

Adjournment

However, the order in council was worded in such a way that even though the Indians might win their case before the Privy Council, they must agree to lose it. In other words, they had to agree to sign a treaty on the same basis as treaties which were signed in the early days, namely that they would get \$5 a month, a sack of flour, 100 feet of twine, a bit of gunpowder and a new suit of clothes every three years. That has been the attitude of the government since that time with regard to aboriginal rights.

Although the government has now been forced to admit these people perhaps do have these rights, it is now denying its constitutional responsibility. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development say they recognize the validity of the force of the proclamation of King George III, which was made long before Canada was founded as a nation. They recognize the proclamation states we should treat with respect the claims and rights of the Indian people of this land.

When Canada was formed as a nation in 1867, a phrase was included in the British North America Act that the parliament of Canada has exclusive jurisdiction over Indians and lands reserved for Indians. In 1867, parliament committed itself to carrying out the proclamation of King George III, which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development now say they recognize as being valid. Although they say we have that constitutional responsibility and recognize the validity of the proclamation of King George III, they are not going to do anything about it. They want to shunt that responsibility to the provincial governments. Even though the provincial governments do not have anything to do with this question, they want them to say where they stand before entering into any discussions or negotiations.

● (1450)

I think it indicates once again the deceitfulness of the Liberal party in dealing with the native Indian people, and particularly with their claims to aboriginal and hereditary rights. It reflects once again the deceit started by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1910 and 1911, a deceit which was repeated in 1913, which was repeated in 1915-16 with the Royal Commission, which was repeated in 1926 before the joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons, which was repeated in 1948, which has been repeated every single time the question of aboriginal rights has come up for discussion and consideration. Since we are in the position of being a House of minorities, and since there is now one opportunity available to us to force the government to deal with issues on their merits, as has not been the case in the past when they had a majority on their side, we should not rest until parliament has been allowed an opportunity to declare itself on this issue of aboriginal rights and set the stage once and for all for a decent and responsible settlement of the aboriginal rights claim in this land.

As I said before, I think it is shabby and shameful that one man, whether the Prime Minister or the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, should set himself above parliament, should set himself above a committee of parliament and say: I don't care what the committee recommended in connection with aboriginal rights, I shall not let parliament have any say about it at all. I had hoped that somehow or other the Conservative party might have

[Mr. Howard.]

combined with us—the few of us who are interested in this subject matter—to say to the government: No, we shall not permit you to adjourn until we have dealt with the question of aboriginal rights in a declaratory way, until parliament has had a say about it. I hope—and this is all I can do at the moment—that commencing on October 15, when we come back to resume this parliament, we shall deal with item No. 32 on the order paper, the report of that committee endorsing the concept of aboriginal rights and calling upon the government to enter into meaningful negotiations for a settlement of that matter. I hope the government will have the courage to say: yes, we are going to resume the debate on the motion standing in the name of the member for Kingston and The Islands (Miss MacDonald) and seconded by myself. In this way, parliament would be in a position to declare its view on this issue, and thereafter, whatever government came to office, whether a minority or a majority government, parliament would have spoken, not just one man in government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Howard: On division!

Motion agreed to on division.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to determine from whoever is government House leader, or whoever is acting in his place, the intention of the government with respect to the business of the House until four o'clock, approximately an hour and four minutes from now.

Mr. Reid: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is our intention to call the amendments to the Parole Act now, and when discussion of that measure has been concluded we would call the Co-operative Credit Associations bill, to which we hope second reading will be given. At that point, consultation could take place and if there were agreement among hon. members not to proceed with private members' hour we would be prepared to adjourn at 4 p.m. or when the Co-operative Credit Associations bill is passed through second reading, if that so happens.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PAROLE ACT

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL AD HOC MEMBERS TO NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

The House resumed, from Wednesday, September 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Allmand that Bill C-191, to amend the Parole Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.