

point in suggesting to the House that the motion which he has proposed under the guise of privilege be debated at this time. I do not think there is a *prima facie* question of privilege.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise on a question of privilege but I should like to make it very clear that I take no exception at all to the description of my party as a rabble because it is my understanding that rabble means the common people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Translation]

MR. FORTIN—PROTESTS RESPECTING RECORDED TELEPHONE MESSAGE

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the Social Credit Party of Canada has been informed that people who dial a certain phone number in London, Ontario, hear a recorded message against the Negro population of the United States as a group. At the end of the message, the listener is invited to write to the Social Credit Party of Canada at a local address and in Ottawa.

In the name of the Canadian Social Credit Party, I want to put on the record of the House that neither the telephone number nor the address given in the recorded message has the slightest relation with our party. The Social Credit Party of Canada believes in the brotherhood of all human beings and that message has never been authorized by our party which entirely repudiates its content.

Mr. Speaker: Again I very much doubt that the hon. member would expect the Chair to render a ruling concerning his question of privilege. The hon. member has submitted his remarks for the consideration of the House and I believe he should not pursue the matter any further.

[English]

MR. REILLY—REPORT IN "LE DROIT" ALLEGING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF COMMONS PROTECTIVE STAFF

Mr. Peter Reilly (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I believe affects all members of the House. It is based on a report in yesterday's *Le Droit* in which it is alleged that certain members of the protective staff of the House complain that they are being discriminated against. It says that many ministers of the Crown are aware of the complaints and sympathize with them but that they would rather an ordinary member of the House of Commons raised the issue. I hereby raise it, Mr. Speaker, because this House is a symbol of opportunity and justice for Canadians and I believe that allegations of this kind should be investigated. I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. O'Sullivan):

That the subject matter of my question be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice from the hon. member and have given the matter some thought. With respect, I suggest to the hon. member that there is no

Questions of Privilege

question of privilege. The hon. member suggests that his rights as a parliamentarian or his rights in the discharge of his function as a Member of Parliament are impeded in some way. The grievance or matter to which he has made reference is one, rather, of administration, and I would think that if there is a complaint it should not be considered in the way the hon. member has proposed, that is, by way of parliamentary privilege.

MR. BALDWIN—STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER CONCERNING ABORIGINAL RIGHTS OF INDIANS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to follow that pillar of pure parliamentary propriety, the hon. member for Skeena, on a question of privilege. Nevertheless, I raise an issue which involves a statement made by the Prime Minister yesterday, to be found on the same page of *Hansard* as that already referred to by the hon. member for Skeena. On page 826 the following exchange is recorded:

MR. HOWARD: Would the Prime Minister tell the House today whether his statement in 1969, which then reflected government policy of rejecting aboriginal rights, still stands?

MR. TRUDEAU: The hon. member will recall that spokesmen for his party as, indeed, for the Conservatives approved the government statement which was made in 1969.

MR. BALDWIN: No.

MR. TRUDEAU: If hon. members look up the record of what they said in *Hansard*, they will see that the only comment they had to make about the minister's policy was: "Too little, too late".

MR. BALDWIN: Not on that issue.

I might have been inclined to let the matter go on the basis that it might have been part of the prime ministerial repertoire of red herrings, but it happens that on January 26 the right hon. gentleman, responding to a question from the hon. member for Yukon, answered as follows:

Mr. Speaker, if I might disagree with the premise of the question, there has, of course, been a very clear statement by the government on the question of aboriginal rights. It was made in the House of Commons at the time of the publication of the policy paper on Indian Affairs, and it was wholeheartedly supported by the spokesman for the Conservative party and the speaker on behalf of the NDP at the time.

I do not know whether it was because of lack of knowledge, ignorance or intent on the part of the Prime Minister that the statement was made. I am concerned about this very important issue, I followed the advice of the right hon. gentleman and examined the text of the statements which were made. Although it is true that both I, answering on behalf of my party, and the hon. member for Skeena, answering on behalf of the New Democratic Party, gave some qualified approval to some of the proposals dealing with the issue of Indian problems the right hon. gentleman's assertion is not in accordance with the facts. On page 10583 of *Hansard* for June 25, 1969, appear two sentences, which is all I will read from my remarks of that time. The first reads:

There is bound to be some contention about aspects of the statement.

The second, in the next paragraph, reads:

The statement involves what would seem to be a limited interpretation of existing treaty rights, and a reluctance to deal with specific claims of aboriginal rights.