

Oral Questions

Sault Saint-Louis and that the Seigneurie is now being claimed as having legally belonged to the Indians.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians, and especially the residents of these eight municipalities in Châteauguay expect the Government of Canada to do something to allay their concerns.

My question today is a question all residents are now asking: What will happen to the territory of the municipalities around the Kahnawake Indian Reserve as a result of the Indians' land claim?

Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism) and Minister of State (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises an important question.

First of all, the claims made by the Mohawk Council of Kahnawake that they have legal title to the former Seigneurie de Sault Saint-Louis were considered by the federal Government in the seventies, when the claim was rejected.

We have been advised that the Mohawk Council is preparing a new claim, Mr. Speaker.

In fact, the policy with respect to specific land claims has never been to expropriate third parties to settle a claim. Normally, such claims are settled by compensation in specie or some other consideration. Our policy is not to settle land claims by expropriating people who own and occupy the land.

* * *

● (1450)

[English]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS**BANK'S REPORTED \$2 CHARGE FOR CHANGING \$20 BILL**

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On Monday this week, Mrs. Clara De Gruchy of Ottawa walked into the Bank of Nova Scotia at Fourth Avenue and Bank Street with a \$20 bill and asked for two \$5 bills and \$10 in quarters. The clerk gave her two \$5 bills and \$8 in quarters. When she asked for her other \$2 she was told that was the service charge because "too many people were requesting quarters". This is simply an exchange of Canadian money for Canadian money. Does the Minister not agree that this kind of service charge ought not to be allowed?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if the facts are accurate, and I do not mean to be disparaging or suggest they are not, I find that outrageous, particularly if there was not a big sign that said: "We charge for making change". If there was a sign and someone did it anyway, that would certainly be wrong. I find it objectionable. Certainly, if I were that customer, I would have

no further dealings with that bank. I suggest other consumers take the same action.

Mr. Rodriguez: In view of the fact that the Minister's responsibility is consumer affairs, I hope he will follow this up and report back to the House.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that this happened on Monday, the same day that the Finance Committee tabled its report on bank service charges. It is clear that the banks are doing to consumers what Bonnie and Clyde did to the banks.

Is the Minister prepared to do something to protect average Canadians like Mrs. De Gruchy, or is he simply prepared to be the Government's Charlie McCarthy to the bank's Edgar Bergen?

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the committee of which the hon. gentleman was a member made its recommendations and its proposal to the House. The Government has that under consideration.

My colleague, the Minister of State for Finance, has indicated that—

Mr. Rodriguez: You fiddle while Rome burns.

Mr. Andre: I gather that the Hon. Member suggests we should have had the necessary legislation in here before the committee reported.

Mr. Rodriguez: You should have had a freeze.

Mr. Andre: Then he would stand up in outrage at showing contempt for Parliament by not waiting for the committee's report before acting. The Hon. Member knows that is a bit unreasonable.

Mr. Rodriguez: You should have had a freeze on the charges.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**LEAVE FOR FATHERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION**

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton-East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday, when the Federal Court of Canada confirmed what the Liberal party has been saying for a long time, all of Canada realized that the Unemployment Insurance Act is unconstitutional since it does not recognize the parental rights of fathers.