

*Motions for Papers*

**Mr. Gray:** I should like to speak to this question of privilege—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I understood there was a point of order raised originally. The hon. member for Renfrew South, I believe, is still on the same point of order. I do not believe he has completed his argumentation and he should be given an opportunity to do so.

**Mr. Greene:** If I misquoted the hon. member's constituency, it is possible I was thinking of the import and weight of his words when I referred to "Deadwood", rather than his constituency.

I point out, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Skeena that if this motion for papers was put on the order paper in good faith it was surely because there was an inference that, in some way, there was not sufficient information; there was not sufficient participation by the people who should have been represented there and who had a right, on behalf of the Indians, to be heard. I submit that a recital of the persons who attended is quite clearly relevant on the issue of determining that there were no persons who were barred by reason of any bias or prejudice; that there was a full attendance and that these confidential matters were discussed by a wide variety of concerned persons. I think this clearly indicates that the motion for tabling the papers is not in the public interest. Surely, the number of persons and variety of organizations which they represented is highly relevant in determining whether or not the public interest would be well served by the production of these papers at the present time.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sure all hon. members are agreed with all the precedents relating to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Skeena. There is a very limited point of debate here, and it is whether or not certain documents should be tabled. I have before me lengthy notes prepared on the subject which would take the next 25 minutes to read. Some of them refer to statements made on similar previous occasions by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) and other members with quite a bit of experience in this house. All these comments and precedents show that when the house is considering a motion for the production of papers the debate and the contributions to the debate should be strictly limited to this point as to whether or not the documents should be produced.

20220—793½

I assume the parliamentary secretary will want to limit his speech to this particular aspect of the problem.

**Mr. Badanai:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There was no thought on my part of using the list of those who attended at the conference for the purpose of taking up the time of the house. My only thought was that it was an important argument because it showed the number of people who attended this important conference from all the provinces. However, at the end of the two day conference a joint communiqué was issued. I am going to read a part of it which indicates the purpose of the conference and what was accomplished. I quote:

Ministers of the governments of Canada and of the provinces met in Ottawa, October 29 and 30, 1964, to discuss improved ways of correlating the policies and programs of the federal and provincial governments in Indian affairs and to consider ways and means of providing for the extension of provincial services to the Indians. The commissioners of the Yukon and the Northwest Territories also attended as observers.

This conference was the first of its kind devoted solely to Indian affairs and had its origin in the conclusions reached at a federal-provincial conference held in November, 1963, when Indian administration was discussed. It was noted that the decision to hold the conference reflected the growing interest and desire on the part of both provincial and federal governments to improve the conditions of Indians and to correlate policies and programs for the provision of education, health, welfare, community development, and other services to Indian communities.

The ministers confirmed that consultation with Indians was of fundamental importance for the success of any federal-provincial effort to further extend services to Indian communities. To this end it was agreed that Indians, through their band councils and organizations, should be approached with a view to establishing necessary consultative machinery such as Indian advisory committees in each province or region, which would provide a ready means of consulting with Indians on questions of concern to them. It was recognized that the use of such advisory committees as a consultant body would not replace the need to consult individual bands on matters of direct importance to each band.

There was mutual recognition that conditions and problems differed as between provinces; and, accordingly, it was considered desirable that there be flexibility in the extent and scope of any arrangements that might be made. This could best be done province by province in a manner consistent with conditions and circumstances existing in each province. To this end—

**Mr. Barnett:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would be pleased to hear the point of order raised by the hon. member, but I assume that he wants to take up again the point raised by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). I can assure him