

Indian Affairs

far to indicate that it is prepared to enshrine in the constitution their aboriginal and hereditary rights. He went on to speak about turbulence, fury, tribal warfare, and the rest. This is not a responsible statement by a member of the House of Commons, regardless of his party. The only word which would apply to this remarkable flipflop, to these verbal pyrotechnics, is disreputable.

What have the members of the New Democratic party been advocating these past few weeks? I have before me some of the words which they have uttered in this house. On September 19, 1968, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) called for self-determination. He said:

It is about time they were given the right to make more of the decisions affecting their own lives—

On September 23, the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) said:

—Indian people have the right of self-determination. The implications of this principle are that not only does it give Indian people the full right of integration into the community and society as we know it, but also that it gives them the right to live their own existence as they wish to live it—

Then, we heard from the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) on October 28, 1968. He was attacking the idea of paternalism and centralization, saying that more decisions should be made by the Indian people themselves.

Then, on December 17, 1968, we heard the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose), again attacking paternalism. He said:

—in spite of repeated proposals from the natives that they take part in the decisions which affect them.

Then, we heard once again on January 14, 1969 from the hon. member for Winnipeg North who spoke about self-determination. He said:

—one thing which the Indians want more than anything else is their right as citizens of Canada, and surely they are the original citizens of Canada, to direct and manage their own affairs,—

This is the consistent N.D.P. demand.

Then, we heard from the hon. member for Skeena who has spoken many times on the subject of Indians. On March 6, 1969 he said:

The Indian Act gave birth in 1867 to a system of paternalism which has been like a fungus growth that unfortunately is still with us today and still growing—

As long as we have an Indian Act, a special law relating to people with a different cultural inheritance from everybody else, and as long as we have a separate department, we will have discrimination and denials of fundamental human rights.

[Mr. Perrault.]

The hon. member called for the abolition of the Indian Act. He said:

We in this party have suggested for a long time that the objective of the government and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development must be self-destruction of the department and the minister's position.

These are the statements which have been placed on the record by a party which today sponsors a resolution questioning the motives of the minister and questioning the report which he brought to the house. I ask the house whether or not this is a responsible attitude.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the contradiction?

Mr. Perrault: I can go on and on.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member says we have been questioning the motives of the minister. The hon. member may be questioning the motives of the minister, but at no time have we suggested that we question his motives. Quite the reverse.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: I am pleased to hear at least a partial return to a responsible attitude by the party to our left.

These are the suggestions made in the report on Indian policy:

—this is the right time to change long-standing policies. The Indian people have shown their determination that present conditions shall not persist—

This government believes in equality. It believes that all men and women have equal rights. It is determined that all shall be treated fairly and that not one shall be shut out of Canadian life, and especially that no one shall be shut out because of his race.

Then, a new policy is advanced in the report, which reads:

The government would be prepared to take the following steps to create this framework.

It does not say that the government is determined arbitrarily and unilaterally, without consultation, to impose this policy. There is an offer from this government. The government says that this is what they are prepared to do and the report states very explicitly that the measures for implementation of the