

author of a book by that title, a book which deals with the plight of the native people. I can recommend it to anyone who is truly interested in this subject. My colleague, the hon. member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger), quoted Chief Manuel in his closing remarks.

To return to the Knox report, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this sound like Canada 1980? The following illustrates how the Indian people of Canada are disadvantaged: 11,000 new houses are needed to meet existing needs while current construction barely meets new demands; 40 per cent of Indian housing needs replacement or repair; and one family in three lives in crowded conditions on reserves, usually in relatively small houses in poor repair, resulting in unhealthy and unsafe conditions. More than half of existing Indian housing lacks safe water or proper waste disposal. The alternatives are unprotected water supply and waste disposal that is a potential source of pollution. Fires and fire deaths on reserves are six or seven times higher than national levels.

Indian use of health services is two and a half times higher than national levels. Disease, accidents and violence are four to five times higher than national levels, with a considerable proportion of those related to alcohol abuse. Mortality rates are improving, but three times as many Indians die between birth and middle age as do non-Indians. One-third of Indian deaths result from accidents or violence. This is especially true for young adults, among whom the number of suicides is particularly high. Between 55 and 70 per cent of the Indian population use social assistance. This is 22 times higher than national levels. These are documented facts. And we, in Canada, the fabled "Just Society" have not been willing so far to supply the solutions.

As Canadians, how can we continue to pat ourselves on the back to maintain such a holier-than-thou attitude while such statistics occur in our own backyard? How can we continue to pump money into foreign countries and not address such horrendous problems in our own nation? In my view, it is hypocrisy of the ultimate magnitude.

Even this report, from which I have just quoted, is, with all due respect to its author, an example of the misguided endeavours so typical of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This little gem, "Survey of Indian Conditions" cost the department \$246,940.26, almost a quarter of a million dollars. But what is even more disturbing is that \$154,000 of it, or 62 per cent of the total cost of this catalogue of chaos, went to so-called consultants. This means to me that the Department of Indian Affairs is such a circus that it is not even able to author a report dealing with the very problems it works on day in and day out. What a sad case for economy, efficiency and effectiveness.

Who were the consultants? Surely they must have been some of Canada's foremost Indian leaders but, as far as I know, no Indian people were among the consultants. The consultants included W. Babcock, M. Giuliani, J. Nicholson, and G. Cassidy. I do not recognize any Indian names among those. If we are going to spend money on reports such as this one, at least some of the hired consultants should be Indian

Indian Affairs

people. Who know the problems better than those who have faced them head on every day of their lives?

What we have here is a report, a rehash of well-known facts, which has cost the taxpayer a quarter of a million dollars. Worse still, it has deprived the needy of a quarter of a million dollars.

I say the Indian people of Canada have been studied to death. We have had report after report. All of them have pointed out the failure of various programs which continue to roll out of the department. We have had report after report on how to correct the situation, rolling out of the offices of the various organizations. It has become a game of report writing, or who can turn out the highest pile. It is the battle of reports, and I have a stack of them six feet high in my office. If anyone does not believe me, they are welcome to come to my office with a tape measure and measure them. Maybe all of this is simply a diabolical plot to have the problem solved by the department and to have the Indian people reading themselves to death.

These issues are with us today. Why are we making such slow progress in helping the Indian people of Canada solve the problems we have imposed upon them? I think I am aware of a few reasons for this. At the top of the list, and of paramount importance in my view, you must have a federal government willing to give the issue top priority. Have we seen this since 1968? I think not. This is borne out when you consider that the department has had six ministers in a 12-year period, not counting the nine months our party formed the government. I have been told that it takes most men or women at least two years to become familiar with and to get control of a ministry. I should think that this would be especially so vis-à-vis the ministry about which we are talking. If gambling were allowed in this House, I would bet you \$20, Mr. Speaker, that our present minister is shuffled to a new post within six months. The pattern is there, and it is well established.

Think what ramifications this must have upon the department. It is not hard to see why this department is run by bureaucrats. If you worked in a business, Mr. Speaker, which had seven managers or bosses in 12 years, you would probably begin to think that you knew more about what was going on than any new manager. You and your fellows would begin to make and implement policy simply for self-survival, if for no other reason. Also, if you are so disposed, you would be able to control the manager, or minister in this case, because he would never be around long enough to know what was really going on. In my opinion, this is what has happened in the Department of Indian Affairs.

There are many examples of programs and policies initiated through discussions between Indian leaders and well intentioned ministers which have been scuttled by the bureaucrats in the great teepee in Hull. Promise after promise made by the minister is thus broken, leading to frustration, building rage in those people who are supposed to be the benefactors.