



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

AANO • NUMBER 061 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, July 26, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Colin Mayes

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Thursday, July 26, 2007

•(1105)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Colin Mayes (Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC)): I open this Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development of Thursday, July 26, 2007.

I will ask the media to discontinue recording, as this meeting is being recorded by the House of Commons. Thank you.

Committee members, you have the orders of the day before you. Today we'll be dealing with Bill C-44, an act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act, pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday, February 21, 2007.

Technical witnesses with us today are Douglas Kropp, senior counsel, resolution strategy unit; Martin Reiher, senior counsel, operations and programs section; Jim Hendry, general counsel, human rights law section—

Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.): I have a point of order.

The Chair: I'm reading the introduction of the meeting, and then we'll move to clause-by-clause consideration.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: No, you won't, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Lemay.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. I'm going to take my time because I think it's important that you hear the interpreter clearly.

I'd like you to explain to committee members on the basis of which Standing Order you agreed to call this meeting. In other words, what is your basis for calling us here today?

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Lemay, I had a request from some of the committee members to hold a meeting to proceed with clause-by-clause. This bill was presented to this committee by the House—unanimously sent to this committee to consider—and therefore I think we need to proceed.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chairman, I believe you relied on Standing Order 106(4), which I have read. If you received a request from a number of members of this committee and you relied on that Standing Order, you should have received a written request from four members, in accordance with that Standing Order. Despite my repeated requests, I have in my possession copies of letters from only three members of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know who is the fourth committee member who made that written request.

[English]

The Chair: I'm calling this meeting in my capacity as chair of this committee, not under Standing Order 106.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: The minister asked you to.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. Since you called this meeting, you must have in your possession two motions that I sent. I ask that we study those two motions before anything else this morning.

[English]

The Chair: Is that the pleasure of the committee?

I have that as the committee business to be dealt with after we deal with clause-by-clause. I need a motion to change the order of business.

Madam Neville.

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): This is a motion to change the order of business.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Winnipeg South, CPC): That's right.

The Chair: And we're going to debate that.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Right now first nations people in Canada can't file human rights complaints. This is why we're here today.

The opposition parties want to put off clause-by-clause, but we took the time to come back this summer to deal with the very important issue of extending human rights to first nations people. It's a shameful reality in Canada today that first nations people on reserve don't have human rights—

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): I have a point of order. Is he speaking on anything?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: As a Métis Canadian, I have access to the Canadian Human Rights Act. I can take it for granted, but first nations people, over the last 30 years—

The Chair: Mr. Bruinooge, the motion is that we deal with the motions that have been presented.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: And this is why we've brought forward clause-by-clause today. That's why we requested it.

The Chair: I understand that. You can speak to that as we get to the motion as presented. The question here is whether we proceed with the motions or whether we proceed with clause-by-clause. Madam Neville has moved that we speak to the motions first.

Madam Neville.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Okay, Madam Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder: I just want to point out to the committee that the May 10 subcommittee report was unanimous that clause-by-clause would be deferred until September. That was a unanimous report of this committee.

That's the point of order I wanted to raise.

The Chair: Madam Neville.

Hon. Anita Neville: That was my point as well, Mr. Chair. You've just advised the committee that on your own volition you called the committee together to deal with an agenda that you determined. What I'm hearing from you is that you are ignoring the subcommittee report concurred on by all members of the committee on May 10.

As I understand the minutes, it was concurred on by all members of the committee that we would deal with this issue in September. So on what basis do you come forward on your own volition to supersede that agreement by the entire committee?

The Chair: Well.... Mr. Bruinooge.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: I think he should answer the question.

Hon. Anita Neville: I'd like to hear from the chair, please.

The Chair: First of all, the June motion by Mr. Lemay superseded the motion to defer until September.

I believe it's the duty of this committee to proceed with the House business. We are at the pleasure of the House. They have directed a bill to us to deal with.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Oh, please. We can't even report it back.

The Chair: I think it's important that we report the bill back to the House in a timely fashion, so let's get to the clause-by-clause.

Mr. Bruinooge.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, not only did four members of our committee request that we go to clause-by-clause—and thankfully you did call this important meeting—but a number of people all across Canada, first nations people on reserve who don't have access to the Canadian Human Rights Act, have called me and asked to extend the Canadian Human Rights Act to first nations people.

Your party might choose to not do this, as you have; you have voted against extending the Canadian Human Rights Act to first nations people. But this is something we must do and we should do. If you want to continue to block what we're attempting to do, you can.

• (1110)

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Did you memorize this script today?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: No, I believe what I'm saying. That's the difference between you and me. You obviously point out scripts.

The Chair: Order, please.

Hon. Anita Neville: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a motion on the floor, which is whether or not we're going to deal with the motions by Madam Neville and Mr. Lemay. That's the question, so let's deal with that question.

Any further discussion?

Hon. Anita Neville: I have a point of order, please.

The Chair: What's the point of order?

Hon. Anita Neville: I would like to know which four members requested, and I would like clarification as to whether four members can determine the agenda. Four members can call a meeting, but my understanding is that four members cannot determine the agenda. It is the committee that determines the agenda of the meeting.

The Chair: I've already answered that question.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Yes, the chair has made his ruling.

The Chair: Mr. Storseth, please.

Mr. Brian Storseth (Westlock—St. Paul, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

In speaking to this motion, I think it's incumbent that we recognize the fact that you did call this meeting today and that you did put clause-by-clause—which we are now in—at the forefront of this agenda. I feel that changing this agenda around to try to circumvent clause-by-clause would be harmful not only to first nations people across this country but also to the identity of our nation as a whole.

So I will be voting against this idea of going to these motions. I think we need to carry forward with clause-by-clause.

I notice that the opposition, Mr. Chair, has several amendments that they obviously want to put toward this. I suggest that we continue to clause-by-clause, look at the opposition's amendments, and hammer out something that will be amicable for all parties here.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Yes, absolutely.

The Chair: Go ahead, Madam Bennett, but let's stay on the motion at hand, that we deal with the motions before we move to clause-by-clause.

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: This is a point of order in that at the moment my understanding is that it's at the call of the chair, at the request of whoever, that we are convened here today. It is now your job, as chair, to determine the will of this committee as to the work done at this committee, if any. Your job is not to dictate the work of this committee. Your job now is to ask the committee if they are prepared to do clause-by-clause. That is your job.

I think you will find that we do not want to do clause-by-clause because of the previous decision of this committee to wait until there have been appropriate consultations with first nations and native women in this country, which this committee agreed to twice.

You have called this meeting. We are all here. But now it is your job to ask us what we want to do.

The Chair: Okay. Dealing with the motion by Madam Neville to proceed with the motion—

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: No, we're not there yet.

The Chair: That is the motion on the floor.

Mr. Lemay, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've understood the question, and I've understood the answers you gave earlier. I respect them, but I do not share them.

However, we have two motions before us. I ask that the orders of the day be amended so that we study these two motions now, the first introduced by Ms. Neville from the Liberal Party, and the second, which I introduced on behalf of the Bloc québécois.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that we consider these two motions immediately.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on the motion by Madam Neville?

Mr. Blaney, please.

Hon. Anita Neville: I would like to close debate, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven Blaney (Lévis—Bellechasse, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak to the motion. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak.

It seems to me that it is of the highest importance at this time that we pursue the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill. We received a unanimous mandate from the House to review this bill and to refer it back to it. That responsibility was accepted by all parties, and our committee has a responsibility to refer this bill back to it, amended, if necessary, unanimously or by a vote.

Among other things, I remember that Mr. Lemay said, on February 7, that he especially wanted this bill to be studied quickly by the committee. Unfortunately, we have been unable to do so.

• (1115)

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Steven Blaney: I would like to finish—

Mr. Marc Lemay: No, I'm interrupting you—

Mr. Steven Blaney: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Marc Lemay: Yes, I have a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, you've made a ruling. Do we agree to amend the agenda and to study Ms. Neville's motion? That's the question. Then we'll discuss the merits of Ms. Neville's motion, as my colleague Mr. Blaney has just tried to do. Mr. Chairman, I believe we must first debate the question whether we agree to amend the agenda and to study Ms. Neville's motion on a priority basis. That's the issue.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Lemay, you're exactly right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request a vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: So would the committee members stay on that topic, please?

I'm going to move on to Madam Crowder—

Mr. Marc Lemay: Call the vote, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven Blaney: I would like to finish my address, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

The Chair: —and then I'll go back to the government side. I'll finish with Madam Neville.

Madam Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to support Monsieur Lemay's comments. I think it's important to remind the committee that there are a couple of procedural steps here, as I understand them. One is that you called the meeting based on some requests from at least four members—although we only have proof of three—and the meeting has now convened. The second stage in that process is to determine the business at hand before the committee.

I am supporting Madam Neville's motion to reorder the agenda. That is the decision the committee can rightfully take in terms of determining what business at hand it will deal with.

So I will be supporting that motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

Speaking to that, we'll go to....

Mr. Blaney, you had an opportunity. Have you finished?

Mr. Steven Blaney: I will just wrap up.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak. I feel that what Mr. Lemay said did not constitute a point of order. I want to say that I think it is important at this time to stick to the agenda and to review this important bill clause by clause—let me finish, Mr. Lemay—so that, in September, at the start—

Mr. Marc Lemay: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Steven Blaney: I would like to finish—

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order. You said I was right; you said I was right to raise a point of order, and you let Mr. Blaney speak. I think we have to interrupt him. I call for a vote on the motion.

Mr. Steven Blaney: Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that—
[*English*]

The Chair: There's a request for a vote on the motion.
[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven Blaney: Mr. Chairman, if we proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration, we'll be able to present the bill to be amended to the House upon its return. That is the reason—and I'll close on this—why I think it is important to stick to the agenda set for this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
[*English*]

The Chair: There is a motion, there's been debate, and I am going to proceed. There is no more debate on that.

Point of order.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Point of order, Mr. Chair. First of all, I don't believe you're allowed to call for a vote within a point of order, which I'm sure Mr. Lemay knows.

The Chair: You're correct.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Secondly, Mr. Chair, I actually want to bring us back to the motion we have in front of us. I want to clarify that there are two motions there we will be moving through, whether it be Monsieur Lemay's or Mrs. Neville's that we'll be moving to first.

Mr. Chair, my last point I want to make is that Monsieur Lemay and Ms. Crowder are absolutely right: we are on the record, we are in clause-by-clause right now, so if they do want to bring it back to the agenda, if they want to change the agenda, that is absolutely the committee's right to do, Mr. Chair. Unfortunately, I would find it somewhat sad that the opposition has to resort to procedural tactics to escape giving human rights to first nations.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: This is a discussion on the point of order. First of all, I want it to be clear that the motion Madam Neville brought forward was to deal with her motion, because that was the first one received. That's the one we'll deal with first.

Hon. Anita Neville: My motion was to change the agenda of the meeting, to establish the agenda. If we are concluding debate on it, Mr. Chair, I would like to speak.

The Chair: I'm going to go to Mr. Albrecht and then I'll go to Mr. Lévesque and then Madam Crowder can have the last say.

Please be brief.

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Mr. Chair, I intend to vote against this motion simply because this is another delaying tactic keeping us from moving ahead with important work that all Canadians want us to move ahead with. We've had this on our plate since December. This has been studied

and has been put before Parliament a number of times in the last 30 years. It should have been a temporary measure. It's time to act now. So I'm opposed to the motion.

• (1120)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Albrecht.

Mr. Lévesque and then we'll go to Madam Neville.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Chairman, you admitted that Mr. Lemay's position was the right one. Considering that the time of all the members around this table is precious, I ask you to put Ms. Neville's motion to a vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Lévesque.

Madam Neville, do you have any further comments before we go to a vote?

Hon. Anita Neville: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair, and I am in part repeating myself.

My understanding is that four members can call a meeting or request a meeting to be called. You have done it on your own authority, not on the request of four members. We've established that.

My understanding as well is that when the committee is called, the committee determines the agenda of the meeting. It cannot be determined by four members of the committee. It cannot be determined by you acting alone. And I sincerely hope this is not part of the playbook that we heard so much about six weeks ago. This is a very serious issue. We have heard over and over again of the importance of this issue to first nations communities, of the importance of it being done properly, of it not being done through a father-knows-best approach to it.

So I am asking the committee to reorder the agenda so that we can deal with it in the manner that I believe is most appropriate to first nations, aboriginal peoples, and to Canadians generally.

The Chair: Madam Neville, the chair can request a meeting for a specific issue to be dealt with, and the committee can change the order of business or the purpose of the meeting. So you have that ability—

Hon. Anita Neville: And that's what I'm asking for.

The Chair: —but I do have the ability to call a meeting for a specific purpose, which I did.

Now we'll move on to the motion, which is that we deal with the motions prior to the clause-by-clause.

An hon. member: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: I'll ask the clerk to record the vote.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Bonnie Charron): On the question that we change the agenda to move to the motion of Anita Neville first.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll move on to the motion that has been presented by Madam Neville.

Madam Neville, would you like to speak?

Hon. Anita Neville: Would you like me to read it, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes, if you would, please.

Hon. Anita Neville: My notice of motion, which I provided to you earlier this week, Mr. Chair, reads:

Whereas the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development agreed at its meeting of May 10, 2007, that the clause by clause study of C-44 "be reserved until September",

Whereas the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development adopted a motion on June 19, 2007, calling on "all debate on repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act be suspended for a maximum of 10 months, following the adoption of this motion by the Committee",

That the clause by clause study of bill C-44, An Act to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act, should immediately be suspended until proper consultations have taken place pursuant to the motion adopted by this committee on June 19, 2007.

The Chair: Do you wish to speak to the motion, Madam Neville?

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chair, I do wish to speak to the motion. What I'm going to say is not new to any of the members of the committee sitting here, and I don't know that it is going to be new to many Canadians.

We have heard many, many representations over the months. We've heard from first nations communities, we've heard from first nations leadership, and we've heard from men and women right across this country who have come to speak to the motion. Overwhelmingly, Mr. Chair, we have heard that first nations communities are not prepared for this motion to be put forward.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Chair, what I have said on the record several times in committee and in the House of Commons. While we support the intent of this bill, we do not support the process by which it is being foisted upon aboriginal communities across the country.

We have heard overwhelmingly of the importance of consultation—consultation that is meaningful, consultation that takes place in the communities, consultation that speaks to the impact of this legislation, and consultation that will impact the lives of ordinary aboriginal Canadians on reserve. We have heard that they're not ready. We have heard that they need this process.

I strongly support the motion that was put forward on June 19 that this consultation process take place.

We've had a month already and nothing has happened. We put a maximum of ten months for it to take place. The clock is ticking. It is important. We have heard overwhelmingly—and I will come back to this later in debate—from women, who this bill is intended, as we have heard many times, to help, support, whatever, that they want the consultation process. Just the day before yesterday I attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Manitoba, and I heard overwhelmingly from first nations women: "Don't use your standards to make policies for us. Consider our culture. Consider our concerns. Consider our heritage and our way of doing things."

I think the consultation process is important. I think it is equally important that the will of this committee be supported. We said

unequivocally in early May that we would not be dealing with clause-by-clause until at least September.

So there are two issues: the issue of consultation and the will of Parliament. I do not understand how, as chair, as a government, you are choosing to override the unanimous consent of this committee to move ahead in the middle of July. The committee of—

● (1125)

The Chair: There was not unanimous consent.

Hon. Anita Neville: Read the minutes of the meeting. There were no negative comments on the May 10.... Let me find it and read it into the record, Mr. Chair, because at the May 10 meeting there was concurrence.... It reads:

It was agreed, — That the report of the Subcommittee be concurred in.

The subcommittee report indicated that "clause-by-clause be reserved until September".

So there are two issues. The first issue is overriding the will of this committee, which was agreed to, if not by a majority...and it appears to have been concurred in unanimously, but certainly by a majority of the committee. The second issue is the consultation process.

I'll come back to it in the debate, but I have more to say.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to go to Mr. Lemay and then to Madam Crowder.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chairman, we are going to support Ms. Neville's motion for a number of reasons.

First, I would like to remind you that the majority of committee members voted in favour of the June 19 decision. The majority of the government members opposed it. Rather I should say the minority, because they have to be reminded that they are in the minority and that this government must behave like a minority government, that is to say that it must consult those that can help it move this issue forward.

I'm going to reread it since a number of people have asked me the question.

To allow a reasonable time for consultation with and between the First Nations regarding repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act and its intent, the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development pursuant to Standing Order 108(1)(a) recommends as follows:

1. That all debate on repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act be suspended for a maximum of 10 months following adoption of this motion by the Committee, in order to make possible the following:

a. discussions between the federal government and the organizations representing the First Nations locally, regionally and nationally, on an appropriate level of funding to support an adequate consultation process, with each First Nation to receive such funding;

b. consultation of its citizens by each First Nation, and consultation by the First Nations of one another, within their regional structures;

c. the launching by the federal government of consultations with the First Nations, either on an individual basis or by regional or national organization, as determined by each First Nation.

2. That, once the process defined above is completed, and no later than 10 months after adoption of this motion by the Committee, the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development resume debate and public hearings on repeal of section 67 of the Canadian Human Rights Act, or its replacement, so that the First Nations could either appear before the Committee to explain the results of their consultations, or submit the results in writing.

Mr. Chairman, nothing has happened since this motion was adopted on June 19 last. The proof that nothing has happened is that the national chief of the Assembly of First Nations, Phil Fontaine, is denouncing the federal government, which abuses the universal rights of the First Nations of Canada and of the other Aboriginal peoples of the entire world, in his view.

At the same time, again according to Chief Phil Fontaine, the government is trying to impose new laws on them without providing the necessary resources for them to achieve the expected results. That's what Phil Fontaine has just declared in reaction to the premature resumption of proceedings on Bill C-44.

We have in hand the position of the chiefs of Ontario. The Assembly of First Nations of Quebec and Labrador has the same position. Nothing has happened with regard to Bill C-44 since June 19. It is time this stopped. It is time the government put in place a genuine system of consultation, in accordance with the decision made by this committee on June 19 last. Consequently, I ask that we vote on this motion as soon as possible. We are going to vote in favour of Ms. Neville's motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

• (1130)

[English]

The Chair: Madam Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will be supporting Ms. Neville's motion.

I think there are a couple of important points here. One is around process.

The committee, after hearing from witnesses from all over the country, consistently heard the message that appropriate consultation needs to happen before this bill is put into effect. The majority on this committee—the opposition members on this committee—have, after having heard from witnesses, who included the Native Women's Association of Canada, the Indigenous Bar Association, the Canadian Bar Association, the Assembly of First Nations, chiefs

and councils from across this country.... After hearing substantial testimony, considered testimony, and legal experts as well, the committee determined that based on everything they had heard, it was only responsible of this committee to consider that testimony and call for appropriate consultation. That included looking at the communities across this country, looking at perhaps some self-government agreements that have already drafted their own human rights codes. It would seem to me that the committee, in being responsible, heard that testimony and called on the government to do that appropriate consultation.

So we have the issue of the fact that the majority of this committee passed a motion calling for that. They passed a motion back in May; they passed a subsequent motion in June. We have a minority of this committee attempting to disregard that process. It does call into question the commitment to a democratic process. But of course it's not really a surprise to a number of us in opposition, given that the Conservatives have chosen to ignore a number of key issues that have come before the House where the majority ruled and the Conservatives have chosen to ignore it. So it does call into question a commitment to a democratic process.

The second piece of this is around the substance, and I did touch on it briefly already—around the amount of testimony that we have heard talking about the need for consultation, talking about an interpretive clause, talking about non-derogation, but also talking about the unintended consequences of legislation that has come before the House in the past and perhaps was passed without that appropriate consultation. Everybody is very familiar with Bill C-31 and the impact it's having on the second-generation cut-off.

Even more recently, we've had a Conservative Party that likes to tout itself as a champion of human rights appeal the Sharon McIvor decision, where the Supreme Court in British Columbia.... This is what the justice said: "I have concluded that the registration provisions embodied in section 6 of the 1985 Indian Act continue the very discrimination that the amendments were intended to eliminate." This provision prefers male Indians and their descendants to female Indians and their descendants. So despite the government asking her for 24 months to give Parliament time to consult, she didn't agree, and said that it needed to be looked at quickly.

Later, on July 6, after the House had recessed and on a Friday, when there's not a lot of media attention, the Conservative government chose to appeal that decision.

It's difficult to put into context the people who are saying let's move ahead on human rights in the context of a decision that they've now appealed, which discriminates against Indian women, using the justice's words. So I would urge this committee, after hearing the amount of testimony it heard, to take the appropriate amount of time to ensure that the repeal of section 67 is implemented in a way that works in first nations communities and doesn't end up with unintended consequences.

I haven't heard one person talk about not supporting the repeal of section 67. We all support the repeal of section 67. It's how we do it. I am sure that in a future generation we don't want to have to try to deal with consequences of a bill that was flawed, as we're doing with Bill C-31. Ten months is not an unconscionable amount of time. I would urge this committee to take that appropriate amount of time to hear from people and make sure that we're making the best decision possible.

• (1135)

I think it is part of our mandate and our duty as responsible elected officials to listen to the people who are going to be most affected by this piece of legislation. So I will be supporting Ms. Neville's motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Crowder.

Mr. Bruinooge, please.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Our government—the members of this committee—brought forward Bill C-44 because we feel that after 30 years, first nations people on reserve deserve access to the human rights that all of us in this room, or many of us, take for granted. As an aboriginal person myself, as I've said already, it's something that I can take for granted. But we've received communications from people on reserve who want to see this happen, who want to see this happen as soon as possible.

We've seen 30 years of information brought forward to numerous Parliaments. Unfortunately, all of these attempts have failed. We have the opportunity today to actually move forward, extending human rights to first nations people through Bill C-44. In the past, we've seen actually majority governments fail in this attempt. As a minority government, we can never predict when the next election is going to happen, but we do know that this must be done.

All of the opposition parties in the past, during the initial introduction of Bill C-44, glowingly asked to have it passed. But once it's come to committee, they now decide we need to put it off further.

Mr. Chair, I know that this is something we can look at as being not only historic but meaningful as well. People will actually have something tangible. They will be able to bring forward a human rights violation to the Canadian Human Rights Commission. Right now, if a first nations person walks through the front door of the Canadian Human Rights Commission, their actual complaint will be turned down, not allowed.

This is why we called this committee. I know that some of the members opposite have complained about having to come back to Ottawa at this time to deal with this issue, but as I see it, the most important thing we can possibly do as elected officials is actually take time out of our summer to address the very important issue of human rights for first nations people.

You're calling that a script. Unfortunately, this is something we believe. As an aboriginal person myself, I couldn't think of a better thing to be doing with my time this summer.

I'd like to address some of the comments Ms. Crowder made in terms of democracy. She's right that she can vote for this motion today. She can vote to continue putting off human rights to first nations people. That's democracy. But we're here today to highlight the fact that this is something we believe in. This is something we actually want to see go forward.

You can choose today to vote against extending human rights to first nations people. That may be what you do. But one of the things we want to do is highlight all of the reasons why now is the time.

We heard from a number of people in the spring session, and many of them called for a longer transition period. When we introduced this bill, it had a six-month transition period. We wanted to extend human rights as soon as possible to first nations people on reserve who are having their human rights violated. However, many people asked for a longer transition period, so our government actually brought in an amendment this week extending this transition period to eighteen months.

A longer transition period was asked for by a number of people from all across Canada, from people who came before our committee, including Professor Larry Chartrand, one of the most senior aboriginal professors in Canada. When asked about the time of transition, he mentioned that six months perhaps was too short, but a year to sixteen months would be appropriate. We've actually gone further than that with the eighteen months.

Looking at the testimony of the Canadian Human Rights Commission before this committee, which was very helpful to us, they also called for a longer transition. We've done that. But they also said that they would continue to consult post-repeal with first nations groups to help draft their provisions for dealing with the implementation of this important act.

It's important to remember that at the Canadian Human Rights Commission, they are the experts. They've had 30 years in Canada to deal with this state-of-the-art legislation. They are the individuals who have brought Canada to the very forefront of human rights legislation in the world. The world looks at Canada and looks at the act we have as being the most important thing we can bring forward to individuals.

So this is something they have said they will do, and I'm sure first nations people will also work together with the Canadian Human Rights Commission to find the balance section 35 calls for.

Speaking of section 35, we often talk at this committee about the section 35 rights of aboriginal people, of first nations people specifically. Of course everyone here appreciates that that is the highest law in the land, so naturally the repeal of section 67 will incorporate that important piece of legislation just by the sheer fact that it is the highest law in the land.

•(1140)

Mr. Chair, just in closing, I would like to ask everyone here not only to finally extend to first nations people on reserve the Canadian Human Rights Act but to consider all the things that we have done as a committee. It is something where today we can put an historic stamp on this session and actually do what so many Parliaments previously failed to do. This is something we can do today. I look forward to hopefully seeing a positive result.

I would also like to put a motion forward to table Ms. Neville's motion so that we can get back to dealing with the important business of extending the Canadian Human Rights Act to first nations people.

•(1145)

Mr. Brian Storseth: That's a fair point.

The Chair: There's a motion to table the motion that is—

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, I believe this must go right to a vote.

The Chair: It's not debatable, so let's go to a vote. We'll go to a vote on it right away.

The motion is that we table Madam Neville's motion, the one we're dealing with now, until after—

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: We passed a motion that we'd like to change the agenda. This is pathetic.

The Chair: The motion is out of order. The reason is that we've already decided that we're changing the agenda of the meeting to deal with the motion. If we return to going to clause-by-clause, then we are contradicting the motion we've passed. So we're going to carry on.

Mr. Brian Storseth: A point of order, Mr. Chair. While I understand what you're saying, Mr. Chair, I believe that what the parliamentary secretary has brought up really has hopefully changed some of the—

The Chair: This is not debatable, Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth: I'm not on the debate. This is a point of order on your ruling, Mr. Chair, that there's no vote.

The Chair: Then you need to challenge the chair.

An hon. member: Are you challenging the chair?

Mr. Brian Storseth: No. I'm calling for a point of clarification.

The Chair: Let's move on with the debate, please, on the motion of Madam Neville.

On my speaking list right now I'm going to move to Mr. McGuinty and then to Mr. Albrecht.

Mr. McGuinty, please.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Thanks, Mr. Chair. I am very new to this committee, so thank you for including me today.

I've had a chance to read the minutes of the proceedings dated June 19, 2007, meeting number 60, of this committee. I've had a chance to take a closer look at Marleau and Montpetit in *House of*

Commons Procedure and Practice. In it there's an interesting and operative passage that I'd like to read. It says:

Where a committee has not made a formal decision concerning the convening of its members, either by adopting a work plan or by concurring in a steering committee report, the Chair usually consults with members informally concerning possible future meetings.

Now, notwithstanding anything I've heard from the parliamentary secretary, which I think he's trying to frame as, effectively, using my language, a nobility of purpose, why would we convene this meeting in the summer, against the will of this committee, against the will of Parliament? Why would this happen?

There's an old Latin maxim from law that loosely translated goes something like this: A man always acts for a reason. I think Canadians would be forgiven if they were to discern and detect here a pattern of conduct from this government over the last eighteen months that is troubling. Let me review.

At the international trade committee witnesses were directly and explicitly censored by the chair. At the environment committee the chair—

Mr. Steven Blaney: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Could we deal with the motion?

Mr. Steven Blaney: It's not relevant to what we're talking about today.

Mr. David McGuinty: This has everything to do with the motion at hand.

Mr. Steven Blaney: Mr. Chair, I think we're talking about the human rights of first nations here.

Mr. David McGuinty: And that's exactly what we're talking about.

Mr. Steven Blaney: I invite the member to—

The Chair: We're dealing with.... Please, Mr. Blaney.

An hon. member: We're talking about parliamentary procedure.

Mr. David McGuinty: At the environment committee the chair was forced to resign for the same kinds of similar shenanigans. At the official languages committee the chair was removed; similarly, at the ethics committee.

You know, it's interesting, if a man always acts for a reason, what is the reason here? This is a minority government. If the outcome is the nobility of purpose that the parliamentary secretary seeks to achieve, why is he then proceeding, I assume with the chair, in such an antagonistic fashion? Why? Why are we working against parliamentary tradition and procedure? Are we really trying to achieve a better outcome for our aboriginal peoples, or is this mid-summer doldrums and a need to create a crisis in order to pursue PMO shock-and-awe communication strategies?

This committee is the master of its own destiny. The minister himself has repeated many times that he is interested in constructive dialogue. Those are his words. The Conservative MPs may laugh at their minister; I won't. I take him at face value. I believe he does care about constructive dialogue. He says it's essential.

If this is what constitutes constructive dialogue, Chair, through this process, through these shenanigans, then Canadians could be forgiven, because it's reminiscent of another government—another government at the provincial level. That was the government of one Mike Harris.

• (1150)

The Chair: Could we...?

Mr. David McGuinty: This is very much on point.

The Chair: You're beginning to ramble. Please stay on topic.

Hon. Anita Neville: I find this fascinating.

The Chair: I can imagine you do, but this chair would like you to stay on topic.

Mr. David McGuinty: Let's talk about Ipperwash, Chair, shall we? Shall we talk about Walkerton and Ipperwash?

The Chair: No, let's talk about—

Mr. David McGuinty: Let's talk about the conduct of a Republican government in Ontario—

The Chair: —Bill C-44.

Mr. David McGuinty: —and its treatment of aboriginal peoples there.

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty, please, Bill C-44.

Mr. David McGuinty: I'm dealing with Bill C-44, and I'm dealing with your unilateral decision to call this meeting.

This isn't surprising, and I think Canadians should be aware of this. This is Karl Rove in action. This is a transparent, identifiable, Republican political technique. It's a cheap and low-brow technique to drive a wedge between parliamentarians, to drive a wedge between Canadians, to drive a wedge between aboriginal Canadians. It speaks to division. It speaks to halting dialogue. It speaks to halting consultation.

What exactly does the government seek to achieve here, Mr. Chair? What exactly does the government expect to achieve? When will it understand that it is not permitted in minority government fashion to undermine parliamentary procedure, democratic principles, and practices that have evolved over a century? If the parliamentary secretary is so ultimately committed to the changes contemplated, why is he driving forward against the will of this committee? Why is he driving forward against the will of Parliament—to create a crisis, to seek to drive a wedge, to seek to fail?

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty, you're speaking off the topic. The chair is going to rule that you discontinue and just deal with Bill C-44, please.

Mr. David McGuinty: I'm dealing with Bill C-44.

Here's my final comment. If the government is really concerned, this is not the way forward. This is simply going to continue to poison the atmosphere of dialogue and consultation and consensus at this committee and in the House. Everybody in this room knows it. The staff of this committee know it. The MPs on that side of the room know it in their heart of hearts, and the staff behind the wall know it.

So I would strongly support the motion put forward by my colleague Ms. Neville.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'd like to remind the committee that the motion that Mr. Lemay put forward June 19 was contrary to the recommendation by the subcommittee to wait until September to go to clause-by-clause. There wasn't a word spoken at that time about the fact that we're changing the agenda, and that's what happened. So I actually take offence to the fact that they would accuse the chair of trying to move this bill forward, because I believe the intent of the House is to move a bill forward in a timely fashion, and that's why we're here.

We'll move on to Mr. Albrecht, please.

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think all of us around this table will recall vividly the dozens of witnesses who came before this committee in the last six months. Each of the witnesses had two primary concerns. One was the consultation period, and the other was the implementation period.

Around consultation, there really was no consensus as to what adequate consultation was. Around implementation, our government, as our parliamentary secretary has pointed out, has made a significant move by extending the implementation period from six months to eighteen months. Twelve months are added there.

I have a question in regard to this particular motion that's in front of us calling for consultation. I would like the mover of the motion to clarify, are we going to first nations groups to consult on Bill C-44 in its current form? Are we going to first nations groups to consult on one of the amendments that she has proposed, or possibly one of the amendments that the NDP or even the government has proposed? Which consultation will occur over these next few months? If at the end of that time an alternate form is decided upon, will we again need to go back for another ten months of consultation?

Mr. Chair, it's clear to me that we will never come up with a bill that has every single "What if...?" addressed. There will be questions; there will be review. In fact, this bill gives opportunity for review. I'm just disappointed to see that we are dragging our feet.

No, we're not creating a crisis, Mr. McGuinty. This has been for 30 years. Previous Parliaments have attempted to change this. Governments of all stripes have attempted to change it. Why are we now suddenly afraid to move ahead with legislation that Canadians have been asking for, that first nations people have been asking for, and take the responsibility here at this committee to get some legislation in place? Yes, we'll fine-tune it as time goes on, but to hide behind a perfect solution when action is needed I think is irresponsible. We need to move.

• (1155)

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to go to Mr. Russell, who hasn't had an opportunity. I haven't been ignoring you, Mr. Russell, and I would like to give you the opportunity now.

Mr. Todd Russell: I wouldn't want you to break a trend, just the same, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, or it soon will be good afternoon. It's good to be back in Ottawa to speak to this particular matter.

I am going to speak in favour of Ms. Neville's motion. It respects the will of the committee and the previous decisions of the committee. It respects the will of the vast majority of the witnesses who have appeared before us. But most of all, and I've heard this time and time again, it respects the will and the voice of aboriginal Canadians. That, to me, is the most important thing about this particular motion: it respects the will and the voice of aboriginal Canadians to be heard, to be listened to, not to have something rammed down their throats, and to respect their traditions, their customs, and their own laws. That, fundamentally, for me, is what this motion says.

I'm saying this as a parliamentarian. No parliamentarian, and certainly not a minority of them, has the right to dictate the lives and will of aboriginal people in this country. I was an aboriginal leader for ten years, and I fought against parties of all stripes, to be quite frank with you, when things were being foisted upon us against our will. It's not that we're against the repeal of section 67. We're against the way this minority Conservative government wants to do it, without consultation, without listening, without understanding the dynamics. Mistakes have been made in the past. We're only saying let's not do things in a way where mistakes are repeated today and into the future.

I want to highlight that they talk about noble means, noble ways of doing things. Well, what did I see before the first throne speech came down? The Kelowna accord was cancelled. What did the rest of Canadians see? The appeal of the McIvor decision and the rejection of the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. Do you know what the worst was, from a personal perspective, Mr. Chair? You can't consult on this human rights legislation, but you want to consult before you make an apology to the aboriginal people of this country around residential schools. How crass is that?

This motion respects the will of the committee, it respects the witnesses who have appeared before us, it respects aboriginal people, and it respects the democratic process we have in place. For all of those reasons, I support this motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to go to Mr. Blaney, and then the final say will be Madam Neville.

Madam Bennett, do you have something further to bring forward? Okay. Mr. Blaney first.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Steven Blaney: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the chance to speak to this motion, which I strongly oppose.

In life, there is a time to talk and debate, and there is a time to act. Mr. McGuinty asked what the government is seeking to achieve with this bill. I will also remind him of the will of the House. It has referred this bill to us for us to review it and to return it to the House so that it can make an informed decision on it. Over more than

16 meetings, we have heard from representatives of the communities, who have made comments on this bill.

The government's purpose is simply to seize this historic chance to extend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to the First Nations. It's simply that, Mr. Chairman. The simplest and clearest response we can give Mr. McGuinty is that the government wants to extend the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms to the First Nations.

I understand his frustration, because, in the past, the Liberals have tried to adopt reforms with the First Nations, particularly with regard to governance. Unfortunately those efforts did not produce results. Today, we parliamentarians—including Mr. Bruinooge, who is Aboriginal—have the opportunity to propose a breakthrough for the First Nations. This is a real chance. We are prepared to move on to the clause-by-clause consideration. The bill may not be perfect, but it at least corrects an injustice that has lasted for 30 years and that has made it so the First Nations are not subject to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That's unacceptable, and everyone here recognizes that. We have a chance to proceed today.

So let's move ahead. What are we waiting for? This is a historic chance offered to the members of this committee to send a bill back to the House so that we can at last correct this deficiency and this error.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that my colleagues have expressed themselves very well on the question. I believe there is a time to talk and debate, but this is the time to act. We have the opportunity to do that; let's move ahead.

Thank you.

• (1200)

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay. I want to wrap up really quickly, so I'm going to allow Madam Bennett to bring her concerns forward, speaking to the motion for a short—

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, Mr. Storseth hasn't spoken to the motion.

The Chair: Actually, I've got Mr. Albrecht. Do you want to share...?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: I have not received a response to the question I raised during my presentation, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Anita Neville: I don't have to answer any questions, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay.

Madam Bennett first, and then we'll....

Hon. Carolyn Bennett: Mr. Chair, I am in full support of Ms. Neville's motion, in that I believe this is actually about getting this bill right. It is really not up to the chair to determine what's a timely fashion. This is about listening to our aboriginal people, particularly aboriginal women, and getting right this complexity between individual human rights and collective human rights. It is very important for what we've heard from our aboriginal peoples, particularly the women.

I am very concerned that for us to feel that it's up to us, in some sort of paternalistic way, to jam this forward, before our aboriginal people feel there has been proper consultation, will only mean that we will get it wrong. Regardless of how long implementation takes, if the actual framework of the bill is wrong and flawed, we won't be able to implement what is not a good bill.

Eighteen months of consultation went into Kelowna, and it was extraordinarily well received. The people themselves felt they had got it right, both in accountability and in the what, the when, and the how. I think it is extraordinarily important now that we move forward and that by September the government be able to explain the meaningful consultations that have taken place over this time; otherwise, the will of Parliament will not have taken place in terms of what was passed and agreed upon by this committee in May and the intent of the bill and the intent of the Bloc motion.

I think it is really important, and I say to the chair that once this motion is passed, it is really incumbent upon you to make sure that meaningful consultation, proper consultation, has taken place before this bill comes back to this committee.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Storseth, and then we'll wrap up with Madam Neville.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I find that interesting. The last time this legislation was brought forward the member was actually sitting at the cabinet table, and admits that there wasn't adequate consultation.

Mr. Chair, we've had a lot of debate on this, we've had a lot of discussion on this. I have to admit that I'm just a normal person; I'm not a big city lawyer like some of the members opposite or an academic who speaks in many tongues. But what I do know, Mr. Chair, is that when I go home, when I go to my own community and talk to first nations people, I hear from them that they want this moved forward. Normal people want to see the Canadian Human Rights Act extended to all Canadians and to all human beings in this country, Mr. Chair.

I know that there are many things in this bill the opposition has said they would like to change. We have admitted that there are some things we'd like to do to enhance the legislation, after listening to and working with first nations communities and organizations, as well as after listening to some of the debate around this table.

The proof is in the pudding. There are amendments sitting in front of us, Mr. Chair. What we are suggesting is that the opposition go forward, work together, as you have to in a minority government, in a minority Parliament, and work with us on the amendments. Let's set this aside. They can keep this motion over our heads. Let's set aside the partisanship and work together to provide human rights for all human beings in this country, Mr. Chair. That is really what we need to do here. That is really what the people of my constituency have asked me to come here to do today.

It's not that the opposition can't.... Let's hammer out some of the ideas, some of the amendments here. Let's be reasonable, let's be parliamentarians, and let's see what we can get done. And if they don't like it at the end of the day, bring this motion forward.

Just as an ending, Mr. Chair, I know that the time comes for decisions, and people and leaders have to make decisions. They have to. The people in my riding are saying get this done—not tomorrow, not next week, not next month, and certainly not ten months from now. They want to see some real action on this. So let's see some leadership from the other side and from the other parties.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1205)

The Chair: We've just about finished here. I've allowed Madam Neville the last say. Can I proceed?

Mr. Lévesque, do you have something? Please be concise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: I'll be very concise, Mr. Chairman, as always.

A transition period has been proposed to us. We had suggested, not a transition period, but rather a consultation period, as the government promised the First Nations for every project or legislative amendment concerning them. At every meeting where testimony was heard, at least two out of three witnesses—and very often the majority of witnesses—reminded us of the need to consult them before proceeding with a change concerning them.

I deeply regret the fact that the government always says the opposition should work with it. Why wouldn't the reverse be possible? Why doesn't the government work with the opposition? If that were the case, we would have gotten quite a bit further. There would already have been five weeks of consultations, if we had undertaken to act in accordance with the motion adopted by this committee.

I'm sorry, but, to my mind, this meeting discredits the work of this committee. I inform you that I'm going to support Ms. Neville's motion and propose that we at least wait until the consultations are completed. In 10 months, if nothing has been done, we'll make a decision.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Madam Neville, wrap up, if you would, the comments on your motion. Then we'll be voting.

Hon. Anita Neville: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I have a number of comments I want to make.

Mr. Chairman, we have sat here for a number of months. We've heard representation from a whole host of Canadians—aboriginal, non-aboriginal, and, I would put forward, normal Canadians. I don't want to get adversarial, but I take great offence when I hear my colleague opposite say normal Canadians want this bill passed. One delegation said the legislation is just fine. Every other representation we had here had concerns.

I know the clerk extended the notices to go out to Canadians across the country who wanted to come before this committee to make presentations, to make representation. We expanded the notice. Those so-called normal Canadians who want this bill passed didn't come to the committee or didn't submit written representations. I would say that the very normal Canadians who came before this committee over the last number of months made their positions very clear.

First of all, what I want to reiterate again, because nobody seems to let it sink in, is that we do support the intent of this legislation—I have said that over and over again—but we feel that the process has been badly flawed. We have heard from Canadians who have come before this committee making representations on the nature of consultation that should take place. I guess what I ask my colleagues opposite is, why do they think they know best? Nobody who came before the committee, but one, said they were on the right track, so why do they know best?

Mr. Chair, I want to read into the record a number of statements made before this committee. They're not lengthy, but I think it's important to underline the importance of the consultative process that aboriginal Canadians—men and women from all parts of this country—are asking for.

The first quote I want to read is from Beverley Jacobs, the president of the Native Women's Association of Canada, made to the committee on April 17. She said:

We agree that the repeal of section 67 is long overdue. However, we feel there has to be meaningful consultation as a strong first step of an evolving and collaborative process. We do not view human rights protection as compartmental. It is a process in which each step is necessary to achieve success in the overall goal. Consultation is not an excuse for inaction; it is an essential element in an active process.

The next quote is from Mr. Ghislain Picard, the regional chief of the Assembly of First Nations of Quebec. He said:

...Bill C-44 was not developed jointly with first nations, at least not so with the members of the AFNQL. Despite its virtuous intent, it is another example of imposition on first nations without our consent, despite the fine promises of the Crown to the contrary.

I am not reading it all; I'm just reading some, Mr. Chair.

Chief Lynda Price from the Ulkatcho First Nation, on March 29, said:

Repealing section 67 and replacing it with appropriate legislation to protect our individual rights and collective rights will be a giant step forward. Getting it right will be the challenge.

There are a number of changes that need to be made to the bill to get it right.

On May 31, Rose Laboucan, from the Driftpile First Nation, said:

As for the principle of Bill C-44, the repeal of section 67 I don't have a problem with, but let's talk about the process and what has to occur prior to that, instead of

ramming something down my throat again. I say that as a first nations person who has had to live under the Indian Act all my life.

I'm going to conclude, Mr. Chair, with comments made the day before yesterday at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference by Chief Betsy Kennedy. I referenced it in my opening comments. She said:

The challenges for aboriginal Canadians, cultural and political, are the differing world views and competing values. Is it possible to promote first nations cultures and achieve our desired political outcomes within the context of the Canadian political system?

• (1210)

What did she use as her examples? The matrimonial real property on reserve, and proposed Bill C-44, an act to amend Canadian human rights issues.

If you will recall, Mr. Chair, the first nations women had a summit last February, in your part of the country, in British Columbia, and as part of their statement they articulated:

We are mad as hell with the crown government interference in our lives, and we're not going to take it any more. We maintain our authority to be law-makers and caretakers of our nations, our families, and our lands. We stand united to oppose attempts by the federal government to unilaterally impose legislation and policy. Through our collective efforts, we will achieve systemic change.

Mr. Chair, I put forward this motion because I think it is imperative that we get it right. My colleague Ms. Crowder has cited Bill C-31 and the McIvor decision, years of legislation, costly legislation, much of it under the now-abolished court challenges program, and unintended consequences. It is important that we do it right.

We support the intent of this legislation. My colleagues on this side, and I would say all parties, support human rights for all Canadians, but we don't ram it down their throats. Human rights rammed down a community's throat is not human rights. We have heard overwhelmingly from first nations, from men and women, that they want it done right—"consult with us, involve us, let's work it out together"—and that's all we're asking, Mr. Chair.

So I would ask members present to support my motion and let's do it right.

The Chair: We're going to move to the motion.

Would you like the vote recorded?

Some hon. members: Yes.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (1215)

The Chair: Mr. Lemay.

Mr. Marc Lemay: I move to adjourn.

[*Translation*]

I move that the meeting be adjourned.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is it carried? All agreed?

The meeting is adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.