

Inquiries of the Ministry

million that has been mentioned, but perhaps that will come out in the discussions.

* * *

POWER

**JAMES BAY HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT—
GOVERNMENT POSITION RESPECTING EFFECTS ON
INDIANS**

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development if he would make a statement at an early date indicating whether his department has considered the effects of the proposed James Bay project on the native peoples living in the area, what studies his department has conducted, and whether the project as contemplated by the province has the approval of the minister with regard to its effect on the native peoples?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. leader of the official opposition for his question. We are now looking into this problem. As I have already mentioned in the House, the Indians of the province of Quebec are negotiating with the Quebec government so as to reach a satisfactory settlement. I am following the situation very closely. We have already told the Indians that we would be willing to help them but up to now they have preferred to conduct their negotiation themselves.

[English]

**JAMES BAY HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT—STUDY TO
DETERMINE ACCEPTABILITY FROM ENVIRONMENTAL
VIEWPOINT**

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of the Environment. In light of the admission yesterday by the Minister of Transport that the government will have to give prior approval to all dams built for the James Bay project, is the government now undertaking an environmental study to determine whether the project is acceptable from an environmental point of view?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of the Environment): Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Jamieson: I rise on a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I am sure—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Transport rises on a point of order.

An hon. Member: Too many points of order are being raised.

Mr. Jamieson: I simply wanted to clarify, for the House and the hon. gentleman, the statement made yesterday. If he looks at *Hansard* he will find that I did not say all dams will require approval under the Navigable Waters Protection Act.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Mr. Nesbitt: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not usually do this, but since the minister has raised the matter can he indicate to the House what dams or bridges he would not have to approve under the terms of the Navigable Waters Protection Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think that might be the kind of question the minister should answer by way of a statement on motions. The question period expired a few minutes ago but the hon. member for Churchill has a supplementary. He may ask his supplementary.

**JAMES BAY HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT—DATE FOR
SETTLEMENT BETWEEN QUEBEC GOVERNMENT AND
INDIANS**

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the fact that the James Bay project seems to be progressing unhindered at the present time, is the minister prepared to set a date by which the Quebec government must come to an amicable settlement with the Indian people in order to be allowed to continue that project?

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): It would be very difficult for me to give an exact date. However, I already said many times over the phone to the Quebec Prime Minister that the sooner the better. As I mentioned earlier the Indians are consulting the government now and when they ask me to intervene I will be pleased to do so.

[English]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS**BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

**ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—EXPEDITION OF PUBLIC
SERVICES AFFECTING QUALITY OF LIFE**

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It has been agreed among all parties that after the speech of the hon. member who is presenting the motion and the speech in reply of the government member, all speeches should be limited to 15 minutes. I am told there are many members on both sides who wish to speak, and this arrangement will give them more opportunity.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is true there has been agreement amongst those representing the parties, but it is also part of the agreement that no one request overtime.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.