

*Routine Proceedings*

and dead, retired and still working, who were involved in that incident where a small group of 15 Inuit families were uprooted from their homes in northern Quebec, transferred up to the hostile climate of the high Arctic, and left basically to their own devices.

The issue is that this House now has an opportunity either to accept the report and the recommendations made by a select standing committee of the House, an all-party committee of the House, which came to different conclusions than the bureaucrats, or they can vote non-confidence in their committee and accept the word of the bureaucrats and the internal examination that the bureaucrats had done of themselves by what they call an outside report.

I think this is a very important question for members to deal with. This House, if it makes a decision to vote concurrence with the recommendations of the committee, then supports the select standing committee and the direct evidence that the committee heard. If it decides either not to vote and to talk out this motion or to vote against this motion then what it is doing is expressing non-confidence in the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, non-confidence in the witnesses that it heard, and non-confidence in the committee process. That is a very dangerous precedent to be established in the House.

• (1130)

As I said, the committee heard direct evidence from people who were directly involved, as opposed to the report tabled by the minister in the House yesterday which was an internal examination by a consultant selected by the Department of Indian Affairs to examine its own actions. As a result, the House has a very difficult decision to make. It must either vote non-confidence against the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs, with whatever ramifications that might have, or vote non-confidence against a report which whitewashes the bureaucracy, both current and past, with whatever ramifications that that has.

The report that was submitted yesterday, as I said, is extremely selective. It was designed to whitewash the bureaucracy and to absolve it of all wrongdoing. The report, in many cases, directly lies to the members of this House of Parliament and those lies must be corrected because they are complete falsehoods. The House should express its opinion about this report by voting in

favour of the concurrence motion. To do so is going to have some serious consequences to the future credibility of standing committees of the House and certainly to the credibility of members who serve on those standing committees.

First, it should be noted that this report says it is a report that was jointly done or that it was done by an independent consultant who was acceptable to the Department of Indian Affairs and to the Makivik Corporation. That statement, Mr. Speaker, is a lie.

What happened was that the Department of Indian Affairs approached the Makivik Corporation which represents the Inuit people in this case. It said: "We have three consultants whom we are going to present to you. You are allowed to select one of them." But they were the three consultants selected by the Department of Indian Affairs. The Makivik Corporation and the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada said: "We cannot accept the first two because they have done negative reports against natives in the past, so we will accept the only one you are offering to us that we do not know." That is the one that was accepted and the one that did this report.

I am sure that if the Makivik Corporation or the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada looked at this report today, they would not have accepted any of them, but they had no choice. They were offered three choices by the Department of Indian Affairs.

So, this is not a joint study as the minister and as the bureaucrats in his department would like us to believe. This is a study that was imposed upon the Makivik Corporation and a consultant was imposed upon the Makivik Corporation by the Department of Indian Affairs. Makivik had absolutely no choice in which consultant did the report. They were all three Department of Indian Affairs consultants.

From the very first paragraph of this report, it is misleading. It is an attempt to deceive the House into believing that this is a joint study, which it is not.

The then study goes on to say that the sovereignty of the north was not an issue in Canada's decision to move those 15 Inuit families from northern Quebec up onto Ellesmere Island, up to Grise Fiord and Resolute Bay. In fact, the minutes of meetings held to discuss this issue are very clear on the subject that Canada's sovereignty was a very important concern of the Canadian government.