CANADA

Red Indian Power

E. A. BRYAN

(in *Freefolk*, British Columbia)

THE red man has learned that the easy way to get things is not to work for them. Work is troublesome. Work begets taxes, and taxes are a loss, not a gain. No, the red man has learned to confront, to threaten and to use violence in order to get an increase in handouts.

Some Indians in B.C. decided that they were not going to live in shacks any longer. Now, when the white man makes that kind of decision, he goes to the lumber yard to buy some materials and tools to fix up his place. This method did not appear attractive to these Indians. They took a look at their shacks and decided to get the overworked, overtaxed white man to build them a number of good quality homes. Along with some imported agitators they strutted and postured with guns, blocking off a public road and demanded $5 for each car passing. The media immediately gave them the publicity they needed and relayed their demands for handouts. All the while the police stood by watching this lawless behaviour.

Next, they went to Ottawa, took over an empty building, and engaged in brawling on Parliament Hill. Finally they were granted interviews at ministerial level. Then they dispersed. Now they are showing their intention of keeping the pot boiling with threats of more violence, perhaps even more serious than before.

In Washington State, a judge has just ruled that Indians cannot be prevented from fishing anywhere at any time. This may sound fine, but the result will be that when whites are not fishing in the interests of conservation, the Indians will be making great catches and eventually depleting the salmon runs. No-one will be able to prevent them fishing this resource to exhaustion as long as this judgment stands.

If we look into the justification for this antisocial behaviour, we find the land problem undisguised. Centuries ago, treaties were made between Indians and whites relating to the use of land. There is no doubt that the white people often deprived the Indians of the use of land on which they had been accustomed to support themselves, but it seems to be forgotten that these Indians had often conquered other tribes and taken over their land without any compensation or treaties. While Indians live on reserves they receive welfare and other handouts supposedly in compensation for land.

Unfortunately the people being taxed to provide them with doles are not the pople who benefited from the original treaty, — not even the ones who benefit today from land holdings. Landless Canadians are being taxed to keep Indians docile. The Indians who make threats to support their claim for handouts are not the ones with whom the treaties were made. They died long ago. Since it is a matter of the rights of all human beings that no-one should be able to bind posterity with with present promises, all such treaties are spurious documents.

This brings us to the point of realising that the only relationships to be respected are the equal rights of people of all colours and ethnic origin. Indians have as much right to the Georgia-Granville district as whites have to the Capilano or Semiahmoo areas. No treaties are needed to secure these rights, merely the acceptance that the earth is no-one's property and that people who wish security of tenure of any area should compensate the rest of society thereby excluded, by the payment of a rent into public funds for the privilege.

Letters to the Editor

"EUROPE — A GREAT ADVENTURE"

SIR — There are two kinds of knowledge, the one of the mind, the other of the heart. The latter is the deeper, because it relates more to the whole person. It is also the sounder, for the same reason, although this fact may be annoying to those who are more familiar with the kind of knowledge that can be categorized, because it is not knowledge of that type.

It is this latter kind of knowledge — perhaps better called wisdom — that would come to light in a referendum on the Common Market.

Which type of knowledge Mr. Heddle is more familiar with is made plain from his own letter, where he equates "the deepest implications" of the Common Market with "the economics of the argument".

Perhaps this is why he found the rest of my letter irrelevant!

Yours faithfully,

SHIRLEY-ANNE HARDY

*London W.*11

FREE TRADE IN BEEF

SIR, — The farmers are doing their utmost to keep good food, especially beef from Ireland, out of this country. The British Housewife wants food at the cheapest possible price and is not really concerned with where it comes from. Last year she had to pay very high prices indeed for her beef so that it practically disappeared from dining tables, particularly of poor families. As a result of the high price, the farmers produced more beef than they can now dispose of. This is not the fault of the housewife. Now that there is a surplus of beef she is