organizations and other interested persons the opportunity to study the proposed Indian Claims Commission legislation before proceeding with second reading?

Hon. J. R. Nicholson (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is the Government's intention to refer the Bill to a committee. Whether it will be a committee of this House or a joint committee of this House and the other place will be announced later.

Mr. Patterson: A supplementary question. Is it his intention to refer the subject matter of the Bill to the committee before second reading so these organizations can present their views with regard to the new measure?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance Bill C-130 was submitted to Indian bands and other interested persons in late December of 1963 and early in 1964. Many suggestions and views have come in, and as I intimated earlier some of these new ideas have been incorporated into a new—a revised—bill. However, the new Bill will not be made public until it has received first reading in this House, and then it will be sent to a committee.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Will the terms of the Indian Claims Commission legislation be wide enough to permit some remedy to be given if the interdepartmental committee considering matters concerned with Indian treaties and traditional hunting rights makes any recommendations? If not, in what way does the Government propose to proceed if this government committee should in fact decide that there should be certain remedies provided as a result of their findings?

Mr. Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the Indian claims legislation in my view relates largely to a different subject matter than that which has been referred to the interdepartmental committee. The Government's ideas were incorporated in the Indian claims bill which was distributed in 1963. If any action has to be taken as the result of a report from the interdepartmental committee on another subject, that will be the subject of separate study and consideration.

22620—66

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAM

On the orders of the day:

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Grégoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Labour.

Could he inform the house whether it is the intention of his department to reconsider its position on the extension of winter works in May, so that more municipalities could profit by the extension of winter works during the month of May?

[Text]

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, no decision has been taken to change the system of extension that was announced some time ago.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Can the Minister of Labour tell the house why the federal department rejects applications for extension of the winter works period, when these very applications have been accepted by some provincial governments?

[Text]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, one of the conditions of the municipal winter works program over the years has been that each project submitted by a municipality must be approved by the Provincial Government concerned. Then the project is forwarded to the Federal Government. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to accept projects which meet the terms and conditions of the program itself, and a particular application is rejected only on the ground that it does not meet the conditions of the program.

[Translation]

Mr. Grégoire: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask another supplementary question.

Does this mean that the federal Department of Labour did not explain properly the new conditions for this extension to the provincial governments, or that the latter were ready to accept projects which did not fulfil the conditions requested by the Department of Labour? Or are the requirements set by the federal Department of Labour too rigid to allow the extension of the winter works period?