

Indian Affairs

provide for the transport of food to Nigeria and Biafra and this is to the credit of all Canadians. I welcome the fact that the government is ready to provide the neutral inspectors needed in order to organize those relief flights.

Canada must do its best to help those who are suffering, because not only do we have food in abundance but we have surpluses, so we are told. Therefore, while helping those who are suffering, Canadians will be able, through their work, to make a greater contribution to peace in order to alleviate world suffering.

I really hope we shall find proper ways to organize those relief flights as soon as possible. Some were found during the war, for the transport of all kinds of weapons. So I hope that we, who are enjoying peace, will do all we can to help those unfortunate people who do not want war and who are the victims of war. This way, we shall contribute to the establishment of true peace in the world.

[English]

• (2:20 p.m.)

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

INDIAN AFFAIRS

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO CONSULT NATIVE PEOPLE IN DEVELOPMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the house under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely the failure of the government to have consulted the native Indian people in Canada in the development of its policy statement on Indian Affairs presented to this house on June 25, the almost universal rejection of this policy statement by Indian people, the growing discontent among Indian people over the manner in which the government has treated them both with respect to the policy statement and in general terms, the refusal of the government so far to indicate it is prepared to enshrine in the constitution those aboriginal and hereditary rights arising out of the treaties, and the similar rights relating to land, resources and the like in areas where no treaties exist, the general refusal of the government to enter into meaningful discussions with the native peoples of Canada over such

rights and inheritances, and the attendant possible turbulence and fury which may follow from the aforementioned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) gave the Chair the necessary notice pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 26 and I have had an opportunity to study his proposal at length and in depth.

There is no doubt but that the question raised by the hon. member's proposed motion is one of importance; indeed it is one which I am sure is of deep and continuing interest to all hon. members of the house. However this is not the only consideration which the Chair has to take into account in making a ruling at this point. The Speaker has to determine whether under the terms of Standing Order 26 the house should be adjourned for the purpose of a debate on the subject matter dealt with in the hon. member's motion.

I have suggested before that Standing Order 26 requires a statement of the problem and that hon. members should not attempt to argue the case for or against the adjournment of the house. It is a bit difficult to determine in the hon. member's motion what is the statement of the matter requiring urgent consideration and what might be considered argument in support of his proposal for the adjournment of the house.

The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has based his motion on what he terms, and I quote from his statement to the house

—the failure of the government to have consulted the native Indian people of Canada in the development of its policy statement on Indian affairs presented to this house on June 25.

This statement is accompanied by a number of additional statements which might well be interpreted as debate or argument. In any event my understanding or interpretation of the hon. member's motion is that he calls into question the failure or alleged failure of the government to hold consultations with the Indian people of Canada in the development of the policy announced on June 25 last. Essentially the hon. member's complaint deals with matters of record which are already some weeks old. I have serious doubts as to whether the debate today could correct a situation which occurred before June 25.

According to my interpretation of Standing Order 26 and my understanding of the motion proposed by the hon. member, it is not open to the Chair to agree to the adjournment of the house at this time under the provisions of that standing order.