

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 14, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees; Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

I'd like to interrupt proceedings for a moment to introduce a very distinguished guest we have with us today on my right in the loges in the person of the Hon. Armand Russell, Minister of Public Works, Province of Quebec. The Honourable Minister is visiting our province in connection with the All Star Pee Wee Week Hockey Team. For the further information of the honourable members, the boys are drawn from all parts of the Province of Quebec and I understand that the officials connected with hockey in the province have made a special effort to draw the members of the team from all nationalities throughout the Province of Quebec. The boys have been in Winnipeg competing with the St. James-Assiniboia All Stars and were successful in winning a very close series with the local boys. An added feature of the visit is that 20 citizens came from Quebec, travelling at their own expense, which has added to the goodwill of the tour. Mr. Minister, on behalf of the members of the Assembly, may I congratulate you in showing interest in this great undertaking, and in doing so I welcome you here today.

I'd like to introduce our young guests while we have a moment. We have 100 students of Grade 8 standing from the Hugh John McDonald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Fedak, Mr. Enns and Mr. Swain. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

We also have with us 29 students of Grade 8 standing from the Warren Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Boyd. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (The Pas) in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, introduced Bill No. 6, an Act to validate an agreement between The Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg and the Canadian National Railway Company; and Bill No. 68, an Act to amend The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act(2).

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 64, an Act to amend The Department of Welfare Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 67, an Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Act.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 30, The Veterinary Medical Association of Manitoba Act.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 61, an Act to amend The St. James-Assiniboia Charter and to enlarge the Boundaries of The City.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) introduced Bill No. 62, an Act to amend The Brandon Charter.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 66, an Act respecting Victoria General Hospital.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) introduced Bill No. 65, an Act for the Relief of Janet Pearson Morton Alexander.

MR. COWAN introduced Bill No. 69, an Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Gladstone . . .

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Trying to be helpful. Orders of the Day.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, by leave, if I may be permitted to read a short statement bringing the members up to date with the current flood situation in the province. I should inform the members that the Water Control and Conservation Branch have continued active flood fighting activities around the clock over the past weekend. The warm weather released water into the water courses throughout the province. Flows on the Red River continue to rise, and on Sunday evening at 8 p. m. the flows on the Red River reached the crest of the floodway inlet and the inlet control structure was placed in operation for the first time. Gates were raised to 7 feet and 2,000 cubic feet per second were diverted down the floodway. The inlet control structure will be maintained on a 24-hour basis and necessary gate adjustments will be made to maintain the upstream elevation at the level which would have been obtained under natural conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's opportune to take note of the operation of this great floodway. I know the floodway itself is no longer news, but again the fact that it's been around with us has somehow dulled our appreciation of its significance. The best way I could perhaps underline its significance to the residents of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area is to simply underline the fact that in 1966 when we were faced with identical flood situations we were expending upwards to eight or nine million dollars in emergency diking operations; this comparable to this year's allotment of some three to four hundred thousand. This is a significant difference to say nothing of the hardship, the inconvenience to businesses and residents by the emergency diking that their putting in place and their subsequent removal caused.

I think it's a particular point of call that most members should attempt to make. I have no official tour lined up of the floodway in operation, but I would suggest members or groups of members who might wish to see the operation of the floodway to contact either my office or members of the Water Control Branch, who I am sure would make it possible for them to witness the floodway in its operations.

Further to this, at various communities which have been diked in the valley, preparations are proceeding for the closure of the openings in the dikes to provide protection up to the predicted flows. At the Roseau Indian Reserve the temporary dikes to provide protection to the 1966 level has been completed.

On the Assiniboine River there is still ice cover between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie. However, there has been a five-foot rise in the last 24 hours and continued surveillance is being maintained in the reach of the river below Portage to prevent possible serious ice jamming and flooding in this reach. Above Portage, ice jamming has occurred along the river. However, due to the deep valley there has been no serious damage although the Spruce Woods Forest Park was flooded out on Saturday night.

On the Souris River, record flows are predicted along its course in the United States and it is anticipated that there will be high flows along the river in Manitoba. However, the tributary streams along the west of the river in Manitoba are not flowing to full capacity as yet, and the warm weather yesterday and today should result in the movement of the water through these same areas. It is anticipated that flows from these streams will be in the main stem prior to the peak flows from the United States.

On the Icelandic River, serious ice jamming occurred in the reach of the river between Arborg and Riverton, but the report this morning indicated that ice jams had cleared and no blasting operation was required.

On the Whitemud River, the river has overflowed its banks south of Gladstone and the flows are following the Dead Lake channel as has occurred in former years. Diking operations and maintenance is being carried on in Gladstone.

At the Oak Lake Indian Reserve, flash flooding occurred on Saturday night and overtopped the local dike, forcing the evacuation of some 15 to 20 homes. This dike has now been reinforced with freeboard being provided as a means to prevent further flooding from the Oak River and its tributaries in the immediate vicinity of the reserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should also indicate to the members that I have a number of the daily flood forecast sheets available and would ask the members to avail themselves of them from me. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the honourable Minister that the Greater Winnipeg Floodway is now in operation and is taking in water at the rate of 2,000 cubic feet per second, and in light of the flooding which has taken place west of the Red River in the Municipality of St. Andrew's and north of the Town of Selkirk, and in light of the further fact too that there's still ice on the Red River and that Lake Winnipeg is not open yet to take water, what assurance can the Honourable Minister give to me, so that I can give to my constituents, that the control of water entering the Greater Winnipeg Floodway will be controlled to such an extent that Selkirk and the district north will not be subject to flooding?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the Honourable Member from Lakeside on previous occasions, and I do so again, that we anticipate no additional flooding as a result of the operation of the Red River Floodway to Selkirk and the surrounding district. We have of course, as we have along the full stretch of the floodway, staff members carefully monitoring and recording this initial operation. We will be watching most closely the situation in the Selkirk area and we have every indication, engineering-wise, that this in no way will add to the difficulties that Selkirk normally faces each year at this time, or in years of high water.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister. What is the government policy towards assisting municipalities that are going to have to spend large sums of money due to the flash floods in western Manitoba? I know of one particular area where there are three bridges washed out - these are municipal bridges and roads. What policy have you got to help them financially?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, other than in those areas that are well known to the members where, because of the magnitude of flooding, they have been designated as areas for which provincial assistance has been forthcoming, these responsibilities are within the confines of the municipal authorities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota -- a supplementary?

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary. This is an unusual circumstance this year, particularly in the area of the Municipality of Daly. The Member for Virden is suffering the same way I am, and the First Minister and the Member for Turtle Mountain. It is very unusual and I wondered if the Minister will be giving some consideration to this if they appeal?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. It's reported that the provincial governments of Canada are taking a "wait and see" attitude towards the federal government in the field of consumer credit legislation. Are there any areas within which the Honourable Minister proposes to bring forth legislation dealing with matters related to consumer affairs, that is bring forth legislation before waiting to see what the federal government does?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, members will be advised in due course of what our plans will be. I would like to take exception to the suggestion that the provincial governments are waiting to see what the federal government will do; in fact, we are pressing the federal government to go much further than they are prepared to go at the present time.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. The same news item invites suggestions regarding matters that may fall into the Hazardous Products' Act. Is there an office within Winnipeg to whom persons with such complaints could turn - complaints or suggestions?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of areas where they might want to register their complaints, either the Department of Health and Social Services, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, or the Department of Labour that deals with fire hazards and things of that kind. I would also like to mention that the Federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will have an office in the City of Winnipeg in the very near future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. A couple of weeks ago a meeting was held with the mayors of the Metropolitan area regarding the threatened flood,

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . and it was my understanding that the materials, the sandbags and sand would be made available to the municipalities - would be supplied to them. Is that policy being pursued or has there been a change in policy?

MR. ENNS: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I'm not fully cognizant of the arrangements that were made with my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the municipal authorities. I will take it upon myself to advise the honourable member at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: My question is for the Minister of Transport. When will the Minister be announcing the decision of the Motor Carrier Board re the truck rates, the increased truck rates?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Minister will not be making any announcement. That matter is within the purview of the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board. I do not know when they will be rendering a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota - a supplementary?

MR. DAWSON: Can the Minister take it on himself to find out when the report will be made?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I would not wish to appear to interfere with the operations of that Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Is the Minister aware of an editorial comment in the Financial Post relating to the economic unfeasibility of the works constructed by Churchill Forest Products at The Pas?

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the editorial referred to by the Honourable Member for Inkster. I believe I replied to a similar question late last week in the House when I stated very firmly that the points brought out in this editorial were unfounded and untrue as far as I'm concerned and this department is concerned.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I wasn't aware of the Minister's previous answer. As a supplementary question, I wonder if the Minister could advise the House, or obtain information as to the number of employees engaged in labouring occupations by Churchill Forest Products Limited?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to undertake to get the specific number of employees presently working. The member is aware that only the first phase, that is the first portion of the sawmill is in operation. I understand, just from the top of my head, that there are some 26 or 27 employees working, that is in the labour force, of which 17 are native citizens drawn from the local Indian Reserve at The Pas.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer. Again, is he indicating that he will have the exact information tomorrow? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question at the Minister of Labour. In the news there was a report of an accident at Portage and Smith in an excavation. Has an investigation been conducted as to what created the hazard, and are the inspectors looking into other areas of this, because we have had a number of excavation accidents in recent periods.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour) (Flin Flon): The answer, Mr. Speaker, to both questions is yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. A Return to an Order of the House No. 8 was tabled last week. There were some questions regarding the Boundaries Commission - the Local Government Boundaries Commission, and in this reply it's indicated that the total cost of the commission as at February 28, 1969, was a little over half a million dollars - \$511,841.64. In the light of this very major expenditure, could the First Minister indicate whether he intends to continue this commission or does he intend to disband it?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I've answered that question either two or three times this session.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister made a type of answer but he didn't reply whether he was going to disband or not.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if I may repeat, it is a matter of government policy, and if there is an announcement to be made it will be made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Apparently many universities are turning to the convention trade as a means of supplementing their income during the off period insofar as attendance in their residences are concerned. Would the Minister undertake to give consideration to this matter insofar as proposing it to our universities in Manitoba, perhaps to look into the possibility of using the residences and other facilities for a similar purpose.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the recommendation under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, due to the news over the weekend that the Qu'Appelle River in Saskatchewan is giving a lot of trouble, and it does feed into the Assiniboine, and the queries over the last three weeks or so that the Assiniboine would not flood west of Brandon by all probability, but over the weekend it has flooded a big chunk in the Virden area, and when this Qu'Appelle flow comes down, how serious is this going to be in the valley? I realize at this late date it is pretty near impossible to move grain, but if those farmers were warned, there is some way that they could get it out, because this Qu'Appelle comes in the St. Lazare area and I would fear that it would be a serious condition in the Assiniboine yet. I'm not trying to criticize my Minister, but have the forecast committee look at this as early as possible because I think there is a lot of danger there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and perhaps he can carry out both of our requests at the same time and with the same survey. Now question number one, it is a fact that the government is responsible for the Whitemud River and damages that result from spring flooding, I believe, and in consideration of the fact that yesterday the tops of the tombstones were just sticking out above the water in the cemetery, there will be a lot of damage. Will the government make a contribution to restoring the damage that was caused by the overflowing of the Whitemud into Dead Lake, as he has already reported to the House earlier today?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Honourable Member from Gladstone that this government will always accept those responsibilities that are within the jurisdiction of this government. I have indicated to the honourable member, and other members, that because of the widespread flooding in other parts of the province, we of course will be assessing many like situations throughout the province.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. I take from the answer that I have just received that it will be in order for the municipality and the town to request consideration in respect to the damage anyway. You will look on all applications favourably.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister. A survey in Toronto indicates that one-fifth of the families therein are living in housing beyond their income. Does the First Minister know whether any of his departments . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Did I understand the honourable gentleman to say he was discussing housing in Toronto?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, this is with reference to Manitoba as it may apply here. My question is, Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister know whether any departments in his government have conducted a survey of this type; and if they have, what is the situation in Manitoba?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter that could logically come up for discussion under the estimates of my colleague the Minister of Health and Social Services who is in charge of the housing responsibilities and will be up in due course.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

(1) The amount of power consumed by International Nickel Company in Thompson in 1961 - 1962 - 1963 - 1964 - 1965 - 1966 - 1967 - 1968.

(2) The price per kilowatt hour Inco paid to Manitoba Hydro for the years 1961 to 1968 inclusive.

(3) The cost of Manitoba Hydro of putting power into Soab Lake and Pipe Lake for International Nickel.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before the next item is called, I believe that there is unanimous agreement in the House to suspend the operation of Rule 22, subsection (3), which requires it to be called at this moment, on the understanding that it will be called tonight at the time which will be convenient to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to participate in this debate. If that's agreeable, I think the House is agreeable with that suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed). The adjourned debate on third reading of Bill 48. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say at the outset that I have no intention of opposing the passing of this Bill at third reading. I indicated to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that there was some research that I wanted to do with regard to the Investors Syndicate of Canada Limited - or the Investors Group, because I think that this Bill affords us a very good opportunity of looking at the corporate structure of a very very successful business, and Mr. Speaker, I'm not criticizing them for being successful; I rather congratulate them for being as successful as they are.

I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Winnipeg Centre was very determined to point out to the House that the passing of this Bill will enable the Investors Group to make the Great West Life Assurance Company into a Canadian owned company and that Investors Syndicate itself is a Canadian owned company. Mr. Speaker, I have never been one to place too much emphasis on the fact that a company should be Canadian owned; I'm much more concerned, as I think all members of the House should be, that our economy as a whole be democratically controlled. It's my belief, Mr. Speaker, that economic ownership is the equivalent of economic power, and that despite all of the political rights, without economic powers the country is not democratically controlled. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't mean a great deal if the economic control of the country were owned by a very very small percentage of Canadians, I don't think we are much better off - although I concede there is some advantage than if it were owned by a very small number of Americans, or indeed people of any other national standing. I'm not one who has been very anxious that we substitute the Canadian elite for the American elite in companies which control this country.

There has been a very common myth, Mr. Speaker, that with the development of corporate enterprise that more and more members of the public are given an opportunity both to participate in the ownership of the Canadian economy; and that secondly, they will therefore and thereby be able to participate in what really counts, and that is the economic control of the country itself through the power that that ownership would give them. And I think that the Investors Group is a very good demonstration, Mr. Speaker, that this is not true - and again I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I don't blame the Investors Group. I think the Investors Group is doing exactly what a business should do; it is attempting to grow and attempting to obtain for itself more and more economic power and control. I have no objection to a business doing that. I may have some objections to a government not permitting its people to do this, but I think that certainly a business would take advantage of every opportunity to develop its business growth. This is what it's for and this is what it demonstrates to its shareholders. But the suggestion that was made by the Member for Winnipeg Centre, and the suggestion that I sometimes read in the newspapers and other periodicals, that somehow Canadian ownership will solve the problem of political control in Canada; and secondly, that the public by participating within the corporate structure as it is, gradually through the corporate structure is able to economically participate in the control of those things that count in our community, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this is just not so.

I would like to point out first of all, Mr. Speaker, that the Investors present shareholdings

(MR. GREEN cont'd) is owned to the extent of 75 percent by five corporations, not by small groups of people who gather together and buy shares and then attend shareholders' meetings and discuss what the company should do, but essentially by five corporations. The Royal Bank of Canada holds eight percent; the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce holds 10 percent; the Canadian Pacific Investment holds 22 percent; the Imperial Life holds 30 percent; and Richardson and Sons own five percent; for a total, Mr. Speaker of 75 percent of the shareholdings in the company owned by these corporations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that Investors themselves are doing a tremendous job in terms of extending economic power through ownership of shares in other companies. The Investors Group - at the present time my information is that the Winnipeg based companies that form the Investors Group presently have assets of about \$3 billion, and with the Great West Life under its control the Investors Group emerges as the most influential financial company in Canada. It has links with every aspect of the financial world. Investors hold, to my information, Mr. Speaker, 25 percent of the Montreal Trust Company; the Royal Bank of Canada has a 10 percent share in the Investors Group; Laurentide Finance Corporation is 70 percent owned; the Affiliates Union Acceptance Corporation are linked to the group through Power Corporation of Canada, which is itself linked through 51 percent holdings in Imperial Life Insurance Company.

Through the Great West Life and Imperial, the group becomes a major participant in the Canadian life insurance industry. The Investors Group has directors in common with many of Canada's largest one hundred financial and non-financial corporations. Indeed, various political leaders, such as ex-Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, have been directors of some part of the Investors Group empire, and Mr. Speaker, this is the purpose of a corporation of this kind. Again I say I have little argument with a corporation trying to do that, and that is to consolidate its financial power, and through that, Mr. Speaker, whether members of the House will admit it or not, the political power of the corporations which achieve this power.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer the honourable members to the "Vertical Mosaic", because in Mr. John Porter's book on the subject he went into the question of corporate ownership and political control and the number of people who buy corporate ownership are able to exercise a great deal of political control, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that what Investors Group is doing demonstrates what can be done by a relatively small number of people through the exercise of economic control and ownership to affect all of the economic, social and political features of our country; and I want to dis-abuse members of the notion that the general public are the people who exercise the control of corporate empires such as the Investors Group.

Again from Mr. Porter's statistics, Mr. Speaker - and they are old, but I think that they are as valid today as they were when he wrote them - it is determined that 65 percent, Mr. Speaker, of all dividend income is received by 76,360 taxpayers or 2.1 percent of the taxpayers, which means, Mr. Speaker, that 2.1 percent of the taxpayers control 65 percent of all the shares in all the companies that pay dividends, and I would assume that if we went to the companies that don't pay dividends we would find even a greater percent controlled by a relatively small number of the population. Sixty-five percent held by 2.1 percent of the population. Even more significant, Mr. Speaker, 97.8 percent of the taxpayers, that is the other taxpayers, receive 35 percent of the dividend; and when we get to the lower income groups, Mr. Speaker, under \$5,000, 85 percent of the taxpayers fell within this group, that is taxpayers earning less than \$5,000 - I suppose we could make it \$1,000 more to come closer to today's figures - but the figures, as they then were, were that 85 percent of the taxpayers earned less than \$5,000 and received 17 percent of the dividend income.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it does well to sit and cogitate on the amount of economic control that is exercised by a relatively small group of people, and it's wrong to think in terms of the great public of Canada democratically participating in the ownership of our country through the purchase of shares in large corporations. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that even when we talk about those who are participating, of the broad population, that their shareholdings would be such that they would have no effective voice in the operation of any of these corporations. When we see the Investors Group controlled 75 percent by five companies, then we know that the balance of the 25 percent don't have a great deal to say about how the companies operate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate, because the members may misunderstand, I am not critical of this, I merely want members to recognize that these are the facts of life, and that when they talk about democratic control of our economy they should not ignore that not only are the corporations owned by a very very small group of people in the economy; but secondly, that

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . a relatively small number of corporations through obtaining economic power, by virtue of the type of growth that Investors Group has undertaken, means that it becomes closer and closer to a small economic elite, and Mr. Speaker, Mr. Porter's book is interesting in that regard, because something developed in our society during the last four or five months with respect to Great West which was confusing from a financial point of view. The Great West Saddlery, which is not part of the existing corporate structure and corporate group that we are talking about, attempted to purchase a controlling share of the Great West Life Insurance Company and the directors of that company, very solicitous of protecting their shareholders, encouraged their shareholders not to sell. Now I assume these are the same shareholders who have been encouraged to sell to the Investors Group, and they have that perfect right, Mr. Speaker, to favour one group of shareholders or another, and to advise them as to the financial risk which would be assumed by one or the other, although we all know that the company wouldn't lose money no matter who purchased the shares.

In any event, what Mr. Porter said - and I ask members to consider this, it's not my statement - Mr. Porter says that the economic elite is anxious to retain its own identity and not to permit other groups to invade its territory, and I think that the example of Great West willing to permit its shares, or to encourage its shares to be sold by one group as against another, I think that the reasons given certainly can't be the whole reason. I suggest that we have to look deeper for the reason, that it may be that we will never find it, but the reasons given can't be the right reasons, because it just doesn't make economic good sense for a company to say that you will do better if you wait to sell your shares to somebody else, because the company shouldn't be - and when I say "shouldn't", I don't mean that there's something wrong with it - but ordinarily does not deal with the traffic on its own shares; this is something that is left to the market place. In any event, the previous takeover did not go through and now we have a takeover which is going to - as my honourable friend said, a Canadian based company, if that means a great deal - is going to a company which is within the good graces of the economic elite of the people who are involved, and I suppose everybody should be happy, and Mr. Speaker, frankly, I'm not greatly disturbed.

I would indicate to the members of the House that this appears to me to be a very successful company, the Investors Syndicate. The Member for Lakeside said that it was the size of the amount that intimidated him. I think that the amounts are very interesting, especially from the point of view that there is now going to be floated \$3 1/2 million -- \$6,500,000 of common stock and \$1,600,000 of preferred stock, with a par value of \$25 which brings the dollar figure much higher, but Mr. Speaker, I think that this company is achieving a great deal of economic and political control. I think that being a company that's what it must do, that's what it should do. I am just wondering whether the people of Manitoba could find a way of also achieving some economic and political control, and perhaps we should be the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are buying this new shareholding.

Now I don't make that as a proposal, but I ask the First Minister to look at what is being sold, look at the financial opportunities that are made available thereby for the people of Manitoba to participate in the same growth that is taking place within Investors Syndicate, and perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we should become involved in this, because I know that the government has refused to involve itself in its own industrial projects, here's one that's existing, it looks like one that's successful. I'm not able to recommend yes or no, but the First Minister has available to him many financial advisors who could tell him, and I think, Mr. Speaker, for us to have a real democratic control of the economic portion of our country that we have to have this type of participation.

So I ask the Minister to consider this. As I say, I have no objection to the Bill. I think that the Bill affords us an opportunity of looking at the real power structure of our country and I think that we have to participate in that power structure if we are to be effective legislators for the people of the province.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 8. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. WEIR presented Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, in terms of an explanation of the principle of the Bill, I don't find it very difficult because the Bill represents the recommendations that have been presented

(MR. WEIR cont'd) by the Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission, and while I, and I am sure every other member of this House, had been charged with the responsibility of doing the same job, we would have come with differing lines in some detail, or in some degree, than is represented by the Commission. There will be an opportunity at Law Amendments Committee for members of the community to present their recommendations to us, but in terms of principle, I present to you the recommendations of the Electoral Boundaries Commission in their entirety for consideration by the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a question of the First Minister. I take it then that there are absolutely no changes between the recommendations of the Commission and this Bill. It was a question, Mr. Speaker, because I intend to speak.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, in terms of the question, the answer is no. The instructions were that it was to be the report as it was presented, and while I haven't checked it in detail myself, I assume that this is what we have.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well then I rise, Mr. Speaker, to commend the government for having taken this action and for accepting the report of the Commission as is. I recognize in saying that that probably very few members in the House are completely satisfied with the solution. I can't imagine, for example in my own case, particularly jumping with joy in having an extra 100 miles added onto the length of my constituency and some very difficult areas to represent, and yet I recognize that having taken on the principle which this House accepted some years ago, that this is the proper course and I sincerely commend the First Minister for having proceeded on this basis. I know what sort of pressures he was probably subjected to from individuals who would like this change and that change and this corner adjusted here and there, and yet we know that once you start making changes in this there is just no end to it, and that in this particular area we have to depend on the basis on which the legislation was originally established.

And on this I want to pay particular heed and compliment my colleague, the then leader of my Party, the Honourable Member for Lakeside for having taken this very courageous and forward step back in 1956 when the legislation was introduced and establishing this Commission as he did then on an absolutely impartial basis. I think this was the first time in Canada that this step had been taken, and here was removed from the Legislature directly, recognizing of course that in the final analysis the Legislature has the right to change it because the Legislature is master of itself, but removing it in the initial instance and placing it in the hands of a commission where it was not individuals who were named, because the danger any time a government appoints a commission and names a certain individual is that it might be considered to be favoring one individual over another, and here such is not the case, it's not by individual but it's by official position that three individuals are placed on this most important commission. Having been given this task then, it is important that they be free from political pressure, and I am satisfied that with the individuals we have named by position in this Bill, and by the particular individuals who have been in those positions, that it has been a totally impartial step. I point out again that this was the first time in Canada that this has been removed from the Legislature and given really to an independent commission, ending the gerrymandering which had occurred in certain areas in past years, and following through now is the proper course.

The 1956 legislation provided for a specific ratio of 7 to 4, and while that was not certainly totally acceptable to those who want specific representation by population, once again it was a very major forward step over the past, when I recall some rural constituencies with as little as 5,000 people in them and some urban areas with some 30,000 residents. The 7 to 4 ratio was a forward step but as time went on it was obvious that this needed revision. I think that the revision proceeded with last year was a very great improvement. When you look at the way in which the commission, and here it seems to me that they used the legislation as it was intended and that they applied the legislation in a sensible way, because they have arrived really with basically three divisions you might say. The far northern areas, where there is an obvious problem of geography and of representation, have the smallest population. In fact I think one of them is within less than ten people of the absolute minimum, and this is sound because it happens to be the Thompson area which is obviously going to grow and has already surpassed the numbers of people which were there at the 1966 census. The balance of the rural areas again have roughly been equalized where most of the rural seats are in relationship to each other and somewhat halfway between the minimum and the maximum. The urban areas - again on the basis largely of being equal between themselves and somewhat higher than the rurals.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)

Now again this will not be entirely satisfactory of course to everyone. Those who want specific rep by pop will feel that this is not being fair to the urban areas. I hasten to point out that my own Party, Mr. Speaker, at an annual meeting some two years ago, adopted the principle that it was time to change from the 7 to 4 to come to an equality of representation. There is, however, another element in representation, and when you speak of rep by pop there must be a communication and a possibility of communication between the elected member and his people, and it seems to me that at this point the commission has done as good a job as could be done in the light of these circumstances, and that the very major forward step is in the general interest of the people of Manitoba. Like all other compromises it won't suit everyone, but in the light of the situation it is the best possible at this time.

So I commend the government for accepting the recommendations of the commission as they are, proceeding on the basis that it is an independent commission that has done basically a good job and that should not be tampered with by the members of the House. I again pay special tribute to my colleague for having initiated this major reform in 1956 and led the way in Canada to independent redistribution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, as has been indicated, the people of Manitoba have reason to be proud of the procedure that we have for reviewing and re-establishing electoral divisions boundaries. It is unusual; it was history-making in 1956; it is still important that the principle not only should be but has been maintained. Last year in introducing the Bill for second reading that we had last year for the review of the formula, the First Minister - I checked back to see what was said then - and I find that the First Minister in introducing it said the following: "I think that the impartiality that has been contained in the Act still is contained in the Act, together with the flexibility that is there for the judgment of the commission to be used in the case of the individual constituencies after having been instructed to look at certain conditions that exist within the province, without limiting the generality of their options to consider anything else that they may wish to consider in allowing them to come to their own conclusions." On reflection, that's a pretty long sentence but it boils down to a reiteration of the principle that was first accepted in the House as being an impartiality that should be maintained.

Last year there was an interesting debate on the formula and I think many members participated in it. We were not all in agreement with the refinements of the formula as it was finally presented, but I think we all accepted it. The Electoral Boundaries Commission has met, and what is more important, has given notice of its findings, has held review hearings in order to reconsider those boundaries which are pointed out to it by various interested bodies, and then it's come in with a final report which therefore has already incorporated in it a reconsideration and a review after an appeal. For that reason I was pleased to hear the answer of the First Minister to the question, that the instructions were that the Act follow exactly the final recommendations of the Boundaries Commission. I would have thought as the mover of the Bill he would have proofread it himself, but I assume he has seen to it that it has been properly prepared and properly checked.

So we of course endorse the second reading, and we urge that the Ministers see to it that the Bill proceed as quickly as possible into committee so that we have an Act finally passed quickly and begin to think in terms of new divisions and new responsibilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I too congratulate the commission on its report. I don't have any particular quarrel with the report as such. I was present when it was made public - I forget the exact date - and discussed a few items with the commissioners at that time. I think we all agreed on a previous occasion when the commission was appointed, or the Bill was brought in, that the 4 to 7 ratio should be eliminated or narrowed down.

There is a few things though that I would like to mention and also probably get some answers to. I recall when the report was made public that further hearings were slated, but Mr. Speaker, at that time we had a late harvest, people were very busy and it just so happened that the hearings fell on the dates when we had very nice weather and people did not take the time to attend these hearings, at least from our area, otherwise we probably would have had representation at that time. As I said, I do not want to quarrel with the way the boundaries were drawn up, but in a few cases I feel that geography or rivers, which are natural boundaries, were not adhered to, and whether or not improvements couldn't have been made.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, I'm just wondering whether the First Minister could give us his version on this. Is this a government bill, and if so, are the government members bound to vote on this measure as a government bill or will there be a free vote? I feel that on an occasion of this type it should be a free vote to indicate whether the members accept it or not. Maybe I'm wrong in this but I certainly feel that way. Then too, if it is a government bill, will they accept amendments in Law Amendments Committee when the Bill will be dealt with? On some occasions we find that when the government's mind is made up that they're not very easy to budge, and whether they will accept amendments of any kind at the committee level, because I suspect that we will be hearing from people of the province in respect to certain areas and it will be interesting on these points whether the government has a definite stand taken.

The matter of rep by pop will no doubt give this House, after the next election, a different orientation. Up until now we had the rural members in the majority and now we will find that the urban or city members will be in the majority after this, -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well, that's a majority. The Honourable Member for Elmwood thinks that the majority isn't large enough, but it's 30 to 26 I think. It's still a majority, and if the members, especially on the government side, should all be, or most of them be from the city area, well then you can see what could happen. So you could have a distinction here after the next election in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose the Bill at all at this particular time, but these few points that I did raise, if the First Minister can give us some indication on what the score is, I'd be happy to learn - to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a couple of brief comments and to pay tribute, as other members have already done, to the commission and the herculean task that they set about on, and to say now, to go on record as saying that I am delighted with the opportunity that every member in this House had to appear at hearings throughout the province. I thought that the hearings were well advertised, not well attended perhaps because of certain circumstances, but at least everyone in this House had the opportunity, if they were not entirely satisfied with their constituency or the boundaries of the new one, to go and register that complaint at the hearings.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, how many took the advantage, but the Mayor of Neepawa, the Deputy Mayor of Neepawa and myself, appeared as a trio and attended the commission hearing in Portage la Prairie, and -- (Interjection) -- and who else was there my honourable friend asked. The Honourable Member for Lakeside was there. -- (Interjection) -- I said from Gladstone constituency. The trio incidentally was from Gladstone constituency, the Honourable Member for Lakeside was there on behalf of the Lakeside constituency. But the Mayor of Neepawa and the Deputy Mayor and myself did make certain recommendations and we thought we presented a good case for making changes in the boundaries, slight changes because of trading areas and other factors, and those changes were made. Now I hope my honourable friend the First Minister -- they took a little bit away from the territory they were going to give to the First Minister and put it back. But it was a good move, because I think it is important to have trading areas - as much as possible people from trading areas put in one constituency, as closely as possible, but you can't always do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make that comment and to say that every member of the House did have the opportunity three or four months ago of registering complaints at that time; if they didn't appear then I assume they were reasonably happy. And then I want to thank the commission for the carrying out of that herculean task.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I am interested of course in this Bill, and I too was glad to hear the First Minister say that it is exactly as the commission recommended. Like everyone else, I suppose I feel that I could have improved it in some particulars, but I recognize the fact that the commission did a very important job and gave a lot of time to it, and likely the reasons that impelled them were ones that if we knew them all we would be more inclined to agree with them in detail.

The Leader of this Party mentioned the fact that in setting up this commission we had named the positions rather than the individuals, so that until the legislation would be changed in Manitoba - and I would expect that it likely never will be changed - whoever is Chief Justice of the province, whoever is President of the University of Manitoba and whoever is the Chief

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) Electoral Officer, will constitute that commission. I think that is a good way in which to appoint such an important commission as this, and you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that not only are these really high level positions, but only one out of the three of them is appointed by this Legislative Assembly or by the government of Manitoba, and at the time that the legislation was put through we moved to increase the independence of the Chief Electoral Officer by providing that he, like the Comptroller-General and the Civil Service Commissioner, should be removable only by a vote of the House, not by the government. So this is really in fact, as well as in word and certainly as in spirit, an independent commission.

The Honourable Member for St. John's had taken the trouble to look up what the First Minister said last year in introducing the Bill dealing with the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I didn't take the trouble to look up what I said last year - I'm always a little nervous about looking up speeches that I made as long ago as a year, let alone any longer - but I remember that for what seemed to me to be a good and sufficient reason, that on the occasion of that Bill I broke forth into poetry and I quoted Milton, a very sound source I think, but I was trying to make the point that in reviewing the long term that I have had in public affairs in Manitoba that if I had the feeling that I had a claim to fame in any regard it would be, as my honourable Leader has said a little while ago, it would be in connection with this Bill and the other one, that I always thought of as being to some extent a companion piece of legislation, the legislation providing for a permanent speaker.

And on that occasion having thought about that question of fame, I attempted to quote Milton, and Milton said: "Fame is no plant that grows in mortal soil, nor in a glistening foil set off to the world - but lives and dies by those pure eyes and perfect witness of all judging Jove, as he pronounces lastly on each deed of so much fame in heaven except thy meed." And being a politician I was probably oftentimes interested in, not the fame in heaven as much as here while a fellow was still actively in politics, but I think that in the long run this will perhaps be considered as having laid the groundwork, not only in this province but having been copied imperfectly by Ottawa and I believe by some other jurisdictions now, as something that really is a landmark in the legislation of this province and in the country as a whole.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy that there is such unanimous agreement with this type of legislation. I've listened with some interest to what the Honourable Member for Rhineland said, as I always do, and I caught his comments about the changing ratio between urban and rural constituencies. This is something that I have given a good bit of thought to through the years too, but I think it is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that this change had to come. I think the end is not yet, but I think it is only right that it should be tempered all the time with full consideration to the changing population of our province, and yet never forgetting to some extent that question of the adequate representation for the huge areas that must always exist in some of the constituencies of this province.

I was always rather proud of the fact - and I imagine I said this last year too, Mr. Speaker - I was rather proud of the fact that it was given to one who was considered to be very definitely rural oriented to make the first major step in Manitoba towards this principle of representation by population. And I'm not concerned about the change, Mr. Speaker, because I have found, after sitting in this House with a tremendous number of members through the years, that there isn't really as much difference between the rural and urban members as a lot of us are inclined to think, and there aren't many of our constituencies that don't have a good sprinkling of both kinds of people, if there are such things as two kinds of people in that regard. I think that it is generally recognized in the Province of Manitoba - I think it has been for a long time and I think it is becoming more so all the time - that we are one province, we are one people, and I don't think that there is any major difference of opinion between the people who comprise the rural areas, particularly the one big Metropolitan area, and the rest of the province. And if there were, then I think that legislation of this kind, and a proposal of this kind, and met in the House by the kind of spirit that's being shown today with unanimity among all the parties, that we'll go a long way toward dissipating any small amount of that difference of feeling that might exist.

So, Mr. Speaker, you will have gathered that I'm inclined to support the legislation. I would answer to the Honourable the Member for Rhineland by saying yes, I suppose it is possible that amendments will be accepted, that is accepted to the point of view of the amendments being allowed to be put, but I would question whether in Committee either it would be advisable for the members on an ad hoc and cursory examination to start changing what the commission

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . . has given so much attention to. So my guess would be that there'll be a pretty unanimous vote here and in the Committee as well, and I join with the others who have expressed appreciation to the government, and particularly to the First Minister, for having met the letter of the Act as well as the spirit.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I feel that at this point I should say a word or two on this Bill, because it is my understanding over the years that upon second reading agreement in principle or disagreement in principle is registered, and while I am inclined to agree with most of what the Member for Lakeside has just spoken - and certainly I think that the Province of Manitoba owes a debt of gratitude to the Member for Lakeside for the original conception of an independent commission - I feel that nevertheless there are instances where some small local changes, which would be purely in my opinion beneficial, should be aired in committee, and it's my intention to move an amendment in respect of the Brandon area generally.

It is obvious that I will be the last single member representing the seat of Brandon, and as you know, in order to build up sufficient population numerically, a considerable area of rural Manitoba has been added. Now thinking somewhat along the same terms as the Member for Rhineland, I rather regret that this province is dominated by one large city, and I think it doesn't speak too well for the province to have a city which will eventually so completely dominate the agricultural section of the province, and it's on this particular issue in the Brandon area that I'm speaking and intend to move some sort of an amendment to this Bill. That is, they've split Brandon pretty well equally, for general purposes you could say city-wise, and then added a piece of the rural part of the new constituencies to each section of the purely city population of Brandon, and I think that this is, in my opinion -- now first I would like to say that if I were speaking purely for a strictly city of Brandon viewpoint I would not be uttering these words, but I think in view of the countryside around it would be better if Brandon were split with one purely city constituency made up entirely with the city population and the other portion left smaller and then all the rural added to that portion of the city.

Now this doesn't mean that the rural element would dominate that smaller portion of the city, but they would be left with a coherent voice which would give them more influence, which I think they deserve, and I think it would go a long way to easing some uneasiness over the past years in the municipalities around, and Brandon, in discussions of extending Brandon's boundaries have never been able to come to a complete agreement, and I think a splitting of their voice might tend to, at least not smooth things over, but might make them a little resentful. Left in a bloc the smaller portion of the city - which don't forget the city would still dominate - I think would be the best solution in my viewpoint, and the municipalities appearing before the commission hearing at that time voiced similar objections to the proposed plan as outlined by the commission.

So I felt that since this vote is a vote on the principle of the Bill, then I would be wrong to vote for it and then raise objections in the committee afterwards unless I had served notice of this objection that I intend raising. And for the very same reason, to be consistent, this is the reason that I appeared before the hearing in Brandon.

Now having said that, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote in principle for the Bill.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . was his suggestion put forward to the commission when it held hearings after the initial report?

MR. LISSAMAN: Yes it was, in Brandon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): It isn't often that the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet casts a sour note on the wisdom of all the members of the Legislature, but in the redistribution of my constituency I have to rise to my feet. I did make representations to the commission as strongly as I could. I had great concern personally, had great concern amongst the people of the constituency, that they have divided what I think - and I guess many others think they have the prize constituency - but I always thought I had the most compact, the most interesting, the most vital and the most wonderful constituency in Manitoba. I say this in sincerity. They have a diversification of people in very many different occupations - I could name you so many in mining, in fishing, in mink ranching and resorts and what no. But I made my representation strongly because of the people of my constituency not wanting to have this division.

I tried to tell myself that I was not doing the right thing until I consulted with the whole

(MR. BJORNSON cont'd.) of my constituency, with everyone that would even speak to me about it. I also see that in this little booklet, the report of the Electoral Divisions Boundaries Commission, that they take various considerations, and they named so many in determining the areas to be included in the boundary. They named the interests of the population, the means of communication, the physical features, etc. etc. What has happened in this paradise of constituencies is that they have chopped off the top part - they've chopped off the head of the Lac du Bonnet constituency. They have, - and when I say "they", whoever is responsible for working out the plan - I don't think they gave too much consideration on the very points that I make here, and I think that it was the numbers game and nothing else. They couldn't find the population to fit in squarely, so they chopped off one of the most vital and interesting parts - one of the most interesting parts of my constituency. I did make as strong an appeal as I could. I still feel that it could have been handled in a different manner. If it had to be a numbers game, I was quite eager to help in determining how many people were in the constituencies of Rupertsland and Churchill. I got figures from our own Northern Development Branch and it seems that they have lost 10,000 people somewhere so they had to move 6,000 out of mine. It belongs to me right now - maybe I shouldn't word it that way - but the constituency of Lac du Bonnet. I made a strong representation that the figures that I had received from the Department of Northern Affairs of our own provincial government, that there were enough people in that constituency that they didn't have to touch the Lac du Bonnet constituency at all. This was the basis of my argument. I tried to figure out what the DBS figures of 1966 were - and I had many of them - and I argued that the change didn't take place in just a few years. I equated them one to another, I made the representation before the committee in all sincerity, and it seems that I was whistling in the wind. I have a feeling that I'm still whistling, that it will not be changed, but I feel so strongly about it.

This constituency and this compact area, with the interest of the people going north and south, with the river flowing there, with all the plants that are along the river, the communications between people north and south, were of a vital issue. And now if one looks at the boundaries, it's spread over one-third of the province of Manitoba, east and west. I think that it could have logically been left as it is, and I felt so very strongly about it that I went to work and I got a chartered accountant to help me and we worked out a scheme. However, it seems that it was settled. I made my objections, I have done everything that I could to further this, to leave Lac du Bonnet the way it was and not cut off the head of this constituency.

I have no objection to the fact that there has to be redistribution, but I have a feeling within myself that it could have been handled better. I have the feeling we have lost some 10,000 people in the north from the figures that I've given, and so I must stand in my place and put my objection to the way that it was done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to make to the works of the independent Boundaries Commission and I realize and appreciate the difficulty of the job with which they were confronted, but I think that they discharged their duties under the Act without favour or without fear and they did a very good impartial job.

Now as far as my own constituency is concerned, I've had territory added to it, and I can't object to that because they had a formula which they had to meet, and with that formula in mind they had to make their political boundaries to conform to that formula. It's true that there may be individuals in this House who feel that they have been prejudiced by reason of the boundaries given to their constituencies, but I think on the whole that the Boundaries Commission has done a good job and I would hate to see this House going back to the old gerrymandering which used to take place when the political boundaries of our constituencies were fixed by this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): I support this Bill in principle because I think it's the duty of an elected man to run wherever he is told to run. I think the commission has done an excellent job. It's a very difficult matter I think for any commission to try and arrive at boundaries that will suit some 57 constituencies in this province.

I also think it's my duty, Mr. Speaker, to voice the views of those who it is my honour to represent in the Roblin constituency, and I have had considerable amounts of protest over the boundaries that have been established under the new Roblin constituency. In fact it has been drawn to my attention that certain guidelines were not followed. For one, to go from the south part of the constituency to get up to the north, he must drive through another constituency to go

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) there by highway. There's no other way, which is unfortunate. But certain protests have been registered in my constituency and on their behalf I raise them here today, but I will support the Bill. As I say, I think it is the duty of a politician to run wherever the people who are in the area ask him to run, so I humbly submit the views of those who it is my honour to represent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I think I should say a few words and join those of my colleagues who presented minor protests to certain smaller aspects of the redistribution report. I might say that I join with the spirit of the members of the House in praising the work as a whole of the commission because it was an impartial and excellent job in view of the restrictions that we as a Legislature imposed upon them in the governing legislation.

But what really annoys me when I look at the map - and I pointed this out to the commissioners during their hearings - is when I take a look at the map of the urban Winnipeg area I see nothing but a series of very crooked lines. I look at the Winnipeg Centre constituency, and I just look at the northern and western boundaries and I see 20 different streets used when about six could straighten it out. And I can find about 15 spots like that in the urban area. Now when I made my protest known to the commission they pointed out their side of the case, which is the logical one and which has to govern, and that is that they are forced to go by the 1966 Federal Government Census and that breaks down the urban area into census polled or divisions of about 500 people in population, and this is the smallest unit of population they as commissioners have to go by in determining the population and they are required to determine this population accurately, to the last man, and that is impossible for them to get by breaking up these smaller census sub-divisions because it would be pure guesswork on their part. They have no finer breakdown of figures to go by. We as a legislature impose upon them the responsibility to stick to the 1966 federal government census.

Now the people of Greater Winnipeg will be very confused, especially those that live in the vicinity of the crooked lines, and I think that in many cases that we could alleviate the confusion which will surely result in any enumeration in any forthcoming general election if we straightened out a number of the obvious mistakes, because we could do so because the population change would be a very negligible one, and we could determine that quite easily with the statistics that are at hand here. And when we get to the committee stage, I'll have a few suggestions to make to the committee on those lines, but all within the spirit of both the Act and the Report.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): I, too, must voice my approval of the manner in which the boundaries were altered, but there is one point which does concern me somewhat and I wonder if the Commission had given real study to the matter of naming of the constituencies after the boundaries had been changed. Now I know in some areas this is not a serious matter, but in other areas the old names do not represent a major portion of the constituency and perhaps due consideration should be given, maybe not at the present time, but at some time in the near future, towards an adequate system of naming the new constituencies. And on that point I think that's all I have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, if comment on the Bill has been completed and no objection to my closing the debate, I think that I might just voice my appreciation, Sir, to the constructive approach that has been taken by all members of the House at second reading of the bill -- second reading of the bill - all members of the House I don't really think that any replies are necessary to many of the comments that have been made; they stand on their own feet fairly well.

One question though of the Honourable Member for Rhineland is whether it's a government bill, and may I say that I would expect that while I'm holding my present office that most of the bills that I present to the House will be government bills and that at second reading certainly this is a government bill. I would also like to say that with the system that we have of taking the bills outside the house for Law Amendments Committee, that this bill must be like other bills and leave the public with some assurance that there is some point in listening to them when they go outside the house. And at this point in time, I would have to weigh very heavily any changes that are suggested in the interests of all of Manitoba and that any changes would

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) have to be justified and should, I would hope, receive consideration by all members of the House; that we wouldn't want to leave the impression that the system that has stood us to well over the years of taking legislation outside of the House, that we were making this exercise useless. If it did, we might as well not take it outside the House, we might equally as well sit here and do it in committee of the Whole. So that I would say in terms of amendments that they would need to be well presented, well documented and considered by all members of the committee as usual. Certainly I don't know of any government amendments that intend to be rammed down members of the committee's throat, but by the same token I don't think the government wants to adopt a position at this stage of the game any more than it does at any other stage of the game, all members opposite recognize that we listen, and reason is the thing that applies itself to the activities of the Government of Manitoba at the present time. I would like to think that as we continue in office and even as we happen to wear out through old age, that our successors in office will take the same approach.

But, Mr. Speaker, again may I say that I join all those others who have given tribute to the members of the Commission and the effort that went to developing this set of boundaries for the elective process in the Province of Manitoba. We all share the same difficulty in that if we were doing it would probably have done it a little bit different, but I commend consideration of it to the members of the House at second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Perhaps I didn't make myself clear or the First Minister misunderstood me. Normally I wouldn't even ask the question whether this was a government bill, because the First . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Is the Honourable gentleman asking a question of the First Minister? I take it he has had his say.

MR. FROESE: It wasn't actually a question. I wanted to raise . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the honourable gentleman knows that he had the opportunity of speaking and did speak and I don't think he should take advantage of this situation unless he has leave of the House. Does the honourable member have leave to speak?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): . . . point of order, he meant privilege I think

MR. SPEAKER: It didn't get to me like that.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege then. The reason I wanted to speak is that I feel that this involves each member individually and not alike and that we should take a stand individually on this bill. This bill covers a commission report that they're bringing in, that they brought in and . . .

A MEMBER: Order. Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that is a point of privilege at all. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. ENNS presented Bill No. 15 an Act respecting the Diversion of the Churchill River at Southern Indian Lake for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, let's speak about Southern Indian Lake. The bill before you, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 15, is pretty plain in its manner. It is composed of primarily two basic portions, the first portion dealing with the granting of the final license to Manitoba Hydro for the diversion of the Churchill River waters at Southern Indian Lake and it sets out the specific conditions under which the license is being granted.

The second portion of the bill deals with the re-establishment of the residents and other related matters and sets out specifically the responsibilities therein. Under Part 1 of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Hydro will be required to submit to the Minister all construction plans for the works, for approval prior to commencement of construction and no construction shall be undertaken until such approval is received. The Minister may request Hydro and Hydro must supply such additional information which the Minister deems necessary to properly assess the plans for the proposed works. Also under Section one of this Act, Hydro agrees to pay an annual rental for Crown lands occupied by the works and for the purpose of storage of water. This rental shall be determined by the Minister but subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and shall be paid on an annual basis, commencing in the year the diversion takes place.

It is not proposed, Mr. Speaker, to require Hydro under the clause under this bill to clear the entire reservoir area. However, there are specific areas which will be cleared prior to flooding to reduce resource loss in specific locations. In these areas the Minister and Hydro shall come to an agreement in respect to the location and the degree of timber clearing which will be carried out at the expense of Hydro before or after flooding takes place. Provision is made in the bill for the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to order such clearing as may be recommended if agreement cannot be reached between Minister and Hydro.

The government will conduct further natural resource surveys in the project area to determine the present and future potential development of the resources. It is proposed that this survey will continue beyond the time of actual flooding of the area and directed - this is rather important - to maximize to the greatest extent possible, the resources in the project area for hunting, fishing and trapping, as well as assessing effects of altered water levels on the total ecology of the area. Hydro will be required to assume the costs of such surveys up to the time of flooding, but we anticipate ongoing studies and ongoing costs involving these other resource areas and these of course will have to be assumed by the province.

Part II of the bill is a provision where we introduce the concept of a commissioner, independent commissioner, to deal with the many problems that will be facing the communities and indeed legal counsel for representing the communities in dealing with the various departments of government. A fairly rapid perusal of the bill indicates the scope, the authority and the work that is cut out for the commissioner. As for instance, set out in Section 18 of the bill - "the commissioner shall provide assistance in the form of guidance, counselling and information services, assist the residents to establish new homes, to adjust to new surroundings, to take advantage of new opportunities and to accept new responsibilities, inform the residents of the natural resources available in the project area for use or development and to assist them in using and developing resources properly and extensively. The commissioner is empowered to gather about him sufficient staff." In other words, Mr. Chairman, our intention would be that we would hope to make it as easy as we can for the communities and those speaking for the communities to deal with government and the many facets of government, both federal and provincial, in attempting to come to agreement on how these matters will be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I can anticipate that in view of the importance that we stress to the appointment of the commissioner or the commissioner role in this Act, that members would be asking questions as to who, if anybody, the government has in mind to fulfill this role, and I would like to indicate to the House at this time, Mr. Speaker that we do have a person in mind, and aside from the impressive qualifications of this individual, perhaps his most important qualification is the fact that he comes to this position untainted by any of the controversy that has surrounded this issue to date, and with what I think, I can say, with a fresh and open mind, and I'm pleased to announce to the House that subject to the successful passing of this bill that it would be my

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.)... intention to appoint Dr. Monture from Toronto to take on the responsibilities as Commissioner, as indicated by this Act.

Dr. Monture is a graduate of Queen's University. Following early employment in the mining areas in Ontario he joined the staff of the Department of Mines of the Government of Canada. He went on to a distinguished career with the Federal Government, eventually becoming Chief or Head of the Economics Division of the Department of Mines. He had a very varied career throughout his life. Dr. Monture has accepted a number of important consulting assignments for such organizations as the United Nations and the Colombo Plan. These have involved resources, resource studies, economic studies, in Indonesia, Ghana, Venezuela, Malaysia, Ecuador and the Philippines. He did important consultative work with United Nations in the technological and the natural economic and resource field. Dr. Monture has been the recipient of a number of awards for distinguished service to his country and his profession, among these perhaps the Vanier medal awarded annually to the Canadian who has made the greatest contribution to public service, is of particular significance.

I should indicate to the members that the particular area of work that attracted Dr. Monture to me and to government was his work as a special consultant attached to the Atlantic Development Board and specifically his work in New Brunswick which involved much of the same kind of situation that we face here, that is large resettlement problems, relocation problems of communities under some of the development programs that have taken place in recent years in that province. I would also want to indicate to the House that Dr. Monture attended the meetings at South Indian Lake at my request as an observer as I wanted to have some outside advice in this matter. I feel confident, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Monture will bring to the successful conclusion of the relocation problems facing these communities his many years of wisdom in dealing with related problems that he has studied and had an opportunity to deal with in many parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that at second reading of a bill one should confine one's remarks to an explanation of the basic principles involved but I am sure that you will grant me the privilege of taking some latitude with this particular bill. I think I owe to the members of the House some explanation for the reason this bill is before them today. Indeed I have been chastized from time to time by the members opposite for failing to speak on this subject matter.

First and foremost, of course, the importance of the subject matter itself. The Power project currently underway on the Nelson River and those contemplated rank among the world's greatest construction projects in the world and are of fundamental, economic importance to all Manitobans, and for this reason alone the members should have an opportunity to express themselves about it.

Another reason, of course, Mr. Speaker, is that not only those in opposition to this scheme but I and my government as well, are not happy with what I choose to call the thwarted hearings held both at Southern Indian Lake and here in Winnipeg. I describe these hearings in this manner because it became evident very early that the original purpose for these hearings was being totally ignored.

I remind the honourable members of the occasion back in the latter part of November, or early December, when I first announced the holding of these hearings and the Honourable Member from Portage has referred to the news release about that announcement and that I indicated at the time, very clearly, very firmly, that the decision to grant the license as far as government was concerned, had been made and that these hearings were being called to enable all those persons and communities that would be affected by this decision to document publicly their legitimate requests for fair and equitable treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a delicate crisis and I believe that the press reports matters of public interest as accurately as they can, and I make no criticism of them, but in the emotional fervor generated I do question in this particular case their choice of what is newsworthy and what isn't. I refer specifically to the statements that I publicly made to numerous members of the press at the time these hearings were announced by me, that in fact the project would be proceeded with and that these hearings were being called, not to question the project but to put on public record with the aid of legal counsel for those who questioned it, as was the case for those of the Southern Indian Lake and Granville Lake, the legitimate needs of all persons affected by the project. This aspect of these remarks were down played by the news media and yet great surprise was voiced when I reconfirmed these same general remarks several weeks later in January after the first hearing had taken place. Mr. Speaker, I can document that I

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . have been consistent throughout in this matter, and when I made further statements such as that nothing would be done until these hearings were concluded and until I had satisfactory answers to some of these problems facing us, I was always referring to the original purpose of the hearing, namely to identify the needs of those persons and persons affected by this project. To this day I have not granted the license, until as we are now doing by statute, to provide the mechanism to deal fairly and equitably with these concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I must accept of course what in fact has been perhaps the most serious error in my handling of this entire situation, and that is that the formal notice that was placed in the papers publicizing these hearings did not in fact reflect the true purpose, or the original purpose of the kind of hearings that I had in mind at the time that I announced them. This was an error on my part, Mr. Speaker, and I have to accept full responsibility for it.

However, be that as it may I direct your attention to Section 18 of The Water Power Act, which simply calls for the chairman of the hearings to receive briefs from the general public, and I would say that despite the reflections that have been cast upon these hearings, this in fact was done and I had full authority to receive the report from the chairman and thence formalize my decision. I should point out that back in 1966 members of this Legislature considered the facts of the case after several days of hearings before the Public Utilities Committee and on the basis of this plans proceeded for the Kettle Rapids project and for the diversion of the Churchill and water storage at Southern Indian Lake. But while the basic decision to go ahead had been made in 1966 the question left to be resolved was how best the effects on the people in the area could be mitigated, how their relocation could be undertaken, how their future could be assured. It was largely because of the fact that most of the hearings were devoted to challenging the project itself rather than helping to identify the needs of these concerned, as well as other related matters, that the decision was made by government to present this in Bill form before you today.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to address myself to the project as a whole for a moment. We have to begin with some pretty fundamental principles regarding the utilization of perhaps the greatest single resource we have in this province, namely water. This fundamental fact of our economic life in Manitoba was certainly recognized by our late Premier, the Honourable Duff Roblin and by the later General Manager of Manitoba Hydro, D. M. Stephens, and is still recognized by the current management of Hydro I'm sure. And let me suggest that in recognizing this capacity of this tremendous natural resource, it should be relatively easy to explain in layman's terms how uniquely suited this source of energy meets our growing yet very fluctuating demand for power. It's true that our demands for power are doubling, every 10 years, every eight years, but within that doubling of power we have the unique situation in this province due to our climate, due to our particular demands on power, whereby our total hydro demands fluctuate as much as 40 percent within a given year and it is important to keep this in mind, to realize or to understand or to be able to grasp why the application of hydro-electric power, the use of water, is so uniquely suited to supplying this kind of a fluctuating power demand. It is much simpler to regulate the flow of water through turbines, increase, decrease according to the needs of the whole power system. This kind of flexibility is not available to us in the nuclear field. It's not as readily available and certainly much more expensive to us in the thermo field. We have little of no fossil fuels in this province. To attempt to replace the power that is available to us on the Nelson River is of astronomical figures. I believe some 35 million tons of coal a year would have to be purchased, probably from the soft coal fields of Alberta, which would do tremendous for the economics of that province but not so much for the economics of this province.

I don't really want to get into the technical aspects of Hydro's operation. I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, and I ask you, is it that unreasonable to suggest that I assume and I ask the members of this House assume that Hydro does in fact know what they're doing, and in making this assumption we thereby express a measure of confidence in this great public utility that has served this province so well.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Finance, who is the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro in this Legislature, will in his own time indicate Hydro's position in this important matter, and further to that my understanding is, of course, that members of this House will again, as they had in March of 1966, the opportunity to question Hydro management direct at the Committee stage of this Bill.

Allow me then to address myself to what I know is concerning members opposite and of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... course Manitobans in general, and that is the matter of human and natural resources. No attempt has been nor will be made to minimize these losses and hardships but I will attempt in a rational and moderate manner to bring some degree of relativity to this very important area which has generated so much heat and so much controversy.

Again, Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing the same confidence in my senior staff as I've just finished expressing in the management staff of Manitoba Hydro. I would suggest to the honourable members that they bear in mind the calibre and qualifications of my senior official, and I'm referring specifically to my Deputy Minister, Mr. Mair who in attempting to sort out the many judgments that have been freely given and made in the area of other resources involved in this subject. I would want to single out my Deputy Minister, Mr. Mair, and do so for this reason. Mr. Mair attended the University of British Columbia, receiving a Bachelor's and Master's degree in Arts, specializing in zoology and wildlife management; he is a member of the Arctic Institute of North America, the Wildlife Society, the American Society of Mammalogists, the American Fisher Society, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the Ottawa Field Naturalists Club, the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, the Canadian Audubon Society, the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishing Biologists, the Canadian Society of Zoologists and many other societies associated with this work. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in making a point of mentioning this particular man's capabilities is simply to underline that not all the expertise is on the outside, that in fact I do have capable people advising and assisting me in my deliberations. For many years this particular man was a director of Canadian Wildlife Service in Ottawa. Hardly the kind of man to take lightly; hardly the kind of man to pass over lightly the losses or the lack of concern that is being attributed to this department over the other natural resources as they relate to this project.

You have before you a summary of the conclusions of the much talked about secret resource report. My senior official, Mr. Mair, went to considerable length in explaining the exact nature of this so-called report and that too is available to the members in the transcript of the hearings that I distributed to them. When 25 or 26 professional persons are asked to collaborate in putting together their opinions and judgments with a view to establishing estimated costs and values in a total resource field, I would expect a great variation of opinions and judgments to be expressed. It is only when some inter-disciplinary action consultation takes place with this information gathered at first flush, that you have any hope of arriving at some reasonably accurate "guestimates", and even at that it still has to be done. To have it any other way, Mr. Speaker, would be to suggest that I surround myself with nothing but "yes men". The report's primary function was to identify, pinpoint the very necessary specific kind of ongoing resource study that should accompany this project. This has been done and the particular clause in the Bill relative to the resource studies will pursue and carry on these studies.

Mr. Speaker, it would perhaps be in order to have a look at these resources that we are so concerned about. Under the heading of "Forestry": Present value of commercial timber stands in this area have to be regarded as nil. It is simply not economical to harvest those widely scattered areas where there are some stands of potential commercial timber. Potential forest values in this area are difficult to arrive at because you cannot store or bank standing timber; it is subject to rot, decay and fires. I remind the honourable members that we possibly lose as much timber every year in forest fires as is being jeopardized in this particular project but no outcry of the public is heard on this particular matter. However, our surveys indicate a potential forestry resource of some 500,000 cords initially, that is if one clear cut all the standing available timber that is there and one had markets for it. And perhaps an annual harvest potential thereafter of some 20,000 cords, with no indication of when technology, transportation and markets would make it possible for us to extract this resource on a commercial basis.

Mr. Speaker, last fall I - or perhaps more correctly, my predecessor - took the trouble to fly in some commercial woodcutters from, I believe it was The Pas area, flew them in to Southern Lake to assess the stands, and we suggested that we would be prepared to waive stumpage fees and any other normal licensing costs that the department would normally place on this kind of an operation. The unanimous decision of these independent private woodcutters that are in the business to make a dollar would be that there was just no way possible for them to harvest a cord of wood and that it could be done on a commercial viable basis. They estimated their costs would be running as high as \$45.00 a cord, where the current price laid down

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . at The Pas is some \$20.00 a cord.

Let me remind the members of the House that while I refer to the fact, so I don't know when I acknowledge that there is some commercial timber up there I don't know when we can use it, and I have no way of guaranteeing that it will be there when we might have advanced to the point with transportation, with technology to use it. In the meantime if a fire wipes something out, it takes 125 to 150 years to grow a marginal tree in that part of the province. Under no circumstances would this department for instance consider a reforestation program in that part of the province. That has some reflection to the potential of recreational values that are being attached to this particular piece of land.

Mines and minerals are, I need hardly remind the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, of vital and major importance to the development of this province and the provision of first rate geological maps and other data are basic to the exploration and mine development. In accordance with the advice of the University of Manitoba and our own staff a special program of investigation was commenced in '68 and will be completed in three years. I have already touched on this during the course of my estimates and I won't belabour the point, but wish to underline again that modern technology makes possible exploitation of minerals under most varied of circumstances although, of course, factors such as flooding influence costs.

Also noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that while I am receiving all kinds of unsolicited help both in and outside of this House from people who have very quickly become mining experts, these companies and individuals most immediately concerned and in the business of mining are satisfied that we are not in fact writing off forever vast undiscovered mineral wealth by proceeding with this project. Much more to the point, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the abundant supply of reasonable priced power is probably more significant in developing known ore bodies than anything else as well as related secondary industries, hopeful, increased smelting capacities in this province, things that are very close to the heart of my honourable friend from Inkster.

Commercial Fishing. The approximate landed value of fishing in this area is reported at some \$172,000 annually. This figure varies somewhat; I think it was somewhat lower last year but the figure that we'll use is \$172,000.00. Theoretically the fish population could increase in the same ratio as the water area increases. That potential of course is highly speculative and I'm aware and acknowledge that disruptions will occur, certainly during the immediate post-impoundment years. However, as a matter of interest, I should like to inform the members, and you, Mr. Speaker, about what has taken place at Cedar Lake since the reservoir as created by the Grand Rapids project. The last year prior to the flooding that took place in that area, the total production amounted to some 553,000 pounds; then followed the impoundment and that year fishing dropped to 363,000 pounds. The second year after flooding the production was back up to 521,000 pounds; the third year after flooding the production was up to 739,000 pounds and this last year the production is some 870,000 pounds of fish out of that lake, an increase of some 40 percent. I won't argue it out, but a very significant increase in the harvest of fish at Cedar Lake, an area which I remind the members of the House that was doomed by many of my same colleagues that are dooming this project as being lost forever to the resource field here in Manitoba.

Recognizing that we haven't solved all the problems at Grand Rapids, I'm sure that the Honourable Minister of Labour can speak with some authority in fact about the situation at Reindeer Lake. I'm not that familiar with that lake but I look forward to him advising the House of some of the personal information that he has with respect to that lake. Mr. Speaker, I'm not attempting in any way to minimize the fact that it will present a very large problem to the fishermen to continue their fishing operation immediately after the flooding but I do want to reject totally the thought that this resource, namely commercial fishing, will be lost forever as a result of this project.

In trapping, Mr. Speaker, we have some \$70,000 per year that is currently being harvested by some 115 trappers on some 50 trap lines. There's no question that some species, particularly beaver and muskrat will be most severely affected, and further the reduction of habitats suitable to these species will affect the other furbearing wildlife that is currently being trapped to some considerable degree. An estimated loss of between twenty and fifty thousand dollars annually is probably what we are facing here. I think serious thought and consideration should be given to the possibility of introducing domestic fur farming to this community, particularly if we move forward with the suggestion, and I believe this is moving

(MR. ENNS: Cont'd.)... forward, that a fish processing plant is being considered in this area. By products of this plant, in the production of mink feed, could well make this feasibility indeed a possibility.

I should point out to the members just as a matter of general interest, that it is not my dear friends in the wilds that are chasing the muskrats and the furs along hundreds of miles of barren traplines that are making the money in the trapping business but it is indeed the handful of domestic fur farmers who are making upwards to \$5 million worth in that area compared to the static position of the wild fur production which hasn't varied. In 1955 it was \$2 million. It drops to \$1 1/2 million in certain years. This year it was up to \$2.3 million.

When we speak and we put our attention to other wildlife in this general area, this general area is not particularly significant to ducks. The area downstream from Missi Falls has significance for geese and certainly my department is prepared to accept the challenge to do all we can through studies, surveys and subsequent management practices to minimize the disturbance here. Caribou have sporadically moved into this area although the last time was in 1950 and thus cannot be considered significant. Moose are present around the area but are not used a great deal by the residents because of the low density of animals and difficult terrain. For the same reason, potential sport hunting of moose, even with future access, is very questionable and I wish to underline that. We have many areas in the province that have far better moose populations where it is indeed much easier through wildlife and game management practice to encourage the development of moose populations, where in fact the department or the government efforts would be expended in this direction, where we will be doing this prior to any consideration in this area for this particular purpose. So quite aside from what happens 50 or 100 years from now I question very highly as to whether this area will ever have particular potentials with respect to these specific wildlife species with respect to recreation. A fact that seems to escape us at some times is that it is in the southwest corner of this province - my colleague, the Member for Brandon, the member from Arthur - where we have our greatest wildlife potential in this province.

There is a general myth that the northland abounds with wildlife. Well I've said it before but in a facetious manner, I'll say it again - wildlife is not all that different to human life. We prefer it where it is a little bit more comfortable. This isn't to pass over lightly any loss of our precious wildlife. I'm well aware that we have wildlife there, but I'm suggesting that in terms of management practices, in terms of potential - the use of this resource as potential recreation and so forth, we have many areas in this province more suited, more hospitable to the development, to the maintenance of wildlife than in this particular region. However, in this brief summary it does become very apparent to the members that in those specific areas, namely commercial fishing and trapping, where the greatest disturbance of loss must be contemplated, are precisely the ones most meaningful to the livelihood of the community at Southern Indian Lake and Granville Lake and that very specific programs of assistance will have to be undertaken in recognition of this fact. It may be feasible to introduce as I already mentioned, domestic mink farming or mink ranching in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I got ahead of myself just a minute ago because I did want to dwell specifically with the area of recreation. It's probably, in arriving or attempting to arrive at some understanding of the estimated potential loss in this area, that has generated the greatest amount of concern. Estimates ranging anywhere from \$8 to \$120 million annually as a potential loss of recreational values indicate the wide disparity of opinion here. I should point out at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that an authoritative report covering the recreational area made up of Banff, Jasper, Yoho and Kootenay National Parks report an annual value to the area's economy of some \$60 million, and that only, after an in placed capital investment of some \$100 million. I only mention this, Mr. Speaker, to give some basis for comparison when unfounded statements are bandied about, about the recreational losses at Southern Indian Lake, which after all is some 500 air miles north of Winnipeg and far removed from the populated centres with no capital investment in place.

Mr. Speaker, there is no quarrel with the position so strongly presented by those extolling the beauty of the natural resources of this area. It is a lovely lake. It has unique qualifications for potential recreation. But surely we cannot allow ourselves to focus all our attention to this area in this regard, to the exclusion of all other recreational facilities this province has to offer. It is important to achieve some degree of relativity in this respect and take a look at the province as a whole.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

Let me digress for just a moment and remind you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, of what past provincial and federal governments have done in this regard, in this province. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to bore you with a long list, but the list is long, beginning with our national park, the Riding Mountain National Park, our provincial parks, Asessippi, Birds Hill, Clearwater, Duck Mountain, Grand Beach, Grass River, Sprucewoods, Turtle Mountain, Whiteshell, our whole series of game bird refuges, Big Grass Marsh, Delta, Dog Lake, Fort Whyte, Wildlife refuges, and I'm just naming a few, Mr. Speaker, Wildlife Management areas - and I presently have with me as a current item of cabinet some 14 additional wildlife management areas that I intend to pass. These are all lands, these are lands that we are setting aside into perpetuity for the use of future Manitobans for the preservation and for the continued supply of our wildlife resources in this province.

I should add to this the fact, the kind of programs that we are now entering in co-operation with the Federal Government. The ARDA program where some \$5 million has been set aside for the re-acquisition of marginal agricultural lands that perhaps never should have gone into agriculture, that we are buying. We're purchasing back some - we've made an offer to purchase some 172 quarter sections around Lake Winnipeg alone because of their suitability to wetlands for ducks and so forth, and at the same time alleviating a flood prone situation in that area. Certainly the Conservation Act that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture hopes to pass in this session is part of this ongoing project. Mr. Speaker, consider the Department of Tourism and Recreation. It's just beginning to flex its muscles. It has before it a long list of projects that I wouldn't even want to go into, in addition to those that I just mentioned that are already a fact. Furthermore, virtually every member in this House has from time to time, particularly during the course of the estimates of my colleague the Minister of Tourism and Recreation, pleaded for the attention and the development of a particular favorite site or lake of his own, Rock Lake, Pelican Lake - the Member from Burrows talked about the development potential as a recreational area of the Island of Hecla. The proposed development at Pembillier has tremendous recreational facilities in terms of recreational future in this area, and these are real, because these are accessible. It's been proven that 90 percent or 95 percent of your tourism or recreational use is within a very close circle. Mr. Speaker, what I am attempting to, is certainly not to suggest that we have done all there is to be done in providing for adequate recreational facilities for future generations of Manitobans. But I do suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that for a province of less than a million people, and recognizing our fiscal capacity to do so, we and past administrations of this province have in the most responsible manner concerned ourselves with the provision and preservation of lands to ensure the enjoyment of Manitoba's yet unborn the pleasures of recreational pursuits in our outdoor and wilderness area.

Mr. Speaker, I have said very little about the some 100 families that are most vitally concerned in this whole matter. I have done so by design, believing as I do that last impressions are perhaps the lasting ones and I want to make it very clear to the members of this House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, to the public at large, and of course in particular to the residents of the communities affected by this project, that I am very much aware and concerned about the sacrifice we are asking these people to make for the greater benefit of all. I am also aware, Mr. Speaker, that at this time these people do have a viable community with little or no dependence on outside help and it concerns me greatly that anything I or this government, or Manitoba Hydro should do, should change this. But Mr. Speaker, I have no tolerance at all about some of the letters and suggestions that I have been receiving of late about how dreadful and how awful it is to do anything to change this.

I am not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to relegate any group of Manitoba citizens and tie them down to what best can be described to a static or dwindling resource. I'm prepared to utilize this opportunity to continue to commit the resources of this government and other agencies to bring new skills and new opportunities to these same people. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it would be my fervent hope that we find it within our capacity and will to do much the same for all our remote settlements, and in particular our Indian and Metis communities. Surely the message from our merging leaders of these people is becoming loud and clear. They recognize the necessity of expanding the horizons of opportunity for their people.

Let me agree with the Honourable Member from Inkster when he touched on this subject a few days ago, our time is running out on this particular subject. This is not to say that I or government or anybody has the right to dictate how or in what manner any individual or group

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... of individuals should make their living, but it is a realistic appraisal of what kind of a living a specified resource space can sustain.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, let us review what has happened in this matter to date. The relocation of 77 families currently living at South Indian Lake and those at Pickerel Narrows presents a serious and complex problem. We appreciate the plight of these people and to that end there has been considerable discussion with them. By way of compensation for the proposed rise in the water's level at South Indian Lake, Manitoba Hydro has fully committed to undertake the following: To either move buildings or to replace them with equivalent structures; where needed new homes would be built to a standard comparable to the Department of Indian Affairs Northern Settlement Homes at Split Lake and similar locations; to provide docking facilities for the proposed new community site; either replace or pay for fishing camps that would be flooded or damaged by the proposed rise in the water level; clear the new townsite area and provide access to the new fishing camps; pay all costs for moving the displaced people and their personal effects to the selected new location; make arrangements suitable to the people of South Indian Lake and Pickerel Narrows to move and/or mark existing graves affected by the water rise and to establish a new graveyard; to co-operate with other agencies to provide electric service to the new community on standards equal to other comparable communities such as Island Lake; share with other government agencies to the extent of \$60,000 the cost of constructing a floating fishing plant at Southern Indian Lake; share with the appropriate government agencies the cost of training programs to generally upgrade the skills of South Indian Lake residents and others who may be working for contractors engaged in the Churchill River Diversion project at Missi Falls or N....; provide under mutually satisfactory arrangements a boat equipped with an electronic depth and fish indicator to help and assist in relocating the fish in the enlarged lake.

Before we proceed any further, Mr. Speaker, perhaps one very vital point should be made. It is this, that more than half of the settlement are 16 years of age or under and by the limited nature of the resource stakes at Southern Indian Lake they would have had to move in any event. Fishing and trapping resources are being fully extracted and in recent years there have been not enough fishing licenses to satisfy all those who seek them. The people at the settlement realize this and there is both active competition for the jobs that Manitoba Hydro as a matter of policy makes available to our northern residents, and active support of the educational programs for their children. This fact must be borne in mind in all discussions relative to the Southern Indian Lake.

Consultations have been held by Hydro, by my Director of Fisheries and by Indian Affairs representatives to see what might be done and to anticipate fishing problems. As a result of these meetings the Mines and Resources boat was moved to Southern Indian Lake in March of 1968 and a proposal was developed for a floating fishing plant. Hydro arranged for one of the Fisheries Research Board's senior biologists to visit Southern Indian Lake to discover how fishing efficiency might be improved and to suggest research by the Board regarding probably conditions after flooding. An honest and sincere disclosure of findings to date would have to admit that authorities are dealing with many unknown factors. No one can say with 100 per cent certainty what the exact effects on fishing would be after the water level has risen, but it is necessary to point out that while effects on fish and fur resources are not fully known, experience with other reservoirs has demonstrated that these effects are not necessarily permanent. Further to this my Deputy Minister of Mines and Natural Resources agrees that there is yet time to complete necessary studies required to develop sound resource management programs as they relate to the future of the South Indian Lake and Pickerel Narrows residents.

At the recent hearings, Mr. Speaker, it was stated that people concerned were kept in the dark about developments concerning the proposed Churchill River Diversion. Mr. Speaker, this is simply not true. South Indian Lake residents have been generally aware of the work done by Manitoba Hydro and its consultants since 1964. Indeed nearly three years ago, the Nelson Agency was created to insure a continuing and active liaison. The Nelson Agency approached Indian agent Oscar Blackburn, a long term resident of South Indian Lake, to work together with the agency to attune it to the thoughts and needs of the people in the area. Mr. Blackburn and his school teacher wife are noted and trusted members of their community. Since establishment of the relationship with Mr. Blackburn, the head of the Nelson Agency has made repeated trips to South Indian Lake and Mr. Blackburn established an office in this community. The Nelson Agency was instrumental in establishing a Relocation Committee composed

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . of five South Indian Lake residents. These elected representatives were kept fully informed of developments and related these to their neighbours, colleagues and associates. In turn, they kept Hydro via the Nelson Agency informed of community attitudes and needs. In an effort to keep the South Indian Lake and Pickerel Narrows communities fully informed, an audio-visual presentation was prepared and shown at South Indian Lake prior to the public hearings. In addition to this, a three dimensional model of a new settlement area was displayed, oral and written representation was given in both Cree and English. The Pickerel Narrows community, the smaller of the two, presented a more difficult communications problem as it is far more dispersed for the most part of the year. The residents were invited to the South Indian Lake audio-visual showing and the entire community was provided with prints, showing the proposed new water levels. In January of this year they elected their own relocation committee. Manitoba Hydro through the Nelson Agency also recommended and arranged and paid for legal representation for the South Indian Lake community. In conjunction with the Relocation Committee, Mr. Harold Buchwald Q. C. was selected as their legal representative. Subsequently the Nelson Agency arranged a stay of several days' duration at South Indian Lake for Mr. Buchwald and his colleague, during which time they visited the residents homes, familiarized themselves with the needs and attitudes of these people. Since then the Relocation Committee has visited Winnipeg on numerous occasions to consult with their lawyer, to meet with Cabinet Committee, to meet with Hydro officials and to attend the recent public hearings. Mr. Speaker, to suggest that these people have been kept in the dark of all this! The three man Pickerel Narrows Relocation Committee spent two days at the hearing at South Indian Lake and then joined the South Indian Lake Relocation Committee for the trip to the Winnipeg hearing.

The Nelson Agency has also been instrumental in advancing the educational training of Southern Indian Lake area residents. Manitoba Hydro has always followed employment preference in terms of hiring people who live in the area wherein it is working, and in this case, went further than that in a sincere effort to equip people to assume jobs demanding certain levels of skill and training. Southern Indian Lake has been faced with various social and educational problems. In 1967 Manitoba Hydro was asked to provide the sum of \$100,000 towards assisting with these problems. One of the results of this was the creation of foster homes for area children whose family situation would have made it impossible for them to acquire schooling.

There existed another problem. Many area residents in their late teens and early twenties with Grade 8 or less had no work training which could have qualified them for suitable employment. The Nelson Agency arranged for several representatives - Canada Manpower, the provincial Rehabilitation Services and the Department of Welfare to visit the community. More than thirty young people and adults were interviewed and about 20 of these were enrolled at the Pembina House at Ninette for rehabilitation and upgrading which would qualify them for training courses at Winnipeg and other urban centres.

The Nelson Agency convinced the Frontier School Division of the need to amend the existing school curriculum at South Indian Lake, and as a result three additional classrooms were added in the summer of 1968. The school now has five classrooms, including a kindergarten, with a teacher for each room. Mr. Speaker, we have done our level best to prepare the people of South Indian Lake and Pickerel Narrows for the relocation problem they face and we stand ready to accept the people's choice on an agreeable site.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with persons who make a conscious choice to live in a particular way. I do think that I have some responsibility as a member of this government to ensure that citizens of this province are in fact in a position to make that choice and not simply strapped into a given occupation because of lack of opportunity. It is of general concern to me as an individual, and I'm sure it is to many of us, that in attempting to keep abreast with the demands for better roads, or better parks, better drainage systems, adequate power, all these demands that governments are faced with, that the rights of individuals, or indeed as in this case the rights of an entire community, are increasingly infringed upon.

I believe it was the Honourable Member for Lakeside who made a brief comment at first reading of the new Expropriation Act that was introduced earlier on in the session, and I must say I share this concern but I don't have any pat answers. Let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, that just in the past few years some 979 property owners, involving some 200 families, were asked to make a similar sacrifice, albeit with different conditions. Let me refer to two

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... specific instances. The Birds Hill Park involved the expropriation, or the acquisition - I shouldn't say expropriation because expropriation entered into it in very few and isolated cases - acquisition of some 158 individual properties involving the physical moving of 46 families. And is there anyone in this House today that will suggest we did otherwise, that we did not locate that tremendous social development on the outskirts of this Metropolitan area of Winnipeg? The Red River Floodway, Mr. Speaker, the very project that we have every reason to be thankful for today, which is saving this year the taxpayers of this province nine million dollars - nine million dollars, but to do that I had to expropriate or acquisition individual property owners, some 655 individual property owners involving the physical moving of 124 families, many of them in many instances small market gardeners poor and ill-equipped to do anything else. There was no sugar daddy Hydro to pick up the bill for them either. They were given a deal and they had to move.

Mr. Speaker, every time we pounce on this table for improvements, to improve a better road or to do this or to dig a better ditch, those in responsible government, somebody -- I had to send somebody out and take that land from somebody to do that, and it is with no particular joy that I have to take this unoccupied Crown land from the residents who have become accustomed to living in that area of South Indian Lake, but, Mr. Speaker, the fact that it has to be done is patently plain and obvious to all of us.

In summary then, Mr. Speaker, let me make it abundantly clear to all concerned. We accept the responsibility of helping these communities during this difficult transition period and every effort will be made to ameliorate, to the greatest extent possible, the difficult readjustment process these communities face. This is not simply a promise of a Minister or indeed a politician, we are in fact underlining this intent by statute.

Mr. Speaker, there are many different things that I could add before concluding. I have not made any remarks and don't really intend to with respect to the opposition shown to this scheme by some of our members of the academic community. I respect their rights as individuals to make whatever protestations they see fit and I respect further that they are speaking as individuals and not as representatives of the University of Manitoba. However, I would like to comment on the one suggestion that this group has to my understanding made of recent date, that this House is not competent to deal with such an important and technical matter. I leave the members of this House to decide that kind of a comment. I would assume that in the same vein of argument we should allow the doctors to develop the Medicare scheme for this province; we should allow only the highway engineers or someone like that to develop and build the highways of this province; that we should allow perhaps the dentists to create the necessary dental legislation for this province. I don't really think I need answer that kind of criticism, Mr. Speaker.

However, I would like to -- this stand disappoints me, Mr. Speaker because in my experience with the previous portfolio of Agriculture I was only too much aware of the importance of working with and in co-operating with the talent available at the university. This same combination has helped develop our Department of Agriculture into one of the foremost in the country, and it was with some pleasure that very early during my tenure in office as Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that I was able to participate and indeed financially support the creation of the new Resource Group at the University of Manitoba. It is my will and my desire that my department particularly utilize and support these efforts to the fullest extent possible, and I would hope that in the months and years ahead this Resource Group would continue to develop competence in this field.

Mr. Speaker, finally, the challenge that this Bill presents to all members of this House is simply this: Do you wish to participate in making perhaps the most important single decision fundamental to the economic well-being of this our province, because let there be no mistake about it, this is just that kind of a decision. The successful completion of this project provides the basis for achieving many of those targets as set out by the recently concluded TED Commission. The successful completion of this project will ensure that we have the capacity to fully develop and utilize our natural resources. The successful completion of this project will ensure that we will solidly join the ranks of the "have" provinces in this nation. Mr. Speaker, one of our great opportunities is before us; let us grab it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the honourable gentleman would object to me speaking at this time?

MR. MOLGAT: Not a bit, Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to speak now.

MR. SPEAKER: Probably I could put the question and then.... Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I am willing to have the member speak if he wishes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: And when he has completed, I will ask for the adoption of the question without putting it to the House, if I may continue. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's presentation reminds me of a story that Tolstoi tells and it's rather a leftist story, but I don't tell it for ideological reasons at all and I hope that the members of the House will accept that. He tells the story about the rich man and poor man and he says that the poor man goes through life carrying the rich man on his back and on his shoulders, but everywhere he goes the rich man directs the poor man and the poor man follows this direction. And of course the rich man is very decent and good to the poor man and when he sees that the poor man is rather tired, he tells the poor man that he can take a rest, sit down for a while; and if he has to go someplace in a hurry, he will permit the poor man to trot rather than to run at a full gallop; and when the poor man is obviously weakening, the rich man will see to it that he gets a glass of water or he'll even feed him something to eat; and the rich man is completely and at all times trying to do the best he can to make sure that the poor man is not unduly being hampered by this procedure. When the rich man sees the poor man is perspiring, he will even go to the great length of taking a white handkerchief, a white silk handkerchief out of his pocket and wiping the brow of the poor man. And Tolstoi says the rich man will do anything for the poor man except get off his back.

Mr. Speaker, through all of the remarks that we have heard from the Minister, I have waited patiently to hear him say something which would indicate that this project is necessary or that there are no alternatives to this project, and the one word that he used, Mr. Speaker, the one statement that he used in this connection is that it's plain and obvious that this flooding has to be done. But that's all. Oh, he did make another reference. He said, don't I have a fine Deputy Minister? Isn't he fully qualified to be able to advise me on these subjects? Mr. Speaker, I think this is a rather unique experience, because as I understand the concept of governmental responsibility, the Minister accepts full responsibility for everything that his staff does, but we heard today something of the reverse of that suggestion. What the Minister had said is that the Deputy Minister has advised me that this is right, and having such great confidence in my Deputy Minister and knowing that I can suggest that it was he who advised it, don't you think I should go ahead with this project?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it's only the Minister who has access to his Deputy Minister; the House does not have access. We can't ask all the questions. We can't deal with all of the recommendations that have been made by a Deputy Minister, and I accept the fact that this is proper, Mr. Speaker, but for the Minister to come into this House and say that the project is justified because it's plain and obvious, the project is justified because his Deputy Minister told him something about it, is indeed to say, Mr. Speaker, that he has nothing to say to this House with regard to the one fundamental point that perplexes the conscience of all of the people of this province: Is it necessary to provide all this solicitation, all of this protection for our resources for the Indian people concerned, is it necessary to do that or are there alternatives?

Mr. Speaker, we haven't heard anything from the Minister which would satisfy this House - and I submit that that has been the difficulty all along - he has never ever accepted the fact that he has the responsibility to this House to show that this project is the best possible project taking into consideration all the factors - the hydro-electric factor, the natural resource factor and the interest of the people concerned. That has not been demonstrated, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we indicated during the estimates that those are the answers that we would want, because to date what we do know is that the natural resources will be affected, that the people will be affected, that both of these things will be affected irrevocably and that there is no change.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Now if, Mr. Speaker - if, Mr. Speaker, the Minister was able to show us - and I submit that the reason he doesn't show us is very profound and significant and he hasn't let us know - if he were able to show us that we have no choice, then I suggest that we would have to look at what he is now suggesting. But he hasn't shown us that, Mr. Speaker, and everything that has happened up until now would indicate to us the fears of the public and the members of this House that the real reason that this project must be proceeded with in the way in which it is being proceeded with, and in spite of the criticism from intelligent people in all parts of the community, well-founded criticism, that the reason that this is being done is that the government has made a mistake and it cannot now admit that it's made a mistake, and therefore it has to proceed full-steam ahead and that is what it's doing. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister has indicated and I think it's significant -- the Attorney-General is laughing...

MR. LYON: You're usually not quite so entertaining.

MR. GREEN: I enjoy entertaining the Minister. Let me use the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' language. He says that he is going to get a Dr. Monture, I believe his name is - Dr. Monture - and he used the phrase, Mr. Speaker, that Dr. Monture is an eminently reasonable choice, and one of the main reasons is that he is untainted by previous events; he has had nothing to do with the previous controversy. Mr. Speaker, I think that probably that's a good reason for choosing a person to handle the administrative portion of the Minister's program to flood this lake, but Mr. Speaker, how does it make the government's position on the main question look? Are they untainted by previous events? Well, Mr. Speaker, they're obviously not untainted. We have, Mr. Speaker, a government that called hearings - and I submit to the Minister that his explanation that he was consistent throughout is rather shabby to say the least, because despite whether he agrees with it or not he called hearings - the frame of reference of which were to decide whether or not a licence should be granted, but not how people should be compensated. The hearings were held for the purpose of whether or not a licence should be granted - not the compensation involved.

Secondly, he was present at the hearings. At the hearings in South Indian Lake he was present when it was announced by the solicitors for the Indian people involved that they were there to oppose the granting of a licence and that was the position they were going to take. They weren't going to talk about compensation. They wanted the Hydro to prove that the project as they conceive it was the best project in light of all the considerations - natural resources, the people concerned, hydro-electric power. He stayed at those hearings; he didn't tell his employee that this is not something that should be discussed at these hearings, there should be no cross-examination on these points. He waited approximately a week - I hope I'm right about the time - but he waited some period of time in any event, to announce that that wasn't the purpose of the hearing which he was present at, at which he heard solicitors for the Indian community state their position, that they were there to oppose the granting of a licence in accordance with the frame of reference that they were given, that Hydro was here asking for the granting of a licence. He heard those things. He then, a week later, said that these were not the purpose of the hearings, the hearings were to determine compensation.

But within a very few days, Mr. Speaker, after a considerable public uproar at the obvious injustice of the Minister's position to have hearings to decide whether or not a licence should be granted and then to grant the licence, or to say that he was granting the licence before the hearings took place, within a very few days of reversing himself the first time, he reversed himself again and said - and I'm trying to be fair and to quote his words - "that Hydro will have to prove the feasibility of the project beyond a reasonable doubt" at the hearings - at the hearings. Mr. Speaker, this is what he said, "the feasibility of the project would have to be proved beyond a reasonable doubt"...

MR. ENNS: To whom?

MR. GREEN: ... and if any person could assume that he wasn't talking about the hearings, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Minister at that time would have suggested he wasn't talking about the hearings at that point, because as a matter of fact that's what happened. That's what happened.

MR. ENNS: Would the honourable member permit a question? Would he care to indicate in his mind to whom Hydro has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that from everything that was said and that from what happened subsequently, the Minister was referring to what was going on at the hearings,

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... and to prove that he was referring to what was going on at the hearings, he also said that he would permit cross examination, which he had previously outlawed. And indeed after the hearings did come in, that's exactly what happened. People were permitted to come and to speak - not to compensation. And the lawyer representing Hydro, at no time during these hearings, said, "Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to rule that all this conversation, all these briefs on the feasibility or non-feasibility of the project are irrelevant." I'm sure that Hydro was well represented. Mr. Dewar would have said to the chairman, if the Minister is suggesting that it wasn't the hearings where these things were being considered, that Mr. Dewar would have got up and he would have said: "Mr. Chairman, this evidence or these briefs on whether or not we should proceed are out of order because all we are discussing here is compensation." As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, compensation to my knowledge was not discussed at all. Maybe I should go through the transcript, if the Minister can help me because it's a long document, but I don't recall compensation ever being discussed at the hearings.

So we are in the position of a government who has recognized that they have embarked on a course which has proved to be abortive, and that's why the Legislature is a difficult forum. I'm not unhappy about discussing serious problems in the Legislature or making serious decisions in the Legislature, but if the reason for being in the Legislature is that a group that was set up to independently consider a position has somehow been aborted, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the reason we are in this Legislature is that an independent body looking at the thing was going to interfere with the government's determination, which apparently they now tell us was fixed since 1966, to go ahead and flood the lake. And if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then all of the rest is camouflage. All of this -- I'm sure that this government wouldn't talk about displacing 650 people and not exercising the greatest care to see to it that they were reasonably treated. I've never criticized the government to that extent. I think that certainly they would try and do everything to see that they were reasonably treated. I'm not satisfied with some of the provisions of the Bill itself but I'm satisfied that the Minister, if we only do not interfere with the flooding of the lake, that he will do anything possible to make it painless, to make everything else painless, and I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that he is giving a great deal, because what he is saying is that I'll do anything for you except get off your back, and that's the one issue that he refuses to discuss.

And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is the issue, because we are now faced with a proposition where we don't have somebody deciding this problem that is untainted by previous events. We have somebody deciding this problem - and I refer to the majority, the government party in this house - that has consistently propagandized the Province of Manitoba with the suggestion that the Kettle Rapids project, that the Nelson River development is - and I'm going to use their words - "The world's greatest construction project, or one of the world's greatest construction projects." Well, Mr. Speaker, anybody who thinks that, can they be objective about deciding whether or not they should flood South Indian Lake when the flooding of South Indian Lake, or the refusal to flood it, may interfere with what they have been telling us about the project. And in view of every mistake that has been made, is this government in a position to look at this problem objectively? The Minister admits that certain mistakes were made.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a system, in the legal profession at any event - the Honourable the Attorney-General will know about it - if we are operating on a file where a mistake has been made, the first thing that we like to do is to turn this thing over to somebody else, because otherwise we will try to rationalize our mistake in deciding what we are going to do in the future. And the medical profession will do the same thing. If there is a mistake that is made in the treatment of a person, then it's in the interests of that doctor to change doctors, otherwise there is a tendency to try - not to try to be, to be subjective about whether this in fact was or was not a mistake.

Is it true, as I have heard, Mr. Speaker, that the amount of power that can be exported, or that the projected possibility of exporting power to the United States when this plan was originally suggested, is it true that that is no longer a reasonable forecast and that we will not be able to use the full potential of the Kettle Rapids development and the Nelson River project? Is it as important to flood South Indian Lake as was originally suggested, because I recall very vividly, Mr. Speaker, hearing from Hydro that it's possible that this does not have to be done - soon after the hearings were completed. Or still more important, Mr. Speaker,

April 14, 1969

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... how is it that the Minister has not been able to rule out alternatives, because he says Hydro knows what it is doing. And Mr. Speaker, that was another justification for the flooding itself - Hydro knows what it's doing, and we agree that Hydro probably does know what it's doing when it comes to electricity - when it comes to electricity.

The Hydro people no doubt, in full conscientiousness to do a good job, looked at their proposition and decided on the cheapest one available and presented that to the Minister, and that's what we should do. We don't blame Hydro. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we regret the constant reference in the Bill and in the proceedings to the fact that Hydro will do this and Hydro will do that, as if the Minister is somehow divorced from this program. This is not a Hydro program, this is a program which is tied hand in hand with the policy of the government of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It looks like 5:30 to me and I am sure the honourable gentlemen will carry on later. It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again this evening at 8:00.