

Since we live in a country under a system of a constitutional monarchy where Parliament is supreme, and since the McDonald commission specifically recommended that all regulations dealing with emergency circumstances be approved by Parliament prior to implementation, will the Prime Minister at least agree to rescind the emergency planning order at this time and bring in emergency legislation at an early date so that we in the House of Commons can look at it in a cool and dispassionate manner and protect the civil liberties of Canadians?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, I must again point out to the hon. member that I am not chastising the President of the Privy Council. I am perhaps reproaching the hon. member for closing his mind to what the President of the Privy Council said very clearly, that there is a redress under the charter. I remember the minister saying explicitly that there is a redress either by way of prerogative brief or by compensation. That is spelled out in the charter. I wish the hon. member would put his head together, look at the charter and see the value of that charter which this party brought into the Constitution.

\* \* \*

## INDIAN AFFAIRS

DEPARTMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR 1982-83

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. For many years the government has agreed that Indian people should have greater control over their own affairs. Can the minister say how this policy fits with the fact that the estimates for Indian band administration have remained constant this year with no allowance for inflation, funding for Indian associations for policy development and consultation is being slashed by 9 per cent, while at the same time a 25 per cent increase has been given to the executive in the administration of his department?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Madam Speaker, I have been informed that I will be appearing before the standing committee next week. I will be more than happy to go into all the figures and financial implications of the department's budget for next year or any other year that the hon. member wishes to examine. Suffice it to say that this department has received, and it is indicative of the commitment of the government, substantial new moneys which the hon. member is well aware of because I identified them to him in this House of Commons.

There has been substantial new money for housing in particular that will result in a doubling of the total amount for Indian housing, and this is just one area, and hopefully a tripling of the total amount within a three-year period. That gives some indication of the commitment of this government to do something substantial about the poverty situation of the Indian people. It is hardly indicative that we are transferring

our priorities in terms of funds from needed areas just to administration.

• (1425)

## TREASURY BOARD APPROVAL

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Madam Speaker, I think that the minister owes this House a better explanation than that, and not just in committee. Last year Indian bands had to get Treasury Board approval for all aggregate budgets over \$4 million. For the coming fiscal year this has been changed and they now have to get Treasury Board approval for all aggregate budgets over \$3 million. Does this mean that the policy of Indians' control over their own affairs is working in reverse, or is it simply a reflection of the fact that Treasury Board has lost confidence in the increasingly expensive Department of Indian Affairs?

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Madam Speaker, I do not think that it is indicative of either one of the conclusions that the hon. member has reached. The fact of the matter is that, as the hon. member is aware, the Auditor General came to certain conclusions with respect to the appropriateness of the way in which the department was handling funds, and the Indian leadership is well aware of that. These are not unusual safeguards in response to those criticisms by the Auditor General.

May I point out that many opposition spokesmen are constantly making statements implying severe criticism of the department when we do not positively respond to observations in the Auditor's report. When we do, they seem to take the other tack, which is somewhat contradictory.

\* \* \*

## EMERGENCY MEASURES

STAFFING FOR PLANNED CIVILIAN INTERNMENT CAMPS

**Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland):** Madam Speaker, with respect to the emergency planning order that has been referred to earlier, my question to the Solicitor General, who has the responsibility under that order to plan for and set up civilian internment camps in this country, is that fundamental to that planning there obviously must be a decision, which must have been made by now, as to who would provide the staff for those internment camps. Would it be members of the RCMP, members of the Armed Forces, members of the correctional service, or some special force being planned by the minister?

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General):** Madam Speaker, as I indicated when the member asked questions in a similar vein before, no planning and details of that level have as yet been given any consideration at all in my ministry. We have been assigned the responsibility, in the event of a war emergency, of preparing for a regime of civilian internment camps, but no work has been done on it in my ministry yet. I am not in a position to answer that question.