

Opposition, should it become the government, to increase the potential number of returning Indians from 70,000 to 140,000 people by taking the reinstatements back to the grandchildren of those who lost their status. Implicit in that is the deluge of people who could potentially come back to the reserves, to say nothing about the hundreds of millions dollars more which the Official Opposition should be prepared to put up front in a separate fund to assist all those Indians who come back. I hope Members opposite will put their muscle where their mouth is today in the House. Let us see whether they will do it. I do not think they will. From private discussions I have had with many of them, I do not think all Members in the Official Opposition think like that.

My colleagues on the committee and I are trying to give some type of assurance. We want to give some type of comfort rather than stimulate the concern and worry that is already there. Let us try to inject some calm in the situation. The reading I have of the amendments that we are making to this Bill do this. I will speak very slowly, because it is a fundamental type of assurance for which some Members in the Official Opposition were looking. I am talking about reinstated people.

Reinstated people will become band members as a matter of right after two years. Part of being a band member is the right to access to reserves. We could not change this without creating two classes of band members. I emphasize this for all the chiefs across the country and all the Indian people who are troubled by this, but bands will have the power to provide for the orderly settlement of reinstated persons. This means that bands can make rules on such things as the zoning of land, the use of land and buildings, the timing and procedures for returning to reserves. In this way they will be able to manage the return to reserves in a way which makes sense in each one of their communities, depending on their different circumstances. Reinstated Indians will also have the right to have their non-Indian spouses or children live with them on reserves, but these families will also be subject to by-laws regulating settlement. Also, any rights beyond that of residency would be decided by the band. It seems clear that the federal Government has a duty to restore the rights it took away. This Bill does that.

When I refer to the rights which the federal Government gave away, the Parliament of Canada gave them away when it passed the Indian Act. It also gives bands, in conjunction with existing powers under the Indian Act, power to manage effectively the settlement of reinstated persons on reserve. I would like to point out that as far as Bill C-52 is concerned, when Parliament approves it, bands will have the right to obtain much broader powers than they now have under the Indian Act to manage their own communities. They can regulate that power of movement back on the reserves because of zoning powers and all other powers such as building codes and so on. That is absolutely essential if there is not to be chaos on the reserves. There can be that space-plan treatment.

Let me point out one more area to which the critic for the Official Opposition, the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid), made reference. There is provision in

Indian Act

the Bill now to which every Member, including the Hon. Member for Athabasca, who is concerned about the implications which this Bill may have and some of the dislocations that it may cause on reserves because of the impact it might have in increasing the deplorable poverty which exists already on reserves, should pay attention. The Bill provides for a parliamentary committee to review the reinstatement provisions within 18 months. By that time we will know with reasonable accuracy how many people want to be reinstated and to what bands. If there is a problem, Parliament can take the necessary legislative action at that time, before the reinstated people are put back on the band list. It is a two-year period. You have that essential guarantee of the parliamentary review.

Mr. McDermid: Where did it come from?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I give the Hon. Member full credit. He asks where it came from. He brought up the idea, we checked it out, found that it could be done, so we put it in there. That shows what can be achieved when all Parties get together and try to find a solution. As I say, it is now in there. The only credit the Government takes is that it had the wisdom to adopt a useful and constructive suggestion. There is nothing wrong with that. It is in here and it gives that type of assurance. Let us take some relief from that.

As far as my successor is concerned, and certainly as far as many of my colleagues are concerned, if we form a government the next time, I will be around, although not as a Member of Parliament, to insist to the maximum of my influence that the Government I will insist that the Government take a hard look in 18 months and see if some of the implications of the disastrous situation referred to by the Hon. Member for Athabasca will occur. If there are not adequate safeguards to take care of that, action will have to be taken before the two-year period is up.

In conclusion, I want to refer to something of fundamental importance. This was pointed out by the Hon. Member for Athabasca. What about the money? How deplorable it would be if we removed this injustice only to create more injustice by raising expectations for these people who lost their status if, when they came back on the reserve, there were absolutely no financial resources to look after them. It would be a mockery. The money that has been established to treat this situation is identified in a special fund separate from Indian Affairs estimates. As the experience comes to us of people moving back to the reserves, that identifiable fund can be tapped based on need, whether it is for infrastructure, community services, land, or whatever. If those numbers coming back on the reserves meet a band that is totally incapable of treating them with adequate resources and the band comes to this special fund and is denied the money necessary to treat those people right, that will be identified immediately because of the accessibility of that fund. Parliament can be the watchdog starting next month, starting next year or starting when the new Parliament convenes. It can be the watchdog to see that there is fairness in terms of access to that fund. Noticeable