

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, May 9, 1968

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 Bills
 Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Before the Orders of the Day may I address a question to the Minister of Public Works, to inquire whether it is again or still the law prohibiting attendance in Memorial Park after midnight.

HON. STEWART McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works)(Dauphin): ... change in the regulations. Now, just quickly from memory, it's 12 o'clock midnight until 7:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask if it was necessary for the provincial authority to make special arrangements with the Winnipeg Police to clear Memorial Park after midnight or is that law that should be maintained in any event?

MR. McLEAN: No special arrangements were made, Mr. Speaker. The Winnipeg City Police look after that matter in the regular course of their duties.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it is expected, I assume, that the Winnipeg Police will clear people off the park after midnight since it is against the law to stay there.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Police will enforce the law. I also assume they use their discretion.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, the House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the announcement today of an application made by the Water Control and Conservation Branch of the Manitoba Government by Manitoba Hydro to raise the level of South Indian Lake by 35 to 40 feet thereby (a) forcing the relocation of a large Indian band; (b) inundating about one-quarter million acres of land; (c) destroying many natural resources without first considering all of the alternate locations and possibilities for diverting the Churchill River.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Would you care to hear any representations ... with respect to the motion, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Beg pardon?

MR. LYON: Would you care to hear any representations with respect to the validity of the motion as to whether or not it is in order? I have one or two, if it would be of any help to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest again that we come back to the cardinal rule in these cases that the House should not be adjourned to discuss a matter of urgent public importance unless it can be demonstrated beyond any reasonable question that the urgency of debate is absolutely necessary. It does not relate at all of course to the importance or otherwise of the resolution. What is before us or what is before Your Honour is the urgency of debate.

You will recall, Sir, that this topic that is raised tonight by the Honourable Member for Portage for discussion was something that was first mentioned in the House two years ago. It was dealt with in the Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources by Manitoba Hydro I'm informed, certainly this year, and I'm not aware as to whether or not it was dealt with by that Committee two years ago. In other words it is a matter that has been before the House on at least one occasion that I am aware of and certainly it was made clear in the announcement that was made with respect to the whole Nelson River Development some two years ago.

If there is any desire to debate the matter the estimates of one of the departments with respect to water control, I think it's the Department of Highways, the Department of Highways will be before us within a matter of a few days I would trust and the matter could be debated then. If my honourable friend feels that it's important enough to adjourn the regular business of the House, then of course he could put it on the Order Paper by way of a resolution if he

May 9, 1968

(MR. LYON cont'd.) wished. It already being a matter of common public knowledge two years old, I would suggest that it does not fall by any stretch of the imagination within the accepted rules that operate within this Chamber regarding urgency of debate; that it already has been debated; that there are opportunities for it to be debated in the future and that it should be ruled out of order.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the same point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, an argument has been advanced.

MR. SPEAKER: . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, if I may refute the arguments of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

To begin with, when this matter was talked about two years ago it was in the planning stages and I'm sure that most members - I know I was not aware of the enormity of the whole operation nor did I know that 530 people were being displaced out of their homes. Number 2, my second reason for bringing this in is that an announcement in today's paper states that if the licence is granted by the Water Control and Conservation Branch this means that it is through with; the licence has been granted to the Hydro and there is no other recourse to take the action which I am suggesting at this time. So it is for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I consider the motion to be urgent and cannot wait till another time.

Now, finally, the Honourable Attorney-General has suggested that this may be covered by a private member's resolution and I would suggest to you, Sir, that with the speed-up motion about to come into force, private members' resolutions will be - and I believe there are about 37 of them - this will be at the bottom of the Order Paper and I don't think it will get the attention that it deserves.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I note that the Attorney-General suggested to you that you might hear representations before you make a decision.

May I suggest in all deference to the Attorney-General, the rules of this House were changed a while ago, two or three years ago if I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, making it a prerequisite to the introduction of a motion to adjourn the House, whereby a member desiring to do so should submit the subject matter to Your Honour so that you would have ample time to consider as to whether or not the matter was in order. That, I respectfully suggest, Sir, was the purpose at that time. If the rule of the House has been complied with and you have received due notice of this, I would suggest that the responsibility as to the admissibility of the subject matter has been considered by Your Honour in the meantime, and I'm sure that it has, I would suggest there would be no other course than having fulfilled the law, or our rules, that Your Honour will decide without any additional representations at this particular time.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opinions of the honourable gentleman and I can assure the House that the Honourable Member for Portage did meet the rules in every degree. Nevertheless, it always seems to me to be helpful if there is an opinion from the floor that may conclude my opinion, not necessarily change it, but conclude my opinion as to exactly what procedure I should follow.

I have studied this in all its aspects and with the necessary references that are available to me and I am prepared to read the motion, and having read it, indicates that I approve of it.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to proceed? -- Agreed.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my motion was prompted by a news release, or a news item I should say today, that has appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune, and if I may read in part what the news item states for the edification of those members who may not have seen it. The heading is "530 May Move. Hydro Plan Would Flood Settlement. Manitoba Hydro, now in the second stage of Phase 1 in the Nelson River Development, has made application for a licence to provide water storage at South Indian Lake as part of the Churchill River diversion. The licence, if granted by the Water Control and Conservation Branch, would mean relocation of 530 Indian and Metis in a settlement 100 miles northwest of Thompson. Hydro Assistant General Manager Kris Kristjanson said Wednesday the Churchill River diversion would extend the natural boundaries of South Indian Lake and raise the water level by some 35 feet, flooding the present location of the settlement. If the licence is granted the people will be required

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) to move by 1972", he said. And this refers to Mr. Kristjanson. He said Hydro officials as well as licensing authorities have negotiated with the people of the settlement and a procedure has been established through the appointment of George Bowman, Chief of the Nelson River agency and the local Indian agent, whose prime concern will be to represent the interests of the people. Mr. Kristjanson said a new settlement area would have to be developed at a convenient location and existing buildings would be moved or replaced with costs borne by the Hydro. Location of a new settlement to be decided by the Indian and Metis would take into account the access to fishing and trapping areas as well as transport of produce and supplies, he added. They are interested in a site which would be traditional to their way of life, possibly near Lynn Lake or Thompson, but this has not been confirmed. It would be unfair to say the people were happy about it but many could see where it could be in their best interests. But there was no antagonism, he said.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know that the Manitoba Hydro is charged by the people of Manitoba to bring onto the line an ever increasing supply of power at the most economical rates possible and certainly their planning is devoted to this end. And may I say that I have no quarrel with this. They have a tremendous responsibility; they have a limited amount of funds at their disposal and certainly I think they are doing a fine job in this regard. On the other hand, the government of this province has a solemn responsibility to guard and protect the interests of all its citizens whether they live in Gimli, Tuxedo or South Indian Lake. Mr. Speaker, it is a serious matter when the government makes or allows to be made decisions which affect the lives of 530 people and their dependents forevermore, a group of people who, through no fault of theirs may not be able to speak as clearly or as forcefully or with all the resources which more highly organized communities may be able to do. I am told that the Indian and Metis community at South Indian Lake is an industrious group of people who earn their living by fishing and trapping. I am told that South Indian Lake and the surrounding district is relatively rich in fishing and hunting and trapping and indeed is one of those few bounteous areas in what is sometimes called the inhospitable north.

To flood 250,000 acres around South Indian Lake would, in my opinion, destroy the wild-life habitat of large numbers of fur bearing animals as well as animals hunted for food, such as deer, elk and others of that nature. The waterfowl areas would also be harmed. Certainly fishing would be seriously affected for decades to come. All vegetation presently growing would turn into rotting masses under water, which, through algae growth and contamination of the waters, would so upset the purity and chemical balance of the presently clear water that I cannot conceive of South Indian Lake being of value to future generations for many, many years to come.

I am sure sociologists, economists and others charged with the persuading and eventually moving of the people will do their best to relocate, retrain and assist these people. But what really are the alternatives? A second best or even worse location where fishing is poorer, hunting is worse, trapping is poorer? Who among us would suggest these people be persuaded to go to the mines or other white man's work. Yet I have heard this suggested and in a very serious manner. What else then? Regardless of what solution these people will be persuaded or coerced to accept, it could very well turn into another sad chapter in the story of the native Canadian's dealing with the white man. I am told that welfare is not common among the South Indian people, but it wouldn't surprise me, Mr. Speaker, if this uprooting process were completed that there would be welfare as part of their lives.

I ask the government to see to it that the following suggestions are implemented: No. 1, That other methods of diverting the Churchill River into the Nelson or Saskatchewan Rivers be studied. No. 2, That public hearings be held before the license is granted. No. 3, That the South Indian Lake Band be supplied with the best legal counsel available whose sole duty will be to fight for the rights of the people. No. 4, That the Public Utilities Committee be reconvened so that Manitoba Hydro officials can present tentative solutions and also to explain their position. Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say on this matter and I hope that some assurance can come from the front benches of the government side, that this matter, this important matter will be dealt with without delay.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I was puzzled that the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie would trespass upon the time of the House to bring up this matter, which of course has been considered previously, and it wasn't until he began reading his document that of course I realized he was simply reading into the record a memorandum or brief which had

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) been presented or made public some three or four years ago by a group of people living in northern . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . those are my own words and while I had them in written form, they are my own words and no one else's.

MR. McLEAN: . . . the honourable member has said so and I accept his statement and remark upon the remarkable coincidence that two submissions could be so similar.

As has already been indicated, the proposal related to the entire development of the Hydro Electric Power on the Nelson River involved just such works as are indicated in this news story and which is the subject matter of this motion, involving the diversion of the Churchill River, the substantial raising of the level of South Indian Lake and the consequent dislocation of the people who live in the area of that lake. And as my colleague the Attorney-General pointed out earlier on the Point of Order, this matter was discussed, was made very clear when the late Mr. Stephens, then Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, presented the plans for the Nelson River Development to the Committee on Natural Resources and Public Utilities of the Legislature. It was always pointed out of course that the action, the proposed action, was subject to being able to obtain the necessary license to do so and what has given rise to the story which has appeared is the fact that that application has been made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one would have to consider what the alternatives are and I'll discuss the matter of dealing with the people concerned in a moment, but one would have to consider what the alternatives are and indeed, to acknowledge that if this action were not going to be taken, if this application were not to be made, I presume we would never have embarked on the Nelson River project since it was obviously a very integral part of the whole operation and - or alternatively, if it had been decided to proceed with the Nelson River but not to take the action which would result in raising the level of the South Indian Lake, then I presume that probably the water would have had to be put into Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg and I would be interested to know the comments of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie if that action were taken.

The sum and substance, however, of what the honourable member has said and the impression that he is endeavouring to create in this motion and in his submission is that in some fashion or other this is all being done without any consideration for the people concerned. He says bravo to the Hydro but of course you big bad government, you're not interested yourself in the people who are going to be affected by this. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. In fact, a very great deal has been done in the provision of personnel, special personnel, special monies by Manitoba Hydro to assist in, first, the planning of the move that would be necessitated if this license is granted; and secondly, carrying it out in a dignified and proper manner. And as the news report refers to Mr. Bowman, he is only one of the persons who are assigned this special task. Another officer with great experience and I'm informed outstanding ability has been assigned to this task as well, especially, and in the case of the latter person, especially commissioned to concern himself with the interests of the people who are going to be affected by this change, I think that one could say that ample funds have been placed at the disposal of those concerned when the necessary measures have been determined and when they come to be carried out. But more particularly, it ought to be recorded in this debate that these people, that is Mr. Bowman and the others especially commissioned for this purpose, have met with the people on a number of occasions. They have been working closely with them. They have been seeking their advice and their views as to suitable alternative locations and are discussing with them what would be in their best interests. The reports are that most amicable meetings have been held and the people, that is the Indian people, have expressed themselves to independent parties as being completely satisfied with the manner in which they are being dealt with; not necessarily happy as indeed none of us are happy to have to move from our home, but satisfied that they are being dealt with fairly and honestly, forthrightly and with compassion and understanding of their needs and of their personal wishes.

In addition, the Director of the Water Conservation Branch of the Department which is under the head of my colleague the Minister of Highways, has also gone far beyond his narrow limits of his duty. He has visited the community. He has talked with the people concerned and they have had a full opportunity already of presenting their views to him, but have indicated that they understand the necessity that gives rise to the flooding of the lake and that they appreciate the concern that is being expressed and the possibilities that are being open to them.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.) So, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was only proper to put on the record this is not a new matter; it is a matter which has been receiving continuous consideration and concern; it is a matter to which senior people have been assigned and it is a matter for which money has been provided, in my opinion, in ample quantity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course there is a human side to this as indeed there is in all matters, and one can only feel concerned of course about those who may lose their traditional home, and I have to confess I know of no solution except that we pull the switch and close down and stay where we are. It's really no different in principle to the farmer in Portage la Prairie who loses his land for the Portage diversion or for an extension of Highway No. 1, or to the person in Winnipeg who loses his home because the Winnipeg General Hospital is being expanded or extended, or to any person in any part of the province who, because of the advancements which are part and parcel of our modern life, have to be made unless, as I say, we are willing to do what we are sometimes accused of doing, and which isn't true, of standing pat.

So one must understand it - and I'm sure we do - but we can't really prevent someone and some groups of people being discomodod because of these advances which are made in the development of the Province of Manitoba. The only thing we can do is to ensure that these changes are carried out in an orderly way according to the law, according to the approvals that have been given by this Legislature, and in this case - and I speak of the policy of developing Hydro electric power on the Nelson River that has been approved by this Legislature - with compassion and understanding. I'm convinced that such is the case and that we may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that nothing will be done here that in any way would not be considered in good taste and with fairness and considerateness of those concerned.

So, Mr. Speaker -- I'm always puzzled to know what one does on motions of this kind. Do you ask that the Honourable Member from Portage be sent home in a Cadillac? You can't ask that his motion be voted down since we are not going to vote it, but I wanted to record here this other aspect which should be part and parcel of this story, and to assure the members, Mr. Speaker, that everything possible will be done to accommodate these very good people who will be put out of their homes by this substantial development.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister. Did I understand you correctly to say that there was only one other alternative, and that was to have the waters eventually end up in Lake Winnipeg?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of alternatives. I was indicating an alternative with regard to the water was to have it go into Lake -- my understanding is into Lake Manitoba and thence into Lake Winnipeg, or I may have that reversed. I'm not really that familiar with the geography of that area, but into that lake system - Manitoba, Winnipegosis, Winnipeg - would be one alternative, not necessarily the only one.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question to that. Well with the other alternative, you have mentioned them, but I wondered with the other alternatives would you have had to move the people at South Indian Lake?

MR. McLEAN: No, we'd move the ones around Lake Manitoba.

MR. DAWSON: I'm not suggesting that -- you said there were other alternatives, I didn't mean that you would move the people around Lake Winnipeg at all. You said there were other alternatives - is that correct? You said there were other alternatives.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we can just -- I wasn't undertaking to make a detailed technical response, I merely said earlier that an alternative was; there may be several alternatives, and in that connection if I may - and I'm assuming I'm speaking on a point of order at the moment - that members will well remember that the late Mr. Stephens indicated the possible alternatives with relation to the cost and their feasibility, and said, if I recall it correctly, that this particular method was the most feasible one technically and financially.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I just have one comment to make and that is in connection with the matter of the area being cleared. At the time that this whole matter was discussed in committee and when we were considering the matter in committee, I don't think it was pointed out whether the area that would be flooded would be cleared. The point was raised by the member from Portage, and I wonder whether the Minister could not answer that point now. The area that will be flooded, is that going to be cleared?

MR. McLEAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would assume so, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: indicated that what he was concerned about is whether all alternatives had in fact been properly assessed and that this was really a responsibility of

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) government, that Hydro's responsibility quite properly is to recommend what is in the best interests of Hydro power but that there are other considerations as well in these matters, and that what he sought from the government was some assurance that the other factors were in fact being considered by the government. For the Minister to say that this was brought up before and therefore shouldn't be discussed again just doesn't stand up, because the facts are that now the application is before the government according to the news reports. Till this point there apparently was no application to the government, and now the government must look at the situation from the overall considerations which are the proper responsibilities of government.

It seems to me that in this regard the Member for Portage is in a proper position asking what are the other alternatives and have they all been checked out insofar as the total effect on the Province of Manitoba. I'm told, for example, that there are possibly five different locations at which the Churchill River could be diverted - one of them in the Province of Saskatchewan and four in the Province of Manitoba. One of those, which is the one recommended to date, means raising the level of South Indian Lake some 35 or 40 feet. The other three choices in Manitoba don't involve the raising of the lake. There are other alternatives. The one in the Province of Saskatchewan would mean diverting the river into the Saskatchewan River system and would bring other considerations obviously, because it would mean the water would be flowing through the Grand Rapids Power Station, the Kelsey Power Station, in addition to the Kettle Rapids one where the present proposal is involved.

So the assurance that we are seeking is that in fact these alternatives have been considered, not just in terms of straight dollars and cents - obviously that's part of the factor - but also in the overall human terms, in the terms of the long-range development of our province, the retention of our natural resources and so on. And this is a government responsibility; this is for the government to assess. So what my honourable friend is seeking is assurance that this had and will be done by the government. Secondly, I think quite properly so, that there will be public hearings on this matter so that those people who are concerned about this can in fact appear before the government and have their views considered. This, it seems to me, is a perfectly reasonable request.

Another request he is making is that the people of South Indian Lake be in fact given the best technical and legal help that can be given to them. I think we have to recognize that because of their location and their isolation they are not equipped themselves to stand up for their own rights and therefore it's incumbent on the government to do so. We know, Mr. Speaker, what happened in the southern part of the province when government be it this government or a municipal corporation, wants to move into an area and do something. There are very quickly portests by the people there because they have the means of so doing. We've seen this in the case of Birds Hill Park where some of the local people who do not feel that this is a proper procedure have gone through the courts and stood up for their rights. We know, for example, when there was a proposal some months ago where the government would move the Vaughan Street Detention Home to a site in the other part of the city where the Fort Osborne Barracks previously were, how immediately there was protests from the local area and how the government did not proceed on that initial step that apparently they were considering. But what we want to be sure of, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of South Indian Lake who are not in a position to protest in that way, through no fault of their own, are not disenfranchized and are not in any way hurt by this action, or at least that they have the opportunity of having their case properly hears. And this is what my honourable friend is seeking.

It may be that after full study of this, after all the considerations, that the government will finally decide there is no other alternative; and if that is so, then what the Minister says, that this is the path of progress and you can't stand against it, will be acceptable. But what we want to be sure of, Mr. Speaker, is that there is in fact a complete analysis by government of the total effect of this change, an appreciation of all the factors, and a proper chance given to the people concerned of having their rights protected.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, to back up the information which the Minister of Public Utilities has brought forward in answer to this matter of urgency, I would like to point out a number of things. First of all, the area of South Indian Lake has been under intensive study by a number of government departments, including my own, which is presently involved in both the mineral examination as well as the other natural resource examination of the area and as well as the interests of

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) the people in the area. I would also like to point out that as far as the alternatives are concerned, there are a number of fairly straightforward considerations which have to be taken into account from a technical point of view, and that is that you have to provide storage space at some location ahead of the Kettle Rapids and other dams on the Nelson River to provide you with water during the off periods when you don't have precipitation.

The alternatives are basically in terms of storage: South Indian Lake, Lake Winnipeg and Reindeer Lake in Saskatchewan. If you don't store in South Indian you're pretty well faced with the fact of storing in Lake Winnipeg or in Reindeer Lake in Saskatchewan. If you're going to store in Lake Winnipeg, I think you have to compare primarily with the numbers of people which you are inconveniencing in the South Indian Lake area. If you're going to store in Reindeer Lake in Saskatchewan, you're involved in something that is not only outside of your province but is probably also of the magnitude comparable to that of Lake Winnipeg. So I think that really technical examination, which is not a matter to be discussed at this point but which has been discussed in years past, brings you back to the realization that South Indian Lake is the point at which you must store water for this great Hydro project as you have to do in all other Hydro projects to provide you for the period of the year of low precipitation.

I don't wish to drag this out but I would like to assure you that we're looking at not only the natural resource problems, we're also concerned about the human resource problems. We're willing to admit there's going to be some inconvenience in relocating people here and we're not at all sure that some of the points which the Honourable Member from Portage has made, which I presume he has checked out, particularly with respect to fishing, are in fact true. We know that in front of the Grand Rapids dam that the great concern over the drop in the fishing potential has in fact been reversed, and that the fishing potential in the Grand Rapids forebay is much greater than it was prior to the dam construction. I don't think there's any definite proof that the fishing potential of South Indian Lake is in fact going to be diminished. If it follows the pattern of the Grand Rapids project, it will in fact be improved. I'm not saying it will be, but expert opinion is not sufficiently well justified at this point that we can say that it's going to go down. As we know, the economy of that particular Indian reserve, which in fact I will point out is one of the best Indian communities that we have in all of Manitoba in terms of their cultural development and their income, there's no indication that in fact their livelihood in that area is definitely going to be in jeopardy.

MR. MOLGAT: Will the Minister permit a question? Will the government have a public hearing prior to the granting of the licence so that people who have views on this can be heard?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can answer that on behalf of the government. I will say that there have been more than one study completed and have been examined with respect to this problem.

MR. MOLGAT: studies be available to the public? -- (Interjection) -- No, I think it was a different question, Mr. Speaker. I asked one, and if another Minister wishes to reply or the Premier wishes to tell us that there will be hearings, then that would answer the question. The Minister said he could not reply for the government but he said that there were studies. I wonder then if the studies would be made public and would be available to anyone who is interested in the project.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): also ask a question about the control dams. We know that there is to be one at Warren's Landing or -- isn't that -- Lake Winnipeg and this one at South Indian Lake. How many other similar control dams are there to be placed generally to create water reserves and what is their location?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a most interesting subject that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has raised and it deals with the question of human rights, the question as to the advisability of proceeding with an undertaking and protection for the development of the Nelson River complex and the natural results of progress in the development in a particular area, and I think all of the points have to be taken under consideration by the government.

Now, I don't want to take much time insofar as the debate is concerned, but rather I rise to make a suggestion to the government in order that the government itself may not be placed into an embarrassing position, because as I understand the legislation at the present time, under The Water Control and Conservation Act the Minister is the final arbitrator or has the final say in the general matter that we have before us.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

We have however in legislation another agency dealing with the matter of water control, namely, the Manitoba Water Commission, and as I understand these two pieces of legislation, in one the Water Control and Conservation Branch of the Manitoba Government is directly concerned with the Minister and the Lieutenant-Governor and there is no provision as I see it for the Water Control and Conservation Branch to hear representations and to make recommendations as a result of those hearings. There is however, Mr. Speaker, under the Manitoba Water Commission. The Commission is given the right under Chapter 69 of the Statutes of 1966-67: "The Commission has the power to study projects, problems and schemes relating in any way to water that may be referred to it by the Minister, and to report and make recommendations to the Minister on these matters designed to secure the maximum benefits to the province from the use, allocation and conservation of water." I respectfully suggest that there is enough scope under that particular section, and in regards to an important matter of this nature that the Minister concerned with the Water Control and Conservation Branch could quite easily refer this matter to the Water Commission, and of course under the legislation setting up the Water Commission, the Commission itself can have public hearings to hear from the various parties concerned with this development.

Now I don't know whether I read the legislation correctly or not. Under Chapter 70 of the Statutes of last year it appears to me that when the Water Control and Conservation Department is dealing with persons who may not come under the general jurisdiction of the provincial authority - and in this I'm thinking of Treaty Indians - that they have to make representations to the other jurisdiction as well.

So while I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the points raised by the Honourable Member for Portage, and also the contribution to the debate made by both the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I suggest that if the government would take under consideration my proposal of referral to the Water Control Commission, they would in effect make sure that people who may be adversely affected one way or the other in this huge undertaking in northern Manitoba would assure to them that they had a hearing. I think this would be an advisable course of action for the government to take and refer the matter to the Water Control Commission. And I say this too because as the Honourable Member for Portage points out in his motion of adjournment, he points out the considering of other alternatives, locations and possibilities for the diverting of the Churchill River.

And I think that this would give a sort of an aura of non-governmental direction which could achieve the same thing. And when I say non-governmental, of course we're all cognizant of the fact that the Water Control Commission is a commission appointed by the government, but at least they would have - and my honourable friend from Dufferin is a member of that commission so I'm sure there's an aura of association - but I would suggest -- (Interjection) -- oh, he's like a judge when he's sitting on that Commission; he's non-governmental.

But anyways I do make the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, as an alternative and whereby people will have an opportunity, if they're so concerned in this important matter, of being able to be represented and being heard. Under the terms of the Water Control and Conservation Branch it doesn't appear to me on my superficial reading of the Act where there is provision for a direct representation; but the Minister has the power under the Water Control Commission legislation to refer this matter to the Commission for their consideration and I would suggest that this would be a manner in which this matter could be handled and that people would have an opportunity of being heard.

MR. SPEAKER: inclusive debate, if we might not get back to the business of the House, if the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is content with the debate thus far. The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is no doubt in the minds of yourself and members of the government that those of us who are on the opposition realize full well the necessity for the continued expansion of hydro electric power for the betterment of Manitoba. My question, as far as I am concerned, is basically, are the people of the certain - if it's an Indian reservation or just an area - are these people being taken care of in the proper manner? And my question to the Minister of Public Utilities, I believe, or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, if this permit is granted, has a definite decision been made, a new townsite set up or a new camping ground or a new definite location been established as to where these people are going to re-establish themselves?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer the question. No particular location has been selected yet but the matters to which the honourable member refers will be taken care of and will be part of the resettlement arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: which I'd like to speak to answer an allegation. -- (Interjection) --- Well since when are you advising the Speaker? I address my question to you with all respect, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I think he realizes unless he possibly withdraws this resolution the business of the House must continue along the lines of this resolution, and I wondered if he was content with the debate that has gone on, to be in the position to withdraw this in order that we can come to the Order Paper.

MR. JOHNSTON: my request to speak on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't deny the honourable member that privilege. I understood when he was speaking to the Honourable the Attorney-General that that was his point of privilege, but apparently not. He may rise now.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when I started my address, to begin with I haven't heard for some time when a Minister makes an important statement he thinks nothing of reading his statement to the House, and for the first time in this House I read a statement and I resent very much his allegation that I was reading someone else's words. It seemed to me that it was quite all right for the Minister to take this frivolous -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the floor. -- (Interjections) --

MR. MOLGAT: of the House as well as the Attorney-General and it's about time you put him in his place, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has accepted my opinion, that he take his chair and I'm sure the Attorney-General will do the same. The Honourable Member for Portage has the floor and I'd be pleased to hear his point of privilege.

MR. JOHNSTON: My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is the way my words were twisted by the Minister of Utilities when he replied. Mr. Speaker, he made a misstatement. The Minister said that he was sure, or he was giving assurance to this House that the 250,000 acres which were going to be inundated would be cleared, and I would like him to support that statement. He said that 250,000 acres of land were going to be cleared. -- (Interjection) -- The point of privilege is the Minister is supplying misinformation to this House, and I would like the Minister to dwell on that point -- on a point of privilege. He has been giving misinformation to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the honourable gentleman is that his point of privilege, that he feels that the Minister is misinforming the House about the clearance of the land? That is your point of privilege? I am sure the Minister would endeavour to reply.

MR. McLEAN: It will be remembered that the Honourable the Member for Rhineland asked if the area to be flooded would be cleared, and I answered that by saying that I assumed it would be.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, this happens to be in the middle of the Churchill constituency and I think that I probably should say a few words on it. Since it reflects on the Hydro development at Gillam, and since we were up at Gillam and saw the size of this development we must realize that it is a large project, and as large projects are concerned, it is found to affect many of the people in the surrounding area and unfortunately, or fortunately, I might say that the South Indian falls within this area - in God's country.

The South Indian people historically belong to the Nelson River Band which is located some miles closer to Thompson. The South Indian people are actually the descendants of those who decided to relocate outside of the reservation area because they felt that they were going up there each year to trap and to fish at different seasons of the year - they were a very industrious people - and they decided that they could make a better living, have a better life by staying at South Indian. Now actually they're squatters, if you want to put it, they're squatting on Provincial Crown land, but they've been doing it for so long that I would say that they probably should be given more rights than that rough type of language.

The South Indian people are industrious; they've got good work habits; their welfare is very small and their demands from government have been very little in the past. They moved there because they were happy to move and they must consider what they are going to do in the future. They've known for some time that this is going to happen. I must point out that when

May 9, 1968

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) I first heard about it my first thought was that they should have legal rights and they should be assured of a fund set up so that they could choose legal counsel of their own choosing, and this assurance has been given me that this will be done.

I'd also point out that the men that are working on it, in my point of view, are strong men and they know the situation. I'd say particularly one man who has been a trader in the area and I would like to name him. It is Mr. Oscar Blackburn, a great supporter of the Liberal Party. Oscar has since gone, in the last few years, gone to the Indian Affairs Department and has been taken back on some type of loan basis with Northern Affairs to work with the Indian people at South Indian, the Manitoba Hydro and the Government of Manitoba, to see to it that we can best look after the problems that will arise - and certainly there will be many arise out of the relocation of the South Indian people. I must point out too that the majority of these are Treaty Indians and Indian Affairs are concerned and are being involved in this. I think that we will find that Northern Affairs, the Manitoba Department of Northern Affairs become more involved in it as they arrive at the different stages of what these people will decide to do.

And at this point I would like to state that the South Indian people are arriving at a stage where they realize that they are living in isolation and possibly this disturbance will become a blessing to many of them, certainly not to the older ones - certainly not to the older ones who feel that this is home and they do not want to leave - but this South Indian is one of our more isolated communities and I think that great consideration has to be given as to what we are going to do for these people. I think they have to be involved in all the discussions that take place. I don't think that government or Hydro or Indian Affairs or anybody else can go ahead and plan without involving these people, and we are assured that they are going to be involved, they have been involved, and they will become more involved as time passes. We have the assurance that nothing will happen until the people have been looked after, and that I suppose is why the official announcements have been made now.

But these people have known for some time. There has been commissions in looking at it, talking to them, trying to negotiate, and I suppose really if you looked at the community itself in respect to the debate we had this afternoon on the Jones Report, then the Jones Report would probably in many cases give the same report in respect to the conditions at South Indian because we've got to keep in mind that this is an old Indian-type community and certainly not modern in any way. In fact I presented quite a lengthy paper for them to the Northern Transportation Committee in respect to postal services. It's almost impossible for them to get proper types of postal delivery in that area -- and nursing care has been very difficult. Their medical problems are astronomical in respect to what we have to look after in the more modern communities. Their higher living costs -- everything now, I believe, is pretty well flown in, and this is coming to astronomical amounts. We tabled a report to the Northern Transportation Committee, and unfortunately I haven't got it here tonight, but some of their costs are almost double in food costs to what we're paying in the city here, or in fact in Thompson or many of the other larger communities.

So really maybe it's a blessing in disguise, but it only will be if we can get out of this something that will keep five hundred-and-some-odd people happy. It's not going to make them all happy but I think that they should be allowed at this time to start a construction program. If they can come to a decision on where they live, let them build their own homes; use it as a training scheme, as an education program and develop their own townsite, whether it be in a subdivision as part of Thompson or as part of Lynn Lake. I favour Thompson myself because we have a large fishery there. There's the Nelson River fishery for the availability of over one million pounds of fish a year and they could quite likely -- this would be a good area for the Minister of Industry and Commerce to consider developing, along with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, a fishery product which will allow us to get more money out of the fishing industry than shipping it on a dry run direct from the lake to Chicago area.

So this could come out of it. It would allow a labour pool to be developed for these large communities in northern Manitoba who require labour, who are advertising every day pretty well in the big newspapers for labour. Maybe we can introduce -- maybe we can use our vocational schools at Cranberry Portage, maybe we can use our trade training schools at The Pas to get the younger group integrated into our type of society. Perhaps we can use the trade training and the relocation of these people themselves to assist other people to move out. Certainly moving people has been a problem not only in northern Manitoba but all over.

MR. SPEAKER: the matter under discussion which is in my hand here.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) I wondered if he would come back to that.

MR. BEARD: I guess I'd better — I've taken enough of your time, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that the Honourable Member for Portage is possibly right in his concern. I feel myself that these people are being considered and that the proper steps are being taken to assure these people that programs will be set up to allow them to relocate to areas that will certainly improve the conditions for both them and those youngsters that follow after them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: to speak to this resolution to possibly keep it as brief as they possibly can in order that the business of the House may proceed, or the business of the province may proceed. It is very important, but at the same time I would appeal to them to co-operate with the Chair.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I thoroughly enjoyed the recommendations that were made by the Honourable Member for Churchill and I think that this points up that the motion was quite in order at this time. I enjoyed listening to the recommendations and conclusions that he made, and I must confess that after listening to him twice today I don't know how much longer they will put up with him on that side of the House, but nevertheless he has made some real contributions to the debate today.

Now the resolution that is before us simply asks for four considerations — I suppose that's it — and I conclude now that we have assurance from the government on (1) and (3). I don't know if you people all have been supplied with the — (Interjection) — no, this is the — you wouldn't be supplied with the speech that was made by the Honourable Member for Portage, but he ended up by saying: I ask that the government see to it that the following suggestions are implemented, then he lists (1), (2), (3) and (4).

On (1), the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities has consented to; namely, that you would — one was that the other methods of diverting the Churchill River into the Nelson or Saskatchewan River be studied. We've had your assurance that that would be done. — (Interjection) — We haven't? I — thought we did. Didn't we? Well, I understood from all the discussion that you promised to do that.

And then the Honourable Member for Churchill certainly assured the House just now in respect to (3), that the South Indian Lake Band be supplied with the best legal counsel available whose sole duty will be to fight for the rights of the people. Now certainly the Honourable Member for Churchill assured us that that would be done. Now I don't know whether he's speaking for the government or not but he said that would be done, so if my Honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities is now saying that he — (Interjection) — Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: in what he is saying.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, I'm not trying to be repetitious, I'm just trying to get a commitment from the government, and after having listened to them, I must confess that I understood in respect to the four requests, the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities said that all alternatives would be studied and the Member for Churchill said that counsel would be supplied to the Indians. Now, am I right or am I wrong?

Now, I wonder too, Mr. Chairman, because after all this whole motion I think was put before the House because of the concern for the 530 Indians, and when the application was made, or will be made, did the Honourable the Minister of Welfare supply the government with the anticipated cost of welfare in respect to replacement of the 530 Indians, and if he has not already supplied Hydro with a figure, is it his intention to do so? Because all of these alternatives must be considered. And the Minister of Agriculture, who I understand has the authority in his hand to say yes or no, has he considered all aspects, and if not, will he do so? And the Honourable the Member for Dufferin, has he already explored all the various avenues? And then the Honourable Member for Churchill, I am certain we don't need to worry about him because he has demonstrated his concern for the people in his own area.

These are the things that we're concerned about. I for one believe that the hour — (Interjection) Pardon? I must apologize to the Honourable Member for Brandon, I believe that he is on the Hydro Board and certainly he will have concern in this whole matter as well as everyone else. I don't consider that the hour and twenty minutes that we spent is wasted at all. If the lives of 530 people are at stake, certainly we can afford to spend an hour discussing their welfare. I'm sure that if they lived in Dauphin my honourable friend would be concerned about their welfare; if they lived in Neepawa I would; and the member for Churchill is naturally concerned. I don't consider it wasted; I think it was well spent, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Honourable the Member for Portage prepared to withdraw this motion? Is he ...

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's customary for the mover of the motion such as this to withdraw it, and I so withdraw. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment you in resisting the efforts of two would-be speakers on that side to give you advice.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment my honourable friend for his new-found interest in a subject that is already 2 1/2 years old.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the business of the province might move along now at a rapid pace. The second reading of Bill No. 60. The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa). presented Bill No. 60, an Act to amend The Electoral Divisions Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that Bill No. 60 is a Bill that has had the consideration of all of the members of the House by this time. There are many things that could be said about the principles that are involved in the Bill. Many of the points have already been covered by the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lakeside earlier in the session and I don't propose to go into any lengthy details on it this evening.

The changes in the operating section of the Act primarily repeal in the definition sections all reference to things rural and things urban, and special references to Brandon, Greater Winnipeg and definitions of that type within the Act; and replaces in the operative section the flexibility, after having given consideration to specific matters, to the commission - an independent commission, the commission as already exists within the Act - to make a judgment within certain limitations, which I think are fairly flexible, and provides them to use their judgment from a quotient which is defined within the Act and allows them to go 25 percent upwards in the area of high density populations or 25 percent down in the areas of low density populations.

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 and allowing them to come to their own conclusions.

I think that this Act, Mr. Speaker, provides this satisfactory impartiality and sufficient flexibility to be satisfactory in this distribution, and hopefully in distributions to come in the Province of Manitoba, and I'd like to recommend approval of Bill No. 60 to the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I had taken the opportunity on the sub-amendment in the Throne Speech debate to speak specifically on this item only, the question of redistribution in the province, so I will not be repeating tonight the things I said at that time. I indicated then that insofar as my Party was concerned we accepted the principle of representation by population. We recognized that in certain circumstances because of the problems of geography, of access, that there had to be obviously some other considerations in this as well. My comments then were particularly on the question of the impartiality of the commission and of the way in which the work of the commission was done, and I would like to commend the government for not having proceeded with any changes in that commission. There had been some rumors prior to the opening of the session that possibly the government was thinking of some changes there, and I think that regardless of what change had been made it would have appeared to be either a criticism of the previous commission or at least some indication that the government was not satisfied, and I think that it is much better to leave it as it is and I approve of the government in that regard.

I'm prepared to support the Bill for second reading. I think there might be some concern about the percentage of leeway that is allowed, and we could well hear representations at the committee stage in this regard.

One of the items that is not in the Bill which concerns me somewhat, and which was in the previous Bill by nature of the racial structure, was that all of the similar types of constituencies were at least alike in population whereas now we will have to await really the report of the commission before we can tell whether or not they have in fact got this balance. In other words, under this structure they could end up with a constituency, for example in

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) densely populated regions, still varying considerably one from the other in population, because nothing in the Act says that they should be as close to being alike as possible.

Similarly, constituencies in sparsely populated regions could vary again substantially one from the other, and it's difficult under these circumstances to really give a final commitment as to the effect of the redistribution until we really see the boundaries that are drawn. I would hope that the commission in its work will attempt to have all like constituencies of similar population quotas, otherwise we are leaving the door open to very considerable leeway in the commission itself and we could end up with a great variety of constituencies.

I am wondering too, Mr. Speaker, if we won't find ourselves with this Bill in conflict with a Bill that was passed last year. I note that this Bill merely amends the 1957 statute and does not in any way refer to the amendment that was passed last year which is Chapter 14 of the 1966-'67 statutes, and that Chapter 14 of last year amending the Act of 1957 established some specific dates. It amended, or inserted immediately after subsection (3), the following subsection which stated that the commission shall not prepare or submit a report in the year 1967 but the commission shall, after the first day of July, 1968 but before the last day of December, 1968 and in the year 1977 and in each tenth year thereafter, prepare a report.

So this Bill of last year merely made an amendment for the one case instead of following what had then been established by the previous Act of every ten years following the six-year census. For this year it made an amendment then it went back after that to 1977, whereas this Bill now, without changing last year's statute it seems to me unless I'm missing in the reading of the Bill, says something different again because it establishes that this be done, as I understand it, every ten years following the 1968, because in Section 9, "in the year 1968 and each tenth year thereafter." The Minister may have an explanation for this but it seems to me that we have here two statutes in conflict.

So, Mr. Speaker, I accept and recommend the principle of representation by population. I am going to support the Bill for second reading. I would be anxious to hear at that time representations. I would like to know from the government more details as to exactly what they mean by densely populated regions; what they mean by sparsely populated regions; and what the definitions are going to be. I think that this, in the final analysis as I said, will have to await the report of the commission, but I think that this should be more clearly defined and we should have possibly another look at the percentage leeway. But in general principles I support the Bill.

MR. PAULLEY: This is a very important Bill in that it purports to set out the representation in this House, and at the offset may I say that I can't quite agree with my honourable friend the First Minister or the Leader of the Liberal Party in reference to establishing the question of representation by population, because really it doesn't if one analyzes the contents of the Bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it's not really a great improvement over the ratio that prevails in the present Bill. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, in the present Bill there is first of all established a ratio of 7 to 4, that is between rural and urban seats, and then there is a seven percent tolerance or 7 1/2 percent tolerance up and down. Many people, including the press, have suggested that in the present Bill we have the provision of representation by population, but if one analyzes the present contents or the present permissive variances within the legislation proposed by the Honourable the First Minister of a 25 percent variance up and down, the representation even at the best mathematical consideration of population by representation comes to a ratio of about 5 to 3 instead of 7 to 4 at the present time.

Now I would suggest that if the Honourable the First Minister of the government wants to bring in representation by population, that the worst that should occur is a tolerance, the same percentage tolerance that was permissive under previous legislation, namely 7 1/2 up or down. I think a tolerance of 15 percent would be far more reasonable than a tolerance of 50 percent, which would be in effect the situation if the Bill was passed in its present form. So I suggest that this should be considered. I do say, in all due respects to my friend the First Minister, it's a misnomer to say that this is representation by population.

Now I know that there are a number of provisions in the Bill that have some merit. And indeed the Bill is not all wrong, it can easily be corrected after the Bill is passed to committee, and I for one am not going to oppose the Bill going to committee where we can consider in detail the provisions in the Bill. I think it's generally a good idea of some of the directives

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) to the commission, and that is to take into consideration the community interests and the municipal boundaries. Also a very important consideration that the First Minister is proposing in his Bill is the fact that it takes into consideration population growth and area. I think this is most important because I'm sure, as you're aware, Mr. Speaker, that I can speak in this House for more individuals in any single constituency than any other member of the House. As a matter of fact, I have the honour to represent almost as many persons in Manitoba as most of our federal representatives that may be going down to Ottawa on June 25th. — (Interjection) — Yes, and representing them well too, may I suggest.

But I am pleased to see that in there because when the consideration was before the independent commission — and I thank my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside for introducing the divisions and the commission while he was the First Minister. It was a good idea; it took it out of the realm of gerrymandering as far as government is concerned. I think it's a good idea, although at that time I think that it was a little too restrictive in that the commission had to deal more or less specifically with the 7 or 4 ratio, the 7 1/2 up and down based on the last available census, and now of course in the present Bill, as I understand it, there is a little more flexibility or directive to the commission to take into consideration population growth in areas, and I welcome that.

Another thought that I have, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the Bill is concerned, is whether or not we shouldn't consider some of our sparsely settled communities, such as Churchill less Thompson, and Rupertsland, on a straight basis of representation, or whether or not some areas that are at the present time lacking in communications and transportation facilities may be prejudiced. Now, this is my own personal observation and I just raise it at this particular time.

I'm also deeply concerned with the legislation that we have before us, Mr. Speaker, that would change the years in between consideration. Now the Leader of the Liberal Party a moment ago referred back to Chapter 14 of the Statutes of last year — which I have before me at the present time — and an amendment was made then to defer for one year the consideration of the commission of the establishment of the new boundaries. But what the legislation did last year, as different from the suggested legislation this year, was to bring back into focus the ten-year period in between; it brought it back to where it was in the original legislation.

Now I suggest that when the original legislation was proposed dealing with the five-year census of the federal authority, it provided for a leeway of just two years between the consideration of the commission and the taking of the census, and now the First Minister in this legislation suggests that that period should be extended to three years, which only would mean, Mr. Speaker, of course, that there would only be two more years until the next census was being taken and a period of eight years then before there would be further consideration of the population content in the respective constituencies.

So I would suggest to the Honourable the First Minister that at least, at least he should adhere to the legislation as passed last year which read that after the 1st day of July, 1968 but before the last day of December, 1968, and in the year 1977 the Commission should make its report. In the legislation we have before us at the present time, it says in the year 1968 and every ten years after that, so I would suggest to my honourable friend that he should conform with the legislation and the thought behind the legislation as passed a year ago.

Now I do know, Mr. Speaker, that there are many other matters and principles contained in this Bill that members of the House will wish to consider, and I just point out that unlike the previous legislation which made provisions for urban representation, under this proposal of the First Minister it will be possible once again to have a mixture of urban and rural representation in the House. And just to use an example, in my own constituency let's say of Transcona — I imagine under the quotient it would almost be entitled to a seat by itself — it would be possible for me to absorb pretty well all of the constituency of my honourable friend the Member for Springfield. It might be well for those people, but it would change the content of representation. This is a principle, of course, that is once again re-established by the legislation as proposed by the First Minister.

I think again, Mr. Speaker, and in conclusion — I stated that others will have an opportunity and I'm sure that they will take it of making their observations on this Bill — I want to point out again, though, that it is a misnomer to call it representation by population. I can appreciate to some degree the desires of my honourable friend the First Minister in proposing

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... this legislation, but on pretty close scrutiny, if you take the full flexibility of the 25 percent up or down it really doesn't bring in to focus what normally one would consider representation by population. Now there may be those that argue that this is not possible here in Manitoba. Others of course have affirmed over a considerable period of time that this should be one for one all across the whole province. Now I personally do not quite accept that, but when we do talk of representation by population, this is the only way we can really approach it.

So I suggest to my honourable friend - and as I said earlier I'm not going to oppose the Bill going for second reading - I would suggest to my honourable friend the First Minister that more consideration should be given to the allowable tolerances above and below the quotient, which at the present time would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of, as I understand it, somewhere in the neighbourhood of 16,000, which would give approximately 12,000 to 24,000 that is with a variance of 25 percent under and 25 ---(Interjection)-- or 12 to 20, yes - thanks - 12 to 20 which may be too great a variance and may land up in a somewhat similar situation that we have at the present time. --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Something close to that.

There could well be - there could well be a differential of about 9,000 in two constituencies, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest in all due respect, with the transportation facilities that we have, the areas and lines of communication we have, is a little too great a variance between constituencies, although, as I did say, I think possibly some consideration could be given - and this is personal - to special consideration for some of our more sparsely settled communities, and to use the present constituency of Churchill as an example, I would suggest taking Thompson out of the area and making it a constituency and then the other area considered separately. That's my personal opinion in that regard, but I do suggest that we should give more consideration to narrowing down the area or tolerance above and below the quotient.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have occasion to speak on a Bill of this type. The previous time when a Bill of this type was brought in - and I take it the last one was brought in before the 1959 election - at any rate I've not had the opportunity of discussing a Bill of this type before.

I feel in many respects the existing Bill that's on the Statutes is preferable to the one we have before us, and when I do say these things I refer especially to the definition sections. I prefer to have the definition sections in the Bill rather than to remove them and have them just refer to sparsely and densely populated areas. I think we should spell this out so that the people in charge will know what we mean by it, and this is what you have in the old Act and the existing Statute. To me, a densely populated area is the urban area of the province and the cities that we have, cities of greater Winnipeg, probably Brandon and Thompson, Portage. These are, in my opinion, the densely populated areas, because when you consider rural population in comparison to urban areas, I think the whole of rural Manitoba is sparsely settled in comparison to urban areas. Therefore, I feel that the old Act is much better in that it spells out and defines these areas.

Under the new Act - we've talked so much of the farm cost-price squeeze, well I think the farmers are going to have another squeeze because of this Bill - they will be squeezed out of more representation in this House and I do not like it. I think as a rural member and representing a farm area, that we should have a little more representation in the House than the urban area who is much more accessible to the Legislature, to matters that are discussed here. When we pass laws, take them to Law Amendments Committee, they're right here; they can be represented at any time. They are the ones that have the daily newspapers at hand and know what's going on, whereas many people in the rural areas do not get to read these papers until the following day, and if committee meetings are called, unless they're specifically notified, they're not able to attend. I think these things have to be taken into consideration, and therefore I feel that the rural area should have more representation population-wise. I'm sure that former members of this House who've been in here longer than I have, and especially the former Premier of Manitoba - I'm referring to the Member for Lakeside - will have much more experience in matters of this type and I'd certainly like to hear from him sometime in this debate.

I would also like to refer to a couple of sections in the old Statutes here, when I read from Section 11, subsection (a) which says, "The population included in each rural electoral division", shall be as nearly as possible the same as the population included in each other rural electoral division"; and then (b), "The population in each urban electoral division shall be as nearly as

May 9, 1968

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) ... possible the same as the population included in each other urban electoral division." These are the sections that we are striking out by the new Bill and I think these sections are worthy of being retained in the Bill.

Therefore, I am not satisfied with the Bill that is before us and I certainly will have more to say when the same gets to committee. No doubt the government has decided on this and they will vote for it so that it will go to committee, but I am not satisfied the way it is.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question, Mr. Speaker? Was he expressing the point of view of the Social Credit Party of Manitoba or is this a free vote?

MR. FROESE: In which way a free vote? What does he mean?

MR. CHERNIACK: I quite seriously asked whether this is the position of the Social Credit Party of Manitoba - what he expressed.

MR. FROESE: I think this is the position that the former government took to this matter and I believe in it.

MR. CHERNIACK ... answer my question, I know he doesn't have to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, there's a quotation that I have always been fond of, and I think the author is Milton; it says: "Fame is no plant that grows in mortal soil, nor in the 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 expect thy meed."

Well I am not one that usually aspires to great fame and I'm not usually having it thrust on me from either in front of me or to my left, but I think on this particular Bill I would take the opportunity of saying a few words about what I consider - I've heard a lot of what other people consider to be the failings, not as frequently the accomplishments, of the ten years that I had the honour of heading the government of this province - but I think that I might be permitted to give my opinion as to what I think are the accomplishments, or one of them.

I know that the most of people if they heard me starting out to tell about the most important highlights of my career as head of the government here would say, it'll be the financial administration and the sound position in which this province was left at the end of that administration. Some other people would likely say - well if I said no it isn't that, they'd almost certainly say, well it's the farm electrification program. If I said no it isn't that, I think there's something bigger than that, they'd say, well then it's certainly the reorganization of the electrical industry, because that one in my opinion was actually bigger than the farm electrification program itself and made the farm electrification program possible and made the industrial development that has come since that time possible too by laying the foundations for it. But I'd still say no that isn't it yet, because I honestly think, Mr. Speaker, that if I have any meed up there at all coming to me, that the most important one of all is this piece of legislation that we're talking about now, and the second most important one in my opinion, Mr. Speaker - because those other things were economic; these matters lie in the realm of good citizenship and good administration of the public affairs of the province - the other one was the legislation we put on the books - and I'm sorry it has not yet been implemented - with regard to a permanent Speaker.

I think that when the perfect witness of subsequent historians come to judge, that they will write those two accomplishments of the Campbell years as being of greater importance even than the economic ones that I referred to earlier on. And so perhaps you won't be surprised that I'm interested in saying a few words on this subject because I do consider it to be one of the two high points of the ten years that I had the honour of leading this government.

And the situation why I think it is really an accomplishment of great merit is that I think it did more than any other single matter of that time to cement the goodwill which was always potentially there but which at some times suffered some erosion between the rural and urban parts of this province. There had been some politicians at one time who were willing, in my opinion, to exploit to at least some degree the possibility that lay there of fanning some difference of opinion between the urban and the rural points. I think it was a fortunate circumstance for me that I happened to be in office at the time when the opportunity came along to do something to add to the feeling of the people that really was there but needed some tangible action to cement the position, to consolidate it, that we really are one people in the Province of Manitoba whether we be rural or urban, and I think it is fortunate that it was a person who was known to not only be the representative of a rural constituency and to be rural-oriented but that was

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.)... one that was definitely a farmer by profession up to the time I went into the profession of politics. I was never a very good farmer after that, but up to that time I was considered to be a pretty fair one and to know something about rural Manitoba and about farmers and their programs and their problems, and I think it was one of the fortunate circumstances, so far as I was concerned, that I was able to be the one, a rural person, who made the first definite move toward this question of giving at least recognition to the principle for representation by population.

Of course we didn't achieve it or come close to it, but don't forget that I had not only myself to contend with, I had a government that had a good many members in it of something the persuasion of my honourable friend from Rhineland, my honourable friend from Gladstone and some others, and the fact that we got as good a start made as we did at that time I think was really an accomplishment and one that has meant something to the Province of Manitoba, and I still consider it, along with the legislation re a permanent Speaker, Mr. Speaker, as being the highlight, or two of the highlights of my years in office as First Minister.

I guess you've gathered that I won't likely finish what I'm going to say in the next couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, and this might be a good time for me to interrupt myself, but I did want to say this much at this time to sort of introduce the more practical matters that I hope to lay before the members later.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Friday morning.