

*Routine Proceedings*

shows that the people concerned benefited materially from the move in a very short period of time. The facts clearly show that the relocation of the citizens was not done in the hope of protecting Canadian sovereignty.

Historical documents go back to 1930 when an exchange of notes between Norway and Canada occurred to support Canadian sovereignty. This exchange formally and officially recognized Canada's ownership of the Sverdrup Islands which are more northerly than Grise Fiord and Resolute Bay.

The Soviet Union had no designs on our Arctic and the United States agreed that it would use the Arctic islands only with Canadian consent. The only territorial threat, and I use the word "threat" in quotations, was from a few Greenland Inuit who occasionally, hunted illegally in Canada's territory in the late forties and the early fifties.

By 1952, the RCMP was on site and quite ready to deal with such problems. In fact, it was only in the sixties, when the American ship *Manhattan* went through the Northwest Passage, that the notion that Canadian sovereignty was an issue in the Inuit relocation of the 1950s developed. In response to the *Manhattan*, the Canadian government at the time started talking about things that were done to protect Arctic sovereignty, and history was rewritten. And the relocation of the Inuit was added to the list of things done by the government to support its control of the north.

The sovereignty issue was again raised in the 1980s by the Makivik Corporation, an organization set up under the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement of 1975. This represented the interests of all Inuit in northern Quebec, where Inukjuak is located. It is important, therefore, that research into the sovereignty issue, conducted by the Makivik Corporation in 1982, concluded that the move did not occur for reasons of sovereignty.

In 1990, Makivik, in its paper to the standing committee, turned its back on its own research in 1982 and declared its belief that sovereignty was the main motivation for the move.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge that, although sovereignty was not the reason for the move, the Inuit families who did move did assist indirectly in the promotion of Canadian sovereignty. By being part of the north, they were able to help the RCMP. They occasionally assisted the Mounties, who had concerns about the poaching of wildlife on Ellesmere Island. The Inuit from Inukjuak were able to help the RCMP administer the territorial game legislation and, indirectly, aided in upholding Canadian sovereignty.

The standing committee suggested that the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development was at fault for both the planning and the implementation of this project, which resulted in hardship for the Inuit.

In 1953, the means of transportation in the north left something to be desired. The main form of mass movement, perhaps one of the only means, was by ship. There were evidently problems that occurred because of this. One of the problems of Arctic travel, in fact any travel, is the transportation of goods.

Equipment and supplies which the people would need in their first year were carefully planned, purchased and shipped to selected sites. Unfortunately, some of the equipment was not off-loaded at the appropriate places. Consequently, that first winter in the high Arctic was, for many Inuit, very difficult.

The difficulties that were encountered in 1953, however, in large part were simply because it was 1953. Transportation and communications were relatively primitive. Since that time, there have been tremendous technological changes that have improved conditions in the north. They must also be set against conditions in the bush camps surrounding Port Harrison, from which the Inuit had come. Conditions were very poor and, in contrast to the high Arctic, there was almost no game. Hardships in the south easily matched that in the north and there was no chance for improvement.

I would also like to point out that the oral statements made to the standing committee about extreme hardships and starvation were not substantiated by letters from the people concerned. In the research, for example, an article entitled "Salluviniq's Story" published in 1977 recounts a very different experience. In the article this gentleman, one of the original people moved in 1953, states: