

*Motions for Papers*

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 33 and 86.

REPORT OF THE LEGISLATION REVIEW COMMITTEE,  
CHAired BY JOHN G. BRYDEN

**Motion No. 33—Mr. Forrestall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for the tabling of the Report of the Legislation Review Committee, chaired by John G. Bryden.

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** The Bryden report was commissioned on the understanding that it was to be an internal, confidential document for the use of the minister through whom the Public Service Staff Relations Board reports to parliament. It is for this reason that the Bryden report has not been released. When the proposals relating to changes to be made in the Public Service Staff Relations Act are presented to the House, however, the government will then review the situation to determine whether it would be in the public interest to publish the report. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

• (1450)

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Perhaps this might be an appropriate occasion to remind hon. members that when parliamentary secretaries and members of the government reply to these motions, although a brief explanation to the House might be helpful there should not be an extended reply. I am not saying that this is what was done in this particular instance, but this might be an appropriate time to place this caveat on the record.

**Mr. Forrestall:** I ask that the motion be transferred for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate.

BRYDEN REPORT RELATING TO REVISION OF PUBLIC  
SERVICE STAFF RELATIONS ACT

**Motion No. 86—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the so-called Bryden report concerning the revision of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, which was submitted to the then Minister of Manpower and Immigration in June 1971.

**Mr. John M. Reid (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with exactly the same subject matter as the last. Therefore I appeal to the hon. member to withdraw it for the same reason.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I appeal to Your Honour to put the question.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Transfer for debate.

**Mr. Speaker:** Transferred for debate.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Speaker, notice of motion for the production of papers No. 133, which admittedly only has the date of February 6 on it, relates to the Stanbury-Fields report on the taxation of Indian people and Indian lands

[Mr. Speaker.]

in the province of British Columbia. During the previous session in the last parliament the House passed such a motion subject to the agreement of the province of British Columbia. That agreement has now been given in a letter to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, whom I am very pleased to see back in the House in good health. We wish him the best from now on.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Howard:** In view of this piece of past history regarding endorsement being given by the province of British Columbia to the tabling of this report, I wonder whether the matter could be proceeded with.

**Mr. Chrétien:** Mr. Speaker, may I thank the hon. member for his kind words. I should like to inform the House that the document will be tabled within the next few days.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining notices of motions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Stand.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### INDIAN AFFAIRS

#### CLAIMS OF JAMES BAY AREA NATIVES—ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

**Miss Flora MacDonald (Kingston and The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and is based on last night's report released by CTV with respect to the lack of federal participation in the claims of the James Bay Indian people. Can the minister tell the House if the role of the federal government is now relegated to that of an observer, as directed by the chief negotiator for the province of Quebec; and has the federal role been confined so as to prevent the government from participating in the negotiations and, if so, why?

[Translation]

**Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Mr. Speaker, it is true that on certain occasions the representative of the provincial government wanted to make a distinction between the federal government and the Indians, but I never accepted that policy and each time the Quebec Indians asked me to attend, I complied. I must say in that connection that I met four or five times with the Quebec premier but unfortunately we could not come to an agreement and the Indians have decided to lodge legal proceedings. As all hon. members know, in my capacity as Minister of Indian Affairs, I am pleased to grant them funds so they may plead their case before the court and it will now be heard in Montreal.