

citizens of Canada. Those rights cannot just be glossed over quickly. We cannot try to convince the House that it will all be looked after. The Indian leaders who appeared before the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development on numerous occasions have too much bad history to relate to have any confidence in us. I will return to that point later if time will permit me.

Members of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development joined members of the Fisheries Committee to hear the testimony. There are two committees involved in this. The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development supports this motion. At the last meeting the Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) asked that this report be appended to our own minutes of proceedings and evidence. That was agreed to unanimously. There are two standing committees of the House of Commons that support this report.

No matter what kind of bureaucratic arguments we put on a piece of paper, Indian people are going to be affected. We can argue about how many reserves, how many bands or how many nations, but it does not matter. The alliance of the three nations involved have given very telling testimony about the impacts that they see upon them from this twin-tracking project. It is not that they want to stop it. They have said that these concerns are so vital that they need a little more time. From having spoken with their elders they know about the past grievances. They know that when the first railway track was built those grievances were never satisfactorily settled. We want to build a second track while we have outstanding grievances from the time the first track was built. In many cases the acquisition of rights of way proceeded in an irregular fashion without approval of the bands and without fair and adequate compensation.

Hydro-Québec said that it had a big project in northern Quebec which could not be delayed because billions of dollars and jobs and the future of Canada was involved. The Cree of northern Quebec went to court and said that they were being run over by a roller and needed some time. They got a sympathetic Justice who said that he would impose an injunction on the project until there was a proper settlement. That led to the James Bay and northern Quebec agreement. That could very well happen in this particular case. Mr. Speaker, if we do not pass this motion. If we do not arm the Ministers who are concerned—the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie) and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) are deeply concerned—with this motion to get such a moratorium, then perhaps the courts will do it for us.

● (1730)

The Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East in looking at the motion was concerned that it was too vague. He told us, for example, that the second paragraph which states that a twin-tracking project has social and environmental impacts on the 36 Indian bands was much too vague. Let us see how vague it is. Let us talk about the social and environmental impacts.

Fisheries and Forestry

This is a resumé from the testimony received from the alliance of the tribal councils to which I referred earlier. These are just some of the land-related impacts. These land-related impacts are based on historical documents and on oral accounts that were passed on from the elders to the Indian leaders living today. Here are just a few of them:

Loss of fields, gardens, orchards, timber, irrigation flumes, and ditches due to the construction of the CNR. Desecration of graveyards, heritage sites, sacred sites and village sites by the CNR.

Let us elaborate on one, the desecration of graveyards. Supposing in the City of Toronto you want to build a spur line and it just happened to go through a graveyard. What do you suppose the CNR would do, Mr. Speaker? Can you just imagine what the CNR would do? Can you imagine the meetings with Metro Council and the Toronto City Council? Can you imagine the millions of dollars they would be prepared to spend? Can you imagine the public relations program they would introduce? It would be something to behold, Sir.

Here is how the CNR deals with Indian people. This is from a document dated 1913. The Department of Indian Affairs informed the CNR, the Canadian National Pacific Railway, about the desecration of graveyards on the Ashcroft reserve. Let me read from the document. It states that the Chief of the Ashcroft Band reported that in consequence of extending the slope of the railway grade at their old graveyard at Ashcroft, a large number of bones of deceased Indians were exhumed and left exposed along the grave. This was reported to the engineer in charge who informed the Indians that he was not going to pay for the burying of any more Indian bones, that the Indians could take them away if they wanted to, but he would have nothing more to do with it. Apparently it was necessary to desecrate the old Indian burial ground. Under these circumstances it is thought that the remains should have been treated with common decency.

Something should be done or compensation should be made to satisfy the reasonable complaint of the Indians. The document goes on to state that cases of the above nature with railway companies have been allowed to drag along at great length, allowing a large amount of apparently useless correspondence. We read also: "I should be much obliged to you if you will cause each case to be gone into and settled as soon as conveniently possible."

In response, the CPR right-of-way agent informed the Department of Indian Affairs that this complaint has been settled with the Indians finally and, I believe, satisfactorily to them.

I can quite imagine with the second tracking that there will be witnesses from the Canadian National Railways appearing before one committee or another saying: "We had our meetings. We had our negotiations. We paid attention to all the concerns and they were all satisfactorily settled". Do not believe it for a moment, Mr. Speaker.

Here are some of the other impacts: the disruption of drainage patterns and flooding of farm land; fragmentation of limited reserve land base; discouragement and displacement of settlements adjacent to tracks. Some specific places are