

**Mr. Lambert:** Oh yes it does.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** If the point is being contested, I wish the Hon. Member would rise and make his point of order.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Speaker, I will agree that you did call the report stage and that there was nothing said at that time. However, to have the report stage adopted—which it was—and to move to third reading, the Chair required the unanimous consent of the House because the report enclosed amendments. When there are amendments put, there is a requirement—if one is going to go into third reading—to have the unanimous consent of the House to move to third reading. Otherwise, third reading is deferred until the next sitting of the House. That is particularly important in legislation, not just taxable legislation which comes from the Committee of the Whole, as I heard suggested to you. I emphasize that it is a basic requirement—if there are amendments made in committee, in Committee of the Whole, or at the report stage—that there be unanimous consent to proceed to third reading after adoption of report stage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Once again, I thank the Hon. Member for his comments. However, I would refer him to Standing Order 79(14) which reads:

When a bill has been reported from a standing or special committee, and no amendment has been proposed thereto at the report stage—

It goes on to say, “and in the case of a bill reported from a Committee of the Whole”, which is not applicable. Therefore, when no amendment has been proposed at the report stage, a motion that the Bill be read a third time and passed may be made at the same sitting. Thus, it is not necessary to have unanimous consent to move into third reading immediately following report stage. Since there were no amendments made at report stage, we are automatically in third reading. I maintain the position that we are in third reading and I am calling for debate on third reading.

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we check the “blues”. I denied unanimous consent at the report stage. I denied unanimous consent when you wanted to proceed to third reading. I denied unanimous consent every time you sought unanimous consent on this Bill—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Order, please. The Chair in all honesty must say that it certainly does not deny what the Hon. Member is contending. However, the Chair did not hear any such noes. The Chair has proceeded in the normal fashion and we are now in third reading debate on this Bill.

I will recognize the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), and I hope that it is a new point of order.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I distinctly heard a “no”. I suggest we check the “blues”.

### *Indian Act*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** I am sorry. The Chair has made a decision. The decision stands. The Chair's decision is that we are now in third reading of this Bill.

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** It must be a new point of order.

**Mr. Shields:** Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members in this House must give unanimous consent when it comes to the report stage. You called for unanimous consent and I yelled, “no”. I was told to wait until third reading—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert):** Order, please. That is a repetition. The Hon. Member is contending that he said “no”, and I agree with that. It is when I put the question on third reading that I distinctly heard a loud “no”. At that point I assumed that the Hon. Member wanted to debate third reading. We are now in third reading debate. For debate on third reading, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand).

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East):** Mr. Speaker, I was going to propose two amendments at the report stage, but unfortunately I believe the rules require some improvement, because I feel that my rights have been denied in not being able to make those amendments. In any case, I will state what I intended to do now at third reading. While I completely support those parts of this Bill which would abolish discrimination against Indian women, and I have supported the abolition of Section 12(1)(b) and others for many years, I do not hold the same position with respect to some of the other clauses in the Bill, in particular, those clauses which deal with the reinstatement of those persons who lost their status in past years. I firmly believe there has to be reinstatement provisions. We have to reinstate those people who have lost their status. However, the clauses in this Bill for reinstatement are extremely inadequate and many witnesses before the standing committee which met in the last couple of days gave evidence of that.

● (1400)

Once again, by passing sections of the law on such sensitive measures which affect Indian people, we are acting like a colonial institution. We are a white man's Parliament, for the most part, imposing our views on Indian people in a very paternalistic way. I would like to point out those parts of the Bill which are inadequate and which have been highlighted by the Assembly of First Nations and by the Native Women's Association of Canada.

First, the Bill does not permit the reinstatement of all Indian citizens who were previously denied registration. Because reinstatement is arbitrarily cut off at half of the second generation, the Bill perpetuates the very discrimination which it is supposed to terminate. I was going to propose an amendment which would have allowed the reinstatement of more people, basically a great many more people who had lost their status but who were still able to trace their lines to certain Indian