

those circumstances one may well feel is beyond comprehension. However, there are people, in fact, who are in worse financial circumstances living away from the bands and the reserve land. Accordingly, it may be advantageous for them to move back even though the circumstances into which they move are not the best. Whether we are talking about wealthy bands or impoverished bands, there is an obligation either to share some of the wealth or add to the poverty.

It is to the addition of the poverty particularly that Hon. Members who have spoken in this House, and for whom I have the highest regard, have directed their attention. I am speaking, of course, of the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) and the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I am inclined to be moved by arguments of Hon. Members of this place who have firsthand knowledge of the problem which we are endeavouring to solve. I am very concerned when well meaning Hon. Members of Parliament say, I have a solution for your problem although I and my constituents do not suffer from it. Those Hon. Members have come here today to speak, raising their voices in opposition and drawing the attention of the House to the problems which they recognize will transpire.

I believe we must recognize that we have approached the second aspect of this double-barrelled alleged solution hoping for perfection but realizing we have not achieved it. We might well have suggested that the bands elect to disenfranchise male members of the band who married outside the Indian community and in that way the disenfranchisement would have been complete. In that way the bands themselves would not have been burdened with the colossal cost of attending to the needs of some 70,000 persons who are about to return to the lands where the financial situation of the bands, to say the very least, is not the best.

I am troubled, quite frankly, by the whole concept of the Indian Act, not only by these amendments. We in Parliament have treated a whole section of Canadian society as though this was the year 1884 and not 1984. How in the name of heaven, Mr. Speaker, could this House pass Clause 12 of this Bill? Clause 12 (109)(1) reads as follows:

On the report of the Minister that an Indian has applied for enfranchisement and that in the opinion of the Minister the Indian

- (a) is of the full age of twenty-one years,
- (b) is capable of assuming the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, and
- (c) when enfranchised, will be capable of supporting himself and his dependents the Governor in Council may by order declare that the Indian is enfranchised.

What kind of a paternalistic interference in the affairs of Canadian citizens is this? I do not know how many of us who have not dealt specifically with this problem, who have not served on the committee and are not acquainted with the problems—and a lot of us are not—could sit here and pass a clause which deals with Canadian citizens as though they are second, third or fourth-class Canadian citizens as though we are adults and they are children. That is exactly the problem which confronts us and which finds itself imbedded in the very statute with which we deal today.

I am not happy with the Act and, like the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid), I wish there was

Introduction of Bills

something better. I fear that what this House is doing in its mad haste to pass legislation at the last moment is less than what we wish. I have not been in this House too long but, quite frankly, I recognize that in dealing with the Indian Act in 1984, it will be 10 or 15 years before it comes back for re-examination. What we pass here today with all of its warts and imperfections is going to hamstring the Indian people. It is going to create financial burden, hardship and unhappiness. I believe that Hon. Members of the House should recognize exactly what they are doing before they proceed to pass this Bill into law.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there questions or comments? Is there further debate?

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the third time and passed.

* * *

● (1540)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following Bills without amendment: Bill C-51, an Act to implement a convention between Canada and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland providing for the reciprocal recognition and enforcement of judgments in civil and commercial matters; Bill C-53, an Act to establish a National Park on the Mingan Archipelago; and Bill C-54, an Act to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act.

* * * * *

The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council on a point of order.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I think you will find there might be agreement to move directly to the introduction of the Miscellaneous Statutory Amendments Act at this point.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, we will deal with that Bill, and I gather with Bill C-56 as the next item of business. As to this Bill, it will be introduced and passed in all stages without debate.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this Bill amending a variety of different statutes can be passed in