Speech from the Throne

been necessary for the Alberta Indian Association to dismantle the staff which had been assembled and the plans which had been drawn up for such a cultural centre?

Mr. Chrétien: This is a new program, Mr. Speaker, and we are now developing this program. The question of the Indian associations in Alberta was discussed at length in this chamber a few months ago. I have expressed my view. I have nothing to withdraw. I felt the associations were not at that time serving the best interests of the Indians. Some of them were merely interested in raising political hell. We have established good relations with the new administration, and I think we shall certainly help them to establish cultural centres. But one must recognize that there are three different groups in Alberta, each of which wanted grants. It is not because there is pressure on me that I would give preference to one group rather than to another. However, I need a national program in order to be just to everyone. I have been Minister of Indian Affairs for more than three years, now, and I know what pressure is. I am used to it. I keep my cool in order to make good decisions even if it takes a few more weeks.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In his response to the question I posed to him the minister let his imagination over-ride the facts of the situation and made three deliberate and distinct misstatements.

## Some hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): With respect, I do not think he should be permitted to do that. The first mistake was in saying that Dr. Barber had been appointed.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member may rise on a point of order, but he is required to take into serious consideration one of the long-established rules of the House. Even if he feels aggrieved, he has no right to suggest that another hon. member has made a deliberate misrepresentation of facts. He has no right to say that.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): He made it accidentally, then, out of ignorance of the true facts. The minister said the government had appointed Dr. Barber to look into the question of aboriginal rights. That is not true. Aboriginal rights were specifically excepted from the relevant order in council. When we inquired about this before Christmas the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) substantiated this assertion

The second misstatement of fact related to the recognition of aboriginal rights themselves. In September, 1969, the Prime Minister admitted that he and his government had no time for the aboriginal rights of the Indian people, did not intend to recognize them and disregarded them completely. That statement by the Prime Minister has never been put to one side by the right hon. gentleman or by the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is obviously debate between the minister and the hon. member. I suppose a debate as to who is right and who is wrong could go on for a long time, but if the Chair were to allow these statements to go on for a long time it would be doing so at the expense of other members who have indicated that they are anxious to take part in this debate. My understanding is that this is

not a debate on the affairs of the minister's department. I would hope we could give the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) an opportunity to make the speech he has been waiting to make for some time.

**Mr. Chrétien:** On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member has shown to the House that he has been a member of the opposition for a long time, and he will have to stay there for a long time because he is quite thin-skinned.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): But accurate.

**Mr. Gibson:** Mr. Speaker, it seems the House has been misled by the remarks of the last speaker.

An hon. Member: You mean the minister?

Some hon. Members: Oh. oh!

Mr. Gibson: I mean the last speaker on the opposition side. He completely overlooked the inquiries within the constitutional committee. The committee heard representatives of Indians from coast to coast.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question of privilege amounts, again, to a dispute concerning facts and at this time a debate cannot go on under the guise of a question of privilege. I suggest to the hon. member that we might go to the next speaker. I am prepared to recognize at this time the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

• (1530)

Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wish the state of the Canadian economy was such that I would be able to take more time to comment on the minister's generally pleasing announcement this afternoon, but unfortunately that is not the case.

The only distinguished aspect of the speech the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made in this House last Friday was that it made very clear that a lousy Conservative economic policy was not an adequate substitute for a lousy Liberal one. In this respect, the right hon. gentleman was very cogent. However, in the process his own record as an incompetent, callous, bumbling, glib, smug Prime Minister was not alluded to at all. Acting on the old maxim—and the Prime Minister always acts on old maxims—that when your position is defenceless it is best to attack, he did precisely that.

On listening to and reading his speech, one would have thought that the next best experience to an "after life" in heaven was to be a Canadian living anywhere north of the 49th parallel in the winter of 1972. Our land, he said, is one in which men and women can "live and work and play and think in either the English or the French language". Well, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it is also one in which almost 700,000 men and women are walking the streets in sub-zero weather looking for a job. It matters not whether whether they do it in English or French, or indeed whether they do it in German, Hungarian or Italian.

Rarely has a distinguished mind, such as that of the Prime Minister, so laboured not to elucidate or make clear reality but to obscure it. Rarely has so much cool rhetoric been employed to disguise the harshness of the complete truth. A mind once given to an analysis of the *Cité Libre*