

Indian Affairs

member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) referred:

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development announced a new policy on Indian affairs yesterday. As an organization we totally reject the policy as outlined in the statement.

The next telegram is from the president of the Indian Association of Alberta and reads:

The Indian Association of Alberta rejects the policy paper enunciated by the Honourable Minister John Chrétien. Our association fully supports the position taken by the National Indian Brotherhood—

Our association is appalled by the fact that the policy statement of the federal government was written in isolation from the Indian people of Canada without any consideration whatsoever of the issues most sacred to them.

Another telegram that I received from the Fraser district bands representative reads:

Delegates representing the bands and band councils of the Fraser district meeting, Vancouver, B.C. June 26 and 27 request that no further action be taken in the implementation of the Indian policy white paper dated June 25 until there have been consultations with band representations on the same manner as for the revision of the Indian Act.

Another one from four chiefs in British Columbia reads:

We the four chiefs of Hobbema reject the policy statement of the federal government in support to position taken by the National Indian Brotherhood.

Chief Nor Yellowbird
Chief Same Currie
Chief James Bull
Acting Chief Maurice Wolfe

I am sorry that the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo (Mr. Marchand) had to leave the chamber because I have a telegram signed by the president of the North American Indian Brotherhood of British Columbia, of which he is a member. The telegram reads:

We, the undersigned wish to make the following statements: 1) It is quite evident that the new "white" paper policy made by the federal government is a complete "sell out" of the Indian birth-right as the first citizens of Canada.

A little further on the telegram reads:

● (5:00 p.m.)

The new policy does not spell out legal guarantees in terms of lands, education, health, welfare, hunting, fishing and usufructuary rights of the Indians of Canada.

Here is another telegram from the chairman of the Fraser District Bands. It reads in part:

Delegates representing the bands and band councils of the Fraser District meeting Vancouver B.C., June 26 and 27 request that no further action be taken in the implementations of the Indian policy white paper dated June 25 until there have been consultations with band representations on the same manner as for the revision of the Indian Act.

The National Indian Brotherhood, the representatives of which represent all the major Indian areas in the provinces, issued a statement on June 26, 1969, and I want to spend a few minutes reading from it. It is signed by W. Dieter, Chief of the National Indian Brotherhood; D. Courchene, Vice President of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood; P. Doubois, Director of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians; P. Paul, Director of the National Indian Brotherhood of Victoria, British Columbia; A. Deslisle, President of the Association of Quebec Indians; W. Nadjawan, Director of the National Indian Brotherhood and the President of the Union of Ontario Indians; J. Snow, Secretary of the Indian Association of Alberta; L. Stevenson, Director of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indians; J. Pete, Chairman of the Saskatchewan Native Development Fund, and M. Bellegarde, Chairman of the National Native Communications Society, Ottawa. That is a pretty impressive list and, for the next few minutes, I shall read from the statement. I quote:

—in their present form, the policy proposals put forward by the Minister of Indian Affairs are not acceptable to the Indian people of Canada... We know it was not the intent of the new policy but we fear the end result of the proposal will be the destruction of a nation of people by legislation and cultural genocide... an essential first step in developing a new approach to the so-called Indian problem would be to honour the existing obligations; the outstanding promises and commitments made to the Indian people—

At all consultations across Canada the Indian people expressed concern over the abrogation of their Treaty rights by the Migratory Birds Convention Act and Regulations—

At all consultation meetings the Indian people expressed a desire to take on greater responsibility in running their own affairs. Yet the new policy will have the affairs of Indian people run by still another bureaucratic structure—

It is apparent to us that while there was a show of consultation, neither the Minister nor his Department really heard and understood the Indian people—

The policy statement was prepared unilaterally. There was no negotiation with Indian people, nor was any part of the policy discussed with Indian people while the Minister's office was preparing it—

The policy mentions a Claims Commission and a Commissioner to be named soon. Will we be consulted as to the make-up of this commission or will there be a unilateral appointment by government?

Since that statement was made, the minister has answered that question in precisely the way the native Indian people did not want it answered. As my colleague for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) has pointed out, who the commissioner is to be and what his terms of reference are to be will be decided by the