concerned, when we came. We see that for 20 years, year after year and many years before, the government has always skirted the basic issue, the basic concerns of our people. We are interested in protecting and guaranteeing by legislation whether it is federal and preferably to be included in our Canadian constitution, the rights of our people. We are interested in coming up with a proposal or in arriving at a proposal with other delegates to support the position of our friends in B.C., of our brothers who live in areas where no treaties exist but our concern is our right and it's time that we did take concrete action, it's time that we took a stand to either ask the Government of Canada to honour its commitments, to fulfill the intent of consultation. I do not want to come back in 10 years and make the same statement, because if the government has its way at this point, there is no guarantee that we will again have the chance to take a stand to protect our rights. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel: Before I call on No. 6 I have a number of notes here, 3 or 4 notes from the stenos and the people who are reporting here and are having a very difficult time to get the identity of each speaker and they have suggested that instead of calling the numbers, I think there are 3 or 4 people who use the same number so they are suggesting that you use your own card number, this little number instead of mentioning your name just call your number, Mr. Chairman call your number, and then proceed. Name and number.

Well who did this note come from?

You will have to give the mike numbers.

Manuel: Well who did this note come from?

It came from the stenographers. I have to have the mike numbers or ...

G. Manuel: Well who do we respond to?

Just say the name.

G. Manuel: Well the stenos are overruled then, we will go by the mike number and the names then. O.K. fine that's clarified. Just remember so I don't have to tell you again. I am getting tired of telling you guys this.

Manuel: No. 6.

E. Bellerose, from Driftpile: The reason I refrained from speaking ahead of my colleague because I have the same idea what he presents and I knew what he was going to present in his speech. And I strongly support his speech. The ideas that we came here from Alberta and I strongly support, it is time we as young Indians and old Indians take a stand and do things for ourselves. Our help that is available for us but it's we, that we have to put a knowledge of what our peoples needs. I don't need a lawyer to tell me what my peoples' needs are. Where I need a lawyer is to present it properly, the needs of our people to present it in that brief so it can go to the House of Commons. And I strongly support my colleague and the rest of Alberta and those who want to support this, that we stand here today that we stand for once in our lives on our own two feet without having to lean on anybody. We can lean on somebody that we know and trust. I have no further comments but to stand and stand firm on my peoples' wishes that I come here and I will stand to this convictions of ours in Alberta.

Chief Frederick Plain, No. 4: On January 24, I asked the Hon. Jean Chrétien four specific questions for which I received absolutely no answer at all. I want to read from the red book exactly what he said. I do think, and I am quoting the Hon.

Minister, "I do think that the Indian Act is a way that we, you, operate yourself at the band level and you handle your own things. If we were to stop the revision of the Indian Act or change anything up to the time that the problem of all the treaties were over, you know we have to be realistic about these things. It's a different proposition." These are the words of the Minister. Now the Government of Canada announces to the Canadian public that the Indian Act must be changed for the betterment of the Indian people. They also announce to the Canadian public this just society; we are now going to give the Indian a strong voice in the changing of legislation. How realistic can this declaration be? When we speak what we think, when we try to put across our point this same Minister was asked by members in the House. "If there was anything realistically being done about steps towards an actual change in the Act, and did the consultation meetings amount to anything at all." The Minister replied, to the House, "The Indian has spoken loud and clear. He has made his point." One member of the House rose and asked about treaties and aboriginal rights. The same member declared that when biculturalism and bilingualism is announced immediately the ears of the House members are alerted and there is considerable debate goes on. But when the very mention of Indian treaties and Indian aboriginal rights is mentioned there is scarcely a ripple of enthusiasm - not enthusiasm but even attention given to such a deep subject as Indian rights. The Minister answered me in Toronto by stating, "These are two separate problems." He answered not one of the four questions I put to him. One of my colleagues has asked that the Indian Affairs Branch be represented here at this Canadian wide delegation to state their viewpoint. Now let me again go back to the making of an Act of Parliament. Why are there changes in Acts of Parliament? Is it not because different political parties make an issue out of complaints that are received from the various constituencies, and when they come in in volume, then the political party must take it up as an

issue. And certainly I do not feel that the problem that the Indian people face in their relegated place as second-class citizens of this country, I do not feel that the poverty ridden areas, the slum conditions, the inadequate health facilities provided to our people; I do not think that these things should be even given or made an issue by a political party whether it be any of the known parties of the Government of Canada today. But I believe that there should be a strong unified effort. In my letter to the Prime Minister I suggested that a few years ago two members of opposite political affiliations banded their efforts together to see a bridge built from the Ontario mainland to an Indian Reservation. One member was a P.C., the other member was a Liberal. Very strange that two members of different political affiliations should unite their efforts but they did, to see that a bridge should be built to an Indian reserve. What was their basic reasoning for binding themselves together when politically they are far apart? Was not the main reason for the betterment of the Indian people that these two should get together and make a joint submission in an effort to get the financial support needed for such a bridge. I submit it to the Prime Minister, let the Government of Canada, let their political affiliations be forgotten and let there be a unified effort on the part of every political group. Let there be a unified effort to bridge the vast gulf that has existed over the years between the Canadian public and the first citizens of this land. I don't think that we should be talking about legislation, I think realistically that we are talking about I can't think of the word immediately. Constitutional issue. We are talking about something that should be written into the Constitution. As Mr. Cardinal puts it, he doesn't want to come back in ten years time when there may be another possible revision or another amendment suggested. If our rights are going to be stood up for by the unique opportunity that we have right now, then I suggest that we ask the Government of Canada represented by the Minister of Indian

Affairs to answer questions that we want to know "When did the sovereignty of the Indian people suddenly dissolve?" The Funk and Wagnel interpretation of a treaty is "A contract entered into between two sovereign nations, one of the attributes of Government being the ability to enter into treaty negotiations. I asked the Minister "When did we become a non-entity? How did the land in question that is referred to in Section 2 of the Indian Act, when did it become vested in Her Majesty? Were the treaties that were entered into, were they mere tokens as has been suggested by Mr. Hugh Conn when he suggested that the powers that be drafted out very expertly these treaties?" If this be true, then perhaps they were mere tokens and true justice was not rendered to the Indian people but it was a travesty of justice. I asked the Minister were they then mere tokens and if they were we must use the harsh words used by one of the dictators who would attempt to conquer the world a few years ago when he suggested that the Canadian Government's promises to the native people of this continent was mere scraps of paper. If they were tokens then, that's all they are is mere scraps of paper that are meaningless. If they were treaties and treaties affected between two sovereign nations then they must be recognized as such and renegotiated in modern 1969 terms. I agree with Mr. Cardinal, this could take years maybe more than the two years he mentioned.

I have lived for 44 years, I've struggled to get by. I've struggled to keep my family looking well. I've struggled to keep them healthy. Up to this point we have not starved. I realize that there are conditions in the province of Ontario that need vitally attention. They need it bad. This attention can be given under the present system of social and family services that are offered. They can be forced to alleviate the situation, but we are not looking for a mere alleviation of the situation. We are looking for a solution, a complete solution and that

solution will only come if we can make the government of Canada recognize that we are not separated. We are not asking in one group here for a certain path to follow. We are not asking as separate groups for just segments of the Act to be amended or revised. But we would ask the Government to come and listen to the unified effort, a unified voice raised saying "we demand that you recognize our sovereign rights as a sovereign people who entered into sacred treaties and these treaties must be recognized." The Minister, if he is not a figurehead of a dynasty, he must be in a position to answer us and if he cannot answer us then he must be recognized as a figurehead of an entrenched system.

G. Manuel: Thank you very much. Now we have just before we have a coffee break we have a dignitary here. Is Harold here? Which I'll ask him to introduce.

H. Cardinal: I would like to introduce, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Gladstone. Stand up Senator.

G. Manuel: Just wait a minute, I want to get these two clear, they have been wanting to talk. John Tootoosis

J. Tootoosis, Federation of Saskatchewan Indians: Now we have heard Mr. Conn speaking. Mr. Conn was an official of Indian Affairs for a long time until he was superannuated and we Indians, we understand the agreements that we made with the Crown in all this and all these interpretations of the treaties has to be by this government looked upon to words that were used, the thoughts of the people that they had in their mind when these agreements were made and they believe in them and the reason why we surrendered the country. You can use the modern language today, to translate the beliefs of the two people who made an agreement at that time in that stages they were in, in the understanding they were in. Even Alexander

Morris himself, being a man of the Government representing the Queen, the language he used when he made the deal with the Indians. He had to talk the same level of language and Indians understood this and we've been understanding all this time, but now, today, the Canadian people starting to use different interpretations of our treaties and the Indian Act that's been on is been abrogating and whittling away our rights. We cannot allow this anymore.

Today is the first time, we have a meeting here in Ottawa, all the representatives from across Canada and this is one of the very most important conference Indians ever had in Canada. Nobody else, just Indians talking here in their own rights, so we have those rights. We have the first claim of the land. As I said this morning, like Northwest Territories and Yukon Indians. They have that right on the human rights, on the Bill of Rights, these people to at least have a home. Now we have our reservations. This piece of land we-I kept in is not Canada or Saskatchewan, Poundmaker Reserve where I come from. I'm in the stages of an domain I have sovereign rights in that piece of land. That is the stand we want to take. We want Canadian Government to recognize our treaties and the rights of our land that is where we stand. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Now, ladies and gentlemen before I call on the next speaker, the coffee is here. We'll adjourn for coffee.

Tuesday, April 29, 1969

3:30 p.m.

G. Manuel

Well, some of our members are not here but we shall proceed with discussions so I declare this assembly in session. Now, before you John and I still I got No. 2 but I want to mention one thing here which needs to be clarified. The stenographers and recorders over here have asked if you are going into a night session tonight because if you are going to go into it they want to be prepared to get replacements.

There's a hockey game on tonight.

Speaker?

No. 5

A point of clarification before we can decide whether we need a night session will be entirely on the Minister if he is available. I think then we would want a night session because I think it is abundantly clear that his assembly that the expression given by the former speakers before break, everyone here is in concurrence with their talks, their speeches and their points and Mr. Hugh Conn. Therefore, I think it is at this point that we should ask that the Minister be made available to this assembly for questioning on what approach he is going to take in view of the assembly's expressed desire that they want consultation on their rights and treaties. Now, so we couldn't at this point, I believe, say whether will need or could use a night session.

G. Manuel

In other words you're saying that there will be no night session unless there were suggestions from this meeting that there should be a meeting tonight with the Minister.

A. Delisle

Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister whether he would be available. He said, even though he had to sit in the House he would come down at any time of the week.

G. Manuel

Well, then is it the pleasure of this assembly to make a decision through a motion that we have a night session and invite the Minister and No. 3.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba, No. 3.

I would like to suggest to the group that possibly we should prepare a documentation on our subject material before we call the Minister in so there is no division of our delegation and possibly tomorrow morning we should do this and call the Minister in the afternoon. That way our documentation on our subject material should be ready so that each and every one of us understands our position and questions to the Minister. Now at that time, I'm sure if the delegation so wish we could confirm this by this evening that both Ministers should be here. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and also the Minister without Portfolio. Since they both have an obligation.

G. Manuel

Dave, I have never given you an opportunity, and you've wanted to speak for a long time.

Just keep your numbers up we'll get you.

Your number Dave.

No. 15 David Ahenakew, Saskatchewan

I would just like to reinforce what the previous speakers were saying. I enjoyed very much listening to them and I can assure you we are in concurrence with what they said. Now the proposals that were made or the speeches that were made are in essence identical to ours. As I listened to them, as I read the submissions that were made, it seems to me they are saying we should at this

meeting be discussing policy only from which either our representation in the National Indian Brotherhood or the Indian Affairs personnel may be able to draw up the new Indian Act with further approval. These approvals we agree with. It is the feeling of the Saskatchewan group that there is no real conflict of interest between those Indians under treaty and those who are not. Because of the treaties, the Government will be required in the future to provide many services to the Indians. The services will not be given only to those under treaty but will be provided to all Indians as has been done to a certain extent in the past. Therefore, we believe, because of the treaties we have a strong lever to get a strong adequate Indian Act for all Indians. I believe the specific proposals of Saskatchewan as to the procedure which should be followed here is that we discuss the basic rights of the Indians - treaty and non-treaty - as we see them. Some specific areas requiring discussion are land claims, hunting and fishing rights, education, medical and hospital care, self administration by local bands without the final authority being vested in the Minister, financial assistance to provincial organizations and the National Indian Brotherhood sufficient to request the Indians of Canada. That it would be definitely understood no amendments be made to the Indian Act without full consultation at an annual meeting of Indians representing all provinces and regions. I'll emphasize again that non-treaty Indians will benefit greatly if we present a unified front to the Indian Affairs Branch in having the treaties and the rights honoured. Now, we are saying then that we must establish and deal with the basic issues, which are with the aboriginal rights, residual rights if you want to call them that and the treaties. What we must believe after that, if that we must interpret the aboriginal rights and the treaties. Only then can we deal with the Indian Act. Thank You.

G. Manuel

Thank You Mr. Ahenakew, No. 14.

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick, No. 14

Mr. Chairman, In the meetings which we had in New Brunswick about two weeks ago, our executive was instructed by our Board of Directors and members, because we knew we were sending delegation here to this National Conference, to solicit consultation from Mr. Conn which we did because we are very concerned about our aboriginal and our treaty rights in New Brunswick. And so, now, I am supporting, whole heartedly, the position taken by my good friend, Harold Cardinal from Alberta, that these rights have to be assured, very explicitly or else we are wasting our time from now on. Mr. Chrétien, as the Minister of Indian Affairs Branch and Northern Development, his staff of the Indian Affairs Branch and the Government of Canada have rolled over and played dead for much too long. We feel that the commitment from the Minister has to be made within the next 24 hours or else our delegation will leave as we see no sense in sitting here and going through an exercise in futility. In his address in his opening address, the Minister said that he hopes to have a response for us in June. This is a pre-supposition which we condemn and which we intend, like I say, if we don't get this commitment that we will withdraw the delegation and go back to New Brunswick.

No. 13 Andy Delisle

I would just like to state that I agree with the presentation from the delegates of Alberta, the speakers that followed and I am speaking on behalf of the representatives of Quebec. We agree that there must be a foundation that we must start working on and we must be recognized as being on that foundation and this is our rights, rights including our aboriginal treaty rights and so forth, but I will ask that we do not leave this meeting and become so much concerned as we are. I agree it is the time to become concerned. I am whole heartedly for that but we must consider the needs of our people at the present time. I

agree also that we should not only speak to the Honourable Minister Mr. Chrétien who we had no voice in choosing, he is already chosen for us by the Cabinet. We must speak to the Canadian public. We must make our hearings strong and if his reply is negative we will be separate from the other people but as Indian people I hope we will be together. This is my concern and this is the position that the delegates from Quebec takes. Thank You

G. Manuel

Thank You Mr. Delisle

Peter Johnston, Cutler Ontario, No. 5.

Mr. Chairman, after having taking this subject into very strong consideration, I must give fullhearted support to my fellow delegate from the Maritimes. I agree completely that unless we get a definite commitment from the Government of Canada that they are going to respect our rights, I don't say aboriginal or whatever rights - I will just say rights, that there is hardly any point in us going any further unless we have the commitment from the Government of Canada. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel

Before I ask the next speaker, I would like to mention that you are all in agreement that there will be no night session tonight? This was what we started off with. Because the stenos and the recorders want to know now so you know. No sessions tonight. Raise your hands? So there will be no night session that's for the benefit of the recorders. Aren't you lucky.

I would like to call on Forrest Walkem. I think the B.C. delegates have been having their sessions and they come to the decisions of what standard they are going to take and Forrest Walkem has been chosen to present the stand that British Columbia is going to take. Policy statement.

Forrest Walkem, No. 11

We the representatives of British Columbia, Indian Organizations and delegates of consultation meetings held in various parts in British Columbia, bring to the attention of the delegates here assembled from across Canada our position with respect to this assembled conference. We recognize the problems of our brothers in areas of the country where the treaties exist and have not been honoured. We strongly support the position that our brothers from the treaty areas should insist that the Government at all levels must honour existing treaties and where necessary should re-negotiate treaties. Our people from the non-treaty areas, however, have been sent here by their representatives to review the proposals made at the consultation meetings to confirm those that are considered useful to our people. We are instructed further to place on record in each field of our activity the principles and policies which our people believe should be incorporated in a revised Indian Act. We believe that this conference should review the principles, and objectives that have been brought forth from consultation meetings across Canada; weigh them, analyze them and give those that have merit, the weight and prestige which this conference carries. We believe, and our instructions are that the Government should be asked when we adjourn to incorporate these principles, policies and objectives in the draft of a revised Indian Act and this draft should then be sent back to us for further consideration on a local level. After considering this draft, our people will then ask for any changes and additions they feel are required. Our representatives and delegates from the consultations meetings are further instructed to state to the federal government that our people require a new firm commitment by the government that they will, without further delay, give us a public affirmation of their recognition of our aboriginal rights in all fields, including among other things aboriginal land rights, foreshore and riparian rights, forest and timber rights, hunting and fishing rights,

mineral and petroleum rights and all other rights that are ours by hereditary, historical, moral and legal obligation. We expect that our brothers from the treaty areas will make similar demands with the respect to their treaty rights. We support them fully in their quest for justice. We recognize that our problems are different from those of our brothers from the treaty areas. We suggest that the delegates here from treaty areas should meet separately from the delegates of the non-treaty areas and that each of the two groups should then bring their policy statements to this entire body of ratification. We suggest time can be saved by having these separate meetings held after the regular conference hours. The entire conference could then be asked to support both policy statements. One for treaty areas and one for non-treaty areas. We believe much time will be lost here if the entire conference attempts to discuss as a whole body questions and problems affecting the two basic areas of treaty and non-treaty.

In this way, this conference can immediately resume consideration of the revised Indian Act which was postponed until now on adjournment of our area consultation meeting. We believe as do the people we represent, that it is absolutely essential at this time, at this meeting that the government be advised of the principles we want incorporated in the revised Indian Act. The future progress of our people requires that the Act be revised and up-dated to meet the challenge of a new age. The Minister, the government through the Prime Minister and members of Parliament and through them the people of Canada, have said to us tell us what you require in the new Indian Act to lead our people to a rich, new life in partnership with all other Canadians. Our people have spoken at the several consultation meetings and have said to us, their representatives and delegates, "give them our answer loud and clear, here are the rights we require". We, their

delegates and representatives, consider we are bound in duty to convey this message to the government with the full support of this assembly. Let it not be said of us they were given the opportunity to chart their future and they failed to grasp it. We ask this assembly to review the recommendation of the area consultation meetings to confirm those principles, policies and objectives that are considered essential for a new Indian Act. We asked this assemblage to request each of the two groups from treaty areas and non-treaty areas to meet separately after regular conference hours and to formulate and recommend to this full assembly their separate statements of policy, principles and objectives with respect to treaty rights, breaches thereof, revisions of treaties, aboriginal rights and claims, and any other matters considered essential by each of the two groups. We present this proposal and ask for the support of all delegates earnestly believing it is in the best interests of all our people from coast to coast. This statement of position is submitted by and on behalf of the following representatives of British Columbia organizations and delegates from the consultation meetings held in British Columbia. Kelowna Consultation meeting: Gus Gottfriedson; Nainamo Consultation Meeting: Philip Paul; Terrace Consultation Meeting: James Gosnell; Chilliwack Consultation Meeting: Joe Mathias; Prince George Consultation Meeting: Nicholas Prince; Whitehorse-Yukon Consultation Meeting: Edward Smith; Native Brotherhood of British Columbia: Guy Williams; North American Indian Brotherhood: Don Moses and Victor Adolf; British Columbia United Interior Tribes: Forrest Walkem; Yukon Native Brotherhood Edward Smith; Southern Vancouver Island Tribal Federation: Philip Paul.

G. Manuel

Thank you Mr. Walkem. Peter Dubois No. 1

Peter Dubois, Saskatchewan

I cannot help but reecho the sentiments that have been stated prior to this. I would just like to emphasize the point a little more and say prior to the coming of the European to this continent, our form of legislation did not need too much revision. We had a system that was adaptable to the conditions of our environment, the environment of the people. We had a very good educational system which was also adaptable and we also had an economic system that was very reliable in supporting the views that have been presented so far, the only thing I can say with our system that may have been wrong was that our immigration policy might have been out.

So apparently, that didn't go over too good. But nevertheless I again cannot help but re-emphasize the comments that have been made to the recognition of our treaty rights and our aboriginal rights. Thank You.

Lawrence Whitehead, Manitoba.

I have been listening a great deal to the various comments and it has given me the impression that who is best qualified to present the grievances that we have or the rights we have talked about. But as Indian people and we have done this so well in fact that no one else is qualified, I believe, that us Indian people can do this job, we know our problems but we merely can not identify our problems and present them to the government as is. In order for any realistic solution that will work, we must directly play a part in solving our own problems and presenting our grievances.

We simply can't allow the government to rearrange legislation affecting Indians so that they may feel comfortable for a short period of time. Let's take an example of an Indian community who wishes to have community planning or a relocation program which has occurred, with a sincere desire for Indian people to better their living or to improve their living conditions, the Indian people

plan their community or plan how their re-location is to take place. Then it is up to the experts or resource people, legal counsel or what have you, to act according to their requests of the people and according to the wishes of the people. There has been a case where engineers have gone into a community and planned a community and arranged houses to the least possible expense of the government. This may happen to our way of doing things when we try to re-arrange legislation. So I come back to the question who is best qualified but us Indian people and to act accordingly as to the wishes of the people of this country, Indian people, so that legislation cannot be re-arranged without involvement of Indian people. And I suppose when we talk about rights, whatever rights we have, and I suppose this can be regarded as such and this can be taken into consideration, that we on a national basis may be able to do the job that is best for Indian people across Canada. I know that if we act on the Indian Act we are not going to be fully satisfied maybe for a few years but I think that the basis of an Indian Act should be stated loud and clear in our paper. Recognition of treaties and obligations. And I think this is the right pattern and we must take this stand I believe for any meaningful Act to appear.

John Tootoosis from Saskatchewan

I would like to make an argument this afternoon. The foundation of our rights is on the King's Proclamation 1763 October 7, on King George 11 and at that time the Kings had the say over the government. We heard Hugh Conn saying our treaties and obligations toward the Indians were passed by the House. It was passed by King George 11 1763 on the King's Proclamation over the British Government, Parliament. He made that proclamation when the King said that it was it. And when he made this proclamation that was it. He had to live up to

it and Canadian Government and that is the foundation of our treaties and Indian rights what were demanding that we want them now. That we have been so badly neglected all those years, almost a hundred years, just imagine almost a hundred years, we have been so neglected. When we stretch our hand with the Government, we are not begging we are only asking something that has been given to us and that's all. We are not begging, we are asking something that been given to us, one of the greatest countries which we have given to the white race still call them white. I think maybe sometime we should call them black. But these treaties that we made at that time when they came to obtain our country in the western world, we met nation to nation, men to men at that time and we agreed our Chiefs were very intelligent leaders them days. They were thinking about us today living and our future generations. When wording of those treaties says as long as the sun goes over and the river runs and the grass grows, in other words as long as we are under the present flag our treaties have to be respected by the Canadian Government and that is what we are demanding now. Right today in this conference. Everyone of us we want those rights, that were given to us as natives of the land.

Under to the King's Proclamation. Even on the capitulation of Quebec, there were certain rights given to us. Under the Jay Treaty, rights were given to us. Across Canada we demand those rights off this conference. Jay treaty support St. Regis it all effects the Indians Across Canada. These are the rights we are demanding for in this conference and if this just society government we have now this good government and I certainly he will agree with us and come across and give us those rights which we demand as a nation of the Indians across Canada.

There had been certain presentations made in England and to the League of Nations and Indians were told across Canada and they would be recognized because when those treaties were signed the only treaties that could be made as nation to nation and we were men to men when we signed those treaties. It says treaties. We have to stand up and demand and ask for it. Thank You.

No. 14

Wallace LaBillois, Maritimes, No. 14 Mr. Chairman, I listened a great deal today and said very little. And I fully agree with my colleague, Mr. Nicholas, to the stand New Brunswick intends to take and we're going to stick by it. I think it is necessary for us to get a clear commitment from the government as to their intentions in respect to our rights as Indians and, if you will as citizens. I, during the past few months read quite a bit in preparation for this meeting and I happened to run across a book called the History of Acadia. I would like to read an excerpt from this book because this statement or this article was inserted on paper back in 1607 by a French person who happened to be living in the Maritimes at that time. He was more or less recording the early history and one of his observations he said this and I quote, "All over America, whether the white man is a friend or an enemy the red man fades before him. Peace is not less fatal than war to the Indian. In the latter he is shot down with an unsparing hand. In the former he is demoralized and degraded by vicious customs, exposed to temptations he has no power to resist which enovate his fame and end in misery and death. Every tree that is felled in the forest reduces the area of the hunting grounds which he inherited from his fathers and on which his existence depends. Every mill which attest the energy and industry of his white brother is an additional omen of his extinction. Every day he seems to girdle the fields and meadows narrowing to circle of his home. Driven back by mile by mile whither

he at least shall retire. He is a stranger and an alien in his own land, an outcast, robbed of his birthright by a stronger race. He and his tribe are but a feeble few and their efforts avail nothing against the ceaseless advance of the paleface race who came welded together into a resistless by the iron hand of civilization. It is impossible for us to teach our children that valour, fortitude and in some cases skills are the noblest accomplishments of a man because today in order to obtain them it is necessary to sacrifice decency, honesty and truth, in other words they are falsehoods, never passed into approval. The Indian was distinguished for his honesty."

Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel that this wise man who wrote this saw the conditions then in 1607 and he sees the conditions today in 1969. I maintain that what he said then applies to this present day. In the matter of education and here not only in the education and in employment and in resources that we have to somehow or other to spell out the rights that we require. Recently, a young lad was picked up from his home, transported elsewhere and as a result that young man is dead today. He was taken from his home. I'm sure you're all familiar with the case. And what Mr. ---? said in 1607 regards to shooting the Indians this was done not too many months ago, the very same situation. I believe that we are in a very poor position as Indians and as citizens under the government system. It is time here and now that the government makes a firm commitment as to how they are going to treat us in the future. In regards to employment, I have attended quite a few sessions in the last couple of years and I heard this word over and over that we are going to do something. On my reserve, and I hate to be using my reserve as an instance, but in this case I think it is necessary, we have come up with a fairly feasible project and after having just finished attending a workshop on revolving funds and it was stated in this workshop that money was going to be made available for the Indians. They said this over a number of years.

We had a meeting very recently with one of the top officials of the Branch and we were informed that Revolving Fund Loan is broke. Yet they keep continually keep telling us that they are going to do something for the Indians. Yet they continue to tell us that money is going to be made available. This is not the case. Now who are they kidding. If any of you people have had the opportunity to read the Hawthorn Report it was made quite clear at that time that the development program of the Branch only allowed seven dollars on per capita basis to create employment on the reserves. Yet it costs the federal government \$10,000 to create a job off a reserve. How realistic is these figures. Quite recently within the last couple of weeks I read a very confidential article whereby this article said that in 1969 it costs some \$65,000 to create one job. How realistic then is the Indian Affairs program. Can they not make this money available or are they denying the Indians their rights. This is up to them to answer this question. I can go on and go back in history. It is unfortunate that the true history with respect to the Indians is not taught in our schools. We feel pretty bad about this. If you look at the white society and basically one of the first things that they do is brainwash their own children and I'll emphasize on this a bit to explain my views. The first show that a young kid ever sees is Cowboys and Indians, and right away the Indians are the bad guys so they are really brainwashing their children. Is it any wonder that today you can go half a mile from the reserve and the people don't know how the Indians live on that reserve? Is it any wonder that these people don't know the Indians or don't know the conditions and have never visited an Indian home? Is it any wonder that the Indians cannot get the support that is necessary to maintain or even get some of our rights? Is it any wonder that the government of Canada is not doing anything about the Indians or for the Indians because of this ignorance? It really bothers me to see these things. And these conditions exist today in 1969.

In 1967 during Expo' Year it really surprised me that no provincial legislature invited any Indians to sit at the opening of their houses. You would think that they would try and honour the Indians. I don't think they want to. They are making this quite clear. These are the rights that we specify. I won't go into the hunting and fishing rights because some of you have expressed this quite eloquently and I feel that these are the things now we want to hear from the Minister. What is the government's intention as far as the rights of the Indians are concerned? Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Andrew Delisle - Quebec

I just wanted to mention something that Mr. Tootoosis had said that the rights which were given to us, I think that we should make the stand that the rights were not given to us, the rights are ours as a people. I would also like to mention that we in the province of Quebec, what is generally known as the province of Quebec have made certain demands and have been hoping and waiting for the Federal Government to back our demands and I think they should back us because this is their responsibility. I mention this because it is very important to us, just as it is important to other areas that are making representations to their provincial governments. I would also like to state that the demands of this delegation should be made to the federation government who has a responsibility to fulfill these demands and we should not be divided provincially. I would also like to add to what Mr. LaBillois said when the white man came to North America he thought the people here to be savage. The people thought of him to be god. Who was more human in his thinking. And this is the issue we are talking about today.

No. 5

Chief Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians, No. 5.

I fully concur that today's session has proved that most of the delegates seated today are primarily interested in aboriginal, residual and treaty rights. But I must, and I definitely state that we have to be sensitive to those people, delegation from British Columbia who have no treaties and are unsure of their treaty rights. We are trying to sit here as an Indian assembly with one mind. There is very necessarily here a division. I think a discussion between the members here and a consideration should be given the delegation from British Columbia who have no rights to or believe they have not the same rights we'll say to negotiate. But I think their prime interest would be that a commitment from the Minister that he is willing to negotiate those rights that they think they have other than the Indian Act would be taken into consideration by the assembly, that we do not want to impose a certain path for this assembly here. When there is a large group I believe to have no treaties that is point No. 1. Point No. 2 would be that I would hope that Andy Nicholas and his delegation would reconsider the statement that they would leave if this condition is not fulfilled until such time as the assembly would unanimously decide to go home. Thank You.

G. Manuel

No. 14

Anthony Francis, Union of New Brunswick Indians

I would like to repeat one paragraph of what I read this morning regarding our Indian status. That the question before the English courts in 1694 was how really a sovereign nation can change the laws of a conquered nation above and beyond treaty agreements. The English courts decided this could not be done and that the English law could not be imposed on a conquered nation unless this was done by a treaty agreement. This proves how unjustly we have been treated through the years. The provisions of the Royal Proclamation of 1763, and this is after the French were defeated, were two-fold First, it prohibited the issuing of patents

to deprive the Indians of their aboriginal land title and secondly it provided that the Indian land title could only be changed or altered through the purchase of land from the Indian nations through a treaty based on fair trade. In the Maritimes there were never any treaties made to cede or sell any lands. The only treaties that were made were peace treaties. The U.S. courts consistently upheld the sanctity to the treaties of the treaties made with the Indian tribes and with equal justice the courts also held that property cannot be taken from the Indians whether or not the treaty exists except in fair trade. Now, I think the reason why we took this stand, that the government must make a commitment about our treaty and our aboriginal rights. Yes, I think that there is a danger that if we let this Indian Act go on without this commitment being made, that it will put us in a very weak position. I think there is going to be in the Indian Act flexibility that would enable reservations or organizations to become municipalities. It would give a chance for reserves to sort of denounce their rights as Indian nations. And I may read one paragraph here as I said this morning. I think it is very important that we maintain our present status as Indian nations. Because this position enables us the right to negotiate with the Canadian government for the injustices that have done to us for depriving us to participate in the development of our country and least of all we should not bring the responsibility down to the provincial level.

G. Manuel

Thank you very much. No. 2

Isaac Beaulieu, Manitoba

I'd like to make quite a brief statement on the topic and I think if we let ourselves involved with the Indian Act, if we start suggesting some changes I

think we are going to become a rubber stamp. I think somebody is going to say well this is what the Indians want. There are 200,000 thousand of us Indians and I bet you every one of us if we had an Indian Act individually we would have 200 different Indian Acts. 200,000. The government is going to take common denominators and say these are the things the Indians want. I think that we have much more basic problems to worry about and those are human rights that we are talking about. Those are the things I think our presentations here that started off with Harold Cardinal because we want to see these things first. I think that if we can clearly within ourselves and know what we want to do we want I think the Indians Act will become our next responsibility within the group. It will come with it. And also if you will remember, I think the Minister said that he was going to make a policy statement sometime in June and I think I will take a gamble on it that policy statement will be that we have consulted with the Indians and now we are going to have the Indian Act. Now, I don't think Ladies and Gentlemen this is exactly what we want. I think that we want much more and much deeper commitments than that. Now that is my stand on this. I would like to mention also that perhaps we should get some of these things now in action. You know I would like to see for example, you know, that we are making some of these statements that we see somebody or somebody represents a group, if we are going to make this presentation somewhere, and also document some of the statements we have made. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Fred Plain: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Speaking again Fred Plain at microphone No. 4. I would like to hear some comments from the Legal Advisers who are seated with us at the conference table here today. I think that it should be made very clear, to the delegations, what is an act of Parliament. I have the utmost respect for the delegation from British Columbia and these people certainly must be recognized as acting in the best interest of the people that they are sent here to represent. And I would certainly in no way detract from their stand that they have taken. I have tried to understand since these consultation meetings began, and when we were first informed that we were going to be actually be a part. An Act of Parliament is essentially the work of the elected people, or the voice of the Canadian public. No matter how comprehensive or how complete any Act of Parliament is, now perhaps the lawyers can clarify this, but I am under the impression that no matter how complete and comprehensive an Act of Parliament is, no matter what it effects, any act can be changed by changing government-is this a fact?

Paul Walsh on microphone No.3. I could answer that question in one word. Yes. Unless the act you're talking about is the Constitution of the Country. Any act, even the Canadian Bill of Rights, as you well know is subject to change and in fact to be wiped out at the will of the next parliament or the will of the parliament of the day. So consequently you are quite correct. To answer your first question I think that the problem that faces this body is a political one rather than a legal one. If I might straighten out one point that's been made, I think that this body is concerned with not so much choosing alternatives as presented to it by the federal government, but as selecting its own alternative, and I think that if one of the alternatives

is the recognition of treaty rights and other rights, rights in their widest sense, merely because this alternative has been presented to this body by the federal government doesn't necessarily mean that isn't the most important thing that has to be decided and if this body determines that it is the most important thing that the future of the Indian people depends more on the rectification of injustices done by non-recognition of rights, rather than by amendments of certain powers of the government as to given to itself through the acts it has passed, it would be folly for this body in convention organized merely to feed back to the government, yes and no answers to questions that it is asking. That is consultation at the most shallow level and the consultation at the most meaningful level is to say merely because you are asking us questions doesn't mean that those are the only questions and merely because you are asking for certain answers doesn't make it a fact that those are the only answers and if this convention determine that the most meaningful questions and answers determine the rectification of treaty obligations and the commitment on the part of the government concerning the nonfulfillment of certain obligations, then it would be the job of this convention to make a stand on the treaty rights. But as to your latter question of course, any act the government does pass is subject as the 1951 Indian Act was to revision and alteration.

Fred Plain

Again, thank you sir, Again Fred Plain on microphone 4. I think that we should take the answer that is given us really to heart. Again with all due respect to those who feel that we must seek alleviation in mere amendment to an act of parliament. No matter how loop-hole free the legislatures may work it out and certainly it goes through several stages before it is finally enacted as a piece

of legislation, I think that we have been told, or we have been sort of given the idea, in the consultation meetings, that there is a time element involved. Mr. Chrétien informed, or told us, he said let's get things done quickly, let's not think about treaties, let's not think about your aboriginal act. He said this is a problem. I recognize it as a problem, but he said let's try to iron out the real issues that confront you right now. What is the real issue? I'm saying right now that he is probably going to answer us in the same manner. I'm asking this delegation to refuse such an assumption that time is of the essence. It will take time to revise or amend even an act of Parliament. It has to go through several stages and even in its initial wordings it has to be talked over by the standing committee and even the Civil Servants gets into it to offer their views and their opinions on the wording of anything. After its first reading it goes back to your committees again. It goes back to your Cabinet and this all takes time, and when they try to impress us that time is important I think that they are just trying to channel us into their area of thinking and again let me ask the legal opinion here. Is our problem or is what we are facing here, is it legislative or is it constitutional? If it is merely legislative, then any government that comes into power can change the Act. I submit that what we are facing here is not legislative but rather constitutional.

Paul Walsh: Perhaps Mr. Lueck can expand on my answer to that question. I would think it is more constitutional than legislative in a sense that if the Indian people find themselves in a position of either poverty or lack of education it can be solved by legislative action to that extent it is a political problem. To the extent that certain rights have been taken away and

certain actions have been committed unilaterally by the federal government to that extent it is a constitutional problem and perhaps even more than that it can be a problem of international law. Mr. Lueck might want to comment on whether the international courts of justice would hold with the Indian people of Canada were a sovereignty when they signed the treaties and you may have to seek regress in the court higher than those courts which have been created by Canadian action.

Allen Lueck: I agree with Mr. Walsh that you have got two levels here. If you want to deal with legislation only, that is legislation which can be changed from year to year, you are going to have to realize that you will have to be constantly on guard to see that a future government doesn't change your Indian Act and doesn't take away some of the rights which you, through your efforts, are able to acquire at this session or at subsequent sessions. It will be a continuing thing, something that you have to guard every year, year after year because slowly they will attempt to whittle away what they have given to you by the Indian Act. It will be the monetary thing of course they are concerned about. The federal government is concerned primarily with money. They would give you any kind of an Indian Act if it didn't cost them anything. The minute it starts costing money they start yelling. So this is what you are going to have to guard against in an Indian Act and you are going to have to do that year after year. Now the constitutional part of it or the treaty part is, I would think, a very thorny problem and I just haven't got the answers for you on that issue. If it were possible to get your treaties recognized in modern day language and placed in the constitution this would be far better than having them in a simple Act called the Indian Act. On the other hand if the treaties are there and you don't want to

renegotiate them because you feel you are no longer an Indian nation as such or Indian nations as the case may be, then the only thing you can do is to have the present treaties interpreted in modern day language in the Indian Act itself and of course then they are subject to change. But hopefully if the provincial organizations stay operative as they are now and the Indian Brotherhood stays operative they will be guarding against any of these problems and one good way of guarding against it of course is to get a firm commitment from the federal government that they will never make an amendment to the Indian Act without complete consultation at an annual meeting such as you have here. I don't know if that answers that or not but . . .

G. Manuel

I wonder if Dave or Dwayne Rowe has any remarks on this.

Dwayne Rowe of Alberta. I would agree with the remarks made by the two previous gentlemen. It's a dual problem. I think that the federal government should be informed that the Indian people want them to immediately commit themselves to call a constitutional conference or to include in the constitutional conferences which are going on from time to time, that type of condition that will rectify and restore the aboriginal right that we have been speaking about. It's taken us one hundred years to even get around to thinking about changing the B.N.A. Act and I can think of no better way to guard one's rights than to get them included constitutionally especially because we are having great difficulties in even getting around to talking about B.N.A. Act changes at the present time. The day-to-day if you want to call it that or year-to-year problems can be done by amendments, regulations or legislation. But the federal government I think should be told that the Indian people are looking for constitutional guarantee.

H. Conn: Does not the amendment of the constitution, that is the British North America Act at the moment require the concurrence of all 10 provinces, unanimous concurrence, before they change the constitution, or does it not?

Paul Walsh on the same microphone. Not at all. The British North America Act is still in fact amended in Britain. Recent attempts both by the Conservative and Liberal governments have been futile to arrange a formula so that it could be amended in Canada and nobody really knows what traditions have grown up concerning the right to amend certain sections of the B.N.A. Act whether the provinces have to be in agreement or whether they don't. So it is really traditional and not legal as to what concurrences the provinces have to be obtained. Once again if there is any incorrectness in that statement I'm flanked on both sides by people who might know more about it than I do.

Allan Lueck on No. 15. That's correct. Actually the biggest problem with changing the B.N.A. Act right now is to decide how it will be amended in the future. They have argued this problem time and time again and they have had at least a half a dozen conferences on how to amend the B.N.A. Act if they ever bring the B.N.A. Act home as they call it. It's now a statute of Britain and they would have to initially go to Britain to change the method of amending it and their problem is how then are they going to draw up this legislation. Is it going to be all ten provinces that have to concur or two-thirds or whatever, and I think Quebec is one big stumbling block again in that area because they want a veto on that.

H. Conn: I asked you specifically to comment on number 3 to bring that point to the attention of the meeting because all of these people representing the Indians here today have from time to time dealt or tried to deal with the provincial administration. I think if provincial concurrence to a constitutional amendment

is required to give substance to the Indian rights, I think everybody can see breakers ahead. If, however, when as we anticipate might happen the constitution is repatriated then this may not be an absolute requirement I think that for instance, the outstanding commitment regarding lands in the province which you represent, I mean assist the Indians in representing here, that the Premier had to take an absolutely adamant position with regard to the lands which they are committed to provide by a constitutional amendment in the form of the Natural Resources Transfer Act of 1930. And still in spite of this commitment which is embedded in the constitution, there is a tremendous reluctance to provide this.

Perhaps it is six of one and half a dozen of the other of the two evils choose the lesser sort of deal. I mean there is sort of a choice is what is facing us. So the question is to devise some kind of a method which will at least have the rights embodied and for the first time in valid and subsisting legislation and reverting to the point and a good one which you made. It would require eternal vigilance on the part of the various Indian organizations and their advisers to scrutinize this. But if it came in any other form, a form of an agreement this can be, as we see by the present agreement, wiped out unilaterally through perhaps other not apparently pertinent legislation like the Migratory Birds Act knocking off part of the treaty. So this was my basic thought that to amend an Act of parliament first you get warning in the speech from the Throne that my government intends to amend the Indian Act during this particular session. Then it has to go through the three stages, goes through committee and it's got to be read three times. Surely if the Indian rights were in a section either of the Indian Act or another Act which had not withstanding any other Act of the Parliament of Canada, the Indians would have these rights. It would be impossible to sneak something through the back door without every Indian in Canada through his organization knowing about it. This is the point I wanted to bring up.

Ed Bellerose - Driftpile - I'd like to remind you how vital of importance is today and at a time of the treaty No. 8 in my home reserve where my grandfather participates and I would like to quote from this book the name called, the book name is "Through the Mackenzie Basin" and the Commissioner of the treaties was Laird. Then rose and unrolled his commission and that of his colleagues from the Queen proceed with his proposal. He spoke as follows: "Red brothers we have come here today sent by the great mother to treat with you and this is the paper she has given us." I'll stop herefor this moment. In other words what Hugh was saying that a draft was already prepared from Ottawa here going out there to make treaties and I would like to say and bring this to you but Chrétien, the Minister of Indian Affairs said that he is going to bring out something for us in June. In other words he has already got it prepared. Identical thing that happened in 1889 and it is happening again in 1969. Are we going to stand for it? When I supported my colleague that we are going to stand on our own two feet and I strongly support Manitoba that we make our own proposals that will stand and challenge to the government to the people of Canada not just Chrétien. Chrétien cannot give us anything but talk circles but he is conditioned and that is his duty to talk circles with us. But we have to make our own stand, our own proposals and we better start doing this right now before we go off and form a committee to look at this very strongly.

G. Manuel: O.K. now the British Columbia group has declared their policy with regards to the involvement in this assembly. They've documented it and now they are going to pass it around to you people so give you a chance to look at it tonight. So can you go ahead now Philip and pass it right around.

Now the other is ah. It seems to me now as Chairman. It seems to me all day, all afternoon you've heard everybody saying the same thing. Everybody is saying it in a different way, but is saying the same thing. I think you are all in

agreement; there is no conflict. I think you have to make a decision whether it is now, it's your prerogative, it's now, tonight, or in the morning, (the time is five after five now) - of documenting your position, your decision and your position and selecting those people who are prepared to document; maybe our Legal Adviser with some of your Legal Advisers or some of you. I think these people should meet tonight if it's possible. And I also think number 2 that you have to decide who is going to present this. Who is going to be the official that will present this to the Minister. It is a matter of assessing your discussions here today. The other thing to remember is when we adjourn, just remember one thing. A document was presented by the Manitoba Association. Was it? Oh, the National Indian Brotherhood, through Dave Courchene this morning, and you all have copies. Study this and we can discuss it tomorrow. And there is a motion that was tabled in that regard that's true. We have to deal with it tomorrow morning. Now, No. 14 wants to make a statement.

A. Nicholas: Mr. Chairman I move that when we deal with the presentation made by the National Indian Brotherhood that those sessions be held in camera. When we deal with that particular submission.

D. Courchene: I was wondering to the delegation here, I think it has been widely publicized already and I think it would only hurt our case if we went in in camera session. I think the cat is out of the bag so to speak.

A. Nicholas: I've made my motion and it was seconded.

G. Manuel: Well Courchene has every right to speak on the motion, anybody else has a right to speak on the motion that was presented by Mr. Nicholas and seconded by Kelly. No. 5 you speak on a motion.

Yes Mr. Chairman, Peter Johnson number 5, Ontario. Mr. Chairman I support Mr. Nicholas' motion completely. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Any other discussions on the motion?

Mr. Delisle: I support Mr. Nicholas' motion.

Forrest Walkem: What is the motion again.

G. Manuel: The submission by the National Indian Council, the National Indian Brotherhood. Excuse me is that the N.I.B. I've got N.I.B. Submission discussion be held in camera. The paper this morning that was presented by Dave Courchene on behalf of the National Indian Council who was presented to all of the delegates this afternoon, was it this afternoon? It was presented this afternoon and copies have been given to every delegate for study tonight.

No. 1 on the motion ah? On the motion.

No. 1 mic. Peter Dubois, Saskatchewan. For a change I am going to oppose something. We have agreed to everything so far. As Mr. Courchene stated this information was already made public and I would feel that we are missing an opportune time here to relate to the general public as to what our feelings are. Many very fine statements have been made in our in camera sessions that should be revealed to the public so that would be the reason why I would want to oppose this motion that is presently on the floor.

G. Manuel: No. 14. On the motion.

Microphone No. 14, Andrew Nicholas from New Brunswick. I stated previously today that the submission contents are very good and I am glad that they were made available to the delegates and to other people and however, there are certain

contents of this which I feel, and this is why I make a motion should be discussed in camera. The submission as such had to be thrashed out so that the final draft of the submission and I understood this from the mover, Mr. Courchene, that this was a draft presented to the delegates. What I'm saying is that when you get down to the details, these are the things that should be discussed, between the delegates who are here.

Fred Plain: Microphone 4, one of two representatives from Southern Ontario. Support Mr. Nicholas.

G. Manuel

Question has been called. You have heard the motion, it's been regularly moved and seconded. All those in favour raise your hand. Count these. All those against. Count these.

It's a deadlock, looks like. I much prefer another vote be taken because everybody didn't vote that was in this assembly and I think to be fair to me. Could we ask for two volunteers of the observers to come up here to count the votes.

Paul Walsh: Mr. Lueck could do it I'm sure, we are not voting.

G. Manuel: I think we will have to get observers these people are involved. O.K. then fine. Is there two observers.

A. Nicholas: This is microphone number 14 from New Brunswick. Before the vote is taken again I think we have to keep in mind there is some non-voting delegates.

G. Manuel: You mean non-voting delegates that are here? Let's get this clarified. We have an issue here. Four Alberta can only vote, and how Columbia got? You still got? You still have seven votes.

A. Nicholas: No. 14, My friend from Quebec just reminded me the reason why, we are just questioning the National Indian Brotherhood element of this submission and we want to clarify certain aspects of this element in the submission.

G. Williams: Gentlemen I think debate is over. We are in the process of voting.

G. Manuel: Thank you Mr. Williams for reminding me of this. Could you then read the minutes, I mean the motion again just so everybody is clear on this.

I. Beaulieu: Resolve that the discussion on the National Indian Brotherhood Submission be held in camera.

G. Manuel: O.K. now, all those for raise your hand and hold it up until I tell you to put it down. O.K. then, raise it again because this boy voted and he hasn't got a vote. Count it again. All those against, raise your hands and hold it up. Raise just one hand I mean. Nineteen votes against, against thirteen. Motion defeated. Now is there any other further things that you wish to make decisions on? Well a motion has been made that we adjourn until, just wait a moment don't run. Now before I declare this meeting adjourned, I want to know what time you want to have the session in the morning. Eight thirty. Who says nine-thirty say I. Nine-thirty, the meeting stands adjourned until nine thirty.

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Meeting opened at 9:55

G. Manuel

With what members we have here we shall declare this assembly in session. First of all apparently there is some question with regards to the, Mr. Chief Richard Isaac's presence here, whether he is a delegate or not. He would like to clarify this so I will call on Chief Richard Isaacs from Six Nations.

Chief Richard Isaacs

Thank you Chairman. I first of all I would like to say that I'm thankful that I am here at this meeting. I'm sure I wouldn't have been here if it wasn't for Mr. Omer Peters. We had our consultation in Toronto. I wasn't picked by the Ontario Indians. I was invited, that's how I come to be here and I really appreciate being here because there is lots of things that I've learned. Another thing I want to clarify is that why we are called Six Nations. Our Six Nations Reserve is - there is six tribes. There is Cayuga, Onandaga, Mohawks, Tuscarora, Oneida, and this is why we are called Six Nations. I thought maybe, I know there is different ones have asked me why we were called Six Nations and this is why I thought well it is no better time here to tell you why we are called Six Nations. I think this is a historic meeting for this is the first time I think in history that the East and the West has met and I think that we all know the feelings of our Indian people. I think that we should be united in our deliberations we should all work with one accord. I sat here and I listened and I thought there once that we weren't going to get along but I think things has straightened away. Our band membership is ten thousand on our reserve and we have 42,000 acres; it is twelve miles wide and nine miles square, like one way is 12 and the other is 9. So I just thought that I would tell you that I am very much in favour of unity and I thought it was a nice thing that the first day that there was a prayer here where it

would unite the Indian here. I think this is one thing we should look forward to is to unite and ask God's help. I think that this is a thing that we shouldn't forget. That we should all look to our Maker for all our decisions because I think that we can solve a lot of problems and I just want to say that this meeting is certainly an important meeting and I would say that let's be united in all our deliberations. I thank you.

G. Manuel

Thank you Chief Richard Isaacs. Next on the Agenda. Yesterday we tabled the presentation made by Dave Courchene on behalf of the National Indian Brotherhood, I think you have had time to examine it. I hope you have examined it and made your decision with regards to how, what you are going to do, whether you are going to support it or you have some suggestions for amendments or deletions. So this now is open for discussion.

You want to have the floor first Dave before we open discussion on it to begin.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairmen. First of all I'd like to welcome you again this morning and hope you had a good night's rest and time to think of some of things that have happened over the past couple of days here. We are in the process of, we are getting closer to the time when we have to submit to the government our views in relation to what our future will be as Indian people. As I said earlier we are all responsible to the people that we represent which is the total Indian population of Canada. I know that possibly we have made errors and if these errors were made they were not intended to hurt any part of the country or any group of Indian people. They were made with honesty and sincerety hoping to clarify the position that we have to take as Indian people. If we do get a united front, and I have great hopes that we will, I hope that our presentation to the government will be articulated well enough so once again they will not say the Indians don't really know

what they want, but we know and they will make a revised Act to the favour of the government rather than the Indian people. And before I get the lawyer to read out the presentation I would also like to suggest to the delegation that we, before we leave we have to meet as a national body. I know that there is some things that are not understood and I will be talking to the national president by telephone today hoping to get some of these things clarified, so not only at this meeting should we have national unity but on a day-to-day basis year round because we cannot meet only once a year and hope that we will have a future together. It has to be on a continuing basis. Things are developing so fast in this day and age, that we to have to keep up with it. Otherwise we are going to be put on the side lines again. So I would like to ask the delegation if we could read the presentation as was given out yesterday morning with certain items and I'm sure there is certain parts of it which you like to talk on.

If I could have Mr. Paul Walsh.

Paul Walsh

Ladies and gentlemen this is the brief which was read to you yesterday by Mr. Courchene and amended in accordance with the suggestions that were made at yesterday's meeting. Now what I propose to do is merely read it out paragraph by paragraph stop after each paragraph and through your chairman you can discuss what changes you want to make. I'm going to read it out to facilitate Mr. Courchene's participating in the discussion so that he can make his own suggestions as to changes and it won't impede the discussion in anyway.

"Submission to the Government of Canada, Ottawa, April 29, 1969.

The Indian people of Canada as represented here by this National Delegation are deeply concerned that the Indian Act Consultations are not meeting the expectations of the Indian people of Canada. We delegates submit that the method used does not realistically recognize the priorities for discussion as Indians see them. It has been made

abundantly clear both in the consultations to date and in Indian meetings throughout the land, that the principal concerns of Indian people center around (a) recognition of the treaties and the obligations imposed by same (b) recognition of aboriginal rights, acquired rights, residual rights and human rights (c) reconciliation of injustices done by the imposition of restriction on Indian hunting to the ratification of the Migratory Birds Convention Act and subsequent federal and provincial legislation. (d) the lands claims commission. It is our opinion that before meaningful consultation on amendments to the Indian Act can take place these four items must be dealt with and a position of mutual understanding and commitments reached. We would remind the government that there were two signatures on the treaty, yours and ours. We further state that in the eyes of the Indian the treaties constitute solemn promises and in fact contractual obligations. Before the obligations undertaken by treaty can be changed or compromised, it is essential that the agreement of both signatories to the agreement accept such changes."

I'll carry on unless anybody wishes to make any changes and I'll try and go as slowly as possible. On page 2.

"Changes have been made with consultation. The Government of Canada representing one of the signatories has arbitrarily and autocratically ignored its obligation to the second party to the agreement Indians and continually compromised the position of Indians. It is unimportant today to define specifically what the treaties say as measured by the significance of the language used. What is important is what the treaties intended to say and what each party understood them to mean. For the last century and descriptions and definitions of intent and content both legalistic and otherwise have reflected your opinion and yours alone. Indians have not been given a reasonable opportunity to interpret their understanding of the intent in such a way that public policy could reflect an understanding of the Indian position. We are not prepared at this meeting to debate this issue nor the amendments to the Indian Act. We are prepared, however, to discuss with you a more realistic basis for meaningful consultation. To date the discussions have been heavily weighted in favour of the

government. You have the resources at your disposal to develop your position while we are hard pressed to develop and present our opinions. In the final analysis it will be your interpretation of what we want that will be reflected in the legislation you submit for our consideration. We submit that this situation should be reversed. The New Indian Act will be our Magna Carta. Its impact will be more closely felt by Indians than it will be by government." There are several speakers who have raised their cards and perhaps this will be a good place to stop.

No. 10

Joe Mathias, British Columbia

The body here is well aware of our statement that we brought forward yesterday. There seems to be a conflict of ideas with this submission and B.C. submission. (a) on page 1, Claims Commission. It is our opinion that before meaningful consultation on amendments to the Indian Act can take place these four items must be dealt with in a position of mutual understanding and commitment reached. And on Page 2 " we are not prepared at this meeting to debate this issue nor the amendments to the Indian Act. We are prepared however, to discuss with you a more realistic basis for more meaningful consultations." First of all I would like to make my position clear. I represent the Chilliwack Consultation. I was given the authority. My instructions were to come here and discuss, proposed revisions to the Indian Act. I have no instructions to counter act their wishes. There are forty-one bands in Chilliwack and I have no way of contacting them and I cannot go back and say to them that I supported another body, or I supported another submission when in the first place I was here instructed to start making our recommendations to the revision of the Indian Act. I would like some clarification on that point with respect to our submission and this submission we are reading right now. Possibly we could discuss this point and maybe make an amendment.

G. Manuel

Is your card No. 6 up at all. Eddy? Good. No. 12

A. Delisle

What is generally known as the province of Quebec. There is one thing that I would like to add in place of treaties. I think you should consider non-treaty people or non-treaty areas. We have band numbers, we have reserve numbers, but we don't have any treaties and we would like to incorporate in the original statement that these areas should be considered. I don't know how you legal people would word it or phrase it, but I think there should be some stress that we are, we should be included and our claims should be respected. The other

Paul Walsh

Which one was that Andy? Is that No. (a) on Page 1.

A. Delisle

That's right, yes.

Paul Walsh

Would that not be included as part (b)?

A. Delisle

But I would like to spell it out.

Paul Walsh

Could you then in consultation perhaps with Mr. Lueck draft a section (e) and we will include that in the section.

A Delisle

I would also like to state that, I think we all came over here to discuss the Indian Act and I think the people that have selected, at least our delegation have let us and have given us, and have had confidence in us to discuss things which are mutual amongst all people of Canada, all Indian people of Canada. And I appreciate the concern of the delegation from British Columbia but I also feel my delegation is flexible I think enough to discuss the basic issue and I will stress to not only

the delegation from British Columbia but to all here concerned. They said yesterday we have to have a sound basis to work on and it's no use talking about by-laws before you form a company. A company has to be formed first and then you talk about the by-laws and this is the stand that I will take. My people have asked me to come and talk about revision of the Indian Act. I have heard here for the past couple of days that we have to talk about a foundation before we talk about anything else. And this I ask, I sincerely hope that every group, every delegation will understand and I specifically make this the request to the delegation from British Columbia.

G. Manuel

No. 10

Joseph Mathias, Squamish, B.C.

I appreciate the previous speaker's comments. He mentioned the word flexibility. We desire, I suggest on my part, that this is what we want. We support the views of the other delegates and we hope that they support our views also and that we should set our foundation and discuss the Indian Act because the Indian Act deals with bands and reserves, the Indian Act sets out that foundation of administration and management of reserves and I believe that this is the only place where progress of the Indian people can come about.

G. Manuel

No. 5

Wilmer Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians

If I recall, I believe yesterday, in the deliberations on this presentation that this document was supposed to have been examined by committee. I believe that the discussion that has to take place now would not be necessary if the committee

has been struck and in closed session go over the recommendations submitted, the revisions necessary and I believe an understanding can be arrived at that would be suitable at this assembly. Thank you.

G. Manuel

Thank you Wilmer. There was a voting to have this committee struck; there was also a move and a seconder to table this and this was carried and this is what happened to that recommendation.

Speaker?

What are we talking about now?

G. Manuel

We opened discussions on the presentation of Dave Courchene on the behalf of the National Indian Brotherhood.

Speaker?

You mean the submission to the Government of Canada

G. Manuel

And the legal adviser of Manitoba was reading it by paragraph by paragraph to get the reaction of the, of this assembly you know to make any suggestions for deletion, amendments or ratification. But Mathias suggested that B.C. presentation with regards to what they want had to be dealt with first before, at least this is what is coming across to me, if I am wrong you can correct me.

No. 11

Forrest Walkem, British Columbia.

I've been listening for the last couple of days of the different grievances that the people have across Canada. I would like to give a few of my views from the people I represent. Now I don't know whether it will be of any assistance to the people but they certainly are going to be ideas and I am sure that this presentation that the

National Brotherhood has drafted, it could be a guide line to some of us people. There is no doubt in our minds right across Canada that the present Indian Act as it is today is not what we want. If Canada or any country in the world by any white society I'm sure Canada could be given the leading role and by using the present Indian Act as it is written out they would get a medal, I'm sure they would. The peoples of Canada were able to live off their land, summer and winter. They did not have to go to an Indian Act and to look at it to see whether they could hunt or fish. It is in the minds of everyone, it is what they want, they want something. The B.C. people want something. I'm sure that we are all wanting the same thing. The greed of the white society is so great that it has deprived us of our rights and freedom. Instead they should be trying to help us to protect them, help us to carry on in this land of ours. We call it ours, we feel it is ours. I'm sure that they would help us. It would be a step in the right direction and we would be able to live in harmony among white and Indians. Instead they are creating a dishonest attitude by the Indians and incompetent attitude for our people. After reading many of the consultations they are concerned the people are almost the same - they are concerned about the rights to their lands, their fishing, hunting, medical education and minerals. The Indians figure it is an awful small price for such a great land. The Indians are the rightful owners of this land and no unjust deal of any kind should be made. The treaty Indian would like their treaties recognized and the B.C. Indians would like their land claims recognized. The Indian Act in its present state is only a tool used by the white man to keep the Indian in a dormant state. When important issues come up regarding taxation, land claims, aboriginal rights, etc. the Indian Act fails. The native people would like the rights to the same priveleges as do the big companies, for example the Hudson's Bay Company. It literally controls our whole northland at one time. Another example is the Canadian Pacific Railway. It holds, and I mean owns more land in British

Columbia than all the Indians and this was given to them. It fairly excluded mineral taxes on these tracts of land including timber, mineral resources and subsidiaries literally control flying in British Columbia, rivers and air space, C.P. Air. And if it gets into trouble, the Government subsidizes them. The CPR has certain expropriation rights right across this beautiful land of ours - and to think the majority of their stockholders are foreigners. This is only one example of how the prime investors give the red carpet treatment. More investors have big mineral deposits and you're entitled to the lands of oil rich provinces. They have more rights than the Indians. The native Indians want anything to borrow money to develop his little reservation. He is wanting just a little consideration. He gets none. There again the Indian Act failed. The Indian peoples having to take our grievances before the Supreme Courts of our provinces - of their provinces. Then told to take them to the Supreme Courts of Canada to be judged by patriotic people of this land of ours is unjust to both people. Our taxation problems for example, the land claim, our fellow brethren from B.C. the Nishgas, our fishing rights, our hunting rights, our mineral rights, all tested by the same court. The treaty rights which are like sacred writings to our friends that are under treaty. Let us bring them up to date with the present day and age and interpret them in a fair and just manner, not ignore them in a childish and fearful way as has been done in the past. If the powers to be are in the federal government hands let us sit down and throw away all fears of whose going to get the better deal and get to the point and solve these problems. If need be, let's take it before world courts, compromise of unbiased peoples who could give us both a fair judgement so that we could live side by side as free peoples without prejudice as Canadians and an Indian Act is not the answer. The majority of the treaties were signed by the Indians and the federal government on behalf of the Queen yet one of the most important treaties, namely the Jay Treaty was signed between Britain, the home of the Queen, and the U.S.A. and recognized by the U.S.A. yet ignored by the Government.

Is there to be no justice at all? Another glaring example was mentioned by the Manitoba consultation is the fact that the government of Canada, when dealing with the Indians on treaties were dealing with people who could neither read nor write. It stated that the official committed a legal fraud in the very sophisticated manner upon unsophisticated unsuspecting illiterate uninformed natives. In the Edmonton consultation there was a mention of treaty payments of \$1200 for headman, five dollars for each individual each year. Why I would charge my best friend a lot more for a lot less. It seems quite strange that all treaty payments are made in white man's tender rather than Indians' tender. If the white man had to pay you in buffalo robes as tender he would loose the country. The Indians' tender has increased in value for the white man's tender has decreased. Another sore spot that shows the sincerity of the white man is the Migratory Birds which the native have lived off for year-round long before the white man came. The claims that the Indians are disseminating detrimating the stork is false. Would one simple factor for instance is the amount of one certain species of water fowl that are dying yearly from lead poisoning that they pick up lead pellets for grit from the bottom of lakes and ponds. There is enough birds dying through lead poisoning to allow every Indian across Canada three birds, and the equivalent to the total take of the whole of Ontario not including Indians. And yet who do they go to first? Who do they blame? Who do they want to stop? the Indians. The Indian Act does nothing to protect us from such grave an injustice. The fishing rights of Indian in B.C. is in jeopardy. Whenever there is a notable decrease in the salmon catch by the commercial fishing the first people they blame is the Indian. Any yet the greatest destroyers of the fishing industry is the commercial fisherman himself. The American fisherman have nets far greater and far bigger than the Canadian fishermen. This should be dealt with between the commercial fishermen. The annual take of the Canadian commercial fishermen is approximately \$37,000,000, and yet they begrudge the Indian of a few dollars worth. The problem is

not the Indian. Once again the Indian Act fails. Regarding taxation development there are a few outstanding cases in B.C. I hear Joe Mathias from the Squamish Band speaking down here. For example the Squamish Band leases out its land for a \$170,000 a year and the land is taxed by the city or the municipal for \$385,000 which goes to show that the Indians themselves could be making a lot of money. Imagine having to pay out \$555,000 plus your power and water and heating and still make a profit and I'm sure there isn't anyone that will invest money unless they were getting no less than 10% on their money. Where are the lending institutes for the Indian to help them to develop their own lands? My own complex is another example - The Sportsmen Motel, Sportsman Shell Service. I carefully read the Indian Act, then I tried to borrow money to develop this reservation land. There was no lending institute that would loan me money. While being kicked from pillar to post we were able to finish building it, and it was six months later before financing was arranged, thanks to the speed and efficiency of Indian Affairs. I would say that I had ten times the hardship that any free enterprise ever had and yet I wind up with a lot less. The reason is that the provincial government, I'm told by the Department of Indian Affairs, has every right to tax me and yet I do not have the right to sell if I did not like the tax structure. Who in his right mind would want a ball and chain like that. The Indian Act fails again. The Musqueam Band is having problems now. They are wanting to get services from the City of Vancouver and they are being refused. When the first development on the Musqueam Band from the Musqueam Reservation was put through it was put through by a white Company called the Musqueam Development Company. It had no problem of getting the certain things that wanted and they made about a million dollar profit on it. So the Musqueam Band itself decided it would develop the next piece of ground and right today it is still having problems. There was nothing wrong with the City of Vancouver running their sewage disposal, there sewage lines through the reservation to get to their disposal unit, but it was very wrong for the Indians to hook up to it and use it. Our mineral rights in British Columbia. I, as you

probably know, am attempting to show the white society that I am competent. The band has wanted to do something with their minerals. We studied the Indian Act. We read it and lived by it to a "T". And yet it is three, about three years now and we still haven't been able to get to the market. Yet I'm sure if we wanted to sell it, it would have been gone a long time ago. The powers to tax, now this is an important thing that seems to touch every Indian's heart, is to be taxed. I maintain the powers to tax should be left in the Indian's hand. If there is to be any tax sharing it could be easily discussed between the provincial governments municipal governments and the Indians. The Indians are willing to pay for the services that they receive from the cities, the municipalities and any surplus that would be accrued from any taxing the Indians would like this back so that they could put it in for the betterment of their own reservations rather than to be spent elsewhere. The floor is yours George.

G Manuel

We will adjourn for coffee now. Stand adjourned.

G. Manuel

I now declare this assembly in session. There has been a one thing brought to my attention, that is the fact that I am not seeing everybody that puts their number up and so if everybody wants to speak definitely gets the opportunity. Isaac tries to help me here since I lost my glasses sometimes I don't, I'll try to be more careful in this regard. I asked the co-chairman to help me on this, but two of them are delegates maybe Isaac would help.

Now the other is this. Each one of the groups that has extended the number of delegates to this conference that should have expenses, you know, I think the committee that was struck of Harold Cardinal, Philip Paul, Mr. Nicholas is going to be seeing the Minister very shortly, today some time. If you have the names bring them up (but they are already up here that is quite all right.) The secretary here will make up the names including the co-chairman because I don't think the co-chairman should be left out.

Now, I'll get somebody to pass around this prepared items of what has been discussed in the past two or three days. Number 10. I mean No. 14.

James Gosnell

Mr. Chairman, No. 4 speaking for Terrace consultation meetings. I see that we are now discussing the Submission to the Government of Canada, Ottawa, April 29, 1969. I believe the submission was made by the National Indian Brotherhood. It states that "It has been made abundantly clear both by the consultation to-date and through Indian meetings throughout the land, that the principal concern of Indian people centered around..." From that point on, Mr. Chairman, I want to make this very clear to this assembly that I registered as speaking and I was elected by the Terrace Consultation Meeting and this comprises of population of 16,000 people. I want to make it very clear that the National

Indian Brotherhood does not represent us because of the fact to date we have never been notified. There are other three meetings held prior to this. Supposedly being that representation has been made on the part of National body. We were never notified of this, we have no knowledge of this and yet it claims here that they are supposedly being speaking on our behalf. I think Mr. Chairman that this I think it has brought more disruption. My thinking is I wonder how this thing came about? Terrace as you all know is situated in northern British Columbia. We have no communication whatsoever. That's why I find it very hard that's why I sat here and never said a thing in the last two days and I am wondering what the people I am representing will think of me. Because I am put in a very, very awkward position. During the future if there is going to be such a thing as a national body I want communication. At least let it be known that somebody was supposed to be representing our people for this is not the case as far as this submission is concerned. I have been sitting here and listening and being very sympathetic with people who are concerned with treaties. My people who I am supposed to be speaking of are going to ask me questions. You sat there and you never said a thing. We didn't send you to Ottawa to talk about treaties; we sent you there to take part in this Indian Act Consultation. This is what is going to be said of me. That is why I feel Mr. Chairman I think that care should have been taken before anybody claims that they are representing somebody else. I want this registered because I know those people that I am supposed to be speaking for are going to read the minutes of this meeting. We find it very, very difficult to take part in what has been said before. The British Columbia delegation has sat here in silence for the last two days. Because we have no treaties because of

G. Manuel

I think we have two schools of thought here I should have allowed the first speaker to speak, I think B.C. has spelled out its position in the policy paper, I'm sorry I have allowed it to go this far and I think it is now in order either to call a meeting in-camera or strike a committee. This is your wish as an assembly. Before we go, we have been offered to tape our full meeting in-camera and that we control this and we keep this whether we want it or not this is available for your information. Now back to the first subject. What do you want, Wilmer Nadjiwon suggested yesterday, I think he said in his wisdom that this will erupt and he suggested the meeting in camera I mean to discuss the paper in-camera and this was tabled and I think we should open this for discussions now. Are you going to speak ...

James Gosnell

Mr. Chairman, you interceded in my part, I still have the floor and I am speaking on the subject that is being discussed.

G. Manuel

I want you to continue after we have discussed the issue if we should have a meeting in-camera. I think it is wrong to have a conflict within our assembly.

Speaker?

Point of Order Mr. Chairman. The resolution was duly recorded yesterday, late afternoon, resolved by Mr. Nicholas seconded by Peter Kelly that this meeting on this very issue should be held in-camera. The delegates offered their support vocally of this resolution and a vote was taken and it was defeated. Now you're suggesting that this resolution being disregarded and that we do call a meeting in-camera.

G. Manuel

The resolution to adopt the paper was tabled and we didn't foresee the differences of opinion in this regard. I think British Columbia makes a strong stand that they want to go into consultation regarding the Indian Act - the others I think the paper that Dave Courchene suggests is a paper which suggests that we don't discuss the Indian Act until the recognition of the treaties and aboriginal rights. A commitment was made by the Minister and I don't think that this is the type of discussion should be made available to the public. No. 7.

Harold Cardinal

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are talking about broader issues and we are diverging on broader issues on this point I would like to move that we call an in-camera session so that we could continue our discussions.

G. Manuel

Motion has been made to call the meeting in-camera. Are you ready for the question? The question has been called. All those in favour, all those against. Motion carried.

Meeting moved into in-camera sessions at 11:20

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Meeting opened to all at 3:50 p.m.

G. Manuel

There is a motion on the floor. No. there was another motion on the floor made by Andy Delisle. What is the motion.

Peter Dubois

At this time I take the privilege of calling upon our Chief spokesman, The Federation of Saskatchewan Indians, Dave Ahenakew, please.

A. Delisle

I requested that after we had passed Mr. Peter's motion that the delegation insofar as the National Indian Brotherhood goes makes it definite, is a motion now.

G. Manuel

Is there a seconder to that motion?

Would you repeat the motion Mr. Delisle?

A. Delisle

Motion is that the official voice of the Indian people be this delegation and not one organization.

G. Manuel

You have heard the motion.

A. Delisle

If you are going to word it, ask the legal counsel if you know what it means.

G. Manuel

Would you read the motion to these gentlemen?

I. Beaulieu

Vote that the official voice of the Indian people will be this assembly and not any one organization.

G. Manuel

You have heard the motion, is there any discussions on it. It has been regularly moved and seconded by Max Gros-Louis.

G. Manuel

Well you have heard the motion is there any further discussion. Are you ready for the question. Question has been called. All those in favour, all those against, carried.

No. 15

David Ahenakew from the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians.

Mr. Chairman, we wish to make very clear to the delegation that this is Saskatchewan speaking. We have our own Saskatchewan ideas. We have discussed at length in this assembly the rights of the Indian people and have shown we want unity, our rights recognized and want to be able to do it ourselves. We have had good representation from all delegates. Now the Saskatchewan delegation wishes to make a resolution which we feel will be acceptable to all. After it has been discussed by this delegation resolution "To enable the Indian people of Canada to establish its own destiny and priorities. Be it resolved that a national committee composed of the representatives of province or region at this meeting be established to affect the following purposes.

- A) Investigate the rights including aboriginal, acquired, residual and human rights of the Indian people of Canada.

- B) Formulate a draft, an Indian Act for presentation to this delegation, reassembled as a whole at a date to be specified and
- C) Research the rights of Indian people generally with special reference to treaty rights, hunting rights, fishing rights and rights to medical, educational and local government services, foreshore and riparian rights, forest and timber rights, land, mineral and petroleum rights. Be it further resolved that regional and provincial committees be established and authorized to research and investigate the above subject matter as it pertains to and affects the particular areas and submit proposals to the national committee for its consideration. Be it further resolved that the financial resources for the said investigations be supplied by the Government of Canada according to the draft budget prepared by this meeting."

I would second that motion.

G. Manuel

Could you condense that Mr. Ahenakew or explain the meaning of it for the delegations who may not ...

David Ahenakew

What explanation do you require?

Ya, we are proposing here I guess there will be a national committee composed by the delegates here, not by the National Indian Brotherhood, to look into these points that I have covered. All the rights that we are discussing here as a delegation. This is specifically what this is.

G. Manuel

O.K. It has been regularly moved and seconded and is there any further questions or discussions to the motion? Directly to the motion.

Peter Kelly, Ontario.

I would like to ask the previous speaker whether it would take into consideration I think also this question may be directed to Mr. Courchene as well, as part of the Treaty 3 and is part of Manitoba. The question is in Northwest Ontario, we have been dealing with the Government for the past, I don't know how many decades, to come up with the definition of the headland to headland issue and it seems to be at this point that no definition is forthcoming at all unless some precedent is established say at the Maritime headwaters. The off-shore fishing rights. Now does this take into consideration then the things that I have outlined here is that included in that brief?

D. Ahenakew

I think, No. 3, Manitoba. I think all that will be involved in the research because we cannot give the answers because we don't have the answers now. That this will bring all the research some of these things that we don't really know about yet. Right.

No. 4

No. 4

Speaker?

Mr. Chairman, on speaking on the motion on the matter of research. I am speaking for our organization only. We are going to take advantage of a research that is going on presently on the matters that my good friend from his province has stated and this is a \$25,000.00 research. We have been promised by word of mouth, by the people who is making this research possible that their findings will be given to us in September and this is going to be our stand on that. Maybe it would be worth the time and consideration to look into the \$25,000.00 research on the things you have just mentioned.

No. 6

Mona Jacobs, N.W.T.

Would it be possible to get a definition of aboriginal rights from our legal advisers and Mr. Conn, first of all? Secondly, this type of research is needed very badly in the N.W.T. - research on the treaties and funds to do this type of research and this is all I have to say.

G. Manuel

Hugh Conn could answer this question, I think the native people themselves will have to answer the question, "What is aboriginal right in their own interpretation" I think this is what this committee is been struck up for, for each province to make their own studies of what they feel is aboriginal rights.

Paul Walsh

The intent, as I understand it, of the entire resolution concerning definition of all the rights that were mentioned, would have the effect of adjourning this meeting and striking up this committee with its regional sub-committees to do in the areas

which have a committee of purpose. The result of which research would be within the budget as proposed in the brief of the National Indian Brotherhood of some half a million dollars, not by the National Indian Brotherhood but basing it on the same sort of budgetary definition that this body would adjourn for I don't know, six months, eight months and when it would come back it would have all the research done by its own committees. It would be able to have a draft of its own act and its definition of its own rights as researched by its own personnel and consequently asking the answers to the questions now is a bit pre-emptory. As I understand the Resolution, the resolution wants this meeting now to recognize the priorities of a new Indian Act, aboriginal and other rights and all the things that everyone has been talking about with the intent of unity and to go and gather the research so that the Indian people or this meeting can present its recommendations to Government in a concrete, specific way rather than just a general way without any background. I think that is why the mover said that he had a particular solution for the problem raised by Mr. Peters. So, rather than get into a legal quandry about what the answers to all these questions are, that is, what the government will finance, so that the mover of the motion hopes the government will finance these regional and national committees to do so that we can come back researched. I think that a lot of people including your legal advisers came to this meeting with a brief case and a big empty pad and that shouldn't be the case. We should have all our research done and our definitions at hand if we are going to properly discuss these issues. And perhaps what could be done right now is to ask the staff available to copy this resolution and hand it out to everyone here. It is a

culmination of all the debate that has been happening. The resolution seems to be a crystallization of the thought that has been taking place to this point.

G. Manuel

We have sent one of the hostesses out to make up a bunch of these resolutions.

M. Jacobs

Are you saying that we have to make our own definition for aboriginal rights?

Paul Walsh

Well the study should be made of the aboriginal rights that is what the resolution suggests ...

M. Jacobs

What I am asking in what sense is it used here? Is this an all enveloping thing, aboriginal rights. Do we put a definition on it later, or is this a term that already has a definition?

Hugh Conn on No. 3

In my brief discussion yesterday, as reported and you have the report before you right now, dealing with the question of aboriginal rights in the broadest sense of the word, I came up with this one sentence which I am going to lift out of context. "These rights may have varied and may have varied in terms of land usage but basically and fundamentally the Indians owned this continent lock, stock and barrel." That's what the word aboriginal rights means to me. Absolute, unequivocal ownership of this continent and the basic thought behind this was that the government of today must show how and by what means this absolute title was extinguished.

M. Jacobs

Thank you Mr. Conn. That answers my question.

G. Manuel

No. 13. 12 then.

A. Delisle

Now there is a resolution on the floor now and I want to just voice the opinion of the delegation of Quebec and if the resolution on the floor and wait till ...

No. 15.

David Ahenakew

I was wondering whether we could table the resolution till such times the copies are handed to each and every delegate here.

G. Manuel

Well it has been suggested that we adjourn for ten minutes. Is it in order. We stand adjourned for ten minutes.

G. Manuel

First of all I will declare this assembly in session and I want to mention and I think that most of you know that the Gestetner machine is broken down so there is no copies as far as the motion which we adjourned for 5 minutes on. No. 4 has something to say, so I'll give him the floor.

G. Williams

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our British Columbia delegation we submitted to you and the assembly our policy, a policy statement on our stand as British Columbia. We will appreciate it very much, Mr. Chairman, at this time if it be considered

paragraph by paragraph. We believe it has some merits. We believe that if there should be any matter that may be of not real benefit to other provinces, we want the opportunity given to us and give us the reasons why it may be.

G. Williams.

I so move.

G. Manuel

Is there a seconder to that motion to deal with the B.C.'s policy.

Seconded by James Gosnell. It has been regularly moved and seconded that we deal with the B.C.'s present policy statement presentation here. Is there any discussion? Or are you ready for the question. I think everyone of you has a copy which was distributed yesterday to everyone. B.C. has only one policy statement which was presented to everyone.

Oh, I see, what is it, Mr. Williams?

G. Williams

It says here a National Conference on the Indian Act, Ontario, April 29.

A. Delisle

Mr. Chairman, if I may just get away from the subject ...

I respect the chair and I respect the individual sitting in the chair but previously I made a resolution asking that the Minister be asked to come over here. I found out only when we broke off and asked the executive assistant of the Minister if he had been requested to call the Minister and he had not. The delegation from Quebec is not coming over here to waste any time. We have the fullest confidence we know you as individuals but I think it was your responsibility to ask the

Minister to be here because it came from the floor and the Minister was not asked. I just want to get that cleared up. Anything that is decided whose is going to do the running around.

G. Manuel

The message has gone to the Minister, Mr. Delisle. The Minister has a commitment to meet with the committee to which your assembly has struck here with regards to the extended delegates which was approved here.

A. Delisle

But Mr. Chairman, we did not ask the Minister to sit with the committee. We asked him to sit with the whole delegation, and the Minister was asked but his executive assistant didn't know anything about it. How was he asked? Where and what channels have you worked through? It is a concern of mine. Because when we specifically moved that a certain thing takes place we would like that request to be taken into consideration and we do not expect to go ourselves and run around.

G. Manuel

I appreciate this, an error on our part. But the message has gone through. There is a motion on the floor. Is there any comments on it or are you ready for the question. Has the question been called? Question has been called. All those in favour raise your hands. Do you want to hear the motion again?

Issac Beaulieu

It is moved that we deal with the British Columbia policy statement.

Speaker?

To deal with it in what way?

G. Manuel

I think he stated it quite clearly, he wants to go through with it paragraph by paragraph and he wants the reaction of the assembly towards any section of the policy statement.

Speaker?

What happened to the motion that we were talking about has that been tabled?

G. Manuel

It has been suggested that they didn't want to discuss it unless everybody had the paper and the paper is not ready yet. Well it is here now. I was told before that it was not going to be here till tomorrow.

No. 15

D. Ahenakew

Point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with mine.

G. Manuel

It's up to the B.C. group now.

D. Ahenakew, Saskatchewan

wonder if and when we could move toward the resolution because there may be some areas here that we might overlook.

G. Manuel

Which one do you wish to deal with.

Mr. Fred Gladstone, from Alberta

I don't know, I am getting confused here. This morning we started to take the submission by the Indian Brotherhood with its amendments and we was going to tear this apart and we went half way through it and then we stopped and now we got two more resolutions we are going to talk about. Are we getting bogged down with parliamentary procedures or what?

No. 15

Dave Ahenakew, Saskatchewan

Perhaps there is a reason why B.C., as a matter of fact, I know they have a reason why, although I don't know the specific reason why. They have a reason for wanting to go through with their submission and I would hope that it has a bearing on the Resolution that has been made by Saskatchewan, so I'll withdraw my previous statement. I'll table the resolution.

G. Manuel

You will make a motion to that effect. Secunder to this. All those in favour, all those against. Carried. No. 12 were you going to make a statement?

A. Delisle

Chief Delisle what is generally identified as the province of Quebec. I was just going to question the delegates from Saskatchewan and British Columbia and I think

the question has been cleared in my mind.

G. Manuel

O.K. then we will discuss the presentation of British Columbia, paragraph by paragraph as requested by Mr. Guy Williams and will leave it to Mr. Guy Williams to do this or whoever he wishes to appoint.

G. Williams.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this before we go into this that this policy statement made to this assembly is without prejudice, done in good faith. We have our delegation over there and they can all participate in it, I think I will ask my friends in Vancouver Island of province of B.C., Philip Paul to do the section by section. The legal counsellor will also be there. We will chip in here and there where we can at this.

G. Manuel

It is in order, Mr. Philip Paul.

Microphone No. and name.

Philip Paul, Vancouver Island, British Columbia

We the representatives of British Columbia, Indian organizations and delegates of consultation meetings held in various parts of B.C. bring to the attention of the delegates here assembled from across Canada our position with respect to this assembled conference. We recognize the problems of our brothers in areas of the country where treaties exist and have not been honoured. We strongly support the position that our brothers from the treaty area should insist that governments at all levels must honour existing treaties and where necessary should re-negotiate

treaties. Our people forming non-treaty areas from non-treaty areas ... Do you want me to continue or do you want me to stop at the end of each paragraph?

G. Manuel

I think it is entirely up to the Assembly if anybody wants to ask questions just raise their number up and we'll stop you.

Philip Paul

Our people from non-treaty areas however have been sent here by their representatives to review the proposals made at the consultation meeting and to confirm those that are considered useful to our people. We are instructed further to place on record in each field of our activities the principles and policies which our people believe should be incorporated in a revised Indian Act. We believe that this conference should review the principles, policies and objectives that have been brought forth from consultation meetings across Canada. Weigh them, analyze them, and give to those that have merit the weight and prestige which this conference carries. We believe and our instructions are that the government should be asked when we adjourn to incorporate these principles, policies and objectives in the draft of the revised Indian Act, and then this draft should be sent back to us for further consideration.

No. 12

Andrew Delisle, Quebec

I was wondering if the delegation from British Columbia would consider that paragraph, we believe and our instruction are that government be asked when we adjourn to incorporate these principles, policies and objectives in the draft of the revised Indian Act, because of its opposition to the thinking of the Indians of Quebec where the Indians of Quebec feel that they should draft the Act and not the government. There is a specific request here, that the government draft the Act or if they are going to draft the Act and it is completely opposite to our position.

Ed Bellerose, Driftpile

I strongly support Quebec on this question because I feel this is one of the reasons that we throw away that chose the path that we were assembled for. The Act of any Act are common in Canada in the proper democracy should we have to say what applies to our life. I know Andrew stated a fact here, there are still people who are still starving out there and I lived with these people for a number of years. I travelled to N.W.T. right down to Inuvik and the biggest part of northern Alberta and if the Act is going to be depend on the Government again, especially in the bureaucratic system I wouldn't go for that. I support the Act should come from us.

Chief Nicholas Prince, B.C.

Apparently the delegate that was reading this never had a chance to finish reading the paragraph. It must be understood that there is more to that paragraph than what the first three lines says.

Bernard Charles, B.C.

In line with what Mr. Prince has just said we feel even further along in the paper there is clarification on our position. We are not here to ask you to discuss revisions of the Indian Act. We have made our points quite clear in our consultation meetings in British Columbia as to our position and we are not going to take up valuable time here on your behalf and on our behalf, to discuss item by item changes we want in the Indian Act. I think the B.C. delegation will agree that we are here to ask the affirmation of this body to accept in principle the ideals that were proposed in B.C. because we feel that we are in the best position to know our requirements there. We are not going to impose our ideas on you. We would just like to say that you affirm our position and give you prestige to our demands in B.C. that conditions we want made in new legislation go along parallel with our paramount objectives from B.C. which is some settlement of our aboriginal and hereditary rights. That is the paramount thing that we are after but we would like to work in a parallel basis to develop a vehicle to progress in the way that we feel we can. We're not here to discuss Indian Act revisions because we have done this in B.C. and we have reached a number of conclusions. I feel that this paper might be a little misleading as it's been read up to this point and that if we could go a little bit further in the paper I'm sure some of the other speakers from B.C. will be able to stress this point and make it clear to you. Thank you very much.

Speaker?

Perhaps I would like to make a suggestion. The delegation from British Columbia read their submission. I wish to make a motion that we, the delegates here, accept the B.C. submission as it now stands as an official submission of British Columbia. We wish to continue to read back to section by section again. That motion still stands.

G. Manuel

I just wanted this clear.

G. Manuel

Now. 14. Now 11 first before 7.

Could I interrupt. The Minister is now here. Do you want him to sit in our session now. He is coming in now.

I'd like to give the honour to Max Gros Louis to thank the Minister for coming.

Max Gros-Louis

J'aimerais remercier le ministre des affaires indiennes et du nord canadien M. Jean Chrétien d'être venu assister à nos délibérations et j'espère qu'il en repartira avec de bonnes idées de ce que nous voulons avoir dans la loi sur les indiens. Merci.

G. Manuel

Mr. Max Gros-Louis says, "We welcome the Minister for coming here and I hope that before he goes away he will have a full understanding of what our people want here."

So I will give this privilege to the Minister to say a few words.

J. Chrétien

Excuse me if I am late a bit. There is terrible traffic down town and I only heard about 15 minutes ago that you asked me to come. My colleague Mr. Andras

No. 6

Speaker?

I was referring to the other Minister.

G. Manuel

What is the wish of British Columbia in regard to the policy statement. There has been a mover and a seconder that this be adopted by this assembly. Now do you wish to continue reading it first before we vote on it or do you wish us to vote on it now. I'll leave it up to the B.C. delegates.

G. Williams

Mr. Chairman, I believe in all fairness to the delegates whom are assembled here and now that this will become an official document, I believe that we continue to read it to the end of it so it will be official and officially recorded in our records.

G. Manuel

Is that the wish of all B.C. delegates. Fine. Proceed Mr. Paul. No. 7.

H. Cardinal - Alberta

I would like to get the point clarified. If this policy position is supported I don't see where we will have trouble supporting it. Does this mean that we tackle first the question of our rights and get these affirmed before we go into specific revisions of the Indian Act as such? I'd like to get this cleared.

Philip Paul

I think the paper itself, Philip Paul. I think further on in the paper this is spelled out quite clearly. The position in regard to what we should do with

specific instructions. We'll proceed further. I think it will unfold and you will see if your question is answered. If not it will be answered later on.

Philip Paul, B.C.

After considering this draft our people will then ask for any changes and additions they feel are required our representatives and delegates from the consultation meetings are further instructed to state to the federal government that our people require a new and firm commitment by government that they will without further delay give us a public affirmation of their recognition of our aboriginal rights in all field including among others, aboriginal land rights, foreshore and riparian rights, forest and timber rights, hunting and fishing rights, mineral and petroleum rights and all other rights that are ours by hereditary, historical, moral and legal obligation. We expect that our brothers from treaty areas will make similar demands with respect to their treaty rights. We support them fully in their quest for justice. We recognize that our problems are different from those of our brothers from treaty areas. We suggest that the delegates here from treaty areas should meet separately from the delegates of non-treaty areas and that each of the two groups should then bring their policy statements to this entire body for ratification. We suggest much time can be saved by having these separate meetings held after regular conference hours. The entire conference can then be asked to support both policy statements, one for treaty areas and one for non-treaty areas. We believe much time will be lost here if the entire conference attempts to discuss as a whole body questions and problems affecting the two basic areas of treaty and non-treaty.

Peter Johnson

I would like to have a point of clarification here Mr. Chairman. This is Peter Johnson, Ontario. I would like to know if perhaps the British Columbia delegation might not have changed their minds since this policy statement was made a few days ago. Or does this affirmation of a two conference, two separate conference still stands yet.

G. Williams, B.C.

I'm not clear Mr. Chairman on the reference to two conferences.

G. Manuel

It is suggested I think in this paragraph, if I may try to interpret it, that treaty people and non-treaty people have separate conferences during the evening after the regular meeting hour to present policy statements with regard to non-treaty and treaty. Is this what it says in your paper and I think this is the clarification of the question asked. Is that right?

G. Williams

That is right and one of the reasons, there may be other reasons, is that we are not familiar with your treaty problems and only through a policy statement from you to us shall we understand your problem and we will then be in a stronger position to give you the support that you require and to consolidate our stand in seeking justice for people across Canada.

Speaker?

I was just going to say what Mr. Williams has put forth to the conference.

G. Manuel

O.K. continue Philip.

Philip Paul

In this way this conference can immediately resume consideration of the revised Indian Act which was postponed until now on the adjournment of our area consultation meetings. We firmly believe, as do the people we represent, that it is absolutely essential at this time and at this meeting that the government be advised of the principles we want incorporated into the revised Indian Act. The future progress of our people requires that the Act be revised and updated to meet the challenge of a new age. The Minister, the government through the Prime Minister, and many Members of Parliament and through them the people of Canada have said to us tell us what you require in a new Indian Act to lead your people into a rich new life in partnership with all other Canadians. Our people have spoken at several consultations meetings and have said to us, their representatives and delegates, give them our answer loud and clear. Here are the rights we require. We, their delegates and representatives, considered we are bound in duty to convey this message to the government and with the full support of this historic assembly. Let it not be said of us they were given the opportunity to chart their future and they failed to grasp it. We ask this assemblage to review the recommendations of the area consultation meetings and to confirm those principles, policy and objectives that are considered essential for a new Indian Act. We ask this assembly to request each of the two groups from treaty areas and non-treaty areas to meet separately after regular conference hours and to formulate and to recommend to this full assembly their separate statements of policy, principles and objectives in respect to treaty rights, breaches thereof, revision of treaties, aboriginal rights and claims and any other matters considered essential by each of the two groups. We present this proposal and ask for the support of the delegates earnestly believing it is in the best interests of all our people from coast to coast.

This statement of position is submitted by and on behalf of the following representatives of British Columbia organizations and delegates from consultation meetings held in British Columbia.

No. 14

Wallace LaBillois from the Maritimes

In view of the fact that there is a motion and in view of the fact that the B.C. delegation was allowed to continue reading this; in view of the fact that there are very important issues in this policy paper and in view of the fact that the Minister of Indian Affairs is here, and in view of the fact that the Maritime delegation is only represented here by the province of New Brunswick, I would like to ask this assembly if they will at this time seat a representative from Nova Scotia because I don't know who is going to determine what areas have treaties and what areas have no treaties. I feel that the government in the past has indicated that the Indians in New Brunswick do not have treaties. I maintain here today that they do have. In view of the fact that its government policy or the government recognizes that there are none in Nova Scotia, I would like at this time to have seated in this conference a delegate from Nova Scotia. I am in a position to say that we have a representative from Nova Scotia who is not the official delegate but I would like to make it quite clear to all delegates here that I can't discuss this very paper unless there is a delegation from Nova Scotia.

G. Williams

Mr. Chairman, I said that this policy statement is being presented without prejudice. We have no objections whatsoever to give the right for a delegate or a representative from Nova Scotia.

G. Manuel

Before we come back to your question, Mr. LaBillois, I think I will allow others to speak. No. 3.

Dave Courchene, President, Manitoba Indian Brotherhood

I endorse certain portions of the B.C. presentation and I think it is up to us as delegates to clarify this amongst themselves. I would hope while the Minister was here that there would be questions and I think that this was the reason why the Minister was asked to come in this afternoon to clarify some of the questions so that our presentations after documented would have some idea on what the Minister's statements will be. Thank you.

G. Manuel

No. 12. I wouldn't forget you Wallace.

Chief Delisle, Province of Quebec

Asking our delegation to accept the policy, we do not intend to infringe on the rights of the Indian people of British Columbia. We respect any decisions that they make. It is not our jurisdiction to go and tell them what to do but as a National group and I state what I have noticed in that fourth paragraph that the delegation is asking that the Department of Indian Affairs or the government of Canada to draft up the Indian Act and I can't agree with this. I believe it should be the Indian people that should do it. I have read the paper and I respect their belief, but our belief in the province of Quebec is that first our treaty rights and our rights as people have to be respected. As I said before we have to work from the foundation and build the house after and we don't build the house if there is no foundation and we will maintain that position. The paper that is being presented is asking some other group of people to do something for us

I think we should be involved from the very beginning and I think we should all be involved in the formation of the Indian Act. Therefore we find it very difficult to support this paper unless there is more clarification or more discussion on it. Thank you.

No. 2.

J. Chrétien

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a comment here to clarify some of the points that have been raised up to now. I understand that there is a lot of talk going on here since the beginning about treaty rights and the recognition of the treaty rights. I attended all the consultations either myself or when I could not be there, the Minister without Portfolio attached to my department, Mr. Andras attended. The Government of Canada intends to recognize the treaties. There is no doubt about it. The problem that you face and that we face is on the interpretation of the treaty. What does that mean? Some people say that the treaties have not been respected; others say that the treaties have been respected. There is diversion of opinion on that. But as far as the Government is concerned, the material fact is that there are treaties. We want to respect the treaties but when you come to, you know, in the treaties there are many things that have to be looked into. The people expressed some views; they say that they have not received as much land as they were entitled and that sort of thing. These questions are open in the air a long time. That, and I made that plainly, to all the consultations, that I'm not in the position to look personally into all the treaties and make decisions. There is a divergence of opinion between the interpretation of the Government and of some of the Indians and some of the problems have to be resolved. So in the policy statement that we will

make in June, we will provide the Indians with the mechanism, you know, to clarify these points and to make their case. And if they have a case, you know the Government will respect it. It is very much in the mind of the Government. Nobody in the Government said that they will not respect the treaty. But there is problem as far as interpretation and we have talked in the past about an Indian Claim Commission. I mentioned that many times. It is to look into that kind of problems and to solve them, you know forever. We will and you made the representation on that when we introduced in the House of Commons in 63 the Indian Claims Commission and in 65 I think, yes the spring of 1965. We have received something like 200 briefs from Indian communities making representation. So when I will make the policy statement on behalf of the Government, after because I cannot make it now. If it is a consultation I cannot tell you before the end of the consultation what the policy of the Government is because it will be useless to have a consultation. But as far as the policy statement is concerned on the treaties we have nothing but intention to respect the treaties. There is the other question of those who have no treaty. It is quite a complex problem that face the members from British Columbia and Quebec. I know that the Nishka Band as example, has decided to put their case in court to have the court recognize their aboriginal title. You know its one way to look into the problem and be made very good and very well documented I cannot appreciate the legal value of it but they made their case in court. When we will make our announcement, I hope at the latest, you know I will have to make the proposals to the Cabinet before but I said I want to make the proposal known, I said in my speech yesterday by mid-June. From thereon you will know. You know what is the mechanism, what are the mechanisms that we propose to solve these problems and you will have occasion to comment on that and to

make other representation about it. I want to make that very clear so when I see people saying that we do not want to respect the treaties it is not so. We want to respect the treaties but interpretation of the treaties is up in the air for years and years and we have to solve it. But these are problems of yesterday and we have to solve them and we can't go above them. It's a reality and we're committed to do something about it. I said that all of the treaties are up in the air for a long time and we have to solve it. And I said all the time that as far as the Government is concerned we intend to respect the treaties. But these consultations were designed to know from the Indian people what they think of their treaties. I know that it's a big priority in your mind you speak about it but it is not the only problem you face. What kind of society do you want in the future. What kind of organization do you want at the band level. Should I as the Minister of Indian Affairs keep on making decisions for you on every aspect of the life of the Indian or turn the responsibility for these decisions to the Indians. Should I as the Minister sign all the documents that concern your life or let you make the decision. What should we do with this relation, this trustee relation between the Superintendent of Indian Affairs with me and you concerning your land. Should we handle it or turn over the land to you and let you administer that. That is the sort of the question you have to answer. I know that's what you want according to what you have said since the beginning of these consultations. You know, you remember the first consultation. It was supposed to be chaired by one civil servant and one Indian and after that we said let the Indians run the show and you discuss all aspects in all the consultations. You were not limited on anything. And we received a lot of good advice from you people, from all across the country. Now you have the occasion to exchange the point of view that you have expressed in each of these consultations and present us with some recommendations. I know that the treaties are a big problem and I am very much

aware of it, but what I would like you to know too that there is a problem. I tell you the policy of the Government is that we intend to respect the treaties. But how to interpret the treaties signed 100 years ago in the context of today are quite difficult problems and we will have to provide you with the mechanism to solve these questions. What I would like you to discuss is the other problems that face your life. Your economic development, your problem of education, your problem of welfare, your problem of housing and the administration of your land and the administration of your farms, who should be members of Indian bands and so on. What should be your relation between you and the federal government, between you and the provincial government and so on and other questions that are vitally important for you too. So on the treaty question I think it will be useful I hope I make that statement that as far as the government is concerned we intend to respect the treaties but for the interpretation of it, it's a matter of mechanism to develop in order to solve it. It will be either through consultation with the people of various treaties or for some quasi-judicial court such as the Indian Claim Commission to decide if we cannot see eye to eye on that. I hope that you will deal with the other problems too because, you know, if it is the situation as far as the request by some of you to draft the Indian Act yourself, we have to be realistic about it. What is an Indian Act? The Indian Act is an Act of Parliament of Canada. Is it good or bad? It is up to you to tell us. But it will be replaced by another Act of Parliament and the only one who can pass an Act in Parliament are the members of Parliament. In the past what we used to do was for the administration to draft an Act and to pass that to the House of Commons and let that vote by the House of Commons and everyone will have to live with it. For this new Indian Act, for this new approach in policies we have decided to get your view and that I have started nine months ago. So we are at the end of it. From all the information we have received from these consultations, we will propose a policy that will in the end, be in a form of legislation. From thereon either it will be a good or a bad legislation. It will be the new Indian Act, the new legislation,

the new approach. You will be invited to make your comment. If it is no good, and you prove to us it is no good we will be open minded about it and will change some of the things we have. It is impossible to think that we can do that the other way because you cannot draft an Act. The Act has to be approved by the House of Commons and you know, it will be the responsibility of the Parliament of Canada to make the decision. You have had the occasion and you still have the occasion to make the views known about all the aspects of your life that are affected by the Indian Act or by the treaties and so on, but don't let the discussion narrow on one point where I can say on behalf of the Government, as far as we are concerned we intend to respect the treaties that the Crown has signed within the Indians over the years. Still there is the interpretation of these treaties that are open. Is it true for example that in one specific treaty the Indians received less land that was mentioned at the time of the treaty. Is it true that there are things that were promised to the Indians and have not been carried by the Crown over the last years. If there were some things that were not carried out, if there were some land that was not delivered, we will have to compensate the Indians involved in that treaty for the breach of that treaty, and we will have to look into each of the treaties. But the principle will be that the Government will intend to respect the treaty.

G. Manuel

Thank you Mr. Chrétien. No. 14.

Andrew Nicholas from New Brunswick

The Minister has stated his position and we ourselves as delegates for the Indian people of Canada are working on ours. It is going to be very interesting as to the position that we arrive at later on in our discussions but I feel that in New Brunswick, the unique position that we are in, it is us that want to determine our priorities with respect to the question of aboriginal rights and treaty rights. We want resources, financial resources available to us to make a presentation and not something to come from the Indian Affairs Branch or from the Government to come

back to us to have them interpret for us what we feel we want to do it and this is all we ask for.

G. Manual

No. 5

Peter Kelly, Northwestern Ontario.

I'd like to make some statements here regarding the Minister's remarks. First of all there is an implication here that the government's position is that they are going to work on the premise of extropolating which implies a further revision of the Indian Act further and further on, which seems to suggest to me that this new Indian Act is going to be legislated out of existence as been pointed out before. Now when you are dealing with a problem area of expropriating you are suggesting to yourself that all the conditions that are existent today are going to exist in the next hundred years. Well that is a complete falacy. We have to start and look at what is going to take place in the future. I think this is what we are doing.

Also one of the things that happens here this afternoon, a suggestion was made; here, as presented by the paper from the Saskatchewan delegation, that every statement, that every paper that has been presented to date seems to suggest with accordance in accordance with that brief. What it means that if research is carried out it means we will give the government our interpretation of the treaties. Now if we are going to give our interpretation of the treaties in the future, well how can the Government make a policy statement then in view if we haven't been allowed to carry out that research. Thank you.

G. Manual

No. 12

Andrew Delisle

Mr. Kelly said all what I wanted to say.

G. Manual

No. 6

Eddie Bellerose from Driftpile, Mic. 6

The Minister's statement is nothing new to me. It's just like a whirling wind with lots of words, the same old Indian Affairs that's been speaking for the last hundred years. "We intend to recognize"; "we will provide mechanism," "we will have the replace" and "how many courses we are going to design." Over and over and over again honourable Minister. This is not our intention in our treaty. Our intention is to formally recognize first the treaties, black and white not just we intend. How many of our people are suffering today in Canada. The people I represent in Alberta in Treaty 8. Look at the conditions they are in the environment they are in and you're telling me that you still intend, that doesn't satisfy my conscience. And what is this the mechanism that you will provide. I'll question that mechanism.

No. 13

Chef Max Gros-Louis.

La région que l'on nomme communément Québec. Seulement une chose ici qui me fais peur un peu c'est quand vous avez dit Monsieur le Ministre vous devez nous prouver que c'est correct ou que c'est faux, à ce moment là, je me demande si les gens du parlement, les gens d'Ottawa penseront de la même manière ou auront l'idée indienne ou si auront l'idée des non-indiens. C'est à ce moment là que ça nous effraie un peu qui est pas de la même vue de ce qu'on veut avoir. Merci.

G. Manuel

Well he says that one thing that scares him is the fact that whether the viewpoint of parliament or commons will be based on Indian thinking or it will be based on white thinking. That is the only thing that scares him. Before I ask you to comment I'll finish all the numbers

No. 4

Could I interrupt this program for two minutes to get a chair here.

I will call on Isaac Beaulieu here to introduce the Minister without Portfolio and also the Assistant Deputy Minister.

Isaac Beaulieu, Manitoba, Mic. No. 4

As you all notice, because we moved around a bit, you know, they are becoming very conscious of my size as I get more and more squeezed out here. The person that just came in as you probably all know is Robert Andras the Minister without Portfolio. He is from Fort William which is generally known as northwestern Ontario. This is the Minister that has been largely responsible for the consultation meetings. The Indian Act was a specialty as I understand, and so we have Mr. Andras with us for our meetings. The person that came in much earlier and perhaps some consciousness on what is going on on what has developed during the past years the person who quietly took a chair at the back over there is Mr. Bob Battle, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Indian Affairs Branch.

George Manuel

Fine Thank you. Before I ask for remarks from both parties there is No. 4

Chief Plain, southern Ontario.

During the early part of this conference I made suggestions to the rest of the delegates regarding the presence here of the Ministers; the Minister of Indian Affairs and the Minister without Portfolio. In regards to their statements that they have made to us in consultation meetings recently and also in regards to the present statements that have been given to us by Honourable Jean Chrétien, I cannot in any way change my position that I have stated very clearly and have written very clearly to the Government of Canada. I have received no answers to specific questions that I asked. I realize that policy cannot be stated immediately in regards to a direct answer but I am going on the assumption that these men are in the position

that they are in today because of their abilities and because of the faith of the electors of their constituency that have sent them to represent them in the Government of Canada. But I am saying that these men have aspired or they have gained at this position because of their integrity, because of their abilities and lastly and probably because of their being politicians. Now Honourable Minister, I asked in Toronto at what point in history. Before I ask this let me read, what is a treaty? A treaty is defined in Funk and Wagnells universal standard encyclopedia as an agreement in international law entered into between two governments or sovereigns of two or more states. The right to enter into treaty relations being one of the essential attributes of sovereignty. Now you say, we will and we do now respect your treaties. In Toronto you said these are two separate problems. I disagree. They are one and the same. The aboriginal rights and the Indian Act are not two separate problems, they are one and the same. The aboriginal rights and the Indian Act are not two separate problems, they are one and the same. What the people are asking here and why I supported the resolution by Andrew Nicholas was that the delegation that has made their document to us, have every right as sovereign people to make such a document and I have no right to turn it down because of any of its wording. The government must listen to every native voice that is raised. You must listen, it must not go in one ear and go out the other. The issues have been made clear. You are differentiating, Sir. You are trying to tell us that we are wrong. I have submitted to this delegation that our problem with you as the government of Canada, is not legislative, it is constitutional. No matter what you say about an Act of Parliament I think that we are learning and we are learning very fast that any Act of Parliament can be changed by any changing government. You are saying that it is interpretation of the treaties that is involved, that is the main principle. I disagree with you, Sir. If you mean what you say, then you should be in a position to speak not as a legislator or a Cabinet Minister, but you should be able to tell us if you think

we are wrong in those kind of words. You told us in a political way that we are wrong. You have told me in Toronto when I asked you the question. Let's be realistic. I am, Sir, being very realistic and I will not change my position. The aboriginal rights must be dealt with. You say time is of the essence. Let that stand and let there be immediate effort put forth to not alleviate the sad plight of a frustrated people. I'm personally not looking for alleviation. I am looking for a complete solving of a condition that can best be described as intolerable. You, Sir, are telling me this delegation let us alleviate the situation. Let us deal with legislation. This is not the issue. I respect the document that was read to us. It is very clear. The voice of the people that have spoken throughout the three days so far have been very clear. We need, before we leave, some kind of an answer other than the vague answers that you have given us. "We will make a policy statement in June." As a gentleman, Sir, you should be able to answer when at what point in history did these nations of people that entered into treaty, at what point in history did they cease to become legal entities? Again, were the treaties that were entered into, were they tokens or in harsher words, scraps of paper? If the answer is no, then you are saying that you were sovereign, when you entered into treaty. Then I must know when did I lose my identity.

G. Manuel

I just wonder now, we got quite a number, Wilmer, but I'll get your number but you're down on the list. I just wondering its a quarter to six, I wonder what time do you intend to adjourn and I'm asking another question as when is the Minister going to be here tomorrow.

J. Chrétien

I said that I would be here anytime. If you want me to be here tomorrow morning, I will be here tomorrow morning, afternoon, Friday morning, and afternoon. I put

aside that week to be with you.

G. Manuel

Fine thank you. O.K. No. 9

Nicholas Prince

You know, it must be understood here by the delegation that living in a different environment must be considered by the government and in revising the new Indian Act, which I don't know when it will be, but that is one of the problems that have been dealt with throughout the provinces. In British Columbia, we have five or six different organizations but we can iron out our eternal problems right in the province, whereas we came down here with leaders of different organizations. We are united for this revision of the Indian Act and I believe I honestly believe, that in a lot of isolated areas for people who cannot come in or out, these people are to be considered even if they are treaty or not because in my own area I have people who are under Treaty 8 up in Northwestern British Columbia. And they have put their faith in me to come down and to represent these people. So therefore, I am in a position where I have to talk for the treaty people and the non-treaty people. That's why it was presented by our B.C. delegation that this policy statement we made, we were in full support of all other people across Canada. Thank you.

G. Manuel

Is there any extra copies of the B.C. policy statement, I think the Minister without Portfolio would like a copy. And what about the Deputy Minister, you got two. Now No. 7

Harold Cardinal

Mr. Chairman, Honourable Ministers. Our delegation came with very strong convictions with the same beliefs as the delegation from Quebec. We have received assurances before by succeeding governments that our treaties or our rights would

honoured. Even on the most basic question of education, there is an existing written policy directive by your department that no educational assistance will be given to post graduate Indian students. We believe that this is an infringement on our right to education and this is probably the main issue of contention between our delegation and the position you have outlined. We want to be involved in the interpretation of these treaties. We want to have a say in what these treaties mean or what our rights mean to us. We realize in our delegation that it is unrealistic to expect us or to ask that we pass the legislation itself since this is a duty of the parliament of Canada, but we do ask that the work in preparing this draft that is done by your department be done by our people. We do request resources to be able to do this so that our presentations will have the same type of resources that your officials have behind them when they prepare legislation. I was disappointed to hear an implication that our treaty or our rights were not the only issues. That there are other important issues. We recognize that there are many social problems that exist that we have to tackle as a people but these cannot be tackled until we have guarantees to our treaties with our interpretation of those treaties on those guarantees. We cannot, and I don't think it is realistic for your government to expect us, to believe you when you tell us of social development or the other things that you are going to do for us when you will not allow us or give us the opportunity to present our interpretation of what our rights mean. These are the basis for these are the basic considerations and they are the basis upon we wish to start in the creation of type of society that your government and our people are working for.

G. Manuel:

No. 5.

Chief Nadjiwon, Mic No. 5

Representing Union of Ontario Indians. I would like to address my comments to the, of comments made by the Honourable Mr. Chrétien. No. (1) I felt that he was very disappointed in the turn that this delegation, the turn that it has taken and is deviated from what Indian Affairs hope to be a finalization and the crystallization of views towards Indian Act per se. This was a premise and the approach always used in the past which has led to the difficulties that we are faced today. If they had approached the Indian people and had said let us consult with one another about what is formost and what is important to the Indian people, the consultations would have never gone into the form of consultations around the Indian Act. They would have started from the very basic which has shown up here today. We have tried - the government has tried presuming that the Indian Act was the most important in the Indian's life therefore, all consultation was centered around this.

J. Chrétien

I said earlier that it is exactly why, you know, when the concept of consultation was elaborated before we took over that department, it was centered on the Indian Act, only you receive the "Choosing the Path" and from then on, you know, we have decided in the first meeting that we should open the discussion and not limit discussions on the "Choosing the Path" but let the Indian discuss all the problems that they have in mind not only the Indian Act and we have provided the form and have not limited the debate on anything.

Chief Nadjiwon

I believe that this assembly here today, is sensitive to the difficulty to the failure that history so well records and we are trying in our own knowledgable way to have the future history written with some success. I would like here to use one illustration. This illustration is in the form of education in which government believed the answer to the Indian problems was to educate him.

Education is necessary. I have no quarrel with the idea that education is necessary. However, I believe that the policies in education had educated our children into the penal institutions. They have educated and developed a degree, a higher degree of frustration. They have taken from the Indian people the very thing that is necessary so basic, their culture, their language. The groundwork, it is the groundwork that has been taken from us and somehow we must be, somewhere and sometime at history and the time should be now that we start from the ground up. I think I have made my point. I think that I have made my point here.

David Ahenakew, Federation of Saskatchewan Indians

Mr. Minister we made a resolution here, but I am sure it will get to you in due time. However, I would like to point out the position of the Saskatchewan Indians. We are saying, and I think we said this often enough during the past three days, we are saying that an Act is, or should be, an implementation of the treaties. Therefore, the first thing that must be done is to analyze actually what the treaties do provide. Until that is done there can be no Indian Act. Further I feel that the 34 questions have no relation whatsoever to the Treaties of the Saskatchewan Indians. The treaties as far as Saskatchewan is concerned are the main issues. We cannot deal or keep scratching the surface as the government have done for so long. We must build a foundation like my colleague says from Quebec upon which the fundamental issues may be based on. These issues of course are the aboriginal rights and the treaties that we have. We will in due course interpret our treaties. We do not want the government of Canada to interpret what we feel is not right.

G. Manuel

Chief Delisle, Province of Quebec

This is just to emphasize the statement made by the delegation from Quebec that we want to know how we stand before we start discussing by-laws which is the Indian Act. It is very difficult for us to talk when we don't even know where we are or what we can do. I wholeheartedly support the delegates in the request for resources to talk about the Indian Act; to talk about rights, not only rights, aboriginal rights, but rights as people. People living in what we call North America and Canada. It is very difficult for us to wait or to understand the delay in the government in its support of various groups of Indians and I specifically mention the province of Quebec in its claim against the province. There has not been one policy put forward to us to back up our claims with the provincial government and I feel that it is not only a commitment but it is a full responsibility of the Federal government to support Indian people no matter where they live. We have arrived at a conclusion, decision at this meeting that Canada is not divided into provinces as far as we are concerned. We have decided that we are going to work together as people and people striving for rights and because of the differences of the federal government with the provincial government especially in the province of Quebec should not effect us and the federal government should make a stand and I would ask the Honourable Minister at this time if you would be able to say to the Indian of Quebec that you back up our claim to the provincial government. Thank you.

No. 3.

Dave Courchene, Province of Manitoba

I am very happy, first of all to see our delegates, which in opinion that has formed a very strong concensus within the group. I would like to first make some of the statements that our Minister has made and which brings hope to our delegation. He has stated, let the Indians run the show. For the first time in our history in Canada we have a Minister in Canada, a Minister that is saying let the Indians run the show. I hope that these are just not words. That these are definite actions

by this present government. Our Prime Minister and all his cabinet ministers but I still contend that we have not been given sufficient time to run that show. We cannot, in a few area meetings, in one National meeting, do justice to what the Minister has allowed us to do, run the show. We have not been given enough resources to hire the expertise available to us that should have been available to us, to draft the suggestions, that could be meaningful to all our Indian people across Canada. If there is thinking that the Minister and the Cabinet now can draft a new Act then I think it will be a farse. But if the Minister is sincere and his other Cabinet Ministers are sincere for us to run the show, then I implore that the two Ministers we have here today to give us the resources. We have got the time and the organizations but we are lacking in financial resources. To be able to give to the Minister some of the things that we had a chance to discuss within a few days here, is going to take more research to be able to better articulate the position of our people and unless this is done, then our chances of a new Act will not really be the kind of Act that our Indian people are requesting for today. I implore the two Ministers that before we leave the City of Ottawa that there will be some commitment from the government to allow us more time and financial resources so that we could do a good job, so that we don't have to repeat again in the next century the things that we know are happening today. Thank you.

G. Manuel

I would ask Harold Cardinal No. 7

Harold Cardinal, No. 7

Before we adjourn the meeting I assume as this is what you want to do. Our delegation is very interested in hearing from the Minister without Portfolio. We notice that he has been noticably quiet since we got here.

G. Manuel

In order Mr. Andras.

Hon. Andras

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is a pleasure for me to join you again today. I came with my colleague Jean Chrétien. At the beginning of the meeting at which he stated and I applaud him for stating this that this would be your meeting. That we would participate, either he or myself or any other people from the government, upon your invitation and I got the invitation a few minutes ago and hurried over and got caught in traffic and so on. The matters you are raising are matters that almost at each of the regional conferences starting in Yellowknife last July were raised by the delegates who attended those. I think that the, if the premise on which the consultation meetings were founded in the beginning was to discuss proposed revisions to the Indian Act that cheezed very quickly. In my own experience and I have stated this at each meeting that I have attended which I think amounts to ten or eleven, that very quickly it became apparent the Indian Act itself was only one and perhaps not the major one of the issues that you wanted to debate, and I think Jean Chrétien is quite correct in saying that from that moment on, most certainly in all the meetings I have attended and in the meetings we have attended together and from studying the transcripts from those that I didn't attend, the debate was wide open. In those I attended I think the discussions of the Indian Act and particularly the discussions of the booklet "Choosing a Path" took a very minor role and most of the discussion was about the very issues that I see before me today. The question of your feelings about government commitments to you, treaties, treaty rights, aboriginal rights, fishing rights, hunting rights, and transcending all that was your expression of your wish that there be meaningful consultation. I think that we have made errors in the format in the style, in the conduct, and perhaps in the beginning in the premise, on which the 18 or 17 Regional Conferences took place. I think Mr. Chrétien and I and those associated with us have learned a lot in these last nine months and I suggest together all of us in this room with the colleagues you represent back home have

learned a lot about this whole structure, this whole style, this whole desire to consult and I think the consultation process is improving. And I believe that while there are differences of opinion even amongst some of you as to priorities, as the exact wordings of perhaps resolutions and so forth and as there are still things we have to learn and as we learn, Mr. Chrétien and I have to convey and express your views about what we have learned to our colleagues in the Cabinet. This may be frustrating in terms of a desire on everybody's part a genuine and I know the sincere desire on everybody's part to begin move now in the field what you would term and what I have heard many of you term action rather than words. But I suggest to you that it is just, is less than one year ago July through April is nine months, that this new government began this whole process that were very, very much obviously and I think that you will be the first to agree with me that it was much for us as non-Indians and as government people to learn and we are learning this as quickly as we can. We are conveying it as quickly as we can, to our colleagues in Cabinet.

The measure of the importance of the whole matter is the fact that Cabinet itself, every Cabinet Minister is involved in the discussion when Mr. Chrétien and I present, component or partial or total recommendations in translation to what you have told us and this time the government of Canada, I know, and this may be the cause of some slight delay, wants, sincerely wants, to take the right action, the kind of action that you will join with us in formulating policy for when it is known.

Fundamental too, meaningful change is immediate and continuing consultation in detail and I know that Mr. Chrétien has told you that our hope is that we will be able to meet with you in June to describe the reaction of government to the whole period of this last nine or ten months and then to sit down again with you to work out how best policies and programs to reach a certain set of objectives

should be devised. And that consultation, that continuing consultation, to me is most important, I would respectfully with each one of you say that it is probably the mechanism for consultation is probably the most important thing that we must all work together to achieve. The best form and the recognition that it is so necessary. This again has been, I guess the 18 meetings and I think each meeting has contributed some progress although I know everybody is anxiously waiting for a reaction by government which will be forthcoming before too long. Thank you.

G. Manuel

Thank you Mr. Andras. I would like to call on the Assistant Deputy Minister who has been with the Department of Indian Affairs a long time for a few remarks.

Mr. Battle

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ministers. Except to say that I am very happy to be here and I wish you well in your deliberations and I would certainly be happy to help in any way I can because I have over all these years developed a very keen interest in trying to see you and help you to achieve your objectives. Aside from that I'm simply here to help. That's all. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel

And now I would like to introduce the first Indian member of Parliament I would also like to ask him to make a few remarks Mr. Leonard Marchand.

L. Marchand

Thank you very much George. You took me by surprise. I'm bringing a message also from the chairman of the committee or bringing an answer that he wants and I would like to get the feeling of the meeting. Apparently there is some wish of members here, members of this delegation to meet with the parliamentary committee on Indian Affairs and I understand it that this is set up for 9:30 tomorrow morning. Mr. Chairman is this correct or was the business for tomorrow on some other subject.

G. Manuel

I never heard about it, this is news to me.

L. Marchand

I don't know where the communication came from but there was a request in some point in some place. I received a message through Bill Mussell that the members of this delegation wanted to meet with this committee so tomorrow morning the Railway Committee Room has been apart for 9:30. I don't know what, Mr. Chairman, is the wish of this group but we are, we have been scheduled as the committee.

Isaac Beaulieu

I'd better clarify that Mr. Marchand

I think that the suggestion was the other way; that the parliamentary committee wanted to meet with a group from here. Now this is what we got from them and we have not conveyed this message to the chair because we were not ready to meet anybody until such time as the delegation itself would decide the time, if it is at 9:30 tomorrow morning then the delegation would have to find out which people would be going.

L. Marchand

Well this is a tentative date and we were responding to your request. I have been out of town I just got back. The chairman was not clear whether this, in fact this time was set. I guess I will go back and tell him that we will wait until we hear from you. Would this be correct then.

G. Manuel

I think that this would be correct.

L. Marchand

Well, gosh, I'm kind of stuck for something to say. Members of Parliament should never be stuck for something to say but I am. I just want to say that I am happy to be back and I am looking forward to attending a lot of this meeting over the next few days. I have some experience on both sides of the fence,

experience on the reservation, some experience as Special Assistant to the Minister, Art Laing and Jack Nicholson and I have some insights on some parts of the place. I don't know what my future role is going to be as a Member of Parliament. I have had some trouble finding my feet in some areas. I am trying very hard to be a good member. I said before that I wasn't going to be the Indian's member of Parliament because I am the member of the Parliament for Kamloops-Cariboo. I hope that you will not misunderstand this in anyway. I hope you will understand this that I will fight very hard for all of your problems but on the other hand it will be a little bit difficult because I have 80,000 people that I represent in Kamloops-Cariboo and I sort of I kind of have to look after them because they are those who elected me. I also have ten reserves in my riding and I just want to assure that in case these remarks that I have made might disturbed some of you, I will, I am one of you, I will do my best as the Member of Parliament of Kamloops-Cariboo and I will do my best to speak with the voice of an Indian when the occasion arises also. Thanks.

G. Manuel

Now another question before we adjourn, if you wish to have the Minister here tomorrow. I know you had a motion.

J. Chrétien

I can come, you know, and if you find me embarrassing I will get out and come back. But I can be here tomorrow morning.

Max Gros - Louis

I think the Minister will give his answer tomorrow.

G. Manuel

I just wonder if the assembly here you have got two motions here (2) B.C. Policy Paper; the Saskatchewan Paper to deal with. Do you want the Minister without Portfolio too.

J. Chrétien

Just a minute.

Perhaps tomorrow morning, you will have to be, one of the two should be at the Cabinet. We have a lot of problems in front of the Cabinet and he will be there and when he will be over with his problem, he should bring the Cabinet here. It is a good idea. We should. I will be there and I know Bob will come as quickly as possible. O.K.

G. Manuel

Well this is clarified but there is another subject here that has been lying on the table and I know the person who presented it is anxiously waiting. He asked the assembly here whether the Maritimes could seat another 'delegate.' Could you cite that again Wallace.

Wallace LaBillois, Maritimes.

I requested the assembly if they would be willing to seat a representative from Nova Scotia. I can't put this as a motion because I am asking you.

G. Manuel

There is one thing I want to remind the assembly and I don't know if this is in line. 5,000 to one and is entirely up to you. Wallace is making an legitimate request that should be seriously considered by this assembly.

It has already been accepted that he should be allowed to bring in the delegate. There is a standing resolution to that effect. Will Mr. LaBillois hand me the name of the delegate, we will then transport it to the regular O.K.

Noel Doucette is his name.

Are you satisfied now.

G. Manuel

No. 6 did you want to say something. I see the card up. O.K. Now there is a motion there was a mover and a seconder to adopt the B.C. policy paper, what do you wish to do, deal with it tonight or I mean this is night-time.

J. Gosnell

I think we would rather had that tabled and probably the B.C. delegation would probably want to get together and some portion has been not been agreed upon and perhaps we could. I feel we should get together with the B.C. delegation so I would appreciate it if this would be tabled.

C. Manuel

Can I leave it up to the B.C. delegates. Raise your hands if you are all in agreement with Jimmy's suggestion. Are you in agreement with it Guy?

G. Williams

Yes.

G. Manuel

Is there any B.C. delegates opposed to this. Fine, then I guess its considered tabled now O.K.

H. Cardinal

I just want to make it clear to Mr. LaBillois he feels that there are 28 resolutions that we made. The additional delegates from each province have the right to be included if they wish to do so and claim their seat in the conference under the same conditions as the statements presented by the Alberta delegation. This moved by James Gosnell seconded by Omer Peters and has been carried unanimously.

Fred Plain

I am speaking to the government representatives. Some of our delegates have come a long way, some under extreme hardships due to the air strike and when we arrived here under normal consultation procedures in the past, the government made asking on our behalf our accommodations at reduced prices. Now in this, I think they are staying at Motels, they don't do this, I think that this is their policy. Now, you are allocating to the delegates here \$15.00 a day for expenses. \$11.56 of that goes for sleeping. I have .44 cents left to eat.

J. Chrétien

I don't know the situation. I will ask my people to look into that. I don't know the situation that was in Toronto or in Winnipeg and so we will look into that. But I will call it a mechanical problem.

G. Manuel

I think it is in order to adjourn now if you wish

What time tomorrow - 9:30 tomorrow.

G. Manuel

I'll declare this meeting open. There is an announcement to be made so I will call upon Max Gros-Louis. Max.

Max Gros-Louis

Dans la chambre voisine Chef Max Gros-Louis de la région que l'on connaît habituellement sous le nom de Province de Québec. Micro numéro 13.

Dans la chambre voisine il y a une exposition d'artisanat indien montagnais. Nous invitons tous les délégués à la visiter et aussi ce soir à six heures il y aura une ouverture officielle avec l'honorable ministre Jean Chrétien. On invite tous les délégués à venir visiter cette artisanat comme j'ai dit qui provient de tous les montagnais que le Chef Daniel Vachon représente. Merci.

G. Manuel

Mr. Max Gros-Louis says there is a handicraft show on display in the next room by the Montagnais native people of Quebec and that everybody is invited and welcome to come and look through this exhibit and that there will be an official opening tonight at six p.m. by the Minister and that everybody is invited. Is that right Max?

I'm good interpreter eh en French.

Now I guess we were on the British Columbia policy paper yesterday unless there is any further announcement. I think the British Columbia delegation tabled it for this morning. If there is no further question on that paper it is in order to make a motion to adopt it by this assembly. It's been regularly moved and seconded so it's open for further discussion if you so wish and if there is no discussion.

No. 11.

Don Moses, British Columbia, mic. No. 11.

After talking to many of the delegates across the country there seems to be some problem as to the interpretation of our proposal. If I could just make this one statement clear, and I am sure that the British Columbia delegates agree with me, that

G. Manuel

Ah, Don somebody said that you are not talking loud enough for

Don Moses

Oh, I am sorry. Well if everybody would sit down and be quiet then maybe I could.

As I stated earlier after discussing the British Columbia proposal with delegates from other provinces there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the actual content and meaning of our proposal. If you will check paragraph 2 it specifically states that we give whole-hearted support, we strongly support the position of our brothers from the treaty areas should insist that government at all levels must honour existing treaties and where necessary should renegotiate treaties. I think it is very important that you understand that we support every delegate, every proposal. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel

No. 14.

Andrew Nicholas, New Brunswick

The reason why I made the motion yesterday is that there has been sentiments expressed here, delegations from different provinces saying we in New Brunswick or Quebec should not impose our position with respect to the other delegations from other provinces. So in making the motion yesterday I moved that we accept the

position paper submitted by British Columbia as the British Columbia position.

G. Manuel

No. 6.

Eddy Bellerose, Driftpile

I fully realize and understand the second paragraph of your report. But I have doubts when you're asking the Minister to draft, and this is what you're stating in here on the third paragraph, to revise the Indian Act. I cannot support you in this degree because my people have sent me the wishes that their treaties must be honoured and recognized and then we talk about the revision of the Indian Act. But I will support you through New Brunswick delegates this is going to be on your presentation, we will support it on that behalf, but not as a delegation. No. Because this is enough of this, that everything is done by the government on our behalf. You may not realize it, maybe because you are rich in Vancouver or British Columbia, that our people are in a worse states of poverty conditions in Northern Alberta and I think when we are talking about our treaties we are talking about the rights and aboriginal rights of the people and I am here to represent those people. I cannot see where again it is going to jeopardize their ways of life by government they themselves drafting this revised Indian Act. I would rather see us, us people, like the colleague of Quebec said, we, we are the people here that have to set up this foundation where we stand today as the democratic people of Canada.

G. Manuel

No. 6. No, No. 12.

Chief Andrew Delisle

Generally identified as the province of Quebec. Our stand is the same, we thoroughly support the request of the delegation from British Columbia though

we still must insist that our position is that we discuss and find out who we are first, then we talk about the by-laws and the reason why I mentioned this yesterday is that fourth paragraph where we ask the government to do something for us and maybe it is not clear to everybody but what I would like to see is that we draft together with the government and not let them present us with a paper as they did in 1951. But we become involved. We're sitting here now for three days going on four. We didn't do very much, maybe we should sit here for three months and if we have to do it this is what I am talking about. This is the kind of participation I feel the Indian people should have when we start talking about legislation which is going to effect us. But I still respect the wishes of the delegation of British Columbia. But I would hope that as a group we would take the stand that we become totally involved in the drafting of any laws that effect us.

No. 3.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba

I have one objection to British Columbia wording in the last paragraph of their statement "that it is the best interest of all people from coast to coast". I contend that it is not the best interest of the Manitoba Indians and as a representative of the Manitoba Indian people we too believe that we should have a basic foundation to work from. We have heard it quite clear from our people in Manitoba that the treaty rights, the aboriginal rights, residual rights, human rights of our people come first before any action will be taken with the revision of the Indian Act.

If British Columbia wants to go through we will give them verbal support, but we cannot in good conscience vote in their favour. Thank you.

G. Manuel

No. 16.

Joseph Mathias, Squamish, British Columbia

Mr. Chairman, I think that the delegates assembled here are missing the entire point of our proposal. They are referring to paragraph 4 on Page 1. They specifically pointing out certain words and making it very, very narrow. I believe we explained it right above that paragraph, the last sentence. "We believe that this conference should review the principles, policies and objectives that have been brought forth from consultation meetings across Canada, weigh them, analyse them and give to those that have merit the weight and prestige which this conference carries". What we are actually saying here is, let's review what the bands across Canada have discussed at their own consultation meetings. Let's see what they really want in the Act. Let's discuss them, let's analyse what they want. Then this body here confirm what these bands want we say this is what these bands want, these are the Grass Roots people, let's analyse them, that's our job here today is to confirm what the bands across Canada want, then we prepare these proposals that these bands want, then we say to government this is what the Indians of Canada want you prepare the draft, send it back, we will see what you have done with it, if you haven't included what we wanted you are in trouble because we are going to tear it apart. That's what we are saying. Then on the next page, page 2 last paragraph. "We firmly believe as do the people we represent that it is absolutely essential at this time and at this meeting that the government be advised of the principles we want incorporated in a revised Act". Just to follow up on what I've just said. Also in reference to the last speaker page 3 where he didn't like this "we present this proposal and ask for the support of all delegates earnestly believing it is in the best interests of all our people from coast to coast". If you do not agree with it and if it's in concurrence with the other British Columbia delegations we could omit this paragraph, but we put this in because we found that there was two interests involved, the treaty areas and the non-treaty areas, this is what we thought was the basic fundamental

problem here. The interests are two different things and we thought if we support each other, we are supporting each other's interests. Thank you.

G. Manuel

No. 17.

Chief Bernard Charles here from British Columbia

In support of my colleague, Mr. Mathias, I would like to address a few remarks to this honourable assembly. I would like to make quite clear that I am not here as a leader from British Columbia. I am here as a spokesman from a truly representative conference held in British Columbia and I am here to support the request that they have made. A number of delegates here have expressed the same opinion that they are here under a certain line of reference made by their people in their various provinces and I feel that we cannot, at this time, move away from this position. Our people in British Columbia have given us certain guidelines to follow and we are here to do our best in that respect. We have said that we appreciate the position of the other people across the country and all that we are here to do is to try to make clear our own position as I think our paper, we thought our paper had been quite satisfactory in doing but apparently there is a bit of misunderstanding here as to our position. We feel that as spokesmen from the people of British Columbia we must do all in our power to represent their ideas and they want immediate action in some respects with regards to the present Indian Act and we are prepared to outline these to the assembly if need be. But we can only speak for the people of British Columbia and we would like to make this quite clear that we are just here to represent their idea and we ask for the support and the affirmation of this honourable assembly using the full extent of their wisdom and understanding to take into consideration our requests. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel

No. 11.

Forrest Walkem, British Columbia

It seems Mike that there, we are running into a rift here and it is going to carry on again. Maybe I could give you an idea, the idea may not be very good it's hard to say, take it for what it sounds like, I heard the Honourable Minister mention yesterday when some of the delegates said that they wanted to write the Indian Act. He said that he could see no way where we could write the Indian Act. Maybe we could compromise. It seems that a lot of the people, and I understand their feelings, I'm with them in some of the cases, the 'Choosing of the Path' is not really the answer to a new Indian Act. I can see my fellow friends from the treaty areas, they don't wish to use this as a guideline for their new Indian Act. There are certain things that are first and foremost in their minds. Their treaty rights, our land claims, these are only a few ideas that we can probably put down as a guideline for a new Indian Act. Mineral, fishing, hunting all these things we can put down and put them down on a piece of whatever you might call it. Maybe you want to draft it out as a policy and then let the government give them the ideas and let the government draft an Indian Act and at the same time have the Indians with the same things go back home and draft an Indian Act. Of course, naturally the Indians are going to have to have financial assistance so that he could have the same powers to be able to investigate certain things. He might have to look into the Canadian Constitution, the Provincial Constitution, Human rights he is going to have all these avenues open and in this way I believe it would satisfy the people all across Canada. There will be more fairness in it and the mistrust would then be gone and then you could come back to another assembly like this and put your views the acts that you have written, that the government has written, you could trade them back and forth and hack them out, and this way I do

believe that we might make progress.

G. Manuel

No. 8.

Sam Currie

Chairman, Minister and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am representing Alberta. I have listened for the last three days this meeting we have here in our assembly. I fully agree with all the speakers what they speak about all these three days. We speak about two things. Treaty rights and land claims. Now, we are representing our people from our local area and this is what they ask us to do. We are concerned what they wish. Our people are not concerned about revising the Act, what they want to do is bring our treaty rights be compromised and same with the British Columbia people I'm sure they are the same. They are here today, this is the first step that we make as we are having this national conference. What we should do is all get together and support one another and from time to time we having these problems ever since the treaties were signed and it seems funny to me when I found out these people they're under the Indian Act and they are not treaty and I fully support whatever they ask the Minister. We are asking those things to the Minister and I wish the Minister would bring this up in the Cabinet a report we have been putting up today and I am sure the people will be satisfied and back home, when we go home because everybody looks upon us. They want to find out what's going on in this assembly and I am sure all the delegates from throughout Canada, they have the same feeling. We come up here, we are all united, this is the first time that ever happened and I hope this is not the only time. I want to ask the government to give us assistance to have these meetings from now on and maybe this way there will be better communication between Indian Affairs and the Indian people. In the past we have been neglected, we are victims of Canada. I found that out and I often wish to come down here in person to bring my problems

what my people have been bothered with, and I'm sure all the people here have the same feeling. Thank you.

Frederick Plain, mic. No. 4, Southern Ontario.

I would like again to make clear why I supported the motion presented by Andrew Nicholas. Again I must state that in no way must I bear the responsibility or accept the view from the rest of the delegation whether it be those that have spoken against the document or those who have presented it. I stated that the government must listen to each and every voice that is raised. In my mind this document is the voice of the British Columbia delegation. Now whether I accept what they have written, or what they have said is immaterial at the present. If I were to speak out and say no we must not accept this as a delegation in very real effect we are trying to stifle a voice. They have the right to express their true feelings. Now I don't expect that this delegation as a whole will accept everything that I have said. I would like you to, I would like you very much to say, yes our problem is not legislative it is constitutional. I have very good grounds for that statement. I must also insist that whatever you speak, whatever language you speak in, whether it is the two foreign languages of the country, English and French, or whether it be the true native voice of Canada you have the privilege, you must have the right to speak what you feel in your heart, and I must not endorse what this delegation has presented, but I must say that they have the right and I cannot stand in their way and I must not do anything to try to stifle that voice. I said yesterday I will not be led. I will not be feared I know what my goal is, I know what my aims are and no amount of your persuasion so far has swayed me or turned me in another direction. I feel that the government of Canada represented here by one man at the present and I again very strongly feel that if the Indian Affairs Committee composed of the members of Parliament can travel across the country while the House is in session there is

no reason in the world why they cannot be seated here to listen to us. Right here on Capital Hill. Now, again I must say why I seconded this resolution. These people must be allowed to present their voice, they are going to do it anyway, and I must not take a stand that I would try to stifle them, and I don't expect that they will try to tell me what to say. I believe that we should very quickly come to a conclusion so that we can make good use of the opportunity to ask the one man that is representing the Government and I emphasize that, one man. Later on I am going to ask him expressly what his position is, what his duties are, it's been long accepted by the Indian people what the duties of the Minister are and I am going to ask him expressly state what his duties are. But right now I think that we should, I do not endorse some of the things, I do not accept some of things they are saying, I do not accept some of things that other delegations are saying about the Act. I do not believe there should be a national Indian Act to lump together the different nations of Indians in this country, as one people. Thank you.

G. Manuel

No. 6.

Eddy Bellerose, from Driftpile mic. No. 6.

There is a slight indication here to me from one of the British Columbia delegations and I want to remind you once and for all that during our consultations and every one of the Chiefs of the treaty no. 8 that I have talked to and have elected me to come to this conference and one of the thing they assured me was that they want a real confirmation of their treaty. That they didn't want no part of the Indian Act discussed and I will not discuss it. I am not denying you, I will support your resolution if you want to present it separately fine. This I will do just like as you say to me here that our treaties that you are going to support, but on the other hand you are saying that the government should

be asked and the colleague of British Columbia again that he stated that we have no choice but the Minister should adopt our policies. He knows that the world has changed. There are impossible things being done and in Canada true democracy there is no such a thing that things cannot be done. Today honourable Minister Chrétien one of the possible things can be done, is that we accept our foundations and we revise and tell Canada because we have been neglected so long and tell Canada the people that you represent, with whom half don't understand us people, and once and for all that they understand how we feel, and want our confirmation of our treaties and then we become to belong to Canada because the people I represent, half of them feel that they don't belong to Canada, because the things that were promised to them, things that were said to them by their forefathers have not been kept. This is why your drop-outs of education. Another day here one of my colleagues mentioned about we're creating institutional problems. Loading them up. And our courts in Saskatchewan, in Alberta is full. Ninety eight per cent in the Indian, in Women's institute. Why? Because people are insecure in their own country. One of the things that give them insecurity is that their government does not recognize their treaties, their aboriginal rights. Who in the world today can be God and tell us how we should live, how we should respond. Remember there are birth rights that no one can change, and the birth right was this country where we were born, and we are partly belonged to this country whether you Canadian people like it or not. Just imagine I became Canadian few years ago. Isn't that a shame. When I'm an aboriginal man from this country. I had aboriginal rights before the white man came. My British Columbia delegates I am saying this that we in Alberta have talked - my Chief here about an association have went and spent and the people did not want to talk about the Act. They want and foremost is their treaties recognized, not intend to recognize or will provide mechanism or will design, or will go to the court. This is not what they want. We don't want to go to Supreme Court we want our confirmation from us, and

that confirmation when we draft this to this assembly, to the things that we want and then will happen but not before. But remember this, what I said, there are things happening which called impossible and Canada can adapt a lot of impossible things and one of the possible things that I am talking about is that we can start setting this foundation that will coincide with our neighbourly Canadian society. Right now I sound as if I am in the opposite side of the Canadian society. I sound this way because my people feel this way and I'll have you know that I was a real genuine Canadian ever since the day I was born and I'll have you know that I spent four years in the war fighting for this country and I have suffered a great deal from it. And I have a colleague here that I was in the army with, fought with in the services and we haven't met since then till we started the conference here, and this is when you saying that things cannot be impossible. I don't agree with that. We are ready, as young people of Alberta and our own people are supporting us. Things can be changed to our benefit.

G. Manuel

No. 12.

Chief Delisle from what is generally known as the province of Quebec

I think there is something that can be cleared up fast. Because of the mention in the submission by the British Columbia delegates that we talk about revising the Act now this is what they want to do. The reason why I mentioned the other side, the finding out where we are first, is because I hope the whole delegation takes that stand. I would like to see the whole delegation take that stand. I would like to see us find out who we are. I'm not, we are not against, this submission by the British Columbia delegates, but we want their support. When we ask the Minister in the government to talk about laws effecting us are we going to talk about the by-laws. The Honourable Minister yesterday said answer our questions, tell us what you want in education, housing and welfare and so forth. We can do that. He can get not elected the next time another government will come and the

same guy will come and ask us the same questions. These are the problems that we are talking about. We want to find where we stand. Next year they are going to change the Act again. What guarantees do we have? This is what we want to know before we talk about the by-laws. It is very easy for them, as I say, to sit down and come to the meeting over here and worry about education. They have the whole Indian Affairs Branch there how many people working. Why aren't they out there in the field worrying about our education, or welfare, or housing and so forth? We are coming over here, we should be allowed to tell the Canadian government what we want, where we stand and they should recognize our position. We should have recourse if we don't like something. We should have some place to go and get it screened out whether it's the Supreme Court or not. From past experience you can't go to Supreme Court. What are our rights in the Province of Quebec. They know damn well that we have rights. In 1912 it says that the province of Quebec was supposed to obtain a surrender from the Indians. Where does the federal government stand on it. They should back it up because it says it right in the law. But they don't do anything about it. We have to get on our knees and plead and beg with them and this is the right which they gave us, because we had a right prior to them giving it to us. This is the type of thing we should be talking about. This is what we want. We want to know where we stand and then we will talk about the by-laws. We'll talk about how each band is going to operate a housing program, we'll talk about how each band will operate a dog control by-law, but before we can start talking about the by-laws we got to make a company. Thank you.

G. Manuel

No. 10.

Gus Gottfriedson, Kamloops, British Columbia

I fully agree with former speakers. I agree on what they say, but in paragraph 4

the reason this was suggested was that the British Columbia Indians feel that they ain't got time to draft up this Indian Act. They feel that the government of Canada has got more time than we have to do this sort of job. We feel that this is their duty, this is what they are getting paid for. We ain't getting paid to do these kind of jobs. We're having it keeps us busy to survive in our country. As Alberta delegate was stating a few minutes ago, I agree with him, maybe this could be arranged that a delegation of Indians sit in when this draft is being made, these are proposals can be made. He stated nothing is impossible. I agree with him, but these are the things that we better spell out what we want. And as far as the delegate from Manitoba in regard to the second last paragraph of our submission, we present this proposal and ask for the support of all delegates earnestly believing it is in the best interest of all the people from coast to coast. Would it be right for us to say that it's only in the best interests of the people in British Columbia? We'd be only talking for ourselves. I think the Indian Act is going to be a thing that every Indian across Canada is going to be bound by, and it is up to us to see that we get the things in there that we want.

Speaker Unknown

Are you asking me a question?

G. Gottfriedson

No I ain't asking no question.

Speaker Unknown

If we feel that it is not in the best interests of Manitoba Indians at this time, we feel that a foundation must be built first to create mutual understanding and trust of our people and their government, and we can't in no way back down from that request that has been made by our people.

Wilmer Nadjiwon

Mr. Chairman I believe that speaker is out of order.

G. Manuel

Thank you Mr. Wilmer Nadjiwon for reminding me.

Speaker Unknown

It would seem to me what they are doing right now is that there presently in negotiation with either the Canadian government or the provincial government. It seems to me that what we are asking for or the other delegates are asking for are that our aboriginal rights are recognized first. I think this is the priority we want to take I Let's be logical about the whole thing.

G. Manuel

We'll now adjourn for coffee.

Thursday, May 2, 1969

- 190 -

11.00 a.m.

G. Manuel

Well, I guess we will declare this meeting open and we were on discussion on the B.C. paper which was presented and Peter Kelly made a suggestion that each speaker clarify his interpretation as he discusses the paper and for what reason he opposes it. This was just a suggestion on Peter Kelly's part. Now number 8.

He is finished, I'm sorry. Number 13.

Chief Max Gros-Louis from the region generally known as Quebec.

(Translation - Original given in French)

On the paper that the British Columbia presented to us, we are trying to find out what we want. What we really want is, I think, a sum, or a small amount of money, which the Department of Indian Affairs is already spending to write a draft on the Indian Act. What we want is a bit of that money so that we can do the work ourselves. You very well know that if the federal government makes a draft of the Indian Act, you know that it is difficult to change the ideas of these people and if you go back to try to change their ideas, it would be almost impossible. We can also see in their ideas that they want to get the Indians off the reserves, to assimilate them. I would also like to give an example. You have the big white cranes, birds that are rare or almost extinct. Forgive me if I make a comparison of the Indians with the birds but I think it is necessary. Are we trying now to mix or breed those birds with another kind of birds to try to get rid of them completely? No we protect them. We have a specific law to protect them. What we want is a specific law for the Indians, so that we know where we are going, know they will respect us, know they will protect us and who else better than the Indians could write that law. Thank you.

G. Manuel

So you all understood it. I'll not interpret it. You people are learning French pretty fast. Number 5.

Chief Wilmer Nadjiwon, Union of Ontario Indians, No. 5.

As I listen to the deliberations this morning I feel that the hang-up again has become one of quiet institution. We are attacking it and attacking our deliberation in the same way as the United Nations from different countries. Let us go back to the time when Indians in Canada, although of separate tribes, of separate nations, were all Indian people in one country. Why do we allow these institutions to separate Indian and Indian thinking today. We concur and are unanimous in our approach. This is one thing that has come out. But when we start saying Manitoba and British Columbia and East coast and West coast, then we begin to find differences. We should be saying, as Indian people, that the people where the sun goes down have every right to address this assembly as Indians, and when the people from the East coast speak it should be where the sun comes up and there would be no difference. We are allowing ourselves to be split into groups, into segments where we should be sitting here as Indian people and Indian people alone. That is the one point I wanted to bring. As far as the paper goes I support it. I support that they have the right as Indian people to present a paper to other Indian people in the language, in the statements as they see them to present. I'm not about to tell people that they haven't the right to say a thing in a certain way. I'd be saying we don't always use the same language, English, French or Indian, we don't all have to say it in a different way. But they have very definitely put down those things we have been talking about in priorities. No. 1, and they used wisdom here, is that they support any presentation, not even knowing what these presentations would

be of other delegates. Number 2. They have expressed the priorities that we have been concerned with for the last two days. That aboriginal right is mentioned before Indian Act, and the process that is going to be needed in order to first define our aboriginal right and a base we were talking about and secondly the by-laws I think is immaterial. There is a process to be taken. Now this process I do not, and I think I'm in a little hot water with some of the delegates here. I would like to see an assembly such as this go over the Indian Act and express will all the views contained around and say to the Indian or to the government this is what we want in section which would in effect be our own Indian Act. This is the way we want it documented. But to say let's take it back and disperse it again, there are some points that we would view different on because people come from where the sun goes down and because where people come from where the sun comes up, there will be differences, therefore at that assembly let them put their point across and have them institute it as separate sections in any revised Act.

G. Manuel

Number 4, B.C.

James Gosnell

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak and express my opinion as far as this conference has gone to this point, and speaking on the submission made by our delegation. I've been listening here for the last four days and taking part in it endlessly and I think that we are all saying the same thing in a slightly different way. I think this is what is happening here, we are all saying the same thing in a slightly different way. I think what is in our minds, and this is what is on my mind that the new Indian Act must be based in recognition of our rights, the rights that we

had long before the whiteman got lost and thought he had landed in India. This is what we are saying. We want these rights recognized. Those of us that have treaties and we specifically stated this here. That if it must be renegotiated, then let us renegotiate it. The area in British Columbia with no, where no claims have been made, let's claim them. We had this entire Continent right from the north pole to South America long before the white man came here. This is our land. We have been gipped all the way down the line and now if we fail at this time to go back to our people that we represent, if we fail to stand united, then God help us. That's the reason why I said I was never going to walk out under any circumstances because I could see where am I to go if I walk out, who would I go to, who would help me. I need the help of every delegate here as much as they need mine. The Indian people up to this point have not at any time sat together and make a very desperate attempt to stand united and even if we just accomplish this form of unity at this conference without even touching the Indian Act we have accomplished something. I think we should have it on record, Mr. Chairman, that regardless of our differences in thoughts, but we have got there a number one thing. We are in a war actually at this time. We are fighting the white man. Let's understand that. The white man have got in the way too long now without paying our land. We want our land paid for if he is going to take it in the right way. That's what we are saying. Isn't it? That's why we subject in our submission that we will support the treaty area as much as they support us. But there may be little technicalities here, but let's forget about them, overlook them, I'm prepared to overlook them in any submission for there might be a slight - probably meant in another way, but I understood it to be different. But basically, basically let us understand this much. That we must stand united in this conference and we must be heard, we've

got to be heard. For too long now our people have been neglected right across the country here. Nobody has to tell you that over there is a Reserve maybe that James Gosnell's Reserve, maybe it's so and so's Reserve. Then they tell you, oh they must be Indians. Why? Because look at the conditions we live in. That's the reason why we have got to stand united. And if the government must be told something to this effect let's tell them now. Let's tell them now. The treaty has got nothing in it. Let's see that they have something in it. The areas that are not claimed, let's claim them. We owned the entire continent long time ago. We don't know how far back, our stories as far as history is concerned we were here in our country before the flood we survived the great flood in the history of the world. We have these stories, and no doubt other Indians across the country had this. We've been here a long time and they are trying to tell us oh, you people are not around, you are from Europe some place, they been telling us this. It just is not so. We were here in the ice age, we've got stories about the ice age. The Indian has a story of outer space as well. Where did he get this, where did he go to school to get these things. Because he was here a long time. And yet today you take a look at us, our living conditions. Take a good look at our living conditions, take a good look at our people. This is a damn shame on the part of the government of Canada, the conditions we are in today. That's why I say let's remain united, let it not be said that so and so bust this conference up. Let the government know that we are going to stand united and we are going to get what we want and we want our Indian Act to be built on the rights that we had long before the white man came. Thank you sir.

G. Manuel

Thank you Jimmy that was a very touching speech.

Number 17.

Chief Bernard Charles here from B.C.

I will at this time surrender my mike time to any of the delegates here accepting if they have any questions to ask me as a delegate from B.C. Thank you.

G. Manuel

Number 11.

Don Moses

Mr. Chairman Don Moses here. I was going to say something earlier but Mr. Gosnell elaborated on what I had in mind.

G. Manuel

Number 1.

P. Dubois

I have changed my mind in not speaking on this issue. Now that my mind was changed once I am going to change it another time and I will take the opportunity to speak. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe we all realize that it's a simple matter that we are faced with right now. We in Saskatchewan haven't expressed our opinion in regards to this submission as yet. We realize that there are some parts of this policy statement that B.C. is presenting to the assembly, but I believe it is their submission and we cannot deny them the right to make this submission to this assembly. So therefore on behalf of our delegates of Saskatchewan we would support this submission of the British Columbia delegates and so I say give us the question.

G. Manuel

Are you calling the question?

G. Manuel

A question has been called by Saskatchewan is there any further discussion.

Do you want a clarification on the motion.

Isaac Beaulieu

Accept the British Columbia policy statement as the official presentation of the British Columbia delegation.

G. Manuel

Is that right Mr. Nicholas.

For your information Andrew Nicholas was the mover to this motion.

Andrew Nicholas

I move that we accept the B.C. submission as it now stands as an official submission of British Columbia.

G. Manuel

Could you read it then again.

I. Beaulieu

Accept the British Columbia submission as it now stands as the official presentation of the British Columbia delegation.

G. Manuel

A question has been called. Are you ready for the vote now? I have quite a number of speakers' cards up, is it going to continue into discussion?

Speaker?

One paragraph that concerns this body and that was on page 3 "In the best interests of all our people from coast to coast", I believe there was some concern

about this. We thought we maybe could strike that paragraph off or just put in, strike out "coast to coast" and put in "from B.C." There were some discussion this matter but we haven't come to any decision on it.

G. Manuel

Just strike it out and put B.C. Is all the delegates in favour of British Columbia. I'll allow British Columbia to talk on this because the questions been called from the floor.

Don Moses, British Columbia

I requested the legal adviser from British Columbia that B.C. discuss or that I wanted to discuss it and possibly some of my suggestions might change the proposal and it was decided that we discuss this over lunch. I have, in my opinion, I have some different ideas as to the content of our policy statement. I want some of it changed and I want to discuss some of it with my colleagues from British Columbia before it is passed. I know the question has been called but -

G. Manuel

The only way you can do this, Don, is if you move or table it for further discussion.

Don Moses

Then I would like to move that we table it until after lunch. I want to, I know that some of my colleagues from B.C. are not in agreement with me, but I think for my own interest and for my own conscience I have to discuss this with them first.

G. Manuel

Is there a seconder from British Columbia.

J. Gosnell

I'll second that one.

G. Manuel

James Gosnell seconds this. Are you all in favour? This is the wish of British Columbia to table this and re-discuss. Question has been called. All those in favour raise your hand. All against. Carried. Now I guess there was another motion that was tabled and that was introduced by Mr. Ahenakew was it. Was it your motion? Could we deal with this motion now?

G. Williams

Mr. Chairman, seeing that it is now after 11 o'clock and that there are very important issues to be taken and the motion of our friend of Manitoba is important, would it be at all possible, Mr. Chairman, that we adjourn now and come back at 1 o'clock instead of the usual 2 o'clock?

G. Manuel

What does the Assembly think?

Mona Jacobs, N.W.T.

Could I bring up a new subject. It's just going to take a few minutes.

G. Manuel

Before we adjourn.

G. Williams

I'll turn that motion down if she wants to speak.

Mona Jacobs, Northwest Territories

Before we go into a new discussion I just wanted this to go formally on record that our Regional Advisory Council in the Northwest Territories has rejected the brief that you will find in your report of the consultation meeting. This brief was presented by the Thebacha Association of Fort Smith on behalf of the band and it concerns all Indians in the Northwest Territories and the Regional Advisory Council has rejected this brief because it does not represent the wishes of the people of the Northwest Territories. I just wanted this to go on record.

Fred Plain

I see that the one man delegation or one man representative from the government is constantly in and out. I think that if you check over Hansard and the questions that are raised by the Members of the House in regards to the consultation meetings that were regional, I think that you will find that by and large the views expressed by the Indian people were not made known to the House, but rather vague answers given to specific questions. I think it is most unfair that since we are called to Capital Hill to talk over our rights and ask that we, that we be heard, I think it is most unfair that one man or even two should sit here and have to report back when this committee on Indian Affairs is allowed time out from their positions in the House while it is in session to travel across the country and again I say that this may be very, very good that they should visit the locales of poverty but again while they are all here and we are here I think that we should request that not only the two Ministers be here, but that the committee on Indian Affairs be asked to come and sit and listen to us so that they will not

have to ask in the House and be given just a general outline of what went on.

Thank you.

G. Manuel

Do you want to continue?

Ian Watson, M.P.

Thank you for inviting us. We as a committee were under the impression last week that this meeting was going to be closed. We arranged for you people to meet with our committee this morning and I found out last night that it is not going to be possible. I thank you very much for extending this invitation to committee members. The first invitation to my knowledge that we had from your group, and I agree with you that all committee members should be attending this meeting. It is a very efficient way for Committee members to become more knowledgeable of your feelings on the subject you have been discussing here in the last three or four days. The cross-country visits are going to continue and I would expect that when the Claims Commission is before the committee that we will want to go across the country with this specific object in mind to consult various regional groups and individual groups of your people across Canada. Thanks for the invitation and we have three or four members of the committee here.

G. Manuel

Can you introduce them.

Ian Watson

We have Len Marchand, first Indian Member of Parliament, Member for Kamloops,

Mr. Martin O'Connell, former President of the Indian-Eskimo Association of Toronto and that's all.

G. Manuel

Do you have your card up for a long time Andrew, do you want to say something?

A. Delisle

Yeah I wanted to say something.

Chief Delisle from what is generally known as the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, we've been sitting at the meeting for the past couple of days and I appreciate the comments of all the delegates. I think we did a lot of talking, I think we did a lot of understanding. We got one day and a half to go. I know there is resolutions that you have, there's submissions that various delegates have given or propose to give. From the point, at least, the delegation of Quebec is that you can make all the submissions you want but if we don't start talking about what we are going to do in the future, about our assembly, recalling our delegation again in the future, making our propositions to the government, we are going to sit here for another day and a half. And when we go home we are going to be waiting for the government to call us again some time when, I don't know, I don't know when I'm going to talk to these people, I don't know when I'm going to see you; I see some resolutions or drafts that call for a National Committee to be set up so that we can continue these discussions. Isn't that what we want to do? Well let's get on with the job. You know the Minister is sitting over there, what have we said to him since we have been here? We haven't said very much! We have said a lot and told him about our people and the problems and I am sure he is well aware of these things already. I think the government wants to know what the Indian people want, and what are they going to do. So let's

get on with the job and let's pass the resolution, I don't care who proposes it. We are concerned that when we go back to Caughnawaga that we're going to have to tell the people something. Well if we're concerned that we will have to tell the people something, let's do something. I don't care, if we don't do anything I'll go back and tell the people we didn't do anything. I'm not afraid because we didn't do anything. But I'd like to go back and tell them we done something. Let's do it. Table this submission, table that submission and we come back the next morning we start talking about the same thing over and over again. It's good, I appreciate the comments of all the delegates, but I'm not going to sit back and be afraid to say what I'm saying now because maybe you won't like me, or maybe he doesn't like me, or this guy won't like me, but it's got to be said and I'm saying it. So let's go. If you want that resolution that was drafted up the way it is let's take it. I think it is pretty good. It encompasses the whole area that we are talking about. Maybe it's going to take a day and a half to talk to the Minister and say we want to have another meeting in two weeks time and this time it's going to be for a month instead of just five days. Let's tell the Minister we are going to set up a committee and we are going to get our people lawyers so that they can really understand what they are doing with the laws that are affecting them. If they are going to set up a Claims Commission, they are talking about it. Are we going to wait till they set it up and then will we work on the machinery to make our claims or are we going to get the money now, get our lawyers, get a legal counsel and find out what our rights are, so that when the Commission is formed we will be able to present. This is what we should be talking about. So let's get on with the job. Thank you.

David Ahenakew

Mr. Chairman we have asked the Legal Adviser to comment on the remarks made by the Minister yesterday. This concerns the rights of the Indian people and it concerns specifically a national concern by all of us which is the medicare issue so if I may have that privilege from the delegates here to allow the Legal Adviser of ours to remark on the comments made by the Minister.

G. Manuel

Does this assembly wish to hear the Legal Adviser of the Saskatchewan delegation?

G. Williams

Mr. Chairman in that case we will go to twelve o'clock - forget about the adjournment.

G. Manuel

Well there is a motion also seconder to that.

G. Williams

Well I'm not hungry anymore.

G. Manuel

O.K.

Allen Lueck, microphone 15.

Honourable Minister Chrétien. The Saskatchewan delegation wishes to express their recognition of the sometimes forgotten fact that you personally have held your present office for only one year and that in that year eighteen consultation conferences have been held including this present National Meeting. Without your support, it would be much more difficult for the Indian people to express their

views as they are now doing. However, realizing the very short time you've had to digest the complex problems which exist and which have either been in existence or have developed over the past 100 and more years we could not allow you unequivocal statement that, and I paraphrase, "we fully intend to honour your treaties. It is merely their interpretation which is a problem" to pass unchallenged. I will cite to you one example to show that the government of Canada, through their Indian Affairs Branch are not concerned about true interpretation, but are in fact attempting to use the inarticulate words of a treaty to end an obligation which has existed since 1876, and which was honoured to its fullest in the beginning and for eighty or more years thereafter without question, and only recently has someone in the government, obviously trying to cut down on Indian Affairs spending, come up with the idea this obligation might not be easy to prove in a court of law by the Indians because today all of the actual signatories to the 1876 treaty are dead. I refer to Treaty number 6 and the clause which reads and I quote "that a medicine chest should be kept at the house of each Indian agent for the use and benefit of the Indians at the direction of such agent. In the beginning in 1876 and until the mid 1950's complete medical, hospital and drug bills were paid by the government pursuant to this clause. Recently by verbal agreement with the provincial government of Saskatchewan, apparently a verbal agreement, the terms of which the Indian Affairs personnel in charge of Indian health in Saskatchewan stated under oath, in court, they had neither seen, reduced to writing or heard by word of mouth. They simply knew there was an arrangement between the two governments. This agreement appeared to be that the federal government would not pay any further medical or hospital bills for Indians who had left a reserve and stayed away for 12 months and it gives the provincial

legislature a green light to pass provincial legislation making it a criminal offence for an Indian, off the reserve for twelve months or more, not to buy a Saskatchewan hospital and medical care card, at a cost of \$72.00 per family. The federal government is presently in the process, in Saskatchewan of checking the residence for the past twelve months, of all Saskatchewan Indians and deleting their names from the lists which are used to make out the yearly medical and hospital cards and are systematically sending out notices to these people that they are now responsible for paying their own hospital and medical care and the provincial government is just as diligently bringing criminal charges against these people as the premiums fall due are not paid. Less the Minister be misinformed or uninformed about the complete lack of justice in the above action, let me assure you, that I, as legal counsel on this matter have researched exhaustively the fact, and there is, the facts, I mean, and there is no doubt, the meaning of the word medicine chest were never interpreted, either by the Queen's representatives discussing the treaty in question, or the Indian chiefs who put their names to it as being merely a box full of medicines. But even if that interpretation were placed on those words the position of Indian Affairs cannot be justified because they are denying the obligation to even pay for medicines for Indians off the reserve for twelve months and let me assure you that there is no clause requiring an Indian to reside on the reserve in order to take advantage of his rights. However, there is no basis at all to restrict the meaning of the words "medicine chest". The Indians who live today and have had the history of their rights passed down to them by their parents and grandparents, as is their custom, are absolutely clear on the interpretation placed on these words at the time the treaty was made. It is that the Queen's representatives

required they give up using their tribal medicine man with his bag of medicine, a man who took care of all, and I emphasize all, the medical needs of the people and a man who remains constantly with his patient poulticing, making medicine, administering to the patients needs until he was either cured or he died. This man who was to the Indian, doctor, nurse and druggist, this man they gave up because they were assured he would be replaced by a far superior medicine man with much stronger medicine and patients, and in fact this occurred. Resident doctors were provided on the reserve. Indian hospitals were built and drugs were supplied. All free of cost to the Indian. But, interestingly enough, there never was supplied to the separate reserves a box containing medicines. Except for what we would today probably call a first aid kit, supplied to the agent of each reserve. I'm sure the Honourable Minister will not suggest that the clause in treaty number 6 which means a first aid kit.

Can the Honourable Minister say this is an interpretation problem? Obviously not, it is a political move Ladies and Gentlemen to deprive the Indian of a treaty right. A move made at a very opportune time. As I have said previously, all witnesses to the treaty are dead and very few records are available which are admissible in a court of law to prove the true intent and meaning of the words medicine chest. The Honourable Minister is well aware of the restrictive nature of our courts of law and that many times justice is not done because their rules do not allow them to accept as evidence such as information as hearsay by the Indians who are alive today. It is for reasons such as this that we, the Saskatchewan Indians, do not trust the extended hand of the government. We do not question the integrity of the Honourable Minister. But we wish to make it clear

that there are many areas across Canada who are having exactly the same problem as we are having with the medicine chest clause. The bureaucracy of Indian Affairs is extremely well aware of what is going on in Saskatchewan. I personally know, and have been told by the representatives of Indian Affairs in Regina, that they are phoned on the average of once per week, long distance from Ottawa to find out what progress is being made on the medicine chest case. Everyone is very concerned but the bureaucracy in Ottawa doesn't see fit to reinstate those people who have had their medical cards taken from them. I feel that the Indian people are fortunate to have a Minister of Indian Affairs from Quebec, a French Canadian, who knows what it is like to have people attempt to take his cultural and language rights from him. Because is in fact the French and English problem in Canada that we hear so much about. I suggest that the very same analogy exists between the Indian-White problem. The Indian is being asked to become English, the French do not accept this; they want their cultural rights, they want their language rights, and the claim they are rights under the British North America Act. The Indians are saying exactly the same thing. This example, that I have given to you, it is hoped will clearly show what the Saskatchewan delegation and those who support it in its resolution mean when they say there must be research into the rights of all Indians across the country. Research done by Indians and their legal counsel so that when rights have been ignored or eroded away, can be restored. You as the Minister in Charge will have the onerous task of presenting and defending the revised Indian Act when it is drafted. The Indian people wish to assist you in this matter by compiling in a proper form for the first time in Canadian History, and I emphasize that, for the first time in Canadian history, the aboriginal and treaty rights of Canadian

Indians backed up by proper research and documentation. With the type of information at your disposal that we intend to make available, you will stand a fighting chance of convincing parliament that the revised Act should be passed. Without that assistance, you haven't got a hope of promulgating a meaningful statute which will meet the requirements of the Indian people. That is the submission from the Saskatchewan delegates.

G. Manuel

Could I ask Mr. James Gosnell to introduce a member of Parliament from British Columbia that just came into the assembly.

J. Gosnell

It pleases me, this is James Gosnell speaking, to introduce the member for the Skeena riding in British Columbia. I will introduce him as Chief Weget, better known as the Honourable Frank Howard.

G. Manuel

Now the Minister would like to make a remark in regards to the presentation.

Jean Chrétien

I just want to make a comment, I think that, I'm glad with the presentation of the delegation of Saskatchewan. It's a specific case where they say that they claim that the treaty has not been respected. I don't know all the facts of this. I'm glad you made that submission, I will look into that. One of the problems that I have on that case I am not the one who administered the problem of health. It's my colleague, I'm not trying to pass the buck, it's just to state a fact. You know I'm glad that kind of presentation was put on the table. A specific case where they said that the treaties have not been respected. It's the kind of

approach I like because now, you know, it's specific and I know what you have that in mind. You say that we do not interpret the treaty in the right way so we can look into such a problem and try to find a solution to it. So thank you for your presentation. I cannot make more comment because I am not more aware than that of it and I will look into that then. This is the only comment I can make right now.

G. Manuel

I would like to ask, tell the assembly that there has been requests from some of the delegates here, to have the presentation of Saskatchewan Indians available to every delegate, if the Saskatchewan delegation so permits.

G. Manuel

Is it O.K. with everybody.

Is it O.K. with Saskatchewan. Could you get it up to the Steno and get some copies made immediately.

O.K. number 6.

Eddy Bellerose from Driftpile

I'm referring to Quebec's request that in this National Delegation it will come out and I'm referring to Saskatchewan resolution, that I strongly support that this is where we begin to establish our foundation. It is good to hear such resolutions that are being, not resolutions but presentations that are being made. But I think that as a National body here we still need the very foundation that we need. And I think that fits in with the resolution that was tabled by Saskatchewan yesterday. We'll keep on talking and talking and presenting briefs until

we get so mixed up with all the briefs and then we won't be able to establish something of our own that we can go back and tell our people that there is something that we have done. I believe through this delegation here, this National Committee here, I think we have a very good resolution that's been tabled that we haven't talked about.

G. Manuel

No. 13.

Max Gros-Louis

If you don't mind I'll talk in English. Microphone No. 13. Chief Max Gros-Louis from the Region usually known as the province of Quebec. Just a little comment. I would like to bring to your attention what the Legal Adviser just said. That's what we are looking for. We want some money to make that kind of brief that the lawyer just brought. This is what we want. You really make a good statement. Now the Minister hears something concrete between the Indian when we say yeah that means yes. But between the non-Indian sometime they say yes and that means no. It's true. We have to work with the Indian thinking but with the will of the non-Indian. That's what the Saskatchewan people just did and that's what we want to do in Quebec too. We want some money. We have to pay the legal advisers and the Indian doesn't know how to put that the right way sometime, to make the non-Indian understand what we want. There is a lot of Indians all around Canada are not able to make a brief like this with the means of the non-Indians to get them understand. I think this is one of the main points that we have to go by and that's why we were not against British Columbia present. We were afraid of saying well I think if I'm right when they say Indian Affairs going to make a draft. We're going to make a draft with our own Legal Advisers,

but the Indian Affairs are spending so much money on so many things they should give some money to the Indian group - to the Indian band to have their own Legal Adviser work with them. Thank you.

Guy Williams, British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a short comment. I appreciate the debate that has gone on for a considerable time. I also appreciate the contribution in the debate made towards our submission. Particularly I appreciate the recognition of the areas of Canada where the sun rises, our friends from the Maritimes. I also deeply appreciate the fact that we are the last ones to look at the sun when it sinks into the ocean or behind the mountains of the great British Columbia. I appreciate the fact that the prairie section walk with the sun and they drink the waters that ends up with that that flows into the Atlantic and the Pacific. This is our country. Or this was our country. If we do not accomplish what we had hoped to accomplish or what our people hoped to accomplish when they sent us. I feel confident that we will accomplish one thing before we leave Ottawa, and that is I'm sure we will have unity and this is an accomplishment that we have never accomplished before. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel

It's in order to adjourn now. What time do you want to reconvene. 2 o'clock. Now just before you break I would like Joe Mathias, Ed Bellerose of the Alberta Indian Association, David Courchene and Dave Ahenakew just for a moment. Just for a little while. This assembly stands adjourned until 2 o'clock.

Thursday, May 1, 1969.

2:15 p.m.

G. Manuel: I think everybody is here so we will declare this meeting in session. Excepting our secretary Isaac Beaulieu doesn't seem to be here and I am wondering if Andrew Nicholas would come up here to take minutes until he gets back. Yes.

A. Nicholas: I have a presentation to make and -

G. Manuel: Well, I think British Columbia is going to have first chance.

Does one of the girls want to come up?

Jean Goodwill: Sure.

G. Manuel: It will be only for a few minutes. Unless Isaac got in jail or something.

Mr. Jean Chrétien: Before we start I would just like to reply - to address myself to the mechanical problem raised yesterday. Because of the high cost of living here, someone said that it was only a few cents left for lunch. So I have authorized my Department to pay just for this meeting in Ottawa because of the high cost in Ottawa to give you five more dollars a day. Five dollars each a day.

Speaker Unknown: Is that Treaty?

Mr. Chrétien: What?

Same speaker: Is that treaty?

Mr. Chrétien: I will look into that.

G. Manuel: Well the representative from the Yukon, I think his name is Smith, is it - has the floor. Number.

Elijah Smith: I represent the Union of the Yukon and the organization up there. I have listened to the people on both sides of this assembly - treaties and non-treaties -

G. Manuel: Could you speak out a little louder. We can't hear down here.

Elijah Smith: I have listened for the last three days to both sides - the treaties and non-treaty Indians and I have made a decision on behalf of my people where I have joined hands with the British Columbia Delegation in bringing my opinions on my behalf to bring a better Indian Act that will be better for the benefit and betterment of my people in the North. The present Indian Act as it now stands ignores the Indian people of the North and it is firm contention that being part of Canada there should be provision made into the Indian Act as it is my belief that the whole of the Yukon is an Indian Reserve to provide full protection of our heritage, aboriginal rights under the Human Rights Act. We have been ignored too long in regards to having Indian rights applied in the Yukon. We have our individual problems and it is my wish that I will get support from brother delegates from across Canada in making my plea for equality and a just society - these are the problems we are fighting for. Now we in the North have a barrier too, such as educational, economical in our attempts in getting land grants which we can call our own. We have never had too much representation anywhere and that again, my brother delegates, give us some thought and I ask this historic assemblage here for the support in our quest for justice. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 16.

Joe Mathias: There is a few corrections we have to make in our submission, policy statement on British Columbia. It was our error and we want to correct this that we have neglected to include the name Yukon because he has signed this and we want to stress that it's not just the British Columbia delegation but the British

Columbia delegation and the Yukon representative. On page 1 the first line "British Columbia Indian and Yukon Organizations and Delegates". I would like to make this note of correction. Yes. "British Columbia and Yukon Indian Organizations and delegates". Also on page 3 second or last paragraph "We present this proposal and ask for the support of all delegates earnestly believing it is in the best interests of all our people from British Columbia and Yukon". If you would insert this correction. And a typing error - at the bottom of page 3 where it has Nicholas Prince, it is Nicholas Prince, Prince George Consultation Meeting. And the other typing error is on page 4 - Bernard Charles, Chiliwack Consultation Meeting. Are they, - is this body going to consider the question of the tabling of this thing?

G. Manuel: Did you call a question on it? It has been regularly moved and seconded that this be adopted. No. 14. I can't see your number.

Speaker Unknown: On that motion, Mr. Chairman. On that motion did he ask for the question.

G. Manuel: Yea. He asked for it. The question has been called on the British Columbia delegate Policy paper. All those in favour raise your hand. All those against. Carried. No. 14. Oh. I am sorry. There is one thing I promised to do and I want to call on Wilmer Nadjiwon who had something to present in between.

Wilmer Nadjiwon: I am presenting this paper to the Minister and it's based on the statement made yesterday which I had time to consider and have written out a few of my thoughts concerning them. The Indian delegation here assembled

G. Manuel: Louder.

Wilmer Nadjiwon: The Indian delegation here assembled has stated their provision with wisdom, determination and unity. The Minister has responded with a vague

statement of the desire on the part of the Government to honour and respect, honour the request of the Indians regarding their treaties and aboriginal rights. However, the government has allowed the provinces' jurisdiction over many of the important issues contained in the treaties and aboriginal rights of our people. It is not sufficient that the statement by the Government by the Minister that the Government wishes to honour these treaties, when in effect, these policies allow this honour to be tested daily by the treatment of the Indian hunter and trapper by the provincial Game Conservationist. I submit, sir, that immediate action can be taken to disallow the practice that allows these people the right to take the food out of the pot that the Indian is cooking his meal in. We, at this time do not expect changes in written legislation. However, we can expect that this practice discontinue until such time as these rights are interpreted as you put it - or re-negotiated. I submit, also that similar practices by the Police Forces of Canada also be asked to temper their operations and approaches and they approach their task in a humane way. I will not elaborate on that. Immediate improvement in the field of medical health is not an impossibility. I would further submit that the statement by the Minister that a policy statement would be submitted to Parliament in June is much too big and I would hope that the Minister could clarify to some degree the focal point of this policy statement. I, as an Indian, would hope that the policy statement is not based on a pre-conceived premise but would contain both points submitted by the assembly here seated and so unanimously ratified.

G. Manuel: Are you finished Mr. Wilmer? Thank you Wilmer. Did you want to make a remark on this?

Jean Chrétien: No I can't make a remark on that. I don't know if it will take the form of a resolution from the meeting or not. What I can tell you - perhaps I can take the occasion to clarify some points, I want to make clear that the

statement of policy that I intend to make in June will be a statement of policy. There is some delegates who have asked me "Do you intend to table the new Indian Act?". I don't intend to do so. I intend to present policy paper on the - for the Government to the House of Commons and to you and to the people of Canada, giving the direction in which we will go - not on the problem of the Indian Act but the problem of the treaties, the problem of the land, of the Indians and where we stand on the possibilities to solve the difference that exists between the Federal Government and the Indians on the interpretation of the treaties and so on. It will be a general statement of policy that we will send to all of you and it will cover many of the points that you have raised up to now at this meeting and in the meetings that we have had since nine months across the country. You will receive that policy statement. I hope that it will be as brief as possible. It will be - I don't know - it will take a form of a statement perhaps of 30 or 40 or 50 pages. You will receive it and you will have occasion to study it and there will be consultations - I don't know now in which form - it is possible it is going to be in the same form that we have used before or other forms - I cannot - I don't know exactly. It will depend on - I will discuss that with the National Brotherhood and with the Provincial Brotherhood to know in which form we should discuss that. But it will not be a new Indian Act. It will be the direction in which we want to go for the future of the social, economic and cultural life of the Indian population of Canada. And you will have occasion once more to express your views on all the aspects and it is going to cover this statement that I made yesterday that we intend to respect the treaties and if there is grievance we will tell you in which way we want to solve this grievance in order to make you satisfied that the grievance - you know has been corrected. So it will take probably a form of direct negotiation with those involved and probably if we cannot find agreement it will go to a kind of neutral and independent tribunal quasi-judicial tribunal that will look into that but I cannot tell more than that is

going to be all in the policy statement that I will make in six weeks from now and I will give you opportunity to make your views known about that and from there on we will draft the appropriate legislation and we will make sure that you are consulted at some stage of the procedures.

G. Manuel: This has been a direct. No. 5.

Peter Johnston: In regard to the Minister's address he said that the next round of consultations will be based on negotiation with the National Brotherhood and Provincial Brotherhood. I object very strongly to this, Mr. Minister. I think that the next round of Consultations should be based on the opinion of the delegates that are here assembled.

Mr. Chretien: I didn't say the form. I said that I will listen to your views. I didn't say the form of the next Consultations. I will discuss that if you have some recommendation about it. I am ready to listen. I am not committed to any course. I just said there will be further Consultations but I don't know in which form yet. So if you have to make representation, you know if you want to subject to the Government, the kind, the form of Consultation you would like to have, you know, I will listen to you and if it is - I will look into that and discuss that with my colleagues and hope that you can be - we will find both you and us satisfaction in the way we will proceed.

G. Manuel: No. 14.

Anthony Francis: Mr. Minister, fellow delegates. The stand we are taking on behalf of the New Brunswick Indians is that our treaty and aboriginal rights are of the utmost importance. We feel that there is not much use even in talking about the Indian Act unless our treaty and our aboriginal rights are assured. These rights are the very basis of our being nations with special status within the

Canadian Government. We know through history books and other documents that no sovereign nation can impose their laws upon a conquered nation unless it was done by a treaty, treaty agreement. No nation can take land from Indian nations unless it was done by a treaty based on fair trade. This was never done in New Brunswick. The only treaties that we made were peace and friendship. This is where our hunting and fishing and fowling rights were promised and these are being violated at this time. I will turn the mike over to my colleague, Mr. Nicholas to comment further to this contention.

Andrew Nicholas: When the Minister says "We honour your treaties" for us in New Brunswick this is not a meaningful position. For him to say that this Conference brings to an end the first round of Consultation for the new Indian Act suggests that the Consultation Meetings held in Moncton last July were meaningful for New Brunswick Indians. I want to assure you, Mr. Minister, that they were not. The meetings which our organization, The Union of New Brunswick Indians, held in Moncton on the 12th and 13th of this month we were - we got clear indication from our Board of Directors who are the chiefs of New Brunswick and our executive and members, that they wanted that stressed here by our delegation. The excellent presentation made by the legal representative for the Saskatchewan delegation this morning which visably impressed Mr. Chrétien; the sound voice of Mr. Hugh Conn who articulates so well the area of aboriginal and treaty rights of Indian people. Both of these eloquent submissions reinforces what we, the Indian people of New Brunswick, demand. I repeat -- demand! We demand financial resources to do necessary research to obtain necessary counsel - legal or otherwise to present our realistic and unique position. We must take your answer back to the New Brunswick Indians. We have, we must have definite assurance that these financial resources will be made available to the Malacite and Micmac people of New Brunswick so that our interpretation and our sentiments will be contained in future submissions. I also agree

with Mr. Delisle that we take a very firm grip with our responsibilities as delegates here. We must from here on present a positive position of our Conference and the delegation. Now we solicited Mr. Conn and now he will make reference to some treaties which I say are unique for the New Brunswick Indians.

Speaker Unknown: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. No. 1 microphone here. I just want to endorse that suggestion by our colleague from New Brunswick. In fact I just want to re-echo the words and emphasize the point that our Canadian Government Laws for the Indians is for the birds. The Migratory Birds Convention Act establishes this they have a law that will preserve the birds. They have better laws to preserve the birds than they do than the rights of the Indian people. And I would just like to support my colleague here from New Brunswick to have Mr. Hugh Conn speak on behalf of the treaties.

G. Manuel: No. 4.

Speaker Unknown: I'll give a place to Mr. Conn if you wish.

G. Manuel: Pardon?

Speaker Unknown: I will give my place to Mr. Conn.

G. Manuel: I think that it would be more specific if you make a motion you know, that this be put on the floor. Mr. Conn.

Mr. Conn: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister. Just last week I came back from a rather extended holiday in Florida. I didn't expect to be asked to make a submission to this group. I visualized my role as working behind the scenes giving the best of fatherly advice I could muster up to the various delegates. And the other afternoon I gave a very brief summary of the situation as I saw it starting at the east coast. In other words I tried to take the salient points out of eight

hours of submission on Indian treaties and boil it down to 15 minutes. I would like now then to use by way of illustration, one or two concrete examples which will at the one and the same time illustrate the validity of the Indian request for more search - research and second to speak to your point of interpretation and particularly the point made by Chief Plain that this was a constitution - or is a constitutional issue.

G. Manuel: They can't hear down there.

Mr. Conn: Oh.

G. Manuel: Maybe if you stand up.

Mr. Conn: Well that's fine. As long as they. On the first point - of the treaties in Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces - I know through the studies I was able to conduct that a proclamation in 1761 created a status quo on all of the Atlantic Seaboard including the now province of Nova Scotia which was then the colony of Nova Scotia. Any person who had willfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any land which were owned or claimed by the Indians were ordered to remove themselves forthwith. They were strictly enjoined on pain of His Majesty's displeasure from molesting the Indians on any pretext whatever in their hunting and fishing and fowling. This was to take effect until His Majesty's further pleasure was known. Some of my colleagues still in your department and I find ourselves at a wide divergence of opinion on the point of whether the Royal Proclamation of 1763 did actually apply to the Indians in the Maritimes. I submit, although I wasn't able to convince them of it, that His Majesty's further pleasure as referred to in the Proclamation of 1761 was made known in the Proclamation of 1763. The connection between the two of them was that Anticosti Island and the Magellans were attached to the Province of Nova Scotia in the Proclamation of 1763. How then could it be stated, could it be claimed, that this

Proclamation did not apply to the Maritimes? This, Mr. Minister, is a concrete example of what these people here are telling you. They need research. This has to be documented. This has to be proved to meet the requirement you suggested yesterday afternoon. If you have a valid claim and justifiably you have raised the submission of the attorney from Saskatchewan this morning, that this was a concrete claim reciting chapter and verse and you have something then you could get your teeth in. The New Brunswick people would like the facilities be able to present to you as moderate, as concrete, as solid a case as was presented by the delegates from Saskatchewan this morning. Turning now to the other point of the Constitutional, Legislative because to me they are identical - that situation. Whether the Consitution is as is presently required - the subject of legislation by the Parliament of Great Britain or whether as we anticipate the Parliament of Canada will be able to do it, is to me immaterial. That being the case, Mr. Minister, I am going to cite two cases of Constitutional rights of Indians which have not been fully observed. The first of course I am referring to the Natural Resources Transfer Act of 1930 which have been referred to with amendments to the B.N.A. Act of 1930. These are - if they are amendments to the B.N.A. Act, I submit subject to correction by yourself, sir, and the other attorneys, here sir, they must be constitutional amendments if they are embedded in the B.N.A. Act. In the transfer of the natural resources to the Provinces, Canada recognized and the Provinces agreed, that in these natural resources transfers in transferring the natural resources, there was a definite, you could almost say, lien or encumbrance on the game resources in the form of the Indian treaties. And consequently, a clause was put in these treaties which guaranteed to the Indians the right to hunt and fish and trap at all seasons of the year on all unoccupied Crown or other lands to which they have right of access. Insofar as Provincial laws are concerned, this clause has been upheld to the Supreme Court of Canada. On the other hand when it comes to the application of Federal laws, the Indian rights as embedded in this

constitutional amendment have been defeated at every turn, on the basis that the B.N.A. Act gave the Parliament of Canada the exclusive jurisdiction over Indians and lands reserved for Indians. I don't propose - it is not my function or anybody's function to quarrel with the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada. But of more than passing significance are the obiter dicta which accompany those decisions. The courts, the highest courts in the land, the learned justices of the highest courts in the land, have expressed dissatisfaction with the law as it exists. I am going to quote only one, and this was in the Court of Appeal of the Northwest Territories, later confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada. The obiter dicta there asked this question: "How can we account for this apparent breach of faith for it cannot be described in any other words." Mr. Justice Emmet Hall in writing this decision of the Supreme Court of Canada said that Mr. Justice Johnston has dealt with the issues completely and correctly in both the historical and the legal sense and there is nothing which I can add to what he has written. This, Mr. Minister, requires research, documentation so that when the next round of meetings come along, when the rights are again before the Government of Canada, this will be properly documented not as it is today, as one man's opinion. I would like to make one more inference, reference - and this is in your own province Mr. Minister, when Quebec was extended from the Eastmain River to its present boundaries in 196 there was a definite provision that Quebec would enter into treaties with the Indians on the same terms that had been done in other places, that Quebec would pay the cost. This is a number of years ago, Mr. Minister, and according to the Halsbury Laws of England this became a constitutional right. This is forty years ago and this right has not yet been implemented. In a friendly fashion, Mr. Minister, if I may end on this note, there have been many references here today, I notice Page 4 of the Minutes of the meeting in Manitoba, right on the top, the top 2 paragraphs, the first necessary step is the implementation, the restoration, the maintenance of our fundamental rights. I would like to point out

one more thing before I finish on this. The gentlemen of the fourth estate, and I think you, yourself Mr. Minister, have fallen into this pitfall - refer to this ancient treaties. The last complete treaty, Mr. Minister, was negotiated in the Northwest Territories in 1921 - the Chippewas-Mississaugus treaties where the Indians were compensated for their residual rights after a land surrender were 1923, but more significantly the last adhesion to a treaty took place in Saskatchewan in the 1960's, 1950's, 1956. So these are not ancient treaties. These are not ancient documents. They are valid and subsisting agreements between the Indians of Canada and the Government of Canada in unbroken sequence from the Royal Proclamation of 1763 down to 10 or 15 years ago. In conclusion, Mr. Minister, I'd like to submit this. You must have, in your meeting with the Indians, detected a very strong undercurrent of suspicion, of distrust, and the basis of all these submissions made to you sir, are that until these rights are substantiated, are restored, you and your Government are going to deal with the Indians in an atmosphere of suspicion and mistrust. Thank you.

Jean Chrétien: Can I ask you a question?

Mr. Conn: Yes sir.

Mr. Chretien: I stated yesterday that the Government intends to respect the treaties. You just said that there is some aspect of the treaties that have not been respected and in order to establish confidence between the Indian population and the Government, these treaties have to be respected. Do you suggest that you understand that there is interpretation, if the Indians will claim, who have some claim, perhaps the authority will not recognize. The other solution to solve this difference of opinion - the idea of the mechanism that should be developed to, you know, to make sure that we will have a meaningful discussion and a fair settlement of the differences. Do you have a suggestion to make about it? What is your views? What are your views, excuse me.

Mr. Conn: The only specific point and this is the sorest one with the most of the Indians across Canada is the Migratory Birds Convention Act. This is the sorest point universally across Canada with every Indian. I don't think there is any question at all about this. This has been known to your Department for years - this dissatisfaction with the Indians. No concrete action has been taken. No concrete proposal has been placed before the Indians excepting one which was illegal and where I found myself so widely divergent in opinion, that I had to blow the whistle on my own department - put it in my own words and let's put it this way the gentlemen who were at that meeting, who had the proposal before them are in this room today. The proposal was to amend an Act of Parliament based on an International Treaty by Order in Council. Can it be done? It seems to me - and here again I am going to revert to the obiter dicta of Mr. Justice Johnston in the Sikyea Case. He said he could not believe that in enacting the Migratory Birds Convention Act the Government of Canada intended to abrogate the Indian treaties. He said that this is much more likely a case of the right hand not knowing what the left hand had done. I submit, sir, that the, now the right hand knows what the left has done and it is time to get over on the right side in accordance with the Constitutional guarantee given them in the Natural Resources Transfer Act. Even if you do have to go to the United States and say to them we boobooed in 1916, we did not at that time recognize that we had a prior commitment to the Indians in the form of their treaties. We are now, as of 1965, told by our Supreme Court that we had such a commitment and we now propose to live up to our previous commitment. This is the remedy - I suggest to that one.

Mr. Chrétien: For the other problems - I suppose like the land question. If there is disagreement between the two Governments as the meaning of the treaty - how you will solve it.

Mr. Conn: This is the Provincial Government? Isn't it?

Mr. Chrétien: Or the Federal Government.

Mr. Conn: Yea. This Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Minister is pretty well out of my Province. The whole reason for this assembly is to get the opinion of the Indian delegates. And while I'm on my feet I want to assure you that this pre-occupation with their basic rights on their treaties, did not originate with me. I - this was one of the main problems I faced and I might say also, Mr. Minister, that I undertook the first study of the Indian treaties to be able to convince them that some nebulous arrangement between their great-grandfather and a long dead Queen was for the birds. And I ended up by convincing myself, as you know now, very thoroughly, that they had a case and that it is deserving of very serious consideration and study which basically, sir, is the proposal which is before you today. Provide them with the sinews of war by which they can do such a study and document and present their case in a manner which will reach, be worthy of and receive the most serious consideration.

G. Manuel: No. 4, Fred Plain.

Fred Plain: Mr. Chairman, Frederick Plain, microphone No. 4. I would ask the Chair to allow me to continue after I ask any one of the Counsellors that are here on behalf of their respective Provincial groups, I question, any one of the lawyers, please, what is a treaty of guarantee?

P. Walsh (Solicitor): Give us a half a million dollars and six months and we will tell you.

Fred Plain: . . . and for half a million dollars you tell us nothing.

P. Walsh: Well this is one of the very problems that affected the Manitoba delegation as soon as I was retained some nine months ago to act on their behalf. They said that Mr. Walsh tell us what our rights under the treaties are. As I dug

deeper and deeper into it I realized how much research had to be done and I believe that the motion presented by the delegation from the Province of Saskatchewan is designed to affect that very thing. If the Indian people knew precisely what their rights were, it would be the most minor step to either take their case before the Courts of Canada or the International Courts if they were appraised of the fact that they had a case to take before the International Court and have their rights resolved. Mr. Plain has already told us what Funk and Wagnell says a treaty is, but the problems of sovereignty and treaties and rights under contract are not that simple when we are considering them in the terms of aboriginal rights and dealing with them in the context of the B.N.A. Act. And consequently, we can pinpoint the areas which have to be researched, we can tell you where the problems are, we can let you know the amount of time it will take to deliver up these answers. That's what we can tell you. And the suggestion that has been made in the Saskatchewan Resolution seems to me to be the only logical step. Don't pass the authority and power over to the Government to ask them this question. Answer it for yourselves, and if the resources don't reside within the Indian people, demand the Government that they give you those resources even as a loan which you can deduct from the millions of dollars of claims you'll eventually have against that very Government.

G. Manuel: No. 15.

Fred Plain: Mr. Chairman, I asked if you would allow me to continue after I have my question asked.

G. Manuel: Fine.

Fred Plain: Thank you, sir. You have answered my question in the way that I wanted to hear it. Now I am going to address to the Honourable Minister some very precise questions that are not that difficult that they cannot be answered

in simple, plain language. I was very impressed yesterday afternoon, or this morning rather, with the analogy, the beautiful analogy that my colleague from Quebec drew for us when he referred to the white bird. As I say the analogy was beautiful and incidentally I am interested in how the interpretators interpreted his beautiful phraseology yesterday afternoon. However, Mr. Minister, I sometimes get the impression that I don't even know who I am talking to. I recognize the authority vested in you under the Canadian Constitution. I recognize that if there is an Act of Parliament regarding any specific issue then that Act must of necessity require authority to carry it out. Now we have been under the impression over the years that with the changing Government, if they be changed in political affiliation, then the Ministry of Indian Affairs also changes. I'm going to refer to some very emotion-charged meetings that we have had with the Heads of your Department. In one such instance here in the Centennial Towers in Ottawa one of the Heads of one of your Departments pounded on the table when we suggested that the Indian Act was discriminatory in its very essence - that it violated this piece of legislation that we own - you are continually throwing at us needs revision and I don't care how you revise it or how you change it, if it is still an Act that is - that tells a particular group of people how to live - that Act is discriminatory in its essence. Now, we ask this learned gentlemen, and he is a lawyer, when did our sovereign land become Crown Land? We asked him - you are a lawyer, you are part of this particular division or branch or department - when, when did it become Crown? And when you seek an answer to these things, you automatically - there's a vast repercussion that spread out like when you drop a little pebble into a pond of water the ripples extend and extend to the farthest reaches of each shore. If we had gotten the answer that is basically right we could then begin to move in a way where true autonomy could be exercised - where we would not be hamstrung by interpretations as you put them. This gentleman pounded on the table. He says "I don't care what you say your lands are." He

says "We must accept the interpretation of the Indian Act and this is what we must go by." One of my Councillors pounded on the table right back and he said "OUR lands are sovereign". Recently, in regards to some Indian lands that are being washed away by the heavy overseas of foreign shipping traffic I asked for a meeting. My community is vitally interested in seeking or resolving our situation. I was informed the Minister is very busy but he is, has set up a meeting with one of the Departmental Heads who is in a better position to evaluate and give you some answers. I am not satisfied with talking to the Departmental Head. If I must be satisfied with that, then I'm talking with the infringed system that has kept me, that has kept my people in the deprived and frustrated state that they have found themselves in over the years. If I am to talk to the Minister, I am going to ask you exactly what your functions are, exactly what your duties are as the Minister, as the Cabinet Minister in charge of Indian Affairs. And what does a change in Ministry mean in regards to protective legislation? Max Gros-Louis said yesterday "We need some kind of protection, the same that is afforded to these birds that fly through the air and are rapidly becoming extinct. If I am to ask you now, you ought to be able to tell me in plain simple language who you are, what your position is and what it means for the Indians to talk to you and ask you questions and expect not vague answers but answers that are directed to the point. Not something about policy that is going to be established somewhere in the future - the vague distant future. Your own future as the Minister is not secure. I say that without any reservation, my future as the Chief of my band is not secure. In the next election they can throw me out. So what does it mean then when I'm asking that the Minister as I have understood it now, I want you to clarify this for me, sir.

Mr. Chrétien: I'll tell you that my job is that I have been appointed by the Government of Canada to be the Head of the Indian Affairs Branch, the Indian Affairs

and Northern Development Department and my responsibilities are to administer the Indian Act and all the relative regulations in legislation. And I do that under the name of the Crown of Canada. And if I go tomorrow there will be another man who will come but he will have to interpret the same law and will be obliged to act under the same regulations. And the fact that you have an individual rather than the other one in term of approach you can change, you know you can have an old or young guy and speak French or English but the law is the same. I represent the Crown of Canada for this Department and when you talk to me you talk to the representative of all the population of Canada as far as the Indian Act is concerned. And so I listen to you. And you rose two points. You said that the Indian Act is a discrimination and that you will always object that we have any Act that is directed to a specific groups of people. Is it your intention with, is it exactly what you said when you said that the Indian Act, you know, you would not recognize an Indian Act, if it is going to apply to a certain group of people. It is what you said.

Mr. Fred Plain: Sir, I am leading up to a point. If there is a necessity for an Act there must have been, there must be a reason for the Act then.

Mr. Chrétien: You say that you don't want to have a specific Act for the Indian people of Canada.

Mr. Fred Plain: No, we want as Mr. Gros-Louis said yesterday, we want protection. I, and I say . . .

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, but you say if we have an Indian Act, it is going to be discrimination. But if we have an Act that apply only to the Indian you say to me that that is going to be discrimination.

Mr. Fred Plain: Can we talk now then in the terms of legislative and/or constitutional issues?

Mr. Chrétien: You rose that question and I said that you imply, you said that if we have a new Indian Act or their present Indian Act, it is discrimination, discrimination against the Indian people of Canada and you rose another point that I would like to pick up too. You mention that the Indian lands, not Crown lands, it should be Indian land. So you mean that you don't like that as Minister of the Crown, that I have a certain responsibility towards the lands of the Indians. You would like to have all the authority on the Indian land into the hands of the Indians and not have the federal government to look into that any more. Is this what you imply?

Mr. Fred Plain: If this were so, how would the protection be afforded us? Would it be afforded by

Mr. Chrétien: By yourself.

Mr. Fred Plain: An Act to be changed at any time or would it be afforded in a constitutional?

Mr. Chrétien: You will be like any other citizen. If I had, my father gave me a piece of land, you know I administer that, if I had the choice to sell it or keep it, you know I will be protected by the law of the land. If I am cheated by someone I will have recourses in court, but if not, you know if I sell my lands for 10,000 bucks and I go in a big party with a couple of you in Europe for a couple of years and I have no more money after that, you know, I could not complain about anything. I will have decided myself. I will have had the choice, you know, the liberty to make a choice. So if you want to hand the trusteeship of the Federal Government with your land, I'm ready to look into that.

Mr. Fred Plain: Would you clarify your statement - you are the head of your Department. What does that mean?

Mr. Chrétien: You know. I have been appointed by the Prime Minister of Canada to be the Minister of Indian Affairs and if he asked me tomorrow to go I will go and I, you know, or if my people in my riding decide that I am not a good member any more and it is possible that they will say so because they tell me that I am not enough often if the riding I'm travelling too much around the country because of my Department responsibilities, but you know, I represent the people of Canada today as Head of this Department. When we consider the problem of the Indian Act and the relation between the Federal Government and the Indian people of Canada and legally me or my predecessor or anyone is bound by the regulations and the Indian Act and he has to interpret that, you know, on behalf of the people of Canada. So the fact that you have a Minister rather than the other one is the problem of relations between two individuals or an individual in a group. But legally the situation is still the same. I am exactly in the same position that my predecessors or the Minister of Indian Affairs 10 years ago or 50 years ago. Legally my position is exactly the same. And if the Prime Minister were to, you know, kick me out tomorrow morning you know you will have another one who will be exactly in the same position than I. He will be more pleasant or less pleasant. It is up to you to judge.

Mr. Fred Plain: Let me ask you another question, sir, and then I'll close.

Mr. Chrétien: Yes.

Mr. Fred Plain: I because I know you are a legal advisory, it would be easy to be a good advisory for the Indians because you know all the tricks now.

Mr. Chrétien: Ah. You know I am a lawyer and if you think I, since I work with the Indians people since a year I will be very glad to keep on working with them even if I am no more the Minister.

Mr. Fred Plain: Sir, one more question. In response to some questions in Toronto, you stressed the time element. You stressed the poverty had to be looked after immediately and you directed the solving of these, of these particular areas to revision to the Indian Act. How long, sir, does it take for an Act of Parliament to be revised, amended? When you say the Consultation is going to be these Consultations are going to be taken into consideration, I'm not familiar with all the processes of the making of an Act or revising or the amending of an Act, but I am under the assumption that it takes months and months and months of comprehensive study. Your committees that are set up, your first reading back into comprehensive studies, your second reading, again back to the committees, back to the Cabinet and before the third reading then on to the Senate. Now, I suggest sir, that much of the problem that is faced by the people today needs immediate attention. It is not just the changing of legislation, it is an implementation of services that can tomorrow be exercised with you as the head of the Department authorizing. Now you might say we're limited to our budget. We are asking now that a proportionate part of the monies that are available be extended to the Indian people to itemize and to go through their aboriginal rights. I can't put it in the same phraseology as Mr. Conn did or the lawyers here. But I am saying that this should be a must and that it should be the rights, the aboriginal rights of the people that should be first considered and at the same time I'm asking you sir to implement immediate resolving of housing problems which can be done under the present legislation as it exists. You don't have to wait until the Act is amended if it is ever going to be amended. But these problems can be partially solved or there can be some alleviation beginning immediately, if you are as honest as I believe you are, I have no doubt of your integrity, but I'm talking to you as the Head of the Department of Indian Affairs. There can be a resolving of problems all across the country by an immediate implementation, not just words alone. We listen to a man make statements who as the Head of your Department who made nation wide headlines and yet the same man said the Indian

can't fight his way out of a paper bag. I'm suggesting that this government and you, as a representative head of the particular department involved, acknowledge that we do have basic aboriginal, fundamental, human rights and that these must be first taken into consideration before any kind of legislation is amended or revised. Thank you.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the Saskatchewan delegation introduced a resolution. Now I listen with great interest to the comments made by the delegation here and I'm enjoying it. However, I would like to at this time re-introduce the resolution that was tabled yesterday.

I. Beaulieu: That is the resolution for Saskatchewan. I think everybody has a copy of it. It was moved by David Ahenakew, seconded by Peter Dubois. The resolution, I'll just read it over and then we can carry on the discussion it if the chairman advises me.

The resolution moved by David Ahenakew seconded by Peter Dubois:

1. Be it resolved that a National Committee composed of the representatives of the province or region at this meeting be established to effect the following purposes:
 - (a) investigate the rights including treaty, aboriginal, acquired, residual and human rights of the Indian people of Canada.
 - (b) formulate a draft Indian Act for presentation to this delegation, re-assemble as a whole at the date to be specified and
 - (c) research the rights of Indian people generally with special references to treaty rights, hunting rights, fishing rights and rights to medical, educational, local government services, foreshore riparian rights, forest and timber rights, land mineral and petroleum rights.
2. Be it further resolved that the Regional and Provincial Committees be es-

tablished and authorized to research and investigate the above subject matter as it pertains to and effects their particular areas and submit proposals to the National Committee for its consideration.

3. And be it further resolved that the financial resources for the said investigation be supplied by the Government of Canada, according to the draft budgets prepared by this meeting.

G. Manuel: You heard the resolution what's your pleasure?

No. 4 did you have anything on that?

G. Williams: No I was going to ask a question to the Minister but that has passed.

G. Manuel: You don't wish to ask him?

G. Williams: I cannot, there is another matter on the floor now.

G. Manuel: No. 1.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Ahenakew our chief spokesman for the delegation of Saskatchewan has taken care of the matter that I was going to present to the assembly.

G. Manuel: Just before we carry on there is some people that came in I suppose that might be introduced.

J. Chrétien: There is some members of Parliament that just arrived and if you want to get up and I don't know where they are all but I know that Frank Howard is arrived and Thompson I think. Mr. Simpson is. There is only two now.

G. Manuel: We are all in favour of adjourning for coffee. We have a coffee break. Coffee is ready.

Speaker Unknown: Should we come to order please. I think that we'd need all this time and I think we should get on with the motion. I think that I'll ask that the

motion be adopted. Recognize the motion.

D. Ahenakew: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add to that resolution that is now before us. No. 4. It's a very brief one ladies and gentlemen and I am hoping that you can write it down as I read it. No. 4. Be it further resolved that the Government provide to the several committees any research material they may have at their disposal in order to facilitate research projects.

G. Manuel: You're adding to that

D. Ahenakew: I am adding to the resolution that we are, I hope we are going to be discussing.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman would you move that that be read over again please.

D. Ahenakew: Be it further resolved that the Government provide to the several committees any research material they may have at their disposal in order to facilitate research projects.

G. Manuel: No. 5 did you want to say something?

Peter Johnston: Yes Mr. Chairman, after having given this resolution very considerable thought I must come to the conclusion Mr. Chairman that although I have not been given the authority by the elected people who, by the people who elected me to represent them, I believe in all sincerity, and I want this on record, that I am representing the best interests of my people. I will at this time approve this resolution provided there are certain amendments. Now basically the resolution I agree with. But there are particular amendments I would like to see in this resolution. Now Mr. Chairman one of the things that I object to in this resolution is, the fact that my interpretation of this resolution is, that we are here at this assembly going to appoint the regional committee from this delegation

and the national. Now I may very well be wrong about, but that is the interpretation that I have from this document. I would like clarification from the Saskatchewan delegation on this point and may I have the floor after I have had that clarification?

D. Ahenakew: They are proposing that a national committee be set up proposed of the delegates that are here, it doesn't matter who he picks providing we pick the right people. The regional or the provincial committee will be at the discretion of the provincial people. It is up to them then to set up, if they so desire. As I said the provincial people will set up their own committees. We are in no way suggesting here that this has to be done. We are not imposing anything upon you. As we said that this is a resolution made up by Saskatchewan and we feel that is is going to be acceptable to the delegation here. However, we would welcome very very much any discussion that may follow.

P. Johnston: Thank you my point has been clarified.

Wilmer Nadjiwon: I fully concur with the resolution from Saskatchewan. I feel that it is the base and I like to say that, I'd like to take the tree as an example, it is the tree that we have been looking for and after some pruning which will be the regulations governing this here submission or this resolution, that we can grow from here and I will not make any motion here, but I would hope that if the Minister comes back and we get commitment from him that every two months from now, and if it takes till doomsday, that the committee here assembled, would reassemble and as a continuing process bring here to the attention of the government the findings in each two-month period. That is a suggestion and only a suggest. Many others will come I know. Thank you.

A. Nicholas: Mr. Chairman, I am assuming now that delegation here as a whole has adopted this resolution and going into the nuts and bolts. It has been passed.

O.K.

G. Manuel: No. 4.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I am, at the present, I am in agreement in principle with the preamble of number 1. I would like to say, though that the strength of the British Columbia delegation lies within their provincial organizations that they represent, and I would like to see somehow if provincial organizations be inserted here or provincial organizations. You have our province, or region, or provincial organization.

G. Manuel: Anyone else? No. 4.

Raymond Bruyere: The way I understand this now is this not then three committees. Regional, provincial and the national committee.

Peter Kelly: I think the specific point here is I don't think the Saskatchewan delegating have authority to select a representative from Northwestern Ontario.

Allen Lueck: Could I just make that clear. This was set up in this manner saying it is further resolved that regional and provincial committees be established and authorized and it could be changed to or provincial and I think it would probably be better to be or provincial because we did not wish to, and as Mr. Kelly points out we have no authority to direct what each province should do. But hopefully each province will have one provincial organization and not be fragmented into groups or regions. However if the feeling is very strong in some of the large provinces that they should have regions represented rather than one provincial organization, then possible this delegation should give thought to that but very, very hopefully it would be that each province and possible even the three maritime provinces, or the four Maritime provinces would want to join together and have one organization to represent them. I have no idea whether they would want to do that or not, and certainly on a provincial basis they would have every right to have

their own organization. So that there are just going to be, according to the resolution there will be a national committee set up from this group of delegates with hopefully one member from each region or province as the case may be and then each province or region will go back and organize their own area if it is not now organized. Saskatchewan has no problem in this area because we have the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians who represent the entire province. I think I'm right there, I looked over at Pierre because I think there is an urban Indian organization as well. But that in effect is the set up. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel: No. 5.

Peter Johnston: I am not at this time saying from what part of Ontario I am from. However, I would like to make it very specifically known and on record at this time that I am from the Northeastern part of Ontario and I represent an area, a geographical area, taking in the Eastern shore of Lake Superior almost to the Quebec boarder, up to James Bay and Hudson Bay. So I have a huge area to represent here. Now this is one of the reasons why I want my region represented in any committee that may be set up under this resolution, regional committee. And this is basically what I am opposing this resolution. Only on that ground. I believe Mr. Chairman that there are people in my area, not saying that I am one of them, who are better able to represent that particular area than a provincial organization or committee, because of the geographical area.

G. Manuel: No. 4.

R. Bruyere: My colleague here has expressed my very thought also. We don't want in any way, shape or form for Northwestern Ontario to be left out. We still want to have our voice in these meetings.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, Honourable Minister, in reply to Mr. Johnston's

question over there, I believe the first part of this resolution was, will answer his questions. We stated region, now we haven't established as to what regions, as yet, but I think this is a minor detail that could be ironed out when the committee is set up.

A. Lueck: He's saying he wants a delegate on the Committee - it can't be set up unless he has a member on it.

Speaker Unknown: I think that whatever committee is set up, I think they are all aware that we all have something to say, and I think we all know what we want and I think this question has dragged on and we should try and do something. We have lost a lot of time and I would ask the question. Is there, or

Speaker Unknown: Before you bring this into a question one of the reasons why we want to talk this a little further is the fact there are certain provinces here who have brought in their legal counsel. I'd like to point out to you that Northwestern Ontario made a request to the Assistant to the Minister and we were told that \$2,000 was made available to the National Indian Brotherhood for this purpose and to prevent this thing from recurring again any money now has to be assigned for a particular region, we want that money in Northwestern Ontario as well. Also we don't feel in concurrence with Mr. Johnston's statement, we don't feel in Northwestern Ontario that anybody from the East or the South is going to be able to represent treaty number 3. We feel that we know that situation as good as anybody else.

G. Manuel: Anyone else?

The question now, are you all want to vote on this motion? Let's make a good clean . . . O.K. thank you. All in favour. Contrary, motion carried.

No. 5.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, just off the record, seeing that the motion has already been passed I would just want a clarification here, on number 3 if I am not out of order. I want to know when the draft budget is going to be prepared.

D. Ahenakew: We hope right now, if possible.

G. Manuel: Does that answer your question?

Speaker Unknown: I'll say once more that it's up to the provinces or to the regions to establish these committees, it's up to them, how they do it, we don't care. We have our method and I'm sure you will find a method in solving this regional problem and it's up to you, you know the situation best and for that reason no one else can tell you.

G. Manuel: There is a request here. There is one member wants to be excused for a short time. I don't know his name, but he is from Alberta anyway. Was it you? Where are you from then? Did you want to be excused? My mistake it's the secretary. It was the secretary that asked. No. 12.

Chef Max Gros-Louis de la region communément appelée Province de Québec.

Micro numéro 13

J'aimerais aussi donner un message aux journalistes. Je vois un papier ici qui dit si les chefs des bandes indiennes du Québec sont vraiment au nom de leurs frères. J'aimerais aussi à vous dire que les délégués de la Province de Québec ont été élus par 42 chefs de bande et nous parlons vraiment au nom des indiens de la région communément appelée Québec. Une autre chose ici on parle du chef Daniel Vachon qui dit qui voterait aux élections provinciales si on nous donnait le droit d'avoir un député. J'ai demandé au chef Vachon si c'était vrai, c'est faux. Alors je me demande pourquoi on fait des commentaires qui laissent des doutes parmi le public qu'on n'a pas le droit de venir parler au nom

des indiens ici. Si on a écrit quelque chose au nom des indiens de la supposée Province de Québec je ne veux pas voir mon nom, le chef Vachon ne veut pas voir son nom, le chef Delisle non plus et le chef McKenzie non plus sans qu'on ait vérifié ce qu'ils vont écrire. Merci.

G. Manuel: I'll have to ask the secretary to explain that, or did you all get that. I have no

J. Chrétien: Well I can translate, but I'm not very good at that, but Mr. Gros-Louis is wanted to say that he is not too happy with the first report that created the impression that you do not represent, or the other chiefs of Quebec do not represent the people and he said they have been appointed the four of them, Mr. McKenzie, Mr. Delisle, Mr. Vachon and Mr. Gros-Louis, by the forty-two Chiefs of the different bands in Quebec and he says that he wanted to put the record in good shape about it. I think that he did that quite well. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 12.

A. Delisle: From what is generally known as the Province of Quebec. Now that we have this resolution passed and I know there will be some questions on it, I think we should get on with the business of this meeting, I think that the Minister is here we should make specific demands. For instance we should talk about where we are going to have an office in Ottawa, to have people permanently or continuously working on this Indian Act or whatever it is revisions or amendments or legislation and then go back to our various regions for instance, draft up budgets as what would be required to consult with the people. Whether we take the suggestion of Chief Nadjiwon that every two months we should meet this group here and this type of thing I think which could be made immediately to the Minister so that we can get this thing on the road. There is a question there of material that has, for instance, Number 4. The federal government supply material

and I wonder if, for instance, this group could be supplied material that maybe the government has already drafted amongst, or within it's own jurisdiction.

J. Chrétien: On the drafting of any Indian Act I told you and I said so in the House of Commons that there is absolutely no draft being started yet on the Indian Act. I told you we will make a policy statement and we have not started to draft an Act before we know this policy on which this Act will be based, so there is no such a thing as a draft of an Indian Act. As far as the requests of facilities and so on I said and I repeat it here, is that the federal government has in the last year decided to help financially the provincial organizations and the National Brotherhood and we have done so. I have received requests by different provincial groups and the National Group to make more funds available. I'm working on a formula now and I don't know when it's going to be ready. I will, and this, you know, will be that fund that the money that the federal government will make at the disposal of the different Brotherhoods and from thereon you will decide yourself what you will do with it. If you want to have special committees, you know, it's going to be yourself who will set these priorities. I don't want to interfere with any kind of your business. It is your association and you made requests to my department for help and I will do everything I can to help you on this account. But, as far as your internal organization is concerned it's up to you to decide.

David Ahenakew: The fourth paragraph of that resolution is directed to the Minister for information only. Now, this money the Minister was

A. Lueck: He hasn't got that so you had better read it to him.

David Ahenakew: Yes, maybe I will read that to you Mr. Minister. The fourth part of the resolution.

J. Chrétien: I have a copy.

D. Ahenakew: You have, oh good. However, I would like to ask the Minister if he approves or disapproves of the financing of this project as suggested by this resolution. We are now asking for a firm commitment on the financing of this research we are talking about. If you can't do this, here and now, I am suggesting that it is useless to carry on with the formulation of these committees or committee until such time we get this firm commitment about the financing of the, of this research we want to do. Further to this I might say that I'm just wondering whether the Minister was inferring that the money that the National Indian Brotherhood has asked for for the Provincial Organizations is for the maintenance and operation of the Provincial Organization as it exists now. This money that I think that he's talking about is not what we are speaking about in this resolution. The resolution is a separate thing altogether.

Speaker Unknown: You mean the general sum this \$2,000 is this the one you're referring to?

J. Chrétien: It was a specific request we received and We've made that amount of money available to the National Brotherhood too, they said that they needed some before it was on interim basis. Because we have not worked on the formula of the money that will be available to the provincial organization and the national organization. We will make some money available under certain formula that has not been approved yet by the government. We will give a certain amount of money to the provincial organization and the federal organization. What you will do with the money is going to be up to the provincial organization and the national organization. These questions of legal aid or you know advisers and so on is an argument that has been put to me before this meeting. It is not the first time I hear about it. And it was one of the

questions that was raised in the discussion I had in December for example, when the National Brotherhood had a meeting in Ottawa. It was one of the questions raised at that time that they need some legal advise and so on. Whenever I went to some Provinces the people talked to me about it and in the formula that I would like, that I am presenting to my colleagues now, now that you have the Indian Association, you know, it's to cover all these aspects. So it's not, you know, for me to decide the priorities of your organization. It's going to be for you to decide which are your priorities in term of the budgets you have, because you do not receive fund only from the Federal Government and you have from the Provincial Organizations and perhaps you can collect some funds yourself. I know that there is some associations of Indians in Canada who make a point that they will never accept any money from the Federal Government. So, you know, it's, it's not exactly the same situation everywhere and it's why I have to work out a formula to make sure that we help you to maintain these organizations but I don't want to be put in a position that the people will accuse us to set the priorities for you in your own organization. So we turn a certain amount of money to you and you have access, I think that some Provincial Government help some association, I'm not sure if all the Provincial Government helps, and there is other organization too in Canada who provide your association with funds and from there on you decide what you want to do with it.

No. 12

A. Delisle: Province of Quebec. What is generally known as the Province of Quebec, which doesn't help Indians. We are talking about financing and I think I will back up the delegate from Saskatchewan. Even though Provincial Organizations would get money and in most cases we are committed with any funds that we have and we would be talking about funds, for instance, of reconvening this group at a future date selected by this group. And at present we are unable to operate

unless through the good wishes of your government, they say O.K. you can have the meeting now or you can't have the meeting now, and we want to be flexible enough, we want to say O.K. I will go along with what you people want, we will finance your meetings. We want to be able to think in this term. That I can sit over here and say to the delegates from Ontario, I propose that we meet in two months time without having to be concerned about financing this meeting. This is what we want to ask you today. And I think this is what the delegates from Saskatchewan

J. Chrétien: I cannot tell you how much money there will be available to the different Associations. You know why, because it has not been approved by my colleagues yet. You will know when it will come public and after that you will certainly

A. Delisle: It's this group we are talking about. It's this group, it's not the Provincial Association. For instance if you give my association in the Province, what is generally known as the Province of Quebec, I'd probably spend more time fighting with the province and not having time to work with my people and this is what is exactly happening now you know. So that money is committed. I can't take any money out of my budget to donate to this organization to come and meet over here.

J. Chrétien: So you say this organization is different, but what you forget here today in my judgement is that you have been delegated, you know, at the consultations that you have had in all your provinces to come in Ottawa for the final round of discussion or consultation, you know, the first round of consultation - you have been delegated to come here for that specific meeting. And, the way that it was put to the people, you had been delegated from your people to come to this meeting as the result of the first round of consultation. But, you

know it's the way that the question was put, we committed ourself, we said to the consultation, send delegates in Ottawa to have a final meeting with you before we come up with new policies. It was for that specific reason, but I know that when I look around it's, there is not a big difference between you who are here and those who come when it's officially for the representing your local association. But this meeting was called by us as the last meeting of the first round of consultation and you have been delegated by your people to come here. So if we start a second round of consultation of the same nature that the one we had and we decided that the end of these consultation there is another meeting of the representative of these consultations, perhaps you people would send you here or send other people here. But I tell you that if you want as Indian people to work together, I welcome it. It's why I organized these meetings. It's the second meeting that I took the initiative to invite you to come in Ottawa. One in December and this one. But it was for that purpose. Now what I say to you, I will give money to your different associations and they will establish the priorities they want. It's up to you, it's not up to me. If I call another series of consultation in the same form, probably it will end by the same kind of meeting. But it is the situation, so I just want to tell you that I am ready to provide funds to your provincial associations. It is the only way for me to deal collectively with you.

A. Delisle: Excuse me Mr. Minister. The previous round of consultations is what we are meeting here for, you know this is sort of an end. And this is what we are telling you. What you did wrong in the past is that you didn't provide us with a legal advise that we needed, independent legal advise. You didn't provide us with enough finances to go around and really talk to the Indian people. And you didn't provide us with the finances really except at your decision to call a meeting. Say April 28 - May 2. We didn't decide that. You decided that.

Now we're telling you we want it to work the other way. We want the finances to be able to get our Legal counsel independent. We to have the finances to convene this meeting. This is what we are telling you.

J. Chrétien: Yes, but are you speaking here in a different capacity. Are you speaking as the president of the Indian Brotherhood of Quebec or as a delegate.

A. Delisle: As a delegate who has passed this resolution.

J. Chrétien: Yes but what is your relation in the future with your Association. Are you telling me that I should not recognize the Provincial Association or the National Association or not?

A. Delisle: I'm not telling you that.

J. Chretien: Yes, but you know, I have to work on it in a frame work and I tell you that at the end of these meetings you know, the Associations are still in existence and I hope that they will still be in existence after the end of this meeting, that will be the end of this meeting. But after, I said that I will be in touch, when I will make my policy with the different associations and we will receive the form of the next consultation. But I am committed to more consultation and I think that is a wise thing to do.

A. Delisle: I think we are going into associations, this is not what we are talking about, I think we, you are referring too much to Associations. Why not refer to each individual chief.

J. Chrétien: I have to choose to deal with Associations or recognize the Associations or not recognize the association. Do you suggest to me that I do not recognize the Association?

H. Cardinal: I think that there are too many points of views being thrown in

here. I suggest that when the federal government decided to implement the B & B Commission it did not cut funds from Quebec, the Province of Quebec, the types of help that it was receiving or giving to the province. I would further suggest that the Minister have a look at the resolution that has been passed to find out what the form or shape of the next round of consultation will be and what the ideas behind these are. We are not talking about our organizations here or the budget. You say that you are going to give us funds but not set up priorities for us. But at the same time by trying to mix these budgets up with the special project of consultation that we are talking about, you are trying to tell us this is how we should use our funds. It is no good if our funds are committed and our budget is set, and how we are going to use our funds that we receive from other departments of the federal government. And we were not prepared and we are not prepared to use that budget for this purpose. We are asking your government for a definite commitment now. That special funds for a special project on the consultation be set aside under the control of the National Committee that we propose here for this specific purpose of consultation as outlined under our resolution.

Ed Bellerose: Saying that we are delegated in Alberta, we are elected - we are elected to come here under our treaties. We are elected in democracy fashioned by those Chiefs in the area that we represent.

G. Manuel: No. 5.

Chief Nadjiwon: I believe, Mr. Minister that the message coming through, and I fully support Mr. Cardinal's resumé, that again it is based on a preconceived, the money which you now have committed yourself to the provincial organization. So you have committed yourself to something that you weren't aware of till today. Neither was any delegate here aware of it today. So then we had no pro -

vision. There could have been no previous provision for this type of a request. Earlier you questioned very closely, Mr. Conn. Alright you know what we want. What is the vehicle by which we settle these problems. The vehicle is being presented and your objecting strenuously.

J. Chrétien: I'm not objecting - to tell you that I want to clarify the situation. I say to you that in fact when you came here in December and you know, I will agree that in a different capacity you made representation to me. You said, you know, we are coming to these consultations and we have to look into the problem of what the new Indian Act will mean to us and the same kind of argument you have used as the problem you face. We want to have the facilities to look into that. It was the meaning of the National Brotherhood of Canada, the Indian Brotherhood and after the representation I said that I would like to, I think that you have a case for, you should receive more help from us to do that. Now today you say that you are forming a different association.

Speaker Unknown: No, not at all. You are mentioning that somebody came here in December. Who came specifically in December?

J. Chrétien: It was a meeting of the National Brotherhood of Canada. We invited a representative from all the provincial Brotherhood to be here at the meeting in December. It was a meeting of a week and there were representative of all of Canada. Many who are here today were here at the last meeting in December. So now you say that you want to establish a different thing than that and you say you want more funds for it.

H. Cardinal: There are two separate things that are being talked about. The monies that were requested in December by the various organizations is for their administration and operation, the monies that are being talked about here are to be specifically used for the consultation process.

J. Chrétien: By who. By the Indian Brotherhood or by

Speaker Unknown: There has been a resolution passed to that effect.

J. Chrétien: I will study that resolution but you know, now you tell me that I have not to deal about that problem with the Brotherhood, or the provincial association.

D. Courchene: I wonder if I could clarify, or help some of the things that have happened as Vice-President of the National Organization. The intent of the National Organization was to try and organize ourselves on the national level with no intent of forcing organizations to be part of the National Organization unless they so wish. This was the intent of asking for funds from the federal government. Although Mr. Dieter is not here I'm sure he could clarify much better than I could, some of the things that Walter has been doing, and there is going to be a lot more funds needed as far as organizational work is concerned, the office set up and so forth. But, in this present issue that we have on the floor I think is directed entirely to this delegation and there is a special project, as a special project where research for some of the various misunderstandings, misconceptions that has been brought out to the floor. If we recognize it as a special project then we are certainly requesting for a special funding of that project, rather than our National Organization. Because we need funds for our National Organization as well, as well as our provincial organization. Until such time as we can find other resources as our communities develop and as we get other commitments from other areas, rather than the federal government. I hope there is no misunderstanding here. I think this was stated in the first part of our session, that this was a national delegation of representatives as chosen by the people in the consultation meetings. And we have erred ourselves in the first portion, now we have corrected this and I think we are

falling back into the same situation and I hope the Minister understands this clearly. That this is a special project needing special funds, other than our National Organization or Provincial Organizations.

G. Manuel: No. 4.

Frederick Plain: Minister of Indian Affairs, you have been quoted as saying this is the Indians' meeting. In your initial speech to this delegation, this is your meeting. We have stated that we wanted you to hear us. You have heard us. I have a paper here that shows expenditures made by public relations committees or companies and in, on one of the letters written, that the public may know what is going on between the Indian Affairs and the Indian people, it states that Mr., the Minister gave a first class response to Fred Plain's retort. May I suggest conversely sir that this delegation, by this resolution, after due deliberation has come up with a proposal for our betterment, and that we have presented you with a first class presentation and you in return are relying on rhetoric, you are saying in effect out of one side of your mouth, you are saying this is your meeting. So in our meeting we, this delegation, have formulated and agreed to this proposal, this method continuing the effort to seek a complete solving of our problems. Now you are saying we arranged this and this is the end of it. Now you are telling us, really we are not in a position. You are saying who are you delegates? Who are you? We are every one of us the elected representative of our area and we have stated very clearly that we want you to recognize what we have said and this you are not doing, Sir.

J. Chrétien: Now on this question of public relation things that you mention I have nothing to do with it. It's true that we have spent some money for public relation and I will not apologize to anyone for that. I've said so in the House of Commons, because I felt that it was important to make sure that the public of

Canada was aware of the different consultations and we made sure through these expenditures that the press and the T.V. and the people who were there, and it was not to hide anything. It was to permit you people to have what you had to say in the press and in the public, and I am very happy that I have succeeded in doing so because since we have started this consultation never in Canada you have heard as much as you have in the last nine months about the Indians of Canada, I made sure that the public was aware and we, it's true that we spent a bit of money to make sure that it was to work that way. And it was to put your case into the public mind, and we have succeeded to do that, so it's just to clarify this question, I said so before in the House of Commons and I'm not shy to make sure that the public of Canada is aware of what's going on here. And for the second point, you come with the completely new proposal to me, you say that now this meeting we have been elected to come in Ottawa for the last meeting of the consultation. Now you say to me, in fact we want to keep the meeting and we want to be for the future the people with who you will deal with. In the same form and shape. It is not what was submitted to the people at the different meetings. So, and you say that it is a completely different ball game than with the National Brotherhood and the Provincial Brotherhood. So either I have to make up my mind and you too, about these relations between the government and the Indian people of Canada. You have formed provincial associations, you have formed a National Association. You came and asked me to recognize them. You have come to the government and you have said to us in December we need some fund to establish some offices to have the expertise we need to make our operation work, to do the research and so on and we are preparing a formula to help you do that. I don't think that the money that the government will give you will cover all the expenses. I don't think that, you know, it is and now you say you want a different association or a different set-up for the consultation.

H. Cardinal: A point of clarification, Mr. Chairman. Throughout the consultation meetings if you have been reading the minutes and even at this session we have always been told, or we came here with the understanding that this was a preliminary conference, not the last meeting.

A. Delisle: We want to run our own consultation and then we will come back and say this is what the Indian people want.

G. Manuel: Could I just interrupt here, it seems to me what I have been hearing from the delegates is they want Indian people from hereon in to handle the consultation, the second round of consultation and that they want the money to provide it to carry out these consultations. Just a point of clarification.

Speaker Unknown: If I might add a further clarification to what has already been said because I was at the meeting of the National Indian Brotherhood in December. It appears that the question is boiling down to who speaks for the Indian people. In December the National Indian Brotherhood had a meeting and it represented to the Minister, certain grievances of the Indian people and asked for certain funds to help solve those grievances. The Minister says to us today, with whom am I dealing, yet the responsibility for this meeting is the Minister's. When he called consultation meetings he didn't go through the National Association he dealt with the people directly and as a result of dealing with the people directly he has assembled all of us here today and now he wants to disassemble this meeting and continue to deal with the National Association. The National Association doesn't at present include Quebec and doesn't necessarily have the unqualified support of all the Indians of Canada. It would appear that by the Minister's own initiative he has created a parallel organization right here today by calling representatives directly from the meetings. Now it seems to me that to turn around now and say I want to deal through your National or Provincial

Associations is to take a completely different tact to the one he has used to derive for himself what the feelings of the Indian people are. He could have chosen to deal with the National Association all the way through but he has not done that. He has decided to deal with the Indian people directly at consultation meetings by calling meetings of the various bands and different groups. Now as a result of his having done that he has produced a body here today more truly representative of the Indians of Canada than any particular association. This body has decided that for the sole purpose, the unique purpose, the one purpose of articulating of presenting Indian claims concerning rights and treaty rights and its position concerning the Indian Act that it wishes to perpetuate itself and conduct research and that is precisely what the Minister has invited us to do. He has called us here together for precisely that purpose and now I can't understand why he should be astonished or surprised that this meeting wants to carry on the very purpose for which he has invited us together. The very purpose is to find out what the people he has called upon, he invited us here, he invited you here by asking you to choose representatives in your larger meetings. Now the fact that we say that we don't have enough answers yet, give us more time. How can he be surprised when he says why should I give you the time and the money why not the National Brotherhood. Because you invited us here Sir. You asked this particular group to make its determination and when it does it shouldn't surprise you.

Jean Chrétien: I will repeat here, you know, we will proceed with this establishing of the new policy and I said that there would be further consultation. What you are asking me in fact is that you want me after the policy statement that I will make to keep on dealing with you as such and not revert to the position that was planned. You know, I said all the time it is going to be a first run of consultation. At the end of this consultation we will produce a new policy and we will

see and there will be another round of consultation. When I was in Kelowna or Quebec or when I was in Manitoba I said that there will be another run of consultation here after in this so we can produce the legislation. Now to me that it's no, we will keep the assembly that we have here in the same form and you will deal with us in the future. So I will study that proposition it's not what it was said at the meeting, you are making a representation to me that is completely different.

My view was and I am very frank about it, my view was that I will help these associations to get organized and the same kind of argument about research about legal aid, legal advisers and so on were put to me in December for the different Brotherhoods. Because you said to me, we have problems with our treaties, we have problems with these consultations and so on. Now you say it is a completely different affair so if I have to give some funds or talk to the government to give funds or to help to this meeting for the purpose of looking into the treaties and into the new Indian Act and so on. You know, I will not put another set of funds for exactly the same purpose into the hands of the different Brotherhood, because we cannot have the same work done at two levels. It is up to you if you tell me today that's it and I will look into that and I will consult with the Provincial Associations and the National Association.

H. Cardinal: Mr. Minister is that a veiled threat to our organizations that if we do not come here to answer the 34 questions our sources of funds will be cut off from our organizations to operate.

Jean Chrétien: I don't make any threats about it I said I am ready to make some funds available for this purpose as you have asked me in December. Now you say to me today give it to that very association that is in Ottawa today and you

tell me it is different from the National Association and Provincial Association and so I will look into that and I will not duplicate the resources.

G. Manuel: No. 13.

Chief Max Gros-Louis: Mr. Minister, I think the request that we are presently doing is necessary. Why are we doing it? It is because when we did some regional consultations we found out that the consultations have not been profound enough. There were some Indians that didn't understand. There was some delegates that came from each band where I assist to all meetings and I also can tell on my own power. We found out that the Indians didn't clearly understand and that we shall go in every band to explain and hope to report exactly what they wish. That is why we have to get the approval of all the Indians of every band and also have with us somebody that knows the Canadian Law as I said a while ago, the Indians say yes it means yes, some other times the non-Indians say yes it means no. We should have some legal advisers that know how to say yes that means no and no they mean yes from time to time. But to make this, it is impossible between us the provinces, associations or the regions. We have no money to do it and what we want we want to deepen a bit more and really have what the Indians wish in the Indian Act.

Jean Chrétien: Listen, I am for that, I agree when the first round of consultations arrived, several among you had communications with my office.

Jean Chrétien: Many of you came to my office and said would you give us more funds to help us either the Manitoba Brotherhood or the Alberta Brotherhood and others give us more funds because we would like to go before the consultation to meet the people at the Band level and I said yes. And when there will be a second run of consultation I will be ready to do the same thing. The question for me is to decide when you came during the first round of consultation the requests were

coming from the Provincial Brotherhood now this request is coming from you to do the same thing. So suppose that you come - you Max Gros-Louis as a delegate here to do that for the next run of consultation with you, I say yes and you come tomorrow as the representative of the Quebec Association to do the same thing. You know I do not want to have a duplication. So it is the problem we face now.

Max Gros-Louis: Continue a little bit more to explain. There is still one thing that we should put into our head and it is necessary that the Indian Affairs put into their head. It is that 90% of the Indians don't understand the Indian Act and they don't know what's in it. So we have to do something so that first of all they understand what was in the Indian Act before and what they want, what they want to put and what they want to take out, and that has not been done. It has to be done and to do it we need money. Now to clarify the question of money, let's say that it is a special fund that we ask so that we could improve a little bit more the discussion and the requests that the Indians wish to have in this Act. It is completely separate from the funds that we have asked to work on another kind of administration, whereby the Indians Association of Quebec explain certain politics of the Indian Affairs. We have to walk across the reserves and surely, it is something that we put a lot of time in. But the fund that we have in mind is completely separate and well understood. I think that the Indians Association of Quebec did a good job right up to this time and if today we have some Quebec representatives that are here to represent nearly all the bands it is because of the Association of the Indians of Quebec. And I think that if you pass by the Association of the Indians of Quebec you shouldn't try to say that those are two different things. It is not what we want to say. It is that the Association of the Indians of Quebec is ready to take the responsibilities but require a little bit more money to go and make some consultations with each band.

G. Manuel: Too bad because what Max Gros-Louis said is a lot of merit in it.

You yourself requested me to go in order of numbers and I would like to proceed in this order and the next one is No. 6.

Mona Jacob: I asked to speak quite a while ago and I think many of the delegates already expressed what I had to say. We're here as a body elected by our people I think that we are separate from what Mr. Chrétien is talking about, provincial organizations and so on and so forth. We are not all represented by provincial organizations and we, I think, are very representative and we should be recognized as a body a special body for a special project for which we require special funds. Any other funds are for maintenance and maintenance of our offices and so forth that they can't be mixed together. This is a separate thing and I don't understand why not everyone in this room understands that this is a separate thing altogether. If there are funds available from the department for setting up Indian organizations, I from the Northwest Territories would like to know where they are because we can't find any.

G. Manuel: As a matter of information to this assembly what Mona Jacobs said from the Northwest Territories is almost the same as Max Gros-Louis said. No it is No. 14. O.K. No. 12.

Andrew Delisle: I think that the point here is this resolution and in mentioning any organization as such is not included in this resolution. It says at the top. "Be it resolved that a National Committee be formed, composed of representatives of province or region at this meeting be established!" And this is what we want. That's all. I don't know National Indian Brotherhood, National Indian Council, Indians of Quebec Association, they can all submit their briefs over here and many of them have and you have heard some of the discussions on them. They are recognized as organizations. Some don't - as Mrs. Jacob says, don't belong to organizations. They are still recognized as representing the people. What we

want now is you to recognize this national committee and help finance it. That's all. I don't think that you said you will have to consider. As far as Indian people representing 449,999 Indians, you know who is missing. This here group here representing these people. They are asking you and this is what he has been wanting to do for a long time, hear what they are saying and we would like to have an answer as soon as possible if not immediately and it is very difficult, we know, we realize that you are a human being but after you have committed yourself to listen to these people and 450,000 people are really speaking and they say what this resolution is saying and we can't get an answer.

Jean Chrétien: You know, what I can say, that this discussion has been very good to clarify the situation. I wanted to have your views quite clear on that. You ask what you say, it is very important to me. I will look into that. I wanted to have it very clear because you know, we, in fact to what you are asking me to recognize you permanently as a kind of National Committee for consultation for on the Indian Acts and any change in our laws. It's very important what you say here. It was not what was intended or what was explained at each of the consultations and the way that the question was put in the consultation was always the same. You were delegated here to make representation to the federal government. Now you make that representation. To make that body here to all those that are here a kind of permanent alternative or spokesmen - a permanent spokesmen for the Indian people of Canada as far as the Indian Act is concerned, the rights, the treaty, the aboriginal rights and so on. So I have to keep that in mind and you say that you are completely different from the National Brotherhood or the Provincial Brotherhood. I would look into that. You can understand that the implication is quite far and I cannot comment right away. I wanted to have a clear view of your intentions and you and I think that this discussion has been good for that.

G. Manuel: Just to clarify again or to remind you that there is a motion on the floor which has been regularly moved and seconded. I will ask the secretary to read the motion just to remind you.

H. Cardinal: Could a copy of this resolution be translated into French and given to Mr. Chrétien?

G. Manuel: All in favour. Fine. O.K. Get a copy in French and present it to Mr. Chrétien. Now No. 12.

Andrew Delisle: I would just like to say. This committee doesn't say that it was going to be represented and going to be the official spokesmen as such of the group. If you look down and investigate the rights, the official spokesmen is going to be the group. The committee that we are asking for support is going to be the working committee if you want to interpret that way.

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, I do believe what the people are trying to get across here this afternoon is the fact what they want to do is draft something like "Choosing the Path" but only the shoe is on our foot so that we could present it to them with our questionnaire. We might not have as many questions but they will be very important questions. And if we can present this to the government at their expenses, give us the same expense that we have answered these 34 questions on. And then I do believe that we as delegates of all across Canada can draft an Indian Act.

G. Manuel: No. 11. 14. 15.

Speaker Unknown: Seeing that we have this resolution and seeing as how there are different interpretations by the Minister there are and it has been clearly defined by the delegation what it needs. I think that everybody in this room with the exception of possibly one understands exactly what this resolution stands for.

There will be no duplication of services here. Money that we are getting now is to run our provincial organizations. I hope it will continue to be there because we still need those funds to carry on the operation of what we are doing now in our provincial organization. And as for the 34 questions. What I would do with the book is throw it out the window and let it drop. Because to me these 34 questions was a mechanism as the Minister says. To channel us into a certain position whereby we can say we have consulted the Indians. The 34 questions have no relation whatsoever with what we are discussing today or the past four days. Now all we are asking at this time for is commitment for the Minister. For any special project which we have clearly outlined in this resolution. There are probably 25 to 35 projects, research projects that are required before the formulation of this Indian Act. I will say once more Saskatchewan will not deal with the Indian Act until such time until we can do more research about our rights. Listen, the medical care issue in Saskatchewan up to date has got about \$2,500.00 and has not even gone to the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan. This is just a little bit of research done by the lawyer. Now, I know that this issue is going to hit the Supreme Court of Canada. How much more research, how much more money. This is a small item of what we are talking here today. Now without prejudice to the proposal made by the Manitoba organization, they have submitted a tentative budget to finance what we are asking for now. I am saying right here and I'm saying here now that is not enough with what we are trying to do. I will ask once more, is the Minister going to the government to recommend our proposal or not. Do we have his support or not.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I tried to listen very carefully and get the merits of the speeches that have been made or the directions of questions to you. I appreciate your presence - I appreciate your interest which I have watched with a great deal of interest on my behalf and on behalf of the organization which I

have represented for some years. In the first revision of the Indian Act, 1947 started in 1946 it took some years before it was finalized in 1952. The conditions and the way of life that the Indian people at that time across Canada in the North was very, very bad. The change came. It did, I agree, and admit, better the lot of some of our Indian people but it did not answer the needs of the Indian people to get in to enable them to get into the swing of the mainstream of the Canadian way of life in the new society. The new society had impoverished the Indian people. I appreciated your appearance and your talk to our own convention where you told our convention that you and your people have experienced some of the poverty that existed in Canada and in the province that you come from. I appreciate that very much because you told our convention that you understood the situation. Now since 52, 46 to 52 the change in the society that is forced upon us is hundredfold different today. The Indian Act of 52 is totally inadequate - an absolute turn an absolute new approach must be taken by you, Sir, and the government that you represent and in order for the Canadian Indian or the Indians of Canada, if they are going to get into this and enjoy the privileges and the resources of this country then a great deal of effort and a great deal of money, Sir, must be made available. I think I referred to the situation in our convention in your presence that the Indian people in British Columbia and other places in Canada were in a state of confusion, the changes, the legislations, provincial non-cooperation in some cases, the militancy of the department of Indian Affairs personnel to confuse the Indians. I recall some words of a great Indian in British Columbia who is no longer with us, the late Dr. Kelly, here in Ottawa when he told Indian Affairs, the Minister at that time, some years ago the Indian has been so brow beaten that he no longer can get up and describe himself and make his voice heard to the government of Canada and I think that this is true, Mr. Minister. I do not intend to take much time here, we are in agreement with our brothers across Canada. If it's money that is required to better our lot and to get into the

society that many of us would like to get into and enjoy then money is the answer, it is the answer. It will make clear the way and it will make way for us that we may talk directly to you and to the government. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel: No. 5.

Speaker Unknown: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would just like to make a few comments that things that have happened throughout history. One of the things that has happened is that there has been many methods used by the non-Indian with their dealings with the Indian people. With respect to history, they used the definition, they use oblivion, they used suppression, they used complete obliteration, they used the white and rule conquer we have seen it used this morning and you see it here this afternoon. I think this could be termed a beautiful satire on human rights. The other thing that happened right here is this comment on January 27, 1969. When an Indian speaks it comes a rhetoric but one of the things that happened if we are allowed to do some research in our own treaty areas and look over some of the documents. By way of accident, I came across a document that stated and it is signed by Mr. Dawson to the Minister of Indian Affairs then. "On the contrary, they are still but savages who indulge in dog feed and scalp dances and considered it a virtue to drink the blood of their enemies." Well this kind of thing, I think has to stop. But much more important than that is if we dig out the treaties and we get our own interpretation I think this is the kind of thing that we are looking for right now. The money is given to us to do the research that we are going to do it by ourselves.

G. Manuel: No. 13.

Chief Max Gros-Louis: I believe that I should clarify an error made in the consultations on the National Indian Act. There are several Indians in several provinces who are not part of the National Indian Brotherhood and I believe the

Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, you have recognized the National Indian Brotherhood as speaking for all the Indians of Canada. Perhaps that is causing confusion now. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 1.

John Tootoosis: Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to bring some of my points on Indian aboriginal rights and treaty rights while we have the Minister with us here. Now, when Great Britain agreed on the King's proclamation, those treaties be made with us. These treaties could only be made nation to nation. So Great Britain recognized the Indians as an Indian Nation when they signed treaties with us. Under those treaties when we signed with Great Britain, under those treaties we agreed to be a nation within a nation and we were asked if we want to keep the piece of land, this reserves which we have today. We are in the stages of eminent domain, we have sovereign rights in those pieces of land we live in today. That is the right we have. That is what he agreed when he signed those treaties. Canada was authorized to make those treaties. At that time Canada had no right to sign any treaty with any nation. They didn't have that right. Great Britain had to give them that permission. So Canada has no right to abrogate any treaty made by Great Britain. That is the stand we ought to take. We got get to talk with this government, to live those treaties, the way we understand them. The way it was interpreted to us accordingly the way we understand. Not the way they understand today, the present day language. The language they used when they talked to us and the interpreters the way they understood. If Canadian government is going to be honest and just society government the good government we have today has to take that stand. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 4. Sorry No. 13.

Omer Peters: I haven't been saying very much here at this meeting and I have

been listening. I have been to several meetings before over the years from way back when they had Andy Paul as President - I think John Tootoosis and we seem to be going through the same thing here today but I feel real good about this meeting because all the Indian delegates across Canada is saying the same thing. We have tried in different ways, going back to the grand Indian councils to try to form groups together that would represent Indian people. And that time, just when we started to get going real good, I think the meetings were in Sault Ste. Marie, and was just the first time before I was going to this meeting that I could remember this. Then at that time, they brought out the regulations in Indian Affairs where they couldn't take any money out of band funds to attend meetings. They had to pay their own ways. Now we are going to hear today, you have asked the Indian people, you said you want to hear what the Indian people are saying. I don't think with all the discussions now you are going to hear any plainer. They have asked to continue these consultations and the reason they have asked because for the first time the Indians themselves, we went through this ourselves and we have that fear where are going to go. I think we have come to the conclusion here that you can say this is one of the solidest groups of Indians in any time since the time we have organized and what we are asking for you to do is to let us to continue on this path. I am not running any other suggestions down but I think that anyone can draw the conclusions from this here meeting that this is where they want to run.

Jean Chrétien: I think I could make a comment on that. It is 5:30 now, you know. I appreciate very well the situation and for me I'm very happy with that meeting that have gather all Indians from all across the Canada and this is the result of the initiative that the government have taken with consulting in every province and every region or rather group here again at Ottawa. The problem that I face and it was put quite well by Max Gros-Louis when he said

that in December I was faced with a similar or same kind of request by the National Brotherhood. For me this meeting is the best representative meeting ever been assembled for the Indians because you have all the associations present and you have people elected from all the regions. I understand that very well and I am very happy that we have organized that meeting and it was the initiative of our administration. Now you propose this resolution to me. Where you say we want to keep this consultation going and you know, it's a very valid resolution. I put some questions to you to clarify the situation but as Mr. Peters just said you know, it is the meeting of all the Indians in Canada and we represent the people in the best way ever that have been represented at any meeting and you put to me this resolution and I tell you tonight, you know, I cannot give you an answer right away. I am completely aware of the representation you made and you present that resolution. I cannot make any decision right now on the spot about it. It will not be responsible on my part to do so. I have to look into that and see what I can do about it. You want to establish that kind of National as is mentioned as a National Committee, composed of the representatives of the province origin at this meeting be established the following purposes and so on. I understand that you will probably form out of that meeting a kind of executive and so on with who I will have to discuss the mechanism of the continuing consultation that you were asking for. So it is one of your resolutions that I will study. I have some questions because I see some implications in it and I am glad that you put that as you did Mr. Peters, in very simple words and I will look into that and I don't know if I will be in a position to make some more comments tomorrow or so on but I know that I can be in touch because the way you have explained it you intend to carry it out and you want that the department help to carry it out. So I will study that with pleasure and I will refer later. I cannot say more but I have asked some questions and you have replied to the questions I directed to you and I thank you for that. I will report probably tomorrow to see what we

can do about it. I cannot make a decision on the spot, you understand that.

G. Manuel: Thank you Mr. Minister. No. 12 first.

Chief Delisle: The chairman of this Standing Committee on Indian Affairs has within his boundaries a reserve called Caughnawaga and the statement that I will make is to these people and the Members of Parliament that have shown interest enough to come and listen to our deliberations. The Minister, I know, is going to go back and have to consider the decision. I hope that this Standing Committee on Indian Affairs will appreciate that people of Canada are really sincere in trying to solve or trying to clear the air as far as the Indian people are concerned. Now is the time and the Minister should come back and we should leave this meeting with guarantees of financial and material help. Because don't forget that if we do settle these treaties and become compensated financially then you won't see us around here any more asking for any money. We will have our own meetings.

G. Manuel: Andy did you ask that a statement be made by the chairman of the committee that you have just mentioned. Before I ask the chairman of this particular committee that Andy mentioned. I am going to ask No. 16 who has his card up. No. 16.

Joseph Mathias: I would like this body to entertain a suggestion that I would like to put forth to the floor. It deals with this matter of the resolution and our discussions resulting from the resolution to the Minister of Indian Affairs. I would like to suggest that this portion, the minutes of this portion of this session dealing with this resolution be brought, be copied in the minutes and made available not only to the Minister of Indian Affairs, but his cabinet and the Parliamentary Committee dealing with Indian Affairs so that they can read the essence of what the Indian people want today. I would like this floor to consider

this suggestion. I'll put in the motion.

G. Manuel: I would like to call for the motion. All ready? So all those in favour. Carried. Now I will give the privilege to Andy Delisle to introduce his chairman of the committee and get him on the floor. His member.

Andrew Delisle: It gives me great pleasure to introduce the Chairman of the Standing Committee. A little bit of background. He used to be a lawyer for our band, now he is a member of Parliament, so he must have got some good training and anyway so without further ado, Mr. Ian Watson.

Mr. Ian Watson, M.P.: Thank you Andrew. This is an unexpected pleasure for me. I, one of the reasons, I can say this quite honestly that one of the reasons I got into politics in the first place was because I was having so much trouble settling a couple of problems at Caughnawaga and I felt that this was and I realize after some dealings with the Department at that time, I think there was a fellow by the name of Jones running things, it was, we still have our difficulties with the Department but compared to what they were then, there has been a big improvement. I would like to say what the committee plans to deal with in the remaining time that we have left before the estimates of the Department are taken into the House of Commons. It is an automatic process now at the end of May the estimates will go back to the House of Commons. However, the Committee has also had the annual report of the department referred to it and this will allow it to continue to sit on questions of concern to Indian Affairs in the month of June and also if we decide to visit reserves during the summer we would be entitled to do this with the report before the Committee. While we are considering the estimates we have decided to concentrate on a few items which are of major concern to the Indian people of Canada, housing and education are two items which we hope to get into in some depth during the month of May.

We got into the question of Indian employment last autumn. I think, it is my personal view, that a lot of the problems that we have throughout Canada relating to our Indian people, are directly concerned with the fantastically high unemployment rate. It is a disgraceful situation and the committee felt that by concentrating some attention on this terribly high unemployment rate that we could perhaps encourage industry to do more about solving the problem and certainly we intend to bring additional pressure on the government to contribute toward solving this problem.

It has to be a joint industry, government initiative but we, as a Committee, would like to hear suggestions from your representatives about what you feel are new initiatives which could produce results in the area of employment, in the area of education, which is really related to employment and we'd also like to hear criticisms of the housing program. There are so many aspects which need considering, that we felt obliged to restrict ourselves to those we considered the most important and I thought you would be interested in knowing that the Committee is going to be considering these items during the next month. We have found these consultations useful we're hoping to, and the Committees' mind is open on just how we are going to, when the Claims Commission Bill comes before the Committee how we are going to deal with how are we going to be able as a Committee to hear the views of people across Canada on the Claims Commission Bill and on - if the Indian Act is brought before us at some later date, how are we going to consult properly with the Indian people. How is our Committee going to consult? Now we need your advice on this because it may only - may be able through a group of people like yourselves to obtain proper consultation because there are well over a thousand - I guess it is over 2,000 different bands in Canada and it is physically impossible to consult with everyone so we've got to decide on how we are going to do the consultation and it would seem to me that a reasonable approach to this consultation should be worked out through a group such as yours and

I would hope that you will. If any of you individually here today, have particular ideas on this subject that you could communicate with members of the Committee and with myself, we will try to work out a procedure so when these things do come before the Committee, when the Committee sees of the Claims Commission Bill and the Indian Act that we will have a procedure available for consultation with as many - as broad a segment of our Indian population as we can reach. We will certainly be prepared to go across Canada, in fact we will expect other people to come to see us but even doing this we are not going to hit that many people and unless we have a full system worked out. With those words I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to say a few words. Thank you very much gentlemen and ladies.

G. Manuel: I will give the privilege to Max Gros-Louis, since he is from Quebec to say...

Max Gros-Louis: I have known Mr. Watson for several years already when he was at a seminar in Montreal and as Mr. Delisle said he worked with the Indians of Caughnawaga. That has given him certainly a good background, in French, and after hearing Mr. Watson's explanations I believe that he is really trying and working hard and we wish him good luck and that they will listen to what the Indians tell them. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Now it is coming to the time when we must adjourn pretty closely. I would like to call on Fred Glynn to explain the expenses, the cheques that are coming to some of you or all of you in regard to the conference here. Would you do that Mr. Glynn.

F. Glynn: Due to the current Air Canada strike, it is pretty difficult for us here at the Ottawa level to be able to find out exactly when all of you are going to reach your home destination. It makes it pretty difficult for us at this rate then to be able to provide as of tomorrow the additional \$5.00 a day payment to the delegates

that the Minister authorized here earlier this afternoon. So to be able to do this, I think most correctly, we would certainly prefer holding off until the delegates reach home. Please advise your Regional Director of Indian Affairs the exact days when you left home, to come to the conference until your return. We will then be able to calculate the actual number of days and process a cheque to each one of you for the additional \$5.00 a day. For the additional, six delegates or so who were named to the conference after it opened here, we will have your expense accounts cheques ready for tomorrow morning. By lunch time tomorrow your \$35.00 a day cheques will be available here. Any questions on that.

G. Manuel: I would like to make one clarification, I think that there was a motion here which asked the Minister to provide expenses for all the extra delegates plus the co-chairman and I understand the representation was ...

B. Charles: When will we get our expense cheques?

F. Glynn: They will be out tomorrow.

H. Cardinal: One more point of clarification Mr. Chairman. Mr. Plain asked that to the Minister to investigate whether or not the policy of this hotel is right in saying that they have given reductions to certain delegates on different consultation meetings and whether or not this is going to be true for this one. On the price of the rooms now I am speaking.

Jean Chrétien: I have asked my people to look into that but I don't know anything about it, this is not possible but what I did was to authorize you \$5.00 more a day to compensate for the large cost of your rooms here. If there is a possibility for a discount we would be glad that you have it but I had no reports about this yet.

F. Glynn: Mr. Chairman, it was looked into by the departmental staff this afternoon, Mr. Chrétien, and the rate that is quoted at the desk is the standard rate which they charge all delegates to conferences here. No reduction was given regardless.

F. Plain: You are stating very clearly now that even if I know I am going to get home I'm not really subject to the results of the Air Canada strike. I can fly home on an independent airline but again I know when I am going to get home. Do I have to continue to skimp?

F. Glynn: No. If you so desire you can be looked after if necessary.

Speaker Unknown: Thank you.

G. Manuel: Now just wait before we adjourn. I want to remind you that there is going to be an official opening by the Minister of the Handicraft display at 6. p.m. I wouldn't try to read it but there is going to be an official opening as you all know of the display in the next room that native people of Quebec prepared. The Minister is going to officiate at the opening and they invite everybody there.

He said you can buy anything of the articles that are on display. O.K. Now before we adjourn I would like to have Dave Courchene, Harold Cardinal, Andrew Nicholas, Philip Paul and Mona Jacobs up here. So will now, we stand adjourned till 9:30 a.m.

Friday, May 2, 1969. 9:55

G. Manuel: I declare this meeting now in session. One of the first things I want to bring forth. One of the delegates has brought to my attention and it should be recorded that legal advisers should be included in the mailing list of the minutes when completed. If they don't they won't know what's happening. Will someone make a motion for the record. Well, anyway, it has been regularly moved and seconded that the consultants and legal advisers get copies of the minutes of this assembly. Ready now for the question? Question called. All those in favour? Raise your hand. Any of Mr. Chrétien's staff here? Now since we have no formal agenda, it would be up to the assembly to suggest one to us. No. 8 from Alberta would like to speak. It is in order No. 8.

Fred Gladstone: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, delegates. I, as a single delegate represent the largest single group in Canada. Maybe you are wondering why I have not spoke. I feel honoured at the trust placed in me by the Blood Indians. We Indians of Alberta have differences of opinion between ourselves and between north, central and southern Alberta and different organizations and associations, but we have put these differences aside in order to participate in this conference. This meeting is an example and may well direct the future of the Indian people. This is why we solved our differences of opinion. I hope we will get the same unity that the Indians of Alberta have established among ourselves. Chief Delisle has urged this unity through the meeting and we should take his advice. While waiting for the Minister's reply let's get the ball rolling by commencing to erect the structure of the committee from this body, so later on in the day if we get the green light from the Minister we will be much further ahead. It also will lay down the terms of reference what we want the committee to follow. In conclusion I want to mention how happy I am with the attendance of so many young people and with their education along with the wisdom of the older delegates I am sure that the assembly will not lead their people down a garden path only to

come to a dead end as so many garden paths have ended in the past. At this time I would like to congratulate the Chairman for the wonderful way he has handled us and also the way he has translated Max's speeches. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Thank you. Now I'd like to call on Dave Courchene since what he has to say in regards to a telegram, I think this assembly should know about this telegram. Dave.

D. Courchene: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Dave Courchene, Manitoba Indian Brotherhood. This telegram is from our National President, Walter Dieter. I received it yesterday, but I didn't want to break into your discussions yesterday to give you the telegram. As you are probably all aware, or at least some of you are aware when the National Organization was set up and since then Walter has been doing a lot of travelling to try and get the financial resources needed, and so forth and of course with what has happened to his family as you all know, he was not able to attend and this is the telegram. "I was almost prepared to throw this Indian problem of ours out and just look after my family I know I neglected them for the cause, but for the untimely death of my baby girl Starla, she was very dark skinned and fiercely proud of being an Indian and extremely interested in what I was trying to do. She tried to give me a message for she had what we all want for our children, the right to live and honor our ancestry in an urban situation. Although I am not able to sit with you in this great arena of decision making, I would like to ask you people today not to make any real decisions but to ask for more time to meet until we have all learned the great traditions of the great spirit and able to share in truly humble kinship of the friendship of National Indians. I cannot get a plane, even a private plane, but I am with you. I wish the chairman would read to Constitution of the National Indian Brotherhood, and may everyone understand the meaning of it. I hope in your discussions if you're angry and disgusted that you are not that angry that you will

not come back and if we are that way then we must ask ourselves, are we really behind the cause of freedom and equal rights of our Indians, or am I in this for personal gain. I have many things to discuss with you. I will strive with all the god given strength to make more meetings so we may talk with respect and honor. For each man in his position as a leader, I would like to say to you Honourable Brothers, let us be able to listen to all people, the young and the old, and gather the suggestions, guided by our pride of race and cultural heritage. Let no man be better than one, and by the same token no man be lesser than his brother.

G. Manuel: One delegate here has suggested that everybody get a copy of this telegram. Is it the wish of this assembly. I guess there is no opposition to it. Could the steno's then please get copies made of this for the delegates? I have just been informed that the Minister is now busy considering a proposal and that he won't be here until 1 o'clock this afternoon. Now I think just to be fair to this assembly before we consider further the telegram which will give the steno trying to get copies made, British Columbia has asked for the floor this morning. Number 16.

Joseph Mathias: As outlined in our policy statement the British Columbia and Yukon delegation has prepared an explanation on the policy statement and has prepared their proposals to be presented to the floor today. You are all aware of our difficult position in British Columbia and how the Indian Act affects the people in British Columbia. As you know, they are just about governed by this legislation and just as your treaties affect your life, so we have prepared our proposals and our Legal Counsel will be reading out what we have prepared with your permission.

Paul Reecke, Legal Counsel: for the delegates and representatives for British

Columbia and Yukon. Mr. Chairman, Delegates to this National Conference:

The British Columbia delegation and the Yukon delegation to this Conference now place before you a number of proposals for inclusion in the Indian Act, as we proposed to do in our position statement considered by this assemblage yesterday, May 1, 1969.

These proposals are among the more urgent ones asked for by the consultation meetings held in British Columbia and the Yukon. They are in no way proposals for an entire new Indian Act. The delegations from British Columbia and the Yukon support the resolution of our friends from Saskatchewan, presented yesterday, which includes provisions for a comprehensive review of Indian Rights and Legislative requirements by national and provincial or regional committees of this representative gathering.

These proposals may be considered as interim requirements to permit the orderly development of our affairs while the process of study and change is taking place.

As our position paper said, we are in accord with our friends in treaty areas whose basic rights have been denied frequently by Governments and by the Courts. For our part, we have no treaties. We do have grievances, however, based on the fact our aboriginal rights have not been recognized by Governments and there has been a steady encroachment on our lands and rights for over 100 years.

As a result we consider it essential that the Canadian Nation, through the Indian Act, now declare its inherent duty to affirm the right of our Treaty friends to live within the spirit of the treaties, as related to present times. Similarly, in the non-treaty areas, the Indian Act should affirm that the Indians stand possessed of their aboriginal rights until such time as they are determined by agreements freely entered into. For both treaty and non-treaty Indians the Indian

Act should provide for genuine and material assistance by the Federal Government in all fields including legal, sociological and anthropological research. There should be a declaration of trust of the lands held by the Federal Government for the Indian people and an examination into breaches thereof on a broad scale. A review of Indian lands in British Columbia taken from the Indian people as a result of the McKenna-McBride Commission and the British Columbia Indian Lands Settlement Act, keeping in mind that the terms of reference of the Commission dated September 24, 1912, provided that land would not be reduced in size except with the consent of the Indians. Where surrenders were not obtained prior to reductions, the lands so removed should be repurchased from the Province by the Federal Government and returned to the Bands concerned.

The Indian Act should in our opinion include also the following provisions:

1. Rapid delegation of authority to Band Councils in all relevant fields.
2. Transfer by long term lease to Band Councils of Reserve land as requested by Band Councils.
3. An economic development fund on a scale sufficient to raise the level of Reserve life to the national average, by a Program of Grants.
4. Where requested by Band Councils, guarantees for specific projects by Bands, to be given to assist long term financing.
5. Control of Capital and Revenue Funds by Band Councils on the request of Bands.
6. Bands and Band Councils to be legal entities.
7. Powers to form Band Development Corporation under federal jurisdiction with powers similar to provide companies under the Companies Act.
8. Powers to form Band Municipal Corporations similar to Corporations under municipal acts, but under Federal jurisdiction, together with a system of Grants similar to Provincial Grant Programs.

9. Indian and Band-owned corporations of all types to be relieved of all taxation as to assets and income of Reserve land.
10. Return of control of natural resources on and under Indian land to the Indian people, by negotiation with Provinces, where necessary.
11. Creation of a realistic municipal services development grants system for the installation of services on Reserve land.
12. Medical Services Branch to assume responsibility for providing medical and health services including dental and optical services for Indian people.
13. Surrender of Indian land to be terminated and all surrendered land to be unsurrendered and returned to Reserve status.
14. Band Councils to have taxing power on Reserve land whether leased or not and whether surrendered or not and no other body to have such power.
15. To pay the costs of education for Indians while they pursue it successfully.
16. Grants to Bands to assist the development of administrative capacity on a broad scale.
17. No expropriation of Reserve land to be permitted. Lease provisions introduced.
18. Creation of a Land Registry System and guarantee fund for Indian lands.
19. Enfranchisement to be dropped from the Act.
20. Power to obtain further lands for Indians of British Columbia as provided for in Act of Union.
21. Provision that Band Councils may have a Reserve declared at their request when they purchase lands.
22. Control of Band membership by each individual Band.
23. Adoptions to be dealt with in accordance with Provincial Law.
24. Housing to be provided to bring Reserve standard to the Canadian average.
25. No deletions to be made to the Act except on request of Indian people.

Finally, we wish to draw the attention of our friends gathered here, and the Government, to the Minutes of the consultation meetings held in British Columbia and the Yukon.

Thank you.

G. Manuel: Number 12.

Chief Delisle: I wanted to speak on the resolution that was presented by the Saskatchewan people and the response of the Minister yesterday, and expecting him to come back, I would ask the delegation here to consider, or anticipate a response, in other words it would be negative or positive. I think in thinking about it and in talking with other delegates, there is some concern on the part of the Minister as to these promises to other organizations who would finance them in their discussions or in our discussions on the Indian Act. He has formerly promised Provincial Organizations finances. He has formerly promised various bands who may not happen to belong to an organization to get funds. Now, I think he's concerned as, is this another group of people who are asking for funds after he has already promised these other people, other groups, and that if we do hold consultation meetings amongst ourselves will it be an unanimous effort or will we have another group coming and saying after, we have presented to the government our ideas on the Indian Act or on treaties and so forth and then have another group come along later and say these people don't represent us, this is what we want and I think we should get this ironed out once and for all. I know the National Indian Brotherhood has made a request to the Government and the Minister has promised that they would be getting funds, and I wonder if I may humbly ask the National Indian Brotherhood, as it so stands, I do not like to say that the delegation from Quebec or the Indian people of Quebec do not belong to the National Indian Brotherhood, they do not formerly belong to the National

Indian Brotherhood, and I think if we go through the minutes of the National Indian Brotherhood we will find that it isn't actually formed as yet. It's a provisional organization. Now I was wondering if the provisional executive with the provisional organization would consider asking the Minister or asking themselves to withdraw their request for funds in order to consult on the Indian Act. Would they recommend that this group, as represented here, with the National Committee as proposed in the Saskatchewan resolution would be the group to handle discussions in the consultation. As an alternative if this would not be done then I would ask the delegates if they so desire to use the National Indian Brotherhood as I say if they so desire as the group to lead the discussions and to lead the recommendations or to be the working committee in the consultation of the Act. I think we have to straighten this amongst ourselves in case the Minister comes back and says - asks these questions. I think we should be ready with a reply, otherwise we would be talking here for the rest of the afternoon and he would then not be able to give us a response. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel: Before I call on number 13, I want to remind this assembly that there are two topics on the floor and it is extremely difficult when you have two topics on the floor. I think Andrew's suggestion falls in line with Dave Courchene's proposal for the agenda, and that is the telegram which was sent by Walter Dieter and also that the other is the British Columbia paper. The one that British Columbia has just presented, so I think we should really select priorities of what we should discuss and deal with one only till it's finished before we go on with the other. Now, I'd like, number 13's got his card, just Number 13.

Wallace LaBillois: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to confuse the issue, but I came here, like I said, during the week for specific purpose and I have to put another topic on the floor. I would like to be able to tell this to the Minister in person, I thought that he was going to be here in person this morning and seeing

that he is writing up some kind of a policy statement to give to us this afternoon I think that I am in order to ask that word be sent to the Minister this morning, immediately. I would like to pose and ask a question of the Minister and I would like this question to be sent immediately. The Minister and the Government has only been talking, he will be only talking this afternoon, I'm sure. What we want is positive action. He can take positive action to allay any fears that we have that the government is sincere. I would like this question to be sent to this Minister this morning, and ask him if he will today send someone from his department to Washington to see if the American government is willing to sit down and re-negotiate the terms of the Migratory Birds Convention Act. If the Minister will do this, and he has this right to do it, he can send the Head of the Department that's responsible for the Migratory Birds, he can send his Deputy Minister, or he could go himself. Now this is the positive action that we want. If he will do this that when I leave this meeting I can go back to my people and I can tell my people that the government is going to do something positive. If he is going to come here this afternoon and just give us more words, more promises, then I'm going to go back home and not bring anything with me. I think what we want is positive action. Now, I would like this message sent to the Minister right away, if this is possible. Thank you.

G. Manuel: It is your decision you have to make a motion if your positive about this.

Wallace LaBillois: Mr. Chairman like I said the Minister said that he would be available to come here at our request. This possibly is our last day.

G. Manuel: Would you make a motion then, I can't make the decision that he come.

Wallace LaBillois: I will so move.

G. Manuel: Is there a seconder for that motion? You want him this morning?

Wallace LaBillois: I realize that the Minister is drawing up a policy statement to present this afternoon, I would like to request that the Minister today send someone to Washington to sound out the American Government, if they are willing to renegotiate the Migratory Birds Convention Act.

G. Manuel: I got still 16, 15, and 4 as well, but could I get a seconder to Wallace's motion. Number 15 are you going, you second the motion. Good. Since Wallace has introduced a motion, I'll call on number 16 but you have to, shall we stick to the motion, or do you want to call a question on this now. Question has been called, all those in favour raise your hand. Or do you want to wait until after coffee I think -. All those in favour again, all against. Carried. Well who will you delegate. Would you do that Wallace. Mr. Wallace LaBillois is delegated to do that, but before we adjourn for coffee I would like to call on somebody from maybe one of the Alberta groups to introduce Dr. Yewchuk who is a Member of Parliament from Alberta.

Speaker Unknown: Ladies and Gentlemen the member of Parliament for the constituency of Athabaska in what is sometimes known as the Parliament of Alberta, is here with us today, Dr. Yewchuk represents the largest constituency in the Province of Alberta comprised of approximately 1/5 of the total land masss. Dr. Yewchuk will you please stand.

G. Manuel: Let's adjourn for coffee.

Number 12.

Andrew Delisle: What is generally known as the Province of Quebec. I would like to move that we table the British Columbia paper until we finish the discussion on the first issue that was brought up in the telegram and also in the remarks that

we made after the British Columbia proposal was made.

G. Manuel: A number of the delegates, Mr. Delisle, mentioned that they wanted copies to have a chance to study, I wonder, I'm not telling you what you should put in your motion, I just want to remind you what other people have said to cut the time down. Number 16.

Speaker Unknown: This is what we feel that we realize that some priority should be given to the Saskatchewan question here. We haven't got our copies, we are just getting them typed up now and we are going to pass them around. This is what I was going to say, that we give priority to the Saskatchewan.

G. Manuel: You second that motion then?

Speaker Unknown: I'll second that motion.

G. Manuel: It's been regularly moved and seconded that the British Columbia paper be tabled until some copies are available to all the delegates. Are you ready for the question. Question's been called. All those in favour. Now it says here, Pete is it you, O.K. I'll call on Peter to introduce an M.P. that's here from Saskatchewan.

Peter Dubois: Mr. Chairman it is a great pleasure for me to have - the doubly great pleasure to introduce our Member of Parliament for Regina Lake Center. Our Member of Parliament has just joined us a few minutes ago and will be staying a very short while, but I want to give him the opportunity at this time, I want to present him to you, to express maybe his ideas as to what he has observed of our conference and I would like to introduce to you Mr. Les Benjamin. Will you please stand Mr. Benjamin.

Les Benjamin: I just want to wish you all the best of luck. I'm impressed with

what I've heard so far I urge you to keep pressing and keep fighting and you have got a lot of help. Thank you very much.

G. Manuel: Now what do you wish to discuss, what are your priorities? Number 4.

Frederick Plain: I realize that Mr. Chrétien may be very, very busy in forming words that will confuse us this afternoon. I request and I hope that this delegation will request along with me, that we send for the Honourable Robert Andras to sit in with this meeting with us while Mr. Chrétien cannot be here.

G. Manuel: All in favour of this? Good. Will you do that Mr. Plain? Now Number 5. Can we stick to the agenda where I'd like to get a topic on the floor because this is our last day.

Wilmer Nadjiwon: Mic number 5. I will stick very close to the subject in my short address and I think the subject in question here is the unification and the construction if, of the group as an Indian Delegation. Whether the concept is a good one for having a National Indian Brotherhood. I think the unification here has shown that this concept is a good one. However, the premature approach the National Indian Brotherhood has made and presented to the Government for funds has caused great confusion. I am going to try in some little way, in some small contribution to try and kind of clarify the situation as I see it only. The money I believe was never asked for from the Government for any specific reason. The motion which we are concerned with yesterday from Saskatchewan had never been introduced. Therefore it could not have been the reason for approaching the government for funds. In this view, then I think the question would be how do we, what is our alternative here if their approach was on the view that we need organization, that we need administrative funds, that we need unification funds, then this is totally and absolutely separate from the submission that Saskatchewan has made. But if it has overlapping, and I repeat overlapping, connotations or reasons then I

think this will have to be very well clarified before any progress can be made. So any one here, and I would ask that Dave Courchene who seems to have the most knowledge about the approach used for these funds, would try and clarify this point I think we would have a starting point on which to form discussions for further progress. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Number 6.

Eddy Bellerose: I would like to support the motion of Quebec. It is at this time so important that this, at this stage of the game we are in, that we should not be hung up on the matters of organization. This is a special problem and project that we are in. It deals with treaties, it does not deal with organizations. It deals especially for what my people are requesting in the rural area. There is a tremendous poverty conditions that exist because of lack of communication. Because lack of necessary understanding in many things with the department and also the structure of the Indian Act. This we realize, but the main issue of my people that I represent in Treaty No. 8 is because ever since the time of treaty they have been insecure in their lives in Canada. Primarily they thought their treaties were very good to them. At first the treaties were alright. Then came the time when Indian Affairs moved in our reserve and started to create conflict and separatism amongst the tribal of people, and then the lack of communication takes place. To make a long story short, the treaties have been valid and through fishing and hunting and today my people themselves are paying for their traplines. And when we are hunting in the reserves the game wardens are also on our backs. Few years ago on the Driftpile reservation they made a fine upstanding nursing station which includes five beds. This was the joy of our people. The medicine was right then close to them. The medical promises have been kept to them, but in these last few years all the nurses have been doing is referring the people to High Prairie and out there they see the doctor and they are given a subscription and they have

to pay their own medical bills. They have to pay the drugs and sometimes if you are proven that you are indigent then the Branch would pay your medical services. These are the treaties that we are talking about. There are lands in which - have been lost that needs to be researched. This is why I'm strongly supporting that we have to have a special project to research in our treaties. Education for instance, take a look at our education, take a look at the drop out rates, the confusion of our children and this is because the assimilation program. If you look at their treaties and it says that education will be provided to you and if I can find a copy here which says in our treaty in the very beginning, I will tell you what it meant, what education meant. They were promised that they will have schools for their children. The government will furnish you with ammunition for your hunt and twine to catch fish. The government will also provide schools to teach your children to read and write and do other things like white man and their children. Schools will be established where there is sufficient number of children and in some of our communities the children are taking the buses spending almost eleven hours away from their home from the time they take the bus. These are the things that need to be researched properly and to be brought forth to our endeavourment to sit again in the future. And the most important of all is the relationship that we have with Indian Affairs today. The misunderstanding, the paternalism. When I spoke at the treaty on behalf of number 8 in Edmonton I questioned this behaviour. Is this done deliberately, to condition us in such a way like little children? And when I look at the treaty that was made in 1889 and shortly after that the appendix was written which was called the Indian Act today and it's altogether different to the understanding of our people. They understood the treaty that they have made and agreed with the government. But when the appendix came then it was different. The administration moved and it has created a monster of administration that some of us confuses in our lives. The importance that I am saying here is once and for all our people are given the security that the government

is honest with them and that by their treaty then the attitude will change, the education will go up, the aspirations will go up, the mentality will go up, the physical health will change and this is what the white man cannot understand. They want to control us and when you control a person he has no authority to think for himself. He has no authority to fight, his aspirations are low and to me it is very serious, my colleagues, very serious that we unite, let's not get hung up on organization. Let's do this project in relevant, that we can go back and research and communicate, first-class communications with our people. We did this in Alberta, but there is some more to be done, on very unlimited time. I've watched my Chief, my President of the Indian Association, Harold here I'm sitting with. I watched him spending night and day on the road travelling with little time as he's got to try and communicate. But with this, if we get the funds and if we get an adequate time we can do a better job we'll sleep in between instead of travelling in between. There are people who are very insecure. People who doesn't even believe us at times when we are talking about realistic about their conditions. Oh the white man has taken everything, what's the use - kiam. This kiam needs to be researched more thoroughly. What makes these conditions? What makes these attitudes? What makes education fair with our people? There is nothing wrong with education. Today's life and year's ago life is no different as I see it. To kill the moose years ago you need skill - a needs of great ability of physical skill and also mental skill. Today to have a job it needs skills, it needs physical and mental skills but they all amount to the same when you kill the moose it's food for your children, when you work it's food for your children. There's no difference. But somehow the government in the past had made us so insecure with our lives because they have promised us in a certain way that they would and no way at all. It says here in the treaty of this book. At no way at all we jeopardize your way of life. But it's jeopardized every time I go out hunting, it was jeopardized when I want to sell something from the reserve, it's jeopardized when I want to go for medical needs.

I pretty well have to beg sometimes. If our white colleagues would really understand what these treaties mean to us and our attitudes will change once they fulfill these treaties, then you will see that the onus is onto us now and that's all we are saying in this resolution. Give us the money, we'll do the job and we'll bring you back the real feelings of our people and from there we'll draw up an Indian Act. Then we will sit down with you and talk and we'll make agreement again. That's all we're saying. My colleagues, again I will repeat let's not get hung up because of the organization. We have a special project to do and a dear one to our people. A very, very dear one to our people. Just keep this in mind and we are elected, we are representing the people whether the National Brotherhood or anybody represented - fine this is the more organized we get the bigger the organization on the national level we have, the better ideal but right now there is a special project that our people are watching and listening to our moves. Now let's get on with this resolution that we are trying to endeavour.

G. Manuel: Since this is our last day and since we have three important things already that we are started to discuss today - the day will finish. I was wondering if the speakers in the future will confine it right to the point, condense it as much as possible because so many people want to speak since this is the last day. Number 12.

Chief Delisle: I'd like to move if I may that a National Committee be formed at this meeting immediately to start the work that is mentioned in the telecommunications from Chief Dieter that has been mentioned from the previous speakers. I'd like by way of explanation to say that a national committee would be formed who would keep, for instance, all organizations informed us that the progress of discussion keep Quebec informed with British Columbia because what British Columbia has stated in their presentation this morning is almost the same word for word as the presentation from the Province of Quebec. But we don't have the opportunity to

communicate with each other because we don't have any funds. And to get the work started just our brief, the presentation of the hunting and fishing brief to the Province of Quebec cost us approximately about \$7,000 dollars and this is not including Chief Max Gros-Louis free time, not including Daniel Vachon free time, nor Chief McKenzie nor many of our people but includes the cost of hiring one student to go and pick up the information required to present this brief and the legal costs. I'm just telling you that as an example as to what has to be done and we have to get started, so I move that a National Committee be appointed from within this delegation to get this ball rolling. Once this committee is formed we will work up the by-laws, we'll respect the rights of the provinces and all this will be put in, even though we have received the draft though the draft mentions the National Indian Brotherhood formation provisional constitution, if this committee has to follow that type of thing then it should, let's get the committee formed, let's get the idea formed and let's get on the ball.

G. Manuel: Before I ask for a seconder to that motion, Plain sent me a note over here and it says that the message to Andras has been transmitted to his office. Now Andy has placed a motion to this assembly. Is there a seconder? Andy Nicholas. It has been regularly moved and seconded that we strike a committee to vote that a National Committee be formed immediately here to get the work started, straight, simple and to the point.

Guy Williams: Mr. Chairman speaking on the motion. I had my card up prepared to speak on the first statements of my good friend from Quebec, generally known as the Province of Quebec, but now with a motion on the floor I am inclined to go along with that motion but may I have a short moment to explain my thinking and position. Far be it from me, with my deep respect and sympathy for Mr. Dieter, I had come here with a great deal of criticism for him as a leader of the provisional organization known as the National Indian Brotherhood, I have attended all their

meetings, I have not been able to convince our organization to become part of it. I think what this motion means, and what it means to me is that a National Committee be formed for the purpose to confirm and to finalize the consultation leading up to a revision of the Act and the honouring of treaties. So with that Mr. Chairman again I say I'm inclined in my thinking that this is the right move. Thank you.

G. Manuel: Number 15 on the motion.

David Ahenakew: I was going to say what Chief Delisle said and I think one thing that we must make clear here that I think we are differentiating between aboriginal rights and treaty rights. I hear treaty rights being mentioned very, very regularly. I think we had better change that, everybody has rights in this room. Let's not stick to treaty rights, because there are people in here who do have treaty rights. I think we should make this very, very clear to everybody.

G. Manuel: Number 3.

Dave Courchene: We are very concerned this morning not necessarily about the National Indian Brotherhood because it is a provisional organization as set up by some of the Provincial leaders that are here, not set up by an individual but more concerned that this research that we are talking about will bog down on account of organizational difficulties. I fully concur with the other speakers that there has to be a mechanism established to continue after this delegation has dispersed. I would like to make a suggestion to the delegation to adjourn and to break into provincial groups to decide by Provinces where the delegates come from, which method in which way, and to come back after dinner with the ideas of which way we would like to go. Manitoba is prepared with its delegation to sit with any other delegation to come out with a realistic approach on a mechanism that we can use together as Indian people. If it has to be a new method, then we must find that new method.

But I think we are going to get bogged down here again and if I could just suggest this to Mr. Delisle's motion, I think we would have a much better chance as Provincial groups to decide. I am sure Manitoba would not have any problem with its delegation in this coming to a decision. Thank you.

G. Manuel: I think what Courchene has suggested is a little bit different than from the regular motion, I think that could come in second after this motion is dealt with. I think it is in line with the motion alright. Mr. Dubois.

Peter Dubois: Mr. Chairman, what I was going to say has already been expressed by the previous speakers so it is needless for me to take up your time and I have no alternative here but to say that I will endorse this motion, support it and I am sure that my colleagues from Saskatchewan will endorse it so I say give us the question.

G. Manuel: There is a motion that we strike up a committee. I'm sorry Guy. All those in favour raise your hand. All those against. Carried. Now I think Dave Courchene's suggestion is in order because it seems to me that now we have to decide who is going to be on the Committee. But I just want to point out one thing here, it seems to me that Dave's suggestion would be confined to the Heads of Organization and I'm wondering if it shouldn't be the provinces across Canada. O.K. go ahead proceed.

No. 6.

Mona Jacob: I was just going to suggest more or less a similar type of thing that we set up a National Committee and with the addition of leaving the administration to the National Brotherhood. I think that even if we do form a large group we have to maintain some kind of communication and there has to be an office somewhere without duplication of services and I think the National Brotherhood could do this

since they have an office and that if we have to, we could join the National Brotherhood on an individual basis if there is provision for this, rather than bring along our associations and so on, you know, into the National Brotherhood.

G. Manuel: I want to remind this assembly that the last speaker where she come from there is no organization there for the native people.

Number 11.

Forrest Walkem: I like the method that is going to be used but in British Columbia it's going to be very hard, very very hard to split up the whale chasers and the coyote chasers and the snow shoes, it's going to be very hard because British Columbia has tried for years and they are all going the wrong way. I was really surprised at this consultation around here that British Columbia was kind of looking like it was going the right way but now you are going to throw an apple in there and we are all hungry boy, we'll be all going every direction but maybe it is a problem of our own, I don't know but how are we going to clear it. You fellows might say we pick so and so but we turn around and we are going to turn against you. Boy this is going to be really something.

G. Manuel: I think all the motion suggested was to set up a committee. It was a proposal to this assembly for adoption. Isn't that right Mr. Delisle?

Now number 4.

Andrew Delisle: The motion was for a national committee as specified in the resolution of Saskatchewan.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman. I'm of the opinion at this moment the suggestion as set down by Mr. Courchene is the right and proper move. Then after the provinces have got together and discussed these problems of setting up or taking into con-

sideration that the discussions in reference to setting up a committee be clearly discussed by the provincial groups and then come back and appoint a committee if it desired of all the delegates. We have accomplished one thing in British Columbia made possible by this National Conference or assembly. We are working together as a provincial delegation and I am sure that other groups or other organizations or a number of organizations for the province are doing the same thing or attempting to do it. And I don't think we should overlook a good suggestion to get together, put your heads together, we'll put ours together and if it is not the wish those that are in majority then we have done something that is proper and right. Thank you.

G. Manuel: For your information the Minister Without Portfolio Mr. Andras is here as you requested this morning. Now Peter Kelly is trying to get on the floor.

Number 14.

A. Francis: I feel that the suggestion made by Mr. Courchene from Manitoba is a good one. I know our delegation from New Brunswick would like to have time to sit down with the delegate from Nova Scotia and possible the people from the Quebec area to discuss the setting up of the committee. I know Mr. Chairman you have stated that time is of the essence now, I realize this but possibly if we could adjourn until about one-thirty that we could break off, decide together and meet earlier and to discuss what decisions were arrived at by the meetings that we have had with groups.

G. Manuel: I wonder if it wouldn't be more convenient for this assembly to arrive at some conclusion as what action you want to take if you set up a temporary committee to make suggestions as to how your regular National Committee should be set up. That's the motion ah.

Andrew Nicholas: Since the motion was made by Mr. Courchene if he so moves I will second the suggestion to adjourn and to break off into discussion groups to bring

D. Courchene: I so move that we adjourn into provincial delegations and discuss the setting up of the Committee in whatever shape and form the delegates will come back with them. Secunder, are you seconding that.

Chief Wilmer Nadjiwon of the Ontario Indians. This will be in the form of a suggestion and I see no reason why this total assembly could not be adopted as the National Committee and what we would be looking for in the - what we would be looking for is provincial sub-committees for this National Assembly.

G. Manuel: It is regularly moved that we adjourn so that the different provincial groups could get together and present suggestions when we reconvene at one thirty. You have heard the motion are you ready for the question. Question has been called, all those in favour. Remember that all provincial organizations, all provinces meet together to thrash out what type of organization or committee you would like.

At what time are we coming back. At one thirty. The meeting stands adjourned.

G. Manuel: Max, is the Quebec delegation here? Is Max Gros-Louis here? I think this had to be had a lot of bearing on, particularly the Quebec delegation. That as long as the press is here, recording the interpretations that may be made in English and French, they are not prepared to make the interpretations. They are not prepared to provide the services because of the misinterpretations that would probably come as a result of the interpretations. So, here, while the press is here, while it's being recorded, while the Minister is here, there will be no interpretations from French to English or from English to French. Is this clear? Just so we wouldn't get hold up after we get started.

We heard the interpretations that have been made by the interpreters. And I hope the press people that are here have got that clear and they will refrain from recording any of the interpretations.

I had gotten a note before morning which I read out to you which stated that the Minister is going to be here at 1:30 and it's after 2:00 o'clock now. I wonder if we could delegate somebody from here to find out and maybe we can proceed with the discussions with regards to your regional meetings before noon. Who is prepared to go and to check out? What? Could you give us information to this respect Bill?

Bill Mussell: Regarding the time.

G. Manuel: The time the Minister will arrive.

Bill Mussell: Just about three o'clock.

G. Manuel: Oh, three o'clock, yeah. No. - We'll just wait a minute - This meeting is not officially opened so I'll declare this assembly into session.

Peter Dubois: This delegation has over the past few days expressed strong desire

to be united and has stated they wish this delegation to form a committee to carry on the research required to complete our work; to be completely autonomous and free to handle the grant of money expected from Parliament. It is also clear that the National Indian Brotherhood set up in December of 1968 is provisional only at this time and requires some revamping to make it completely representative but must be continued to show the people of Canada that we wish unity and continuity in our Act. Now, therefore, the Saskatchewan delegation have a resolution which we feel will adequately fulfill these wishes. Be it resolved that (a) the proposed national committee be established as an independent autonomous ad hoc committee of the National Indian Brotherhood. The national committee would be authorized to use the facilities of the National Indian Brotherhood but would be in no way subordinate to the National Indian Brotherhood. (b) the proposed provincial committees be established in the provinces by the Provincial organizations. I have copies for distribution if the delegates wish.

G. Manuel: Could I get a seconder before you get it, you distribute this. Here's one.

Dave Ahenakew: If you want this on another motion sir.

G. Manuel: Oh, Dave seconded the motion. Now could you distribute this then Peter.

Peter Dubois: You want me to do that.

G. Manuel: Well, I mean you can delegate someone.

Peter Dubois: Yes, O.K. I thought this is an order.

Speaker Unknown: There is a, Mr. Chairman - If I may have the privilege, there is another resolution attached to this resolution which might clarify some of the

questions that entered into your mind but we will deal with that resolution as it comes up.

G. Manuel: It appears to me that this resolution similar to the one this morning excepting that it will be working with the National Brotherhood. I'll just give you a couple of minutes to go over it. Are you ready to open discussions on it?

Andrew Nicholas: Mr. Chairman, the only thing about this resolution is that it does not contain the preamble which Mr. Dubois from Saskatchewan has spelled out. I feel that it would be advisable to table this resolution until such time as a preamble could be made available to the delegates. In the resolution, it stresses independency and autonomous body but at the same time he stressed in his preamble saying that from this delegation which has been here there have been various expressions of efforts for national unity, and I think that this will spell out better the feelings of this delegation.

G. Manuel: Did you make a motion that this be tabled?

A. Nicholas: I was suggesting it and just trying to open up discussion to see if, you know, this is the feeling of the group.

Peter Dubois: Mr. Chairman - May I take the opportunity of giving this to you to read to them if they wish this to be the preamble to the resolution that I submitted.

G. Manuel: Get Isaac Beaulieu to read it.

Isaac Beaulieu: This delegation has over the past few days expressed a strong desire to be united and has stated they wish this delegation to form a committee to carry on the research required to complete our work, to be completely autonomous and free to handle the grant of money expected from Parliament. It is also clear

that the National Indian Brotherhood set up in December of 1968 is provisional only at this time. Excuse me, the National Indian Brotherhood set up in December of 1968 is provisional only at this time and requires some revamping to make it completely representative but must be continued to show the people of Canada that we wish unity and continuity of our Acts. Now, therefore, the Saskatchewan delegation have a resolution which we feel will adequately fulfill these wishes.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman - May I, I think this will express the purpose better if we change "expected from Parliament" to "made available by Parliament".

David Ahenakew: I wonder here if the delegation wishes the preamble attached to the resolution. If so, then we'll take steps immediately, to get this preamble typed up and copies made.

H. Conn: Mr. Chairman - I realize that in rising at this juncture, I may be stepping a little out of my purview but I would suggest that the Prairie Provinces after establishing by this paper that they would be the largest region and that in the interests of unanimity and the interest of all Indians, they were prepared to give up this preeminent position in terms of population that they should withdraw the figure of 90,000 people and just stand on their own merits as the Prairie Provinces where the treaties are similar and the supporting legislature identical. I'm suggesting to my good friends in the Prairies that you have established this point. That as the most populous District, you are prepared to accept one representative for all of the Prairies and that you should perhaps consider the deletion of this figure of 90,000 which can only lead to invidious comparisons where you get to the Northwest Territories where there are only 4,500.

G. Manuel: No. 5.

Chief Nadjiwon: I would support the comments made Hughie, Hughie Conn as being

of a matter of interest, maybe not contention but of interest and further to establish and continue continuity and unanimity of purpose among a group of people. I think it would be important at this time to state that the seats in ratio established previous in this meeting of one representative to every 5,000 people, I don't want to in any way be the seats of this assembly would be called from time to time to consult where more and wider distribution is represented. I have no, nothing against your motion, but I would like to include a representation from not only provinces and organizations and areas, and at different times meet and I'm not stating that the people here necessarily have to be, I am, I am separating personalities from seats. I want to be clearly understood that what I mean is seats in this assembly.

Peter Dubois: In reply to that question, we would, I as the mover, of this resolution, would be prepared to retract the 90,000 people out of this resolution if it is the wish.

No, this hasn't, this hasn't been presented as yet. But we would be prepared to do this if this were the wish of the assembly.

Chief Nadjiwon: We are not discussing this resolution that is attached there but just for clarification, we would be only too happy to point which would be from time to time this assembly or the seat, the seats in this assembly established by a previous motion from time to time would come and review progress.

Mr. Chairman - If I like

G. Manuel: Do you want an answer from Peter first.

Speaker Unknown: What has been said is good enough for me. Pardon.

Yes, if you could give us, if you could give me that clarification and your thoughts about my second point.

Peter Dubois: May I refer this to my Legal Adviser.

Allen Lueck: I don't want to interject here too much but our feeling, I think in the Saskatchewan delegation, is that these people who are seated here today should remain as delegates until this Indian Act is drawn and completed and through the House. Otherwise, if you go back to your home areas and later on there is another general assembly meeting called and someone else comes, they won't have the knowledge that you have and it will be very difficult for them to pick up where you have left off simply by trying to read the transcripts. And at the same time, the National Committee which is suggested would have to be a National Committee that remains as such until Parliament passes the Indian Act and not at any time changed in the interim except for, for some very dire reasons like a death or something like this. But, but that's why it has to be a special committee. If it becomes simply a part of the Indian Brotherhood which it will, it is sort of autonomously attached to, then elections would be taking place over the year, or over the years and this would not be good at all. The National Committee must come from this group, must be autonomous, must have its own money, and must carry out its special project. If I may just say one more word on this National Brotherhood portion, Chrétien has specifically pointed out that there was a provisional National Indian Brotherhood set up in December and that if you're now going to throw that out the window and start another National organization just at the very time when Parliament is talking about giving money to the National Indian Brotherhood for the very thing we're talking about, then he and his colleagues and the opposition will have ammunition to argue that the Indians don't know what they're talking about and aren't continuous and aren't prepared to continue in a unified line and this is what we're, I think, trying to allay. Any fears that you people are, are not in complete agreement because as you have all seen from this meeting you are in complete agreement, it's merely a matter of the nuts and bolts of getting things

settled down. Right.

W. Nadjiwon: Apparently I have caused a problem where no problem existed and you're elaborating on the problem. There is no problem. The only thing that I am talking about is that I am not only representing, you understand representing a provincial body of people. Therefore, I am subject to elections. And I would expect that if I was at any time voted out that the, you know the President of the union would be sitting in my spot. I think a provision, I think we could settle this very easy. That, this could be named as today as the body and an alternate situation for an alternate person to fill the seat. This would give two free seats. Do you understand?

A. Lueck: No. 15 again - I'm sorry, yes now I do understand what you mean. You're saying that if this delegation is ever required to be called again for consultation with the, with the National Committee and certainly finally when they do in fact look at the draft Indian Act that the National Committee finally completes that you would want the same amount of representations from each area. I, I don't think there is any doubt about that.

Paul Walsh: What I am about to say is that very thing. I would hope that the National Committee of six people won't have the final say. That I would hope that there will be a final meeting where the National Committee will present its recommendations to a group at least as large as this one. And hopefully composed of one representative for every 5,000 Indian people as was the wish of this meeting, almost too late because we were already here and it was impossible to complement or add to our numbers. So I would hope that the resolution that was passed on the first day would be used as a guide and when the six members, National Committee, has collected all the provincial recommendations and compiled a draft of the Indian Act that it would propose to the Federal Government that before it could do any-

thing with it, even make it public, it would have to call this sort of meeting together again with one representative for every 5,000 Indian people to get the ratification and suggestions and the additions and amendments of such a meeting as this. It would probably take an equally reasonable period of time to do that.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman - We broke up before noon to discuss a motion on the floor, province by province. We had our discussion, I think what is needed here is that a report from every province on the discussions before we proceed with any other matter pertaining to the appointment or election of a National Committee. In our discussion we believe, British Columbia and Yukon, that this body that is now assembled here be the National Committee for this reason that it represents every Indian in the province. Also for this reason that there are areas of unorganized Indians and areas of uncommitted Indians as to what organization they will support or be a part of. But in this way, we have a clear cut representation sitting around this table and when this body adjourns, their duty should not be terminated, but be in a position to be recalled by the Department or the Minister. And furthermore, we think this is just and the fact that the Department of Indian Affairs and the Minister missed a point by not calling a Provincial consultation after the five separate or regional meetings were called in the Province of British Columbia. A provincial meeting should have been called to consolidate the positions of the five meetings of all the Indians of British Columbia. And then after the provincial meeting he should have called this meeting. So there is the missing link. And this is our decision and belief in the meeting that we broke off for province by province. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Allen Lueck: Now does the member from British Columbia feel that a Committee this size can possibly co-ordinate the different provincial regional groups. The function of the Committee as I see it, is to co-ordinate the regional groups who will be doing the main amount of research work. There has to be a co-ordinating

committee to make sure that the British Columbia group is not working on headland problems, for example, as well as the Maritime Provinces, and therefore duplicating their work. Someone has to do this. But certainly a group this large cannot expect to convene occasionally and carry out the day-to-day work. It's got to be a small flexible group that are representative of this delegation who have to do that. Now possibly we're just discussing terms here maybe what we're calling a delegation, you're calling the National Committee and you visualize a smaller executive or secretariat coming from this group. I don't know but I would like to hear that explained because as such this group cannot function in the way you wish it to function in the next year or two to draw an Indian Act and do all the research.

G. Manuel: I think first of all to be fair, as I understand it you adjourned at 11:30 so each Regional groups could have their own conference and right off the bat Saskatchewan introduces a motion without first hearing the expressions by the other Regional groups in their deliberations and I'm just wondering if the suggestion of Guy Williams is in order to go to get the expression first of all the provinces. Is this good?

G. Williams: That's the way we understood it.

G. Manuel: It's seem to me then this assembly is in accord with this. Our British Columbia has already stated its suggestion. Could I get Alberta then to, which is it?

No. 7.

H. Cardinal: No. 7 - Alberta - Mr. Chairman, very briefly our position is the same as Saskatchewan.

G. Manuel: Oh, thank you. Saskatchewan - The motion so jumps over to Manitoba.

Dave Courchene: Our position is the same as Saskatchewan.

G. Manuel: Thank you Mr. Courchene. I think the next province must be Ontario.

Peter Kelly: Thank you Mr. Chairman. From our deliberations this morning and also from our analysis, we've come up with a graph of the presentation made by Saskatchewan and therefore we are in complete agreement with that resolution as well.

G. Manuel: With Saskatchewan? Right.

Now I wonder what province is next? Oh it must be Quebec.

Andy Delisle: The position of the province is the same as Saskatchewan.

G. Manuel: Now, what is the next province? Oh, the Maritimes. Oh, first can I get a clarification, is there different provincial delegates from the Maritimes or is it going be just the one voice?

A. Nicholas: Just the one.

G. Manuel: Okay, fine, good.

Andy Delisle: He really knows how to hurt a guy.

A. Nicholas: We share the position as explained by the Saskatchewan delegation. We had drawn up a chart which we took into the meeting with them where we had on top the National delegation which is naming its delegates to the National working committee and reading the resolution, this condition is met so therefore it's just the same as Saskatchewan.

G. Manuel: Oh well, fine then. Now as you know that the Yukon is with British Columbia so we need not call on the Yukon but the Northwest Territories isn't there and I wonder, I want to point out one thing since there's just one delegate from the Northwest Territories. She was not involved with any of the groups. She was separate so she'll....

Speaker Unknown: According to some information, did a colleague from Ontario kidnap the representative from the Northwest Territories?

G. Manuel: For the point of information to you she said she wouldn't be here for discussion until quite late that she was for the majority. That if there was a deadlock she said you vote for me. But I told her that it was up to the assembly. So, it looks like the majority is for adopting the Saskatchewan resolution that has been presented.

No. 5 - Sorry. It's all right.

Donald Moses - I believe that during our caucus meeting from British Columbia we also stated that we should leave the decision of choosing a delegate from British Columbia until we get back home and then we will insert it in to this group. I understand from the meeting, if I'm wrong if they will correct me, that it is our feeling when we get back home that we will call a Chief's conference from British Columbia. So that we can choose this delegate or delegates if they are more than one. Before we do so it is my understanding again from our meeting that we will present our views as a Chief's conference and one person or two or three or . . .

G. Manuel: Could I have quietness it's half difficult for me to hear it.

Don Moses: I'll repeat again just what I said - I think it is clear that our, that at our meeting as British Columbia delegates during noon hour that we wanted to call a Chief's conference in British Columbia before we choose a delegate or delegates from British Columbia to sit on such a National committee. Am I right? I think I am right. Yes I am.

G. Manuel: That's still in order with the resolution here. Right.

Well, since there's seem to be unanimity as far as feelings is concerned regarding

the Saskatchewan resolution. Are you ready for the question?

All those in favour, raise your hand. Keep it up for the press.

All those opposed. I would like to take this privilege at the present time to ask, who should I ask, I'll ask Dave Courchene or I'll ask Andrew Delisle to thank the press for being so co-operative with our assembly here.

Andrew Delisle: I would really, on behalf of the delegates, like to thank the press for the job they have done. I know my colleague from what is generally known as the Province of Quebec, Chief Max Gros-Louis, did say at one point in the meeting that he was dissatisfied with some coverage we did get and one person, and he did mention that he did not like to see anything in the paper unless we, the delegates from the province, what is generally known as a province, had seen this but it was a point in the meeting where we were sort of a little hot under the collar and we didn't like to see us as being not really or even an insinuation has been -- not really representative of the people who live in what is generally known as the Province of Quebec. Native people but we've been observing this, we've seen the television coverage, we've seen the radio coverage and I think they're doing a very good job and I think this is one time where we as a unit can say as a unit, thank you very much.

Peter Dubois: Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Saskatchewan delegation gives me the great pleasure of having to introduce the task resolution to the one that you just approved of. Be it resolved that the National committee be composed of one representative from the following suggested regions: (1) The Prairie Provinces - 90,000 people

G. Manuel: That was stricken out.

Peter Dubois: Well I'm just reading it as it was. I didn't strike it out of my

paper. (2) British Columbia and Yukon, (3) Quebec, (4) Ontario, (5) Maritimes, (6) The Northwest Territories. Although the representative from the Northwest Territories wasn't here, you can see that we were considerate. Oh, with, I'm sorry, with the Chairman to be selected by the committee.

G. Manuel: You've heard the resolution by Peter Dubois. Is there a seconder for it? Max Gros-Louis, is there any discussion on it? Are you ready for the question.

Question is been called by the mover. All those in favour. All against. Carried.

G. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I just want to register the fact that the majority of the British Columbia abstain from voting until such time that we have met with out, with the Chief as we stated.

G. Manuel: Do you want this recorded?

G. Williams: I want it recorded that the majority of the British Columbian delegates has refrained not against the convention or the, or the assembly until such time we have further instructions from our Chiefs.

G. Manuel: James Gosnell.

James Gosnell: I want to further to what Mr. Williams has said as to why we are in a very difficult position and first of all I want to make it very clear that I represent 21 Bands sitting here in this conference and these Bands - the people that are within these Bands, Band Councils that is, have a seasonal employment and our seasonal employment in which we, we earn our livelihood that commences in May and it generally finishes off at the end of October or sometimes carries on to November. In other words, it will be from November to April. We were, we're directly involved in the Pacific Coast Salmon Industry and the entire, the entire Band Councils that I represent, 21 Band Councils that I represent in this assembly is involved in this.

Now, we, we have a very, I have a very large portion of this province that I'm representing and this puts our, our delegation in a very critical position because in the month of May it's very difficult for us to attend any meeting even on the Provincial level. Now whether or not the British Columbia delegation would meet on a Provincial level all these Band Councils has to be further instructed as what we would do, what our position would be. It makes it very difficult for me. I want, I want this on record because should a meeting be called, should a National meeting be called between the months of May to October, we will have no representation at all. So, I just want the delegates here to be aware for the, for the area which I represent. This comprises 21 Band Councils. So, if you have any solution or ideas as to how we would come into. I would appreciate this. I believe there are other delegates from British Columbia who has the same problem and I would appreciate it if I, if I would hear from them.

G. Manuel: No. 12 - No. - Okay. No. 11.

Forrest Walkem: I believe at the start of this meeting there was a delegation from Alberta that came. The Minister told them to bring four, they brought six. So I believe that we're going to run into the same problem in British Columbia. The Chiefs are liable to say bring your same ten delegates back. If they're only gonna give you one vote, just take the one vote but at least have ten of your voices there to, to discuss this important question.

G. Manuel: No. 9.

Nicholas Prince: The reason why we choose, the way we wanted it, was this, was this whole delegation to represent the Indian people is the fact that we have had direct personal contact with the Bands that we do represent now. In other words, like James Gosnell and myself represent nearly 2/3 of British Columbia in area and supposing one of us did get elected, we're gonna have to go through all the people

down south and get the views of all the Bands that we're going to represent. I represent 30 Bands and I don't know just, see we live in different economic systems, so we got to learn all this all over again. So we're in a situation where we have to work like heck I should say in order to get to all the people. This, this way we represent, we have direct personal contact with the Bands that we represent today.

G. Manuel: No. 12.

Chief Delisle: We have passed the resolution several days ago where it says that be it resolved that a National Committee composed of the representatives of provinces or regions at this meeting be established to affect the following purposes: I was wondering if I may ask the delegation from British Columbia, the various areas of British Columbia, to reconsider their stand and at least appoint at this time a person who can start the ball rolling on your behalf. That is, on this National Committee and that maybe in the workings of this National Committee we would find that we are not getting the representation of the people and then at that time you would be, it would be opportune for you to consult with all your Chiefs and select your proper delegate. But I feel, that it is such, so important that a month lost is like ten years to the non-Indian for us, and that the sooner we get this National Committee operating, the sooner it will go. We may, for instance, in the Province of Quebec, what is generally known as the Province of Quebec, select the delegate but we hope to eventually find out if this delegate would be doing the proper job and if he was not, we would be then changing it. So, therefore, I would ask the delegation from British Columbia to reconsider their position. I do not want to impose anything on them but I ask as another one of your equal delegates, that we get the job going. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 3.

Paul Walsh: I would like to comment on the intent and the legalistic meeting of

this resolution and I would want to reiterate first the remarks made by Chief Delisle. The National Committee, is really a sub-committee of this whole body and consequently when the Chief from British Columbia says that he would have ten voices on that committee, I think that the intent of the resolution is to get as much work done at the local level as is possible because that's where the people have the problems, that's where they know about them. The National Committee, the sub-committee of six people, would just take in all the information and try and co-ordinate it into a single draft. The more work that's done at the Provincial and regional levels, the better. Then, when this committee reconvenes either with the same personnel or with new personnel chosen on the basis of one representative for every 5,000 Indians, the composite, the combined draft of all the provinces would be presented once again to this committee probably in a large brief type presentation and then the committee would bring its wisdom to bear, to alter and amend that resolution. We see that the most important committee is not the National Committee. The most important committees are the Provincial committees who will be doing all the work and trying to find the basis of their rights in their region and the basis of what they want in the new Act in their particular province or region. So the National Committee merely is a co-ordinating body. It isn't a policy body and it would accept all the information that is sent up to it at the Provincial level. It might, of course, initiate its own research and it would try and co-ordinate a draft for the next meeting. Now if this had been started a year ago today, we could be meeting here, considering the work that had already been done by the Provincial committees and our five or six man National committee and we would be ready to present a draft to the Federal Government. I think the opportunity presents itself very logically now that the expressions of unity have been heard to strike up a small National co-ordinating committee is all it would be and then it would really be a sub-committee of this body and then this body or a body from the same source would meet again in some months' time to consider

the co-ordinated results of all the work that had been done at the grass roots level and I think that that really meets with the wishes that have been expressed during the past five days and ...

G. Manuel: No. 17.

H. Cardinal: 17 - I'll pass Microphone 16 to Chief Mathias.

Joseph Mathias: I don't think we were trying to set up a deadlock here. All we're saying is that we'll, we supported the motion, we'll follow it through. But we want to make this body aware that will be for the time being set up on a provisional, as a provisional delegation until such time that we go back to British Columbia and confirm our position with the people there.

P. Walsh: Will you appoint a provisional delegate then?

J. Mathias: Yes, we will.

G. Manuel: Well I think that problem is solved.

Yes - It's No. 5 then that's next.

I think I'll let Mr. Williams

Are you gonna still hold your cards.

G. Williams: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think we have to be more specific. I appreciate the fairness of my colleague, Joseph Mathias' statement and we are in agreement but when I say specific if we are going to form a sub-committee we must call it a sub-committee, rather than appoint a committee and do not call it a sub-committee.

G. Manuel: Got your number down, it's still five.

P. Kelly: Thank you very much. I would like to just point out now that in the north as we've indicated an internal division here is that I would like to point out in the northern area that there are about 45 Bands totalling something like 30,000 Indian people that are to be represented by this particular delegate. So, having said this, I'd like to just point out that the meeting we had this morning I pointed out that we had a graphic analysis. We came up with the graph of how our understanding of the situation is. We also have, we also made some resolutions this morning which are to be presented to the next meeting of the Union of Ontario Indians. I'd like to just point out that, that perhaps maybe what we're looking for is the setting up of a committee here and appointing people now and the other hand, it could be that what Ontario would like to recognize at this point that a seat be made available and if the seat is guaranteed, we would feel that we would want to appoint our own and we would have to explain this to the different portions of Ontario that we represent. Thank you.

G. Manuel: No. 10 - No. 11.

Philip Paul: I think we're getting hung up on, on representations just for, for starting something and the reason I voted for this, I probably was the only one from British Columbia but we stated quite clearly in our submission that we would support, support anything from the other delegates were proposing and I think the concept of national unity is pretty well accepted across Canada. I think unity, in general, is accepted by every provincial Indian group and I think just on this basis if we're going to get started, I think this is a good time to begin and begin to trust in some of the leaders that we are electing. I think over the last few days there has been too much indication that there is mistrust in the leadership that we have elected and if this is going to be persistent in our deliberations to arrive at unity we're gonna be faced with a lot of problems. And I think all everyone is asking here is that we've got to go somewhere from here. And the way to get started

is to place our trust in some of the individuals here to co-ordinate what has gone on here and the requests and submissions that have been made by some of the various Provincial delegates. I don't think it's too much to ask of anyone that we just have a committee or a co-ordinating group composed of this meeting to co-ordinate where do we go from here. And I think this is where we seem to be getting hung up on its not representation. I think representation was spelled out earlier and adopted that it be on the basis of one for every 5,000 people and I think this is a responsibility of the individual provinces and I think representation is well looked after in this particular resolution. But all we're asking here or the, the majority is asking here, is that we have someone to co-ordinate what is going on, gone on in this, these last few days. And I don't think it's asking too much for this reason I did support this resolution. Thank you.

Andrew Nicholas: I have here the resolution which Mr. Paul and Mr. Delisle were mentioning and it specifically says that a National Committee composed of the representatives at this meeting be established and it spells out the terms of reference and for this reason I thought that we have a responsibility here of the people who sent us to this meeting. A clear responsibility to, which tells us here at this meeting to make commitments and that I supported this particular resolution by Saskatchewan in forming the National Committee to go along with the basic idea.

Allen Lueck: I wish to make one rather legal or clarifying point. The resolutions that have been proposed here have not dealt with the regional committees as you are well aware. That is being left up to the different regions and provinces and it's specifically going to be difficult for some of the areas to get together to form strong committees who are going to do research work but this is highly essential and I think it requires careful consideration that you've got to have strong Provincial groups. You're going to get a tremendous amount of money if this project goes ahead to do research work and if you don't have those organizations at the Provincial

level, this whole thing is going to fall flat on its face. I just wish to clarify that, that this National Committee has continually gone along with the idea that there is going to be strong provincial representations and that means that if you have regions which are in disparity with other regions they have to be properly represented, properly co-ordinated and I simply wish to point that out as your legal counsel that this is an extremely important area and not to be overlooked. Thank you.

G. Manuel: 5 - I see your card up.

Chief Nadjiwon: I strongly support the statement made by my colleague Philip Paul. We are at the stage where if we sit back discussions never come to a head and I would strongly suggest that at this point, that we not only express unity but support unity and that the delegates, this delegation recess and the Provincial delegates or delegates here assembled break off once more and appoint their choice as the National representative.

Yes, I'll put that into a motion.

G. Manuel: Is there a seconder. Oh, I didn't see, I just seen your hand now Paul, I am sorry.

You've heard the motion, are you ready - Oh I'm sorry.

Peter I will second that motion - It's been seconded already, Peter.

Are you going to talk on the motion?

Eddy Bellerose: It is true my colleague from Ontario. We've been sitting here for the last couple of days now talking about the foundation structure and now we have it in our hands and we should try not to confuse it. I am sure my people elected me because I have dwelt on and I have behaved a good responsible person. Therefore,

they would never have elected me and on this motion that we have now I strongly support that we have established a foundation to work on.

I. Beaulieu: Gentlemen, just before the resolution goes through I don't, I am out of order, Mr. Chairman, but it's a problem that has to do with the weight that I've been going through all this time. I have a lot of material, a lot of minutes and a lot of resolutions and it will take a while in one way to get these out to the delegates and I just want to present that so that you keep that in mind. Maybe you come up with a solution. I have suggested that someone might stay here for an extra two days or so to fix them up.

G. Manuel: Have you got money to do this?

I. Beaulieu: I'm not looking for a job. I want to sleep.

G. Manuel: Fine, okay, that's just a matter of clarification on the secretary's part.

No. 6. Where is No. 6. Oh, that's finished. Okay No. 4. No. 4. Well I heard somebody say questions - Oh you a question.

G. Williams: Somebody called a question before you said 4.

Mr. Chairman, I have no personal quarrel with the, the motion or the resolution as set down and it's being debated. It's a normal procedure of democracy. We're not gonna debate our motion. We cannot get along or accomplish the need that is, that is stated in such resolutions. Just one thing bothers me, is this truly a sub-committee resolution or is it a National.

G. Manuel: Did you get your answer Guy? Yes.

G. Williams: We're prepared to go along with the motion that's on the floor.

G. Manuel: Are you ready for the question? Question's been called. All those in favour, raise your hand. Against. Carried.

How long, how long do you want to, to, to recess then. Half an hour, five minutes, fifteen minutes.

Well, let's say, the Minister. I want to remind you the Minister should be here any moment. 11 - What have you got to say?

Speaker Unknown: Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important to, to have someone stay possibly the secretary to compile the briefs and the submissions I think it is, if it would be in order if we could insist on having his salary paid while he is here two days or three days because it is very important that we get the proper message that we have made here to the Indian people of British Columbia and to Government and to press, etc. I think strong consideration should be made of this.

G. Manuel: You make that a motion?

D. Courchene: I would like to comment on that before you make it a motion. I'm sorry that we cannot on account of other commitments that we have, our secretary which is Manitoba Indian Brotherhood secretary at this time. I would like to suggest this to you though that once you have formed your committee, let's get our committee to work.

G. Manuel: Now, we stand adjourn until what time. I want to be clear on this.

G. Williams: Fifteen minutes, 3:15.

G. Manuel: Everybody have coffee. Now will you bring the coffee.

G. Manuel

I shall declare this assembly in session. And at first I think we should deal with the committees who you went out to meet about, is this all settled? Could we get the names recorded of the different people who have...No. 7.

H. Cardinal

The delegation from Alberta would like to introduce the Prairie delegate, Peter Dubois from Saskatchewan.

D. Courchene

Prairie division, Manitoba is also involved and I would like to concur with Alberta in stating that we appreciate that Mr. Peter Dubois represent the Prairie division.

G. Manuel

When you speak this means Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The three provinces. Fine. This will be clear for the record. Who is going to present British Columbia.

Speaker ?

British Columbia, Mr. Philip Paul.

G. Manuel

Very well, Ontario.

Speaker ?

Ontario Delegation would like to introduce Wilmer Nadjiwon to the delegation.

Speaker ?

A point of clarification Mr. Chairman, is that British Columbia and Yukon.

G. Manuel

Now what is the next province Quebec?

Max Gros-Louis

Generally known as the province of Quebec. The delegation

G. Manuel

Okay Max.

Max Gros-Louis

The delegation of the province generally known as the Province of Quebec has decided that Chief Andrew Delisle will be the representative.

G. Manuel

Chief Andrew Delisle from Quebec. Maritimes.

W. LaBillois

Maritime Delegation has picked Andrew Nicholas.

G. Manuel

The N.W.T. I guess would be Mona Jacobs since she is all alone here. Now is that all the provinces represented. I guess that deals with that business. So we will go on with the next business and that is British Columbia paper had been tabled and they want to re-introduce it on this assembly for consideration. Ratification. Will somebody from British Columbia, Philip Paul. It is very difficult for me to see from here so you have to shake it up in the air.

Philip Paul

I would just like to make a statement on what has just taken place. Now that we have beaten Mr. Bennett to the Yukon and seeing we were there first people in Canada, maybe we should pass a motion that and we are the first people who have united across Canada maybe Mr. Trudeau could let us have a crack at the Constitution of Canada. Thank You Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel

I shall declare this assembly in session. And at first I think we should deal with the committees who you went out to meet about, is this all settled? Could we get the names recorded of the different people who have...No. 7.

H. Cardinal

The delegation from Alberta would like to introduce the Prairie delegate, Peter Dubois from Saskatchewan.

D. Courchene

Prairie division, Manitoba is also involved and I would like to concur with Alberta in stating that we appreciate that Mr. Peter Dubois represent the Prairie division.

G. Manuel

When you speak this means Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The three provinces. Fine. This will be clear for the record. Who is going to present British Columbia.

Speaker ?

British Columbia, Mr. Philip Paul.

G. Manuel

Very well, Ontario.

Speaker ?

Ontario Delegation would like to introduce Wilmer Nadjiwon to the delegation.

Speaker ?

A point of clarification Mr. Chairman, is that British Columbia and Yukon.

G. Manuel

Now what is the next province Quebec?

Max Gros-Louis

Generally known as the province of Quebec. The delegation

G. Manuel

Okay Max.

Max Gros-Louis

The delegation of the province generally known as the Province of Quebec has decided that Chief Andrew Delisle will be the representative.

G. Manuel

Chief Andrew Delisle from Quebec. Maritimes.

W. LaBillois

Maritime Delegation has picked Andrew Nicholas.

G. Manuel

The N.W.T. I guess would be Mona Jacobs since she is all alone here. Now is that all the provinces represented. I guess that deals with that business. So we will go on with the next business and that is British Columbia paper had been tabled and they want to re-introduce it on this assembly for consideration. Ratification. Will somebody from British Columbia, Philip Paul. It is very difficult for me to see from here so you have to shake it up in the air.

Philip Paul

I would just like to make a statement on what has just taken place. Now that we have beaten Mr. Bennett to the Yukon and seeing we were there first people in Canada, maybe we should pass a motion that and we are the first people who have united across Canada maybe Mr. Trudeau could let us have a crack at the Constitution of Canada. Thank You Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel

Who is going to introduce a motion B.C. regarding their paper.

Speaker ?

I so move.

G. Manuel

You move that the paper. Is all the assembly clear what paper this is. The paper that was tabled and was read by the B.C. lawyer representing the Squamish Band. There are 25 points concerned and I think it is incorporated with the other resolutions that you had adopted already. Is there a seconder for that motion?

Victor Adolf

Are you ready for the question? The question has been called. All those in favour raise your hands. All those against. The motion has been carried. Now I would like to call on, I might forget so I might deal with it first. I think the staff of Indian Affairs that have been here, the stenographers, the interpreters have done a tremendous job for this assembly and I would like to call on Wilmer Nadjiwon to thank the people who have been co-operating with us.

Walmer Nadjiwon

Thank You Mr. Chairman. Yes, it would give me a great pleasure not only to thank the stenographers but I would officially like to thank the wonderful job you yourself done at this assembly. You have kept the order.

G. Manuel

Thank you Wilmer. Now what else. Oh yes. Now it has been expressed before, I think Isaac Beaulieu mentioned to you that there is papers, submissions and motions and resolutions that were passed and he felt that somebody should stay behind to prepare this for the delegates of all that is assembled here and I think there are

provisions now for this and if it is an order I would entertain a motion that somebody make a motion that they select somebody to stay here, maybe two people to prepare this for your assembly. Have them out as soon as possible.

Wilmer Nadjiwon

I would move that the Acting Vice-President of the National Indian Brotherhood and his secretary be empowered to get these motions in order and have them distributed.

G. Manuel

Is there a seconder for that motion?

Philip Paul seconds it.

Are you ready for the question? The question has been called? All those in favour. All those against. Carried.

O.K. Now I guess the next business on the agenda is to have the Minister make the statements if it please the assembly. Is it O.K.

O.K. Mr. Minister Chrétien.

J. Chrétien

Mr. Chairman, First as we are at the end of this very useful week of consultations in Ottawa. I must first of all congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, for the way you have conducted the deliberation. I know that it was not an easy task. The assembly had great wisdom when they chose you to deal with difficult problems of procedure and so on.

This meeting has been called a long time ago as the meeting following the consultations that we have had in Canada since last July. You have discussed many things and you have made many representations to the government this week and I was very pleased by

the manner and the frankness that you have shown in the deliberations. You passed many resolutions and I would like to comment on two this afternoon, the others will be tabled and I know that the Brotherhood will make . . . Mr. Courchene has been authorized to organize these resolutions and myself, and my officials will study all of them. There are two points that I would like to touch this afternoon that are of concern to all of you. The first thing is the resolution you passed concerning the Migratory Birds. I would like to say to you that you advised me to be in touch with the United States of America to discuss the situation and I am happy to tell you that this has been done some months ago by the officials of my department. We have had some informal talks with the officials with the various departments in Washington. In January I took a few days for rest and I went to Mexico and while I was there personally I took one day of my holidays to visit the officials of the Mexican Government to talk about this very problem because the Migratory Birds Convention concerns the Mexican Government, the American Government and the Canadian Government. So when we will make our statement in June about the direction we want to go with our policies I will cover that topic and I will make known the views of the government concerning the problem of the Migratory Birds. We have received many representations from Indians or organizations over many months, and we have received representation from other groups interested in Canada. I can tell you that I am confident that we can reach a decision that will satisfy all of them and I will, as I said, make that known in June.

Now I would like to congratulate everyone of you who have been elected to represent your provinces on the committee, the independent and autonomous committee of the National Indian Brotherhood to discuss the future form and the nature of the consultations that the Indians want to have with the federal government. It's a very good occasion to congratulate you and I am very proud to be associated with

that big step. For the first time you have reached a common decision and there is no division between yourself. And as it is the result of the consultations that we started in July, I think that I cannot associate myself to that achievement. For the future you have chosen an executive committee who will represent each of the Provinces. At a future date I will make sure that we will have a meeting with them to discuss the nature, the timing and the financing of the future consultations between the Indian people and the government of Canada.

These past months that we have had, have been great for us and for the Indian people too. We made every effort possible to make the case of the Indian people of Canada in the public mind. At each of these consultations, you know, we have seen the Indian discussing the problems of the Indians in Canada and at each of these meetings it was public meeting, the press were invited. We have provided the facilities, both to the Indians and the press to make sure that the message could come across. It is the end of these meetings and you want to keep this format of consultation. So I welcome this move where you have decided to get from this committee an executive committee. I have to report these things to my colleagues in the Cabinet. At the first occasion I will have and it's going to be soon. After that I will call you either in Ottawa or elsewhere - the executive committee and we will discuss the format, the timing and the financing of the mechanism that will be needed to carry on the job that we started together ten months ago. I have been the Minister of Indian Affairs for ten months and I am proud that the Prime Minister has asked me to take over that job. It is a fascinating and challenging task that faces all of us. The Indian people of Canada are a great people. They have been here for a long time before we, the white man, came and there is a lot of problems now that are facing the people of Canada and a group

of people of Canada, the Indians of Canada.

The facts are clear. In term of social and economic development, the Indians are at the bottom of our society. And it is something that we have to correct altogether, the people of Canada and the Indians who are citizens of Canada. We have to work together, because you are entitled to share in all the social and economic aspects of our Canadian life and at the same time you want to keep your own identity. You have a history that is part of the Canadian history. You have to be proud of it. You want to keep your identity and in the society that we want in Canada, we say that it is possible to be full citizens of Canada and at the same time to be ourselves. I know that you have faced many frustrations in the past. But now you get new leaders, you get a better education than ever before. You want to talk, you know to use the facilities of modern life to get your point across. I am the representative of the Canadian Government to whom you talk and the ten last months have been for me and for the government, and for my colleague, the Minister without Portfolio, who is attached to my department to help me to do my job. We have learned a lot from the Indians but it has been gratifying for us. So in the weeks ahead, we will keep on the process of consultations. You have a committee that I am glad identifies itself with the National Indian Brotherhood so it creates no more problems, the same kind of problems that I had in mind yesterday. I welcome that move, I will give the opportunity to the executive committee to discuss the timing, the place, the format and the financing of the useful consultations that we will have in the future and I hope that we will keep on that path. I would like again to thank everyone of you for your contribution I know that many of you spent times and times and weeks and weeks to look into the problems of your people. You know, you could certainly, for yourself, do something else that will be more rewarding in terms of money and personal achievement but you know you have put ahead of your personal interest the

future of the Indians of Canada and the people of Canada thank you for that.

Thank you very much.

Fred Plain:

Mr. Minister, Sir. It would please the people vitally concerned, more specifically the people of Treaty No. 3 of Northwestern Ontario and Manitoba, if you would at this moment elaborate on your discussion with the Mexican Government concerning the Migratory Birds Convention Act.

J. Chrétien:

I would like to make some comments but Chief Plain I, it was an informal conversation I had with them, you know. If it was not official I cannot reveal but you know, if I had failed completely I would perhaps not report at all but I can not say anymore than that. But in June I will be in a position to say what we intend to do with that. I appreciate your concern.

Fred Plain:

An informal statement, Sir.

J. Chrétien:

No, it will be a formal statement, Sir. You know, these things have to be approved by my colleagues in the Cabinet and I appreciate your concern and it's clear that the Indians have talked loud and clear about it during the last consultations and we will face our responsibilities now.

Wallace LaBillois:

Mr. Minister, you are still telling us words. In a motion that I made this morning and it was unanimously adopted here that we want action and not words. You have repeated the very same thing that you said in the beginning that you are going

to make a policy statement in June. We do not know what this policy statement is going to be. You could in your policy statement in June say that you are not going to honour the Indian's treaty rights and I am quite concerned about your statement now. I will go on record as saying that you are talking foolishly. I will go on record and say that you are still talking words not action. Mr. Minister, we have a lot of confidence in you. It is indicated by your address that you are not prepared to say that we should continue to act in good faith. You are still giving us promises on behalf of the government and I feel that it is pointless to say anything else. I would here and now say to the Indian delegates here, the only thing that you can do is go to the Court of Last Resource and put your claims to them. This is the only thing that is left open to you. This is the only course because we have asked that the government make a firm commitment. We have asked that the government start action and his speech indicated that the government is not prepared to do this. I think the only course now is to move that we adjourn and we all go home. We are still in the very same position as when we came here a week ago. The only change there is we now know that we are in united voice. I thank you.

G. Manuel:

No. 4.

G. Williams:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, on behalf of myself and the organization I represent, I want to thank all the delegates here. I have gained a lot of friends and I just want to say that on behalf of myself and my organization we are prepared at this moment to await the decisions in the very near future from the Minister and the Government. We have waited a hundred years, we can wait a few days. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

G. Manuel:

No. 13.

Chef Max Gros-Louis: of the region usually known as the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, all of us agree that a new approach has to be made on reserves and bands before any change to the Indian Act and it might take a year before any decision is reached. I should like here to bring out a point during that time we Indians of the north who live on hunting and fishing, whereas it is now up to them to hunt and fish in order to live. Are they going to die of starvation? An example, at Notre Dame du Nord last week four Indians drowned. Why, because they were hiding from the game warden in order to get some food and were obliged to ride the rapids during the night, what will we do with the Indians who have no housing in the north who live on Crown land? Are we still going to let them freeze for a year or two? What are we going to do with the Indians who receive only mediocre care. They have no doctor and the nurse only visits them every three or four months. In Mistassini not too long ago an Indian travelled 60 miles on snowshoes before finding a radio for communication to get an aircraft to come and get a sick child but when the plane arrived in about four days, the child was dead. I would like to ask the federal government that it take the necessary measures or give the necessary orders to the provincial or federal authorities to at least allow these Indians to live during the year or two that it will take to make a new Indian Act. Thank you.

Jean Chrétien:

One point, Mr. Gros-Louis, the Minister of Tourism, Hunting and Fishing from Quebec is to be coming to Ottawa next week. I am to meet with him and I will discuss the problems that you have raised concerning the Indians who live in the Province of

Quebec, and their problems of hunting and fishing. Thank you.

G. Manuel:

No. 13, no you were No. 13 eh Max. No. 7.

H. Cardinal:

Mr. Chairman, Honourable Minister, on behalf of the Alberta delegation we wish to acknowledge our recognition of the fact that you are in a difficult position to give us the type of firm commitment that we desire. We would like to register, Mr. Minister, our position in stating that we want action as soon as possible to allow the committee that we have set up to start the operations immediately so that we can start to work on solving some of the basic problems that our people face. Our delegation from Alberta does not want to come back to another meeting to be told by yourself that your government has not yet decided. We encourage this, we support the resolutions that have been passed 100%. We are happy with the recognition of yourself that we in this meeting have entered into what you can call a new era. Because for the first time our people as a whole are proposing to work with you on a basis of partnership rather than on a basis of directives from your officials. Our delegation is extremely pleased that this has occurred. We have many problems in Alberta regarding medical services. We would hope that you can discuss this issue with your Colleague so that these problems can be alleviated by having the officials both in your Department and the Department of National Health and Welfare be less stringent in their interpretation of their regulations that they receive from here. We also hope that on your own you can take the initiative to do away with the policy directive from your department regarding the stoppage of education assistance for Indian students at the post-graduate level. I do not think these require Cabinet decisions. These can be done almost immediately. Our

delegation then wishes to thank you, Mr. Minister, for the enlightened position that you have taken and we hope that the approval and the facilitation to implement the resolutions carried at this meeting will be forthcoming in the very near future. Thank you.

G. Manuel:

No. 5.

Chief Nadjiwon:

I would further thank the Minister for coming and giving us at least hope and I will in the future call many times on his words that his government and his department has recognized the problems and is ready to face the responsibility. It is on these words that I will base any future optimism. There are, I fully concur with Chief Delisle and my colleague from Alberta, that there are many stop-gap actions, immediate actions, that can be taken to assist in relieving the problem until such time as there is a definite policy statement referring to each and every problem as it comes up and as a partner now, I would again thank you for coming and at least giving me the hope and the optimism that the future is brighter. Thank you.

G. Manuel:

Thank you Mr. Nadjiwon. Now No. 4.

Frederick Plain:

Mr. Minister, you have formally recognized and congratulated the election of the delegates who will form a National Committee. You have heard the resolution stating that we want research done on the rights, the basic, fundamental, human, aboriginal rights. You did in your speech recognize this committee. Now, Sir, since you have

recognized and I fully realize that you cannot make a policy statement, however in view of the fact of Mr. Max Gros-Louis' fervent plea for immediate action concerning the conditions of the Indian peoples who rely very heavily on the wild life, would you, Sir, if this delegation were to ask you, I am not asking for an outright huge sum, but since you have already approached the government who are involved in the Migratory Birds Convention Act, would you, Sir, finance this delegation that was named, on this National Committee to meet as quickly as possible so that the governments involved would know what the actual condition is, as you have invited us here to Ottawa to let the government know what we are saying. Would it not be better, Sir, rather than you as a non-Indian, although you are representing the branch that is dedicated or was formed to protect our rights, while you did approach these other governments, Washington and Mexico, would it be possible, Sir, if this delegation were to ask you to finance a trip to Washington and to Mexico and back with Ottawa so that this delegation can explain in their own way and in their own terms, the need that exists concerning hunting and fishing rights.

Jean Chrétien:

Chief Plain, if I find that it's useful to do such a thing I will be glad to do that but at this point you know, we are discussing this matter within the government I just told you that in six weeks from now I hope, I will make a statement on that. We know a bit on which path we will be with that statement of policy and that after that you know, let's wait for six weeks, and if it is needed I could organize such a thing. And I want to say something to you. You read a letter yesterday where there was a comment made about yourself. I read it after that and I had nothing to do with it. It's, you know, it was not my words, it has never been my words, and I hope that you do not

associate myself with the comments from this gentleman from Toronto. So I had nothing to do with it and it was not deserved.

G. Manuel:

I want to intercede here Chief Isaac is leaving the co-chair and has to catch a taxi. Give him a good hand.

G. Manuel:

No. 6. No. 15.

John Tootoosis:

Speaking for the Saskatchewan delegation, we want to extend our thanks to the Minister, Mr. Chrétien and all the delegates. We are glad that we did accomplish one thing a unity where we hope will accomplish our objectives, where our treaties and our aboriginal rights would be settled once and for all. I have stated once before when the Government came to make these treaties, he gave you some words mixed with honey and I hope that I don't have to say that again. I told that Minister Andras when he was in Regina because that was just the way I felt at that time. Once again, we thank you Mr. Chrétien.

G. Manuel:

No. 11.

Forrest Walkem:

Mr. Minister, the British Columbia delegates have listed a few important points that they would like to see that if there is any sincerity in what you say when you say that will try to make changes in the Indian Act. Now these changes may carry on for a few years. But there are certain things that we would like to see you take action on. We have only listed just a few of them and we would like you to

show sincerity to us people in B.C. and look at a few of these and give us the majority of them. There are some people back there that are wondering if they are ever going to get in business. And if you cannot, you should let these people know if you could do something for them or if you can't. Cause we have listed them they are of importance and this Indian Act that you want changed or that we want changed. The study on it, it may take time, but we would like to see action and any time that Indian Affairs has ever done anything it's usually very slow. We would like to see you change your ways and maybe move a little faster on some of these things.

Jean Chrétien

If I can make a comment on that Mr. Chairman, I understand that one of the biggest restrictions for the Indians is always delays. And I think that on the other hand when I see a document on my desk that relate to a problem that had been raised sometimes a year and two years ago and I made that statement a long time ago and I can repeat it-it is in my view very urgent that we do transfer to the Indians the power to make the decision that concerns themselves. I said, but I mean it too, I am not too at ease to be looked as a kind of great White father at my age, you know, it is such a big population and when I see that some Indians want to borrow money from CHMC and so on, have to come to my office to get my approval, I feel very much myself frustrated. I think that the Indians should be in a position to make their own decision on these matters without having to come to Ottawa. They are mature people and they can do themselves and it is what we call liberty.

G. Manuel

No. 6.

Eddie Bellerose, Driftpile, Alberta

Honourable Minister, just a day or so ago I called you a whirling wind and this afternoon's statements and just this morning I comment on a few things that my colleague in Alberta, which I strongly support, of this submission to you. In adding these things, I would like to add some more thinking in your behalf and you used the word sharing. Exactly what we were saying in that resolution passed by Saskatchewan that further research to be done, we are sharing the things that we want to do. Another point that you stress was to keep our identity and I see here now today and when I listen that my people back home and I remember the conditions that I left and being a community development man, I know the conditions. I have lived with them. I have talked with the people, I share frustrations with them on their own behalf. What greater way can we keep our identity is by confirming our treaty rights once and for all. We, the people in my area, are insecure in our own land. It is because we are insecure, there are contributing factors to it when we are hunting we are always aware of game wardens. When we are fishing, another uniform of fishing inspectors, in education there is assimilation that I don't like which how else can we divide our identity and in health it is deprived from us in a certain aspect as my colleague has stated. When a man and his family and his children are secure, the education goes up, the aspirations goes up and their pride becomes known and seen in a face of a man and his family. This is what I mean, until you give my people the treaty rights that they have asked for and their aboriginal rights and residual rights, all I am saying here is, this is our birthright. These are the rights we were born with. Until I fulfill my rights of my own that I was born with, then I could gradually change to integration which you may call or maybe prove or improve what I want to be and this process of development will take place in the pride when you say you'll

get your identity as a person or as an Indian origin. Only then you will build a foundation of pride of my people again but if you do infringe on the treaty rights and take the rights that they have been born with, if you take that away from us then Mr. Minister, our young generations are not going to have tolerance or patience like I have. A lot of patience from my forefathers had been put upon me that I have patience today. And I want you to consider this very deeply because this is the very factor why people are insecure in our area in Alberta and remember the sharing part. I love my country, I fought for it in the second World War and ever since I came back I'm fighting the second war now. The war, that is being poverty and frustrations of my people. And I hope as a true Canadian, I feel I am a Canadian, and when I speak this way not only do I speak on behalf of my people but I also speak of your children and other children of many others. That they may live in unity and harmony and build this beautiful country of ours called Canada and in Cree interpretation is Kanata - clean land and let's keep it that way.

Andrew Nicholas from New Brunswick

Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't want to leave this conference without expressing the deep and lasting impressions which I have after participating in this historic and significant conference. It was good to meet some of my old friends and for me to make some new ones. I hope our blood brothers across this country, right across to where the sun sets forgive us people in the east for the poor screening job we did and I hope we meet very soon again. I'd like to propose that the National Committee just like to meet just after the break-up of this session.

G. Manuel

It has been requested by Andrew Nicholas for the National Committee to meet after

a motion for that, maybe you can organize that will you? When you suggest something you have to be responsible for it. No. 7, No. 3.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba.

On behalf, first of the Manitoba delegation I would like to thank the Minister for finding the time to attend our deliberations. There is no doubt in my mind that we are only starting a new era of recognition of our people in our own country. The deliberations that went on here this last week with the Minister present and also with the Minister not present has shown us as a Manitoba delegation the seriousness of the situation in Canada today. We all know as Indian representatives that we are a long ways from participating in our own country, but in the short time that we have had this Minister I would like to put on record, as a Manitoba delegate, that some action has been taken. Firstly, he has made it possible for us to sit here and if some of us has criticized it was to try to get a message across. I hope the Minister will take it in the spirit that it was given, in honesty and sincerity not only in honesty and sincerity but also that we are going to do something about it as Indian representatives. We hope the Minister will carry on in the same direction that he has started in a true partnership with the Indian people across Canada, on equal partnership, not on a partnership of a landlord-tenant relationship but as a partner from one human being to another. If this is the spirit that emerges from this delegation then I am sure we are going in the right direction. Now as a representative of the National Indian Brotherhood, provisional Vice-president of the National Indian Brotherhood, I would like to say to the Minister that too he has allowed to happen. On behalf of our National President, Mr. Walter Dieter,

G. Manuel:

Apparently there is whistling in these machines. Look at your machines to see if they are all turned off.

Dave Courchene, Manitoba.

On behalf of our National President, Mr. Walter Dieter, who was not able to attend our session and I am sure he would have helped in the knowledge that he has had. I would like to say on his behalf that Walter is a dedicated, hardworking person for the Indian people. He has sat with the Minister a number of times and he knows that there will be co-operation. On behalf of this delegation I hope that we will follow the democratic principles because this is the request of not only myself as a representative but also of your National President, where we can sit down like we have done for a full week with the Minister and articulate our situations properly and out of this will come the true partnership for all our Indian people. Thank You.

G. Manuel:

No. 4.

Frederick Plain, Southern Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, In Toronto you heard a delegation from a reserve that is on the American border, part of it in New York State. Before I proceed I want to mention one specific incidence not too long ago. A young native Canadian woman attempted to cross the border at Port Huron, Michigan and Sarnia, Ontario. She had in her possession certain goods and the immigration officials, civil servants, stopped her before she had a chance to say whether she was going to declare the goods or not and immediately seized them. She said I have rights. This civil servant used language on this native Canadian woman that you don't hear decent people using on each other. You made a statement, Sir, that you were going to issue a statement on this particular situation regards to the Jay Treaty. You made this statement, Sir, in January. You said I will look into the matter and I will issue a statement very shortly or in a few weeks. I am wondering, Sir, if there has been any

consideration given to the situation as it exists. The Iroquois of this particular reserve suffered indignities. The Canadian public was led to believe that here was a violent people reacting very violently. They were merely insisting on a basic right that is guaranteed to them in a treaty affected between Washington and Great Britain. You said, Sir, you were going to look into this. You said you would make a statement in a few weeks. If you have not made that statement as of now how long Sir is a few weeks?

Jean Chrétien:

I will touch on that problem, you know, when I make my statement in June. It will be an important statement as you understand.

J. Manuel:

I guess the other No. 4, James Gosnell.

James Gosnell, British Columbia:

I wish to support the statement, and the statement to me is very important to me, made by Max Gros-Louis of Quebec that we are at this time concerned with the ways and means of revising the Act and yet what are we going to do about our problems that we are faced with day by day. Max Gros-Louis made a very, very important statement that something should be done in the meantime and I wish to say this that it falls freely it seems to fall directly in line with a presentation to the National Conference on Indian Act by the British Columbia and Yukon Delegation, May 2, 1969. I wish to point out that they are in no way proposals for an entirely new Act rather than these proposals may be considered as interim requirements to permit the orderly development of our affairs while the study and change is taking place. I don't know Sir, if you have the submission, the submission contains 25 points which the British Columbia Delegation feels that something should be done about, and this seems to fall in line with what the speaker from Quebec has stated.

A lot of us I notice have not seen the things for translating. Max Gros-Louis made a very, I think we should really support this. In the meantime while we are doing this our people are suffering. Something has to be done in the meantime that is the reason why I want to stress that this is the feeling of the British Columbia Delegation. That is why we made our position very clear in this submission that we support other delegations who have a deeper concern of their treaties and so on but this submission is an interim requirement. We would appreciate it, Sir, if this is given immediate consideration by your Department. I want to say at this point now that and first of all I would like to thank the delegation of British Columbia who I am associated with. I feel that we have worked close together and to further this, the results of this consultation meeting which you have made Mr. Minister, has brought the Canadian Indian together. I believe that we can say that we have expressed our feelings although we may have had different approaches but our objective is one and this objective has been clearly stated in all the submissions, the resolutions that have been made by various delegates. We fall in line with this. We fully support other submissions that have been made and now I wish to on my behalf thank all the delegates that I have worked with. I have met some of you before on the National Indian Advisory Board, and I have met more on this conference that created a lot of friendship between myself and all of you. Thank you.

Max Gros-Louis:

First of all I would like to thank all the delegates for the magnificent work that they did and for having supported rather than opposed the delegates coming from the Region we generally call the Province of Quebec. Mr. Minister, I would like to give you a message to send to Mr. Loubier. I would like you to tell Mr.

Loubier that the Indians of Quebec have had enough of the government of Quebec and the inhuman treatment they are giving to the Indians. We do not want any positions or any actions in the final resort or discouragement that all the world would regret. Thank you.

G. Manuel:

Now. No. 5.

Peter Kelly:

Thank you very much. I'd like to ask the Minister a question regarding the Kenora area and in the field of education. It is true that there are about 100 Indian students now in high school in the Kenora area and this is quite an improvement as compared to a handful of students a few years ago. And while it is very important that financing be arranged for post-graduate work on the part of Indian students, it would seem to me more important that we try and place more Indian students into the four and five-year programs. We have found out in the Kenora area that a large number of these youngsters are placed in a continuation program which calls for a Grade 10 and from then on they go on to vocational schools. We have such a, we have an honour student in the Kenora area that was placed in the four-year program and this young fellow is thinking of going on to Engineering School. Well he can only go on to a diploma course

where he could qualify for an engineering course from a recognized University. I would like to see a directive issued to the field personnel in all parts of Ontario, specifically the Northwestern Ontario region that this practice be stopped by the vocational counsellors - effective May 5.

Mr. Chrétien:

We will look into that.

Chairman Manuel:

No. 3.

Dave Courchene:

Yes, I have one question Mr. Minister. I'm sure we are just about finishing off. As one of the gentlemen of the Committee that was allocated the responsibility to present to the Minister our consultants' fees, I would like to ask the Minister now that we have the figures if it would be possible to have these consultants' fees as you are probably aware our provincial organizations are in dire financial situations at the moment and I was wondering if maybe to make it a total success of our delegation if you would look after our financial commitments that we have.

Mr. Chrétien:

I cannot make any commitment. You told me yesterday that you were to present that. I said that I was happy that I had to contribute to that and you asked for further contribution. I say I will look into that and report to the National Brotherhood.

Dave Courchene:

Could I give it to you now, sir?

Mr. Chrétien:

Oh. You can.

Chairman Manuel:

No. 10.

Gus Gottfriedson:

I would not feel right if I left this Conference without saying anything. I think at this Conference we achieved a great goal. We done the things that a lot of people was impossible. We achieved unity here - clear across Canada. And I must say that I fully agree with the delegate, Mr. Max Gros-Louis from Quebec, that called us B.C. Indians and Indians from the land of the setting sun. But I must say that we need action and we need it soon because in the place where I live I am surrounded by non-Indians and they are building houses all over the place and every white man that's building a house, he's building it on a concrete foundation and I believe that he intends to stay. And for years we have heard the non-Indians going around singing "This Land is our Land" and I never heard the Indians singing it yet. But I think that this should be the Indian song. And us Indians in British Columbia, we waited a hundred years to have something done and I felt real glad when the delegate, my friend here from over the mountain in Alberta, said he's tab the Minister with a name as Whirling Wind. I feel that this is a man of action, that really moves fast and I hope he lives up to that, that name he has and I concur with all the speakers that have spoke previously. And I hope that we leave here and have a safe journey home. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman:

No. 5.

Speaker Unknown:

Just for a point of information I was just wondering if you had before you the list of these people that are on this National Committee - just for my own information.

Chairman Manuel:

Well the secretary has them all here. You want them? It'll be in the minutes anyway.

Speaker Unknown:

Oh I see. Okay, thank you.

Chairman Manuel:

Now. Now. 6.

Omer Peters:

I would like to just add my words to the concern of Max Gros-Louis that there be some action taken immediately in some of these areas. I would also like to thank all the people that we worked with. It's been a pleasure. There's one other thing that I would also like to see now since we have this unity. We have a lot of young people that are working in the Indian Affairs Department. I believe we should somehow come out and say that we're discriminating against you in a sense. Let's take the Minister with us to here in these meetings. Let's, because after all if we're going to take the Department over then we'll have some experienced help right there. I would also like, I think, you folk forgot to compliment the Provincial Ontario Delegation here, I think we did a lot of hard work here. I think you notice that the weather you had here was tremendous. And. Well thank you very much.

Chairman Manuel:

If that's all the speakers there are I would like to call on Alenice O'Bomsawin. She has something to say here.

Alenice O'Bomsawin:

I - it was just a suggestion that I had previously. But I realize that you are wishing to go home maybe. But there is a film that was made by the CBC that I thought all of you should see and it is the story of a young Indian boy who came

here to Ottawa. This boy was an Ojibway and he spoke Indian and he spoke English although he could not write and was put in a High School here - the Rideau High School - and as a result had a very tough time. I think. He could not communicate like the other students could and he was laughed at by his class all the time. Anyway I don't want to tell you the whole story but the film tells you what happened to this boy. And he disappeared and for three months no one could find him. And they just fished him out of the Ottawa River. And I thought that, I'd been listening here for three days to what all you said and I was very impressed and I will go and speak to the young people in Montreal and elsewhere and tell them the very fine work you are doing. But I would very much like you to see this film because you will have a bit of an idea of the difficulties of those young people who live in the city. Yesterday, or the day before, when we saw the film, we asked the director of the film if it would be possible for you to see it. And he said yes. All we have to do is ask him and he'd come and show it to you. And it is a 22 minute film. I'd like for you to think about this because this is so true of what happens to our children in the city that I would very much like you to consider it.

Chairman Manuel:

Are there enough delegates that would like it. Is there many want to see it? Raise your hands those who want to see it. One. Two. Three.

Speaker Unknown:

Train or plane?

Mr. Chrétien:

I cannot comment. I tried very hard to get you on plane and you know I have not found any available government plane that is none yet and I am still working on that for those who have no reservation. I don't know if we can do something. I have a sign from one of my assistants that we have not been able to organize that. I don't know, you know.

Chairman Manuel:

Dwayne Rowe, Legal Advisor from Alberta.

Dwayne Rowe:

Mr. Chairman I just realized it is my birthday and I wonder if Mr. Chrétien would like to buy me a drink after we adjourn.

Chairman Manuel:

No. 4. I just want to remind you the Minister's got a commitment in about 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. Chrétien:

No. No. I will give you a dollar and . . .

Chairman Manuel:

Mr. Guy Williams. Order here.

Guy Williams:

Mr. Chairman, at this time on behalf of myself, and our delegation I want to thank this delegation or this assembly that is here for a successful, historical meeting. And I hope that there will be another meeting similar to this that we will renew our friendship, where we'll work in a more experienced way. Please go home and create more unity among your people. We will try to do the same in British Columbia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Manuel:

I think the Minister has to go now. So I think we should ask Mr. Plain to thank him for his presence.

Mr. Fred Plain:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. I will indeed thank him. My wife would not have known me if I had not got the extra five dollars a day to eat. I was wasting away to a shadow.

He did immediately look into the situation. I submit, sir, in my thanks to you for your attendance here, that you give earnest consideration to the pleas that have gone to you and that there will be more than just looking into it. Thank you for your attendance.

Mr. Chrétien: Thank you.

G. Manuel: Just stay put yet. Don't forget that the meeting hasn't been adjourned yet. It hasn't been officially adjourned yet. It's just that the Minister is leaving. He has a commitment.

Speaker Unknown: Where did he get that Indian drum that he's going to give away?

Chairman Manuel: Could we sit down and get a few things straightened here.

Speaker Unknown: George.

Chairman Manuel:

Yes? (No. 1) before we adjourn don't forget your machines. They want them all turned in. (No. 2) before we adjourn the, some of the observers want to make some remarks apparently. What is your wish? Are you prepared to sit and listen to some of them? All raise your hands that want to hear some of the observers.

A. Delisle:

Not too many. The chiefs maybe.

Chairman Manuel:

How many? Just very short remarks. How many want to speak from the observers?

Raise your hands. Oh. Chief Richard Pine. Is that your name? Okay. Chief Pine?

Chief Pine:

I would like to make my comment.

Chairman Manuel:

Could you identify yourself and where you come from.

Chief Richard Pine from Sudbury.

Thank you for asking me to make my comments. Some of my delegations were appointed and I am very pleased with the comment that was made by all the delegates here that we unite and the only way it can be done in the proper manner and to work together. We have worked but naturally we smoothed it out and I thank you and all my friends, my Indian friends, for doing such a good job. Thank you.

Chairman Manuel:

Identify yourself and where you come from.

Speaker Unknown:

I am Councillor of Indian Island Reservation of New Brunswick and I came here also as an observer, or more or less a spectator and I want to stress, you know, that there is a feeling of unity in this here Consultation Meeting and I wish on behalf of my Indian people from Indian Island all the luck to get the Indian Act under way.

Chairman Manuel:

We'll listen to the observers yet. Is there anybody else from the audience? Nobody else? Alenice do you want to? Oh, there is.

Collin Tatz.

My name is Collin Tatz. I am from Australia visiting. My primary purpose in coming to Canada was to observe something of Indian Affairs, in particular the manner in which Indian people and Government consulted each other so that I can take this information back to Australia where we are only beginning to talk about consultation with our native peoples. And I'd just like to say that having seen some of your consultation in South Africa where I was born, in Australia where I now live, in New Zealand amongst the Maoris I have been tremendously impressed by

the manner in which unity, harmony and decision-making have been achieved here. I have learned something for the natives of Australia. Thank you.

Chairman Manuel:

Is there anybody else? If there is not, Eddy Bellerose wants the floor. One minute. One minute.

Eddy Bellerose:

My colleagues, I want you to share with me, to give a great thanks to a man who had consented in helping us identify our aboriginal rights as Hughie Conn.

Chairman Manuel:

No. 11 over here.

Don Moses

I don't know if anybody is going to thank the man that..

Speaker Unknown.

Who's speaking?

Don Moses, British Columbia.

I want to thank you all for thanking us. And I don't know if anybody is going to thank the gentleman that I am going to mention. I don't know if he has been thanked already but I want to say that he has done a tremendous job. I have known this man all of my life. I have seen him. I have talked with him. I have walked with him and I am sure that if such a man were not here for this Conference we would have got bogged down on a few issues etc. and I am not going to elaborate on this I'd like to have the whole house thank the chairman for his tremendous job.

G. Manuel:

Thank you very, very much. One of the things I wanted to say in all the years

I've been involved in Indian Affairs, this is the best I've ever seen. This is the top notch calibre and I think it is because the Indians, even in the grass roots level, are learning how to select their top men. It's first class to me and so all my efforts in Indian Affairs have been worthwhile. I'd like to thank the delegates for appreciating my work. I want to thank them. There wasn't one part of the delegation that tried to manoeuver me or pressure me into anything. And this was one of the things that I really appreciated. I think this delegation, this assembly has really learned the feeling of democracy. So thank you once and all and don't forget your machines.

Andrew Delisle

Just a minute. I would like to thank on behalf of the delegation which, from which is generally known as the Province of Quebec, the Federal Government, Indian Affairs, has provided translators and it was mostly for the benefit of my delegation. I'd like to thank them for this and I'd like to also thank the people who are working on the translation. Thank you very much.

George Manuel:

More copies of the Consultation sheets and summaries and there's all kinds of them. Do you want some more? And don't forget again your machines. I'd now like to call on Peter Dubois.

Peter Dubois:

Thank you. I do not want to out-talk anybody. But I have said all that I have needed to say. I move we adjourn.

George Manuel:

Now before you start off. All the delegates that were appointed to come to this corner over here and made decisions where they're going to meet. Your meeting now

stands adjourned. Phil Paul?

Philip Paul.

No, I was just going to say was there a motion to adjourn.

Chairman Manuel:

No, It's been moved. Yes. We stand. We stand adjourned.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN ACT

APRIL 28 - MAY 2, 1969 - OTTAWA, ONTARIO

REVISED LIST OF DELEGATES

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Philip Paul,
854 Clarke Road,
Brentwood Bay, B.C.

Chief Nicholas Prince,
Box 505,
Fort St. James, B.C.

Chief James Gosnell,
New Aiyansh,
B.C.

Mr. Guy Williams,
193 East Hastings Street,
Vancouver, B.C.,
President, Native Brotherhood
of British Columbia.

Mr. Gus Gottfriedson,
Box 27,
Kamloops, B.C.

Chief Joseph Mathias Joe,
2549 Hemlock Street,
Vancouver, B.C.

Mr. Victor Adolph,
General Delivery,
Lillooet, B.C.,
Rep. North American Indian Brotherhood.

Chief Forrest Walkem,
Spences Bridge,
B.C.

Mr. Donald Moses,
P.O. Box 36,
Lower Nicola, B.C.

Chief Bernard Charles,
16010 Beach Road,
R.R. #2, Whiterock, B.C.

YUKON TERRITORY

Chief Elijah Smith,
Box 2452,
Whitehorse, Y.T.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Mrs. Mona Jacob,
Box 61,
Fort Smith, N.W.T.

ALBERTA

Mr. Harold Cardinal,
President,
Indian Association of Alberta,
Room 307, 10405 - 100 Avenue,
Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. Sam Currie,
Box 373,
Ponoka, Alberta.

Mr. William Bull,
Box 417,
Lac La Biche, Alberta.

Clement Doore,
Box 3002,
Cluny, Alberta.

Mr. Fred Gladstone,
Cardston, Alberta.

Mr. Ed. Bellerose,
Box 304,
Lac La Biche, Alberta.

SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Ernest Tootoosis,
Paynton, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Paul Ahenakew,
Sandy Lake, Saskatchewan.

Mr. David Ahenakew

Mr. Peter Dubois,
Box 722,
Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan.

Mr. Hilliard McNab,
Box 362,
Punnichy, Saskatchewan.

Mr. John Tootoosis

MANITOBA

Mr. Dave Courchene,
President,
Manitoba Indian Brotherhood,
249 $\frac{1}{2}$ Notre Dame Avenue,
Winnipeg 2, Manitoba.

Mr. Isaac Beaulieu

Mr. Lawrence Whitehead

Mr. Steve Anderson

ONTARIO

Mr. Peter Kelly,
34 Sussex Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario.

Mr. Raymond Bruyere,
Box 355,
Fort Frances, Ontario.

Mr. Peter Johnston,
Cutler,
Ontario.

Mr. Ronald Wakegijig,
Wikwemikong,
Ontario.

Mr. Omer Peters,
R.R. No. 3,
Thamesville, Ontario.

Chief Wilmer Nadjiwon,
President,
Union of Ontario Indians,
Cape Croker,
R.R. No. 5,
Wiarton, Ontario.

Mr. Fred Plain,
1048 Tashmoo Avenue,
Route No. 4,
Sarnia Indian Reserve,
Sarnia, Ontario.

Chief Richard Isaac,
Six Nations,
Brantford, Ontario.

QUEBEC

Chief Andrew Delisle,
President,
Association of Quebec Indians,
Box 720,
Caughnawaga, Quebec.

Chief Michel McKenzie,
P.O. Box 531,
Temiskaming, Quebec.

Chief Daniel Vachon,
1 Gregoire Street,
Sept. Iles, Quebec.

Chief Max Gros-Louis,
Lorette Band,
Village Huron, Quebec.

MARITIMES

Mr. Wallace LaBillois,
Box 10,
R.R. No. 1,
Dalhousie, N.B.

Mr. Andrew Nicholas Jr.,
Vice-President,
Union of New Brunswick Indians.

Mr. Anthony Francis,
Big Cove, N.B.

Mr. Noel Doucette,
Chappel Island, N.S.

SUBMISSION TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA
OTTAWA - APRIL 29, 1969.

THE NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD IS CONCERNED, DEEPLY CONCERNED, THAT THE INDIAN ACT CONSULTATIONS ARE NOT MEETING THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE OF CANADA. THE BROTHERHOOD SUBMITS THAT THE METHOD USED DOES NOT REALISTICALLY RECOGNIZE THE PRIORITIES FOR DISCUSSION AS INDIANS SEE THEM.

IT HAS BEEN MADE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR, BOTH BY THE CONSULTATIONS TO DATE AND THROUGH INDIAN MEETINGS THROUGHOUT THE LAND, THAT THE PRINCIPAL CONCERNS OF INDIAN PEOPLE CENTER AROUND;

- A) RECOGNITION OF THE TREATIES AND THE OBLIGATIONS IMPOSED BY SAME
- B) RECOGNITION OF ABORIGINAL RIGHTS
- C) RECONCILIATION OF INJUSTICES DONE BY THE IMPOSITION OF RESTRICTIONS ON INDIAN HUNTING THROUGH THE RATIFICATION OF THE MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION AND SUBSEQUENT FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION
- D) CLAIMS COMMISSION

IT IS OUR OPINION THAT BEFORE MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIAN ACT CAN TAKE PLACE, THESE FOUR ITEMS MUST BE DEALT WITH AND A POSITION OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND COMMITMENT REACHED.

WE WOULD REMIND THE GOVERNMENT THAT THERE WERE TWO SIGNATURES ON THE TREATIES YOURS AND OURS. WE FURTHER STATE THAT IN THE EYES OF THE INDIAN, THE TREATIES CONSTITUTE SOLEMN PROMISES AND IN FACT CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS. BEFORE THE OBLIGATIONS UNDERTAKEN BY TREATY CAN BE CHANGED OR COMPROMISED, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT THE AGREEMENT OF BOTH SIGNATORS TO THE AGREEMENT ACCEPT SUCH CHANGES.

CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE WITHOUT CONSULTATION - THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, REPRESENTING ONE OF THE SIGNATORS, HAS ARBITRARILY AND AUTOCRATICALLY IGNORED THEIR OBLIGATION TO THE SECOND PARTY TO THE AGREEMENT (INDIANS) AND CONTINUALLY COMPROMISED THE POSITION OF INDIANS.

IT IS NOT IMPORTANT TODAY TO DEFINE SPECIFICALLY WHAT THE TREATIES SAY AS MEASURED BY THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LANGUAGE USED. WHAT IS IMPORTANT IS WHAT THE TREATIES INTENDED TO SAY AND WHAT EACH PARTY UNDERSTOOD THEM TO MEAN. FOR THE LAST CENTURY, THE DESCRIPTIONS AND DEFINITIONS OF INTENT AND CONTENT, BOTH LEGALISTIC AND OTHERWISE, HAVE REFLECTED YOUR OPINION AND YOURS ALONE. INDIANS HAVE NOT BEEN GIVEN A REASONABLE OPPORTUNITY TO INTERPRET THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THE INTENT IN SUCH A WAY THAT PUBLIC POLICY COULD REFLECT AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE INDIAN POSITION.

WE ARE NOT PREPARED AT THIS MEETING TO DEBATE THIS ISSUE, NOR THE AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIAN ACT. WE ARE PREPARED, HOWEVER, TO DISCUSS WITH YOU A MORE REALISTIC BASIS FOR MEANINGFUL CONSULTATION.

TO DATE THE DISCUSSIONS HAVE BEEN HEAVILY WEIGHED IN FAVOUR OF THE GOVERNMENT. YOU HAVE THE RESOURCES AT YOUR DISPOSAL TO DEVELOP YOUR POSITION WHILE WE ARE HARD PRESSED TO DEVELOP AND PRESENT OUR OPINIONS. IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS IT WILL BE YOUR INTERPRETATION OF WHAT WE WANT THAT WILL BE REFLECTED IN THE LEGISLATION YOU SUBMIT FOR OUR CONSIDERATION.

WE SUBMIT THAT THIS SITUATION SHOULD BE REVERSED. THE NEW INDIAN ACT WILL BE OUR MAGNA CARTA - ITS IMPACT WILL BE MORE CLOSELY FELT BY INDIANS THAN IT WILL BE GOVERNMENT. IT CAN BE OUR PASSPORT TO EQUALITY AND OPPORTUNITY

OR IT COULD BE JUST ANOTHER COMPROMISE SOLUTION TO A LONG TERM PROBLEM.

THE NEW INDIAN ACT MUST REFLECT THE REAL INTENT OF THE TREATIES, IT MUST STIPULATE THE GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO ITS OBLIGATIONS, IT MUST PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR EQUALITY AND OPPORTUNITY AND IT MUST REFLECT MUTUAL TRUST AND UNDERSTANDING.

TO ACHIEVE THIS OBJECTIVE, THE NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD SUBMITS THAT INDIAN PEOPLE, THROUGH THEIR LEGITIMATE ORGANIZATIONS, SHOULD BE GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO CONSULT MEANINGFULLY WITH INDIANS ACROSS CANADA AND TO DEVELOP THEIR OWN INDIAN ACT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION RATHER THAN VICE VERSA.

TO DO THIS WILL REQUIRE TIME, ORGANIZATION AND FINANCES. THE NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD FEELS THAT THE COMMITMENT OF ALL THREE ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF REALISTIC LEGISLATION, AND MORE IMPORTANT, A BASIS FOR MUTUAL TRUST AND UNDERSTANDING.

WE WOULD PROPOSE THEREFORE THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA, RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FOREGOING AND THAT THEY COMMIT TO THE PROCESS. SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO ACCOMPLISH THE OBJECTIVE AS OUTLINED ABOVE.

IT IS FURTHER PROPOSED THAT THE NATIONAL INDIAN BROTHERHOOD ESTABLISH A SPECIAL COMMITTEE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSULTING WITH INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND PREPARE A DRAFT INDIAN ACT FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF BOTH GOVERNMENT AND INDIANS.

TO FURTHER ASSIST IN THE PROJECT, THE PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATIONS WOULD ESTABLISH COMMITTEES TO CONSULT WITH AND ASSIST THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

THE NATIONAL ORGANIZATION SHALL EMPLOY SUCH ADVISORS AND CONSULTANTS AS REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH THEIR PURPOSE. THE PROVINCIAL ORGANIZATIONS WILL, WITHIN REASONABLE LIMITS, EMPLOY SUCH ADVISORS AND CONSULTANTS AS REQUIRED TO ADVISE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE.

THE COST OF CARRYING OUT THE PROGRAM SHOULD BE BORNE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. THESE ARE ANTICIPATED TO BE;

(A) NATIONAL COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE TRAVEL AND CONSULTATIONS	40,000.00
PROVISION FOR HONORARIUMS	20,000.00
FULL-TIME SECRETARY	12,000.00
CONSULTANTS AND LEGAL ADVISORS (INCLUDING TRAVEL)	100,000.00
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$172,000.00

(B) PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE TRAVEL CONSULTATION	15,000.00
CONSULTANTS AND LEGAL ADVISORS (FEES AND EXPENSES)	20,000.00
PROVISION FOR HONORARIUM	10,000.00
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$45,000.00

TOTAL COST ANTICIPATED

NATIONAL COMMITTEE	172,000.00
PROVINCIAL COMMITTEES*	360,000.00
8 x \$45,000.00	<hr/>
	\$532,000.00

*NOVA SCOTIA, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NEW BRUNSWICK COMBINED - ONE COMMITTEE IN B.C., ALTA., SASK., MAN., ONT., QUEBEC AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

THE AMOUNTS INDICATED ARE APPROXIMATIONS BASED ON PRELIMINARY PROJECTIONS ONLY. MORE DETAILED PROJECTIONS WOULD REQUIRE DETAILED EXAMINATION.

FOR THE BENEFIT OF THOSE WHO ARE ALARMED AT SUCH PROJECTIONS WE WOULD POINT OUT, THAT, THIS KIND OF AN INVESTMENT AT THIS TIME SHOULD PRODUCE LONG TERM BENEFITS AND HOPEFULLY ENSURE THAT THE PROCESS WILL NOT HAVE TO BE REPEATED FREQUENTLY DURING THE NEXT CENTURY.

THE AMOUNTS, THOUGH SIGNIFICANT, ARE IN TURN INSIGNIFICANT WHEN MEASURED AGAINST INCREASING DESPAIR AND FRUSTRATION. NO DOLLAR VALUE CAN BE ADEQUATELY ESTABLISHED TO RELATE TO HUMAN POVERTY AND SUFFERING.

TO THE MORE PRAGMATIC WE WOULD POINT OUT, THAT THIS PROPOSAL IN TERMS OF DOLLARS AND CENTS IS TRULY INSIGNIFICANT, WHEN MEASURED AGAINST RECENT OVER-EXPENDITURES ON THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER BONAVENTURE. WE WOULD ALSO SUBMIT THAT TO INDIAN PEOPLE, DISCUSSIONS OF TREATIES, LEGISLATION, EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIAN ACT ARE EQUAL IN IMPORTANCE TO THE B. AND B. COMMISSION.

WE TRUST THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA WILL CONSIDER SERIOUSLY THIS SUBMISSION AND THAT IT WILL ACT RESPONSIBLY IN RESPONDING TO OUR PROPOSAL.

2.00 p.m.
APRIL 29, 1969.

CHAIRMAN declared the session open. Discussion.
(Introduction of Speaker, Mr. Hugh Conn).

Now I would like to take the privilege to call on, and there is no need for introduction, for Mr. Hugh Conn, of whom you all know. He has been around the country for a number of years working on treaties and aboriginal rights. He will tell you about this event but to accommodate the direction that was raised this morning by Mr. Guy Williams, on the number of treaties there are in Canada - of recognized treaties.

MR. CONN: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. I would like to start with a note of apology, rather explanation, for my absence this morning as this is not usual with me. (Car trouble - paying ticket - no shaver).

This meeting has this in common with every one I have attended across Canada over the last three or four years. It is preoccupied with the question of Indian rights. This is the main preoccupation. There has been talk about aboriginal rights, treaty rights, acquired rights. Residual rights has not been used but this is a part of it.

I think that, perhaps, the most important aspect of the question is the matter of aboriginal rights but not in the narrow sense that the term is used so often today. To me these would be called residual rights, as rights to hunt and fish after treaty. But aboriginal rights in the true sense means the rights of Indians before Columbus got lost on the voyage of discovery and thought he was in India or before Jacques Cartier after sailing miles up the St. Lawrence River thought he was in China.

I am talking about before the white man got lost. At that time the Indians were equal, they all had equal rights. These rights may have varied in terms of land usage, but basically and fundamentally the Indians owned this continent lock, stock and barrel.

The problem that faces the Government representing you and me is "How and by what means did you acquire title to these lands"?

I am going to give a very quick resume from coast to coast in order of discovery. The people will tell you that there are no treaties in the Maritime Provinces but this is just not so. As a matter of fact in the final analysis, the Treaties in the Maritime Provinces are the closest to real treaties that we have. The same form as was used in the Maritimes with the Indians as was used by the British Crown in dealing with other powers. For example, Indian treaties were Articles of Peace and Friendship while the Jay Treaty (Britain) (U.S.) was titled Articles of amity, commerce and negotiation. Moving now to the Province of Quebec, A small, I mean very small area, approximately 1/4 or less of the land mass in Quebec was specifically exempted after the conquest by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 on the theory that France, with 200 years of occupation, must have extinguished the Indian title. If this was the case, the British could acquire title from the other power, it was sufficient for them that the French were in occupation of this part of Quebec, and Britain did not presume that it was necessary to deal with the aboriginal population. One must I think accept this as being perhaps a technical, but never the less valid, legal thinking at the time.

This does not explain how without any negotiation whatever, the boundaries of the Province of Quebec were extended in 1898 to James Bay with no provision however for you the Indian. In 1916 in the last Quebec Boundary Extension Act, Quebec was extended to the area which we now know with positive legislation. The Statute required prescribed when lands were required for settlement to deal with the Indians as in other areas of the country. The point in Quebec, then, is that this legislation, how come it has never been applied. At the same time on the opposite side of Hudson Bay the Province of Ontario was likewise extended and Ontario immediately lived up to this part of the commitment. This is one of the mysteries in Indian-Canadian legislation.

Moving over to Ontario, although Quebec lands had been set aside and exempted, Ontario did not have such exemption, so immediately after the American revolution there was a wave of immigration into that part of Canada which lies just north of the St. Lawrence River. This, according to the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which reserved for Indians all of the lands outside the specified exemption in the Royal Proclamation as their hunting lands and set up machinery, which is observed to this day, for the extinguishment of this title. This wave

of immigration into Ontario necessitated that the Crown should purchase lands from them. This was a requirement of British Law. This proclamation is perhaps without a doubt the most important single enactment in the history of the Indian people. Some legal people will say that the Royal Proclamation of 1763 created the Indian title but this is just not so. The Indian title had existed from time immemorial. What the proclamation did was to recognize the Indian title, confirmed it and incorporated it in British Law.

We are not dealing with any one right. We are dealing with rights which were of concern to all Indians. Consequently, from this point on it behooves the Government of Canada, and we as white people, to show how that title was extinguished.

The southern part of Ontario, that the basic principle set out in the proclamations was that as lands were required for settlement. There was no question of having to go out - they were to be purchased. This led in the period of 1792 to 1840 to what I have, for want of a better term, called "the piecemeal surrender of Southern Ontario" and our close examination of these will show some very important discrepancies in the title.

The treaties in New Brunswick and in the Maritimes were treaties of Peace and Friendship.

The treaties in Southern Ontario - this phase of the operations were purely and simply land purchases. These were headed 'THIS INDENTURE made' (a certain date) just the same as if you get a deed from a certain municipality. This is the way it starts.

The next period then started in 1850. Minerals had been discovered on the north side of Lake Superior and Huron. The Red River Settlement was where Winnipeg is now and already Confederation between Upper Canada and the west was visualized in 1850. William Henry Robinson was given the chore of dealing with the Indians inhabiting the north shore of Lake Huron and Superior. This was the first treaty in the sense we know them now. You see these treaties bound and distributed by the Department. (In answer to Mr. Williams' question, there are some 240 land surrenders that I have been able to find as a matter of record.) The Robinson treaties were the first which dealt with, not with an individual Band or group, but with whole tribes of Indians.

CHAIRMAN: Are these 240 treaties the recognized treaties? .

MR. CONN: The Robinson Treaty contained for the first time specific mention of residual rights, the rights which the Indians would retain to themselves. This was not confined to the Reserves but throughout the whole surrender and, of course, the principal one of these was the right to hunt, fish and trap. The changes made by the Government negotiators in these treaties started from this point are significant. The clause in the Robinson Treaties guaranteed Indians the full and free privilege of hunting, in essence, on all Crown lands.

The next step was the Stone Fort Treaties which covered the old Selkirk Settlement and part of southern Manitoba and here perhaps, it is significant that although in the negotiations leading up to the treaty there was a great deal of mention made of hunting and fishing rights. There is no provision for hunting, fishing and trapping in Treaties 1 or 2.

Treaty No. 3, Northwest Angle. This was the one that led to the famous headland to headland description.

Treaties Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7, cover roughly the southern part of the Prairies and all of this privilege was approved for them subject to such regulations as might be made by the Government of the Dominion of Canada. This in turn was followed by treaties 8 to 11, which provide the same rights but subject to regulations made by the Government of the country. In other words, free privileges of hunting, fishing and trapping, whittled down to regulations by the Government.

Finally now we come to British Columbia and the Yukon, the area west of the Great Divide. A great deal has been made of the fact that there were no Canadian Settlements in the area at the time of the proclamation. This has been found by some jurists as being 'terra incognita' but this is by no means true. Drake was there 200 years before and claimed it as British territory; and before the conquest there was Captain Cooke's exploration. He, just about the time of the proclamation, was given the specific task of exploring the river now called the Columbia to determine if the Northwest Passage actually did exist and if it went through the Rocky Mountains. This was by no means unknown territory. In this I share the opinion of the very eminent jurist Mr. Justice Norris, that there was ample proof that the British knew of the British Columbia coast, of the river, of the people there, and intended that their title should also be confirmed under the Royal Proclamation.

This is a thumbnail sketch of Indians starting out, in the first early word of the Bible 'in the beginning'.

If we take a look, and this point was talked on yesterday, but in my opinion under emphasized, if we take a look at all of these differences, it is the white man who creates all these differences. Is anyone going to tell me that the treaties in the western Provinces and Northwest Territories were on the basis of negotiations when you only have to look at the penmanship of the original to know that they were written by skilled draftsmen here in the City of Ottawa. Negotiate, promise them anything you like but get their signatures.

This brings us up to the present time, to the revision of the Indian Act.

The aboriginal rights in terms of land title in British Columbia are in my opinion intact. They have never been touched. In the rest of the areas where treaties prevail, in many respects these treaties have been honoured more in the breach than in the observance. In Northern Quebec the Indian title is intact and in the Northern portion the Indian title is confirmed by concurrent legislation by the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Quebec. In the Maritime Provinces, again the aboriginal title is intact. These were articles of Friendship entered into in times of stress. The rest of the treaties were entered into during the time of the revolution or War of Independence; then everything is quiet; then comes the War of 1812 - and another treaty. In other words, everytime we were in danger we brown-nosed the Indian and as soon as the danger had passed, forgot about him.

At the present time there has been a great deal of discussion here. The object of the whole meeting is to consider what should go into the new Indian Act. The process of consultation is a result of a promise made by the Honourable Walter Harris when the present Act was inaugurated in 1951 - actually the process was in 1949. The Indians objected strenuously to many of the powers conveyed on the Minister. They said to Mr. Harris, "As long as you are here Mr. Harris, we are not afraid; we trust you; but what is going to happen when you get a different portfolio or get out of politics?" Mr. Harris replied: "I will make a promise in all confidence on behalf of myself and the Government that if you go along with this Act as it is now, in ten years we will come back, meet with you and re-examine the whole thing." Now this is precisely what happened and within the ten years another joint committee of Parliament met and

heard briefs from Indian groups and officials on the Indian treaties indicating that all was not well in this sector. This process is still going on.

In all of this, now here is my message, my suggestion to this group. In all of this, right from the outset, it was made abundantly clear to both the administration and the executive of the Government of Canada that the Indians were uniformly preoccupied with their rights, aboriginal rights, treaty rights, residual rights. This has been abundantly clear; not for six months, not for a year, but for ten years. It has been abundantly clear to the Government of Canada that Indians are uniformly preoccupied with this and are not going to be put off with any vague assurances. The Courts of Canada have stated in a number of instances that the treaties with the Indians have been legislated out of existence. If so the question is, is the Government prepared now to legislate these treaties and the attendant rights back into existence or are they not? It seems to me that with this in mind the Indians are preoccupied; I might say almost to the point of obsession, with this one subject which is so well known to the Government. It seems to me that the Government should during these sessions be prepared to come forward with concrete legislation on this subject which they propose to put before Parliament and let you fellows have a look at it. Now, if it is not possible to speak to the legislators then I suggest that this meeting through the medium of their legal advisors be prepared to put before the Government of Canada a concrete proposal and say "This is what we want by way of legislation to confirm our treaties."

GENTLEMEN, THIS IS MY MESSAGE.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN ACT
Ottawa, Ontario April 29, 1969

We, the representatives of British Columbia Indian organizations and delegates of consultation meetings held in various parts of British Columbia, bring to the attention of the delegates here assembled from across Canada, our position with respect to this assembled conference.

We recognize the problems of our brothers in areas of the country where Treaties exist and have not been honoured. We strongly support the position that our brothers from the Treaty areas should insist that Governments at all levels must honour existing Treaties, and where necessary, should re-negotiate Treaties.

Our people forming non-Treaty areas, however, have been sent here by their representatives to review the proposals made at the consultation meetings and to confirm those that are considered useful to our people. We are instructed further to place on record in each field of our activities the principles and policies which our people believe should be incorporated in a revised Indian Act. We believe that this conference should review the principles, policies and objectives that have been brought forth from consultation meetings across Canada, weigh them, analyze them and give to those that have merit the weight and prestige which this conference carries.

We believe, and our instructions are, that the Government should be asked, when we adjourn, to incorporate these principles, policies and objectives in the draft of a revised Indian Act, and this draft should then be sent

back to us for further consideration on a local level. After considering this draft our people will then ask for any changes and additions they feel are required.

Our representatives and delegates from the consultation meetings are further instructed to state to the Federal Government that our people require a new and firm commitment by Government that they will, without further delay, give us a public affirmation of their recognition of our aboriginal rights in all fields including, among other things, aboriginal land rights, foreshore and riparian rights, forest and timber rights, hunting and fishing rights, mineral and petroleum rights and all other rights that are ours by hereditary, historical, moral and legal obligation.

We expect that our brothers from Treaty areas will make similar demands with respect to their Treaty rights. We support them fully in their quest for justice.

We recognize that our problems are different from those of our brothers from Treaty areas. We suggest that the delegates ~~here~~ from Treaty areas should meet separately from the delegates of non-Treaty areas, and that each of the two groups should then bring their policy statements to this entire body for ratification. We suggest much time can be saved by having these separate meetings held after regular conference hours.

The entire conference can then be asked to support both policy statements, - One for Treaty areas and one for non-Treaty areas. We believe much time will be lost here if the entire conference attempts to discuss as a whole body questions and problems affecting the two basic areas of treaty and non-Treaty.

In this way this conference can immediately resume consideration of the revised Indian Act, which was postponed until now on the adjournment of our area consultation meetings.

We firmly believe, as do the people we represent, that it is absolutely essential at this time and at this meeting, that the Government be advised of the principles we want incorporated in the revised Indian Act. The future progress of our people requires that the Act be revised and updated to meet the challenge of a new age. The Minister, the Government through the Prime Minister and many members of Parliament, and through them the people of Canada, have said to us, "Tell us what you require in a new Indian Act to lead your people into a rich new life in partnership with all other Canadians". Our people have spoken at the several consultation meetings and have said to us, their representatives and delegates, "Give them our answer loud and clear - here are the rights we require". We, their delegates and representatives, consider we are bound in duty to convey this message to the Government with the full support of this historic assemblage.

Let it not be said of us, "They were given the opportunity to chart their future and they failed to grasp it".

We ask this assemblage to review the recommendations of the area consultation meetings and to confirm those principles, policies and objectives that are considered essential for a new Indian Act.

We ask this assemblage to request each of the two groups from Treaty areas and non-Treaty areas to meet separately after regular conference hours and to formulate and recommend to this full assemblage their separate statements of policy, principles and objectives with respect to Treaty rights, breaches thereof, revision of Treaties, aboriginal

rights and claims and any other matters considered essential by each of the two groups.

We present this proposal and ask for the support of all delegates, earnestly believing it is in the best interest of all our people from coast to coast.

This statement of position is submitted by and on behalf of the following representatives of British Columbia organizations and delegates from consultation meetings held in British Columbia.

Kelowna Consultation Meeting,
Gus Gottfriedson.

Nanaimo Consultation Meeting,
Philip Paul.

Terrace Consultation Meeting,
James Gosnell.

Chilliwack Consultation Meeting,
Joe Mathias.
Nicholas Prince.

Prince George Consultation Meeting,
Bernard Charles.

Whitehorse Yukon Consultation Meeting,
Edward Smith.

Native Brotherhood of British Columbia,
Guy Williams.

North American Indian Brotherhood,
Don Moses.
Victor Adolph.

British Columbia United Interior Tribes,
Forrest Walkum.

Yukon Native Brotherhood,
Edward Smith.

Southern Vancouver Island Tribal Federation,
Philip Paul.

On behalf of the United Interior Tribes of B.C.

There is no doubt in our minds that the present Indian Act as it is, is definitely not the answer to the problems of the Indians of today.

If any Country in the world were to be taken over by the non-Indians and were to be put into a depressed state Canada should be given the leading role and would probably get a medal by using the present Indian Act as a guideline. The Indians of Canada were a proud race of people, they were able to fend for themselves in summer and winter. They were able to live off of their land and enjoy all the many good things that Nature provided.

But times have changed and the White Man's greed has put so many restrictions before them. To try and deprive them of their rights, that they should instead be trying to help them protect and keep. This would be a step in the right direction and would create a harmony among the Indian and the non-Indian instead of creating a dishonest attitude toward the non-Indian and the incompetent Indian attitude by the non-Indian.

After reading many of the consultation reports it is quite evident that the Indians' main concern is his rights to his lands, his fishing, hunting, medical, education and minerals. The Indians feel it is an awful small price for such great Land.

The Indians are rightfully owners of this Land and no unjust deal of any kind should be made. The treaty Indians would like their treaties recognized and the B.C. Indians would like their land claims recognized. The Indian Act in its present state is only a tool used by the white man to keep the Indians in a dormant state. When important issues come up regarding Taxation, Land Claims, aboriginal rights, etc. the Indian Act fails.

The Native Peoples would like to have the rights to the same privileges as do the big Companies, for an example the Hudson's Bay Company. It literally controlled our whole northland at one time. Another example is the C.P.R. It owns and I mean it owns more land in British Columbia than all the Indians and this was given to them. Its privileges include minimal taxes on big tracts of land, including timber and mineral resources. Its subsiduaries control rivers, valleys, airspace etc. And if it gets into trouble the Government subsidizes them. The C.P.R. has certain expropriation privileges right across theis beautiful land of ours. And to think the majority of their stockholders were foreigners. This is only one example of how the foreign investors get the red carpet treatment. Another example is the natural resources of B.C. it will soon be controlled by a select number of Co. which will probably be controlled by Foreign Investors and they will get big concessions. Yet the Native Indian when he attempts to brrrow money to develop his own land, the Governments discourage them and will not give them the same concessions as the Foreigners.

Once again the Indian Act fails.

We Indian people having to take our grievances before the Supreme Courts of the Provinces then told to take them to the Supreme Courts of Canada to be judged by patriotic people of this land of ours, is unjust to both peoples. Our taxation problems for example. The land claims by our fellow brethren in B.C., the Nishgas, our fishing rights, hunting rights, mineral rights and tested by the same Courts. The Treaty rights which are like sacred writings to our Prairie friends and Ontario. Let us bring them up to date with the present day and age and interpret them in a fair and just manner. Not ignore them in a childish and fearful way has has been done in the past. If the powers to be are in the Federal Government

hands let us sit down and throw away all fears of who is going to get the better deal and get to the point and solve these problems. If need be, let us take it before a world Court. Comprised of unbiased people who could give us both a fair judgement so that we could live side by side as free people without prejudice as Canadians.

And an Indian Act is not the answer.

The majority of the Treaties were signed by the Indians and the Federal Government on behalf of the Queen. Yet one of the most important treaties, namely the Jay Treaty, was signed between Britain (the home of the Queen) and U.S.A. and recognized by U.S.A. yet ignored by the Government. Is there to be no justice at all?

Another glaring example which was mentioned by the Manitoba Consultation is the fact that the Government of Canada when dealing with the Indians on Treaties, we are dealing with people who could neither read nor write. It stated that the officials committed a legal fraud in a very sophisticated manner upon unsophisticated, unsuspecting, illiterate uninformed Natives.

In the Edmonton consultations, there was mentioned of Treaty payments of \$12.00 for headman and \$5.00 for each individual every year. Why I would charge my best friend a lot more for a lot less. It seems quite strange that all treaty payments are made in white man's tender rather than in Indians tender. If the White man had to pay using Buffalo robes as tender he would lose the country. The Indians tender has increased in value, while the white man's tender has decreased.
(The Indian Act gave no protection here.)

Another sore spot that shows the sincerity of the white man is the Migratory Birds, which the Natives have lived off of year round for many years before the white man came. The claims that the Indians are decimating the stock is false. When one simple factor for instance is the amount of one certain species of waterfowl that are dying yearly from lead poisoning. They pick up lead pellets for grit from the bottom of lakes and ponds. There are enough birds dying through lead poisoning to allow every Indian across Canada three birds and the equivalent of total taken by all the hunters in Ontario not including Indians. Yet who do they go after first, the "Indian". It has never been known that the Indian has ever hunted a species of wildlife into extinction.

The Indian Act does nothing to protect us from such greed and injustice.

The fishing rights of the Indians in B.C. are in jeopardy. Whenever there is a noticeable decrease in the salmon catch of the Commercial Fishermen, the first people they blame is the Indian. And yet the greatest destroyer of the fishing industry is the commercial fisherman himself. The American fisherman has three hundred fathom long nets and their gill nets are three times the size of the Canadian's.

The annual take of the Canadian fisherman is approximately \$37 million. Yet they begrudge the Indian a few dollars worth. The problem is not the Indians. It is quite obvious it is the greed of the Commercial fishermen that is going to destroy the stock of fish.

Once again the Indian Act fails to protect the innocent Natives.

The powers to tax should be left in the Indians' hands and if there is to be tax sharing, it could be easily discussed and agreements made. The Indians are willing to pay for the services that they receive from cities and municipalities and any surplus they would like to put back into the betterment of their reserve not to be spent elsewhere.

Regarding economic development and taxation, there are a few outstanding cases in B.C. The Squamish Band for example leases out their land for \$170,000 and the land is taxed for the sum of \$385,000 which goes to show that the Indians themselves could be making a lot of money off of their own land.

Imagine paying \$555,000 plus your power and water and heating, etc. and still make a profit. And I am sure there is no one that would invest their money unless they were getting no less than 10% on their money.

Where are our lending institutes for the Indians to help develop their own land rather than to lease them away.

My own complex is another good example. Before building the Sportsman Motel and the Sportsman Shell Service, I carefully read the Indian Act. Then I tried to borrow money to develop this reservation land. There was no lending institute that would loan me money. While being kicked from pillar to post we were able to finish building it. And it was months later before financing was arranged thanks to the speed and efficiency of Indian Affairs.

I would say that I had ten times the hardship that any free Enterpriser ever had and yet I wind up with a lot less. The reason is that the Provincial Government, I am told by the Department of Indian Affairs has every right to tax me. And yet, I do not have the right to sell if I don't like the tax structure. Who in their right mind would want a ball and chain like that.

"The Indian Act fails again".

The Musqueam Band is another example how the non-Indian pressured the band into allowing Musqueam Development Co. to make a huge 2 million profit without any problems. Yet that same band in trying to do their own development are being stopped by the City of Vancouver because they, the City, feel they are not making a profit. It was quite alright for the City to run their sewage line through the Reservation to get to the treatment plant, but it was wrong for the Indians to hook up to it. Where is our so called protector, the Indian Act, what are they doing to correct this wrong.

The Kamloops Band is another in carrying out a subdivision development putting in their own roads and services were taxed for more money than they were getting and yet the B.C. Government were never made to put any of it back into the Reservation. They were finally forced to join the City of Kamloops.

Again the Indian Act meant nothing.

Our mineral resources in B.C. were given away without consultation. My band in attempt to show the white society that we are competent decided to form our own mining company on our own Reservation. It is now almost three years and we're still not on the market. And before starting we read the Indian Act and followed it to a "T". Yet when a big mining concern wanted to stop us, the Department of Indian Affairs did nothing. The provincial Government being patriotic people would not have passed a judgement that would have gone against themselves. Here again the Indian Act was just a useless piece of paper.

These are only a few of the problems we Indians have living under the present Indian Act.

What good is an Indian Act if only one party recognizes it. What good is a treaty between two Nations when only one Nation lives by it.

Let us right this wrong and not leave it to endless rounds of consultation to create a bitterness that may never heal.

Resolution: To enable the Indian people of Canada to establish its own destiny and priorities.

1. Be it resolved that a National Committee, composed of the representatives of province or region at this meeting be established to effect the following purposes:
 - a) investigate the rights, including treaty, aboriginal, acquired, residual, and human rights of the Indian people of Canada;
 - b) formulate a draft an Indian Act for presentation to this delegation, reassembled as a whole, at a date to be specified; and
 - c) research, the rights of Indian people generally with special reference to treaty rights, hunting rights, fishing rights and rights to medical, educational and local government services, foreshore and riparian rights, forest and timber rights, land, mineral and petroleum rights.
2. Be it further resolved that regional or provincial committees be established and authorized to research and investigate the above subject matter as it pertains to and affects their particular areas and submit proposals to the National Committee for its consideration.
3. And be it further resolved that the financial resources for the said investigations be supplied by the Government of Canada according to the draft budget prepared by this meeting.
4. Be it further resolved that the Federal Government provided to the several committees any research material they may have at their disposal in order to facilitate research projects.

Moved by Dave Ahenakew.

Seconded by Peter Dubois.

Allen Lueck
Solicitor for Saskatchewan Group.

HONOURABLE MINISTER - The Saskatchewan Delegation wish to express their recognition of the sometimes forgotten fact that you personally have held your present office for only one year and that in that year, 18 consultation conferences have been held including this present Nation wide meeting. Without your support it would be much more difficult for the Indian people to express their views as they are now doing.

However, realizing the very short time you have had to digest the complex problems which exist and which have either been in existence or have developed over the past 100 and more years, we could not allow your unequivocal statement that "We fully intend to honour your Treaties. It is merely their interpretation which is a problem" to pass unchallenged.

I will cite to you one example to show that the Government of Canada through their Indian Affairs Branch are not concerned about true interpretation but are in fact attempting to use the inarticulate words of a Treaty to end an obligation which has existed since 1876 and which was honoured to its fullest in the beginning and for 80 or more years thereafter without question and only recently has someone in the Government, obviously trying to cut down on Indian Affairs spending, come up with the idea this obligation might not be easy to prove in a Court of law by the Indians because today all of the actual signatories to the 1876 Treaty are dead.

I refer to Treaty #6 and the clause which reads and I quote -

"That a medicine chest should be kept at the house of each Indian Agent for the use and benefit of the Indians at the direction of such agent."

In the beginning, in 1876, and until the mid-1950's complete medical, hospital and drug bills were paid by the Government pursuant to this clause.

Recently - by verbal agreement with the Provincial Government (a verbal agreement) the terms of which the Indian Affairs personnel in charge of Indian Health in Saskatchewan stated under Oath in Court they had neither been reduced to writing or heard by word of mouth.

This agreement however appeared to be that the Federal Government would not pay any further medical or hospital bills for Indians who had left a Reserve and stayed away for 12 months and it gave the provincial legislature "the green light" to pass provincial legislation making it a criminal offence for an Indian off the reserve for 12 months or more not to buy a Saskatchewan Hospital and Medical Care Card at a cost of \$72.00 per family.

The Federal Government is presently in the process of checking the residence for the past 12 months of all Saskatchewan Indians and deleting their names from the lists which are used to make out the yearly Medical and Hospital Cards and are systematically sending out notices to these people that they are now responsible for paying for their own hospital and medical care and the Provincial Government is just as diligently bringing criminal charges against these people as the premiums fall due.

Lest the Minister be misinformed or uninformed about the complete lack of justice in the above actions, let me assure you that I, as legal counsel on this matter, have researched exhaustively the fact and there is no doubt the meaning of the words "medicine chest" were never interpreted either by the Queen's representatives discussing the Treaty in question or the Indian Chiefs who put their names to it as being merely a box full of medicines. But even if that interpretation were placed on those words the position of Indian Affairs cannot be justified because they are denying the obligation to even pay for medicines for Indians off the Reserve for 12 months. And let me assure all present that there is no clause requiring an Indian to reside on the reserve in order to take advantage of his rights.

However, there is no basis at all to restrict the meaning of the words "medicine chest". The Indians who live today and have had the history of their rights passed down to them by their parents and grandparents as is their custom are absolutely clear on the interpretation placed on these words at the time the Treaty was made.

It is that the Queen's representatives required they give up using their tribal medicine man with his bag of medicines - a man who took care of all - and I emphasize ALL - the medical needs of the people and a man who remained constantly with his patient poulticing, making medicines and ministering to the patients needs until he was cured or died.

This man who was to be the Indian, doctor, nurse and druggist. This man they gave up because they were assured he would be replaced by a far superior medicine man with much stronger medicines and potents - and in fact, this occurred. Resident Doctors were provided on the Reserves. Indian Hospitals were built and drugs were supplied.

BUT - there never was supplied to the separate Reserves - "A box containing medicines" except for what we would today call a "First Aid Kit" supplied to the Agent of each Reserve. (Surely the Hon. Min will not suggest these are the medicine chests?)

Can the Hon. Minister say this is an "Interpretation problem"? Obviously not - it is a political move to deprive the Indian of a treaty right. A move made at a very opportune time as all witnesses to the Treaty are dead and very few records are available which are admissible in a court of law to prove the true intent and meaning of the words "Medicine Chest".

The Hon. Minister is well aware of the restrictive nature of Courts of Law and that many times justice is not done because their rules do not allow them to accept as evidence such information as hearsay by the Indians who are alive today. It is for reasons such as this that we do not trust the extended hand of the Government.

We do not question the integrity of the Hon. Minister but we wish to make it clear that there are many cases across Canada such as this one. The bureaucracy in Indian Affairs are well aware of this case as they have made a point of telephoning to Regina

on the average of once per week to know how it is progressing. I feel the Indians of Canada are fortunate to have as Minister of Indian Affairs a French Canadian as he will be well aware of the attempt by the English Canadians to assimilate the French Canadian and thereby deprive him of his culture and language. The Indian - White problem is exactly the same. The White race is trying to make the Indian into a White man by depriving him of his culture, language and aboriginal rights. The French Canadian did not succumb to this pressure and neither will the Indian.

This example is hoped will clearly show to the Hon. Minister what the Saskatchewan delegation and those who support it in its resolution mean, when they say there must be research into the Rights of all Indians across the country - research done by Indians and the Council - so that when rights have been ignored or eroded away they can be restored.

You, as the Minister-in-charge will have the onerous task of presenting and defending the revised Indian Act when it is drafted. The Indian people wish to assist you in this matter by compiling in a proper form - for the first time in Canadian History - the aboriginal and Treaty Rights of Canadian Indians, backed up by proper research and documentation.

With the type of information at your disposal you will stand a fighting chance of convincing Parliament that the revised Act should be passed.

Without that assistance you haven't got a hope of promulgating a meaningful statute which will meet the requirements of the Indian people.

PRESENTATION TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE INDIAN ACT
BY THE BRITISH COLUMBIA and YUKON DELEGATION

May 2, 1969.

Mr. Chairman, Delegates to this National Conference:

The British Columbia delegation and the Yukon delegation to this Conference now place before you a number of proposals for inclusion in the Indian Act, as we proposed to do in our position statement considered by this assemblage yesterday, May 1, 1969.

These proposals are among the more urgent ones asked for by the consultation meetings held in British Columbia and the Yukon. They are in no way proposals for an entire new Indian Act. The delegations of British Columbia and the Yukon support the resolution of our friends from Saskatchewan, presented yesterday, which includes provisions for a comprehensive review of Indian Rights and Legislative requirements by national and provincial or regional committees of this representative gathering.

These proposals may be considered as interim requirements to permit the orderly development of our affairs while the process of study and change is taking place.

As our position paper said, we are in accord with our friends in treaty areas whose basic rights have been denied frequently by Governments and by the Courts. For our part, we have no treaties. We do have grievances, however, based on the fact our aboriginal rights have not been recognized by Governments and there has been a steady encroachment on our lands and rights for over 100 years.

As a result we consider it essential that the Canadian Nation, through the Indian Act, now declare its inherent duty to affirm the right of our Treaty friends to live within the spirit of the treaties, as related to present times. Similarly, in the non-treaty areas, the Indian Act should affirm that the Indians stand possessed of their aboriginal rights until such time as they are determined by agreements freely entered into. For both treaty and non-treaty Indians the Indian Act should provide for genuine and material assistance by the Federal Government in all fields including legal, sociological and anthropological research. There should be a declaration of trust of the lands held by the Federal Government for the Indian people and an examination into breaches thereof on a broad scale. A review of Indian lands in British Columbia taken from the Indian people as a result of the McKenna- McBride Commission and the British Columbia Indian Lands Settlement Act, keeping in mind that the terms of reference of the Commission

dated September 24, 1912, provided that land would not be reduced in size except with the consent of the Indians. Where surrenders were not obtained prior to reductions, the lands so removed should be repurchased from the Province by the Federal Government and returned to the Bands concerned.

The Indian Act should in our opinion include also the following provisions:

1. Rapid delegation of authority to Band Councils in all relevant fields.
2. Transfer by long term lease to Band Councils of Reserve land as requested by Band Councils.
3. An economic development fund on a scale sufficient to raise the level of Reserve life to the national average, by a Program of Grants.
4. Where requested by Band Councils, guarantees for specific projects by Bands, to be given to assist long term financing.
5. Control of Capital and Revenue Funds by Band Councils on the request of Bands.
6. Bands and Band Councils to be legal entities.
7. Powers to form Band Municipal Corporations similar to Corporations under municipal acts, but under Federal jurisdiction, together with a system of Grants similar to Provincial Grant Programs.
8. Powers to force Band municipal corporations similar to corporations under municipal acts, but under federal jurisdiction, together with a system of grants similar to provincial grant programs.
9. Indian and Band-owned corporations of all types to be relieved of all taxation as to assets and income of Reserve land.
10. Return of control of natural resources on and under Indian land to the Indian people, by negotiation with Provinces, where necessary.
11. Creation of a realistic municipal services development grants system for the installation of services on Reserves.
12. Medical Services Branch to assume responsibility for providing medical and health services including dental and optical services for Indian people.

13. Surrender of Indian land to be terminated and all surrendered land to be unsurrendered and returned to Reserve status.
14. Band Councils to have taxing power on Reserve land whether leased or not and whether surrendered or not and no other body to have such power.
15. To pay the costs of education for Indians while they pursue it successfully.
16. Grants To Bands to assist the development of administrative capacity on a broad scale.
17. No expropriation of Reserve land to be permitted. Lease provisions introduced.
18. Creation of a Land Registry System and guarantee fund for Indian lands.
19. Enfranchisement to be dropped from the Act.
20. Power to obtain further lands for Indians of British Columbia as provided for in Act of Union.
21. Provision that Band Councils may have a Reserve declared at their request when they purchase lands.
22. Control of Band membership by each individual Band.
23. Adoptions to be dealt with in accordance with Provincial Law.
24. Housing to be provided to bring Reserve standard to the Canadian average.
25. No deletions to be made to the Act except on request of Indian people.

Finally, we wish to draw the attention of our friends gathered here, and the Government, to the Minutes of the consultation meetings held in British Columbia and the Yukon.

Thank You.

SASKATCHEWAN DELEGATION

Be it resolved that:

The national committee be composed of one representative from the following suggested regions:

- 1) The prairie provinces,
- 2) British Columbia and Yukon
- 3) Quebec
- 4) Ontario
- 5) Maritimes
- 6) North West Territories

with the chairman to be selected by the committee.

SASKATCHEWAN DELEGATION

Be it resolved that:

- a) The proposed national committee be established as an independent, autonomous, ad hoc committee of the National Indian Brotherhood. The national committee would be authorized to use the facilities of the National Indian Brotherhood, but would be in no way subordinate to the National Indian Brotherhood.
- b) The proposed provincial committees be established in the provinces by the provincial organizations.