

3. Did the allocations respond to the needs as expressed by the Indian associations and, if not, for what reason?

4. Which projects have been completed?

5. Which projects have not been completed and, in each case (a) what is their present status (b) for what reason?

6. Does the funding meet the research needs of the bands and associations and, if not, what criteria are used by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to determine which research projects will be funded?

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. See reply to question 1,613 tabled this day. There were no "projects" approved by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development under the four-year Indian Rights and Treaty Research Program. The Memoranda of Agreements enabled the Indian associations to "conduct research into Indian rights and treaties on behalf of their member bands".

2. See 1 above.

3. The program was approved by the government in 1972 at the level of \$7.5 million. Total requests for funding approximated \$14 million.

4. The National Indian Brotherhood, in its evaluation report of December, 1976, indicated that approximately 50 per cent of the "Indian Rights" research has now been completed and that claims research and development completion was estimated at between two years in Nova Scotia to in excess of ten years in Ontario.

5. (a) As in 4 above, the research and claims development process will be lengthy and complicated. (b) Because of confidentiality clauses in each research funding agreement, many Indian associations will not disclose details of claims now completed, nor those underway. In most cases the submissions of completed claims have been delayed pending government-NIB agreement on an acceptable claims resolution process.

6. Funding provided by the department under the terms of the Indian Rights and Treaty Research Program was considered adequate at that time to enable the Indian people to commence work on the identification and substantiation of Indian rights and to begin claims research within the limits of the funds available.

TASK FORCE STUDY OF ARSENIC IN YELLOWKNIFE

Question No. 1,826—**Mr. Smith (Churchill):**

What is the total expected cost of the task force study into the question of arsenic poisoning in Yellowknife to which the Department of National Health and Welfare is contributing \$100,000?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of National Health and Welfare): At the present time, it is not possible to state the exact cost of the task force studying the effects of arsenic in Yellowknife. A total of \$100,000 has tentatively been set aside for this purpose for the fiscal years 1976-77 and 1977-78. The final cost will depend upon the recommendations of the task force at the end of Phase 1 of the study which will constitute a review of all currently available information.

Pension Act

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 1,243 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

[Text]

STERILIZATIONS PERFORMED IN NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Question No. 1,243—**Mr. Firth:**

What are the number of tubal ligations performed on (a) Inuits (b) Indians (c) others in each community of the Northwest Territories for each year since 1970?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PENSION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH REVIEW BOARD

Hon. Daniel J. MacDonald (Minister of Veterans Affairs) moved that Bill C-11, to amend the Pension Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to move that Bill C-11 be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. This bill is to amend the Pension Act for the purposes of changing the constitution of the Pension Review Board in order to improve its capabilities. The Pension Review Board was created by parliament in 1971 following the recommendation of the Woods committee established by Treasury Board to survey the work and organization of the Canadian Pension Commission. The procedure for appeal was one of the most important aspects of the inquiry. The committee was mindful that on two previous occasions in the 1920s and 1930s experiments with appellate tribunals under the Pension Act had not been successful.

This history of unsatisfactory experiences with former appeal bodies under the Pension Act led one of the members of the committee to write a dissenting recommendation and gave rise to concern by veterans' organizations, members of parliament and others who had knowledge of these matters. However, the committee, by majority decision, felt that another attempt to set up a strong and independent appellate body was