

settlement of our native peoples' claims. The Indians and the Inuit are the ones who can best accomplish that task. If they can achieve a settlement that suits them, then it will be normal to ask the two houses to express their views, but far be it from me to believe that we should take part in the negotiation of those agreements. Still, nothing will prevent the Senate nor the House of Commons from expressing their suggestions, in the case of a negative result, suggestions which could be taken into consideration by the parties concerned.

During deliberations in the Senate last week, I believe it was Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) who put a question to Senator Asselin and to which I myself replied. He asked then what amount of money the federal government would spend under those circumstances. I mentioned two figures, one of \$32.75 million and the other, \$75 million. In fact, the amount the federal government would pay, under the circumstances, would be \$32.75 million.

Honourable senators, those are the remarks I wanted to make at this time but, before closing, I should like to stress the importance of this bill to our native peoples in northern Quebec, and I trust the Senate will give it its approval.

I am sure also that, as Senator Asselin and I mentioned on second reading, there are many points of law to be discussed in connection with this bill. That is why it seems to me honourable senators would benefit from its deferral to committee where they can be given more details in this regard.

● (2020)

[English]

Senator Williams: Honourable senators, I should like to ask Senator Bourget one or two questions with respect to the language bill. He has mentioned the fact that a number of Crees are involved in the James Bay Agreement. As I understand the bill, it states that only those parents who speak English will have the right to seek English for their offspring, and only those children who have attended English schools in the past will have the right to pursue English as a second language. The fact is that the Iroquois or any other natives, apart from the Crees, who are residents of that area definitely have English as their second language. In my view, only their offspring will have the right to pursue or learn English as a second language. I do not think that is right.

Senator Bourget also stated, if I understood him correctly, that the services of the federal government, through its Department of Indian Affairs, will remain the same as in the past. I cannot see how that can be, when the agreement takes away some of the basic rights of the native people in the area involved, and pays them a certain number of millions of dollars. The Indian people, in turn, cannot effectively be governed by the Indian Act. Clearly in the James Bay agreement they will become municipalities, and municipalities that will be responsible to the Government of Quebec.

Senator Bourget: Honourable senators, with regard to the first question concerning language rights, this was put to the Minister of Northern Affairs in connection with Bill 1 of the Quebec government, and he said that he had referred it to the

Minister of Justice for a legal opinion. Therefore, I cannot at this time provide a complete answer to my honourable friend's question, but no doubt he will have the opportunity to attend the meetings of the committee where he can put his question to the minister.

With regard to the honourable senator's second question concerning the rights of the native people, from my understanding of the bill and the convention they will retain the same rights that they have had in the past. Perhaps my honourable friend will be able to obtain more information in committee. I repeat that from my understanding of the bill the native people will retain the same rights as they have had in the past.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

Senator Bourget moved that the bill be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs.

Motion agreed to.

SOLAR ENERGY APPLICATION BILL

SECOND READING—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, May 18, the debate on the motion of Senator Austin for second reading of Bill C-309, respecting the domestic and industrial use of solar energy.

Hon. Henry D. Hicks: Honourable senators, I shall make two observations about this bill. The first is legal and technical and the second will be of a more general nature. As for the first, which I have described as legal and technical, when the bill was introduced in the House of Commons it established a corporation to be known as:

the Institute of Solar Energy Application (hereinafter referred to as the "Institute").

● (2030)

Clause 2 then went on to say:

(2) The Institute shall consist of ten members appointed by the Governor in Council from among Canadian citizens who shall serve without remuneration.

The third clause of the bill determined what the institute could do; namely, undertake research; encourage the establishment of an industry producing solar energy equipment and parts; subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, receive assistance from government departments and agencies, and acquire money, securities, or other property by gift, bequest or otherwise.

The fourth and final clause said:

4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to require an appropriation of public revenue or an expenditure out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.