



Assemblée nationale
Québec

journal des Débats

COMMISSIONS PARLEMENTAIRES

Quatrième session - 32e Législature

Commission permanente de la présidence
du conseil et de la constitution

Audition de personnes et d'organismes
autochtones sur les droits et les
besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens
et des Inuits (2)

Le mercredi 23 novembre 1983 - No 167

Président: M. Richard Guay

Table des matières

Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake et Comité des droits territoriaux des Haudenosaunis	B-9293
Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake (Oka)	B-9317
Association des Inuits du Labrador	B-9327
Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini	B-9339
Administration régionale Kativik	B-9353

Intervenants

M. Réal Rancourt, président

M. René Lévesque

M. Roland Dussault

M. Pierre de Bellefeuille

M. Guy Chevette

M. Denis Lazure

M. Denis Perron

M. John Ciaccia

M. Cosmo Maciocia

Mme Joan Dougherty

Mme Thérèse Lavoie-Roux

* M. Billy Two Rivers, Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake et Comité des droits territoriaux des Haudenosaunis

* M. Franklin Williams, idem

* M. Brian Deer, idem

* M. Paul Delaronde, idem

* Mme Myrtle Bush, idem

* M. Charlie Patton, idem

* M. Mike Myers, idem

* M. Dennis Nicholas, idem

* M. Bruce Elijah, idem

* M. Bob Antone, idem

* M. Joseph Norton, idem

* M. Gerry Pelletier, Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake

* Mme Diane Sorka, idem

* Mme Frances Williams, Association des Inuits du Labrador

* M. Enoch Obed, idem

* M. Vryan Haysom, idem

* M. Paulusi Sivuak, Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini

* M. Tamusi Kumak, idem

* M. John Utamak, idem

* M. Eliyassi Sallualuk, idem

* M. Josepie Keleutak, Administration régionale Kativik

* M. Charlie Watt, idem

* M. Mark Gordon, idem

* M. Paulosie Padlayat, idem

* M. Willie Makivic, idem

* M. Georges Filotas, interprète

Courrier de deuxième classe - Enregistrement no 1762

Dépôt légal

Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

ISSN 0823-0102

Le mercredi 23 novembre 1983

**Audition de personnes et d'organismes autochtones sur les droits et
les besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens et des Inuits**

(Dix heures onze minutes)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Bonjour. Nous allons commencer la séance du mercredi 23 novembre 1983 de la commission élue permanente de la présidence du conseil et de la constitution qui a pour mandat d'entendre les représentations des autochtones et des divers groupes et organismes autochtones sur les droits et les besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens et des Inuits.

Les membres de la commission sont: M. Perron (Duplessis), M. Chevette (Joliette), M. Dussault (Châteauguay), M. Ciaccia (Mont-Royal), M. Lévesque (Taillon), M. Lafrenière (Ungava), M. Morin (Sauvé), Mme Lavoie-Roux (L'Acadie), M. Maciocia (Viger), M. Bisailon (Sainte-Marie), M. Brouillet (Chauveau), M. Bordeleau (Abitibi-Est), Mme Dougherty (Jacques-Cartier), M. de Bellefeuille (Deux-Montagnes), M. Gratton (Gatineau), M. LeMay (Gaspé), M. Rivest (Jean-Talon), M. Saintonge (Laprairie).

Il y a aussi M. Lazure, du comté de Bertrand. Je m'excuse, c'est la deuxième fois que je l'oublie.

Une voix: Jamais deux sans trois.

M. Lazure: Il y a un problème, M. le Président.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): D'accord. Je déclare la séance ouverte. Nous allons vous donner l'ordre du jour jusqu'après la période des questions. Je vais demander la collaboration de tous pour rester à l'intérieur du temps qui nous a été alloué.

Auditions

Ce matin, nous allons entendre la Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake et le Comité des droits territoriaux des Haudenosaunis. De 14 heures à 15 heures, nous entendrons la Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake et, après la période des questions jusqu'à 18 heures, l'Association des Inuits du Labrador.

Donc, je donne la parole à la Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake, en demandant à son représentant de se nommer et de nous présenter les gens qui l'accompagnent.

**Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake et
Comité des droits territoriaux
des Haudenosaunis**

M. Deer (Brian): Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to clarify that there are two delegations here. One of them is the Band Council of Kahnawake representing the Mohawk community of Kahnawake, on my left hand side; there are six persons. The other delegation is the Land Rights Committee of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, also known as the Iroquois Confederacy, and it is on my right hand side. This delegation represents one particular community. This other delegation represents an entire confederacy of six nations, including twenty-one communities. The two delegations are here out of a common concern for our people, the Haudenosaunee, also known as the Iroquois. Even though we are two distinct delegations, we are here together in a spirit of cooperation.

It is customary among the Haudenosaunee people that, whenever there is a meeting such as this one, we go through some formalities, the first one being the opening ritual, the second one being our greetings to your people and the third one being our greetings to your people and the third one being our condolence, the first three strings of the condolence.

The opening ritual is the thanksgiving for all the things that are around us. So, at this time, the opening ritual will be done by Paul Delaronde and it will be interpreted afterwards by Dennis Nicholas.

M. Delaronde (Paul): (S'exprime dans sa langue)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Châteauguay.

M. Dussault: M. le Président, est-ce possible de demander à nos invités de nous expliquer brièvement - cela serait sympathique - le sens du rituel que nous avons eu l'occasion de voir et d'entendre dans les dernières minutes?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Si le député de

Châteauguay avait écouté au début, il saurait que tout ce qui sera dit dans la langue des Haudenosaunis sera traduit subséquemment par un des interprètes.

M. Dussault: M. le Président, si on veut bien m'excuser, ce que je veux surtout savoir, c'est le sens de ce que l'on a entendu et pas uniquement la traduction.

M. Deer: The opening ritual is done at every gathering or meeting of any sort, whether it is a social dance or a meeting of chiefs and councils or a festival or a meeting such as this. The interpretation of that opening ritual will now be done by Dennis Nicholas.

M. Nicholas (Dennis): Je vais faire mon possible pour faire cela comme il faut. La première chose que font deux personnes qui se rencontrent chez nous, c'est de rendre grâce au Créateur de tous les bienfaits qu'il a dispensés sur la terre. Donc, au moment où nous sommes tous réunis ici, nous viendrons exprimer l'espoir que, chez nous, nos familles se portent bien et que les nouvelles sont bonnes. Pour ces bonnes nouvelles, recueillons-nous et rendons grâce.

Nous voulons également parler du sol sur lequel nous nous trouvons: de notre sainte mère la terre, donc de l'importance du Créateur pour notre peuple. Nous lui sommes reconnaissants de tout ce qu'il nous a donné. Nous considérons la terre comme une sainte mère qui répand tous ses bienfaits quotidiennement et conserve nos familles en bonne santé. Recueillons-nous et rendons grâce à notre mère la terre.

Nous parlons de remèdes. Chaque fois que nous sortons de nos maisons et que nous franchissons la porte, nous avons des remèdes devant nous. Nous avons des gens parmi nous qui ont reçu le pouvoir d'aider les autres avec les remèdes. Ces remèdes sont dans l'herbe et dans les buissons, dans les arbres partout autour de nous. Seulement quelques-uns parmi nous les connaissent et savent s'en servir. Recueillons-nous maintenant et rendons grâce pour toutes ces bonnes choses qui se trouvent encore dans la nature aujourd'hui. Qu'il en soit ainsi.

Nous parlons des arbres qui nous entourent, encore une fois. Nous voyons les bourgeons sortir. Nous considérons que le premier des arbres est l'érable parce qu'il nous donne du sucre au moment où monte la sève. À ce moment-là, nous prenons un jour et nous avons des cérémonies d'action de grâce. Ces cérémonies sont faites encore aujourd'hui. Pour tous les arbres du monde aussi, nous nous recueillons et nous rendons grâce.
(10 h 30)

Il y a les animaux: les quadrupèdes sont nos frères et soeurs. Ils nous ont été donnés

pour une raison et nous devons les protéger. Nous sommes conscients de vivre en harmonie avec nos frères et soeurs du monde animal. Nous nous recueillons et nous rendons grâce pour tous les animaux qui existent et nous savons très bien que certaines espèces ont disparu. Nous ne les avons pas oubliées, même aujourd'hui. Nous nous recueillons donc et nous rendons grâce pour tous les animaux qui se sont trouvés sur la terre.

Nous parlons des oiseaux. L'aigle est l'oiseau le plus important pour notre peuple. Il fait figure de signe. L'arbre de la paix fait partie de la grande loi qui régit notre conduite entre nous. L'aigle se trouve en haut de cet arbre. Il monte la garde et nous avertit s'il voit un danger. Recueillons-nous donc et rendons grâce pour tous les oiseaux du monde. Nous savons qu'il y en a qui sont disparus, mais nous les mentionnons encore dans nos cérémonies. Nous ne les avons pas oubliés. Rendons grâce qu'il en soit ainsi.

Nous disons qu'il y a deux soleils dans le ciel. Le premier est (il s'exprime dans sa langue). C'est l'homme, le soleil mâle. Il ne peut jamais faire défaut ou être en retard. Il agit de façon que nous puissions voir jusqu'à l'horizon et autour de nous toutes les bonnes choses que le Créateur nous a données. Recueillons-nous donc et rendons grâce pour toutes ces bonnes choses qui ont été données pour une raison. Nous le savons et nous rendons grâce à notre frère aîné, le soleil.

La nuit, nous rendons grâce à notre grand-mère la lune. Pour tout ce que nous avons mentionné, il y a un mâle et une femelle, chez les plantes, chez les animaux, chez les arbres, chez les poissons. Notre grand-mère la lune a reçu pour mission de veiller sur toute la vie femelle du monde, de veiller à ce que nous comprenions le sens de ce qui nous entoure. C'est elle, comme toutes les autres femmes, qui contrôle les générations futures de toutes les espèces. C'est par elle que nous savons calculer les mois et que nous savons quand concevoir, donner naissance, donner la vie, perpétuer l'espèce. Recueillons-nous donc et rendons grâce à notre grand-mère la lune.

Nous voulons également mentionner les étoiles et le ciel parce que c'est dans les étoiles et le ciel qu'est écrite notre histoire. Les Anciens nous disaient que, si nous scrutons les étoiles, elles nous indiquent les moments précis pour mener nos cérémonies. Notre peuple se conforme encore à cette directive aujourd'hui. Il y a des gens chez nous qui savent interpréter la langue des étoiles. C'est toute notre histoire qui s'y trouve et qui nous est révélée. Recueillons-nous donc et rendons grâce aux étoiles qui ne s'écartent jamais de la mission qui leur a été donnée. Nous les remercions d'être ainsi.

Nous rendons également grâce aux orages qui viennent du coucher du soleil. Ils apportent les pluies qui fécondent la terre et

qui sont l'origine de toute vie. Nous avons reçu une très lourde responsabilité. On dit qu'à une époque il y avait de gigantesques animaux qui parcouraient la terre. Nous avons demandé à nos ancêtres de les ensevelir dans la terre, ce qu'ils ont fait. Un jour, nous ne pourrions plus rendre grâce aux orages. On dit qu'à ce moment-là la terre s'entrouvrira et que ces gigantesques animaux seront de nouveau libres.

Les dangers qui menacent le monde actuellement ne sont rien en comparaison de ce qui se produira à ce jour. Nous sommes donc sur la terre pour une raison. Nous ne l'avons jamais oublié. Nous avons toujours nos cérémonies. Nous continuons de rendre grâce au tonnerre dès que nous l'entendons. Recueillons-nous et rendons grâce qu'il en soit ainsi.

Nous en arrivons au Créateur lui-même. Nous disons que, là où il se trouve, nous ne pouvons voir son visage. Même si nous ne pouvons voir son visage, il nous a donné la responsabilité de veiller sur tout ce qu'il nous a prodigué; par conséquent, jusqu'à ce jour, c'est ce que nous faisons de notre mieux. Recueillons-nous et rendons grâce au Créateur qui a rendu tout cela possible. Qu'il en soit ainsi!

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Merci, M. Nicholas.

M. Deer: At this time we would like to give our greetings from our people, the Haudenosaunee, also known as "les Iroquois", to your people. The greetings will be done in the Oneida language by Bruce Elijah and it will be interpreted by Dennis Nicholas.

M. Elijah (Bruce): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Nicholas (Dennis): Nous voulons, à ce moment-ci, vous dire que, lorsque nos leaders, et les chefs traditionnels de notre nation ont entendu dire qu'il était possible que nous venions faire un exposé, ils ont convoqué les gens à une grande réunion. Les leaders et les chefs ont donc déclaré qu'ils adressaient leurs salutations aux personnes que nous allions rencontrer. Ils vous envoient donc leurs vœux de bonne santé et de courage afin que nous puissions nous recueillir. Ils nous ont dit: Lorsque vous serez là-bas, nous espérons qu'ils pourront entendre notre voix, connaître nos préoccupations au sujet de leur santé. Voilà donc le message que nous transmettons de la part de nos leaders.

(10 h 45)

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Nicholas (Dennis): Aussi, les mères de nos clans, qui sont à la tête de nos nations, sont celles qui choisissent les chefs.

Lorsqu'elles ont su que nous venions ici, elles ont dit également: Nous voulons envoyer nos vœux de bonne santé et nos bons souhaits aux femmes de leur peuple. Par conséquent, aujourd'hui, voilà le message que nous vous transmettons.

Parmi nos gens également, lors de nos cérémonies et selon nos coutumes, nous avons ce que nous appelons les gardiens de la foi qui voient à ce que les cérémonies se déroulent bien, qui nous rappellent toutes les choses importantes dont il faut tenir compte. Il s'agit d'hommes et de femmes de tous les âges. Eux aussi, lorsqu'ils ont entendu dire que nous venions ici, ont dit: Nous voulons que vous transmettiez notre message et nos vœux de bonne santé, nos bons souhaits, aux personnes ici qui ont des postes de confiance, à la fois aux hommes et aux femmes. C'est pourquoi, à ce moment-ci, il est possible que vous entendiez ce message qu'ils vous ont envoyé.

De plus, nos gens qui n'occupent pas de poste, des hommes et des femmes de tous les âges dont certains n'arrivent jamais à des postes élevés, sont les pivots de notre nation. Lorsqu'ils ont entendu dire que nous venions ici, ils ont dit aussi: Nous voulons envoyer nos bons souhaits. De nouveau, aujourd'hui, nous avons ces gens qui n'occupent pas des postes élevés, à la fois des hommes et des femmes de tous les groupes d'âge, qui vous envoient ce message; vous pouvez l'entendre. Il s'agit de souhaits de bonne santé et de bons vœux.

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Nicholas (Dennis): Et nos enfants qui courent partout, qui commencent à se traîner par terre ou qui sont au berceau, eux aussi, lorsqu'ils ont entendu dire que nous venions ici, ont dit qu'ils voulaient vous transmettre leurs vœux de bonne santé et leurs bons souhaits. Ils ont dit: Nous sommes certains que les gens à qui vous allez parler ont également des enfants et des petits-enfants. Nous espérons que leurs préoccupations seront les mêmes. Nous le disons et avons ces paroles à l'esprit pour les générations à venir. Par conséquent, à ce moment, vous pouvez entendre le message qu'ils vous envoient.

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Deer: At this time, Mr. Chairman, we would like to offer the first three strings of the condolence to be done again in Oneida by Bruce Elijah and to be translated by Paul Delaronde.

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Delaronde: What Mr. Elijah has said is that when our leaders had heard that we

were coming to this meeting, to this gathering, they believed that this was a very important meeting, that this was a very special meeting and that, when we can come to gather with you, we should take with us the first three strings of the Wampum; that these words and these ways were given to us by our Creator; that these were the symbols and he begun with that we have been given water, very cold water, clear water, clean water from the coldest Spring; and that with this water that we would all drink together, this will help to clear our throats so that we may speak good words, that we may speak smooth words; and that it will help to clear our minds so we could have a good meeting, so we could have a good understanding. And so this is the first string, the first message, the first symbol of the Wampum.

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue).
(11 heures)

M. Delaronde: He has then said that it was the people who felt that it was important that we come with the second symbol. The second symbol is a feather, a very soft white feather. With this white feather, with this soft feather, it will help to clean our ears so that we could hear the words clearly, that you could hear our words clearly, and that, by hearing these words in a clear and a good way, it would help us in our thinking, it would help us all to come to a good understanding, it would help us all to come to good decisions. So, this is the second symbol that has been sent to us. And it is a very important symbol because, again, the Creator has given us this symbol. He has given us these ways. And it helps us, not only in this counsel, but in our every day life so that we would always have open ears, clear ears so that we could have a clear mind, a good mind and to do what the Creator has intended for us.

M. Elijah: (S'exprime dans sa langue)

M. Delaronde: Next message. The next thing that was sent was the third string. This message also comes from the people, from the leaders. They sent with us the symbol of the finest and the softest nice white leather that would help to clean our eyes, all was gathered here, so that we could see properly that there would be nothing to obstruct what is going on here today, that our eyes may see the good in what has to be done; and that, with clear eyes, we may see what is best for the people, for the children and for the ones who are not here yet. This, again, was given to us by our Creator. Those things are very important to us. Indeed, it should be very important to you who are listening because we are working for the future, for the generations. We are working the Creator's

work. That is the third message that the people have sent.

M. Deer: Now that the formalities have been completed, we would like to go into our presentation and, again, we would like to emphasize the fact that there are two delegations here with us. We want you to understand the significance of these two delegations. The delegation on the right hand side, the Band Council of Kahnawake, is a Canadian entity. I believe that the Band Council will give you a presentation concerning the problems that the Community of Kahnawake has had when a Canadian entity, the Band Council, has been imposed on a community that already has its own traditional government. They will outline the problems that we have concerning that.

On the right hand side, is the Land Rights Committee of the Confederacy of the Haudenosaunee which under international law is sovereign constitutionally. The Confederacy of the Haudenosaunee is constitutionally sovereign in the international world. The significance of these two delegations is that, in the past three years, there has been a great deal of cooperation that has been going on between the traditional people and between the Band Council, so that we may sort out our affairs in our various communities within the Iroquois Confederacy.

So, at this time, the Mohawks Band Council of Kahnawake will introduce its delegation and will make its presentation.

M. Norton (Joseph): Thank you. My name is Joseph Norton. I am the **chief** spokesman on behalf of the Kahnawake Community. On my left. I have chief Billy Two Rivers. To my right, chief Ida Goodleaf, chief Myrtle Bush, chief Franklin Williams and chief Eugène Montour.

As you are aware, we have submitted a brief that was previously used with the subcommittee on Indian self-government, a federal body that was put together and that went across Canada to interview, review submissions from various Indian and Native groups across this country. We will not read that particular document here today, that has been submitted to you for your general information. I gather everyone has read and absorbed what was in that material. So, if you wish to ask questions on that, we will also be prepared to answer to that. I will be quite brief as there are several members of our Council here who wish also to make statements.

I have no written statement here, in front of me; so I will speak from what is in my mind and in my heart. I am quite new in the area of the problems that surround Kahnawake and in having the full knowledge of the relationship between the province of Québec and the Kahnawake community.

As we all know and realize, Kahnawake has had several centuries of contact with the non-Indians, be it the French, be it the English, be it the Dutch and be it whoever. We have had quite a history and experience in our relationship with the various governments that have come into being, be it provincial or federal.

Presently, I can only speak from within the last two years that I have been sitting as a representative of our community. As was mentioned by Mr. Deer, we are but one community in several communities in Canada and in United States that make up the Iroquois Confederacy. We are in a transitional period. We have faced many problems in the past and we will face many more problems in the future. We have always been cast in a rôle as being dissident or being unreasonable or being outright radicals but there are very many reasons behind those, that type of positions that we have taken.

I can sit here for the rest of the day and explain to you all the various things that have happened, all the problems that have arisen between our community and the surrounding communities and also the Provincial Government. I am sure that the members of the Council here sitting before you today would add some of their problems. So I will just discuss in general the areas that we are presently making quite clear to the Provincial Government, that is that they have to come to an understanding that there will no longer be any impositions. We are at a point in time when we no longer view ourselves as being wards to any government.

With the Canadian Constitution and with the particular movements of Québec in its aspirations, we see ourselves in a very unique position, being that Québec has taken the stand that it will not endorse the Canadian Constitution. That could be in our favour. Now, it depends on the type of relationship that we wish to set up between ourselves and Québec. You have to understand, as outlandish or idealistic as it may seem, that we view ourselves as part of the Mohawk Nation that has the right, that has not given up the right to its nationhood, that has not given up the right to its self-determination.

Legally, we have never signed any document that has abrogated that right. Those rights are still there. What has happened is that we have failed to exercise those rights and it is time, as complex and as difficult as it may seem, for us to start exercising those rights. That is where we come into conflict with the province be it in education, be it in justice, be it in health, be it in anyone of those fields. Those of you sitting here know this very well because we have had some contact with, if not all of you then some of you, or your

representatives in those particular areas.

Everything that is discussed in this building on a day-to-day basis has some impact or some reflection on our way of life. We are fortunately or, in some cases, unfortunately within an urban area. We are surrounded by approximately 6 000 000 non-Indian people. We have to live with that reality and so do you have to live with that reality that we are in that proximity. We have been constantly encroached upon by various - I can only term them as such - impositions: Caisson Point, the international seaway that passed through our territory and took a large chunk of our land; major highways, major thoroughfares, where we have had to put up with anywhere between 55 000 to 60 000 cars per day that have split our territory; major hydro lines that have divided our territory again; major railways that have divided our territory. We seem to be in a proximity where there are major lines of communication, be they transportation, telephone, hydro that have been imposed within our territory. I would say it has always been done under pressure, with the Government standing there with the Almighty hammers saying: Either you accept or you get hit.
(11 h 15)

We no longer will sit still for that type of so-called negotiation or consultation, be it with the Federal or the Provincial level. This, you must understand. It is very difficult for me to try and compact everything into one short presentation. Therefore, I will conclude and pass on to my colleagues here at the table with this statement that we have heard yesterday and last night to the various other groups that sat here and made presentations to you, that you are willing to represent the Native population at the next First Ministers Conference. You are willing to offer to Canada your protection of the Native people here in Québec. You are willing to support and represent your Native people, but you must understand that if we sit here before you and say that we are nations, and if we sit here before you and say that we will exercise our rights, then only us, only we can do that representation if we choose to do so. No one else can do that, not fairly, not correctly, not morally and not justly. So you must totally understand that if we may stand alone out of all of Canada, not only the province of Québec, then that is what we have to do, to prove that there are still people in North America who believe they are human beings; and that is what we are.

So with that I will conclude. Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak before you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you chief Norton.

M. Williams (Franklin): My name is Franklin Williams, a member of the Mohawks Council of Kahnawake. I have a number of points to deliver. I would like to thank you for inviting us here. I hope to have an interesting discussion afterwards. I would like to say that, as a member of the Mohawk Council of Kahnawake, we are elected under the Indian Act and under its legal interpretations. We are nothing but a crazy legal entity, when it suits the purpose of the Federal Government. In its eyes we exist only as an administrative arm of its agent, the Department of Indian Affairs. Contrary to their narrow definition and interpretations of our role, we are Mohawk people who have retaken jurisdiction in many areas of the internal workings of our community. We are in the process of reestablishing, through consultation with our people, the government that respects the constitutions of our ancestors. That government will be decided upon by the will of the Mohawk people of Kahnawake. It will not be decided or imposed by an external order of government. Our immediate role as an elected band council, is to serve as the vehicle in order to facilitate the objectives of our people in reestablishing the recognition of self government in Kahnawake.

In effect we are an instrument which interacts with all levels of government in the political forum with the objective of taking back jurisdictions that the great white father in Ottawa gave to the Québec Government without the consultation nor the consent of the Mohawks of Kahnawake.

Our goal is to establish rapport with the Government of Québec in order to devise an appropriate forum for discussion. Recently, as our grand chief pointed out, we have had discussions with various Québec ministers on matters where your society infringe upon our territory and upon the rights of the Mohawks of Kahnawake. We believe that the time is right for further discussions on an ongoing basis. We further believe that such a process must be formalized in order to insure subsequent governments of Québec recognize the autonomy of the Mohawks of Kahnawake, for we have lived on these lands you call Québec, Canada, North America from the dawn of time and will remain as a Mohawk people for at least that same time span.

Our purpose here today is not to negotiate nor concede any of the rights the Great Spirit has been bestowed upon the Mohawks of Kahnawake. But rather to inform and advise the Government of Québec that you must cancel legislation that have an impact and infringe upon the rights of the Mohawks of Kahnawake.

In concluding, Honorable members of the National Assembly, we also advise that we are in a process in which, over a decade,

we will call an end to the colonial legislation of the Federal Government and his agent, the Department of Indian Affairs. In the accumulation of our objectives we will not allow the Government of Québec to become the next Indian Affairs Department nor will we accept the creation of a Provincial Indian Affairs to administer over the lives of Mohawks of Kahnawake. In effect, as remove the burden of the imposed federal laws and legislation, we will not allow the Québec Government or the Provincial Government to fill the vacuum as has been done under section 88 of the Indian Act which states in brief that the provincial laws of general application apply.

If Québec wishes to make laws related to Indian nations in Québec, another request of particular Indian nations, the Mohawks of Kahnawake must be excluded. We believe that the Government of Québec, within the Canadian Confederation, can well understand our position as we do not wish for universal policies or laws to be imposed upon by any order of government but our own, just as a federal policy or will cannot be imposed upon the Provincial Government by the Federal Government.

We believe that with firm resolve we can work and devise the appropriate forum for discussion so that both cultures will continue to coexist in peace, harmony and friendship. Honorable members, thank you for the opportunity and the courtesy in inviting us here and may I also extend an invitation to all of you to come down to Kahnawake. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, M. Williams. Somebody else?

Mme Bush (Myrtle): I am chief Myrtle Bush and I have just five very short points which, I guess, reiterate what the other two have said. I think it is important that the elected council speaks very clearly on this.

We have presented a paper which we had prepare for the Federal Government outlining all of our grievances to them under their imposed legislation. We were going to read it here and simply state that it would apply as well to Provincial Government in the areas. It is unnecessary to read this paper because the traditional people have prepared a lengthy paper and have used the same, so it is not necessary for us to read out. I want to mention just five points which are important. Franklin and Joe, both look to them too.

I just want to say that the vacuum created by the absence of federal legislation cannot be filled by provincial law. We have laws in our own constitution and that is what we are prepared to use. We do not ask that the Provincial Government write any legislation for us. We only ask that you aid

us by removing your laws, so that ours can apply.

The second point that I want to make is that we have tabled the positions on our grievances in relation to the Federal Government. We have listened for an entire day, yesterday, to the Crees outlining the problems that they have come up to because of the James Bay Agreement which is supposedly a model for settling Native land claims. For one entire day, the Crees were able to seat here and justify all of the problems that have been created because of that. I think it only shows very clearly that the solution lies not with provincial legislation and not with federal legislation but a legislation that the Native people themselves had been able to develop. What they need from the province and from the Federal Government is just the assistance in allowing them the freedom to implement their own legislation.

They have already mentioned that we have problems in our community because of section 88 and where the Federal Government allows the provincial jurisdiction to apply. Our hospitals, for example, without going in lengthy details and I am sure that Minister Johnson can tell you about that. We have been trying to get an hospital built for 20 years. There was federal money which come to the provinces which are for hospitals and Native people are entitled to their own hospitals and hospital care. 20 years it did go and we did not get it. Kahnawake was the only place that had an hospital; our building is old and dangerous. We had minister after minister come and look at it. Everyone has told us that if it was in their own communities, it would not be acceptable. They agree that the money will be there. Treasury Board has already approved it. We have one problem. They do not consider us to be a legal entity. We are an Indian community, they are insisting that we have provincial law applied before they will allow these federal and provincial dollars coming from the resources of Native people, the land of resources, before they will allow us money to rebuild the hospital. They wish to have an assurance that the provincial law will apply and we cannot allow this. Consequently, we have an hospital which is in terrible condition.

In the areas of justice, particularly in family law, family and property matters, Native people have customary ways of settling family problems. We are forced to go to an outside court with that. We are forced in property matters which should only be of Indian and federal jurisdiction, we are forced into settlements of land, divorces or disputes to go to a provincial court. We cannot resolve this in our own way, with our own customary court.

In the areas of our right to freedom

across borders, we have a problem. We have a problem with the Provincial Government because they insist that our men have provincial licence plates on cars when our men spend most of their working years working in the United States, have purchased their cars there, have got to have licences to drive there. When they come home to their reserve and to their families, they are harassed because they have not got a provincial plate on their car. That is just a small area.

We could outline any number of areas that we have problems with: language laws are for Native nurses. Native nurses were prepared only to nurse in Native hospitals. In order to get a licence, they are required to prove that they are proficient in French, but in the Indian reserves and our reserve, French is not one of the languages which we feel is necessary to have in the hospitals. Most of our elderly people have Mohawk or English as a second language. So, that has been a problem. And the thing is always that we cannot have your laws, they do not fit our culture.

The fourth point I want to make is that we do wish to establish a good relationship with the Québec Government because we live as neighbours. We are not here to ask that the province give anything to us but only that our own government system be not hindered but helped by your government.

The fifth point is that we who are elected chiefs are not in a different camp from our brothers the traditionalists. We come from the same root, we go on the same path and we go to the same destination, and all of our people in our community go with us together. It is necessary that some of us act as the buffer or the neutral zone between the outside governments and their imposed laws and our peoples, so that we could survive and so that is our role as elected council.

It is we who are faced daily with the imposed laws and conditions, not because we believe in your system but because the time had not come for you to listen to us. But now, we think that the time has come.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Who takes the opportunity to talk now? Please, could you give your name?

M. Two Rivers (Billy): Sure, Billy Two Rivers, from Caughnawaga. I feel pretty bad that the table is not complete. There are a few faces missing. I would have hoped that everyone felt that it was important enough to call this meeting and to be able to attend this meeting in its totalness. It is sad that everybody cannot take the proper time to devote to these gatherings. I feel bad that your Premier is not here and also that a lot

of our Native people are not here.

I feel that there is a lot of things that are not being said properly, that are not being tabled at the moment. I do not have much equipment or means, I am getting my points across to this committee. I just have just one and I hope that it will sustain me through my entire presentation, that is what I believe to be the truth.

(11 h 30)

I have had a lot of problems or seen a lot of problems with Indian peoples. And all our problems seem to stem from your society. Unfortunately, I think one of the main things that your society forgets, and maybe they will remember next year, is that they arrived here as guests, our guests, that they came to this land and we welcomed them. And next year, you are going to be celebrating that. Even today, they come into our territories wishing to make cassettes, movies or pictures to sell to the public, to show what Québec has done for the Indian peoples, glamorizing Québec's role to Indian peoples to the world. They come today and they say: Let us make cassettes so that we will show what a good relationship we have between Indian peoples and Québec Government.

I think that we should get a few things straight. As you were guests then, you are still guests today. As we welcomed you then, we gave you privileges, we gave you passage, we gave you freedom to come to our land. I do not know what point in time that you got the idea that you, all of a sudden, had jurisdiction, that you had control, that you suddenly became the "maîtres chez nous" of the Indian lands. This is ours and I would hope that you would keep this in mind.

What bothers me is that in dealing with the situation there are a lot of falsities going on, a lot of deceits and a lot of untruths. I think that should be told. First of all, in the constitutional process, there is no one to make representation for nations, be they Mohawk, be they any other nation in Québec. Mr. Lévesque, if he wishes not to participate in the First Ministers Conference, should not go in on the excuse or on the coattails of native people to go and use that as a forum to shoot off his mouth about what he thinks that the position of Québec should be, like he did last year. Do not go under the pretext that he is going to help what he terms "our Indians". We are nobody's Indians except ourselves.

I should think that he should be, or this Government should be, fair enough to tell the Indian peoples they have made agreements with what those agreements mean. If there is an extinguishment of aboriginal rights to a land, tell the people that their rights are extinguished and do not keep them on a string like you do.

If there is going to be talk of

protection under the Province of Québec's Constitution, then this Government should tell the Indian peoples who want this protection that they become citizens of the State of Québec, citizen of this Province, or whatever you want to call it, but do not go on with the deception of trying to tell the Indian peoples: Yes, you are Indians, we are protecting your culture, we are doing this, we are doing that when, all the time, all you have in your mind is to steal the land from the Indian people.

If we want to be straight and we want to be straight forward, then we should tell the truth once in a while, even if it is difficult. A lot of times, we wonder how can we sit here and listen to the good words that come out of the mouths of your leadership. Yesterday, we heard words like "trust": We must trust each other. Well, those words, we heard for the last 450 years: Trust us. We keep our end of the bargain and your end has eroded, and eroded and eroded to this very day where there are Indian Peoples today that are dying, there are Indian peoples on the North Shore of Québec that do not know how they are going to pass the winter, because they do not have adequate housing, they do not have adequate food, they do not have adequate medicine.

If the truth is going to be spoken, then let us speak it. We are Indian peoples, we are nations and we belong to this land. Today, a man sits there and he comes to our land and says: Can I have a right of way for some bus transportation to come through your land? We need it, we need space, we need room, please be kind enough and allow the bus line to pass through Caughnawaga on a special lane. Let us take more of your land. But, last year, the proposal was: We are going to steal your land, put an archipelago on it, put an Hydro project and push that, and we are going to do it with or without your consent. Well, that has been put on the back-burner, but that same man has the gall and the audacity to come and ask for more land and to put a bus line through. These are the things that are happening, that are wrong, that should be corrected.

Today, we have a hospital in Caughnawaga that is in such poor condition, that is a tinder-box; it could burn today. But, because Québec wants his God damned flag hanging from the front of that hospital, it will not give moneys to build the new hospital. Why? Because it is playing politics with peoples life, the same damned thing that is going on in Northern Québec with Indian peoples.

I do not know, it is very difficult to hinder and listen to the words of our leaders here and say: Do not speak sharp or harsh words; but I can help it. It is right up to

here with the hypocrisy of Governments, be the federal or provincial, who come in and have the arrogance to think that they are superior, that they are going to take care of the Indian people. Nobody is going to take care of the Indian people, except themselves. What you have is a responsibility to Indian people, a responsibility to provide medicine, to provide education, but you have no right to steal our minds. You have no right to come in and take our children away and try to put thinking, to make us think that we are a society that is small, that is poor, that is impoverished, that cannot work, that is dependant. You create this dependency, you take away from us our own self-respect, our right to livelihood, our right to earn money.

We have people in Caughnawaga who can work with the best people in the world on buildings, on bridges. As a matter of fact, your bridge overheard in 1907 took 32 or 31 of our Indian lives putting up that bridge. What does Québec tell us? You cannot work in the province of Québec, except in your area; he restricts us. I am a Mohawk on the North American continent and I will not be restricted by any Government, provincial or federal, to tell me where I can be an Indian. We should have a right to work all over the place and we cannot work all over the place. We have a right to be a Mohawk in James Bay, in Ungava, in Alberta, in California and in your small State of Florida. I do not perceive that we are going to be... Well, that is where some people take their vacations, while they are supposed to spend their economy in Québec. Anyway, I really have a hard time to sit here a lot of times and just listen to the distaste, deception and the connivance going on from your area. I do not know; maybe, we do not have the luxury of sinning all week long and then, going Sunday morning get our sins forgiven on and then begin, next Monday morning, with a new slate. I do not think, we do not have that luxury. But, we have to live with ourselves each and every day and we have our conscience that is prodding all the time.

Gentlemen, we have a lot of problems and I can see those problems looking at me right now. Those problems are sitting here, staring me right in the face. This committee sits here, there have been committees, like I said, for the last 450 years and I do not know where the hell the solution is going to come from. I believe that it is going to come from our own people.

Another problem I have, and probably made me schizophrenic, is that when I went to school, I was told I was a savage, I was told I was wild, I was told that I invented missionary soup. I had all these problems telling me that I was wicked. And why? Because I defended my land, because I

defended my home, because I was fighting a person coming to steal my land. And for that, I am deemed to be a person in just above an animal state. I mean, your education, your schools are all geared to lies and racism against Indian people. Today, you can pick up any textbook in the first, second or third grade, and the first thing you have got in there is "Maudit Sauvage", his picture right in the front.

These things - you talk about changes - you do not go about changing them, you build the hate, the racism right from day one. Right from the time the children come off your knees, you build hate, you build it in your schools. You come out and say in your schools: Oh, we, the French, were the first here. This is our land, this is our homeland. It is not. You are guests here. It is our house. Our asking is: Let us coexist together and pay some of your God damned back rent. We have right now, in our area, a piece of land that was set aside. At that time, the type of land was seigniorial land. That was the only type of division that was coming from overseas. Today, in collaboration with the Jesuits and with your Government, you have stolen two thirds of the land of Caughnawaga that lies to the East. And now, you want to girdle it with roads, with all kind of things.

Gentlemen, the problems are sitting right in front of us. I would hope that there will be a good question and answer period. Thank you very much.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mr. Two Rivers. Yes, Mr. Williams.

M. Williams (Franklin): I would just like to give a very brief background on the hospital that it was referred to. In 1905, the Mohawk people in Caughnawaga started a hospital on their own under the auspices of the people of Kahnawake. There was no medicare at that time, there was no federal aid. For fifty some odd years, the people financed the hospital themselves. In the later part of the sixties, when the Québec took over health jurisdiction, there were discussions with Québec in which there was funding made available for operations of the hospital to provide an operational budget. Presently, the hospital has at least 85 employees, Indian, non-Indian alike. The structure itself has already been referred to as being unsafe. We have had, over the last few years, discussions with representatives from the Social Affairs in which, I think, as Chief Two Rivers mentioned, there was a certain insistence. I think that one of the major points, faltering points, is that under the Québec health laws there is a requirement that a cooperation, an artificial entity be set up. Our position is that we cannot submit to such a thing, because the

jurisdiction comes from Kahnawake, and Kahnawake only, from the people of Kahnawake, not from a formed Government. We believe this is an appropriate form, it is an appropriate time we could look at alternatives. We did send a letter to Mr. Pierre-Marc Johnson, the Minister of Social Affairs, in which we outlined a number of alternatives. I would hope that this assembly will study those alternatives and respond before we have human disasters. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mr. Williams. Is there someone else who would like to speak? From the other groups, probably?

M. Deer (Brian): My name is Brian Deer. We are representatives of the Land Rights Committee as appointed by the Grand Council of Chiefs of the Haudenosaunee several years ago. On my left, Mr. Richard Powless, Mr. Mike Myers, Mr. Bob Antone, Mr. Dennis Nicholas, Mr. Charlie Patton, Mr. Paul Delaronde and Mr. Bruce Elijah.

We want to emphasize that this is a committee and we will regard it as a committee meeting another committee. We represent the interest of the Confederacy of the Haudenosaunee which is known to the French as the Iroquois Confederacy and also known to the English as the Six Nations Confederacy.

(11 h 45)

We are composed of six nations: the Mohawk Nation, the Oneida Nation, the Cayuga Nation, the Onondaga Nation, the Seneca Nation and the Tuscarora nation. Our territory extends from the north side of the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario to the south side of the Mohawk River in what is now known as New York State. It extends from the East side of the Richelieu River and Lake Champlain and Hudson River, West to the Ohio River Valley and the Great Lakes.

We represent people in 21 communities within our Confederacy including people in Caughnawaga near Montréal, in Kanesatake near Oka and Akwesasne near Dundee, Québec. We have several alien borders that intersect within our territory including the alien borders of the Province of Québec, the Province of Ontario and the nation called Canada, and including the borders of the State of New York, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Ohio and the United States of America. However, we do not regard ourselves as Québeckers or Canadians. We are not citizens of Québec or Canada and we never have been. We are Haudenosaunee and we reside in the territory of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy.

At this time, I would like to outline our presentation and explanation of the circle of chiefs with a replica of the

Wampum of the Circle of chiefs, and this to outline the constitutional framework in the international world of the Confederacy of Haudenosaunee. Following that will be the explanation of the principles of the Two Row Wampum and we have a replica of the Two Row Wampum here with us. Following that, we will have an explanation of our position in the international world. Following that, we will go through an explanation of Indian self-government as we understand it. And then, following that, we would like to have a question and answer period and a sort of interchange between your committee and our committee. So, we will now go to the explanation of our constitutional framework and the Circle of chiefs. This will be done by Paul Delaronde.

M. Delaronde (Paul): First of all, before we begin to explain the Circle, we would like to let you know that, when we were delegated to come here as people representing the Haudenosaunee, we have been told on how to conduct ourselves when we come here. We have also been instructed on how we should speak when we come here. We have been told that we are to be in our best ways when we come to meet with you. We, the representatives of the Haudenosaunee, will conduct ourselves as we have been instructed.

On the part of the Band Council, they have very much the same feeling, the same wants as the Haudenosaunee people but they have not been given those instructions as we have been given the instructions from the people of the Haudenosaunee. Some words were used, a tone was used which is not the tone and not the words that we would use here as Haudenosaunee people. We are not apologizing for what Mr. Two Rivers has said. Those are his true feelings. He expressed himself the way he felt and the things he knows. He cannot be blamed for the kind of words he has used. He spoke the truth and you must understand that, when someone continuously does the things to you that have been done to our people, it makes you angry. You, yourselves, can look at yourselves and you can just think back in the past few weeks, in the past few months, in the past few years. Many harsh words have come out of your mouth, many tones that you used were not good tones. But we are all human beings. Sometimes, our emotions get the best of us. So, let no one's feelings be hurt.

Let us just try to understand the words that have been said here today, let us try to continue this meeting and let us try to remember the words that my brother, Bruce Elijah, has said, the message that was given to us: that we use good water to clear our throats so that good words can come out; that we use a good feather, a white feather

to clean our ears so that we may hear the words as what the words really mean, the truth; and also that we use that white leather again to clean our eyes and not let other things get in our sight but let us look for truth and let us look for honesty.

Here is the Wampum for the Circle of chiefs. There was a man who came to our people, many years ago, before any European knew the world was round. This man came to our people. We referred to him as a peacemaker. He came with instructions from ...the Creator. He came to remind the people of what was intended from the Creator. The way of life that we should live. When the peacemaker came, he gave us a way in which to follow. He gave us a formula for peace and happiness. A formula where mankind can live in harmony with one another and learn to live in harmony with what the Creator has put on this earth to respect what the Creator has planted here, to respect the creatures that he has put on this earth, and to respect all of the universe. So, when he came he gave us the... the law of great peace. The law which brought our people together, the Mohawks, the Cayugas, the Senecas, the Tuscaroras, the Oneidas, the Onondagas. Originally there were only five in this Confederacy. The Tuscaroras joined the Confederacy about the year of 1713, of 1714. But the original five were included in this Circle of chiefs.

To begin with there is this long string, this is for Atotarho who is the chief, who has been given the responsibility that when the rest of the chiefs of the different nations have come to council he would always keep the chiefs on track, that there would not get off the subject of what they originally had gathered for and that he would constantly remind them of what the purpose is of their council. And of these nations, all of these five nations that are represented on this Wampum, the Onondagas with their 40 chiefs, the Oneidas and the Mohawks, both having 9 chiefs, the Senecas having their 8 chiefs and the Cayugas having their 10 chiefs, all the nations do not have the exact same amount of chiefs but all the nations are equal in power. All the chiefs are equal in power. There is no chief here who has more power than any other chief. They are all equal.

As when the Confederacy was first formed and the chiefs began to function as part of the Confederacy, still to this day, our chiefs sit the same way, all of the chiefs are still in Council. The law that was given to us is still the same law that we live by. The way our Council sits is exactly the same way as it was thousands and thousands of years ago. You can see here the outer edge of this circle. There is one string going around and another one wrapped around each of them.

This is to represent that the chiefs of the Confederacy are united, that they are holding hands together, that the people are in this circle from the clan-mothers to the men, the women, the children, to the smallest ones who crawl on the earth. They are all within this circle. Our language is in this circle; our laws are in this circle; our culture and our traditions are all in this circle.

When this came about our people were told that there come a day that something strange, something different, would come to our shores. They were told that much of these things would be attractive to many of our people and it was asked by our people: What happens when this thing comes to something foreign comes to our land? Our people were told that they did not have to worry because they were free people in here, they would be protected within this circle. But it was said that if anyone wanted what was on the outside that there was a space under the arms of the chiefs and that they could pass under here and that they can go and become apart of that foreign thing that has come. Then the people said: What is going to happen if those people who have left this circle... What is going to happen to them? It was said that when they passed under the arms of the chiefs they would go out with nothing, that they would become nothing, that their language, their laws, their clan, their birth right to this land, everything, they would live within this circle.

And then it was asked: What, if those people find they do not like what is on the outside, what happens then? The people were told that these people who had left can return, but when they return they will not have a voice in the politics of our people, they will not have a voice in the ceremonies and the spiritual life of our people. They would only become workers of the nation; they would never have a voice again because it proves to our people that they could have deserted the people, that they were capable of deserting the people, the Confederacy. So they would have to live with that for the rest of their lives.

(12 heures)

It was also said that when that happen, all these things came about, when these foreign things came to our shores, there was a tree that was planted on the territory of the Onondagas, general ... the great white pine, a symbol of our Confederacy. That that tree was going to fall, that that tree would never hit the ground. It would never hit the ground because the Rotiiane's hands were held together, that tree would land in their arms, it would hit the ground. They would hold it up and the day is coming that those Rotiiane will put it back up straight.

The Rotiiane, the Chiefs, as you refer to them, of the Confederacy have been given

a special duty. They have been put in office by their clan mothers and their clans. These chiefs are not what is known as hereditary chiefs, where a father, a man is a chief and when he dies, his son takes his place. This was not a monarch. This was a person who worked for the people. He was put into office by the people in the truest form of democracy that the world has ever known. This is the way these people are elected, by the people, by the clan mothers.

The title is hereditary because the title belongs to a clan. The clans are headed by the women because the children, as you receive your last name from your father, we receive our clan from our mother and this is why we say the title is hereditary through the clan. It was told that we should explain this to you because it has been explained to you in the past. It has been explained to your forefathers. It had been explained to the English, to the French, to the Dutch. It had been explained to all the people who came to our shores and again, we wish to remind you that we are a separate government, we are a separate entity. We are only here to tell you who we are and what we will continue to be.

At the same time as this was explained to you, you understood, you made treaties. You recognized that we were sovereign nations because you made treaties with us. Today, Canada has become a separate nation but to our understanding, you agreed with the mother country of Canada that you would uphold those treaties, you would uphold those agreements because when those agreements were made, we are told and our grandfathers believed that they were all done in good faith, that there was to be true respect among each other.

Now, we are here again to remind you of these wampums, of these agreements, of these treaties because we say that our leaders, our people wish to sit down as two governments, as two equals and go over the agreements that have been made to remind each other. If there have to be any changes made, that these be done through negotiations, as equal. That is all I have to say at this time on the Circle of chiefs.

M. Deer (Brian): Next will be the explanation of the principles of the Two Row Wampum. We would like to make note of a report of the special committee of Indian self government of the Canadian government, which you are probably aware of. On the front cover and on the back cover they show the Two Row Wampum of the Confederacy of the Haudenosaunee.

What we have found in this report is that the Canadian Government does not really understand the principles of the Two Row Wampum. We are here to make them very clear. Because we acknowledge that

your government is trying to separate from Canada it is very important for us to make clear what our position is. So, if your Government is successful in separating from Canada, if this is what happen, then we will have no problems having relations with you because you understand the principles of the Two Row Wampum. This explanation will be done by Charlie Patton.

M. Patton (Charlie): Just as my brother from the Wolf Clan has talked about the Great Law and how it was brought to us, this wampum becomes an extension of that. There was a time when that law came to us. We were also told that there was going to be a time when a people will come across the great water. We were also told that they will bring with them a different way and that we should try to understand and try our best to deal with them. Because in our ways, when a visitor enters our house and there is food on our table, we will offer some of our food so that our visitor may not go hungry; if he needs a place to sleep, we will also offer him a bed so that he would not be tired and so on.

And there came a time when we noticed the long ships coming across the ocean and we saw them coming to our shores. We acted upon what our instructions were. We welcome the people who came to our lands; many of them were sick from the long journey and we explained to them how to use the medicines. We offered them food. Even this weekend, our brothers across the United States are celebrating Thanksgiving for that time, because the people showed them how to plant corn, beans and squash, so they could be sustained for the first year they were in this new land. We offered them room and shelter.

As the years went on, we gave them a place to sleep, to rest their heads. As the years went on, it became obvious to our people again, as we remembered our stories and we thought about them... it became clear to us that there had to be, something had to be made and something had to be done: an agreement had to be made because we saw how our brothers acted towards each other. We saw how they acted toward the land and how they acted toward everything that was upon it. We saw that it was different from what we were instructed.

So, this treaty came about, this treaty we call the Two Row Wampum: the two roads that we would follow. This was first made with the Dutch and, at that time, in our discussions - we had many long discussions with those people, our brothers and the Dutch - and we began to talk about how this agreement would come about, where our two peoples could live in peace, which was what we were taught in that Great Law and what our instructions were.

So, over the long discussions that we had, we came up with this. We said that on the background of white; some people say that this symbolizes the purity of the agreement, the integrity and the honor of our peoples.

In modern days, we also say that this wide background that symbolizes the land, this river, called North America, that we share, on one side, you will see that we have one road here and, on one part of it, you will also see that we have another road. Two roads in North America, very clear. On this road, is what we call the path of the ... we call the path of what you call Indian peoples, the peoples who were put on this land.

In this road over here, that is symbolized by a tall ship and this is where the long ships will pass. That is the road that your peoples, all of your peoples, will travel in North America. It was also clearly understood that in this path, that the ... follow. Everything that belongs to us is in that road: our land, and our languages, our culture, our responsibility to the Creator. The way we were given, everything that we were instructed sits in that canoe.

It was also clearly understood that in your vessel, in your long ship, with its large bright sails, you would have your religions, you would have your laws, what you believe to be right for you, you would have your ways and everything that went with that and that would be in your vessel and that was yours.

And it was clearly understood between our peoples and it is shown right here in this Wampum as you see it today that those roads never come together. This Wampum maybe 1000 miles long but those roads can never come together and they never will. That was the way we understood in terms of our politics, we understood that they belonged in our own particular vessels. Never, in those agreements, do we have the right to legislate over what your governments and your peoples will do. We can never make you do something that we feel is ours. We can never legislate over you that you will become a... That is in our canoe, we do not have that right. We understand that only the Creator has that right.

In this vessel over here, it was also clearly understood that you have your laws in there and the same goes for your peoples, that you do not have that right to legislate laws that will make us anything that we are not. You do not have the right to legislate laws that will make us "Québécois" or Canadians or Americans. Only the Creator has that right. The Creator made us... He gave us instructions, we can never turn our back from those instructions. And it has to be clear - ...symbolizes that - it is very

very clear, we do not have to read between the lines, there is not fine print, it is very very clear how our governments should act.

And in the discussions between our two governments, in those times, in the beginning, it was with the Dutch, we discussed the terminology of this relationship. And, as we began to talk, they agreed: They said yes, the principles that you outline here are good and we agree to those principles. And immediately in the terminology, they said to us: We will be the father and you will be our children. Because they were used to that, from the lands across the water, that was the way the society was ordered, that there were kings and there were people. (12 h 15)

But in our understanding of who we are, we are all of the same height. The... and the people that live on the land were all equal. Even the smallest grass that lives on the ground is just as important as we are. We are all part and equal in the cycle of life and we understood that in this relationship. And we said, we talked about that a long time, our forefathers said, and after they had talked about it, they said to the leaders of the Dutch: We have thought about what you have said, about you being the father and us being the sons, or the children. And they said: We do not think that it will ever work because you see, our father, he can tell his children what to do, he can make laws for his children and we understand that that is not our way. So we asked and we told them, we said: Let us enter this agreement as brothers, as equals, our heads will be the same height; that we will deal and we will talk to each other as brothers. And still to this day, we address you as brothers, because we understand that relationship there. We still remember it.

And what does that mean when we talk about Governments? Is that we will deal nation to nation, your nation and our nation as equals, that we cannot never be your children nor that we intend to be? Because we understand our original instructions about who we are. And in between these two - I will continue with that discussion because I think it is important as well - they had a number of different discussions about terminology and they discussed the two roads here. And so our brothers, the Dutch, asked our people, they said: Well, we see that you have two different vessels and you know that in our vessel, we have many shiny objects; we have many beautiful things that are part of our culture; we have many things that we think that will make your life easier. And they said: What if some of your people should chose to come into our vessel? And our people thought about that a long time. And they said: They are free to do so but as they do, as they step over into that vessel, they leave everything that belongs to them,

everything behind into our canoe; they cannot take that with them. It is very clear.

And they had other discussions. Our white brothers said: In your vessel, what if some of our people should choose to step into your canoe? And our people thought about that a great time. And we also said that we did not think that that would happen. Because you see, our canoe does not have many shiny objects in it. Our canoe is a simple existence; our canoe is a very simple way. It is a way that respects the cycle of life; it is a way where we deal closely with the earth and we respect that. And it is also a very strict way about how our responsibilities were to be carried out. Never, could we, for example, develop a dam because that dam would also dig a hole in our mother's heart. That is very clear. Everything we do in our canoe, we have to take into consideration the heart and soul of everything else that is around us. And as the discussion went on, they said: There will come a time that we believe...

They said: What will happen if some of your people choose to have a foot in each canoe? And our people thought about that as well, and they looked at the tall ship and they looked how the two, a canoe and a ship, worked together in the water. And they said: You know that your ship has tall sails and as we look across the water, we see that the wind blows into your sails and it pushes that ship. When we have our people with a foot in other canoe, in other vessel, there will come a time, we see, that a great wind will come, a great turbulence will come and it will push our ships apart, and what will happen to our people? We all know what happens when we have a foot in two canoes. They become unstable and as the canoes or the vessels are pushed apart we are going to go in between. That is exactly as they explained it, that as our vessel were pushed apart in that great turbulence, our people would fall in between. And it was told that we did not know what would happen to those people. We did not have the experiences that we have today.

Many of us sitting around this table, we see that in modern day, we see that today. We understand clearly now what those turbulences are. Those great winds are the pressures of your governments; the pressures of many different things that we have upon our shoulders, and we have seen our many people, our women, our children and our men fall in between. We have seen them when they could not deal with the pressure of modern day life and they had to use alcohol to take charge of that. There are many things as well that come into our lives, things like drugs. We see our children; every day in the newspapers, we talk of suicide, the great suicide rate amongst our people. And, day after day, we see the many

children that we have lost because of the great wind. And as we see those things and we understand, we understand our responsibility too, that we have to educate our people. We have to get them to pull their feet out of that other vessel because we love our children, we love our men and we love our women. We feel strong enough that we want them to be strong. They need to be one whole people again and we understand that responsibility very clearly.

In between these two roads, as we go on, that agreement was going to be linked by three chains, by three links. That was going to bind that agreement. And those three chains it was going to be bound by are ... peace, ... a good way, the integrity of our nations, the honour of our nations and good words and ..., strenght because we understand and respect each other ways. That is what those three links symbolize in there.

That is very basically what the Two Row talks about. That was originally made with the Dutch as your forefathers from France came over and they needed our help. They also saw the value of a relationship like this and we extended this same belt to them in term of covenant chains. The same agreement, the same responsibilities to each other, nation to nation. We also saw that in the Americans and we saw that in the British. They all saw the value of a relationship with our people and they all made fine words about how this would last as long as the rivers flow, as long as the grass grows. That is where those words came off; right out of these discussions. And so, still to this day, our people have never once tried to legislate over you. Still to this day, we have not attempted to make you ... because we respect the fact that the Creator did you the greatest honour in making you the people that you are and that you can never be anything else than what you are. But we also understand that the Creator makes us *onkwehonwe*. He did us a great honour as well. He gave us a responsibility as well. We can never turn our back on that responsibility. We can never say to the Creator: You did not know what you were doing and we want to be something else.

You have to understand those kinds of principles in our discussions today and in your discussions from here on. They are very clear, very simple understandings about how our people can live together in peace. This wampum belt, you will notice, on one end has strings much longer and that symbolizes that the belt does not stop. That belt is still alive today. That belt can be extended to other nations who are willing to work with our peoples in peace. We do not only address this to your Government, we address it to our other Indian brothers

because we need to understand that coming to one mind together in peace, is what makes us strong. So, we like them also to take that message to their peoples. These are powerful words, if you really take time to understand them.

I do not think that there is very much more that I can say about that Two Row Wampum, the two roads that we have talked about. I have tried, in my own words, to explain what that means, those very basic principles, principles by which we can live together as human beings. There will come a time we will be instructed to say as well. There will come many times when we should take these things out of our closets, out of your closets because they are your agreements too. We should dust them off and renew our agreements, renew our understandings with each other. We should come to understandings as equals again.

So, we bring you those messages. We have got you to understand as well. You see this Wampum, we say it is a replica. The Wampum of the Kaianerekowa is also a replica, because through the years, our original ones have been stolen. Our original Wampums have been taken by force, in some cases. They are sitting in museums in Albany and some of the vaults in your government as well. There came a time when people thought that if we lost this article, this artifact, this grouping of beads that forms a record, we would also forget the responsibility in our relationship. The relationship is not a material one, it is not written in beads, and that is it. When we lose the beads, the relationship is finished.

No, the relationship is etched in the minds of our forefathers. It has been etched in the minds of our people, sitting here today. That same understanding of principles will be in our children. It will be in the ones we called the Haudenosaunee, the ones that are still coming forward, the ones that are not yet born. Those same understandings are going to be etched in their brains. The same responsibilities are going to be there. We understand clearly what our responsibilities are. We have tried, in the best way that we can, to explain what that Two Row means. (12 h 30)

There will come a time when our governments can sit together as governments, not as committees, the leaders of your Government and the chiefs of our Government, not just committees. There will come a time when that will happen, when we can renew these agreements again. Many of our older people, those who understand this much clearer than we do, those I can explain it for hours the fine details of what that means... In those times, they will also commence it with you, our leaders and yours, and they will make those words known from beginning to end. So, that is all I have

to say on the subject. If I have made any errors, maybe some of my brothers might add on.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mr. Patton. M. Deer.

M. Deer: Mr. Chairman, at this time, we would like to move on to our international relations in the world. I would also like to point out that we have filed two papers with your committee, which we will not read but which are there for your reference.

The first is a statement of the Haudenosaunee concerning the constitutional framework and international positions of the Confederacy of the Haudenosaunee. The second paper is the declaration of principles for the defence of the Indigenous nations and peoples of the western hemisphere passed in Geneva in 1977. So, at this time, Mike Myers will give a presentation on our international position.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Yes, Sir.

M. Myers (Mike): The previous two speakers have established a historical background which we understand ourselves and our relationships through the world. Yesterday, we heard some words concerning equality, concerning legitimate aspirations, concerning how we can be peoples together in this world. We would like to draw your attention for a moment about the history. I will give you an overview of the political history between our two peoples.

We spoke briefly to some of the major points of conflict inside of one of our communities. There is a problem that we tried to ignore. I think Canada has begun to explore that problem by looking at the question of racism in this continent and the role that the phenomena arises and places in our relationships with each other. It was raised earlier as a question: At what point did our relation turn over that you were no longer guests but now the runners of our lives, the managers of our lives. That point was a very long time ago. It was a condition of racism that allows western people to believe they can dominate, not only Indigenous people of the western hemisphere, but Indigenous peoples of Africa and of Asia and elsewhere in the world. It is a very old thought. It is a very old thought that continues to this very day to get in the way of our relations. If you decide that you are going to determine what our legitimate aspirations are, you have fallen into the trap. You do not have the right, as you are not of us. No more do we have the right to determine or define what we feel your legitimate aspirations should be.

If you believe in the establishment of a

French state in North America, that is up to you, but you have to come to an agreement with us since our state existed before yours. What we have laid out so far is the basis of that relationship as two countries cohabitating North America. We have always understood that. We have always been a generous people. We have always perceived ourselves in an international way. That is how we could deal with the French Crown, the British Crown, the Dutch, etc., because we had an international perspective. One rooted in peace, one deeply rooted in equality, real equality. Not equality that we said: OK, we will consider you equal to us, if you do X, Y and Z. No, we accepted from the beginning the manner in which you carry out life on the earth whether it be through churches, through parliamentary procedures, etc. And we had hoped that we had gotten it across, that you were to just simply accept the way we carry out business on earth and not try to alter that. We all know that that is not true.

There was a reference made yesterday that we should forget about the history and look to the future. We cannot forget about the history. History creates this moment right now. What we do in this moment, when it becomes history, will set the terms for ten generations, fifteen generations. So we cannot forget history. We make it as we sit here. We are all victims of it, we are all products of it.

You, as French people being victims of a Canadian history which is giving you your driving force for what you perceive to be your legitimate aspirations, should be sensitive then to what ours are and not perpetuate the same victimizing that you are subject to on us. You should be very clear on how to achieve equality. But we have found in this hemisphere, in this western hemisphere that it was not easy. We have not been able to achieve in with so called progressive governments, such as the Allende regime in Chili or the Soudinists in Nicaragua. We have not even been able to perceive it or to strive for it with right wing governments in this hemisphere. So we have been conditioned by that experience to come to a funny feeling about you, that we are not sure you can raise above your racism, even though you talk about equality, even though you throw around progressive words like legitimate aspirations.

We have set the tone, beginning in the 1500, in the 1600 and 1700. We have set the tone, the Iroquois did, for democracy in the world. We are the inspiration of the American Revolution, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution. Our gift to the world was a concept of democracy, a people controlling their future by controlling their government. That was our greatest gift, not just corn, not just beans and potatoes. But

our gift was democracy and yet we have been consistently denied it. We strive for democratic relationships with all people in the world. We have been doing that for more than 300 years, we continue to this day. In this century, since 1924, we have actively sent delegations to the international bodies, beginning with the League of nations. We have actively followed the development of international covenants and international law and watched how those developments affect us and how they can be used by us to achieve our legitimate aspirations, to be once again a country in this continent.

The paper that was tabled by the Band council in its earlier part speaks in detail about the political, social and cultural rights that exist for us under international law.

International law already establishes certain definitions for words like "self-government", "autonomy", "self-determination". We have found though that the settled regimes in the western hemisphere twist those definitions for their own purposes. The Nixon Government took a early jump before the concept of self-determination became popular and defined it to Indian people: You can be self-determining if you do pa, pa, pa. Now Canada is saying the same to us through a special committee on self-government. Yes, you can have self-government, Mr. Indian, if you do this, this, this and this, and we consent. That is unacceptable to us.

As you look at the declaration of principles for the defense of indigenous nations and peoples, what we would like to point out in our support of this declaration and our pushing of this declaration at the international level, is that anything less than what the declaration says maintains the colonial parental relationship. And we will accept nothing less in our relationships with America, with Canada and if, in the future, a French state emerges in our relationships. This is the framework founded in the circle of chiefs, founded in the Two Row Wampum, founded in other agreements of equality and standing together.

We would like to draw your attention for a moment to the point 6 of the principles. It talks about changed circumstances. When I thought about that remark yesterday about ignoring history, let's forget about history, what we are being asked to do is to forget about the circumstances and how they have got changed, how they have got changed by the colonial presence, more accurately the res-colonial presence that exists, how the manipulation of our lives has occurred, and to ignore that. Ignore those circumstances and let's continue as on if suddenly, everything is okay, everything is all right. We forget about the millions of acres of land that we have lost; we forget about the

thousand of lives that have been taken; we forget about the violent suppression of our way of life. We just wipe that from our mind and we continue, in the future, as a grand and happy people. We can not do that, because it has been a deliberate, conscious effort to change the circumstances of our existence. We will not forget it just as other people will not forget how circumstances were changed for them.

Point 8 also debunks one the popular theories of settler's regimes. The idea that they can exist because of the right of discovery. They discovered some place and unfortunately they happened to be somebody that they term less civilized than themselves; therefore they had the right to exert control and take over the area. That is no longer a popular theory in the international world. The defect of colonialism since the sixties has been based on the rejection of the idea of the right of discovery and the chasing of the European powers from Africa, from Asia and from other places where they tried to maintain their control. Now, we are turning the world's attention on North America and how the same kind of theory continues to apply here.

There has been no military conquest of our people. The French colonial government could not defeat us; the British could not. They recognized us as a sovereign state; we held our territories. We meet all the criteria of a nation. We have a define territory; we have a permanent population; we have the ability to enter into international relations. We have never been wiped out. The enforcement of legislation, the diseases, the alcohol, the creation of the dependency, that is what have changed the circumstances.

What we are faced with is not only a question of cultural preservation that is a very safe item to discuss. It is a very safe item on your side of the table to discuss, to talk about the preservation of someone's culture, their language, their music, their dance, their arts, etc., but this discussion goes beyond that. This discussion goes on to the preservation of Aboriginal Nations. There is a call for the establishment of a new order, a new order of relationships between ourselves an we welcome that call. We would like to point out that that call will be based on the concepts of the Two Row, the concepts of the Circle.

What we are interested: What are Québec aspirations? What do you define as your legitimate aspirations? What do you see as your future? One of you said yesterday that you are 2,5% of the population of North America. Is that 2,5% based solely on your human population or is it also based on the illegally occupied territories? Because if it is based on the land, you have not cleaned up that question yet. That is a massive question

between us. You are not 2,5% of North America if you are basing it on the land. The land is not yours.

(12 h 45)

We would also like clarity on what Québec perceives as its legitimate aspirations in terms of those lands, those resources and the relationships between ourselves. What do you see as potential areas of problems as you pursue your goals and we pursue ours? If you are pursuing the goal of being a French State in North America and we are pursuing the goal of real recognition as an original State of North America, what do you see as the problem areas and what do you see as the potential conflicts between us?

As we are moving just as aggressively in the world community, the Haudenosaunee travels on its own passport, we do not use Canadian or American passports. Up to now there are 19 countries who let us in, who recognize our passport as the passport of a country they do not have diplomatic relations with currently. And we will continue to follow that policy, we will continue to pursue it and expand the number of countries who recognize us.

We actively participate as through non-governmental organizations in international meetings and arenas. We send a regular delegation to the UN Human Rights Commission and we have a permanent representation at the working groupe on Indigenous Peoples. We are not going to be backing off from that issue. We will be continuing. I am reminded that we, currently, have two delegations un Europe right now, who are seeking to improve our relationships with two Western European countries.

We heard yesterday something to the effect of a declaration of Aboriginal rights and we would like you to be clear that in our world, as far as our government would be concerned, unless this declaration of Aboriginal rights pattern itself after this declaration as Québec's adoption of these kinds of principles, anything less than that is unacceptable. We look to maintain a clear relationship. Right now, we have to maintain a government to government relationship with Canada, since you are still a provincial government and we can not recognize you as a full-blown government yet. We do have daily problems with each other that have to be dealt with, as was spoken to, in terms of hospitals, and roads and police jurisdictions, etc. But a protocol still has to be ironed out, how we will proceed with the ironing out of those issues between the province of Québec and one of our local communities.

But our government has to pursue its relationships with the Government of Canada for the time being. But if in the future you do become a French State in North America, we are willing to pursue some kind of dialogue and some relationship in that area

as well.

We have been shown here that we have two copies of the passports that we use, the one that is in gold is the one of our citizens, the one that is in black is the one carried by our diplomatic delegations when they go abroad. This is a trilingual document. It is in Onadaga, English and French.

But we must remind you to look inside your own minds, to challenge your own thinking to its furthest possible limits about the possibilities of relationships between us. Our brothers in the North and other areas of what you call Québec have their own way of making relations with you. And that is up to them, how they make that. That is up to them. But whatever you make with them does not, automatically, apply to us nor whatever you make with us does it automatically apply to them. You cannot just simply think that because we are all Indians or we are all Indigenous, that whatever you do applies to all of us. That has been a very foolish approach in the past. You have to approach us each differently, listen to us, but there has to be flexibility; there can not be just "this is the only way it is going to be" and you have to pursue your own thinking, as far as you can.

If you have complaints as a minority people of Canada, of how this country has treated you, double that when you think about us. And the feelings that you have around how your own people have been treated carry the mount to the furthest. I recognize that there are others with just as intense feelings about that and seek an equal kind of a liberation in the Continent to come back to good human relations with each other again. We are going to be together a long time. We do not see you all packing up and going some place else, we are going to be here a long time. We have time to work these things out if you make the challenge of resisting your own history and resisting the impetus momentum as developed through racist thoughts, through racist legislation and through a racist perception of the first people to this land to arise above that. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mr. Myers. Is there something else?

M. Deer: At this time, Mr. Chairman, we would like to move on to the presentation concerning our concept of Indian-self government, which is to be done by Bob Antone.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Antone.

M. Antone (Bob): I would like to bring some of the thoughts that we have put together here and maybe fallow them up in

front of you, so you can maybe put some good questions to us.

We have come here prepared to talk about self-government and about international relations and to talk about our aspirations as Haudenosaunee. We come to talk to you as a committee of our national governments. We are a committee which has been directed to educate our world and the non-Indian world around us. We see this as a form of education. Our relationship has been broken over many years of oppression that has existed over our lands. We want to talk to you because you have a relationship with Canada. We do not. Canada has imposed many laws and regulations on our community that destroyed the integrity of our nationhood. They have chosen not to recognize our national governments. There seems to be a sense of fear that exists among Canadians and among the people of Québec of the Iroquois people, of our struggle to continue our existence. But I want to draw simple examples of that relationship. So maybe you can understand what we mean. Canada has taken the attitude of their mother country that we are children. We want to put it very clear that we are not children to anyone except the Creator. Canada has, over its history, provided prescriptions to heal us. They say that we are a sick people, that the Indian Act was a form of prescription for Indian government in this country. Even today, they provide another prescription, called Indian-self government, a prescription that does not recognize the integrity of our nationhood.

We want to draw your attention to that document that come out of the Federal Government because you have a relationship with that government, even though it might be in a turmoil at this point. We know that the people in Canada are listening to this presentation. We know that they are concerned. We see this as an opportunity to point out some of the failures in this document. Even though they have covered it with the symbols of our nationalism, the symbols of our relationship that has gone on historically, the one point is that they can draw pretty pictures, but it means very little when you read the material in this document because they do not talk clearly about the races that have existed in this country. They do not talk about a clear need of a recognition of Haudenosaunee. They are saying: From this day on, these are going to be your legitimate aspirations, this is how you are going to achieve self-government through this document. They are going to lay down again for us another prescription. But yet, what they have done in the past has not cured the ills in our communities. So there is no need for us to go back to the same doctor who has not cured our communities and has done nothing to the ills that have

arisen between our relationships as distinct people. It can be a very simple relationship. All they have to do is to say that we recognize your government as being the legitimate government of your lands. That is all they have to say. They do not have to talk about how we are going to govern ourselves, because we know how to govern ourselves. We have been doing it centuries before your ancestors came to this land; we have enjoyed a true democracy in this country.

But I want to draw attention to a point, a point that Western thinkers have forgotten, that is missing in their ideology of democracy. In a circle, you were told that there are two strands that are intertwined. What those strands mean are our political beliefs, and our spiritual beliefs. They are wound together. The spirituality is the foundation of our government. This is why we speak so strongly about the goodness of our minds, of our belief in the equality of all life, not just human life, but all life that exists in this universe. The spirituality is the foundation of our government. That is the reason why our democracy is so pure. That is one of the reasons why we are in conflict, because we see in your concept of democracy that spirituality missing; it is not in there. And so it creates a lot of iniquities in relationship to other people. It creates oppressive conditions because you fail to recognize - vous niez - the total equality of our universe.

When you say that we must have legitimate aspirations, are you not passing down the same oppression that Canada is passing to you? Are you not trying to liberate yourselves as a French-speaking people, as a distinct people, to a true democracy? If you are, you should allow us the same. You should allow us to have the same aspirations, and maybe even more so; we are an original government in this land. We are not something that was created yesterday. We cannot forget the history, because in our history, our political history, lies all the evidence of our existence, lies all of our future. Everything is laid out; our road is laid out for us. We have no need to add something from Canada. We have no need to add something from Québec. And I am wondering if your government is trying to develop a prescription for our people. Are you taking the role of a doctor to try to cure our people? We want to make it very clear that you cannot do that. Historically, you have failed at that process and there is no need for you to take that position today.

If we can begin to talk and accept ourselves as distinct people, then all we need to talk about is what is the relationship going to be. Our suggestion to you is the Two Rows, because in there it allows the equality, it allows our existence as distinct

people, to further our own aspirations. But the real challenge is how are you going to deal with the spirituality of your people. What is your relationship to the natural world going to be? When you take a look at our local communities and the kind of developments that are taking place in and around our communities, the destruction of our land, the destruction of the land that provides for us, are we not going to look at that too? Is there not a need for us to sit down and look at that?
(13 heures)

That is where the discussion should be at: How are we going to improve the quality of life in our land? Because we are seeing the kinds of destruction that your corporations, that your governments are doing to our land and they are not good for anyone. We are seeing our people dying from new diseases. Diseases are the result of the corporate corruption that exists in its relationship to the natural world. That is the life that we should talk about. When we can agree that we are equal governments, then we can move on to much larger matters, matters that concern all of us. Recognition is a simple process. There is nothing hard about it. It will not give you any pain. It will only allow our people to exist and to continue to be Haudenosaunee and to begin to lay out some other things that your forefathers were unable to understand, the reasons why our spirituality is intertwined with our political beliefs, why that is so important for our future, why we need to grapple with that question today, if we are going to have a future in this land.

We want you to take a message to Canada. We know that you travel there often to their National Government. Maybe not one that you wish and enjoy but we want you to let them know that we are prepared for a new relationship based on our Two Row Wampum. But that they have no power to tell us what self-government is going to be for our people.

We are growing people. We project our population growth in fifty year to be 500 000 and that is one of the reasons why we are educating our people, because we support our local communities like Kaknawake. We are concerned about their autonomy. We are concerned because of the influence of all the different governments that are impacted in our communities. We have ability now to mobilize our people and resources to come to the aid of any of our communities. We see that as a necessary process. If we are going to see a real sense of freedom as Haudenosaunee people in our home lands, we want to exist in peace with the foundation of that Two Row. It is spelled out very clearly: peace, friendship and respect. Very simple words but peace is a constant struggle to rid the world of

inhuman injustice. It is not something that put us asleep. It is an activity. It is an activity that we have taken on since we have been giving those tools in giving that direction by our Creator. This is the reason why you are able to enjoy your life today. This is the reason why you are able to enter our Country. It is because we believe in peace. We want that friendship and we respect your people. Those can be the foundation of our government and they are. They can be the foundation of your government and also the foundation of our relationship.

We see that we are going to enter into a period of time because of the Federal Government's idea of self-government, a period of turmoil and we want you to be aware of that. As a growing people, as a people who have gained back their strength and are unifying our people, and are making great strides to continue our existence as the Haudenosaunee, we are going to put all our efforts to ensure that our people enjoy the freedom and peace that we believe in so strongly.

There is no magic, I cannot change any of it. We have our médecine, our power and we can extend that to you. We can strengthen your people in this country if you could come to some kind of understanding of humanity, of what real humanity is, of the basic relationship to the natural world. What we want you to remember in your struggle as a French State to achieve French statehood in North America is that you do not oppress Haudenosaunee, that you do not oppress the natural world of Haudenosaunee, that you do not oppress the natural world that we, Haudenosaunee, protect. We ask you that, because, if you are unable to do that, then, you will be a part of the turmoil that will exist in our lands again.

We are a strong and committed people. We believe in all the virtues and values and principles of our way of life. So, I add that to the fire that we have built before you, there has been much information that has been given to you. So now, we will turn it over to our person who will handle the questions that you will have on your minds.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît. J'ai un problème. Nous devons terminer à treize heures. Est-ce qu'il y aurait un consentement? Avez-vous une possibilité de poursuivre quelques minutes pour certaines questions? M. le ministre?

M. Lazure: Oui.

M. Ciaccia: Nous pourrions poursuivre quelques instants.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Vous êtes d'accord pour poursuivre.

M. Ciaccia: Il faudrait que cela soit limité. On va continuer, mais il faut siéger en Chambre à 14 heures, il va falloir quand même...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Il faut prendre conscience que nous devons être ici pour respecter l'engagement que nous avons pris de rencontrer la Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake à 14 heures. Nous allons poursuivre et entendre des questions, au maximum jusqu'à 13 heures et 30 minutes.

M. le député de Châteauguay.

M. Dussault: M. le Président, malheureusement, je vais devoir quitter dans les prochaines minutes, parce que j'avais un rendez-vous à 13 heures. Étant donné que les invités de la réserve indienne de Kahnawake sont des gens qui sont au cœur du comté de Châteauguay, des voisins, des amis de la population du comté de Châteauguay, je regrette de devoir quitter. J'aurais voulu leur poser quelques questions.

Je dois dire que les dernières heures ont été pour moi un des moments les plus intéressants de ma vie de parlementaire. J'ai découvert énormément à travers l'information qu'on nous a donnée aujourd'hui. C'est pour cela que cela me fait davantage de peine de devoir quitter. Je voudrais assurer nos amis de Kahnawake que j'entrerai en communication avec eux dans les prochains jours pour que nous puissions continuer ce dialogue qui a été commencé aujourd'hui. Merci.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre, Délégué aux relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, au nom du gouvernement, je voudrais remercier le chef Norton et les autres chefs du Conseil de bande de Kahnawake, remercier M. Deer et ses collègues du comité, non pas pour le mémoire qu'ils nous ont présenté, mais plutôt pour la leçon d'histoire qu'ils nous ont fournie ce matin.

Depuis 10 heures ce matin, nous avons appris énormément. Cela était un des buts très précis de cette commission parlementaire de permettre aux groupes autochtones de venir éclairer d'abord et avant tout les parlementaires des deux partis politiques mais aussi l'ensemble de la population, puisque ces débats sont télévisés. Je suis sûr que cette leçon d'histoire que vous nous avez fournie ce matin est de nature à améliorer les relations que nous devons continuer d'avoir, comme vous l'avez dit vous-même tantôt, pendant très longtemps. Vous n'avez pas le goût de partir, nous n'avons pas le goût de partir.

Je voudrais aussi tout de suite vous remercier pour le message qui nous a été

transmis, le message que votre peuple nous a transmis par votre bouche. Ce message est bien apprécié et nous vous demandons de transmettre à votre peuple nos vœux de bonne santé, nos vœux d'une vie quotidienne qui ira en s'améliorant.

M. le premier ministre regrette de ne pouvoir participer à la commission ce matin. Il y a participé hier. Il y a un Conseil des ministres aujourd'hui toute la journée. Le conseil de notre "bande" se réunit aujourd'hui. Malheureusement, malgré tous ses talents notre premier ministre n'a pas encore réussi ce tour de force d'être à deux endroits à la fois. Mais de la même façon que votre comité parle au nom des grands responsables de la Confédération iroquoise, je suis chargé de parler au nom de notre grand chef ce matin. Je suis chargé aussi d'écouter avec des oreilles aussi bien nettoyées que vous nous l'avez souhaité tantôt et de regarder avec des yeux aussi clairs que vous nous l'avez souhaité tantôt. Je suis donc chargé, au nom du gouvernement, de prendre bonne note de tout ce que vous nous avez dit ce matin et de ce que vous allez continuer à nous dire.

Nous respectons la volonté de votre communauté de ne pas participer aux délibérations qui se tiennent à Ottawa actuellement dans le cadre d'une révision des rapports entre le gouvernement fédéral et les nations autochtones. C'est votre droit, c'est votre liberté totale.

I would like to say to chief Norton that we have never attempted, our Government has never attempted, in any way whatsoever, to pretend to represent native groups or, for that matter, to be more specific, the Kahnawake Band. We have only said to your community, as we have said to all the other native communities: We put at your disposal seats that we have around the table at the Federal-Provincial Conference, each province having two seats. We offer you - if you want to accept the offer; you do not have to - to be part of our delegation and to speak from one of the two chairs that we have and say whatever you want - not what we want to hear - to speak as freely as chief Billy Two Rivers spoke this morning. He spoke very freely.

So I want to make this clear. We have made no attempt whatsoever to influence your position with regard to the Constitutional Conferences regarding native rights or self-government.
(13 h 15)

We have entered into agreements with some of your brothers, as you well know, particularly the Cree brothers from the North and in spite of several shortcomings or things that have to be corrected in the implementation of the Agreement, we have heard yesterday that, generally speaking, the Agreement is a good Agreement and this is

from both sides of the House, because the previous Government drew the Agreement. We agree with the Agreement. We supported that Agreement. We are saying our dialogue which has made a big step this morning, this is a historical step as far as we are concerned... This is the first time a government in Québec City holds a special parliamentary commission strictly devoted to the rights and preoccupations of the Native People. This is a historical step. We say to you we want to deal with you from equal to equal. We do not want to impose to you, on you, the same terms that were acceptable to your Cree brothers with the James Bay Agreement. We are opened to negotiate with you on the basis of self-respect, mutual self-respect.

Now, practical problems, inclosing this time goes on: I have accepted the invitation extended to me and I will visit your community, next Friday, December 2, and I will go there as an emissary of our Government. I am not going there as an individual, as a tourist. I will be going there as a representative of our Government. We know certain subjects you want to discuss. We were be prepared to discuss these subjects, particularly the hospital. We have set aside the money to build the hospital. We have a problem that we want to solve with you. We are faced with two sets of laws, two sets of customs. You have your own rights, your own customs, your own laws as it was so well explained this morning. We also have a set of rules, a set of laws and a set of customs in terms of dispensing public money, in terms of dispensing health services. So, having in mind this mutual self-respect, we will try - and I am confident that we will find it - a way to reconcile you own wishes, your own ways of conducting health services and our own obligations towards the population that elected us.

That also includes the other specific problems, that is the only one I will deal with, the specific problem of nurses having right now to pass examinations. We will find a solution of that problem. We will find a solution. So, in conclusion, I again wish to congratulate all of you for this very positive, constructive approach that you have shown this morning; again, please convey to your population, your brothers and sisters all the best regards of our Government. I would be looking forward to see you in about a week. Merci.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: M. le Président. The remarks of the Minister. Towards first of all, I want to thank you for the presentation that you made. I think that it will bring out to the population of Québec some very

serious problems that exist, not only problems that exist on the Kahnawake reserve, but a different way of looking at Native rights and the position of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy. It is a totally different perspective and, at least, the population will have had the opportunity of seeing what you had to say.

The remarks of the Minister, in my mind, must confirm your views of Government because he has been very paternalistic and he thanks you for your positive and constructive attitude; he even talks to you about brothers. But he really has not answered any of the specific problems that you have raised. You have a real problem with hospitals. Did he tell you that he is going to solve that problem and how he is going to give you the moneys? He told you that there is a problem with nurses. There is a law before the National Assembly right now, Bill 57. It does not solve your problem on nurses but he has given you another delay, he is going to come and visit you. It is unfortunate that Government has to take that kind of an attitude because they confirm what you think about Government, what you think about us and you get no action, you get no response. All you keep on getting is promises, the future: You, nice people, we are brothers, and peace and respect and dignity. But concrete actions are not there. I found most interesting your views on self-determination, on yourself being a nation. You have the criteria of a nation: you have your language, you have your culture, you have your lands and you consider yourself a nation.

And you even recognized the right of this Government to try and become an independent state. But did the Minister recognize your rights to become independent? I would like to know what the Minister thinks. I know what they said yesterday, that the principles, in terms of recognition of aboriginal rights, do not include the sovereignty of Indian Nations. So, something that they are prepared to claim for themselves as a Government - they want independence, they do not want to be part of Canada - they are not prepared to recognize your right to the same principles. I find a little bit difficult to accept that certain principles can apply to one group of people, but they cannot apply to another group of people.

I would have liked the Minister to address the basis of your whole presentation. Unfortunately, we do not have the time to go into the details of the problems that you raised, because you raised many serious problems, not only on the question of Indian Nations but deep philosophical problems about our whole society. But whether it is by design or by accident, we just do not have the time; there are too many groups

who have asked to be heard and we just have to allocate the time. I want you to understand this: the Government is the final arbiter as the who is heard, the time that is allowed and the length of the hearings. The Government has chosen that there are three days to hear I do not know how many briefs. So, obviously, we do not have the time to go into all the details.

However, I think that the reaction of any Government, either they should tell you they agree with what you say, they should have the guts to tell you that they do not. And that, they do not have. They have not told you that they are not prepared to recognize you as a nation. He should say that so that you know where he stands, so that you will not have to come back always and say the same things to Governments. This is one of the problems because in the past you have always been given words, soothing words that have not been followed by any concrete action. If they have, they have not been in accordance with the needs, the requirements of your own particular communities. I think that it is time that Governments stop putting on shows, because a parliamentary committee is a big show. It lets a Government say: We are interested in Native people; come and talk to us. Then, they put twelve groups in three days so we cannot ask questions, and what is going to happen to the consequences of the presentation that you made? Your hospital? You will not be able to come back before this committee. You are going to have to deal with somebody in the government, and you have dealt with them for 20 years and nothing has happened. The nurses, the law is before the National Assembly, it does not solve your problem, they did not put anything in that law, which they could have done very easily, to solve the problem at the Caughnawaga reserve. So, I think that we should call a spade a spade.

M. Deer: I would like to respond to Mr. Ciaccia's comments.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Deer.

M. Deer: We have been instructed by one of the women that we do not like to get involved in the internal politics of Québec. We would rather deal with you as Québécois. We do not involve you in our internal politics, in our internal divisions, we do not wish to be involved in the internal divisions of Québec or Ontario, or New York or Canada or the United States.

M. Ciaccia: I do not want you to misinterpret my statements. I do not want to involve you in our problems. These are our problems, you have enough of yours. What I was asking for the Government is to respond

to the demands that you made. Not by just saying I am going to come and visit the reserve or, yes, we will look at this problem in the future, but to respond to the demands that you made on your land claims. Are they prepared to sit down and negotiate with you? You have land claims. Are they prepared to set up a body to say: O.K., we are going to recognize aboriginal rights and we are going to sit down and have a formal mechanism, so we can deal with Native rights?

Are they prepared to seat with you and formalize a discussion? Not just a parliamentary committee of this nature but on an ongoing formalized basis. We could have underlined very many other specific problems that you have raised but, unfortunately, we do not have the time. As far as we are concerned on this side of the parliamentary committee, we are saying that is not enough just to have this parliamentary committee. Maybe, it is a beginning but it is a promise that they have made in their program that they would have a permanent parliamentary committee, which has never been done. I think we should start becoming more concrete, the government should have more concrete proposals and respond more adequately to the needs of the Native people. Not just with promises and good words but with actual actions.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, le député de Mont-Royal affiche, comme cela est souvent son habitude, une attitude très partisane, et le représentant du comité a très bien apprécié - ou a très mal apprécié, cela dépend du point de vue où l'on se place - a très bien compris cette attitude partisane. Le député de Mont-Royal ne comprend pas que les représentants qui sont ici devant nous sont venus d'abord et avant tout non pas pour quêter des réponses sur tel ou tel problème, mais qu'ils sont venus ici d'abord et avant tout pour que nous comprenions mieux leur position et que la société québécoise comprenne mieux leur position.

On nous a mis au courant aujourd'hui qu'il y avait un problème, par exemple, pour l'obtention des certificats d'infirmière, et ce n'est pas seulement par une décision gouvernementale que ce problème peut être résolu. Il y a aussi l'Ordre des infirmières qui doit entrer en ligne de compte. Le député de Mont-Royal tente de simplifier à l'extrême, de rendre les problèmes simplistes. Le premier ministre a dit hier: Nous prenons l'engagement d'établir une commission parlementaire permanente. Nous l'avons pris cet engagement. Est-ce qu'il faut, pour le député de Mont-Royal, le rappeler cinq fois par

jour? Il laisse entendre que nous n'avons pas pris position. Nous avons une position très claire là-dessus.

In conclusion, I would like again to thank the representatives of the Mohawk Nation, the representatives of the "Confédération iroquoise" and I can only say that we do have high hopes that this commission, not only will be followed by a permanent commission, a permanent forum where we will meet, at least once a year, all Native groups that want to be heard, but that we will also take concrete steps to discuss and to resolve some of the daily problems that you find in your community. Merci.

(13 h 30)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je remercie donc le porte-parole...

M. Deer: We would like to make two short responses and then we will close the meeting.

M. Ciaccia: On behalf of the Opposition, I, too, would like to thank the representatives of the Six Nations Confederacy and the members of the Caughnawaga Band Council for the presentation that they have made.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Very briefly, please.

M. Antone: Oust a short response and my brother here, on my left, will also respond.

We would like to thank you for your invitation to the two seats that you have when you are meeting with the Federal Government. But we want you to understand clearly that we cannot accept those seats as Haudenosaunee, because, according to the Two Row Wampum, we cannot leave our canoe, we cannot enter your ship. So, because of that, we cannot participate and sit with you, because would be a violation of the treaty and of the agreement that our forefathers have made.

The other thing is that we understand that your form of democracy has oppositions and we enjoy watching you sometimes in your debates. Our fathers and grandfathers have always told us that when these people would come to our land, they would struggle for many years to form a true democracy; and in that time, we had to be patient with them because they believed in opposites. So you have entertained us today with that, and we see that you have a lot to learn yet when we talk about the question of humanity and how we are supposed to conduct ourselves in a good way and express only good feelings. You know that this problem is the problem of all of us, not just those who assume power now and those who are in the

Opposition. But surely you can take the words that we have offered to you, to pull all of our minds together and to begin working on the future and forget about the opposites that we hold too.

As you can see, we have come here. At one time we were opposites created by foreign Governments. But we come here with the same message, the same feelings. We do not display our opposition. We try to speak our good minds. Of course, at times our emotions are strong, but it is the will of our future that speaks, not a disrespect for humanity.

So I just wanted to clarify that. But there are some other points you raised that we can immediately respond to.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): ...

M. Myers: We recognize that you have a semantical habit of referring to yourself as a nation in terms of a National Assembly and a Prime Minister, etc. But unfortunately, the political reality at the moment is that you are still a province. In terms of our Government, we know that, at this moment, we have to pursue the national question with each other at the level of Canada; that there are local, territorial problems that would also have to be confronted by our local community and that our committee will support fully. However the people of those local communities are determined to regain their homeland, to establish more autonomy over their lives, whatever...

We agree with Mr. Ciaccia that we recognize the parliamentary committees are shows, that they are staging grounds, that they are used, more clearly by your people, as arenas for popularizing certain political thoughts or starting ground for launching new ideas among your people or among your party or whatsoever. And we also come here with the same attitude in recognizing what the game is: we have launched a new idea for you to wrestle with both the Liberals and the Parti québécois and any other party you have in Québec, to see if you all, as Europeans, can come of a mind about this question of our sovereignty, to come to it. I am equally worried about what your side of the table has to say about it, because we have watched the Liberals very closely. We know how to deal with you too and we have seen your paternalism just as well as we have seen "Parti québécois" or PC or NDP or whatever you want to say. We are all affected by the same thing. None of you are exclusive of it and you all have to work it out just like you have to work out your feelings about "Parti québécois" wanting to be our new friends, or whatever it is they want.

So, we recognize the gain, we are willing to play it only to a certain degree

though, and we will continue, as we said, to pursue our legitimate aspirations; and as soon as we can get down to concrete talks, with Canada for the moment, and if you do become a nation, with you as well, about this reality, about this changing reality, the better the future will be for all of us. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je remercie donc la Bande amérindienne de Kahnawake et le Comité des droits territoriaux des Haudenosaunis. Nous allons suspendre notre réunion jusqu'à 14 heures et nous respecterons la rencontre que nous avons avec la Bande amérindienne des Kanesatake à 14 heures cet après-midi. Merci.

M. Deer: Mr. Chairman, we would still try to go ahead with our closing ritual which will be done by Paul Delaronde and which will be brief.

M. Delaronde: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

I am going to try to translate this and make it as short as possible but to the point.

In our ways, whenever we gathered earlier, whether it would be a social gathering, a gathering for council, or whether it would be for ceremonies, festivals, there is always required in our way that we open with an opening ritual. It is also required that whenever we have completed what we have gathered for, that there should be a closing, and so again all who have gathered here, that we should gather our minds together and give our thanks that it seems that we had a very good meeting. It does not seem there are bad feelings between us. Many good words were spoken; we feel good for ourselves; we have educated you to some of the history and for some, we have reminded you some of the history. It was good - because there are many more people who are watching as was mentioned - that they also have received an education that they will not get in any educational institution in the province of Québec.

It was good and we are glad that we have had this opportunity to come and to present our position as the Haudenosaunee people. So we should be glad that all went well and that we should all give our special greetings to each other.

Again we should turn our direction towards the one who is our mother, the earth, because from her comes so much. She holds all the creatures on her body that the Creator has put here. She holds all the plant life that the Creator has put here. She holds the water that we need. She does so much for us and all the things that the Creator has put here, continue to give us life,

continue to give us peace of mind, continue to give us happiness.

So, again, we should gather our minds together as one mind and give our mother and all the things that she holds upon her, very special thanks, very special greetings.

We should also turn our direction to the different beings that are in the sky, our grandfather the four winds, our grandfather the thunders, our grandmother the moon, our brother the sun. They also give us life. They also give us what we need in order to survive. They help the cycle of life that the Creator has made. We should never forget these things. We should never take for granted that these things are there in the sky just to look at them. We should never forget what their functions are. Again, let us gather our minds together in a very special way and give them thanks and greetings.

Now, this to you, to all of us, who are gathered here. We are going to part. When we do so, we are going to go back to our homes, to our families, to our communities.

Let us wish that as we do so, there would be nothing in our path to hurt anyone that we all reach our homes safely, so we may again enjoy the people who are closest to us.

(13 h 45)

Now we should take internal direction towards the mightiest of the powers, that is the Creator, God, whatever name you have for it, is one of the same. We should give a very, very special thanks, try our hardest to gather our minds as one mind and give the Creator a very special greeting, a very special thanks; and to remember that it is the Creator that created the earth, the sun, the moon, the stars, the water, the plants, the animals, the birds, the insects officially; and have respect for all these things and have respect for the Creator, as was intended.

I guess that is all I have to say. In our way, for us, the meeting is closed now.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Les travaux sont suspendus jusqu'à 14 heures.

(Suspension de la séance à 13 h 46)

(Reprise de la séance à 14 h 20)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît!

Nous allons reprendre la commission élue permanente de la présidence du conseil et de la constitution pour entendre les représentations des autochtones et des divers groupes et organismes autochtones sur les droits et les besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens et des Inuits.

Nous devons nous présenter ici à 14 heures. Je regrette que nous n'ayons pas

respecté cet engagement. Nous allons donner la parole à la Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake et vous avisons à l'avance que, quoi qu'il arrive, à 15 heures nous devons suspendre la séance pour revenir par la suite. Donc, je donne la parole au chef Joseph Nelson, lequel voudra bien présenter les personnes qui l'accompagnent. Your name, please.

Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake

M. Pelletier (Gerry): Mr. Chairman, my name is Gerry Pelletier. I would like to make some corrections on that list.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Yes, all right.

M. Pelletier: The best way to do this is to introduce the people who are sitting with me.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Yes, it is the best way.

M. Pelletier: I will start on my immediate left, Grand Chief Hugh Nicholas, on my far right, Chief Wesley Nicholas, and Diane Sorka, our legal counsellor.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): O.K. You are ready. Your brief, if possible.

M. Pelletier: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen of this committee, we would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for allowing us to present our thoughts and views to you. At the outset, we would like to make it very clear that we are here representing only the Mohawks from Kanesatake. I believe we have stated this to the Government of Québec at various meetings we had with them. We have stated this position through our task force meeting on the Constitution. Therefore, we want again reiterate that position: We are only here representing the Mohawks from Kanesatake.

We are members of the Aboriginal people's Québec task force on the Constitution, because we believe that it is important to seek Québec support in entrenching our rights in the Canadian Constitution. That does not mean that we want the Québec Government to speak on our behalf. I believe that that clarification was made this morning by the Minister. We have also stated that in our past meetings.

Therefore, it is also important to us that the Québec Government signs the 1983 accord and fully participates at all future meetings for the First Minister's Conferences. Yesterday's presentations by the spokespersons of the Aboriginal peoples

Québec task force in the Constitution, we stated that, and I would like to quote from our presentation yesterday: "Subject to our fundamental position set out in paragraph C and as to confirm Québec support for the recognition of our rights achieved at the 1983 First Ministers Conference, various groups - I like to emphasize that - of peoples of Québec may wish to conclude immediately with the Government of Québec an agreement or an accord which provides for the tabling before the National Assembly of a resolution substantially in conformity with the schedule to the 1983 Constitutional Accord on Aboriginal rights.

After hearing the whole stories from the Grand Council of the Crees in their presentation yesterday afternoon in regards to the problems they are experiencing, to the lack of commitments on behalf of the Government of Québec in implementing the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement.

For these reasons, the Kanesatake Mohawk Council is not prepared to sign any agreement or accord with the Government of Québec. We are a small reserve and sitting down with the Government of Québec is something new for us. We will have to approach any agreements with Québec with extreme caution. We believe that the Crees and the Inuits entered into an agreement with the Government of Québec in good faith. But it seems, from what we have heard yesterday afternoon and last night, that the Government of Québec has not lived up to its agreements and its commitments.

We also fully support those various Aboriginal groups of Québec who may wish to sign an agreement or an accord with Québec, just like we support those Indian nations who decided not to participate on the Constitution process or who wish not to be part of the task force on the Aboriginal peoples of Québec on the Constitution.

The Kanesatake Mohawk people are one of the original Five Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy, which occupied in pre-contract times the territory where our reserve is presently situated. At the present time, we number approximately 950 and occupy lands both in the village of Oka and to the west of the village. While the present Indian landholding pattern at Oka is entirely unsatisfactory, we point out that the Government of Québec has recognized the existence of an Indian community and "reserve" lands at the Lake of the Two Mountains.

As examples, we cite the Regulation respecting the Taxation Act, order in Council 1981-80, June 25th, 1980, Section 488-R and schedule F, which includes Oka in the list of "reserves", as well as the Regulation respecting Indians Order in Council 2242-81, dated August 19, 1981, made under the Québec Retail Sales tax Act, which also lists

Oka as a "reserve".

Our purpose, Mr. Chairman, in appearing before this committee, is to continue our resistance against any interference in our community, in our lands, in our lives, an interference which threatens our culture, our identity and our livelihood. We wish to speak of two principal forms of interference: first, the forced application of the non-Indian laws and institutions upon us and, second, a consistent, a persistent erosion of our landbase.
(14 h 30)

We have been encouraged to appear before your committee by the results of the work of another legislative committee charged with the responsibility of enquiring into and reporting upon a vital aspect of Indian affairs. We refer, of course, to the House of Commons special committee on Indian-Self Government, which released its report entitled "Indian Self-Government in Canada", several weeks ago. The unanimous report supported by the members of the committee from the three federal political parties is a fine example of the potential for legislative committees such as yours. We are confident that the special committee on Indian Self-Government by its frank, creative, non-partisan and forward looking approaches will have a significant influence in moving the government's policy toward a greater recognition of an equity for Indian people, in making the public at large more sensitive towards the legitimate demands of the Indian people. We trust at you in part on your task with equivalent if not a greater ambition.

We mention that the first major area of interference which we wish to address was that respecting the application of non-Indian laws and institutions to our community and our people. The presentation you heard this morning by the Kahnawake Band Council also made mention of such problems. The special committee identified a number of factors interfering with Indian Self-Government. While the present Indian Act and the interference by the ministers of Indian Northern Affairs under that Act of course was mentioned, so was the question of the application of provincial laws. The committee stated at page 19 of the report, I quote: "Even the limited powers of the Band Councils are further diminished because they cannot be rendered invalid by the federal laws, federal regulations and the ministers disallowance. Provincial laws of general application also interfere with the Band Council's powers. Councils are virtually powerless as governments." The problem of course has been that both the federal and the provincial Governments have refused to recognize traditional forms of Indian Government and have assumed that the only solution to fulfilling the vacuum was to

apply their own laws and values. This line of argument of course led to the assumption that most advanced Indian people are those who had adopted the non-Indian society's institutions and values.

As the special committee stated in one of its most telling statements, page 136 of the report: "In the past, the prevailing approach to indigenous people has been to hold up eventual self-government as a reward for adapting to the custom of the dominant society. This assumption must be turned on its head, indigenous people would evolve and prosper only under self-government."

The fact is that Indian Governments and Institutions existed before the arrival of the Europeans in Canada. The special committee pointed out with particular reference to the institution of the Iroquois Confederacy. The committee stated, at page 12 of the report: "Particularly relevant to this report on Indian Self-Government it is the view held by non-Indian that political structures were unknown to Indian people prior to contact with the Europeans. Contrary to this view most first nations have complex forms of government that go far back into history and have evolved over time. They often operate in accord with spiritual values because religion was not separate from other aspects of first nation's life. Indian nations have not generally written constitutions but, like England, conduct their affairs on the basis of traditions modified with pragmatic innovations. Witnesses gave evidence to the Committee of how these Indian political concepts had directly affected non-Indian institutions. Specifically, they described how the political philosophy of the Iroquois Confederacy has been incorporated into the Constitution of the United States."

As we stated at the commencement of our submission, the Kanesatake (Oka) Mohawk people are part of one of the original Five Nations of the Iroquois Confederacy. This Confederacy was founded and operated upon basic principles of democracy which ensured the right of each community to representation in matters of concern to the several nations generally, the right to participate in the resolution of issues of general importance and the right of people at the local level to determine their own course of action in their own affairs.

The Mohawk people of Kanesatake still adhere to these basic principles, although the application of these principles has been somewhat attenuated over the years through displacement, by the imposition of outside legislation and through Government policies and actions. We maintain, however, that we are sovereign peoples and that this sovereignty is inherent in our status as First Nations, not granted by any government but existing on its own right. It is a gift to each

nation as a nation from the Great Spirit, our Creator.

We assert the right to maintain our own unique institutions and to exercise Self-government unhampered by paternalistic federal or provincial Governments. The assertion of these rights poses no threat to the Québec society or its non-Indian populations. It is merely a legitimate demand to be masters in our own house.

The objective of Indian self-government is being pursued through several channels.

First, Indian First Nation Government is a priority subject on the agenda for the next First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Constitutional Matters scheduled for March of next year. Premier Lévesque has indicated on a number of occasions that he supports the Aboriginal Peoples of Québec in their efforts to have greater recognition of their aboriginal and treaty rights entrenched in the Constitution of Canada. We assume that this position will be maintained with respect to the right to self-government.

Second, the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government, while recommending that the Federal Government commit itself to constitutional entrenchment of self-government as soon as possible, recommends further that in the meantime, as a demonstration of its commitment, the Federal Government should introduce legislation that would lead to the maximum possible degree of Self-government immediately. We ask that the Government of Québec not oppose or frustrate any such attempts to maximize Indian self-government through federal legislation but that rather, it assist in any way possible.

Third, as a very concrete step for our own community, we ask for immediate recognition by the Government of Québec of our laws and institutions and a halt to the insistence that provincial laws which interfere with our customs and institutions be applied and enforced.

We seek the assistance of this Committee in making the strongest possible recommendations on the above-mentioned points.

Erosion of our land base and the importance of our land claim. We have long argued that an adequate land and resource base is absolutely necessary to the exercise of self-government and a viable community. Such a land and resource base is absolutely lacking for our community. We argued this point strongly before the special committee on Indian Self-Government and our testimony on this point was reported by the Committee on piece 113 of its report. We stated, and I will quote: "Until our land claim is recognized and until the Government of Canada recognizes our land base and our territorial jurisdiction, Indian Self-Government will be an illusion. The

Government of Canada must seriously undertake to negotiate our land claims so that our people will have a land base upon which to build our Indian Self-Government."

We believe that it is important for this committee of the National Assembly to understand our claim and the importance of protecting the lands subject to that claim until an equitable, negotiated settlement is achieved. The Mohawk People of Kanesatake (OKA) claim unextinguished aboriginal or Indian title to the lands in the vicinity of the Lake of Two Mountains, which the evidence shows has been recognized, confirmed and reinforced by the Acts of various Governments through history.

In addition, history clearly reveals that there was the creation of a reserve at the Lake of Two Mountains by setting aside a tract of land measuring approximately 260 square miles for the use and benefit of our people in virtue of the original grants from the French Crown, first in 1717 and later in 1733.

A detailed land claim asserting the foregoing was submitted to the Government of Canada in 1977. The claim document runs to approximately 220 pages and was accompanied by several volumes of documentation, as well as maps illustrating the extent of the original grants. The claim is being reviewed by the Federal Government of Justice and we are hoping that a positive opinion will be forthcoming in the near future. We expect negotiations on the claim to commence shortly thereafter.

As we have already mentioned since the presentation of our claim, the new Constitution has been enacted - the Constitution Act, 1982 - which provides an explicit recognition of aboriginal and treaty rights. Section 35 (1) of the Constitution Act, 1982, reads, and I quote: "The existing aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada are hereby recognized and affirmed."

These are the rights which we are asserting and which we wish to bring to your attention. While we do not intend to repeat the questions of law, history and equity set out in detail in our claim, we believe it most important that the Government of Québec and, for the present purposes, particularly this committee, be aware of the basis and extent of the claim. In particular, and as we have done consistently in the past, we argue that nothing should be done to the lands in and around Oka, which would affect our rights or prejudice negotiations toward a settlement of our claims.
(14 h 45)

We must regard the recent developments in and around Oka in the context of the constant threat of erosion of our land base at Oka. Although our aboriginal title and the specific title to the

reserve at Kanesatake have not been illegally extinguished or expropriated, there has occurred, over the past two centuries, a persistent erosion of our land base at the Lake of Two Mountains through encroachment, sales, grants of land and development activity.

This persistent erosion of the Mohawk lands, at the Lake of Two Mountains, does not constitute, in any way, an extinguishment of the legal rights of the Mohawk people to these lands. It is grounds for stating, however, that the various governments have not respected and fulfilled their obligations, clearly established in law and policy, to protect the interests of the Indian people in lands, to deal that interest in accordance with the dictates of established law and practice and to compensate adequately and properly Indian people who are divested of their lands.

This historical erosion has been recognized by all who examined the question. In 1941, the Honourable Mr. Crear, Minister of the Department of Indian Affairs, wrote, and I will quote: "I am informed that the seignior was originally divided into twelve parishes and that eleven of them were alienated by the seignior many years ago, and that the twelfth, in which Oka is situated, is the only one where any property has been left. I am further informed that, in recent years, the seignior made further sales of the property, a good portion of which had, up to that time, been considered common lands of the Indians and which was used by them for pasturing their cattle and their horses, and as wood lots. You are aware that the Indians strenuously opposed the latter sale and it is needless to say that they will more strongly oppose any action that may be taken now or in the future to disturb their rights of residence to remaining unsold lands; that is, to those areas which you now suggest should be purchased by the government for them."

During the 1960's, the Mohawks of Kanesatake were forced to see a large portion of their land taken for the purpose of a golf course. Once again, no attempt was made even to consult with the Indian people let alone to deal with their interests in the land. Included in the brief to the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons of Indian Affairs presented by the Mohawks of Kanesatake in 1961, was the following statement: "A most acute example of this encroachment has occurred recently. A portion of the seignior has, for centuries, been known as the "common lands" on which by ancient use and habit the Indians have been accustomed to cut wood and raise their cattle. Title to these lands passed from the seignior into private hands, and much of it now vests in the municipality of Oka which intends to use

them for a golf course.

Possibly doubtful of its right to deprive the Indians of their former enjoyment, the municipality secured the passage of a private bill through the Québec Legislature in December 1959, affirming its ownership. Now the axe is being laid to the roots of the splendid trees in the area, roads long used by Indians are being closed and bulldozers are completing the work of destruction. The income of the Indians is reduced and their freedom of movement restricted, in order that the white man may have more opportunities for recreation. What was once reserved for Indian use and profit is now reserved for golf.

The appropriation by the Government of Canada, of lands comprising a substantial portion of the lands covered by the original grants for the purposes of the Montreal International Airport, Mirabel, was yet another example of the dealings with the lands in region without reference to the rights of the Mohawks of Kanesatake. It is calculated that approximately 111.4 square miles of the original tract of approximately 259.1 square miles or 43% of the total lands were affected by the actions of the Government of Canada in this regard.

As a final example of development taking place at Oka without reference to the rights in interests of the Mohawks of Kanesatake, we wish to mention the recent construction of a natural gas pipeline close to the village.

Planning and land use in and around Oka.

In regard to the various initiatives by the Government of Québec in the area of planning and land use for Oka and vicinity, we wish to point out that we intervened in late 1983 in an attempt to influence planning work being undertaken at that time by SATRA, an agency of the Québec Department of Municipal Affairs.

Although only informed of the planning efforts in late September of 1973, two months before the deadline of the completion of studies, we met several times with representatives of SATRA and the Department of Indian Affairs to inform SATRA of the position of the Mohawks of Kanesatake and to attempt to influence the planning of the area. Specifically, as always, our concern was to protect the land base at Oka and to ensure that our need for land and a community was not prejudiced.

In November 1982, we were obliged to make representations to Mr Guy Chevrette, Minister of Recreation, Fish and Games to argue against the Government proposal to alter the classification and possibly the limits of Park Paul Sauvé situated in our lands. As has been the case so often, no reference was made in the government's proposal to our interest of the impact upon

our community.

We ask ourselves at this time whether our words in 1961 quoted above respecting the priority given non-Indian recreation over our interests, legal, social, cultural and economic, were not appropriate for that situation in which the Department of Recreation, Fish and Game again apparently was planning for the recreational needs of the non-Indian population without the reference to the rights, the needs or the aspirations of the Mohawks of Kanesatake.

Since the original intention of the French Crown to recognize our interests in a specific territory which was questioned immediately by the Seminary of St-Sulpice, our lands have been under attack. In this respect, the facts speak for themselves. From an original track of land totalling 260 square miles set apart by the French Crown for our ancestors, the land base has been whittled away until today only 2000 acres are recorded as lands set aside for the Mohawks of Kanesatake.

Throughout the 280 year period of illegal dispossession our position has been consistent. We have argued for our rights and made representations to Governments. With respect to recent history, we have mentioned representations to the special committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Indian Affairs in 1961 and the representations made in 1973 respecting planning for the Mirabel Airport, our land claims submitted in 1977 and our submissions to Mr Guy Chevrette in November 1982, you will appreciate therefore that our appearance before this committee is not without pretence.

The basic position of Mohawks Kanesatake (Oka) remains substantially as presented to the Government of Québec through SATRA in 1973 and repeated to the Minister Chevrette in November of last year. These basic points are: The Government of Québec has no right to plan Indian lands;

the Indian community does not want any other autoroutes, roads, bridges, hydro-lines or any other similar undertakings built in the area; the Indian community (presently above 950 persons living in the area) is basically agricultural but has no room to expand;

no planning or development should take place in the area until the land claim is settled;

it is most important that the outstanding material beauty in the wild life of the area be conserved.

The principal purpose of this part of our submission is to inform this committee of the pending land claim affecting the Oka area and to reiterate positions previously submitted to representatives of the Government of Québec in respect of planning and land use for the Oka land and to insist

that our land claim be dealt with and negotiations concluded prior to any changes in legal classifications of development on the ground.

We must ensure that any new action do not fall into the category of historical encroachment, erosion of Indian land base referred to above and treated in detail in our claim.

We thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee and to await your efforts as Legislators to influence Government policy and public perceptions respecting the Mohawks of Kanesatake (Oka).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Merci, M. Pelletier. Now we will ask questions. Can you be there for a question period after the question period, At 4 o'clock? Is it possible you be here at 4 p.m.?

M. Pelletier: I am sorry, Mr Chairman, we have our own commitment just like the rest of the members of this committee have other commitments. We have to be out of here by 4 o'clock.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je dois vous aviser que, suivant l'ordre de la Chambre, quand nous commençons à 15 heures à l'Assemblée nationale, nous devons cesser nos travaux ici. Si vous avez une minute pour réagir, il vous reste une minute, si vous voulez le faire. M. le ministre.

M. Lazure: Mr. President, I would just like to explain to our guests that we have our own set of rules also as you do. When the House starts at 3 p.m., we cannot sit here. We have to go on the other side and sit in our seats for about one hour. What we propose to you is that we come back immediately after, around 4 p.m., because we hold what we call the question period daily. On Wednesday, it is from 3 to 4 p.m. So we will be right back here around 16 p.m. if you can. Can you?

M. Pelletier: It is for 4 o'clock. We are prepared to come back and answer any questions that the committee wants to ask.

M. Lazure: Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Nos travaux sont suspendus jusqu'à la fin de la période des questions.

(Suspension de la séance à 15 heures)

(Reprise de la séance à 16 h 10)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît! Nous allons reprendre la séance de la commission élue permanente de

la présidence du conseil et de la constitution, qui a pour mandat d'entendre les représentations des autochtones et des divers groupes et organismes autochtones sur les droits et les besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens et des Inuits.

Nous avons tantôt, à la suspension de la séance, nous venions de terminer l'audience justement de la Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake d'Oka et nous en sommes, maintenant, à l'intervention du ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens. M. le ministre.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, merci. Je veux d'abord remercier les représentants de la délégation du Conseil de bande de Kanesatake (Oka). Je voudrais d'abord relever quelques points et, si vous me permettez, je vais le faire en anglais puisque la délégation a étudié la langue anglaise et qu'il est toujours préférable de communiquer directement.

M. Pelletier said in his initial remarks that, from what you heard yesterday from the Crees, you were not inclined to enter into negotiations, into agreements with Quebec on the basis of what you had heard. I can only say that I hope, following this exchange today and other exchanges, that you might modify your position, because if you do read again the brief of the Crees, of the "Grand conseil des Cris", you will notice on page 16, and I quote: "The performance of the Government of Quebec in regard to the implementation of the James Bay and Northern Quebec Agreement cannot be characterized uniformly"; which means that it is not uniform, it is not white or black, it is an appreciation, an evaluation which has positives and negatives. And if I continue, on page 17, the following page: "To be fair, we must also acknowledge that the James Bay Energy Corporation and Hydro-Quebec have carried out many of their commitments." Then, it says: "Nonetheless, there have been important difficulties. Thus, to present a balanced picture, we must acknowledge that there is a positive side to the assessment and a negative side to the assessment."

And I think in all fairness we must keep that in mind; we have given a lot of emphasis on this James Bay Agreement because it has been the first major agreement. And that agreement was also supported by the two parties. Therefore, it is important that we pass fair judgments on such agreements. And the Crees have told us at length, yesterday, that they were satisfied in some cases, they were very dissatisfied in other cases.

I wanted to pick up this point: and I would not want you to leave today with the impression that we do not want, you do not want to reach agreements because the Crees have had difficulties with the

implementation.

The second point, and I think I will ask my boss, who has just come in... Perhaps I will just finish my remark and I will ask him to re-emphasize what he said yesterday. The Prime Minister, yesterday, repeated the commitment that our Government is ready to table in the National Assembly a very solemn declaration which will have in its content at least as much as the declaration of March 1983, the accord of March 1983, the Federal Accord of March 1983.

And, therefore, this is in reply to your concern that we may not endorse or put our weight behind your expectations from the Federal Government. In other words, we will continue - this has been our policy - to offer groups such as yours to have a place in our delegation. Some do not wish to take it. Some do, such as yours, and when you do take your place, you speak your own mind, you speak whatever you want to say, just as Chief Max Gros-Louis testified yesterday, at the end of the session, when he testified that he appreciated the fact that we let him and all of the representatives of the Natives say whatever they wanted to say.

And, finally, my last comment. You have, I understand, made recently a research on your own rights, the Kanesatake or Oka-Mohawk group, and we would like, if possible, to have a copy of that report, which, I understand, is completed. It is a lengthy research on your own rights, territorial and other rights, and we want to tell you that we are quite interested in studying this report and then to initiate discussions with you on the basis of that report.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je ne voudrais pas m'immiscer. Malheureusement, à cause de la session et du Conseil des ministres, j'ai dû manquer une partie de la commission hier et aujourd'hui. Je ne voudrais pas m'embarquer dans des choses que je n'ai pas pu suivre, sauf que je peux bien répéter ce que j'ai dit hier. C'est évident que, quant à nous au moins, sûrement, c'est un strict minimum en ce qui concerne la substance des engagements qui avaient été pris à Ottawa par le gouvernement fédéral. Forcément, on espère aussi pouvoir ajouter des choses qui vont plus loin. Sur cette base-là, on présentera, avant les fêtes, une résolution, conformément à l'engagement qu'on avait pris devant l'Assemblée nationale.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Gerry Pelletier.

M. Pelletier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to answer the Minister's first

comment in regards to the statement that I have made about the Cree presentation yesterday. I do not think that I stated that all the report has created problems. What I said was in their own views - and I am not quoting from the report itself during the question and answer period - they feel that there were areas in the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement that were not being seriously implemented. They went back into a time factor of how long they had been trying to get certain things out of the way.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): There is one thing I do not know if it was mentioned. I hope I am not going away from the basis of your question, I could not be here yesterday. As far as the Northern Québec Agreement is concerned, there were and there always will be some difficulties; that was foreseen. So it was agreed, I think, basically, that both signatories consenting, there should be a review when required. We offered that review as early as December 1981, but, for reasons of getting ready and making sure that their files were complete, our Cree interlocutors or partners delayed somewhat that review, but it has now been initiated for at least six months or thereabouts, and the last report we received - I could not check with Chief Diamond yesterday - was that it was progressing very well and everybody was satisfied, at least, to say the least, at the way it was going on. This is as much as I can say. So it is far for the course, I think, in cases like that.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Chief Gerry Pelletier.

M. Pelletier: In regard to the second point that the Minister raised of the land claimed documents, it is a document that does not... We are not saying: That is where our rights are being spelled out. It is a document that was submitted to the Federal Government in regards to reclaiming the land that was taken illegally away from our people, and we are prepared to present to your Government, for your information, that document. But there has to be an understanding that this document will not be used or infringes on the discussions that are taking place now with the Federal Government. We also want to make it very clear we do not want that document to be used as a political football between your Government and the official Opposition.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): As far as we are concerned, we can commit ourselves to that.

M. Pelletier: A second point, I guess, you are raising in regards to signing any agreement with Québec, I think I made it very clear this morning that we are new into this process of sitting down with your Government and we have not... We are a small reserve. We do not have the resources to hire the expertise that would be required to understand some of your laws. I know that they are creating problems for us just as much as the federal laws are creating problems for us. I guess when we stated that we do not sign anything with the Québec Government at this time, we are just in sort of exercising the same sort of position that Québec has taken in regards to the Canadian Constitution, in that they are opting out. So we would just want to make sure that we can exercise that option.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Merci, M. le Président. So, Mr. Prime Minister, you see the consequences and the effect of some of your policies. It is a flattery... It is an imitation of the sincerest form of flattery. The Mohawks of Kanesatake are following your footsteps in taking the example of not wanting to sign agreement.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): I think it makes sense for them in the present context.

M. Ciaccia: Except I would like to go back to what the Minister previously said in response to the Chief's comments on the James Bay Agreement and the fact that the Crees have complained that they had certain problems and you deducted from that the fact that they did not want to sign an agreement. I think that, in this case, while not agreeing totally on the interpretation that the Minister is giving to the degree of compliance or not on the part of the Government, I mean that is something that has to be appreciated by the Crees and by the Government itself, I would agree that, on this position, that should not be a reason for you not to negotiate with the Government in terms of all the claims that you may have including - perhaps I might come to that question afterwards - the land claim. The fact that there are certain difficulties perhaps should not be a bar to trying to negotiate other agreements with the Government, agreements that you have to agree on in any event on the contents as to the particular problems that you see and the kind of solutions that you want in them.

So, in that respect, I think I would agree with the Minister in terms of trying to encourage native groups of Québec to sign master agreements or to negotiate their claims with the Government and sign master

agreements with them. I think it is better to try and do that, to try and resolve some of the problems. Otherwise, they always say in abeyance and as to the question of political football that the Prime Minister mentioned, no... Yes, Chief Pelletier mentioned the undertaking of the Prime Minister that he would not use your document as a political football. I am sure that he means it. He is in good faith and he wants an undertaking from us. We will certainly not use it as what you would call a "political football", except I would like to remind the Prime Minister that we can take positions where we would urge the Government to fulfill its obligations towards the Native people in terms of its agreements or in terms of negotiations. I hope that you do not interpret that as being partisan politics. It is our role to try and incite the government to live up to its responsibilities and without being labelled as a partisan.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Let us say there is a grey zone in your commitment, but we will have to do.

M. Ciaccia: We too have to keep some of our options opened. I know that we do not have all that time because there are other groups that have to be heard. First of all, I would like to thank you for your brief. I think you referred to many of the problems and the approach that you have seems to be also within the line of thinking that the many other Native groups presented to this committee and specially the members of the Mohawks and the Six Nations Confederacy. But you referred specifically to you land claim. Could you tell us where that land claim stands and what can this committee or the Government of Québec do in terms of helping the Mohawks of Kanesatake to accelerate or to help you in resolving that claim?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Sorka.

Mme Sorka (Diane): C'est bien cela. The claim was submitted to the Federal Government, the Office of Native Claims, in 1977. The claim itself is about 220 odd pages of historical and legal arguments. There are six very thick volumes of documents that go along with it. At the moment, the Department of Justice in Ottawa is considering the claim and we are waiting for their legal opinion or the Office of Native Claims is waiting for their legal opinion before commencing negotiations. We hope that we will have that very shortly and that we will get the process started.

M. Ciaccia: Does it involve the Government of Québec or is it strictly a land claim involving only the Federal Government?

Mme Sorka: This is a claim that was made through the federal process, through the Office of Native Claims. It has not been sent to the Government of Québec as a claim as such, although we have spoken of it in a number of public hearings such as this one.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: I presume that it involves lands around the reserve...

Mme Sorka: It certainly involves lands in and around the area of the Lake of Two-Mountains.

M. Ciaccia: ...which are within the jurisdiction of the Government of Québec. You mentioned that there was still developments in that area which could eventually, I presume, prejudice your claims. Is there anything you would recommend or suggest to the government to do at this time to protect your claim?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Sorka.

Mme Sorka: One of the main points of our brief today - it is the same point that we have made consistently in every public hearing that we have attended - is that we are requesting - or perhaps insisting is a better word - that the Government of Québec do not undertake development in and around the area of Oka until the land claim is settled, because every time another development takes place, whether it is the golf course or whether it is a pipeline or whether it is a proposal for a public park, it diminishes the landbase of the Oka band, and what we are requesting is a freeze on that area until the land claim is settled so that we do not lose anymore of the land. Over half of it has been lost in the past 200 years.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: But, to do that, should you not involve the Government of Québec in your claim because, if you are making a claim against the Federal Government and if the Québec Government is not aware of all the details, I would imagine it would be difficult for the Québec Government to react and to take whatever steps may be necessary to protect the rights that you are asking for.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Madame.

Mme Sorka: I understand that the Council of the Band of Oka has agreed to forward a copy to the Government of Québec of this claim so that you will get it to know its final details.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Deux-Montagnes.
(16 h 30)

M. de Bellefeuille: Merci, M. le Président. Cela me fait plaisir de saluer le chef Nicholas, le chef Nelson, Mme Sorka et M. Pelletier. Vous habitez dans ma circonscription électorale. Je sais que vous ne reconnaissez pas nécessairement de la même façon que les membres de cette commission ce type d'organisation politique et de découpage du territoire, mais cela ne vous a pas empêché, chef Nicholas, d'agir envers moi avec une courtoisie que j'ai beaucoup appréciée lorsque vous avez inauguré votre centre communautaire il y a quelque temps. Vous m'avez invité à participer à cette fête, ce que j'ai fait avec beaucoup de joie. Cela m'a permis de rencontrer un bon nombre de personnes qui font partie de votre communauté.

Dans votre mémoire, vous nous parlez de territoires de 260 milles carrés, à la page 8 de la version anglaise, qui ont été accordés aux Indiens sous le régime français - ça doit être sous le règne du Roi-Soleil, Louis XIV - dans le secteur d'Oka. Ce territoire-là a été, par la suite, érodé. Comme vous le savez, lorsque la Confédération canadienne a été mise sur pied, le gouvernement central s'est mis à exercer une juridiction à peu près exclusive sur tout ce qui concernait les autochtones. Il semble que ce gouvernement central n'ait pas reconnu vos droits sur ces territoires attribués par la couronne française sous le régime français. Et aujourd'hui il ne vous reste - vous le dites dans votre mémoire - qu'un millier d'acres alors qu'à l'origine vous aviez ces 260 milles carrés.

Ce qui m'a frappé lorsque j'ai examiné un peu les territoires que vous occupez, c'est leur caractère - il y a un beau mot anglais de patchwork. Ce n'est pas un territoire dont on peut tracer facilement les limites parce qu'il y en a une partie, oui, qui est assez importante, mais il y a d'autres parcelles ici et là, ce qui montre bien que vos droits n'ont pas été reconnus. Ils ont été érodés et votre territoire a été morcelé. Je pense qu'on peut difficilement nier que ce que vous prétendez à ce sujet est strictement exact. Il y a une forme d'érosion qui remonte aux origines de la Confédération canadienne, en ce sens que vos droits n'ont pas été reconnus à ce moment-là.

Mais il y a aussi des érosions de votre territoire qui sont plus récentes, vous en

parlez dans votre mémoire. Par exemple, lorsque le golf d'Oka a été aménagé, vous prétendez que c'était sur vos territoires, et ça paraît extrêmement vraisemblable puisque c'est à côté de votre propre terrain de jeu communautaire. Ensuite, vous parlez des expropriations de Mirabel qui, d'un coup, vous ont fait perdre 111 milles carrés, une proportion extrêmement importante de votre territoire. Vous avez donc, là encore, ce qu'on peut considérer comme un grief extrêmement sérieux. Vous faites aussi allusion au gazoduc, encore que sur le gazoduc, dans la mesure où le gazoduc est un service d'utilité publique, on pourrait peut-être discuter à savoir s'il ne faut pas que tout le monde s'entende lorsqu'il y a un cas d'utilité publique.

Mais vous parlez aussi du parc Paul-Sauvé à la page 14 du texte anglais de votre mémoire et ça m'étonne un peu. Je voudrais vous demander s'il s'agit, à votre avis, de la totalité du parc Paul-Sauvé qui est, comme chacun sait, d'administration québécoise, puisque vous dites dans votre mémoire que vos territoires sont là où se trouve le village et s'étendent vers l'ouest, alors que le parc Paul-Sauvé est nettement à l'est du village. Je voudrais savoir dans quelle mesure le parc Paul-Sauvé, dont j'oublie l'étendue, mais enfin c'est plusieurs acres, plusieurs centaines d'acres, fait partie des territoires qui vous ont été concédés sous le régime français.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Chief Gerry Pelletier.

M. Pelletier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to respond to his first comment where he stated that we live in his territorial riding. I believe the gentleman lives in our Indian territory.

M. de Bellefeuille: À Saint-Eustache? Your territory goes to Saint-Eustache?

M. Pelletier: Did you not hear the Haudenosaunee when they made their presentation this morning?

M. de Bellefeuille: In that sense.

M. Pelletier: So, the other part, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about west of the village of Oka, that is where our present people live right now but the claim itself not only includes those pockets of lands that were mentioned a while ago. It takes in part of Paul-Sauvé Park area. There are also some historical artifacts to prove to the Minister of Recreation, Fish and Game that Indian people occupied that territory many many years ago. There is a study being done now to get an actual date as to all those artifacts.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Oui, M. le député de Deux-Montagnes.

M. de Bellefeuille: Since Mr. Pelletier has referred to these artifacts, I think perhaps our two communities, if you want to consider them as two communities, could cooperate in getting these artifacts together. I think there is a fascinating collection of them that have been found and perhaps we could consider some sort of a suitable place museum where they could be stored and shown to the public, with your cooperation, at a suitable place.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mr. Chief Pelletier.

M. Pelletier: We will take the matter into consideration.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche.

M. Chevette: M. le Président, je voudrais dire que j'ai tenu l'engagement que j'avais pris lors des audiences publiques pour le parc Paul-Sauvé puisque j'avais pris l'engagement d'acheminer ledit mémoire au premier ministre du Québec et, le 10 mars 1982, vous receviez de M. Éric Gourdeau la confirmation que le premier ministre avait été mis au courant de votre mémoire. Si vous avez remarqué, on n'a encore rendu publique aucune décision parce qu'il n'y a pas que des problèmes exclusivement territoriaux. Il y a également des problèmes de droit. Vous savez qu'on est présentement en procès pour des droits exclusifs de chasse dans un bassin au centre du parc Paul-Sauvé, de sorte que nous sommes à reconsidérer l'ensemble des mémoires avant de prendre position et nous vous aviserons conformément à la réponse que vous a donnée M. Éric Gourdeau. Nous ferons appel à vous en temps et lieu. Cela s'en vient, mais sûrement pas avant les fêtes. Peut-être qu'on aura la réponse que vous attendez du gouvernement fédéral. Cela nous permettra, à ce moment, d'avoir une réponse peut-être encore plus éclairée.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Y a-t-il d'autres intervenants? Non? Donc, nous remercions la Bande amérindienne de Kanesatake (Oka) pour sa présentation du mémoire. Nous allons demander maintenant à l'Association des Inuits du Labrador de bien vouloir s'approcher. Do you have something else? Yes. Chief Pelletier.

M. Pelletier: Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you very much. Nous accueillons maintenant

l'Association des Inuits du Labrador. Will you introduce yourselves, please?

Association des Inuits du Labrador

Mme Williams (Frances): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En premier lieu, je voudrais présenter nos gens. Je vais commencer par moi-même. Je suis Frances Williams. Je suis la présidente de l'Association des Inuits du Labrador.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À ma droite, M. Enoch Obed, qui est responsable des négociations et des revendications territoriales des Inuits du Labrador.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À ma gauche, M. Vervan Haysom, un de nos avocats.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. Marc Denhez, un autre de nos avocats.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Notre conseiller, un peu plus loin là-bas, M. Nathan Elberg.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: J'espère que tous et chacun de vous avez déjà eu l'occasion de lire notre mémoire.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous avons aussi fait parvenir au gouvernement du Québec dans le passé un ouvrage intitulé, en anglais *Our Footprints Are Everywhere* qui est le résultat des recherches quant à l'utilisation des terres du Labrador et de toute la péninsule du Labrador par les Inuits de chez nous.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Si vous me le permettez, M. le Président, je vais commencer par un petit discours d'ouverture qui sera suivi par une intervention de M. Obed, puis, nous pourrions discuter des choses contenues dans

notre mémoire.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Williams.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vous remercie, M. le Président, et tous ceux qui sont venus ici aujourd'hui pour nous écouter.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Comme je vous l'ai dit tantôt, je suis Frances Williams et je suis la présidente de l'Association des Inuits du Labrador.
(16 h 45)

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous vous remercions de cette invitation à venir parler devant vous ici aujourd'hui.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est la première fois que les Inuits du Labrador ont l'occasion de venir ici et de parler au gouvernement du Québec.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je voudrais ajouter que nous espérons que cette occasion de vous parler n'est qu'un début et qu'on pourra continuer notre dialogue à l'avenir.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je voudrais profiter de cette occasion pour vous transmettre nos salutations, à vous et aussi à nos confrères, les Inuits et les Indiens du Nouveau-Québec.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. le Président et MM. les membres de la commission, pour le bénéfice de ceux qui ne sont pas familiers avec le Labrador et la situation des Inuits du Labrador, je voudrais vous transmettre quelques informations afin que vous soyez capables de mieux placer les choses dans leur contexte.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: L'Association des Inuits du

Labrador représente environ 3000 Inuits. Le terme anglais pour désigner ceux qu'on représente aussi est "Native settlers". Je ne sais pas exactement comment traduire cela, parce que, si j'utilise le mot "colons", on sait que ce mot a acquis certaines connotations. Ce serait des "pionniers"; on dirait que ce sont des "scouts". Disons des "colons", mais dans le sens le plus noble du mot. L'Association des Inuits représente et les Inuits et les résidents blancs, les résidents non autochtones de longue souche, de longue date, qui résident dans les mêmes villages et qui partagent le mode de vie des Inuits de cette région-là.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les gens que nous représentons résident dans les communautés suivantes: Nain, Hopedale, Makkovik, Postville, Rigolet, Happy Valley et North West River.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les Inuits du Labrador, même s'ils sont peu nombreux, ont, depuis fort longtemps, depuis des siècles, vécu dans des conditions fort difficiles.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Mais, en dépit de ces difficultés, nous avons réussi à survivre en tant que peuple avec sa propre culture, parce que nous avons su respecter et tirer notre subsistance de la terre, de la mer, de la banquise, des animaux et de nos concitoyens.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette communion avec notre environnement et avec la terre de laquelle nous tirons notre subsistance et notre survivance nous est fondamentale et nous voudrions qu'elle soit maintenue comme telle et qu'elle ne soit pas détruite.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Encore aujourd'hui, chaque jour, nous continuons de dépendre des animaux qui vivent sur la terre ferme et des animaux qui vivent dans la mer.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. le Président et les

autres membres de la commission, nous voudrions ici aujourd'hui vous souligner pourquoi notre environnement et nos terres doivent être protégés.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les choses que nous vous disons ici aujourd'hui, vous les avez sûrement entendues dans le passé à d'autres occasions, ou même des choses semblables à cette commission parlementaire ici avant nous, mais nous voudrions vous répéter certaines choses afin que le gouvernement fédéral et le gouvernement du Québec prennent conscience de la raison pour laquelle les choses qui sont la source, qui sont la fondation de nos droits, de notre culture et de notre société doivent être protégées.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: L'Association des Inuits du Labrador voudrait vous présenter ici des façons dont vous pourriez venir en aide aux Inuits de là-bas.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous ne voudrions pas simplement que vous en restiez à l'audition de nos paroles ou à la lecture de notre mémoire. Nous voudrions que vous entrepreniez une action afin de mettre en application certaines recommandations que nous voulons vous faire.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous, les Inuits du Labrador, nous nous trouvons dans une situation un peu confuse quant à notre statut au sein de la Confédération canadienne.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pourtant nous, entre Inuits, nous savons qui nous sommes, nous nous reconnaissons entre nous, même si, pour le reste des Canadiens, par le gouvernement fédéral, on nous place dans la même catégorie, on nous appelle les Indiens.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En 1949, au moment où la province de Terre-Neuve s'est jointe au reste du Canada, on a agi comme s'il n'existait aucun Inuit dans cette partie du pays.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et de la même façon, on a été complètement oubliés au moment où se négociait la Convention de la Baie James et du Nord québécois.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Même si nous avons des intérêts dans les territoires situés dans la province de Québec, on ne nous a jamais rencontrés, on ne nous a jamais entendus à ce moment-là.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les Inuits du Labrador ont subi les contrecoups, l'humiliation de l'action des trois niveaux de gouvernement.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La façon dont on nous a traités, nous les Inuits du Labrador, ressemble pas mal au traitement qu'on accorde aux animaux.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. le Président et les autres membres de la commission, comme je l'ai dit tantôt, je voudrais parler encore de notre manque de définition, de notre manque de statut, de reconnaissance au sein de la Confédération par les gouvernements.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce n'est que très récemment que le gouvernement de la province de Terre-Neuve a reconnu qu'il y avait, oui, des Inuits et des Indiens sur son territoire.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Le gouvernement de cette province administre des fonds qui sont destinés aux Inuits et aux Indiens et qui s'appellent The Canada - Newfoundland Native Peoples of Labrador Agreement. (17 heures)

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Si nous pouvions, nous les Inuits, accéder au contrôle de ces sommes qui nous sont destinées, nous considérerions

qu'un bon bout de chemin serait fait pour le développement, pour assurer l'avenir de notre peuple.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vous affirme, en tant qu'Inuk du Labrador, qu'il y a vraiment trop de lois qui nous ont été appliquées par les gouvernements.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est en essayant d'assurer l'avenir de nos enfants que nous disons ici aujourd'hui que les Inuits du Labrador, comme les autres peuples autochtones, doivent avoir l'occasion d'accéder au contrôle des institutions qui donnent les services aux gens et particulièrement dans les domaines de la santé, de l'éducation et de la gestion de la faune. De la façon dont le système d'éducation est organisé aujourd'hui, ajoute Frances, il est très clair que, dans très peu de temps, nos enfants, nos jeunes vont avoir bientôt complètement perdu la maîtrise de leur langue maternelle.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ces trois domaines que je viens de mentionner, c'est-à-dire les services de santé, l'éducation et la gestion de la faune sont pour nous d'une importance vitale. Je vous pose la question à vous, gens du gouvernement du Québec: Est-ce que vous seriez prêts à nous donner un coup de main pour réaliser nos buts?

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Comme je l'ai dit tantôt, au moment où les gouvernements, les Inuits et les Indiens se sont assis pour négocier et pour signer la Convention de la Baie James et du Nord québécois, les Inuits du Labrador ont été complètement oubliés.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Mais, pourtant, les Inuits du Labrador ont des liens de parenté avec les Inuits du Québec et ils partagent les mêmes ressources.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les Inuits n'ont pas besoin de lois écrites pour leur dire comment la terre doit être utilisée et comment les

animaux doivent être partagés, ces choses étant assurées par les lois qui proviennent des coutumes traditionnelles.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce sont nos lois traditionnelles qui assurent les règles de l'utilisation du territoire et du partage des animaux qu'on y chasse.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est pour cette raison que nous considérons qu'au moment où la Convention de la Baie James se négociait nous, les Inuits du Labrador, aurions dû faire partie de ces négociations.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous nous demandons si la raison de cet oubli n'est pas due à l'existence de cette frontière qui a été tracée sur les cartes par des gens autres que nous.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette frontière que vous trouvez sur les cartes, nous ne la prenons absolument pas en considération quand nous allons à la chasse. Nous traversons d'un côté à l'autre comme le font, d'ailleurs, nos frères, les Inuits du Québec, quand ils vont à la poursuite du caribou.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous espérons que le gouvernement du Québec pourra agir afin que nous puissions continuer nos activités dans ce domaine sans aucune crainte.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. le Président et les autres membres de la commission, nous allons présenter ici aujourd'hui certaines propositions en vertu desquelles le gouvernement du Québec pourrait venir en aide aux Inuits du Labrador. Vous pouvez leur venir en aide en reconnaissant, premièrement, qu'ils sont des Inuits, qu'ils partagent les mêmes coutumes, les mêmes traditions et les mêmes droits que les autres Inuits.

Mme Williams: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vais continuer en langue anglaise.

Mme Williams: Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee, I am keenly aware that this commission has been set up to help discuss in detail the constitutional rights of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, and I want to make a few short comments on this important subject. I am also aware of what Mr. René Lévesque, the Prime Minister, said yesterday. I think there is this give and take which we recognize. But, for more clarification, I would just like to point out a few more things that are dealing specifically with Labrador.

For the Labrador Inuits, the settlement of our claims and constitutional development are closely tied together. One of the main grievances of the Labrador Inuits is the abrogation of our rights in Québec under the James Bay and Northern Québec Native Claims Settlement Act.

There can be no more clear illustration of the need to protect the Aboriginals and treaty rights of Aboriginal Peoples of Canada against the powers of the government than the unilateral, unnegotiated legislative abrogation of Labrador Inuit rights in Québec.

We have claims in Québec that we want to have settled. We are here to call upon the Government of Québec to honour its commitment to negotiate the settlement of those claims. But, more important, we are also here to call on the province of Québec to make sure that the kind of betrayal of Aboriginal Peoples that took place as a result of the James Bay and Northern Native Claims Settlement Act never happens again.

History demands that any negotiated agreement involving the province of Québec and the Labrador Inuits must be constitutionally protected as a treaty within the meaning of section 35.1 of the Constitution Act, 1982. For this reason alone, the Labrador Inuit Association believes it is vital that Québec become active in the national process of elaborating a constitution. Aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal Peoples.

But the Labrador Inuit Association has its difficulties and differences with the Government of Newfoundland on issues ranging from wildlife management to education. There is no need, nor are these hearings appropriate place to go into these difficulties. It should be pointed out, however, that many of them are related to questions of Aboriginal self-government, and funding and control of institutions. Active participation of Québec in the constitutional process would help in the resolution of these questions and would thereby help to remedy many of the problems we face at home,

including those with the Government of Newfoundland. We recognize the active participation and positive approach of the Government of Newfoundland and we encourage you to follow suit. Mr. Chairman, may I have a drink of water?
(17 h 15)

So far, Québec has taken a passive role in this historic process. If that passivity continues, it will generate further mistrust and suspicion on our part. In contrast, affirmative action by the Government of Québec to recognize and advance the constitutional rights of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada would not only speed up the process of constitutional amendments, but also would be a signal to the Aboriginal Peoples that the mistakes of Canada's colonial past can be set right in the future.

I therefore join with the leaders of the Aboriginal Peoples of the Québec Task Force in calling upon the Premier to enter into an accord with all the representatives of the Aboriginal Peoples who have appeared before this commission. The accord should be the same as that entered into by our national leaders and the other First Ministers' on March 7 of this year.

Such a step, by committing Québec to honour land claims settlements as constitutional treaties, and by committing Québec to consult with us before affecting our rights would assure all Aboriginal Peoples that the province treats their rights as rights of the highest priority. If this Premier were to enter into such an accord with the Inuits of Labrador, amongst others, it would constitute a major recognition of the Labrador Inuits by the Government of Québec and would symbolize a commitment to the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada, generally, and not just to the Aboriginal Peoples of Québec.

I would now, again, like to thank you for the opportunity to express our feelings. The brief itself deals with the technical information. I have tried to let you know our feelings from our hearts, and the reality of the situation. Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee, thank you again.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mme Williams.

Something else? Mr. Obed.

M. Obed (Enoch): Mr. Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman and honourable members of the committee, we would like to thank you for the privilege to appear before this standing committee. My name is Enoch Obed. I work for the Land Claims Division of the Labrador Inuit Association. The Labrador Inuit Association was formed in October 1973, in response to the Federal Government's policy announcement in August of that year.

The first task of the Labrador Inuit Association was to clarify that the Federal Government's comprehensive land claims policy applied to land in Labrador. The LIA was incorporated in 1975 and received funding to research its land claims in December of that year. Our statement of claim was submitted to the Federal Government in 1977.

Our land use and occupancy study was submitted in 1978. Our claim was accepted for negotiation as a comprehensive claim in that year. In 1980, the Newfoundland Government announced its willingness to enter into tripartite negotiation for the settlement of the Labrador Inuit claim.

In 1981, the Federal Government is (short list) approach came into effect, that is the Federal Government will negotiate only six comprehensive claims at any one time. Unless one of the six groups on the short list completes an agreement, no other claim will be negotiated. This approach has successfully blocked any further development towards negotiation of our claim.

Your society calls me an Eskimo. I prefer to call myself an Inuk, a person. I was born at Hebron. So my people refer to me as a Hebronimuit, a person belonging to the land in the Hebron area. The Hebron region is one of the biggest and best grazing and calving grounds for part of the huge caribou herd which still migrates between Labrador and Québec every since time is remembered by the Inuits and the Innu, the Indian. For centuries before colonial rule, the Inuits were like the caribou. We knew no artificial boundaries under the land that kept us alive and sheltered. My ancestors and my relatives living today have had to cross from Labrador to Québec and from Québec to Labrador during times of severe hardship. They travelled on the land and on the sea in search of life-sustaining food and economic benefits from the renewable resource base. In fact, the land and the resource base meant so much to the Inuits that we devised our own customary rules for occupancy and wise use of the land and its resource base.

When I was a small boy, I shot my first polar bear. Nowadays, our people can be put in jail and their property taken. Our people cannot even kill a polar bear in self-defence. It is quite different for our Inuit brothers from Northern Québec. They can cross the Labrador boundaries and kill their quota of polar bear without fear of prosecution. Somewhere and sometime in Canada's history, the powerful people who make up the federal and provincial laws forgot about the Labrador Inuits and their Aboriginal rights. Today, the Labrador Inuits are becoming more fearful to use the land that sustains them because of certain legislation that prevents them from exercising their Aboriginal rights to

determine where they will hunt, trap, fish, gather and follow wildlife. Another great threat that the Labrador Inuits foresee is that impending shortsighted, large-scale developments for profit can easily put them at a big disadvantage forever if they are forsaken and not included in the wise development of our land and resource base.

In October 1980, Premier Brian Peckford of Newfoundland announced his willingness to enter into tripartite negotiations and indicated that bilateral discussions on preliminary issues between the Newfoundland and the Federal Government were essential. Those governmental discussions opened in May 1981 but nothing has been achieved.

The Labrador Inuit Association has repeatedly asked the Office of Native Claims when it will be ready to open negotiations. In February 1983, despairing over the lack of response from that bureaucracy, we formally advised the Minister of Indian Affairs that we are willing and ready to enter into tripartite negotiations for the settlement of our claims and asked him to set a date for opening of our talks. Eight months have now passed without even the courtesy of an acknowledgment from the Minister.

Under the James Bay Agreement, the Crees and Inuits of Northern Québec surrendered all their Aboriginal rights to the lands which they claimed in Northern Québec. The surrender of Aboriginal rights was made in return of various rights and benefits defined in the Agreement between the Crees, the Inuits, the Federal Government, the Government of Québec and various Québec governmental agencies. The Labrador Inuits were not party to this Agreement. The Agreement was made into law by enactment of the Canadian Parliament and the Québec National Assembly. The Labrador Inuit claims were known to the province of Québec before the finalization of the Agreement and were well known both to the province of Québec and the Federal Government before the James Bay Agreement was enacted into law. The Labrador Inuit Association registered strong protests before the parliamentary committee on Indian Affairs during the passage of Bill C-9.

We feel like Adam and Eve; we see ourselves naked with not even fig-leaves to cover us.

The blow delivered against the Labrador Inuits denied us our historical, legal, cultural and economic roots without our ever having given our consent, received any compensation or been allowed any resource in accordance with due process of law. This is outrageous and immoral; it is also possibly illegal to seek to abrogate the Aboriginal rights of Aboriginal People without negotiation and compensation. It is simply contrary to

conscience to deprive a people of their rights without their consent.

To the Labrador Inuits, it is urgent that uncertainty surrounding our rights to our land and resources be resolved. The realization of our culture and economy, the protection of our language, the practice of our customs and traditions, the promotion of individual and community developments are for us matters of utmost urgency. All of these aspects of our daily life are subject to the insidious attacks of gradual governmental and industrial incursions into our land and community and their expropriation of our resource rights.

(17 h 30)

We condemn the annulment of just and fair principles by arbitrary, unjust and unannounced strategy. We call upon federal officials who have been charged with the constitutional responsibility and trust obligations of the highest political order to fulfill their responsibility towards Labrador Inuits. We also feel that the James Bay Agreement imposes a clear and moral obligation on Québec to settle the claims of the Inuits of Northern Labrador.

The Labrador Inuit Association offers these recommendations to this honourable committee. First, that this commission recommend to the Government of Québec that the Government move immediately to recognize and clarify the legal rights of Labrador Inuits to enter their traditional lands within the province of Québec, without restriction, for purposes of hunting, fishing and trapping. These rights should be enshrined in a treaty or a specific clause of the Canadian Constitution. In any such constitutionally protected agreement or provision, the province of Québec should facilitate the crossing of the Labrador boundary by the Aboriginal Peoples of Labrador whose movements are connected to their traditional culture and economy. This could be done by the recognition of a passage, or a right-of-way for the Aboriginal Peoples of Labrador. The Québec Government should also work towards a clarification of the legal status and the legal rights of the Aboriginal Peoples crossing the border in connection with their traditional culture and economy. The objective of this clarification would be to eliminate the multiple licencing and permitting systems that must, in theory at least, be followed by the Labrador Inuit hunters.

Second, that this commission recommend to the Government of Québec that the rights of the Labrador Inuits to hunt, trap and fish in their traditional lands within the province of Québec take the form of a licence coupled with a grant so as to ensure that the Inuit have a definite proprietary interest in the animals of their traditional lands and to ensure that the

licensor could not revoke the licence to which the grant is incidental.

Third, that this commission recommend to the Government of Québec that it move immediately to negotiate with the Labrador Inuits for their participation and inclusion of their interests in regimes for the management of wildlife resources in which the Labrador Inuit have vital interests.

Fourth, that this commission recommend that the Government of Québec seek to reach agreement with all interested parties concerning a regime to ensure comprehensive management of the caribou herd according to ecological, cultural and economic principles, free from geographic and jurisdictional protectionism.

Fifth, that this commission advise the Government of Québec that the inclusion of the rights, interests and participation of the Aboriginal Peoples of Labrador in environmental impact assessment and land use planning regimes is essential in order to protect and advance their interests as semi-nomadic hunters and gatherers who have used the land since time immemorial. This must be negotiated between Québec and the Labrador Inuits, would be an integral part of our comprehensive land claims negotiation and would, where appropriate, include negotiations with the signatories to the Labrador Inuit Association. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Thank you, Mr. Enoch Obed. Is there someone else who would like to have the right to speak? Je donne la parole au premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je voudrais commencer par remercier nos visiteurs du Labrador, qui ont trouvé le moyen de traverser cette frontière qu'ils ne reconnaissent pas pour venir présenter leur cause à l'Assemblée nationale du Québec. Est-ce que je peux ajouter tout de suite que je trouve cela extrêmement sympathique parce que, pour des raisons peut-être moins anciennes que nos amis inuits, nous non plus, du Québec, il y a certaines frontières que nous ne reconnaissons pas?

Ceci étant dit, c'est la première fois que nous avons cette occasion de connaître le point de vue, l'ensemble des revendications des Inuits du Labrador. Je dois dire tout de suite que nous avons été vivement intéressés par ce mémoire parce que, d'abord, pour nous, il y avait beaucoup de choses nouvelles que nous ne connaissions pas, qu'il est remarquablement bien préparé, très clair et extrêmement bien documenté. C'est vraiment un apport très précieux que vous ajoutez à l'éclairage de la commission.

Ainsi, mon collègue, le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche, qui travaille actuellement, au point de vue technique, mais c'est très important, sur un

sujet qui vous préoccupe, je pense, de très près vous aussi, c'est-à-dire la question des caribous, s'attend à avoir plus d'informations qui proviendraient de votre communauté de façon que vous puissiez, en fait, participer à la mise au point de ce que pourrait être une sorte de solution au problème de la chasse au caribou. Je pense que c'est un peu cela que vous évoquez, M. Chevrette?

Pour le reste, it is a bit delicate, from what I gather. There is just one correction I would like to make in one of the statements of your presentation. You talked somewhat of the sort of passive attitude of the Québec Government, as far as the federal-provincial exercise which went on this year is concerned. We were very far from passive, but, on account of some basic requirements of our National Assembly concerning the so-called "new Constitution", we have decided, until certain conditions are met, not to participate, in the sense of not endorsing by signing - we have seen signatures, in recent Canadian history, that were not honoured and, until some correction is made to the results of such actions in the rest of Canada, we will not participate through a signatory in things that are concocted at that level. But, on the other hand, we were very active in the preparation and in our attendance at those meetings in Ottawa, and included, as you know, our own Inuit and Indian fellow citizens as codelegates in the Québec delegation, which, I think, gave them striking power which they would not have had otherwise. Additional to that, we also emphasized some concrete accomplishments that have been made in Québec - very much less than what we hope to accomplish in the coming times - which, I think, mean that, with a lots of things yet to do, at least we can say that Québec leads the way in Canada as far as recognition of basic rights of the Native Peoples is concerned. I think that was rather active help to our Inuit and Indian friends.

As far as the specific things that you mentioned in your presentation are concerned, there is one thing which we can do, which I can commit ourselves to immediately. It is that since we know, on account of where you live, how close you are - in fact, you are part of the same family - to our own Inuit population, how much exchange there is bound to be, there is no reason at all why we should not envisage - you will have to excuse me if I do not go into chapter and verse; we are not ready for that yet, but we are going to look at it actively - the idea of a kind of basic negotiation that you have mentioned; there is no reason why not. I cannot commit myself for the moment that we will go into it very quickly, like the day after tomorrow, but I think very seriously, on account of this close kinship - in fact, this family tie that you

have with the Northern Québec Inuit - there is no reason at all why, within the limits that you know about public administration, that we do not open up to the idea of the kind of negotiation you are proposing. We will be looking at it very actively.

As far as one of your preoccupations is concerned - which is also very basic - on account of your relatively smaller numbers and the dynamics of the whole situation, I know that you are very worried - I think justifiably so - about the maintenance of your language which, after all, is the vehicle of you culture. As you know, we are working on that with the Québec Inuits and we are going to explore the possibility - and that is a commitment - immediately of including you, if you feel like it, in that language effort - not just survival, but language, let us say maintenance - which is un the way in Québec so that you can profit by it and also bring in your input. That is a very basic cultural question, it is a question of your identity and there is no reason why you should not be the part of that effort and included in it. So, on the one hand, that can be a commitment, if you are interested, as far as the language question is concerned.

The other commitment, which has to be a bit conditional for the moment - but we are going to look at it very actively - is this idea, which you especially mentioned at 214, that we initiate a kind of negotiation along the general lines that you propose.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Merci, M. le Président. Je voudrais remercier l'Association des Inuits du Labrador pour son mémoire et pour souligner les problèmes qui existent dans sa communauté et aussi qui existent à la suite de certaines ententes qui ont été prises par le gouvernement du Québec.

(17 h 45)

Je voudrais seulement rappeler à l'Association des Inuits du Labrador et à cette commission les circonstances dans lesquelles l'entente de la Baie-James a été signée. C'est une entente qui avait été consentie par le Parti québécois à ce moment-là, qui était représenté par Jacques-Yvan Morin, le leader de l'Opposition, et le gouvernement libéral du Québec. Je crois qu'une des raisons pour lesquelles les Inuits du Labrador n'étaient pas inclus, c'est le fait que vous n'étiez peut-être pas prêts à négocier à ce moment-là.

You have mentioned that you were incorporated in 1975 as an association and I noticed, in the minutes of the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee meeting, you made representations in 1977 when the legislation to give effect to the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement

was enacted, but that legislation was really a formality. Once the Agreement was signed in 1975, it was just about at the time that you were being incorporated to form an association. The Agreement was already signed or in the process of being finalized. In the representations that you made in 1977 to the Federal Government, you advised him that you had notified the Government of Québec, the year before, which was in 1976. So, there were certain constraints on both the Native people at the time we had to negotiate and there were constraints on the Government.

However, I noticed that the Premier today has said that he is making a sort of a commitment in terms of negotiating with you. The Agreement did not totally ignore the Inuits of Labrador or other groups who would have claims to the James Bay territory. I would like to refer you to section 214 of the Agreement which specifically states: "Le Québec s'engage à négocier avec les autres Indiens ou Inuits non admissibles aux indemnités et avantages de la présente convention toute revendication qu'ils peuvent avoir relativement au territoire."

We were aware that there were rights of other Native people to the territory and that is why we provided for it in the Agreement. So, I think that perhaps the Premier today could be even more firm in his commitment because he is really obligated, in the terms of the Agreement, to negotiate with you. So, in that sense, the Agreement, while extinguishing rights - it is true - and they were obliged to do it... I do not want to go into the legality, but the Federal Acts of 1898 and 1912 which turned these territories over to Québec and which imposed as a condition certain conditions to extinguish rights... Nevertheless, I think that there was an effort made both by the Inuits of Northern Québec. I am not suggesting that the effort was only made, by the Government representatives at the time. It was made by the Inuits of Northern Québec to assure as much as possible the obligation on the part of the Government to negotiate with you, recognizing obviously that there were outstanding rights. If I could just refer to the Naskapis, for instance, they were caught in the same problem. There was a time delay with them. They were not ready to finalize negotiations and the Crees wanted the negotiations finalized.

When you mentioned that you view the James Bay Agreement as a betrayal, we had the Crees who came here yesterday and told us that it was the charter of their rights. So, there seems to be a bit of different points of view from different groups, depending on the effect, I suppose, of the Agreement and the consequences; but there is a clear-cut obligation on the part of the

Government to negotiate with you and with any other Inuits who would have rights in the territory. The Premier could even give you a more firm undertaking to negotiate your rights.

The other mention of the Premier about the language rights, I do not know, but perhaps he could clarify a little bit more. He mentioned that he would be prepared to include, at the request of the Northern Inuits, who mentioned some of the problems that they had with the language provision which affect the territory, perhaps we could ask the Premier to be a little more specific as to how they could include the Inuits of Labrador in the legislation which is presently before the National Assembly.

So, I am not trying to make excuses for the extinction of rights, I fully sympathize with the situation in which you find yourselves. All I am trying to say is that the Agreement does provide for the Government of Québec to negotiate with you, just as it provided for the Government of Québec to negotiate with the Naskapees. As a matter of fact, the Naskapees did negotiate and an agreement was finalized between Québec, the Naskapees of Schefferville and the other groups who form part of the agreement.

I just want to ask you a question. Have you spoken... What is the position... Have you discuss this with the Inuits of Northern Québec and how would you envisage the negotiation of the rights and the problems that you bring out in your brief? How would you see this process of negotiation? Because, as you know, the parties to this agreement now are the Crees, the Inuits, the Naskapees, the Federal Government and the Government of Québec. So, how would you see the process of a negotiation for the rights that you are claiming in today's brief?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Enoch Obed.

M. Obed (Enoch): First of all, it has been eight years since the signing the James Bay Agreement. Refer to provision 214. It has been a very long time since we have been able to come here to present our view. I think also that, in 1927, your legal lawyers, during Privy Council Hearings, regarding the Québec extinction that knew about the existence of the land use of the Labrador Inuit in Northern Québec. I also believe that, during your negotiations, although the Federal Government abrogated the rights of the Labrador Inuits of Northern Québec, it was at the insistence of the Québec Government that they did this.

Now, Mr. Lévesque pointed out that you have a major problem dealing with the Federal Government or the Newfoundland Government because of your very strong

views. The prospective adopted by the provinces is important. Québec, in negotiating with the Labrador Inuit Association, is dealing primarily with the Labrador Inuits. Their objective, in entering in this negotiation with us, would be to honour the commitments and obligations towards one of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada. By participating in the negotiations for the purpose of dealing honourably with aboriginal rights, your Government is not compromising its stand in relation to the Canadian Confederation. It is a rather genuine commitment to the process of unravelling the tangled net of Canada's colonial legacy which is, in the end, at the heart of Québec's attempt to define its position in relation to the Canadian Federation.

Secondly, the participation in negotiations respecting LIA claims can be done without reference to the specific territorial jurisdiction of the provinces. The goal of joint management can be achieved without making prejudicial admissions in respect to territory. The recognition of Inuit territorial rights to us constitutes acceptance of a fundamental aboriginal and human right, not a surrendering of territorial jurisdiction.

Lastly, wise management of renewable and non renewable resources and of the environment is in the best interest of our people, who depend upon and use the resources.

For Québec, to seek a comprehensive management regime that accounts for the rights and interests of other users of the resources in question is to act in support of Québec rights and interests and does not constitute an abdication of responsibility or a surrender of jurisdiction. So we see no real reason why you cannot recommend to your Government to provide a process, a procedure to open negotiations of our rights in Québec.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): In fact, I could not agree more fully with you. When the member from Mont-Royal reminded us of that provision in the agreement, quite clearly it was there and it is our duty to clarify things. But you have to admit that this is the first time that we see you, the first time that we have some sort of concrete news from you and that is why I made a sort of commitment awhile ago that we will, as quickly as possible, very seriously and very actively, look at how we can fulfill that commitment, which was there. But, on the other hand, you have to admit that when you get it for the first time, it requires some study before you can initiate anything which can be fruitful. So, there is no

hesitation, as far as saying: Yes, we will try and organize something which could bring you in a negotiating position with us on the basis of the general lines anyway of what you were suggesting.

The member from Mont-Royal will want a little more clarification about the language question. One of the basic things which is going on now - and it is always a long drawn-out effort, but it is one of the most basic efforts that you can make for any language as a first step - is the fabrication, if I can use the word, of an Inuit dictionary, which is going on right now and to which the Labrador Inuits - because that will be an on-going process, I do not know if there is a grammar afterwards or whatever - but at least a dictionary which is, I think, the basic tool for any language, is being put together right now. There is no reason why there should not be, based on that first effort, some cooperation initiated between the Inuit groups on both sides of the so called boundary.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: The problem that Northern Québec Inuits had brought to the attention of this committee was the question of the mobility. As these people have pointed out, there is a constant mobility between the people of Labrador, Québec, even the Northwest Territories and, the way Bill 101 is now designed, they are affected by the provisions of Bill 101 in terms of the schooling of their children because it prevents that mobility, it affects - let put it this way - the mobility. The children cannot go to the schools in which they would normally go to: it would be the English schools. It seems that there is so few numbers involved; and in terms of the requirements of these communities I think that what the Inuits of Northern Québec had asked for was an amendment of that particular clause insofar that it affects them, because they pointed out that they do not have reciprocity with the Northwest Territories and, as you know, the Northwest Territories in 1912, I think, removed the teaching of the French language, unfortunately. But they do have a problem today and it was in that area that they required some assistance.

(18 heures)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): ...to the re-evaluation of bill 101, Mr. Gourdeau who is quick on the draw, quicker than you, has just been telling me that there will be an amendment brought in during the bill 101 debate.

M. Ciaccia: I am please to hear that, Mr. Prime Minister.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, merci. Just a few words to also react to a third point that you brought up where you specifically asked for assistance from Québec, the third point being health services. You mentioned education, health and "gestion de la faune". I think there too, especially with the recent building of the Hospital Kuujuaq, a very modern hospital now, all I can say is that in the same way that the Prime Minister has expressed openness to help you with the maintenance of the language, there could be discussions in terms of what are the most pressing needs. What did you have in mind - perhaps you can answer right now or later on, when we do have further meetings - when you talked about certain assistance from Québec in terms of health?

Finally, I would also like to thank you on behalf of all the members of the commission for this beautiful and interesting book. Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Enoch Obéd.

M. Obéd: I will answer your question. I think what we are saying first and foremost is that we are one of the Aboriginal Peoples of Canada. The focus is on our status as Aboriginal Peoples. Secondly a focus on our status as Inuit is subject primarily to Canadian legislative jurisdiction in the sense that they have a trust responsibility towards us.

Now, this responsibility and obligation on the government's part have never been really exercised and we would like to see action to be treated as one of their Aboriginal Peoples of Canada. I think, since Québec has in its own legislation recognized the Aboriginal Peoples of Québec, you must go along in supporting us to gain the kind of recognition that we have been trying to seek since the beginning of this forum.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme la députée de Jacques-Cartier.

Mme Dougherty: I would like to come back to education. Would you clarify for us what is the set up of education? Who is responsible? Is the Government of Newfoundland responsible? To what extent your programs or monies are provided?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Williams.

Mme Williams: When I specifically mentioned education - I am glad you are asking that - our system of education is the same provincial curriculum. The monies that are...

Mme Dougherty: Are you talking about Newfoundland?

Mme Williams: Yes. The monies that are earmarked for education come through the Canada-Newfoundland Native peoples of Labrador Agreement. We have signed a five-year agreement which is now in the third year and, under this particular Agreement, the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development get money off the top as well as the Department of Education and the Department of Fisheries. And when we say we want education that will enable us to at least retain our language, we would like to see an agreement whereby we can determine what kind of education system our children receive.

Up to this point, we have not been able to get that kind of control and, when I talk about survival, I think the kind of education our children receive is a part of our survival as Inuit.

I do not know if I have answered your question in full, but, basically, that is the background on our education system.

Mme Dougherty: Thank you. In other words, you do not have the same autonomous school board rights such as the Kativik School Board for the Québec Inuit. Would this kind of set up be what you would want potentially, what they might have, when it is developed, when they have an opportunity to develop an indigenous curriculum?

Just before you answer, what I am getting to is it seems the Prime Minister is suggesting perhaps a sharing of materials related to your first language and so on. What we heard last night in relation to the Kativik school program which is only being developed, I think that there is an effort on the way to develop indigenous materials, manuals, curriculum and so on, and I know they are working this at some of the universities, I know that people at McGill University were involved in this, and it seems that, if Québec is willing to look at that, they might be able to speed that process of helping you also to develop your indigenous curriculum, because, if it is being done on the Québec side, why not on the other side of the border if it is essentially a common people, as you have explained to us? Does that make some sense to you?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Williams. M. Obed.

M. Obed: On this, can I answer? That

certainly compliments the Inuits, the Crees and the Naskapees when they negotiated their agreement. They did a very good job on your own behalf.

In regard to health, education, social services, community development, what we are seeking in this recognition of our aboriginal title and aboriginal rights, the right to determine for ourselves those programs offered by the Federal Government. We have not been listened to by any former Government to begin exercising our own determination. So that is the basis of our agreement here. We have to clarify what our position is in areas that we use in Northern Québec, in our communities with three levels of Government, Québec, Newfoundland and the Federal Government.

Now, in the case of negotiating our land claims, our land interest in Québec, I see no other choice but to have the Federal Government involved because of their contract responsibility and also we realize it is only the Government that can give recognition and affirmation and protect the rights under the Constitution. So once you have set a deadline to begin to react into what we have said in our brief, then we will be ready to start negotiation. We are ready.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): The only answer I can make is that it is obvious that the Federal Government has to be involved because it has the traditional responsibility over the whole thing and I do not think it has anything to do with our other basic requirements as Québec Government facing the constitutional process. So, there is no road blocked there.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Une question supplémentaire? Mme la députée de Jacques-Cartier.

Mme Dougherty: On another subject, I think that when you talk about, in your chapter - which you did not speak, but in your brief - when you talk about non-renewable resource development, I think you have made another practical suggestion that could be dealt with right here. That is that there are projects, and you bring up the Iron Ore Company, some of the mineral exploration projects that are causing the building of runways for airplanes and so on, that have environmental impact. You mentioned that, according to the James Bay and Northern Québec Agreement, the Environmental Quality Commission is encouraged to consult people who are involved, who would be concerned about the environmental impact of some of these projects and, because you are on the

Labrador side, you are not included in this consideration. You are suggesting, which makes a lot of sense, that you would like, and you ask the question: "Does the mandate of the - page 6-4 - Environmental Quality Commission enable it to consider environmental or social impacts occurring outside the boundaries of Québec, when those impacts are the result or potential result of actions within the borders of Québec? In other words, can the Environmental Quality Commission pay attention to our interests?"

I think that this is a question I would like to put to the Prime Minister. What is being suggested in the brief... "On a suggéré que la "Environmental Quality Commission pay attention to the interests of the Inuits of Labrador. When there are decisions being taken in Québec that affect the environment, whether it is the animals or the land, in some way, and they give examples of the building of airstrips for the mineral exploration and so on... At the moment, unlike the Québec Inuits, they do not have access to the Environmental Quality Commission. Is that again something that could be looked at? It makes a lot of sense.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): It does make sense and there is no reason why there should be any basic obstacle to that, because if it does have potential fall out which affects them... Obviously, if it affects Québec Inuits, it will affect Labrador Inuits, or vice versa. There is no reason at all why they should not come in.

Mme Dougherty: There is your answer.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche.

M. Chevette: Je serai très bref, M. le Président. J'aurai peut-être une seule question et un commentaire. Ma question a trait aux droits de chasse et de pêche. Vous parlez de la forme d'un permis qui serait accompagné de l'octroi d'un droit sur les animaux. Que veut dire l'expression "droit sur les animaux"? Si jamais on devait mener des discussions, j'aimerais savoir quelle est votre perception de ce droit sur les animaux. Je crois que vous utilisez l'expression "grant" dans votre mémoire, dans la version anglaise. Je ne comprends pas la signification exacte de ce droit sur les animaux.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Sir.

M. Obed: It would be the use of usufruct compared to in your Québec Civil Code. Also, it would mean international right of access, right of way as an international law. If Mr. Haysom can answer you further,

he is our legal advisor and, maybe, he would make it more understandable.

M. Haysom (Veryan): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that there is very little that I could add to what Mr. Obed has said. I believe that the analogy that you use or the correct terminology that you use in the Civil Code would be a usufruct. That is the kind of right that is being looked for in this. The phraseology there uses very much the common law phraseology, but I believe that the analogous provision in the Civil Code would be a usufruct. I think that answers this question.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre.

M. Chevette: Je voudrais vous féliciter de l'intérêt que vous portez à la conservation de la faune. Il est bien évident que, même si nous avons mis sur pied un comité technique pour étudier toute la question du caribou en particulier, on sait fort bien qu'on se doit, en vertu de la Convention de la Baie James, de consulter également le comité mixte et qu'on ne peut pas avoir un plan de gestion global au niveau de la faune sans avoir une entente au niveau de tous les intéressés. Ceci veut dire le gouvernement de Terre-Neuve, les Inuits du Labrador; cela veut dire aussi, bien sûr, nos Inuits conventionnés et le gouvernement du Québec, de sorte que je prendrai en considération tout ce que vous nous avez donné. Si jamais, entre-temps, vous avez des indications, des informations, des suggestions à nous faire relativement à la gestion même du troupeau du caribou qui se promène du nord au sud, elles seront les bienvenues et elles seront prises en considération. Et cela nous fera plaisir, au moment opportun, de vous donner un peu les hypothèses d'orientation que nous avons à ce sujet.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Il n'y a aucune autre intervention?

M. Ciaccia: I would just like to thank the Labrador Inuit Association for his brief and also for this very beautiful volume that you gave to the members of the committee, *Our Footprints Are Everywhere*, above the Inuit lands, uses and occupancy in Labrador. And I trust and hope that the Government of Québec will initiate with you, as soon as possible, a negotiation for your rights in the Northern Inuit areas, in Northern Québec, in accordance with the provisions that were spelled out in the James Bay Agreement.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme Williams, something else?

Mme Williams: I would just like to

point out that I would like to personally put my signature, for the Premier, on Our Footprints Are Everywhere.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt)**: M. Lévesque.

M. Lévesque (Paillon): As a French dictum goes, "Les grands esprits se rencontrent", I have just inscribed a sort of a small message on this beautiful book about the whole of the North, where I think you will recognize your own part, which has just come out a few days ago. So, it is an exchange.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Nous allons suspendre nos travaux jusqu'à 20 heures.

(Suspension de la séance à 18 h 18)

(Reprise de la séance à 20 h 10)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît!

Nous reprenons les audiences de la commission élue permanente de la présidence du conseil et de la constitution pour entendre les mémoires et les représentations des autochtones et des divers groupes ou organismes autochtones sur les droits et les besoins fondamentaux des Amérindiens et des Inuits.

Ce soir, nous entendrons deux groupes. En premier lieu, les Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini, et, en second lieu, l'Administration régionale Kativik.

Prend place à la table, actuellement, le groupe des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini.

M. Chevette: Oui, c'est pas pire. Répétez-le vite. On va apprendre avec lui.

Une voix: Bientôt, ce sera sa deuxième langue.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Il va falloir apprendre.

Une voix: Quel numéro, le mémoire?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): C'est le no 9.

Une voix: Fais comme moi, sors ton appareil.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Paulusi Sivuak.

Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini

M. Sivuak (Paulusi): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je voudrais commencer par remercier le gouvernement qui nous donne l'occasion de nous faire entendre à cette commission parlementaire.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je voudrais continuer en présentant les gens de notre groupe qui m'ont accompagné. À ma droite, M. Eliyassi Sallualuk qui, depuis les débuts de toute cette affaire concernant la Convention de la Baie James, a été, dès les premières heures, l'une des principales forces de notre mouvement. C'est pour cela que, même s'il n'occupe présentement aucun poste officiel, nous lui avons demandé de nous accompagner à la présente commission.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À côté de lui, M. Tamusi Kumak, bien connu par certains d'entre vous. M. Kumak travaille depuis de longues années dans divers projets pour la préservation de la langue et de la culture inuites.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La dernière personne à droite, c'est Johnny Uitagale, vice-président de l'ITN, qui lui aussi a été mêlé de très près à toute cette histoire dès les premières heures. C'est un peu lui qui agit comme chien de garde. C'est lui qui surveille et qui passe à travers toutes les lois. Dieu seul sait qu'il y en a eu beaucoup qui lui sont tombées sur la tête ces dernières années. C'est Johnny qui est chargé de nous mettre au courant de ces lois.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Immédiatement à ma gauche, il y a M. Davidi Mark Ivujivile, qui est un des conseillers, membre du conseil de l'ITN. Il a été mêlé lui aussi de très près et il a été impliqué dans notre lutte.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À côté de lui, il y a M. Kuppale Tayarak, lui aussi membre du conseil de l'ITN. Il vient du village de Salluit.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À côté de lui, il y a M. Ali Lovalinga, qui est président du Conseil communautaire de Povungnituk. Nous lui avons demandé de nous accompagner ici parce que son travail et le domaine dans lequel il oeuvre sont touchés de très près par tout ce qui nous concerne ici.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En dernier lieu, il y a M. Aisara Kenuayak, également de Povungnituk, qui est ici en tant que représentant de la Coopérative de Povungnituk. On lui avait demandé de nous accompagner au cas où la question des coopératives surgirait ici, en assemblée ou en commission, afin qu'il puisse répondre sur ces questions.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous avons préparé comme intervention deux points principaux. Le premier point: la raison pour présenter notre groupe et pour vous expliquer pourquoi notre groupe, les Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini, existe.

Deuxième point que nous voulons aborder ici ce soir, ce sont les recommandations, ce sont les buts. Nous voulons définir devant vous les buts et les souhaits de notre groupe.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il y a deux points connexes que, si on a le temps ou si l'occasion se présente, l'on pourrait aborder. Pour le moment, on voudrait les mettre de côté, mais il faudrait quand même les mentionner. On voudrait aussi parler des créations que les Inuits ont mis de l'avant avant la Convention de la Baie James; le deuxième point tend à vous expliquer, encore si on a le temps, depuis la convention, quelles sont les choses, quelles sont les marques de la convention et quels sont les changements qui ont été apportés à notre territoire.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, je voudrais revenir au premier point, c'est-à-dire vous expliquer les raisons de la création de notre groupe des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini. Soit dit en passant, c'est la première fois depuis huit ans que nous avons la chance de nous asseoir à un forum officiel avec le gouvernement pour vous expliquer notre pensée. Pendant ces huit années, nous avons, à maintes reprises, espéré une telle occasion et nous avons préparé à plusieurs reprises des textes et des idées. Nous avons beaucoup réfléchi; mais, comme vous le savez, ces efforts n'ont jamais abouti. Alors, pour la première fois en huit ans, nous sommes devant vous pour vous présenter ce que nous pensons.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, très brièvement, je vais brosser un tableau des raisons du contexte qui a donné naissance à notre groupe. Ensuite, Eliyassi vous présentera les projets de notre groupe pour le Nouveau-Québec.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Alors, nous savons tous qu'il y a eu, en 1975, une convention de signée, la Convention de la Baie James et du Nord québécois. Peut-être avons-nous été un peu en retard, mais nous avons fait une analyse, une évaluation de cette convention et c'est à la suite de l'entendement de cette convention qu'est née l'Association des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Alors, à ce moment, même si nous n'étions pas représentés par l'Association des Inuits du Nouveau-Québec, la Convention de la Baie James est apparue et nous nous sommes efforcés de l'examiner, de comprendre cette convention.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous savons très bien et nous avons compris qu'on disait de cette convention à ce moment qu'elle ne cherchait aucunement à nuire à quiconque, ni aux Inuits, ni à n'importe qui d'autre.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Même si ces gens ont travaillé très fort aux négociations, à la création de cette convention et ne voulaient nuire à personne, même si c'était ainsi, quand la convention est apparue, quant elle a été signée, c'est par les paroles, les mots mêmes de la convention que nous fûmes ébranlés.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette convention qui devait être pour les Inuits avait pour résultat de nuire aux Inuits, de les blesser en les obligant à céder et à abandonner leurs droits en tant que peuple aborigène.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).
(20 h 30)

M. Filotas: Nous avons donc créé notre association, notre groupe, afin de combattre cette convention qui, selon nous, si elle continue dans son état et sa forme actuelle, va enlever, va miner les intérêts des Inuits à tout jamais.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est donc la raison qui nous a motivés à créer l'association. Si la convention avait été faite de façon qu'elle réponde vraiment aux besoins des Inuits, il n'y aurait jamais eu besoin de créer l'Association des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini. C'est la première chose dont nous

voulions vous parler, vous expliquer pourquoi notre groupe existe.

M. Sivuak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, je raconte brièvement les débuts de notre groupe, même si certains d'entre vous ne saisiront pas complètement certaines choses. Je suis sûr que, dans les discussions qui vont suivre ce soir, on aura l'occasion d'expliquer un peu plus ces raisons.

Maintenant, Eliyassi va continuer à vous présenter les buts, la vision de notre groupe quant à ce qui devrait être fait au Nouveau-Québec.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk (Eliyassi): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous voudrions donc remercier le gouvernement du Québec de nous donner cette chance, cette occasion de nous présenter devant vous, nous, les gens de Povungnituk, de Ivujivik et de Salluit, afin de vous raconter, de vous dire ce que nous pensons.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Une autre raison pour laquelle nous vous remercions particulièrement de cette occasion que nous avons de vous parler, c'est parce que c'est la toute première fois, comme le disait Paulusi tantôt, que le groupe des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini, depuis sa création en 1974, a l'occasion de rencontrer formellement le gouvernement.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous ne reconnaissons pas la Convention de la Baie James, même si nous vivons sur des terres qui, elles, ont été conventionnées. Voici nos raisons: Nous n'avons jamais été représentés par l'Association des Inuits du Nouveau-Québec; nous n'avons jamais créé cette association; nous n'avons jamais demandé qu'elle soit créée.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La seule association que nous avons créée, ce sont les coopératives. C'est le seul outil de rassemblement que nous avons créé. Nous les avons créées en utilisant nos connaissances, nos propres moyens et nous les avons bâties au fur et à

mesure de notre développement, par l'argent qu'elles produisaient.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous avons créé la coopérative; c'est la seule forme d'association que nous avons créée. Nous n'avons jamais eu besoin d'aucune autre sorte d'association. C'est là une des raisons.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous voudrions que vous sachiez clairement que nous n'avons jamais demandé que cette Association des Inuits du Nouveau-Québec soit créée; nous n'avons jamais mandaté personne pour qu'elle soit créée et, de surcroît, nous n'avons jamais mandaté cette association pour nous représenter au moment des négociations.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ainsi, nous n'avons jamais mandaté cette association pour négocier la convention et nous n'avons été qu'informés qu'il y avait eu effectivement entente au moment de la signature de l'entente de principe. Voilà qu'on a découvert qu'il y avait eu une entente de nature globale.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À ce moment-là, nous avons rappelé à notre mémoire l'effort qu'avaient déployé quotidiennement nos ancêtres, ceux qui sont venus avant nous, sur une terre extrêmement froide où il n'y a pas d'agriculture pour fournir de la nourriture, les efforts qu'ils ont déployés pour nous.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Quand nous avons compris que, par le truchement de la Convention de la Baie James, nous avons été vendus, nous avons été très blessés au fond de notre être.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous avons compris que nous avons été vendus en prenant connaissance, après coup, que, à chaque fois que nous voulions exprimer nos besoins et nos demandes, directement au gouvernement celui-ci ne pouvait plus nous écouter.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est ainsi depuis la Convention de la Baie James.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pourtant, avant cette convention, on s'entendait et on pouvait bien discuter avec le gouvernement, mais, depuis la convention, et à cause de celle-ci, nous ne pouvons plus communiquer ainsi avec le gouvernement. Quand on va voir le gouvernement, il nous dit: Allez donc plutôt voir la Corporation Makivik.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vous pose la question: Si on vous vendait, accepteriez-vous d'aller discuter avec ceux qui vous ont vendus?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: On dit de nous que nous devrions aller à l'encontre des lois pour satisfaire à notre refus de la Convention de la Baie James, mais vous devez bien comprendre quand on va vous dire ce qui suit.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous ne pouvons, en aucune façon, prendre le contrôle des choses qui ne viennent pas de nous, des choses que nous n'avons pas créées, des choses dans lesquelles nous ne pouvons pas nous reconnaître.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).
(20 h 45)

M. Filotas: Toutes les choses qui viennent de la convention, toutes les choses qui sont données par la convention et qui sont données soi-disant pour notre bien, pour assurer notre représentation, assurer notre place dans le monde, nous ne pouvons pas les prendre, nous ne pouvons pas les mettre en motion ou en action, nous ne pouvons pas les faire développer.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous savons que les lois n'ont pas de coeur. Les lois ne sont pas faites par amour.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et les lois n'ont pas de pensée.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous vous demandons de réfléchir pour voir de quelle façon des lois plus aptes et qui répondent mieux aux aspirations des Inuits pourraient être adoptées.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, si on pouvait établir une véritable base, une base juste sur laquelle nous pourrions travailler ensemble afin que nous puissions faire cela, afin que nous puissions nous entendre, il faudrait que la chose suivante soit créée: il faudrait que les Inuits puissent avoir un gouvernement avec le pouvoir de faire des lois sur les choses qui nous concernent, qui nous touchent, les choses dont on se sert quotidiennement.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous considérons qu'il faudrait qu'on puisse être capables de faire des lois au sujet de notre propre vie, au sujet de notre travail, au sujet de la chasse, de l'éducation, de la langue, de la culture, de la trappe, en somme, tout ce qui touche notre vie à nous.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: C'est seulement si nous pouvons avoir un tel gouvernement que nous allons pouvoir créer des relations entre vous et nous qui vont être normales.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Vous devriez sûrement comprendre cela, étant donné que vous êtes vous-mêmes un gouvernement à qui on n'a pas arraché le pouvoir de légiférer, d'adopter des lois dans des domaines importants.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce projet pourrait être financé en bloc suivant les besoins déterminés par le gouvernement du nord lui-même pour la région.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous savons qu'il y a au Canada une habitude, une façon de faire par laquelle le gouvernement fédéral fait des

paiements de péréquation aux provinces chaque année.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pour notre gouvernement, celui qu'on voudrait mettre sur pied, le financement pourrait être fait de la même façon, notre gouvernement étant sous la juridiction du gouvernement québécois. Le financement pourrait se faire selon le principe de la péréquation.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette façon de procéder, les principes de ce mode de financement pourraient être appliqués au gouvernement du Nouveau-Québec, le gouvernement que nous appelons pour le moment le gouvernement Amamatisivik. C'est le nom que les anciens donnaient au territoire. Les besoins budgétaires annuels de notre gouvernement pourraient être comblés par ce mode de financement tout en tenant compte du per capita, du nombre de gens.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ces sommes d'argent devraient être versées au gouvernement du Nouveau-Québec sans que les dépenses soient déterminées d'avance par le gouvernement du Québec ou par le gouvernement fédéral. Le gouvernement du Nouveau-Québec serait le seul à pouvoir décider de la façon d'établir ses priorités et de la façon dont ces sommes d'argent seraient dépensées. Maudit que ça va mal ce soir!

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Ça ne va pas si mal, on suit.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Quel est le dicton? "Jack of all trades and master of none." C'est à peu près ça.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je ne sais pas si c'est une bonne traduction, mais on suit votre traduction.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pourquoi dit-on des Inuits qu'ils ne semblent pas être capables de prendre leurs responsabilités? Même s'ils voulaient les prendre, ils ne peuvent pas les prendre. Pourquoi? Parce que les bases et la définition des responsabilités sont légiférées par d'autres que les Inuits.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: L'organisation, la forme que doit prendre un tel gouvernement devrait être plus rationnelle et devrait coûter moins cher que ce qui existe présentement.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Prenons comme exemple l'organisation de ce qu'on appelle présentement le gouvernement régional du Nouveau-Québec, ou regardons encore la façon dont sont organisés tous les divers organismes issus de la Convention de la Baie James. On se retrouve dans une situation qui n'a aucun bon sens, on se retrouve dans une situation où ces associations, ces organismes existent séparés l'un de l'autre tout en prenant beaucoup d'argent pour leur fonctionnement, des sommes qui pourraient pourtant être mieux employées pour le développement des Inuits si seulement les lois le permettaient.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce que nous demandons peut vous paraître énorme; pourtant, nous ne croyons pas que ce soit énorme. C'est très simple, nous reconnaissons que c'est de cela dont nous avons besoin et il serait très simple de mettre cela sur pied.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous voulons que vous compreniez très bien. Nous allons à tout jamais demander, jusqu'à ce qu'on puisse le mettre sur pied nous-mêmes, un tel gouvernement qui sera capable de nous représenter pleinement.
(21 heures)

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous avons besoin d'un gouvernement que nous-mêmes avons mis sur pied, un gouvernement qui respecterait nos besoins, notre culture - deux fois le mot "culture" - qui respecterait notre culture.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il me semble que c'est très facile de comprendre que, si on nous donne un gouvernement qui vient d'ailleurs que de nous ou bien si, à tout jamais, on adopte des lois pour nous, il n'y aura aucune façon de sauvegarder notre culture.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous ne voulons pas être réduits à n'être que des mains-d'oeuvre pour assurer l'application des lois adoptées par un gouvernement qui n'est pas le nôtre. Si on doit faire cela, c'est sûr et certain que nous allons perdre notre culture et ce n'est certainement pas cela que nous voulons.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous réalisons très clairement qu'il nous est absolument nécessaire d'avoir un véritable gouvernement où nous pourrions décider pour nous-mêmes des choses qui nous concernent.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, si nous réussissons à avoir un tel gouvernement, tout le monde, tous les habitants de ce territoire d'Amamatisivik vont avoir le droit de vote, de participer aux élections. Il n'est pas question, du tout, d'exclure ou de léser quiconque.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vous demande de réfléchir un peu. C'est quoi exactement, la somme d'argent qui est dépensée par les deux gouvernements au Nouveau-Québec? C'est quoi, la somme exacte? Est-ce que le calcul a été fait?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Est-ce que les organismes qui ont été créés pour les Inuits, supposément pour les Inuits, ont été comptés? Combien d'organismes y a-t-il?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et les employés de ces organismes, est-ce que leur nombre a déjà été compté?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et ce que nécessitent tous ces employés, leurs salaires et autres dépenses, est-ce que cet argent a déjà été comptabilisé?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Sait-on exactement quel est le montant des dépenses de fonctionnement de tous ces organismes?

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous vous demandons de réfléchir à cela, car il est clair que nous devons avoir un tel gouvernement qui permettrait non seulement une organisation plus rationnelle et plus efficace, mais qui pourrait aussi mieux agir et dans l'intérêt des Inuits, et dans votre intérêt.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Voilà donc les pensées, les conclusions auxquelles nous sommes arrivés aujourd'hui; nous vous les présentons.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Y a-t-il d'autres intervenants?

M. Filotas: M. Tamusi Kumak voudrait ajouter quelque chose.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Tamusi Kumak.

M. Kumak (Tamusi): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Tamusi voudrait d'abord poser une question: Est-ce que la loi 28 sur la chasse, la pêche...

M. Kumak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: ...s'applique aux Inuits?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Quelle loi? On parle de chasse et de pêche.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Kumak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).
J'ai un peu de difficulté à comprendre.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche.

M. Chevette: Je vais risquer une réponse, en tout cas. Si elle ne vous satisfait pas, vous reposerez votre question. Si vous parlez du chapitre 28 qui a créé la Loi sur la conservation de la faune, effectivement,

cela s'applique à tout le monde, sauf que, bien sûr, les Inuits ont le droit en tout temps à la chasse et à la pêche de subsistance. Mais, s'il est prouvé qu'il y a exagération, que cela dépasse les normes de la subsistance, ils sont passibles d'infraction, oui. C'est exact, elle s'applique, sauf qu'on tolère toujours, aux fins de subsistance, la chasse et la pêche.

M. Filotas: Suivant la convention, c'est cela?

M. Chevrette: À l'intérieur de la convention, c'est la même chose.

M. Filotas: À l'extérieur de la convention, c'est la même chose?

M. Chevrette: À l'intérieur comme à l'extérieur. On dit toujours que vous avez le droit de chasser et de pêcher, conformément à vos lois, aux fins de subsistance, mais à l'extérieur ou à l'intérieur des terrains conventionnés.

M. Filotas: D'accord. (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Kumak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Utamak (John): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Kumak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Si la convention reste dans sa forme actuelle, nous allons nous trouver dans une situation, dit Tamusi comme celle que j'ai décrite, à un moment donné, cet été, alors que deux individus responsables du programme de revenu garanti pour les pêcheurs, chasseurs et trappeurs au Nouveau-Québec sont venus nous voir. On leur a écrit ce qui suit. Tamusi lit le texte de la lettre: il dit que les animaux - nous le savons très bien - ne restent pas toujours à la même place. Ils se déplacent d'un lieu à l'autre et c'est ainsi, en les suivant et en les chassant, qu'à travers les âges nous avons réussi à survivre en les suivant partout: sur la terre, sur les banquises, sur les rivières, etc.
(21 h 15)

M. Kumak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous, les Inuits qui vivons ici sur le territoire, nous connaissons très bien les animaux. Nous savons que les animaux agissent, se déplacent, ont des habitudes qui sont régies comme par des lois. Ce n'est pas fait au hasard. Les animaux ne réagissent pas tous de la même façon; ils

ont chacun leurs habitudes propres, habitudes que le Créateur, celui qui a créé les animaux, leur a données. Et nous, les Inuits, nous connaissons très bien leurs coutumes.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt):** M. Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette question qui a été posée, elle a été posée parce qu'elle se rapporte à une chose d'une importance fondamentale pour les Inuits. Elle a parfaitement sa place dans le contexte de ce que nous venons de présenter car nous croyons que c'est un domaine dans lequel notre gouvernement devrait avoir le pouvoir de légiférer. Alors, nous vous demandons - parce que le temps est limité, comme vous le savez - si vous avez des questions quant à l'essence de ce que nous venons de vous présenter.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt):** M. le député de Duplessis.

M. Perron: Si vous le permettez, M. le Président, je voudrais demander à M. Filotas de bien vouloir demander à M. Kumak de reposer la question qu'il a posée tout à l'heure, car il y a une ambiguïté entre la loi 28 et la loi 24. Alors, si vous pouviez demander à M. Kumak de reposer sa question pour que le ministre puisse y répondre.

M. Chevrette: Je pense que je pourrais peut-être répondre tout de suite parce que, de la façon dont il a posé la question, il n'a pas besoin de la poser à nouveau; je l'ai comprise.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt):** M. le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche.

M. Chevrette: Sur les terrains conventionnés, autrement dit les terrains couverts par la Convention de la Baie James, c'est un droit de chasse et de pêche exclusif, y compris certaines modalités en ce qui concerne les pourvoiries. S'ils sortaient du territoire ils tomberaient dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest: je suppose que vous ne chassez pas vers le sud. S'ils chassaient vers le sud, par hasard, ils tomberaient en territoire non conventionné et ce serait la loi de la conservation du Québec qui s'appliquerait. Cela ne peut pas être plus clair.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt):** M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Je veux seulement ajouter:

il y a des catégories...

Une voix: Oui, mais là, ils ne comprendront plus rien.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Donc, M. Filotas, si vous voulez traduire, s'il vous plaît.

M. Filotas: Est-ce que je pourrais faire un petit commentaire?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Oui.

M. Filotas: C'est que, avec cela, on ne sait pas de quelle loi 28 on parle.

M. Chevrette: C'est la loi concernant les droits de chasse et de pêche dans les territoires de la Baie James et du Nouveau-Québec. Le projet de loi 28 donne l'exclusivité de chasse et de pêche aux Inuits sur les terrains conventionnés, les territoires de la Convention de la Baie James. À ce moment-là, des normes ont été établies. C'est vous-mêmes qui faites les règlements pour les pourvoies. Vous octroyez même des propositions à un individu qui veut aller pêcher sur ce territoire: je suis déjà allé avec la permission d'un chef de bande. Donc, je sais comment cela fonctionne. C'est lorsqu'ils sortent du territoire... Naturellement, je pense que vous allez vers le nord et que vous tombez dans les Territoires du Nord-Ouest qui ne sont pas couverts par le Québec, mais par le Canada. Si vous alliez vers le sud, il est bien évident que ce seraient des terrains non conventionnés. Si vous sortez en dehors du territoire couvert par la convention, là, c'est la Loi sur la conservation de la faune qui s'applique.

M. Filotas: Donc, les droits de chasse et de pêche sont définis par la convention et, à l'extérieur de cela, c'est l'autre.

M. Chevrette: Les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, c'est le Canada et au sud, c'est nous.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Avant que vous traduisiez ce que le ministre vient de dire, je veux clarifier ceci. Il y a trois zones, il y a trois catégories de territoire. Il y a la catégorie 1 qui est une zone complètement et exclusivement contrôlée par les autochtones. Il y a la catégorie 2 qui comprend les territoires sur lesquels les autochtones ont l'exclusivité du droit de chasse et de pêche, y compris le droit d'autoriser des non-autochtones à chasser et à pêcher. Ensuite, il y a la zone 3. Cette catégorie couvre tout le territoire, tout ce qui n'est pas dans les

zones 1 et 2. C'est l'ensemble du territoire qui a 423 000 milles carrés. Cette zone 3, c'est une zone ouverte aux autochtones et aux non-autochtones. Les autochtones ont le droit de chasse et de pêche dans tout le territoire. Dans la catégorie 3, il y a des espèces qui sont réservées exclusivement aux autochtones. La liste de toutes ces espèces mentionne les ours polaires, dont on se plaignait, les ours noirs, les loups, etc. qui sont réservés aux autochtones. La loi 28 présentée par le ministre est sujette à toutes les restrictions qui sont dans cette entente. Autrement dit, l'entente a préséance sur la nouvelle loi que le ministre vient de faire adopter à l'Assemblée nationale.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. l'interprète, les explications qui ont été données par le ministre et le député de Mont-Royal vous suffisent-elles pour l'instant?

M. Filotas: Il semble, oui, parce qu'ils discutent de leur prochaine intervention.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): D'accord! On pourrait aussi donner la parole au premier ministre et au député de Mont-Royal, à la suite du mémoire que vous avez présenté. Par la suite, on pourrait amorcer une discussion. Est-ce que cela vous irait comme façon de travailler, M. l'interprète?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Est-ce que cela va? Cela va. Donc, je donne la parole au premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je vais essayer d'être le plus bref possible, mais je dois dire que de voir ici les gens qui s'appellent maintenant Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini, cela me rajeunit de 20 ans parce que cela rappelle les gens de Povungnituk, Ivujivik en particulier, que l'on rencontrait il y a 20 ans, dans les années 1962, 1963, 1964 pour la première fois.

Une voix: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Vous avez rencontré les gens de Povungnituk à ce moment-là?

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Oui, en 1962.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Les Inuits de Povungnituk. On disait alors des Esquimaux.

On n'avait pas appris le vrai mot. Les Inuits de Povungnituk nous apprenaient la situation difficile dans laquelle se trouvait leur coopérative - ils avaient découvert la formule coopérative - qui avait été fondée depuis deux ans à ce moment.
(21 h 30)

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Il y a deux ans, cela fait 1960.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): À peu près, oui.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Alors, le Québec a décidé de les aider - c'était la première fois que nous étions mis au courant de la situation dans le Grand-Nord - parce que c'est évident que la formule coopérative est comme un prolongement de leur culture qui est basée sur le partage et sur le développement communautaire, c'est-à-dire sur le sens de la communauté, de la collectivité.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Et, en mars 1964, c'était la première rencontre d'un ministre québécois - c'était votre serviteur qui était ministre des Richesses naturelles - avec les représentants de tous les villages du Nord. Cela s'est passé à ce qu'on appelait Fort-Chimo, à l'époque. Au moins un de ceux qui étaient présents, M. Tamusi Kumak, est encore ici aujourd'hui. Salut!

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Et je veux saluer tous les autres aussi. Je les remercie d'être venus - je ne veux pas nommer tout le monde, mais, enfin, on se reconnaît - en particulier le président, M. Paulusi Sivuak, et tous les autres. Je voudrais simplement rappeler qu'à ce moment, en 1964, nous avions pris des engagements au nom du gouvernement, qui était le gouvernement libéral des années soixante.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je résume ces engagements pris à l'époque. C'était, premièrement, que les Inuits devaient jouer un rôle clé, un rôle essentiel dans le développement du territoire qu'ils habitent.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): C'est ce qui est arrivé après qui est moins drôle.

M. Filotas: Un rôle clé.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Ensuite, c'est peut-être... Pardon.

Une voix: Attendez une seconde.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Ensuite, le système d'éducation pour les Inuits du Nord devait être fondé d'abord et avant tout sur leur identité et sur leur décision de rester au Nord. À ce moment-là, il y avait une sorte de tendance de l'administration fédérale à essayer de les déraciner vers le sud. On ne croyait pas que cela était normal.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Troisièmement, on avait promis aussi - cet engagement a été réalisé du mieux qu'on le pouvait - d'aider les coopératives pour les raisons que j'ai données et comme on le dit en anglais, "no strings attached", c'est-à-dire, s'ils le voulaient, de leur fournir des services techniques. Je crois qu'à l'époque, les caisses populaires avaient donné un coup de main pour aider les coopératives, surtout à Povungnituk et Ivujivik, à résister à l'exploitation de la Hudson Bay Company en particulier qui était... En tout cas, j'aime autant ne pas dire ce que c'était, mais ce n'était pas très beau.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Ensuite, le temps a passé. Il y a eu d'autres gouvernements. Finalement, d'une façon dont on n'est pas responsables, avant notre gouvernement, on a négocié et on a signé avec ceux qui le voulaient la Convention de la Baie James.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Toute la convention.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Cette convention, nous devons la respecter puisque notre gouvernement a hérité des signatures qui ont été appliquées sur le papier et, contrairement à ce que d'autres font parfois,

il faut respecter ces signatures.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Nous comprenons aussi pourquoi vous êtes dissidents. Nous comprenons certains dangers que vous évoquez, le danger de la bureaucratie, du gaspillage et de certaines, appelons cela ainsi, manipulations sophistiquées qui peuvent sortir des structures inventées au moment de la convention.

M. Filotas: Je ne saisis pas trop votre dernière phrase.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je résume, en fait, certains arguments qu'ils ont dits. Nous comprenons, à partir du fait qu'ils sont dissidents, qu'ils ont saisi une chose qui nous inquiète, nous aussi, c'est-à-dire le danger d'une bureaucratie et de beaucoup de gaspillage dans ces structures inventées par la convention, qui peuvent être manipulées de façon très sophistiquée.

Autrement dit, je pense que quelqu'un a dit: On nous a donné un gros avion et on n'est pas sûr de pouvoir le manoeuvrer. On nous l'a donné avant qu'on ait été capable de le manoeuvrer. Il y en a donc d'autres qui risquent de le manoeuvrer à notre place. Est-ce que c'est clair?

M. Filotas: Cela va. (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).
(21 h 45)

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Il y a le danger même que des parasites professionnels dévorent, de façon excessive, des ressources qui devraient servir, d'abord, au développement et au progrès des Inuits eux-mêmes.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite en inuttituut).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): C'est pourquoi, d'un côté, nous sommes tenus de respecter et d'administrer, conjointement avec les signataires, le mieux possible la convention. D'un autre côté, nous avons, je dois le dire personnellement, beaucoup de respect et d'admiration pour certaines positions de nos interlocuteurs de ce soir, parce qu'ils forcent tout le monde à réfléchir.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite en inuttituut).

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Alors, nous allons réfléchir et vous aller aider, par vos interventions, à la réflexion de tout le monde. Là-dessus, je voudrais vous poser une seule question, mais avant de poser la question, je voudrais simplement souligner

que nous devons remercier beaucoup M. Georges Filotas - il est obligé de traduire cela - qui est d'origine hongroise, qui parle l'une des langues les plus difficiles au monde, le magyar, qui parle aussi le français et l'anglais, on l'a vu, et qui réussit à se débrouiller en inuttituut. Félicitations et merci beaucoup. Ensuite, je poserai ma question. Mais si vous voulez traduire cela et une traduction exacte, s'il vous plaît!

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite). Vous pouvez poser votre question.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Oui, on ne vous fera plus souffrir. La seule question, c'est celle-ci. La situation est très pénible, c'est sûr. C'est compréhensible aussi. Mais est-ce que M. Sivuak ou un des autres pourrait nous dire s'il voit un espoir? Est-ce qu'il y a des relations, quand même, entre les deux groupes, le groupe de la convention et le groupe des dissidents? Est-ce que cela s'améliore et est-ce qu'ils ont l'espoir qu'un jour cette réflexion qu'ils ont poursuivie puisse donner des résultats?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il a répondu à cela de la façon suivante. Je veux vous assurer que, si nous avions un véritable gouvernement, avec des pouvoirs de faire des lois, il n'y a aucun doute que les Inuits du Nouveau-Québec seraient unifiés et que cette division, qui existe présentement, serait oubliée comme si elle n'avait jamais existé.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): J'espère que cela arrivera mais, en attendant, je peux prendre un seul engagement - parce que nous n'avons pas le droit de décider pour eux - c'est que nous allons continuer à soutenir, comme s'ils étaient bénéficiaires - je crois que c'est normal - la population que représente le Tungavingat Nunamini, c'est-à-dire les gens de Povungnituk, Ivujivik et de Salluit. Il n'est pas question de les laisser tomber.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il vous pose une question à

son tour. Si les deux factions qui existent présentement au Nouveau-Québec décident de travailler ensemble pour la création d'un tel gouvernement, est-ce que vous pourriez leur dire: Bon, allez-y?

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Ma réponse, c'est oui.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Merci, M. le Président. Le premier ministre nous a informés que, quand il était ministre des Ressources naturelles du gouvernement libéral de 1960-1962, il avait pris certains engagements envers les Inuits.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Principalement il y en avait trois: l'engagement que les Inuits devaient jouer un rôle clef dans le territoire, que le système d'éducation devait être fondé sur l'idée de rester dans le Grand-Nord et, troisièmement, il leur avait promis d'aider les coopératives "no strings attached", sensiblement pour contrer l'exploitation de la Hudson Bay.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).
(20 heures)

M. Ciaccia: Je voudrais informer le premier ministre - je suis bien certain qu'il le sait déjà - que c'est un autre gouvernement libéral qui a rempli les engagements que le premier ministre avait pris en 1962 par l'entente de la Baie James, parce que les Inuits jouent maintenant un rôle clé. Quant à la question de l'éducation, ils ont la commission scolaire Kativik et, quant à la question d'aider les coopératives, ils ont maintenant la société Makivik qui est suffisamment financée, non seulement pour contrer la Hudson's Bay dans le Grand-Nord, mais pour l'acheter.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Il y a certains propos du premier ministre qui, je l'espère, ne seront pas mal interprétés par quiconque, quand il a dit que son gouvernement avait hérité de l'entente et qu'il devait la respecter. Son

gouvernement en a hérité, c'est vrai, mais, quand il était dans l'Opposition, son gouvernement a donné son entier appui à l'entente de la Baie James.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Notre gouvernement, dans l'Opposition?

M. Ciaccia: Non, quand le Parti québécois était dans l'Opposition, pour être plus précis, il a appuyé l'entente entièrement.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Et, quand le premier ministre parle de la bureaucratie et du danger que des parasites professionnels puissent utiliser les ressources qui ont été mises à la disposition des autochtones, je suis certain qu'il ne fait pas allusion aux centaines d'autochtones qui travaillent pour ces organismes. Ce ne sont pas des organismes qui ont été imposés aux autochtones, ils ont été demandés par les autochtones eux-mêmes, la commission scolaire, la question du gouvernement régional. Ce n'est pas le gouvernement ou l'autre partie, la Société d'énergie de la Baie James ou Hydro-Québec qui ont imposé ces organismes. Ils ont été créés à la demande même des autochtones, sauf les dissidents, mais ceux qui ont signé et qui font partie de l'entente.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Le premier ministre n'était pas ici hier soir. La Société Makivik a présenté un mémoire et elle a témoigné que, des 60 000 000 \$ qu'elle a déjà reçus, le capital est encore intact. Cela, pour démontrer comme cela a bien été administré jusqu'à présent.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Vous parlez de l'entente de la Baie James, vous dites ne pas être d'accord avec l'entente. Je suis au courant que vous ne l'êtes pas, vous avez fait valoir votre point de vue en 1975, à la commission parlementaire. Vous êtes revenus, je crois, en 1978. Je crois que c'était M. Filotas qui était interprète à ce moment-là. Je dois aussi l'en féliciter.

Il y a eu une commission parlementaire sur les coopératives et la Société Makivik. Une autre fois, les dissidents de vos communautés sont venus nous informer qu'ils n'étaient pas d'accord avec les conditions de l'entente de la Baie James.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Après l'étape de 1978, de quoi avez-vous parlé?

M. Ciaccia: Il y a eu une commission parlementaire où vous avez, encore une fois, fait valoir votre point de vue.

M. Filotas: Est-ce que vous avez dit quelque chose là-dessus, par la suite?

M. Ciaccia: Non.

M. Filotas: D'accord. Continuez.

M. Ciaccia: Quand vous avez comparu devant la première commission parlementaire, en 1975, vous n'étiez pas d'accord avec les conditions de l'entente. Il y avait une clause dans l'entente selon laquelle, dans les quatre mois suivants la signature de la convention, celle-ci devrait être soumise aux Cris et aux Inuits pour fins de consultation et de confirmation, et ce, d'une façon acceptable au Canada. Autrement dit, on savait qu'il y avait certaines dissidences, on voulait s'assurer qu'il y aurait une consultation et un vote sur l'entente et on n'a pas pris la section 2.16. On a stipulé que ce devait être acceptable au Canada pour ne pas qu'il y ait de conflit d'intérêts au Québec.

Subséquentement, il y a eu une consultation, un vote et une ratification. Pourriez-vous nous donner le pourcentage de ceux qui ont voté et le pourcentage de ceux qui ont voté pour l'entente?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Ciaccia: Avez-vous fini de traduire?

M. Filotas: Oui.

M. Ciaccia: Juste une dernière question. Est-ce qu'il est possible - je pense que le premier ministre a posé la question, mais je n'ai pas saisi tout à fait la réponse - d'avoir des relations de travail avec les non-dissidents, ceux qui travaillent pour appliquer l'entente? Est-ce qu'il y a des projets spécifiques sur lesquels les membres de votre communauté travaillent avec les autres communautés dans l'application de l'entente?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue

inuite).

(20 h 15)

En réponse à votre première question, M. Ciaccia, les gens de Povungnituk, d'Ivujivik et une grande partie de la population de Sagluc n'ont pas participé, n'ont pas voulu toucher à ce vote, pour ne pas utiliser le mot "référendum".

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À ce moment-là, cette convention paraissait très bonne pour les Inuits du Nouveau-Québec.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Mais aujourd'hui nous sommes divisés, nous, les gens qui vivons là-bas. Nous sommes divisés par la création de cette convention et par ce que cette convention a créé elle aussi.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: 90%?

M. Sallualuk: 90%. (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et, en guise de réflexion...

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En guise de réflexion sur ce que M. Ciaccia a dit à propos des 60 000 000 \$ qui sont encore intacts... là ici c'est très bien; il a vu qu'en dépit de ces sommes, en dépit de l'existence de nombreux organismes, le taux de chômage dans le Nord est incroyable: il frise les 90%.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, il est clair - nous sommes arrivés à cette constatation-là - que nous et ceux qui ont accepté dans le temps la convention de la Baie James, nous devons nous concentrer à changer cette situation.

M. Ciaccia: Juste une question.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Quand nos invités ont mentionné qu'ils voulaient un véritable gouvernement afin de faire leurs propres lois et ont demandé au premier ministre, si votre groupe se joignait aux autres groupes d'Inuits, s'il serait prêt à accepter ou à

mettre en place un tel gouvernement, le premier ministre a semblé répondre oui. Afin qu'il n'y ait pas encore de faux espoirs et pour ne pas qu'on revienne plus tard sans savoir exactement est-ce qu'on pourrait demander au premier ministre ce que représenterait ce gouvernement que vous avez accepté? Les groupes autochtones demandent la souveraineté sur leur territoire. Est-ce que cela comprend une souveraineté sur leur territoire?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Si vous voulez traduire en premier...

M. Ciaccia: Traduisez.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue)

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le premier ministre.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Je ne voudrais pas que l'Opposition libérale - c'est une mise en garde que je fais - se serve de cette perspective pour en faire un ballon partisan. Première remarque. Franchement, je ne suis pas venu au monde hier.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît:

M. Lévesque (Taillon): C'est une première chose. Je m'excuse, je n'ai pas interrompu le député de Mont-Royal, et je vais dire ce que j'ai à dire. Je ne voudrais pas - simple remarque - que les libéraux cèdent à la tentation habituelle de transformer les propos que j'ai tenus sur un sujet aussi important en ballon partisan. Première chose.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite)

M. Lévesque (Taillon): J'ai entendu les représentants de Tungavivat Nunamini dire: Ce que nous voulons, c'est un gouvernement autonome sous la juridiction du Québec, faisant partie du Québec. Est-ce que je me suis trompé?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite)

Vous ne vous êtes pas trompé.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Si je ne me suis pas trompé, ce que j'ai dit tout à l'heure signifie ceci. C'est simple, si l'unité revient chez les Inuits dans le sens d'une autonomie à l'intérieur du Québec qui leur permettrait de mieux administrer leurs affaires, de faire les lois dans les domaines qui les concernent

directement, d'organiser leur vie, nous serions immédiatement prêts à en parler avec eux et à accepter immédiatement la perspective. On pourrait négocier sur cette base, quand ils le voudront.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite)

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Nous serons disponibles n'importe quand, mais c'est à eux de décider.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Je voudrais assurer le premier ministre qu'il n'était pas question de faire un ballon politique ou de la partisanerie politique. Je faisais référence au comité fédéral qui vient de publier un rapport sur le "Indian or Native Self-Government" qui appelle cela l'autonomie politique. Je voulais que le premier ministre précise ses propos, ce que lui entend par un gouvernement tel que demandé par les Inuits. Ce n'est pas une question de partisanerie. Je veux seulement qu'on sache exactement ce que le premier ministre avait en vue.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): On a toujours les plus pures intentions, mais quand même c'est mieux d'en parler un peu.

M. Ciaccia: On s'en parle.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Deuxièmement, demain probablement, si on finit demain, on pourra répondre de façon générale en partie aux demandes qui ont été faites depuis le début, c'est-à-dire les éléments d'une résolution possible devant l'Assemblée nationale. Je pense que, peut-être, ce sera plus précis à ce moment.

M. Ciaccia: On a même offert au premier ministre notre consentement même si c'est passé les délais.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): D'accord. Oui.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Pour permettre à M. Filotas de traduire.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Bonne chance.

M. Filotas: Je n'ai pas compris le sens exact de votre dernière intervention.

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Très simplement, je disais que peut-être certaines choses seront un peu plus claires demain si nous pouvons - je ne le sais pas encore - très bientôt, peut-être demain, expliquer un peu la façon dont on présenterait une résolution sur les droits des Inuits et des Indiens à

l'Assemblée nationale avant la fin de décembre.

M. Filotas: Je ne sais pas si c'est la fatigue là, mais est-ce que vous dites...

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Écoutez...

M. Filotas: Cela dépend de vous. Quand vous parlez de demain, voulez-vous préciser les choses avec ces gens?

M. Lévesque (Taillon): Non, ce serait d'une façon générale, mais cela s'appliquerait à eux aussi certaines des choses qu'on aura à dire si on peut les dire demain parce que cela dépend un peu de certaines discussions qu'on a avec tous nos interlocuteurs. Écoutez, pour simplifier les choses, est-ce que je pourrais dire ceci? Cette idée de l'autonomie qui a été évoquée par le comité fédéral, sans entrer dans le détail, cela nous paraît être la voie de l'avenir pour les Inuits comme pour les autres populations autochtones du Québec. Il s'agit de savoir comment on définit ensemble cette autonomie.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je me permets de vous dire que, sur proposition du premier ministre, acceptée par l'Opposition, nous aimerions faire une pause de cinq minutes, pour vous-même, M. Filotas, et pour chacun parce que nous sommes ici depuis vingt heures. C'est une pause pour tout simplement suspendre la séance cinq minutes et vous reviendrez avec la réponse par la suite. Est-ce que cela vous va?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

(Suspension de la séance à 22 h 32)

(Reprise de la séance à 22 h 50)

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît! Veuillez prendre place. À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît!

Nous reprenons les audiences avec le groupe précité, Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini.

À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît!

La parole est au groupe. Je crois que c'est M. Eliyassi Sallualuk qui a demandé la parole et nous avons convenu ensemble que, dans cinq minutes, nous devrions pouvoir terminer. M. Eliyassi Sallualuk.

M. Sallualuk: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: M. Sallualuk dit que les

gens de son groupe vous remercient d'avoir eu l'occasion de présenter le fond de leur pensée, ce qu'ils veulent vraiment pour le Nouveau-Québec. Ils sont heureux aussi que vous ayez écouté attentivement. Ils sont surtout très heureux du fait que la question qu'ils ont posée a reçu une réponse favorable. Ils remercient les membres de la commission et tous ceux qui sont ici aujourd'hui et ils souhaitent à l'avenir qu'on puisse travailler ensemble pour réaliser ce projet.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je vous remercie, M. Filotas, d'avoir bien voulu interpréter dans les deux sens, évidemment. Je crois que cela met un terme à la rencontre avec les Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini.

M. Ciaccia: Je veux remercier le groupe des Inuits Tungavingat Nunamini pour leur présentation et leur dire que nous allons nous assurer que les engagements que le gouvernement a pris ce soir seront respectés. Nous allons faire notre possible pour appuyer la question et la réponse que le premier ministre vous a donnée.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, au nom du parti ministériel, je veux aussi remercier nos invités. Je veux les assurer que le premier ministre, M. Lévesque, que vous connaissez depuis plusieurs années, a depuis longtemps pris l'habitude de tenir ses engagements, que l'Opposition le surveille ou non. Je vous souhaite une bonne nuit et un bon retour dans le Grand-Nord. Merci.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): ...

Nous appelons maintenant l'Administration régionale Kativik. Pendant que le groupe s'avance à la table, comme nous avons dépassé depuis déjà 55 minutes l'heure qui avait été prévue pour la fin de cette commission, soit 22 heures, je présume qu'il y a consentement pour rencontrer l'Administration régionale de Kativik. On va terminer vers quelle heure? Essayons d'en arriver...

M. Ciaccia: Avant de recommencer la prochaine séance demain matin.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Donc, il y a consentement pour terminer le plus tôt

possible, mais après avoir entendu le groupe de l'Administration régionale Kativik.

M. Filotas: Est-ce que je dois traduire cela?

Une voix: S'il vous plaît, non.

Une voix: Il reste avec nous, il traduit en groupe.

Une voix: Il continue, il traduit en groupe.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je souhaite la bienvenue à l'Administration régionale Kativik. Je demande au président de ce groupe de se présenter et de nommer ceux qui l'accompagnent.

Administration régionale Kativik

M. Keleutak (Josepie): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Mesdames, messieurs, membres de la commission et tous ceux qui sont ici présents en ce moment. Je me présente, je suis Josepie Keleutak, président de l'Administration régionale Kativik. Sont avec moi, à ma droite, M. Charlie Watt, qui est un des négociateurs au sujet de la constitution pour les Inuits et aussi membre du conseil de Fort-Chimo et représentant de la Communauté de Fort-Chimo Kuujjauak, au sein de l'Administration régionale de Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: À droite de M. Charlie Watt, il y a M. Willie Makiuk, qui est mon prédécesseur à titre de président de l'Administration régionale de Kativik. Il est ici, aujourd'hui, en guise de conseiller dans le processus de passation des pouvoirs, car les élections ont eu lieu très récemment.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).
(23 heures)

M. Filotas: À ma gauche, il y a Paulosie Padlayat du village de Salluit, représentant de ce village au sein du conseil Kativik et aussi vice-président du gouvernement régional.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Immédiatement à côté de lui, il y a David Annanack, de Kangiqsualujjuak, connu en français sous le nom de Port-Nouveau-Québec, George-River, et qui lui aussi fait partie du conseil de Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il y a Angnatuic Nassak de la communauté de Kangirsuk, qui lui aussi fait partie du conseil de Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il y a Paulosie Napartuk de Kuujjuarapik, aussi membre du conseil de Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En dernier, je voudrais mentionner Mark R. Gordon de Fort-Chimo, de Kuujjuak, vice-président de la Société Makivik, qui nous accompagne.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous vous remercions de nous offrir cette occasion de nous exprimer à l'occasion de cet examen des politiques gouvernementales au sujet des autochtones. Alors, nous allons vous présenter le mémoire que nous avons préparé pour l'occasion. Avant de commencer, Josepie vous avise que les gens assis avec lui à cette table vont, eux aussi, contribuer à certaines choses dans le courant de la soirée, particulièrement Charlie Watt.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, c'est à la conférence constitutionnelle tenue à Ottawa au mois de mars dernier que le premier ministre du Québec, M. Lévesque, a déclaré qu'il était prêt à discuter du concept d'autonomie régionale dans le cadre de la constitution québécoise.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Or, avant d'entamer un tel débat, nous devons signaler à la présente commission que nous avons de grandes affinités avec les Inuits du Labrador et des Territoires du Nord-Ouest, affinités ancestrales, culturelles, sociales et autres.

Le Québec doit donc reconnaître que certains droits constitutionnels en ce qui concerne des sujets d'ordre collectif dans l'article sont pour nous des garanties de survie.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cela dit, il est loisible de croire que les objectifs que nous formulons dans le débat constitutionnel seront acceptables, autant sur le plan fédéral que provincial, pour autant qu'on n'atteigne pas l'intégrité même de ces gouvernements.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En contrepartie, notre intégrité aussi sera mesurée, mais sur la légitimité de notre politique d'autonomie régionale.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Bien que notre évolution historique n'ait été qu'une longue lutte de survivance sur les terres de glace, nous avons quand même transmis nos valeurs de génération en génération et nous nous sommes ainsi donné une culture.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Or, dans un passé très récent, notre culture a été assaillie par des structures étrangères très complexes pour nous. Vos institutions, avec toutes leurs exigences, nous ont lancé le défi de formuler notre autonomie régionale sans toutefois nous donner les moyens de voir à notre développement.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous sommes donc aujourd'hui à appliquer notre système de valeurs au défi qui nous a été lancé. Nous traiterons du sujet en tant que partenaires du gouvernement du Québec et nous chercherons des assises financières solides pour exécuter nos plans.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous entendons ainsi la discussion à partir de deux systèmes de valeurs différents. Nous cherchons une formule de dialogue constructif avec le Québec fondé sur le respect du peuple de la région Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Les Inuits veulent se servir du territoire de la région Kativik selon leurs besoins. Il n'est pas question de miner le pouvoir du gouvernement du Québec. Nous voulons toutefois atteindre notre autonomie régionale dans les plus brefs délais. Nous

demandons au gouvernement du Québec de percevoir nos revendications positivement. Il faut bien comprendre que se font face ici deux peuples majoritaires chez eux, qui doivent se parler d'homme à homme, d'égal à égal. Nous devons en tant que partenaires poursuivre l'esprit de la convention en termes d'assistance technique, de développement et d'autogestion.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En commençant par l'esprit même de la convention, nous devons, pour garantir notre autonomie, nous assurer que les instances décisionnelles soient celles du Nord. Le gouvernement régional, avec le pouvoir que la convention lui a donné, s'assurera que la décision prise pour les Inuits soit fondée sur le système de valeurs de chez eux.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La convention ne pouvant être modifiée ou changée sans le consentement de notre peuple, il devient prioritaire pour le gouvernement régional d'aller chercher auprès de la population le mandat de faire des recommandations pour des changements à cette convention.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce gouvernement doit - le gouvernement dont on parle plus haut - avoir les responsabilités de toutes les choses qui nous concernent, les questions de travail au Nord, les possibilités de faire des budgets avec l'argent et de toutes ces choses qui nous touchent quotidiennement. Nous nous appliquerons entre autres à définir le chapitre 29 de la convention en ce qui concerne la recherche qui en l'occurrence est une activité stérile sur le plan du développement. Nous tâcherons, en tant que responsables de la planification et du développement, de voir à ce que des sommes équivalentes au budget de recherche soient consacrées au développement économique. (21 h 15)

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En ce qui concerne la mise en application de nos politiques d'administration des ressources et autres qui affectent notre comportement, les affaires inuites seront traitées avec toute la rigueur de la loi en ce qui concerne les délais des réponses ministérielles. Ceci engendra l'évolution des principes de négociation qui ont fondé la convention. Nous ouvrons donc

la porte au changement et à la modification de certains aspects de la convention.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Le gouvernement régional doit pouvoir exercer, au nom de la province, tous les pouvoirs dont a besoin une collectivité pour conserver, reproduire, mobiliser et mettre en valeur ses ressources.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pour ce qui est de nos ressources humaines, nous voulons nous assurer que notre main-d'œuvre sera en mesure de poursuivre un travail adapté aux besoins immédiats et futurs de la collectivité. Étant responsable de la planification et de la formation de la main-d'œuvre, le gouvernement régional veillera à l'intégration de la main-d'œuvre inuite dans toutes les sphères de l'activité locale. En somme, notre politique de développement veillera à l'amélioration des équipements, de la technologie et de l'éthique du travail propre au maintien et à l'évolution de notre mode de vie.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Dans le but d'amorcer la coopération régionale ou provinciale, le gouvernement régional assumera l'ensemble des responsabilités qui lui sont dévolues dans la convention et le gouvernement devra voir à ce que les transferts de pouvoirs se fassent dans des délais raisonnables, surtout en ce qui concerne la main-d'œuvre et l'économie.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Le gouvernement régional se trouve présentement dans l'obligation d'établir, pour le printemps de l'année 1984, une politique d'administration de la faune. Dans un effort de concertation soutenu avec la population et les institutions du Nord, en raison de l'urgence de la situation quant à l'exploitation de la faune, nous établirons une politique concernant l'exploitation du troupeau de caribous et ce, avant le mois de mars 1984. Cette politique devra nous garantir un contrôle sur le site et le degré d'exploitation du troupeau de caribous. De plus, nous concerterons nos efforts sur l'orientation des activités commerciales et de subsistance, en ce qui regarde la chasse, la pêche et le piégeage.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En ce qui touche la constitution, nous insistons pour qu'elle nous garantisse la responsabilité pour la faune et les autres ressources du territoire.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Retenons que la convention a défini nos terres, nos titres et nos droits, et nous a ainsi dépourvus de tout l'appareil culturel, politique et économique propre à notre histoire. Concluons donc que le but du chapitre 29 de la convention, s'il était de garantir le développement, se retrouve aujourd'hui devant le fait qu'il doit élaborer les modalités par lesquelles ce développement peut être réalisé par nos propres institutions.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Réforme des institutions régionales.

Les institutions inuites actuelles sont sur la courbe ascendante de leur évolution, c'est-à-dire que nous n'avons pas encore réalisé notre potentiel avec ces nouvelles structures.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Comme il y a un dédoublement des responsabilités entre le gouvernement central et le gouvernement régional, nous ne pouvons pas administrer le Nord de façon efficace. L'administration régionale doit donc veiller à ce que des décisions favorables à la collectivité inuite soient mises en application, en concertation avec le peuple et les institutions du Nord. Cet esprit de concertation devra être ratifié dans nos droits constitutionnels.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La nature intrinsèque du gouvernement régional requiert une bonne part de subventions. Ainsi, en ayant, d'une part, donné au Nord les pouvoirs en matière de santé, de bien-être, d'éducation et de main-d'œuvre, d'aménagement du territoire, de développement économique, de justice et de police, il faudra aussi, aujourd'hui même, élaborer les modalités de transfert de ces pouvoirs avec, bien sûr, les moyens financiers appropriés. Le financement du gouvernement régional devra être à la mesure de ses responsabilités.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il faudra, dans un esprit

d'ouverture totale, ne conserver au Code civil du gouvernement central que les responsabilités plus efficacement exercées au centre ou absolument essentielles au maintien de l'intégrité de l'État québécois. Laissez au gouvernement régional et à son assemblée d'institution nordique le pouvoir de formuler et d'exécuter leurs propres politiques avec l'ensemble des fonds déjà dépensés ici par les deux gouvernements du Sud. Et que ces fonds soient répartis et indexés per capita et qu'ils soient ainsi fondés sur un partage judicieux de responsabilités territoriales.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Cette formule de péréquation garantira aux Inuits...

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: ...l'usufruit pour toujours des ressources du territoire,

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: ...une formule avantageuse de développement économique pour le territoire...

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: ...et le pouvoir de se gouverner eux-mêmes.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ceci nous semble être une solution satisfaisante à l'éternel problème de nos droits et empêcherait une emprise excessive des fonctionnaires sur la dynamique interne du gouvernement régional.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En tant que porte-parole de la région Kativik, le gouvernement régional assurera une participation avec d'autres groupes autochtones quant à l'élaboration de politiques concernant le milieu arctique. Sa politique de développement cherchera à améliorer la qualité de vie matérielle, sociale et culturelle. Le détail d'une politique régionale de développement visera non seulement les méga-projets, l'énergie, le transport et les communications, mais visera aussi le développement commercial, communautaire et social.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa

langue).

M. Filotas: Au plan municipal, on s'efforcera de décentraliser les fonctions dévolues au gouvernement régional, tout en lui accordant la faculté d'établir des normes minimales dans tel ou tel secteur. Les municipalités devront pouvoir se charger de toutes les tâches en éducation, affaires sociales, aménagement et développement, qu'il n'est pas absolument nécessaire d'exécuter à l'échelle nationale. (23 h 30)

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ceci est le texte d'une résolution qui a été adoptée. "Attendu que nous siégeons pour la première fois avec le nouveau conseil d'administration."

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: "Attendu qu'il nous faut élaborer les mécanismes par lesquels nous aborderons chacun des propos ci-haut."

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je m'excuse énormément, c'est ce qui arrive quand on se fie aux traductions des autres, on ne sait pas où on est rendu.

Je recommence, les attendus du texte de cette résolution.

Attendu que le gouvernement régional...

Attendu que nous siégeons pour la première fois avec le nouveau conseil, que ceci est la première séance du nouveau conseil d'administration;

Attendu que nous devons élaborer les mécanismes par lesquels notre projet énuméré ci-haut devait prendre corps";

"Il est résolu par le conseil régional Kativik d'endosser les déclarations qui précèdent comme étant sa politique de base quant au développement socio-économique et surtout par rapport au développement politique."

L'application de cette politique sera basée sur...

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Le renforcement des juridictions de l'administration régionale par des ordonnances.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La concertation et la mise en place d'une assemblée des institutions du

Nord.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Des audiences publiques de consultation.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Le renforcement de l'exécutif de l'administration régionale afin d'assurer la consultation au niveau communautaire et afin de négocier des ententes dans les divers chapitres de juridiction de l'administration régionale Kativik.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En assurant que le CRD, le Conseil régional de développement Kativik, jouisse de ses pouvoirs de concertation pour assurer le développement d'une politique nordique.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: En nous concentrant sur l'élaboration des modalités propres à la mise en application du chapitre 29 de la Convention de la Baie James et du Nord québécois.

M. Keleutak: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Et nous remercions, en terminant, tous ceux qui cherchent avec nous la concertation dans le développement du Nord du Québec.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je remercie M. Keleutak du mémoire et je donne la parole au ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, je veux remercier M. Keleutak pour sa présentation et remercier tous ses collègues des différentes administrations municipales. J'ai le plaisir de retrouver aussi certains amis que j'avais rencontrés il y a quelques années lors d'une visite au Grand Nord.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lazure: Vous demandez dans votre mémoire au gouvernement de percevoir vos revendications positivement. Je cite une partie de votre mémoire: recevoir vos revendications positivement.

Vous avez sans doute entendu tout à

l'heure les commentaires, les réactions, les paroles du premier ministre, qui a dû malheureusement partir. Je veux simplement, en son nom, vous assurer que notre accueil, notre réaction à votre mémoire sera caractérisée par un esprit très positif.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lazure: Si on essaie d'extraire une tendance générale à l'intérieur de votre mémoire, il y a non seulement un désir de reprendre au maximum vos affaires en main, mais aussi, si je comprends bien, une volonté de réduire le plus possible la machine bureaucratique qui s'est développée depuis quelques années.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lazure: Vous avez entendu comme nous les représentants des communautés qui n'ont pas adhéré à la convention de la Baie James nous exprimer aussi leurs revendications. Fondamentalement, je pense que vos revendications se rejoignent quand vous parlez des deux groupements, quand vous parlez d'autonomie régionale, quand vous parlez d'une plus grande autorité pour la conduite de vos propres affaires.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lazure: Vous avez aussi entendu la réponse du premier ministre lorsqu'on lui a posé la question à savoir si le gouvernement du Québec était prêt à s'asseoir à une table de discussion pour confier une autonomie régionale dans des domaines qui relèvent de vos communautés.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Lazure: Vous avez aussi entendu - et je veux terminer avec cette question - le premier ministre poser la question suivante aux représentants qui vous ont précédés: Quelles sont les chances de rapprochement, quelles sont les chances de, graduellement, dans un avenir prochain, mettre un terme à cette division qui existe? Cette question qui a été posée à vos prédécesseurs, si vous me le permettez... Soyez complètement à l'aise d'y répondre ou de ne pas y répondre, mais je pense qu'il est de l'intérêt du gouvernement aussi, afin de pouvoir voir plus clair dans la situation que vous vivez quotidiennement, d'obtenir votre propre réaction à cette question. En d'autres termes, la question posée par M. Lévesque tout à l'heure, je vous la pose à vous: Quel est le climat actuel, quelles sont les chances de rappro-

chement entre les deux groupes dissidents et conventionnés de la Baie James?
(23 h 45)

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt (Charlie): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Merci, M. le Président, messieurs les députés et tous ceux qui sont ici présents.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Plusieurs années ont passé depuis que nous avons négocié la convention de la Baie James. Plusieurs aspects de cette convention n'ont pas été mis en application comme ils auraient dû l'être. Nous sommes contents d'avoir l'occasion et la chance de vous parler de cette situation.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je veux revenir un peu en arrière pour parler de nos coutumes, de la façon dont nous avons procédé au moment des négociations avec le gouvernement du Québec, le gouvernement fédéral, la Société d'énergie de la Baie James et Hydro-Québec.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: La première chose et la plus importante, c'est notre mandat, soit celui de mettre sur pied un véritable gouvernement, un gouvernement intégral, avec tous les pouvoirs nécessaires. C'était la raison de notre mandat. C'est cela qu'on a voulu créer.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Certains d'entre vous doivent sûrement se souvenir - M. Ciaccia en particulier, puisque c'est avec lui que nous avons négocié dans le temps - que nous nous sommes battus, que nous avons eu de graves différends au sujet du gouvernement régional à ce moment, car nous voulions mettre sur pied un véritable gouvernement, avec tous les pouvoirs nécessaires de décision et d'administration qu'un gouvernement intégral doit avoir, non pas un gouvernement qui soit le simple bras d'exécution du gouvernement québécois.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous savions très bien à ce moment-là que les pouvoirs que l'on avait donnés à ce gouvernement régional - et je

vais les énumérer: pouvoirs d'administration locale, pouvoirs sur le transport et les communications, la justice et la police, la santé et le bien-être, l'éducation, le développement économique, la protection de l'environnement, les ressources et la gestion du territoire - n'étaient que des pouvoirs d'un exécutant et non pas des pouvoirs de décision véritables.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Alors, nous, les Inuits, avons énormément discuté entre nous de ce problème. À plusieurs reprises, nous avons même considéré et pensé à la nécessité de quitter les négociations à cause de ce problème. Nous avons persisté, malgré nos réticences, dans cette direction parce que nous savions que, tôt ou tard, l'insuffisance, ou la non-suffisance, ou la non-pertinence de ces pouvoirs, de la façon que le gouvernement régional était organisé à ce moment, à la longue, deviendrait évidente pour tout le monde.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, nous sommes arrivés à aujourd'hui et, pour en arriver là, nous sommes passés par beaucoup de difficultés. Nous avons essayé beaucoup de choses; nous avons essayé de mettre en application ce que vous nous avez dit d'essayer, mais avec maintes difficultés, entre autres, les problèmes de financement et le manque d'argent pour accomplir le peu de pouvoirs qu'on avait. Il est clair aujourd'hui que cette situation doit cesser.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, pour le moment, ce que nous voulons faire entre nous, Inuits, habitants du Nouveau-Québec, c'est profiter de l'occasion pour mettre un peu d'ordre dans notre demeure. Nous savons que nous ne pouvons faire cela en vous réclamant des choses, pour le moment, puisque cette mise en ordre de notre demeure doit se faire, premièrement, entre nous. Nous devons faire cela afin de savoir où on veut aller au juste, comment nous voulons nous rendre là et ce dont nous avons besoin.

Il est clair que, plus tard, il va falloir que le gouvernement et nous, nous nous rencontrions et que nous fassions face à la question de la création d'un gouvernement propre à nous.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Donc, les membres du Conseil de Kativik ont pris la décision, de réunir, à la fin de janvier 1984, tous les organismes qui existent présentement au

nord, tous les organismes qui, présentement, se partagent et se tiraillent les pouvoirs et les champs de responsabilités, non seulement les organismes qui ont été créés pour les Inuits, mais tous les organismes au nord, afin que nous puissions entreprendre cette mise en ordre de notre demeure. Comment pouvons-nous créer un gouvernement véritable dans la situation actuelle, alors qu'il y a présentement un tiraillement et un éparpillement d'efforts, d'énergies et d'intérêts au nord, avec la multiplication de tous les organismes qu'on connaît. C'est seulement en mettant de l'ordre là-dedans qu'on pourra en arriver à créer un gouvernement à nous.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il y a, dans cette entreprise, quelque chose de très difficile et qui ne sera pas résolu aussi facilement. Ce phénomène dont je voudrais parler est déjà contenu dans la convention et le voici: il vise essentiellement à oeuvrer et essaie de prendre en considération deux champs très difficilement conciliables pour le moment. Ces deux champs sont que certains organismes doivent, à la fois, satisfaire les besoins, les aspirations des autochtones, tandis qu'en même temps, ils doivent aussi s'adresser à la population non autochtone.

C'est un problème de taille, c'est un problème que nous, Inuits du Nouveau-Québec, devons résoudre et auquel nous devons trouver nous-mêmes les réponses. Si nous ne nous en occupons pas, nous ne voyons pas qui d'autre pourrait les résoudre à ce moment-ci.
(minuit)

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue). Our translator is a bit tired; I might as well switch to english now. Basically what I am saying: the remarks that we heard today from the Premier minister, the answers he has given to the dissident communities such as ITN were very much encouraging to hear on our side, because this is one principle that we have tried to push forwards in order for the government authorities to have a clear understanding of what we mean by self-government. This has been going on for a number of years, I am sure you are quite aware of that, and as a matter of fact it goes back to the early 1960's. One of the reasons why we did not come to accept the concept of regional government in the early 1960's is because there was a certain uncertainty related to the constitutional matters, which some of you, people, are fully aware of and also related to the 1912 Extension Act. Because of the ethnic aspects, it has to be sufficiently answered according to the 1912 Extension Act with its appendix to, I believe, the Constitution of Canada.

I do appreciate and thank very much

the ITN that have shown their interest, desire, and opened up the door for us, and made it smoother to stipulate what we have to say. Again I thank ITN once more.

This problem will not be the last one, because - at least - what we would like to be able to accomplish in a very near future is a forum in such a way that people can discuss the issues and make decisions. This is what we are talking about in terms of setting up a forum such as an Assembly for the Inuits, so that collectively we can discuss the matters, item by item if necessary. At least, we will be in the process to think, in our own terms, that we have a better control of our own destiny. I think this is very important to all of you and it is important to us too. Thank you very much.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre du Loisir, de la Chasse et de la Pêche, vous avez demandé la parole.

M. Chevette: Au-delà des pouvoirs que vous recherchez, il y a des problèmes d'ordre pratique et à court terme. Vous administrez présentement le programme de support aux chasseurs et trappeurs inuits. Vous recevez, je crois, au-delà de 1 500 000 \$ ou tout près, ce qui vous permet de payer par localité au moins un salaire plus un autre par tranche de 100 personnes. Il y a des localités qui n'en bénéficient pas présentement. Vous avez la responsabilité de la redistribution. Il n'en demeure pas moins qu'il y a des gens qui n'en bénéficient pas présentement. Que conseillez-vous au ministre, en termes de correctifs concrets, pour cette situation concrète?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

M. Makiuic (Willie): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ces montants d'argent qui sont mis à la disposition des communautés inuites dans le cadre du programme de support pour les chasseurs, les pêcheurs et les trappeurs, sont utilisés présentement par presque toutes les communautés sauf par une qui ne le fait pas par principe, parce qu'elle n'approuve pas la Convention de la Baie James. Présentement, ce qui arrive, c'est que ces montants destinés à cette communauté sont répartis entre les villages qui bénéficient du programme. Ils se répartissent ces sommes dans un cadre de consultation avec les gens du Conseil Kativik. La répartition est décidée par les villages de concert avec le Conseil Kativik.

M. Chevette: Vous oubliez le conseil. Je vous demandais un conseil...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Gordon.

M. Chevrete: Un conseil pour corriger cela.

M. Gordon (Mark R.): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Mark précise certaines choses sur ce qui arrive quand ces sommes ne sont pas utilisées. Premièrement et avant tout, on les offre aux communautés en question et, si elles refusent de s'en servir, on laisse ces sommes de côté pour toute une année au cas où, en cours de route, ces communautés changent d'idée. Une fois l'année terminée et une nouvelle année commencée, alors les villages viennent à nous avec des suggestions et, suivant leurs suggestions, ces sommes sont réparties entre les villages qui, eux, utilisent ces sommes.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: Merci, M. le Président. Avant que ma collègue, la députée de L'Acadie, pose certaines questions à nos invités, je voudrais souhaiter la bienvenue aux membres de l'Administration régionale Kativik. Je vois parmi vous beaucoup de visages familiers. Il y a quelques années qu'on s'est vus, mais l'heure tardive de cette séance me rappelle les séances de négociation qui continuaient tard dans la nuit. Cela me fait vraiment un grand plaisir de vous revoir, je sais que vous avez eu beaucoup de succès sur certains aspects de l'entente, alors que d'autres aspects doivent être améliorés d'après l'expérience que vous avez vécue. Je veux seulement vous dire que j'ai un plaisir particulier à vous revoir ce soir et je vous souhaite encore plus de succès dans vos démarches, dans l'application de l'entente et dans les relations que vous avez avec le gouvernement et avec les différentes communautés du nord.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme la députée de L'Acadie.
(0 h 15)

Mme Lavoie-Roux: Je lis, dans votre mémoire, que, dans un passé très récent, votre culture a été assaillie par des structures étrangères très complexes. Vous demandez, fort légitimement, que les pouvoirs qui sont présentement exercés par le pouvoir central touchant la santé, la police, etc. soient désormais exercés uniquement par le gouvernement régional. C'est l'introduction. C'est le deuxième paragraphe de l'introduction. J'ai la perception peut-être fausse, en lisant votre

mémoire et compte tenu des résolutions que vous avez à la fin, que vous allez reproduire dans le gouvernement régional les structures complexes du gouvernement central que vous condamnez, d'une certaine façon. Est-ce que je me trompe ou si tel est le cas?

M. Filotas: Vous demandez s'ils veulent reproduire les mêmes structures complexes?

Mme Lavoie-Roux: J'ai l'impression, à la lecture de votre mémoire, que les structures complexes que vous avez décrites... Maybe I can go on in English if it might make it easier to understand, because it is so late, you know. What I am saying is that, in the first page of your introduction, you say that your culture was assailed by foreign structures, very complex ones. You are requesting that in certain fields like health, education, police and justice, you do away with the powers of the central structures, referring to the Québec Government ones. I think it is a legitimate request. But when I read your brief, I am under the impression that your regional government - maybe it is a wrong perception I am having - is reproducing the structures that you are rejecting at the Québec level.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Non, ce n'est pas ce que vous dites. Nous ne voulons pas recréer ces structures. C'est justement parce que nous sommes forcés de suivre les pratiques d'un gouvernement qui ne nous appartient pas que nous nous trouvons dans cette situation aujourd'hui. Ce n'est pas ce que nous voulons. Nous voulons baser l'action et l'organisation de notre gouvernement sur ce que les Inuits, sur ce que nos concitoyens sont capables de faire, sur ce qu'ils veulent faire et sur la façon dont ils veulent le faire. Il n'est pas question d'emprunter des solutions et des institutions toutes faites.

Nous savons très bien, par exemple, quel est le problème du service social. Regardez, nous avons un service social qui suit exactement les modèles du Sud, qui applique les principes de base, la philosophie du Sud de la personne humaine, des relations sociales, des solutions aux problèmes sociaux. Imaginez cette structure, ces pratiques appliquées chez nous. Pensez aux conséquences de tout cela sur nos coutumes, sur nos relations sociales, sur la famille des Inuits. C'est un exemple flagrant qui se répète dans tous les domaines. C'est pour cela que nous voulons, entre citoyens du Nouveau-Québec, trouver les solutions, les structures et les moyens que nous jugeons nécessaires.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme la députée de L'Acadie.

Mme Lavoie-Roux: If I do it in English, it is to save you the translation in Inuit. You can do the other translation.

Can I conclude, from what you are explaining to us, that, if you had your own regional government - not the type of institutions that exists presently and that has been imposed to you by the actual central government - an autonomous government, then, you might find yourselves with other types of establishments, institutions or structures than the ones that are described in your brief?

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mr. Gordon.

M. Gordon: I will answer in English to save some time here. The regional government already contains within itself certain powers and, if you read the Kativik Regional Act, it is quite extensive compared to other municipalities in the province.

However, there is a process that we go through in negotiating budgets. We may have the powers written down in theory, but, when it comes to the application, the money that we need to carry out, the funds, are not that forthcoming. What happens is that the budgets that we have to deal with with the Québec Government must be dealt with department by department, in a very piecemeal approach. What we would hope to see is a global budget negotiation that would enable us to have a certain amount of discretion between one program and another so that we could make better improvements on this. Then, that would be a real exercise of our powers.

Every year, we have to face an army of civil servants from the South. If Mr. Lévesque says that we suffer from professional parasites, I would advocate that the Québec Government is probably twice as itchy as we are.

There is also another problem, and that is that there are no established mechanisms between ourselves and the Québec Government when it comes to laws of general application being put on the table, and amending the regional government's authority. These have not been dealt with uniformly. One law will be made to apply automatically to us, for whatever reason - that is not explained to us - and, in another law, we will have an exemption and, again, for reasons we do not know or which were not given to us.

There has to be mechanisms worked out, where the financing would be done on a global basis, so that the people of the region will have some discretion to be able to move funds from one program to another so that

they can choose their priorities and not the priorities perceived by the bureaucracy in the South. We also need a mechanism of consultation for the general laws of application that continuously amend the nature of our regional government.

We also need a process to be able to begin to change the regional government so that it answers more realistically the needs of the people today because it is already becoming out-dated. The people are outgrowing this regional government day by day. There are changes taking place in the region and the Agreement is supposed to be able to be amended and to be changed. We have to see this in order to make things a reality and to make this regional government a real entity of the people.

As it is now perceived, it is merely an administrative link between us and the bureaucracy in the South. In the South, there are special northern sections in each department. There is also a SAGMAI. All these we have to answer to and address. When it comes time for negotiation of budgets, the budgets request are cut by the bureaucracy before they get to the Treasury Board. We are not given the opportunity for the justification for our requests to the Treasury Board. We are not given a chance to have an appeal to the Treasury Board. What is decided is final at the time of the budget requests.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme la députée de L'Acadie.

Mme Lavoie-Roux: I want to thank you. When you referred to some social services or some laws, I know that the law on adoption, for instance, create problems for you and the law on youth protection. I am sure there are laws or other dispositions, for instance, in terms of police and justice in general which do not correspond at all to your way of handling these particular problems.

J'aimerais vous poser beaucoup d'autres questions, mais je pense que vous avez déjà répondu à plusieurs. Je peux vous assurer que ces problèmes nous intéressent beaucoup et que les gens autour de cette table y sont sensibles. Est-ce que ceci fera bouger l'appareil gouvernemental ou le gouvernement? On devrait plutôt dire "les gouvernements" parce que je suis sûre qu'il y a aussi, du côté fédéral, des barrières ou des règles qui vous sont imposées et qui ne correspondent vraiment pas à vos besoins et à vos aspirations. Je peux vous assurer de notre collaboration pour tenter, au moins de corriger certaines de ces difficultés que vous éprouvez avec le gouvernement. Le gouvernement actuel étant ce qu'il est, je ne veux pas en faire une question partisane; ce pourrait être un autre gouvernement et ce serait la même chose. Merci. That is hard to

translate. Excusez-moi.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt)**: Est-ce que vous voulez traduire, M. Filotas?

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite). Qu'est-ce que vous avez dit ensuite?

Mme Lavoie-Roux: J'en ai dit beaucoup. Je pense qu'on pourrait peut-être résumer en disant qu'ils peuvent compter sur la sensibilisation des gens qui sont autour de cette table pour que vos représentations ne tombent pas dans l'oubli, mais qu'elles aient plutôt un suivi.

(0 h 30)

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le **Président (M. Rancourt)**: M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt: Just getting back to the social well-being of the people. (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vais vous donner en guise d'exemple quelque chose qui existe présentement, et vous pourrez voir comment, dans le domaine du service social, les choses ne sont pas correctes et même, on pourrait dire, des injustices sont créées.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Ce que Charlie dit est la chose suivante: Dans l'histoire de n'importe quelle société sur la surface de la terre, les gens n'ont pas une compétence toute faite dès le début pour accomplir ce qu'ils veulent; il y a des compétences qui ne s'acquièrent qu'à longue haleine. Vous-mêmes, ici, c'est-à-dire les Québécois, vous avez votre gouvernement. Vous avez la compétence, en tant que peuple, d'avoir un gouvernement, de diriger vos affaires, d'établir vos priorités, de prendre vos décisions; mais cette compétence-là, vous ne l'avez pas toujours eue. Ce que nous vous demandons aujourd'hui, c'est de regarder les Inuits dans la même perspective: eux aussi sont en train d'acquérir cette expérience, ce certificat de compétence, pour diriger leurs propres affaires. C'est ainsi que nous vous demandons, à travers ces lunettes de l'histoire, de regarder les Inuits.

Le **Président (M. Rancourt)**: M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Puisque nous sommes à parler du certificat de compétence, il y a un autre phénomène que je voudrais signaler à la commission. Il y a présentement des gens

sains de corps et d'esprit, qui ne souffrent d'aucune infirmité, qui possèdent des connaissances et des compétences, qui peuvent travailler et gagner leur vie de leurs mains. Mais parce qu'ils n'ont pas de certificat de compétence, de carte de compétence, tel que requis par les lois du travail qui ont été érigées dans une contexte tout à fait différent, avec toutes les questions de syndicats dont vous êtes au courant, à cause de ces exigences, beaucoup de gens qui pourraient gagner leur vie d'une façon honorable ne peuvent pas le faire, parce qu'ils ne peuvent pas accéder à des postes.

Or, ces mêmes gens qui ne peuvent plus aujourd'hui avoir de "job" habitent des maisons au Nord régies par le programme de la Société d'habitation du Québec. On vient d'ériger un système pour essayer de s'assurer que les gens vont payer leur loyer. N'oublions pas que ce sont des gens qui ne peuvent pas avoir de "job", parce qu'ils n'ont pas de carte de compétence, mais ils doivent payer le loyer. Après un premier avertissement, quand les loyers ne sont pas payés, on coupe l'eau. En deuxième lieu, après avoir coupé l'eau, on coupe l'électricité. Vous savez que les fournaies ont des brûleurs électriques, des moteurs électriques et qu'il fait très froid dans le Nord. Vous devez connaître les conséquences de la coupure d'électricité. Une fois l'eau et l'électricité coupées, on met le bonhomme, qui n'a pas de "job" parce qu'il n'a pas de carte de compétence et qu'il ne peut pas payer son loyer, dehors. C'est la procédure que nos gouvernements locaux doivent appliquer pour nos concitoyens. Pensez-vous que cela a du sens?

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Avec cet exemple - cela s'applique à d'autres domaines aussi - nous croyons fermement que nous sommes capables de trouver des solutions plus justes, plus intelligentes et plus humaines à ce genre de problème.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il paraît que c'est une pratique qui se fait depuis un certain temps. Moi-même, je ne l'ai appris que très récemment. J'ai été abasourdi. Avec le manque de logements qui existe dans le Nord, un individu qui se fait mettre dehors de sa maison, où va-t-il demeurer?

Le **Président (M. Rancourt)**: M. le député de Viger.

M. Maciocia: M. le Président, j'ai une question à poser à M. Watt ou à quelqu'un d'autre de la délégation. J'aimerais savoir

s'il y a eu des rencontres ou des pourparlers avec le groupe dissident pour faire un éventuel front commun vis-à-vis du gouvernement du Québec pour avoir cette autonomie politique dont a parlé tantôt le groupe des dissidents; deuxièmement, si l'autonomie politique telle que perçue par le groupe dissident est la même pour le groupe des Inuits qui sont en face de nous actuellement.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Filotas.

M. Filotas: (S'exprime dans la langue inuite).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Charlie répond ceci: Oui, cela fait longtemps que les Inuits du Nouveau-Québec, de tous les villages, parlent de cette idée de s'ériger un gouvernement à eux. Les discussions qui ont eu lieu dans le Nord remontent même aux années soixante. Cette idée date de cette époque et c'est la même idée encore aujourd'hui. Ce n'est pas une idée neuve. Je voudrais que vous sachiez ceci: Si les problèmes qui existent présentement au Nord ne trouvent pas leurs moyens de résolution par la voie de ce que nous et les gens du Inuit Tungavingat Nunamini voulons mettre sur pied, je vous assure que dans très peu de temps nos mains seront remplies de problèmes et que nous allons être débordés par les conséquences néfastes de cette situation.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je vous remercie. M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: I just want to thank the Kativik Regional Government members. I just want to say one thing to Charlie. You mentioned originally that, when the negotiations were going on, you wanted a regional government in the true sense of the word, and I remember exactly the kind of discussions that we had. Perhaps, what we both did, we did indirectly what many did not want us to do directly, because, if you recall, they just did not want to hear at all about any kind of regional government. So we finally arrived at this formula. But would it not be exact to say that it is not really the formula that you have now that is wrong?
(0 h 45)

I think Mark put his finger on it. It is the budgets and the interference from Québec because the powers have been given to you in this Agreement. You have education, you have a local administration, transport and communications, you have

justice and, according to that, you could even name your own judges. You have social services, health, economic development which can take in a series of things. You have the environment, resources and management of lands. You really have, if the powers that go with these titles would be given to you by Québec, you have the structure. So, isn't - I know people are very tired. We do not want to continue the discussion too long but just - Isn't that really the problem? The structure is there plus the other problems, the other laws. In 1974, we did not have a crazy law like the OCQ which would not let people work who had the ability to work. What can you do? We are not in power now. So, we will have to change that when we get back in.

But, isn't that the real problem? You have got the regional Government, if they give you the budget, if they give you the powers plus an assurance that, before another law would apply to the regional Government, it would be with the consent of the regional Government. Is not that really the solution that you are looking for?

M. Watt: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Charlie Watt.

M. Watt: It is fine for all of us to say that, yes, we two are satisfied with the structure, but, if you only look at the structural side of it, the structural aspect in some ways is going to have to be modified in order to relate more to the territory we represent.

I also would like to say that when you look at only the substance, the principal concepts of the powers, it is easy to say that, yes we do have those powers. But, when you start examining the fine points of the conditions and how far the power goes, that is something else all together different.

And it goes beyond that too, Mr. Ciaccia, that, when the regional Government concept was extracted from the Agreement, put into a specific piece of legislation, the Act itself came out of that. But, if you take a good look at both of the Agreement that deal with the functions and responsibility and the powers attached to it and if you take a look at the Act itself, the two do not match.

M. Ciaccia: They should. Then, we should amend the law to conform to the Agreement. That is what you are telling us.

M. Watt: This is what we are talking about. Hopefully, not too long from now, in a month or two months from now, we will be able to outline the policies in that direction that we want to contemplate and,

then, from that basis we will be putting forward the changes that we want you to make. We want the Government of Québec to make them in relation to the Act and plus the changes that have to be made related to the Agreement.

One other thing too, I would like to go on just to expand a little bit. We have no intention opening up the Convention as such, we would like to deal with them section by section. When you open up the whole Convention, you know what it means, that everybody will be wanting to take a piece out of it. So, we are not prepared to take that risk. We would like to deal with them section by section, when we come forward with some recommendations.

M. Ciaccia: Very wise.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mr. Gordon.

M. Gordon: Just to explain a little bit. I think that, in the area of education, this is the best place where it is illustrated, the question of lack of resources to be able to carry out these powers. The Kativik School Board is given the authority to be able to develop its own curriculum and all of this.

So, the way that the Government of Québec now deals with it is that you get the same curriculum development that any other school is entitled to and you can use the central services that are provided here in Québec City.

Basically, what has been happening in the area of curriculum development, which is very much needed to develop our own instruction in our own languages and culture, is that there is no real money going into that area. That is one area where we have clear authority over and above the Minister, but we have no money, not one penny is given in addition to cover that area. What they tell us is, well, we should use the central services provided in Québec City, not one person in Québec City central services speaks Inuttituut. That is one problem.

Another problem is that we ended up having to use the funds we got to train our Inuttituut instructors to develop some curriculum. So, we are having to do this now. I think this is only one illustration of how this problem works. It goes on and on into other areas. There is always somebody in the South second guessing what our decisions are. Once that second guessing is done, the budgets are set in Québec City with no appeal; we do not even know if our reasons were given to the Treasury Board. And then, once the budgets are set, they are with very very strict guide-lines; it has to be spent exactly in that manner, as prescribed by the Department. It is carved in stone, we cannot move.

M. Ciaccia: Well, maybe the Premier could have stayed here this evening and listen to you instead of just making pious promises about political or regional autonomy. I think he would have heard you and maybe we could have gotten some firm commitments into the actual structures that exist now. That would have been much more useful than grandstanding on regional autonomy within Québec.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre délégué aux Relations avec les citoyens.

M. Lazure: J'allais me réjouir de l'atmosphère de la séance de cette commission jusqu'à ce que le député de Mont-Royal, encore une fois, tombe dans une ornière très partisane. Je pensais qu'il s'était guéri depuis quelques heures...

Mme Lavoie-Roux: M. le Président, une question de règlement.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît, s'il vous plaît.

M. Lazure: Non, on ne va pas faire une question de règlement là.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît.

Mme Lavoie-Roux: Bien oui, mais écoutez. Non, mais...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Mme la députée de L'Acadie.

Mme Lavoie-Roux: ...ça fait quand même partie des procédures de cette Assemblée.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît, madame. M. le ministre. Il y a eu une opinion.

M. Lazure: Alors, M. le Président...

Mme Lavoie-Roux: Bien, c'est une accusation qu'on a faite, M. le Président.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je m'excuse, M. le ministre, allez-y.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, je ne fais aucune accusation, je dis que l'atmosphère avait été jusqu'ici de nature non partisane. Le sujet que nous discutons ne devrait pas provoquer ce genre de remarques. Je referme la parenthèse.

Je veux remercier la délégation qui est dirigée par M. Josepie Keleutak. Je veux remercier le conseil de l'Administration régionale Kativik. Lorsque le premier

ministre a pris l'engagement, ce soir, d'entrer en discussion, lorsque vous serez prêts - à votre demande, l'ensemble du peuple inuit - lorsqu'il a pris cet engagement de modifier l'ensemble de nos relations, de manière que vous puissiez obtenir une autonomie régionale, cet engagement, ce n'était pas pour la galerie, c'était sérieux, c'était un engagement ferme.

M. Ciaccia: M. le Président...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal.

M. Ciaccia: ...je veux juste rectifier quelque chose. Pour le gouvernement actuel, être non partisan, cela veut dire ne jamais rien dire. Je ne suis pas partisan, j'essaie de faire voir au gouvernement comment il devrait appliquer la convention. Mais, si vous voulez qu'on soit ici pour être des perroquets et appuyer le gouvernement dans toutes les sottises qu'il dit et dans toute la partisanerie qu'il fait...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît, M. le député de Mont-Royal. M. le député de Mont-Royal...

M. Ciaccia: Bien écoutez, il y a toujours une limite.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le député de Mont-Royal, je m'excuse.

M. Lazure: M. le Président, j'ai bien entendu le député de Mont-Royal accuser le premier ministre d'avoir fait du "grandstanding".

M. Ciaccia: Oui, oui.

M. Lazure: C'est cette expression que vous avez utilisée.

M. Ciaccia: Exactement et je le redis encore.

M. Lazure: Bon.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): S'il vous plaît. À l'ordre, à l'ordre!

M. Ciaccia: Il aurait dû être ici pour écouter les problèmes que...

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît.

M. Ciaccia: ...ces gens-là ont.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): À l'ordre, s'il vous plaît. M. le ministre.

M. Lazure: Nous avons écouté les

problèmes qui ont été décrits. Nous avons, depuis deux jours, admis l'existence de ces problèmes très réels. Je vais laisser l'interprète, peut-être, traduire ou je vais me traduire en anglais, si vous le permettez.

I was saying that we have listened to you very carefully. We recognize that the problems that you have raised are real problems, whether they are related to budget approval or to the lack of collaboration in such and such a ministry. We admit that you have these problems. We have taken notes; I do not think you expect us to go into the details in trying to give an answer on each one of the problems which you have raised. I do not think that this is the purpose of this committee.

We do have taken notes. We will convey these situations to the Ministry of Housing and to the Ministry of Education, and to the various ministries with whom you have problems currently. To go back to the main objectives of these discussions which, I think, is to find ways of simplifying the budget approval procedures, obviously, not only in your own estimation, you do not have enough money, but also, and perhaps even more important, is the lack of adequate communication and speedy decisions. This current year, I understand that you have a total budget of 72 000 000 \$, of which Québec pays approximately 53 000 000 \$. You find that this is not enough, and you, most likely, can make a good case that this is not enough.

I would like to conclude in saying that this agreement, on which both parties have agreed - and this is what I meant by "non partisan approach" - we are both committed to implementing and improving it. This agreement has been in existence for several years now, and it is just normal that it should be revised. All we are saying to you is that, in this spirit of improving the Agreement, we will be expecting concrete suggestions from you and, hopefully, not only from the Regional administration, but from the whole totality of the Inuit community of the North.

Thank you.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Une dernière intervention, peut-être?

M. Watt: Unfortunately, it is late. Our interpreter is tired.

M. Filotas: Un bref sommaire, M. Lazure, s'il vous plaît, de ce que vous venez de dire.

Une voix: Translate what you have just said.

M. Filotas: In Inuttuuut.

M. Watt: Yes. Unfortunately, I do not know French.

M. Lazure: You have done it before. You can.

M. Gordon: (S'exprime dans sa langue). Is that about everything, Georges? I summed it up.

M. Filotas: I would not have done it better.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. Charlie Watt.
(1 heure)

M. Watt: Mr. Chairman... And again cut down the translation. (S'exprime dans sa langue). The 72 000 000 \$ that you mentioned, I believe that was related to a transfer of agreement between the Federal and the Provincial Governments and applied for nine years. And the 53 000 000 \$, which Mary Simon stated very clearly in her presentation yesterday, that is related to the catch-up programs, it seems a lot of money looking at it strictly by numbers. But you have to understand that during the whole stretch of negotiations, programs that were normally provided for by the Department of Indian Affairs were being cut back. So, for seven years the gradual cut back was taking place, while our communities were getting behind. That is one of the reasons why it seems a lot of money; but it still does not meet the whole needs of the North. We do not feel secure in the sense of having enjoyment, or having an access to the same as everybody else in Canada.

I would like to go a little bit beyond that too, Mr. Chairman. I believe that there is a 6 000 000 \$ capital budget money that has been in a sort of stalemate for the last four years. I can also remember the time when the Department of Indian Affairs had the sole responsibility: the capital budget money - that was about seven years ago - was of 6 000 000 \$. But now, we are dealing with half that money, and a few years have passed. I do not expect anybody to understand the actual implication and detail side of it but we, too, really have problems. We do not expect you to respond to them immediately; but we cannot leave it alone for a long period of time.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): M. le ministre.

M. Lazure: Very briefly, the 53 000 000 \$ coming from the Québec finances is strictly for operating budgets, not investment budgets. This is the yearly disbursement for the fiscal year 1983-1984. Whether it is 52 000 000 \$, or 51 000 000 \$, or 56 000 000 \$ - it is

supposed to be 53 000 000 \$ - the point is that we have to dissociate this constantly from the other investments for capitalization. This is strictly operating budgets.

Now, we also agree that a good part of that money could be better spent if there was more regional authority - we agree with you - if there was less structure, if there was less bureaucracy; we agree with you on that. And we will be quite happy to sit down and receive the fruits of your discussions with your own people. And I think, this evening, both groups we have heard have given rise to very fruitful discussions.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Would you give us your name, please?

Une voix: Paulosie Padlayat.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Pardon? M. Padlayat.

M. Padlayat (Paulosie): (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Il est souhaitable que la prochaine fois on puisse se réunir à un autre moment qu'en pleine nuit.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Je vais parler de trois problèmes, de trois phénomènes qui sont à la source de beaucoup de problèmes. Premièrement, les problèmes de financement ou plus précisément de manque de financement; deuxièmement, l'incapacité de mettre en application la convention telle qu'elle existe; troisièmement, les insuffisances mêmes de la convention.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Entre autres, la Convention de la Baie James nous donnait des pouvoirs, à nous de l'Administration régionale Kativik, sur la police et l'administration de la justice au Nord, devait aussi nous permettre d'entreprendre la formation de policiers régionaux, mais, jusqu'à présent, ces choses n'ont pu être mises en application.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Présentement, nous avons dans les villages du Nouveau-Québec des policiers locaux qui ont été formés dans les écoles de police du Sud et qui mettent en pratique des méthodes policières qui ne relèvent et ne jaillissent pas de nos coutumes. Cette situation n'est pas souhaitable, car nous avons nos propres coutumes qui ne sont pas pareilles aux

vôtres. Nous croyons que nos coutumes aussi doivent être prises en considération quand on parle de l'administration de la justice et de la police.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Étant donné cette situation, nous, du conseil de Kativik, allons entreprendre de créer une véritable force policière du Nord. Nous allons faire les règlements nécessaires afin que cette force policière puisse agir et administrer la justice d'une façon convenable au Nord.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Encore plus spécifiquement, au sujet de l'administration de la justice, nous voulons dire qu'à la façon dont les choses se passent présentement la justice appliquée au Nord fait complètement défaut. Par exemple, vous savez que les juges du Sud vont au Nord pour étudier les causes, rendre des jugements et imposer des sentences. Or, le concept de punition ou de rétribution par amende n'est pas quelque chose qui vient de nos coutumes et cela n'a aucun sens pour nos coutumes. Alors, on voudrait que l'administration de la justice puisse être plus adaptée à la réalité de chez nous.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: De la même façon aussi à propos des services sociaux, les gens qui appliquent présentement le service social chez nous ne sont pas des gens qui partagent notre culture. Ils ne la connaissent pas et ne connaissent pas les conséquences de leurs actes. Alors, on voudrait encore dans ce domaine mieux adapter la pratique aux exigences du contexte nordique.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Pourtant, sur cette même question, nous, qui connaissons nos concitoyens et nos coutumes, pourrions très facilement et d'une façon très efficace nous occuper des problèmes sociaux, mais nous sommes empêchés de le faire encore par cette histoire de compétences: des compétences nécessaires et exigées par les lois qui viennent d'ailleurs.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Alors, ce que je viens de mentionner, ce ne sont que des exemples pour nous, les habitants du Nouveau-Québec.

terminé cette réflexion, nous pourrions nous asseoir avec vous, les gens du gouvernement, pour décider de quelle façon ce gouvernement pour le territoire du Nouveau-Québec pourrait être mis sur pied.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Nous voulons que vous sachiez que nous n'essaierons pas de faire quoi que ce soit derrière le dos du gouvernement du Québec. Nous ne voudrions pas que vous vous mettiez à avoir des réticences et des peurs à notre égard. Cela sera fait ouvertement et je suis sûr qu'une fois cette réflexion accomplie nous serons capables de nous asseoir et de discuter d'une façon productive de ces choses-ci.

M. Padlayat: (S'exprime dans sa langue).

M. Filotas: Merci beaucoup de nous avoir donné la chance de parler ici.

Le Président (M. Rancourt): Je remercie les gens de l'Administration régionale Kativik de leur présence ici, ce soir, et je leur souhaite bonne nuit. Nos travaux sont ajournés à ce matin, 10 heures.

(Fin de la séance à 1 h 16)

À ce moment-ci, il est clair que ce que nous

devons faire, c'est nous réunir ensemble pour discuter comment nous allons mettre de l'ordre chez nous. Une fois que nous aurons