

declaim and to exude confidence. I have always been under the impression that the Liberal party thinks of itself as representing both God and the majority of Canadian voters. I do not know much about God, but I remind my Liberal friends and adversaries in this House, you do not represent, electorally, the majority of Canadians. We, on my side, represent the majority of Canadian voters. You should keep that in mind when you bring in bills like Bill C-66. You seem to think that you can bring in a bill three years before an election, stuff it down our throats, and then feel justified in being angry with us for holding up its passage. You accuse us of blocking the legislation.

Is it any wonder the people of Canada are becoming disillusioned with the electoral and parliamentary process? Is it any wonder that we are debating at length this issue? I don't care what you call it; I will stay here all next month, if necessary, and all September, if I think I can hold up this bill, or if we can pass the amendment to hoist this bill for six months. And when it comes forward again in the House, we will want to hoist it for another six months, if possible.

It is an iniquitous bill. It is unfair, and is unfair to people that you, on your side of the House, represent; and do not forget it.

Hon. members opposite try to leave the impression that they are not getting flak from their constituents. Let me tell you something: they are getting more flak from their constituents than we are from ours. But they will not stand up to admit it. They have to kow-tow to the cabinet.

**An hon. Member:** Pure demagoguery.

**Mr. Blackburn:** That is what that great solidarity of their means. They cannot stand up and really say what they want to say on the bill.

\* \* \*

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton):** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I wonder if we can confirm if we are to consider this bill tomorrow, as there was some question about this earlier today.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I understand that we are to consider this bill tomorrow, subject to discussions which my colleague, the House leader, may have with the House leaders of the other parties at ten o'clock tomorrow morning, in which case, if there is any mutual consent, there might be a change.

**Mr. Paproski:** We can stay here to the end of September, if you want to.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I thought we were to consider the recess tomorrow.

#### Adjournment Debate

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

#### GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION—ALLEGED LEAK OF CABINET DOCUMENT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

**Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River):** Madam Speaker, the subject I am proposing for debate on the adjournment motion relates to a question I raised in the House on May 28. Then I requested some information from the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp) regarding an incident that took place on May 6, 1975, when a secret cabinet document was exposed to officials of the National Indian Brotherhood and subsequently found its way into the hands of the national press.

I raised this matter originally because the occurrence I spoke of was similar to one of about two years earlier. The earlier incident took place on October 5, 1973. The situation was identical, and resulted in the firing of a senior official, Mr. Walter Rudniki of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, his secretary, and other officials of the department.

May I enumerate the events involved in these two incidents? In December, 1974, a meeting was held between representatives of the National Indian Brotherhood, and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, for the purpose of reviewing Indian housing. At that meeting the Brotherhood submitted their proposal for a new housing policy, and the commitment to the consultation process was re-affirmed to the National Indian Brotherhood at that time.

● (2200)

On September 20, 1973, a meeting was held between the National Assembly of the Native Council of Canada and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. At this meeting the National Assembly of the Native Council presented their proposals on Metis housing and obtained commitments to a consultation process. Mr. Leseaux, deputy minister, wrote to the National Indian Brotherhood committing the Minister to a consultation process subsequent to the meeting of December 1974.

In March two representatives of the National Indian Brotherhood met with the minister to discuss Mr. Leseaux's letter of January 15. During this meeting the National Indian Brotherhood asked for funding for a consultation process on housing with their provincial associations, and insisted on further meetings to discuss the housing proposals in detail. The minister agreed that no action would be taken to place the housing proposals before cabinet until there were further meetings with the National Indian Brotherhood. This is almost identical to the commitment made by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Basford).

A draft cabinet document was prepared, mostly in Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and was ready by April 2, 1975. It was reviewed between the minister and his