deny and virtually call the Inuit people deceptive and liars about their own life and what they are about, I was very insulted. I watched the leader of the Inuit people of Canada being insulted by this bureaucrat who should be advocating, not serving in an adversarial role.

I find this to be extremely alarming. What are these people doing? We supposedly have an independent report. I hope that the results of the motion being debated will be favourable and will be independent of bureaucrats who continue to cripple on all fronts the process of social justice for the aboriginal people across Canada.

There are no better words to explain how the people who appeared that day felt, such as Markoosie Patsauq and Sarah Amagoalik, the mother of the president of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada. Those people came forward with a most convincing case.

I cannot believe that we recognize outsiders, build monuments to them, and name rivers and islands like Baffin Island after them, yet there is no room in our hearts as Canadians to recognize the people who were here first, who built the country and who maintained and protected Canada's sovereignty. How can we not have the decency and respect in our hearts to do this?

This requires one fundamental thing. It requires the political will of the government. This report should have never existed. This report refuting an apology, refuting recognition of the Inuit's contribution for the protection of Arctic sovereignty, should have never existed. There should have been a unanimous motion which was consented to in the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs. That should have been upheld. The government should be proud to say to the Inuit people, "We are proud of your contribution. We are happy that you were there to protect our Arctic sovereignty when no one else dared to go". The Inuit people were essentially forced to take on that role and did so under the harshest of circumstances.

We must find in our hearts the respect and dignity that these people deserve and we should give due recognition. I totally support the idea of a $10 million heritage fund because I believe that the Inuit have much about them that is worth preserving and carrying on with in terms of the over-all Canadian context of who we are and what our country is all about.

Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, much has been made in this House of the question of whether or not the issue of Canadian sovereignty was paramount in moving the Inuit to the high Arctic. It is ironic that the minister of Indian affairs would stand in this House and submit a report that is obvious fabrication and lies and then the Minister of State—

Some hon. members: Order.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am quoting from a previous speaker in the House. Those comments were I think justified and quite correct. I was not alluding to the minister but certainly to the consultant.

It is interesting that a previous minister of Indian affairs of this government, the Minister of National Defence said in a letter dated February 5, 1988:

> My colleague, the Honourable Tom McMillan, has already written to the president of the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada (ITC) on October 16, 1987 suggesting two options for recognition of the Inuit contribution to Arctic sovereignty. Either Resolute Bay or Grise Fiord could be designated a national historic site and/or the Inuit relocation to the High Arctic could be recognized as an event of national historic significance by an article in "Recognizing Canadian History". By copy of this letter I am adding my support to ITC's resolution and suggest—(the) follow up on Mr. McMillan's suggestions.

There is no question in the mind of the Minister of National Defence, the previous minister of Indian affairs, that this government was at one point prepared to recognize that. Then, all of a sudden, there is a complete reversal, a denial of all the facts. We now have the minister of Indian affairs and the Minister of State creating a tremendously embarrassing situation in this House, calling confidence in the committee, and their own members on the committee, who voted unanimously to submit this recommendation to the House of Commons asking the House to vote on its concurrence.

I would ask the previous speaker this. Does the member not agree that this House is now morally bound to let a vote occur on this motion; that the honour of the committee, the honour of the committee members is at stake; that upon hearing direct testimony and investigating this matter, the integrity of the committee system and of the committee is at stake? I would ask the opinion of the previous speaker on this. Should we not allow, as a