

registry list that the land and the funds will not be taken from them to create the new bands.

● (1640)

I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you are aware already that the existing pie, if you can call it a pie, is very very small in most cases. Our Indian First Nations, with only a few exceptions, are among the poorest communities in Canada. If by ministerial prerogative we can take that pie, which does not have very much filling, and subdivide it still further, I think we will be imposing a very serious injustice on these people. We are saying that nothing could be done without their consent with respect to the further division of their property or the further division of their funds. It is simply a consent clause.

With your permission, Sir, I would go on to the other two motions in my name since they are grouped for debate. I turn my attention to Motion No. 38. Motion No. 38 can be dealt with very quickly because it has to do with the reporting provisions to Parliament of the actions taken by the Registrar in accepting new people.

As it is now, by my amendment Motion No. 38, we would require more specific information to be included in the report. The Bill does not cover all the Indians who may be recognized as Indians by their own people. I will not say anymore on that except to say that it just improves the reporting provisions. The motion provides more elaboration.

I come now to Motion No. 39. It is somewhat weaker than I would like it to be. The reason it has been watered down is we had to be very careful I did not step on the toes of the Royal prerogative. If I had been able to do that, and if private Members were able to spend even a little public money, our amendment would have had much more validity and strength. Since we could not do that, I had to get the idea across that there has to be some method or means of assessing the impact on bands of those people returning to the community.

I would have liked the Minister to be able to appoint a commissioner through this amendment and have the commissioner agreed upon by the bands to study the impact and then report to Parliament, making it an obligation upon Parliament, where there was an impact determined which demanded there be more land made available or that there be more resources be made available, to respond. Since there no Royal Recommendation can go with a private Member's motion, the best we could do here was to have a Minister's designate who would serve without remuneration, approved by the Minister and by the bands to take a look at the impact of the new reinstated people coming back into the bands to find out what impact was on housing, on educational facilities, on recreational facilities, on the amount of land and on funding made available to the band. That Minister's designate would then make certain recommendations about what ought to be done and report back to the Minister.

It is not as strong and as forceful an amendment as I would like it to be. In fact, it is not as strong an amendment as I originally wrote myself, but I had to take guidance and counsel

### *Indian Act*

from learned people who work for the House of Commons. This is the end result of that.

I would like to emphasize that we should look behind the motion and recognize that there needs to be some way for the Minister and for Parliament to know what the impact is of what we have done by way of Bill C-31. If the Minister finds Motion No. 39 to be appealing or even if it is accepted and proves to be a useful way of proceeding, he may in due course want to give it additional strength and use his ministerial powers to do so.

Those are the three motions to which I wanted to draw your attention and the attention of all Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a few comments on these four motions grouped for debate. I am in support of all four motions. First, Motion No. 27 which, as the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner) pointed out, places the responsibility for making decisions with the band council and the majority of the electors of the present band for any decision regarding new bands. The present Act leaves this at the discretion of the Minister. I am sure the present Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie) would agree that this is the kind of decision that should rightfully belong with the band council and the band electors. I am pleased to give my support to this amendment, and I hope the Government will also.

Motion No. 28 in the name of the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Parry) simply seeks to have some mechanisms by which people who wish to form new bands will be able to get some answer from the Minister because, at present if people want to form a new band and apply, their letters can just fall into limbo. Motion No. 28 requires that the Minister, after receiving notice, shall within two years make some investigation into the merits of forming a new band and issue a report to the House of Commons. I think two years is a realistic time period. It is something where the bands obviously need Government support.

Motion No. 38 just briefly deals with further reporting and more detailed reporting to the House of Commons. That is something I think all Members would want to see. The results of Bill C-31 are something all of us will want to monitor very closely in the next number of years. The more detailed information we have laid before us so we can assess the impact on bands, the better we will be able to do our job and the better we will be able to respond to any situation that many arise that requires parliamentary action.

Motion No. 39 I find very interesting. There will be someone to do a study when bands request a study on the impact of Bill C-31 on a band. The impact of Bill C-31 will be considerable on a number of bands. When I first read this, I thought the Liberals had reformed their whole approach toward patronage since September 4. I thought perhaps they were carrying it a little too far when the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior wrote that "this person shall serve without remuneration", or perhaps he just assumed the person to be