

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, September 17, 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 Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery at my left where we have 60 students of Grade 2 standing of the William Russell School. These students are under the direction of Miss Mann and Miss Ballman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson. On behalf of all of the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, may I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the widespread alarm amongst some of the residents around the shores of Lake Winnipeg, could he give a clear assurance to the people in that area that the use of Lake Winnipeg for reservoir purposes for the Nelson River project, can he give the clear assurance that the necessary flood control projects will be undertaken and that there is no cause for alarm?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the feasibility study which has been referred to in the David Cass-Beggs report and which I believe the Premier has made reference to, is to determine the proper levels of the lake, taking into consideration all interests. In connection with this there would indeed be public hearings and I can assure the honourable member that the government of Manitoba is quite concerned that such interests shall be taken into consideration in great detail. There will be ample opportunity for hearings from such people.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister hasn't quite answered my question. Can the government at this time give the clear assurance that there's no cause for alarm, that present levels will be maintained with safety to the residents of the area?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no cause for alarm because one of the justifications for looking at the Lake Winnipeg control device at this time is to alleviate flood conditions that have been caused in that area for the past couple of years. In fact, this is one of the justifications for going ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to my special friend, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Some time ago the Minister announced that he had appointed a committee, an interdepartmental committee to get the facts on the economic situation insofar as agriculture is in the province and at that time he indicated that he would be bringing in an interim report. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if he could give some indication of that report at this time.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I might point out that I saw some of the work of the committee. They are not in a position to give us an interim report. However, they indicated to me that they most likely will have it complete by some time next week and that rather than take the time of compiling an interim report, they would rather proceed to the completion of it. But I may point out that the suspicions that we have had with respect to the rural economy of Manitoba seem to be accurate, and that is that while the total rural economy is not in dire straits, the grain economy is, or producers in the grain business. It seems quite evident from the material that I have seen so far that the area that must be concentrated in is the area which is essentially a grain producing area.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer, and a supplementary question. Since he has indicated that he has the suspicion that the grain industry is in dire straits at the moment, has he any intention of doing anything about it?

MR. USKIW: I think my honourable friend should appreciate the fact that when we have a complete report before us within a week presumably, that we will be in a better position to announce any policy or action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Minister. My question is related to the statement made by the Premier yesterday in connection with bartering of wheat, a proposal that he intends to make to the Prairie Economic Council. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House what they have in mind in the way of bartering. It is my understanding that farmers are doing it already through the feed mills and the Minister himself is objecting to it.

MR. USKIW: . . . . . talking about bartering, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about international barter arrangements.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In view of the statement of the First Minister in the Throne Speech to the effect that we would have certain reports tabled in this House regarding the Nelson River concept, would the Minister now give us assurance that all reports of a non-departmental nature have been tabled in the House - which the government has in its possession.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware I have tabled the one and only report. There were draft copies of Mr. Cass-Beggs' report around, but this is the final report which is the final thoughts on the matter by Mr. Cass-Beggs, and I believe the commitment of the government has been honoured.

MR. GRAHAM: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In reading today's paper I see a new report has been presented to the government, and I was wondering if this report could be tabled in the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have not received such a report and I'm not responsible for what the newspaper has stated.

#### STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. On September 3rd I reminded the honourable members of this House of an accepted custom respecting attire in the Chamber. Now it was a ruling perhaps in rather mild form and not too forceful because I felt that all that was necessary was a gentle reminder of an existing and accepted practice. May I point out to the honourable members that a Speaker's ruling once accepted by the House falls under the exclusive control of the House and the Speaker is bound by it. There are procedures open to challenge Speaker's rulings and in fact to change the rules. On this point nothing of the kind occurred.

May I also remind the honourable members that it is the duty of the Speaker to see to it that nothing occurs either through omission or commission which would tend to have an erosive effect from the dignity, responsibility and authority of the office of the speaker, bearing in mind that each of the said attributes of my office is desirable and necessary to ensure the orderly conduct of legislative business; and I therefore order that my ruling respecting acceptable dress be complied forthwith.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (CONT'D.)

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the current consideration of consumer protection measures, does the government intend to introduce legislation to require registration of lien notes, time sale agreements and conditional sales?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(Springfield): . . . the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of those.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to I believe the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the attitude taken by the members of this government in past in protesting of the increased prices of food, and I can think of two commodities, milk and beef, my question is, I'm wondering if the Minister has taken any action in the way of protesting against the increased prices of cars recently announced, to the proper authorities.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I will take it as notice. I'm not aware of any substantial increase but this will be looked into.

MR. EINARSON: It's been announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a subsequent question to my answer dealing with the Reserve Fund of the Local Government District of Churchill -- a subsequent question of the Honourable Member for Churchill. The question was: First, how much money is in the reserve fund and I might advise the honourable member that during the past year the amount in the reserve fund has varied from \$15,000 to \$105,000 depending upon the amount that was necessary to advance the Local Government District of Churchill in order that it might carry out operations pending receipt of revenue that was accruing to it.

The second question that was posed by the honourable member was, is it available to the Advisory Committee. The answer to this is that it is available to the Local Government District. The affairs of the Local Government District of Churchill are conducted by the Administrator in consultation with the Advisory Committee, and I might mention that as in all cases involving expenditure from reserve funds, authorization is required from the Department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Since he is not here, perhaps I should direct it to the third acting Minister, the Minister of Youth and Education. In view of the fact that the former government granted a license allowing the new forest products complex at The Pas to dump waste and pollutants into the Saskatchewan River, can this government assure us that decision will be reviewed in the light of the new proposed federal legislation and also in the light of the recent tragic events at Minnedosa?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the honourable member doesn't expect a pat answer from me. I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the honourable the House Leader. Can the House Leader indicate to the members at this time when he intends to call the Public Utilities Committee?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to my honourable friend that he looks up copies of Hansard. I've answered the question half a dozen times. The answer is still the same.

MR. ENNS: No answer. A supplementary question.

MR. PAULLEY: No answer, still the same.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, directed to my honourable friend the House Leader. Is it the intention of the House Leader not to call the committee?

MR. PAULLEY: I refer my honourable friend to the record of Hansard, Mr. Speaker, for his edification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. In view that the bill has been tabled in the House to reduce the voting age, will the government introduce or the Minister introduce any courses in schools to prepare young people for their new responsibility?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point or order, may I suggest in all deference to my colleague this is a matter that will be under debate possibly this afternoon and that matter may be properly dealt with at that particular time we have a bill before us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the honourable member for Portage la Prairie asked me a question relative to the interest rate structure of the credit unions in Manitoba. I have checked with the department and I find that there has not been a serious situation reported to date, although they did advise that there is some concern in some areas. I want to point out to the honourable member that there is a new Credit Union Act being prepared for the next session in which it is intended that the six percent ceiling restriction would be removed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the one put by the Member for Portage the other day. The Minister says the matter has not been drawn to their attention. I would at this time though tell him that the situation is very serious, that the credit unions are losing thousands and thousands of dollars because of the . . . and will he not

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... further consider this and bring in an amendment to the Act?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I pointed out a moment ago that for the next session there will be a complete new Act before the legislature. There's no doubt that it won't be long before the next session, so I think that we can wait for that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable House Leader would allow the Honourable Minister to answer my question. I think he was prepared to answer it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if it's a proper question. The matter will be under discussion hopefully this afternoon providing we can get on with the business of the House.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I think it's a proper question.

A MEMBER: It's up to the Speaker. -- (Interjections) --

MR. PAULLEY: We're the government. Mr. Speaker, may I...

MR. SPEAKER: ... but I believe the honourable member is well aware of the rule with respect to answering questions, and...

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Minister wanted to answer....

MR. PAULLEY: ..... answered by the Honourable the House Leader....

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the answer given by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture regarding credit union deposit rates, my question is, would it be in order for credit unions to grant a bonus over and above the fixed percentage rate set by law?

MR. USKIW: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is anything in legislation that prevents that from happening.

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

MR. JACK HARDY (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.....

(Recording Failure)

MR. HARDY .... advise the House that approximately \$7 to 8 million of local debenture issues by municipalities was still unsold. Has this figure changed appreciably? (Not audible.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Before the Orders of the Day, would the Honourable the Minister, the House Leader, consider adding my name to the Committee of Statutory Orders and Regulations, by leave?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe I indicated last night that my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland is on an over quota of committees and he may make representations to me for consideration outside of the House. The answer specifically to his question is "no".

Mr. Speaker, may I indicate to the House what is proposed as the order of business for today. That on the terminations of questions we will call for the Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Roblin, then hopefully to go into Committee of Supply to further consider the estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources until 4:30 this afternoon, when my colleague the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources must leave to attend a meeting of resource ministers across Canada, and at that particular time we would suggest that the Committee rise and deal with other government matters on the Order Paper, because, of course, adjournment normally would be this afternoon at 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister took it for granted that we were finished with Orders of the Day. I'm not finished as yet. I have a further question to place before him. When will the committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders consider the regulations that were passed during the past previous year, when will they be sanctioned?

MR. PAULLEY: My answer to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, is the committee will be called in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In the Cass-Beggs report, it mentioned that Manitoba will need X surplus power in four years and it will be purchasing it from as far away as Quebec or British Columbia. Have any meetings been held to purchase power from Quebec and British Columbia?

MR. EVANS: I think some of these detailed questions could be properly answered in the estimates discussions -- (Interjection) -- In the committee, yes. Is that satisfactory?

-- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): I suggest you move Committee of Supply, Mr. ....

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there's an Order for Return before....

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh yes.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): ..... seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that the name of the Honourable Mr. Paulley, Transcona, be deleted from the list of members composing the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, and that the name of the Honourable Mr. Pawley, Selkirk be substituted therefor.

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Swan River

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) the number of automobiles and station wagons owned by the Government of Manitoba;
- (2) the number of half-ton trucks owned by the Government of Manitoba;
- (3) the number of automobiles and station wagons owned by boards and commissions of the provincial government;
- (4) the number of half-ton trucks owned by boards and commissions of the provincial government;

all as of July 15th, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to accept this motion....

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Resolution 72. The Honourable .... -- (Interjection) --

MR. EVANS: I just wanted to make a brief ten second announcement with the indulgence of the honourable member. Respecting the booklet on the "Sale and Disposition of Crown Lands," I had a dozen or so last night available for honourable members. They sold like hot cakes apparently. Other members have requested copies and I believe we have copies available now so if anyone cares to have a copy of the booklet prepared by the department they are now available from the Clerk of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, yesterday I was pointing out the kind of further information on the decision that this government has arrived at with respect to South Indian Lake and all its implications, the kind of information that I was quite prepared to accept the Minister is not necessarily in a position during the course of these estimates to give us the detailed information on, but that nonetheless on a matter of such vital importance it's really quite impossible to believe that the members of this House will not be given an opportunity to examine some of these questions. Because the suggestion, or the implication that the impression that's being left by the government on this decision is that the changed direction will alleviate most of the flooding, certainly it will change and alleviate the dramatic flooding. But the Minister in his statement indicated very clearly that the river systems, for instance, would still be flooded to a very considerable degree. I think that with the high level diversion project that was contemplated we were talking about sending some 50,000 - 55,000 cubic feet per second through the river systems of the Rat and the Burntwood. Under the low level diversion scheme that's being put forward by this government we're still talking in the neighbourhood of between 25 and 35,000 cubic feet per second. And if those members will remember the banks along this river system, the valleys of

(MR. ENNS cont'd.),... the Burntwood and the Rat River are among those few areas where the greatest amount of wildlife habitat is. These are still going to be flooded. There's going to be significant flooding in other areas and lakes, and we have no information about this, and nobody's going to be given any information about this at this time. I just can't accept the fact, Mr. Chairman, that all of a sudden the interest of flooding any portion of our province is no longer of any interest to members of this House. Maybe I'm particularly sensitive about it, I don't know.

Also I think when we see in the paper - Tribune of September 17th - the consultant hired by this government refers to the four millions of dollars that was used in the necessary investigation and surveys as waste. I think the people of Manitoba have a right to know if in fact this is waste. Is it the judgment of the government that in fact this four million dollars was wasted? I think that's a pretty legitimate question. We have had the privilege of having the Public Utilities Committee called on many issues, many issues far less important than this, and here we're talking about the possibility that perhaps Manitoba Hydro, or the government of the day or whoever was responsible for the putting forward into motion the necessity of spending some four or five million dollars worth of taxpayers funds on studies, to have them now being called a complete waste in our papers. I think that we have ample reason there to ask at the committee stage if this in fact is a waste, or whether that money was properly direction.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say and feel that the decision that the government arrived at on South Indian Lake is essentially a political one because they have often accused us of being hung up on certain issues. I would suggest that the members opposite made this into a political issue and they find themselves now in a very difficult position to do anything other than not to proceed with the proposed diversion and the full development of the Nelson River. I say this is a serious charge because the main contention of the government when they were in opposition, when the other members, when they were in opposition, they were making the case -- and it was a valid case to be made to some extent on their part if they wanted to make it that way -- that it was for lack of information that they were taking the position they were in opposing moving forward with the high diversion plans at Southern Indian Lake. Many of them in their speeches did not indicate necessarily that they were unilaterally opposed to it. They said give us some further information. Give us some further facts and we'll make a clear headed judgment and it may well be in favour of the high level diversion.

I've made the charge once, I've made it twice, I make it once more and then I'll leave it be I promise you. Members have had a chance to sleep on it again - and I'm referring specifically to my colleagues here on this side. They've slept on the reports once more. I say it once more: What additional information has this House received; has the public received that they did not have last year? -- (Interjection) -- All right, just name me the additional information that's contained in those so-called reports that you did not have last year. I've asked for that now three times. Surely on something that has attracted so much notoriety, you know so much interest on the part of the news media, I had every reason to expect that when these reports were finally unveiled; when they were finally presented to the House that it would be just a little bit like the coming of Messiah or something, that something would take place. But nothing took place. We accepted the reports; we thanked the Honourable First Minister for tabling them. No speeches, no questions, no great revelations about the contents of the reports, because of course none of the information contained in the report was new or indeed newsworthy. It had all been given before. It had all been in the possession of the members of this House before, and indeed in the possession of the public at large through the coverage of the news media.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have made a decision, a very vital, a very important decision. Now I'm willing to assume that the government has had access to or has availed themselves to, or have carried out further studies to help them in arriving at this decision. We're aware, of course, that they have this report -- and this report by the way, I don't want to deal with this in detail at this time, but it raises as many questions as it apparently solves in the eyes of the government. Page 14 it says: "Any decision to continue with the development of the Nelson River as the main sequence of power projects must also include a diversion in waters of the Churchill River". So we're including with the diversion of the Churchill River. So we're still taking the water away from the Churchill. Who's expressing the concern about the geese nesting grounds on the Churchill River after the water is being diverted? Who's expressing the concern for the water supply for the Town of Churchill? Where's the honourable member from the north? He's not too concerned all of a sudden about the water supply in Churchill and so

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... forth, because we're still diverting the Churchill River. But you see we have a different ball game here now. I couldn't divert the water from the Churchill River because it would cause tremendous problems for the northern community such as Churchill. But when the government of the day suggests that they have to divert the Churchill River then they have to, to make any sense out of the Nelson development scheme at all.

What about the concerns that these conditions don't overcome, the water will be diverted, there'll be less water, there'll be presumably less water at Churchill. Although I was satisfied and I told the House that there was no question - no thought that a responsible organization such as Hydro, or indeed any government of the day, would stand by and wilfully cut or reduce to the point where it would be harmful, the water supply of any community in this province. It's inconceivable that that would happen. I'm just pointing out that the course being suggested by the government at this stage does not alter any of these specific conditions.

The Premier in a report to the Business Reporter in the Tribune - also the 17th - advises and comments on the advisability of us doing all we can to increase exports. With this decision of course we have precluded the possibility of exporting power to a considerable extent.

-- (Interjection) -- to a considerable extent, whether or not it's been spelled out in the First Minister's statement, but the tenor of the statement is essentially that we will build the necessary back-up thermal plant to see that there will not be a brown-out. I believe him. We will have to continually weigh the advisability of thermal versus hydro-electric power development, but we're walking away from a position of total development of the Nelson in a planned and in a programmed way that would put this position in a power to export, at least for some number of years.

I'd like to know what is the position of the transmission line that is being built south at this time. I know that it's being built south. For the first two years it will be importing power into this province because of our requirements, but the intent was to be in a position to export, use the same lines to export power into the north state power grid. And surely, following the Premier's advice that all we can do to increase our exports in this province, this would be an advisable feature. I don't know what this does to our fiscal arrangements with respect to the transmission line.

Now I know agreements with senior governments can be changed, but at what price? At what price? To what extent will this decision delay the full development and extraction of our maximum potential out of the Kettle Rapids site? On Page 281 of your transcript of the public hearing, Mr. Bateman, one of the responsible officials of Manitoba Hydro, was asked about the Kettle Rapids situation, and he refers to the progression of generating stations that are being put in. He goes on to say that, "Now I would have to say" - and I'm quoting Mr. Bateman - "Now I would have to say that if we haven't got the high-level diversion then we cannot justify Kettle Rapids." That's a pretty serious situation - and I don't wish to read individual statements out of context - the members have the hearings, the transcript of the hearings before them.

He further goes on to say, "In addition to that, the Government of Canada agreed with Manitoba that this was the case" - I'm talking about the arrangements arrived at for the financing and the feasibility of the financing of the transmission lines - and not only did they agree, but they put some conditions on it. They entered into the agreement, that is the financing of the \$117 million direct transmission line from the north, they entered into the agreement on the condition that the Kettle Rapids station would be developed to a particular potential, or to a particular capacity in order that the amortization rates and so forth over the next 15 years would be feasible and economical.

Mr. Chairman, all I'm suggesting is that the Minister opposite cannot give me the answers on all these. The First Minister may want to give me the answers on all these. I think that we have reason to question a great number of the conclusions arrived at; we have reason to question the whole range of some of the arithmetic that's been arrived in this Cass-Beggs Report; and to suggest that we will not have the opportunity of having expert testimony before us at a committee where we can determine in public some of these very far-reaching decisions, the impact of the decisions arrived at by this government, it's a sad day for this Legislature. It's a sad beginning for a government that has made so much to do about their openness, their approach, and how differently they would do things, particularly in this area and this field, to have them seriously deny us the opportunity, to have them seriously deny us this opportunity of examining the officials that are now influencing and now guiding the government in these areas, or indeed

September 17, 1969

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... not to give the officials and the technicians, the very capable people that we have that have so capably guided Hydro development in this province for the last number of years, them an opportunity to express themselves on technical matters, on the matters that are within their competence. It's a denial, Mr. Chairman, that will go down very badly with the people of Manitoba.

I suggest very seriously to the Honourable the First Minister that if you are looking for that first chink in the credibility gap, first chink in the credibility armor, this kind of action is how these gaps begin. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, maybe we should know that, and I'm offering only good and sound advice to the members opposite, the government of the day, primarily because this has been the evangelistic gospel that has been preached to us by this government whether it was in the Throne Speech or whether it was on any other occasion, but as my colleague from River Heights said, it's you fellows over there who keep telling us how more moral and how more open and how more forward you were prepared to be in these areas than we are, so don't just point your fingers across to us and suggest to us, you know, our failures or our lackings in these specific areas because surely this is not the strength on which you hope to govern the Province of Manitoba and set about setting up your image as a new government in Manitoba. So I'm not worried about that kind of a retort from the other side at all. But, Mr. Chairman...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... the honourable member had about 35 minutes considering his comments yesterday and has approximately five minutes remaining.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, let me close my remarks by once again suggesting to the House Leader, who's not here, the First Minister, that this is a course that we're taking on the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources because we have no alternative in discussing the question of South Indian Lake other than at these estimates. I would have preferred dealing with the estimates more specifically.

There are very many questions that I would like to ask that also have to do with his specific estimates as a result of the decision arrived at. We entered into a three-year geological survey to gather, in an accelerated pace, the geological information around South Indian Lake. This was a million dollar study. The Minister has the first instalment of that in his estimates. I see this here, some \$400,000 to be financed by Hydro. What's happening to this particular aspect of the program? Is it being cancelled now or will it be -- I don't imagine it will be because this is the kind of information the Department of Mines and Natural Resources want anyway. All we are doing there is doing it in an accelerated manner with the help of Hydro funds, but with the flooding of South Indian Lake no longer imminent -- and I use the word "imminent", I'm not so sure if it's not still under consideration -- but with the flooding no longer imminent then there obviously is not the reason for the acceleration of surveys and studies that have to be carried out in that area, particularly those that were being done specifically prior to flooding, or prior to impoundment. And I'm speaking specifically of the geological survey that we entered into, a three-year program that was started in fact by my colleague -- at that time Minister -- the Member for Riel, were just in the midst of it.

I know that there are other funds set aside for archeological purposes. I believe in the supplementary estimates we saw certain figures. Again, if the imminence of flooding or if the flooding is something of the past, then I suppose there would have to be some rearranging of the priority of how these funds are going to be spent. It's one thing to suggest spending \$50,000 on sending an archeological team up there if the flooding was imminent to get the necessary work done that could only be done in the next year or two, but if it's not going to be done now or ever, then I think the First Minister might well be advised to take a look at some of these funds that have been set aside for this purpose. I'm sure some of his fellow Ministers, or he himself has some priorities of where that money he may wish to re-direct it to. -- (Interjection) -- Very well, very well. Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): ... has only a few minutes time and it would be a pity if he were to take his place, take his seat without, you know, letting the House know, taking the House into his confidence and explaining to us just how it happened that the matter of Lake Winnipeg controls, which was very much a part of the original concept of the development of the Nelson, why the idea was then dropped. I suspect the Minister was very much involved with the decision to delay by quite a few years the matter of control works on Lake Winnipeg. Can he tell us what happened there?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have an opportunity to answer that

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)... particular question because I would have to, for the public record, make it very clear that the decision to drop Lake Winnipeg out of the Nelson River development picture was never made. It was our intention, in fact our dedication of this government to the full development of the Nelson River system which included the Churchill and the use of Lake Winnipeg. What has happened as a matter of fact, and I think we will be able to demonstrate this very clearly in later speeches, what has happened is that the attractiveness of Lake Winnipeg as a reservoir following further and subsequent studies has considerably diminished in the sense that it's become very apparent that there are very severe restrictions, social human restrictions as to what can be done about the levels of Lake Winnipeg. In other words, initial reports that indicated -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Lake Winnipeg as a reservoir was very important to the Nelson River development if Lake Winnipeg was controlled at a level of 725. These were some of the early reports. The First Minister asked me a question -- (Interjection) -- certainly I was involved, I was involved in these reports, and if Lake Winnipeg can be used at some of these levels then its desirability, its attractiveness was paramount to the consideration. Obviously, and for the same reason that the Minister "pooh-haw" even the mention of that level, that was not anywhere an acceptable level to begin any discussions about.

Coming back to the levels that become more reasonable - whether 712 or 713 or 714, it doesn't really matter - the attractiveness in the immediate phasing and planning of the development of the Nelson River lost its necessity for urgency at that time but it was never dropped. It was never dropped. And I don't think the First Minister is seriously suggesting that this government, my predecessors and my First Minister, particularly the Minister predeceasing the current Leader of the Opposition, wasn't wholly and fully dedicated to the total development of the Nelson River systems, and certainly that would include the use of Lake Winnipeg as its reservoir.

Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to overrule your ruling. I of course want to suggest to you that I intend to sit down and rise again and speak for another 40 minutes very shortly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TOUPIN: Would the Honourable Member from Lakeside submit to a question? Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Lakeside mentioned at least three times that actually no information was held back, that all the information was supplied to the honourable members of this House, and he even challenged the honourable members of this House to find the declaration in the so-called "secret reports" that were not revealed in the last House. Why, Mr. Chairman, did the previous Minister not accept the Order for Return?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, firstly, the interpretation of my remarks as interpreted by the Honourable Minister are wrong. I did not say -- I made the point very clear when I'm speaking about the question of information, whether it was given or not, I was saying that the House has received no additional information. I have never stood up in the House and said that all information of all kinds and sorts-- certainly when I was the responsible Minister representing government there were documents of an interdepartmental nature and others that quite properly are of a privileged and confidential nature which I didn't reveal to the House, in the same manner that the present Minister is not revealing, or the present government is not revealing to this House. My specific challenge on the matters of two reports that have been tabled was simply this: that no additional information has been given the members that was not given them by myself during the last session and prior to the last session, and I'm still waiting for somebody to indicate to me what additional information, because the information that was given in the House - I make this statement with some authority - because the information that was given in the House is recorded in Hansard, is recorded in the transcript of the hearings, is recorded in the actual releases that were made at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get into this debate since the Honourable Member for Lakeside seems to be concerned, and let us have a little talk about these things. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that I made representation because I was concerned about the Churchill River, and I am concerned about it and I was concerned about it because secret reports were acknowledged to be secret by the Minister at that time and he said that he would not table them. Now he tells me that what we have received is still not the whole complex of the things that he knows about, that the members for the Liberal Party do not know about, the member for the Social Credit Party doesn't know about and I don't know about. Now if you have something that's under the carpet that you know about, then let's start hearing

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... about it instead of starting these innuendos about things that are not tabled in this House that should be, because I asked this question a while ago when that was tabled -- and you sit down and wait and listen....

MR. ENNS: A point of order.

MR. BEARD: ... when the transmission was put on our desks and the reports I got up and asked if this was a full report. I was assured that it was and the Member for Lakeside didn't get up and challenge that. He didn't get up, but now he says, "But my Deputy Minister when I was Minister said all these things at the hearing." He snuck them in somewhere along the line so that nobody would know that this was supposed to be the secret report really being given to the public not as a whole but on statements, and he holds up some kind of a report as big as this and says, "This is the whole thing. We revealed everything." And now he stands up and says that it wasn't all revealed.

Now if it wasn't, then he should stand up and say it wasn't revealed, because if he is right then I will change my stand, because when I got up I told him, and I told this House, that I would support a change to thermal plant first and continuing with Hydro programs after the second studies had been made if there was assurance that northern industry could still carry on with the necessary power or have necessary power to carry on to develop the new mining industries in the north and any other industries that were there. And the Member for River Heights can shake his head till it comes off, but I said it and if he wants to read back he'll see it. Now if he wants to get up and say, if he wants to get up and say there is enough electricity and power to develop the potential industries in the north now, then this is the time he should do it, after I've sat down.

But let's go back a little further in history when the first development was started in the modern age, or announcement. It was before the decision at South Indian had even been arrived at. Kettle Rapids and the rest of it had been announced before government or Hydro had made their decision on South Indian, because time after time they said we will not make an announcement in respect to South Indian and the diversion until the survey was finished, and they told the Indian people there, and if you don't believe me then I would suggest that you go up there - and some of you for the first time - and get up there and ask the Indians what they said, and if you wanted me to tell you, where Hydro would say, "We don't know what we're going to do," the same statement that "we're working for Hydro," or say, "You'd better learn how to swim and you'd better buy a bathing suit, because when you're finished you're going to be 35 feet under water." And you have the audacity to tell me that I got up and supported the program brought in here without knowing the whole thing.

Now, if I am supporting this and I do not know the whole story, then it is up to you to make sure that I do know the whole story, because I can change my attitude toward this, but until somebody gets up and tells me that I still don't have the full report, then I will have to go along with the decision that is being made now. And I would tell the Minister that the people in northern Manitoba are not happy about what could happen to South Indian. This doesn't matter whether it's Flin Flon, The Pas, Thompson, Churchill, South Indian, or wherever it may be, these people are still saying, in the majority, in the large majorities, "Do not flood South Indian the way that it is being brought up." And if the Member for Lakeside wants to get up and challenge these things, then I think he should review the results of the last election, because this in many cases was one of the large things that were being considered in the whole of the north, not in my area alone but in the whole of the north, and they lost two ministers, and they must take this into consideration, and I don't think it was because of the capabilities of the ministers, but it was because of the program that was trying to be shoved down the people in northern Manitoba.

They have always welcomed Hydro. They have always come out and said they welcomed Hydro, but that doesn't mean to say that they have to accept Hydro under the conditions that Hydro lays down, because if they are, then Hydro is a master rather than a servant, and this is not intended. I do not believe that Hydro was incorporated to be the master of any segment or section of a country, and I think that we in the north welcomes Hydro, we respect Hydro, we respect the fact that Hydro can introduce new industries into the north and in fact complement the industries in the north; and I may say now, as far as I'm concerned, I respect the people in Hydro and I respect the Board, but if they have made a wrong decision, if they'd done things for expediency of Hydro alone rather than considering people and industry other than the development of electricity, then I think that they should be stopped and there should be another look at the

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)... whole thing. I don't say this government is entirely right but they have promised us, as far as I understand, that there will be a decision made and a review made in January and, as far as I understand, there will not be flooding without a public hearing.

Now I am told that they could go ahead and do this without coming to this House, as they have done with minimum wage, which I think is wrong, but I think that this is warning enough to them that the people of northern Manitoba and all Manitoba want this fully discussed, and maybe there should be a debate between the Cass-Beggs and the Board, or let us hear both sides at once. Maybe this is a good idea, and I would go along with this 100 percent whether it's under Utilities or whether it is under an open hearing such as the last Minister, the Member for Lakeside when he was Minister, bowed to, and I think maybe this is a good idea, but carry it through the whole way, lock, stock and barrel, and let's get it out into the open; let's find out if there are secret papers that aren't being tabled. I get very disturbed when I hear people say that there cannot be memos sent from one department to another and not given to us, because this means, as far as I'm concerned, there's a civil service running this government and not the politicians, but that is something that Cabinet and that government has to decide on. But I say that if there are reports and there's only one person or one group of people that can assure us that we haven't got all the reports up to now, that is the Member for Lakeside and the Cabinet who were sitting at that time.

Now, in respect to Cass-Beggs, it is up - and I would agree - it's up to you and myself and all members in this House to see that we have the whole report of Cass-Beggs so that maybe we can review it, but I don't know whether even we can come to a decision when you get two sets of engineers discussing something, but we can at least decide on the moral issues and try and forecast into the future what will happen. But I don't think we can take an arrogant stand either one way or the other. I say, let's get along with this House and come back in January or February and get into the nuts and bolts of this. When this government says it'll make its decision by then, then we must then decide whether they are right or whether they're wrong, and if we have to defeat them on what they're going to say, well then I'm ready to defeat this government, but I want to hear the whole story. I want to hear why they've come to a decision on it, and I say to them that they've got to tell us, yes. They've got to tell us why they've come to a decision. They've got to tell us both sides of the story, and if they don't, then I'll join you, because I will say to them that they have taken an arrogant stand, just as you took the arrogant stand when you wouldn't give us all those secret reports. But you just said that we gave them to you but actually stuck them into the Deputy Minister's -- talked to us in the open meetings. He didn't say these were the secret reports. All he said was -- just gave a bunch of answers, a bunch of things, but he left us with the impression, or Cabinet left us with the impression there were still things that were not being said. Now the Minister says all the things are being said that we've already got - or the past Minister. Does this mean there are things that I don't know about? If there is, then I think that he should come out and say it, and call a spade a spade, and say, "This government still has not revealed the whole nuts and bolts of a program in which we made the decision and in which we were defeated on," because if there are things that have been held back, that the people didn't know, that supported government stand at that time, then the people should know about it so that maybe some proper decision can be made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter this debate but after the Member for Lakeside once or twice or three times kept on bringing our group in, I think I must say a few words. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Lakeside now agrees that we did not get enough information last spring, because he claims we have no more information now than we had last spring. I, for one, do not agree with this, in fact I think I know it better. But does this prove when he says time -- I believe he said it yesterday and he said it today, that he did not have enough information at this time, nor I presume at any other time. He still -- apparently last spring you were ready with your government to go ahead with whatever information you had. Did you not have any then?

MR. ENNS: The point of relevancy is being missed. The simple statement that I've made several times is that there's been no additional relevant information issued by this government in the release of the reports that was not in the members' hands. That's all I meant. Now I'm suggesting that that was certainly sufficient information for the government of that day to have based a decision on, was information for the House to base a decision on, and it's the same information that we are now accepting the decision by the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to enter into this debate, but let's be factual and let's be open and above. What the Honourable Member for Lakeside has just said is simply not true. We did not receive the full reports. We received the opinions of the honourable former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. As a matter of fact, in order to put the record straight, that government dissolved the House because they were not prepared to come out of the committee that was considering this matter and face the music in this Chamber.

MR. ENNS: You're not prepared to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You weren't here. You weren't here. I was, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the new members of this House that --(Interjection)-- you can read. I want you not only to read but inwardly digest.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, let's get the record straight. I've been accused on a number of occasions of not having the records straight, but in this instance I want it straight and it's a fact, and I'm sure that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside knows that it is a fact that the information that members in the Opposition at that time desired from the government was not forthcoming, and for my honourable friend this afternoon to say that it was there, I think is a little bit stretching the facts of the matter of the last Session.

MR. ENNS: Will the honourable member who's made this impassioned plea give me one pertinent piece of information that the members now have that they didn't have when I gave it to them in the House last session. One single piece of information on this whole business of secret reports. They had it in written form, they had it in printed form, they had it in spoken form. Now I've asked this a third time, I've asked it a fourth time. Now you tell me. I've been accused from here to Fork River about revealing information, about withholding information. Now this government has made a big folderol about releasing these secret reports, but everybody evades the question I'm simply asking: Tell me what is contained in those secret reports that is not printed, that was not documented, that was not before the members last Session.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, if I may in reply to my honourable friend's question, if indeed it was a question. . . .

MR. ENNS: One fact, not a speech, Russ.

MR. PAULLEY: All I say -- (Interjection) -- yes, I will continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I've recognized the House Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I asked my honourable friend a pertinent question: Is it not a fact that at the last meeting that was held in the Committee of Mines and Natural Resources, that the then Chairman of that Committee refused to allow cross-examination and further revealing of reports by a member of his staff, and that the motion was challenged, that we were to come into this House for a ruling of Mr. Speaker, and that at that particular time between the adjournment of the Committee on Mines and Natural Resources and 2:30 that afternoon when the matter of the ruling was to be put to Mr. Speaker, the government arrived at, or made up its mind that rather than let. . . . a yes whether or not the information or cross-examination was to be forthcoming, announced the dissolving of this House. Is that not the truth? Is that not the truth?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I ask my honourable friend, is that not the truth?

MR. ENNS: The Honourable First Minister is merely underlining -- or the House Leader is merely underlining my argument. He's stating that this examination at this committee was curtailed, was not further forthcoming. He's also quite agreeable to carry on that action by not letting us continue those hearings at Public Utilities Committee, because that still supports my argument. Now if he's suggesting that certain information did not see the light of day as a result of our action in that committee, then I'm -- that's the only point that I'm making, that that information still obviously hasn't seen the light of day, still isn't before the members here, and yet a decision, a very vital and important decision has been reached. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, we've seen again in my capable friend the honourable House Leader, so capable that . . . going around in a circle at it -- I would like to answer his question if he would answer mine. I've asked again for that specific area of relevant piece of information that was so important, that was not in your hands at that time and nobody has -- perhaps the honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party will accept the challenge.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my honourable friend for agreeing with me.

MR. ENNS: I always agree.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure that he agrees with me that the facts that I have put to you, Mr. Chairman, in this committee, are accurate.

MR. ENNS: When are you going to call Public Utilities?

MR. PAULLEY: When we're ready.

MR. ENNS: But not now. Why not now?

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend agrees with me that the dissolution of the House was on the basis....

MR. ENNS: All the things are not shown here.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable bombastic friend would just desist until I'm finished. My honourable friend the Member for Lakeside has just substantiated what I said that the government of that day, rather than to come into this House to make a ruling or have a ruling made as to whether or not the committee could cross-examine and have full... of secret documents, chose to dissolve this House, and I say to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure that inwardly he will agree that I am right, that the information that was refused us at that time has to the best of our knowledge been tabled in this House.

A MEMBER: What is it?

MR. PAULLEY: One of them was "The Transition of the North" - which you refused.

A MEMBER: What did it contain?

MR. PAULLEY: You refused either to table or refused us in opposition at that time to have an opportunity of cross-examining those that were knowledgeable. And I'm glad to know, Mr. Chairman, that today....

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): ... and we're going to be given that opportunity under this government.

MR. PAULLEY: .... that today the Honourable Member for Lakeside agrees with the error of their ways at that particular time; and really and basically, Mr. Chairman, all that my honourable friend is attempting to do is to chastise us and to criticize us because we gave to this House and to the public the information that he and members of his government refused to do back last May.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I didn't really intend to get into this cross-fire of discussion here but my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside is determined to somehow confuse and obliterate the record for new members and for people who are looking at this debate that I felt that I had to make some corrections in some of the statements he's made. He's been trying to say that when he was the minister he made available freely to members of the House information that they needed to make a decision on a bill. Now isn't that what he's been trying to say for the last evening and today?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, if the member would permit a correction, I know he has to proceed on this, but again the point is being missed. I'm merely saying that this government has not produced additional relevant information to the information I was given. That's all. -- (Interjection) -- But we've made a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I distinctly heard the Member for Lakeside say last night that he made available condensed forms of reports. He didn't make them available when they were asked for by Order for Return in this House. He didn't make them available when he was repeatedly asked at other times. He wouldn't even come to the platform of the hearing held in the Auditorium when there was repeated calls for him to come out of the back of the hall and up on to the platform and answer questions and give information. But what did he do? He put a civil servant up there who had to look after his job and had to do what he was told, and he to be humiliated as well, and he stayed in the back of the hall. He would not answer questions at that time, and he has the audacity to come in here and pretend that he was offering information as it was requested. What nonsense! As a matter of fact it's so nonsensical that the counsel for the South Indian Lake people reluctantly said: "Although I belong to this party, I must say that the Minister was deceitful to these people in holding back information and concealing decisions being taken by his government."

Now my honourable friend, once a day for the last few days keeps saying: "When are you going to call the Public Utilities Committee?" Well that's the last thing he should talk about. The way he treated the members of the Public Utility Committee, the people, the leaders from

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . South Indian Lake who came 600 miles because of their concern; the high-priced legal staff that were supplied by government funds to help those people through a decision - and I don't know who made the decision because no one wants to take the responsibility for it now. They closed down that committee; they closed down this House for strictly political reasons, and they have the audacity to say: "When are you going to call the Public Utilities Committee?"

If we were to call the Public Utilities Committee - what for? What reason? For my honourable friends here to start trying to make some political hay - that's why.

A MEMBER: You're not interested in information now?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yes, I'm interested in information but I'm willing to wait until some studies are completed. The people who made the studies can be called before the Public Utilities Committee and their judgment and their values can be questioned at that time. But to call a Public Utilities Committee at this time is strictly for a fishing political expedition by my honourable friend and he knows it.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to either criticize or chastise my hypersensitive friend across the way. -- (Interjection) -- I say I don't wish to either criticize or chastise my - in your words - my hypersensitive friend across the way, but I do wish to take part in this very important portion of the estimates.

And first of all may I wish nothing but well for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in the very difficult role which he presently has assumed, and a very important role for the future of Manitoba.

I had a number of topics that I wanted to mention in the estimates address, but I would like first of all, and probably singly, to discuss the topic which has been under discussion, namely the power development in the north. I must say first of all that the remarks of the Honourable Member for Portage which he just made and which are very fresh in mind with respect to not calling the Public Utilities Committee, I cannot agree with in any way, shape or form, and I hope to be able to give indications to him and to the House why this, in the interest of Manitoba, cannot be postponed.

Now the First Minister has suggested that some of the esoteric - or whatever it was - comments that I was making the other day weren't really in fact relevant to the very hot political issues of the day and people didn't understand them and this sort of thing and so forth. But this of course is, I think, the very very basis and the very foundation that you have to get at in making your decision with regards to power development and to energy consumption.

We have heard an awful lot about the humanistic argument, and probably the best place to assess it is in a House such as this where participation can be made by politicians; but in terms of the technical field, I think we have to agree that this is probably an area where we wish to accept advice from people who have spent their lives in doing this sort of thing and selling their expertise to people such as ourselves so that we can make a decision on our future power requirements. In that respect I think all of us are pretty well prepared to accept the advice that is given to us by the experts which we have and there are no great contradictions between much of the information, but there are some contradictions which are very evident in the report that has been just tabled before us in the last two or three days, enough contradictions that it proves beyond a doubt that some of the statements which are in the report are just not credible. Either that or somebody else is dead wrong.

Now one of the things that has not come out is the fact that if a decision is not made within the next three months to go for the high-level diversion, it's going to cost the people of Manitoba an awful lot of money and the decision should be made now. The First Minister has given us every evidence that the first priority is to avert the high-level diversion. As a matter of fact there is a majority of the people of the province, I'm sure, think that there is not going to be a high-level diversion of South Indian Lake. This is the way that they have read it, and I think that he should clear this up for sure. Is he saying that he has postponed his ultimate and final decision to some point? Will he say definitely that he's going to make a decision by a certain date? Because this is all important. If he would say this for clarification it would help. If he is going to make the decision within three months this means that it's going to be made before possibly - not necessarily but possibly - before we have another chance to call the Public Utilities Committee.

Now going over some of the considerations that have been made in arriving at the decision that has been taken, first of all I must - and again this is where the problem lies - to expect us to read this report, and our only opportunity to discuss it just happened by accident to be the Minister's Salary of Mines and Natural Resources is a flouting of democracy, and there is absolutely no reason why the Public Utilities Committee cannot be called. This is the most important decision that is going to be made in Manitoba for many years. It's a decision right now which is being taken -- (Interjection) -- The decision of June 25th has got nothing to do with it. We've spent all day listening to past history. That's not what Manitobans are interested in right now. Manitobans are interested in less talk and more action, and all we're getting in here is a lot of talk. So let's talk about the basic issues and not be worried about what happened on June 25th.

The basic issue right now is that a decision is being made to cost Manitoba \$170 million. A decision is being made to build a thermal plant for a capital cost alone that cost \$30 million, that has a 30 percent chance of being used in 1973-74, plus the cost of the coal to go through it. That's what is at stake right now, and if you add it all up, the cost to not go for the high-level

September 17, 1969

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . diversion, the statements which Mr. Cass-Beggs has made in here are absolutely false. Now take that and that is a -- (Interjection) -- Now okay, if I ever argue . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I, on a point of privilege, suggest to my honourable friend that he should not make such statements pertaining to an individual who is not here and able to defend himself.

MR. CRAIK: Well call the Public Utilities Committee then. -- (Interjection) -- Do you want me to read it to you? I'll read it to you out of the report.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not worrying, Mr. Chairman, if I may about the contents of the report itself, but the imputation that the man is not honest.

MR. CRAIK: Let's put the facts on the table. You cannot make . . .

MR. EVANS: Would the honourable member permit a question? I'm a little befuddled. On the one hand you just informed us that this is a very technical subject, we need experts to consider it and give us their opinions and so on; and then you very blandly suggest a figure of what additional costs may be. Now do you not agree, Sir, that you're contradicting yourself? Because there are all kinds of estimates on for instance coal costs. There are all kinds of estimates on coal costs, do you not admit that? You can't blandly state that it's going to cost X millions of dollars no more than anybody else in this House can state it. So do you not agree with that?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we could have the committee now with this at stake, with this at stake - and I don't know if it's going to be 170 - but we do know what the cost of the thermal plant is. We do know that there's a 70 percent chance that that thermal plant will not be needed in 1973-74. And you're going to have to build it. You've displaced the good judgment of power planners by pushing it back so far that it will be questionable even by the end of 1969 whether the adequate requirements with the high-level diversion can be achieved by 1973-74, but hopefully at this point you're going to try and buy that amount of time to make a decision. If it is a case of saying we want three more months to make up our mind, then just say it, but the implications are now with this report that what has to be done is to study first of all the low-level diversion plus the Lake Winnipeg storage possibilities. That in itself, from all appearances, can't be done in a period of three months and be done adequately. There aren't very complete studies on Lake Winnipeg. The only one that is really of value is the one on which Mr. Cass-Beggs is basing his opinion. He does say in here that the costs are quite similar for the high-level and the low-level diversion. Well the capital costs might be the same but the power recoveries are not the same. He's got a statement in here: "Moreover, this could be achieved at a cost in the same order as the cost of a low-level diversion" - he's talking to the high-level diversion - "at the same site for the same volume." That's not true. It's not the same volume. -- (Interjection) -- Page 6. The information in here is not credible, either that or the other engineers that presented their informations aren't credible. That is a purely technical question, and if those basic answers are not known we ought to know right now, because what is at stake is millions and millions and millions of dollars.

And the other thing is - and Mr. Cass-Beggs has as much as said it in here - is that if the high-level diversion is not used it's a different ball game, the whole project is in question; the whole Nelson River project is in question. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the House Leader is shaking his head, so there is a point of disagreement.

Now let's go on and look at some of the other areas. If we are going to go to the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member have a point of privilege? The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, I would like to ask the House if it is possible to establish a rule to have a private confession once a week for certain members from the opposition, but especially for a former minister.

A MEMBER: Do we have to put up with sarcasm?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm afraid so. Would the honourable member proceed. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in connection to that statement made . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know exactly what the point of privilege is but we'll allow it to slide by for now.

Now let's go to Page 9. "Clearly the low-level diversion or its equivalent plus the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . control of Lake Winnipeg would be the most attractive proposition if it were not that current cost estimates indicate this combination would involve double the investment." Now what he doesn't say is that it's only two-thirds of the benefit. Double the investment for two-thirds of the benefits. The picture is just incomplete. All it points out is - and there are some good points in here - but all it points out is that he has been put in the very unenviable position - and I feel sorry for him, and I said before in this House that I cannot understand why he accepted this assignment - he's been put in the very unenviable position of questioning the opinion of the peers in his profession and having to do it in a matter of weeks. And he can't help but have stumbled a few times, and the stumbling spots are too important for this to go past an open hearing where the other professional people that did the preparation of these very technical points have an opportunity to present to the decision-makers, who are the politicians - and this has been taken out of the hands of Hydro where it was put several years ago because political decisions in power development were assumed to be, or decided not to be in the best interests of Manitoba - but to present their two cases to the politicians, to this House, so that they can decide then which group is right. Because there is no question that the evidence, Mr. First Minister, on some of the important points in here is not the same.

MR. TOUPIN: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: Well if it's like the last one, I'd just as soon not.

MR. TOUPIN: It's not. Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Member for Riel was the government today, would he go for the high-level diversion? And the second question, if he was going to go for the high-level diversion, why didn't he before the election?

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on and I'll tell you exactly. Obviously, you have to make the decision on the best evidence that you have. -- (Interjection) -- I'll answer your point before I'm finished, but let me answer it in my own good time if you would.

Now, let us talk about this problem of evaluation of resources. All during the month that we've been hearing representations from the various people in the province, many people who classified themselves as experts in fields that they undoubtedly did have some expertise - and I speak primarily of the people at the university who we normally expect to have a little longer view down the road in terms of resource development - at no time did any one of that multitude of people who spent so much time working on this, did they ever look at the question of the utilization of non-renewable resources. And I have asked them about this. I've gone to meetings where I was requested to go at their request so that I could be put on the griddle and asked all these questions, and when I returned the question to them about total non-renewable resource use, energy supply looking into the future, they said, "That's a good question."

And the question was: What are the energy reserves that we have in non-renewable resources, and what do you think of that? And that question should be directed to Dr. Solandt of the Science Council as well because he is responsible, and I have asked it of the Science Council, What are Canada's energy reserves? And they know what they are. The National Energy Board - and I can provide the documentation here because I had it ready for the Public Utilities Committee last spring - in natural gas the proven reserves are from 10 to 15 years; in oil the proven reserves are from 20 to 25 years; in uranium at \$10.00 a ton they are between \$10 and \$15 a year. And here out of none of this has ever anybody questioned whether it's a good move to be going into non-renewable consumption as opposed to water. You'd think, in talking about the utilization of water, that we were polluting the water in using it as a power resource, and all you're doing is attempting to build it up to a level so you could harness its fall over a dam as it makes its way to the ocean - nature's natural cycle. We never question the export of wheat; we never question the export of nickel; but when it comes to water, we seem to have a completely different attitude towards it. We worry about its export; we worry here and we seem to confuse the picture because it's a single use application of a natural resource and this is bad.

Well now, let's just take a look at this because we don't really know how to assess our natural resources. You know, Mr. Cass-Beggs says you ought to have rules and regulations in evaluating. How do you set rules and evaluations of a natural resource that is completely subjective opinion. And it is; it is very largely an emotional decision. But if you look at it from an economic point of view, if you take the high-level versus the low-level diversion, you take the additional cost and the loss of income to go to a low-level, at \$1.64 million a year for the first eight or nine years and \$9 million a year thereafter - and I'll use those figures because they were presented on good authority to the last Public Utilities' Committee - it works

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . out that the cost of the acreage that you're going to use to flood works out to between a hundred and a hundred and fifty dollars an acre, the same price as the best farmland in Manitoba.

Now use it as an argument if you want to. You can't use it as a 100 percent argument, but what you're saying is that if you're going to give up the high-level diversion and you're going to go to the low-level diversion, you're giving up a piece of natural resource that is going to be worth more than an average value on those seven or eight hundred square miles, an average value of more than a hundred to a hundred and fifty dollars an acre. Is that likely? That's some of our highest prices land in Manitoba and that is what that land is returning the people of Manitoba through optimum utilization of its water resources.

And then we get all involved in the problem of the local community. What is the occupation of the local community today? Is it fishing? No, it's working for Hydro. There's more working for Hydro than there are fishing. Why? Because they can make a better living. What does the Legasse Report say in 1957? The Legasse Report says: "This community has to find another economic base." What is the average age of the community that's living there, the 77 families that are living in South Indian Lake? Fifty percent of them are less than 16 years old. A definite schooling problem; a definite problem in occupation training; a definite problem in adjustment to a community where they're going to have to adjust because they can't make a living from the natural resources they could make. Great disfavour has probably been done to that community by not having provided a new community for them. It's just unfortunate that the hypertension grew up around the move as it did because in actual fact this is a blessing in disguise for the community. I know there are many people that are going to say that's a heartless approach to take to it, but in actual fact it's true. The location of the community, in my own personal, humble opinion, is not the first consideration that has to be made here. It would be if you were doing them a great disfavour but you can't say that you are.

A MEMBER: They say you are.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question? My honourable friend referred to the Legasse Report which, if I understand it, was tabled in this House back in 1956. Would not my honourable friend agree that the recommendations of the Legasse Report at that time were based on the economic situation prevailing at that particular time, which of course was 13 years ago? -- (Interjection) -- But the base was there, that's my point.

MR. CRAIK: As I mentioned, over half the population is less than 16 years old. They are, with the added health protection and so on they've had in the last 10 to 15 years, they don't have the childhood mortality and so on and you have this younger generation coming up and the community cannot continue to exist under the rate of proliferation that they have. So that is what you are trying to do, is do something in their best interests. So there are two considerations.

MR. PAULLEY: Might I also ask my honourable friend, has he read the report recently in its entirety?

MR. CRAIK: No, Mr. Chairman, I haven't read it in its entirety.

MR. PAULLEY: That all I want to know. I have. Yes, I have.

MR. CRAIK: I wouldn't go so far as to make a claim like that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: And I'd be glad to forward it to my honourable friend.

A MEMBER: Do you remember it?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I remember it.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I come back to the major point, that the crossroads that we're at on this decision is here now. I don't blame my honourable friends for trying to buy a little more time but I don't think they're serving the best interests of Manitoba and there's only one conclusion you can draw. This document that has been tabled, all this does is tell us that it's very urgent, very urgent that the technical people get together. I don't expect, I knew from Day One that Mr. Cass-Beggs had a problem on his hands, that he couldn't possibly assess all that work and come up with something that was going to give the answer. He's tried to cover a lot of fields. Some of the statements he's made in here are in direct conflict with very basic information that was provided by the consultants to Hydro and information that was given to us in the committee hearings.

There is only one thing we can do now and it is call the committee now. The last thing I want to do in this House is to try and force the government to make a decision, whether

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . they're going high or low or what on this, but not a political decision based on the posture that may be taken by this side of the House. But I do think that the committee has to be called to get the two sides of it presented, to narrow it down to what are the facts - and the facts are there - there's nothing that's going to be overly contradictory. They are there; there's no reason why we can't get them now. The natural resource considerations, many of the biological factors if you study them for three years you're not going to have the answer. You're going to have to be 80 percent sure that you've made the right decision. Make up your minds and get on with the job, but realize what you're doing, and if you don't go for the high-level diversion now don't delude yourself, you're costing the taxpayers of Manitoba an awful lot of money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Minister of Mines, but does the Member for Logan have a question?

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Chairman, could the Honourable Member for Riel answer a question? Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member and the former government members opposite who were in the last House were as certain of their facts at that time as they seem to be today, why did they not make the decision then? I understand that they could have made the decision for a high-level diversion at South Indian Lake by Order-in-Council. Why didn't they do it at that day?

MR. CRAIK: Well, I think this has been answered and given in the House. But I'll tell you very definitely, based on the existing information, that I have no choice but to go for a high-level diversion, but if in committee hearings - I'm not inflexible, I feel just as strongly about this thing as everybody else does and I appreciate the arguments of all the people that have gone there, and anybody that has been there could not help but get a heartfelt feeling for the natural resources and the people and the community and the whole thing - but based on the information you have, as I said, you have to go on the best information you have, and if there's definite indication that you're going to get information that's going to change your mind and go against it, that's fine. But you can't get those answers as fast as you want them and you're going to have to make up your minds that if you call the committee and Mr. Cass-Beggs can defend his economic statements, I'm quite flexible, but right now he has told me nothing that changes my mind. -- (Interjection) -- Well, you ask it then. What didn't I answer?

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, the honourable member asked if you were so sure about that, why didn't the former government act at the time. -- (Interjection) -- let him answer.

MR. CRAIK: Well, you followed the Act for one thing, but you're all suggesting here that it was a very undemocratic thing to bring that Bill into the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: We're asking you a question.

MR. CRAIK: What could have been a more democratic act than to bring the Bill into the House for a full-blown discussion. If the government had wanted to sit on the thing, it could have easily have done it. Now all we're asking is for you to reciprocate. Call the committee. The Honourable Member for Portage says we're trying to play politics with this thing. Well, maybe some people are trying to play politics but they're not who he thinks they are. Let's put it that way. You call the committee; let us ask the questions, the answers to the contradictory statements that are in here based on evidence that was placed before us before, because there's no doubt that if your decision to delay is based on some of that information, you're being deluded.

MR. EVANS: Well, indeed there are many many questions that have been raised and I think we have many many answers, but unfortunately time is of the essence. But I'd like to make a few remarks, some of which are of a detailed nature, some of which are a more general nature. I would just reiterate however the statement made by the Premier earlier that the government has made an assessment of the problem and we are assuming our responsibility and we're following a course of action which we think is appropriate and beneficial for the people of Manitoba.

There are a number of detailed questions. I think, as the Honourable Member of Riel mentioned, this is a very technical matter and I think what we should try to do is all try to take a very rational look at this and try to keep emotion to a minimum, because I hope we are all reasonable men and I'm hoping that I can approach it in an unemotional and very reasonable way.

A question was asked with regard to the \$4 million that were spent previously on

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . engineering studies, and the Honourable Member for Lakeside suggested this money was wasted or has it been wasted. Well, the fact of the matter is that while some of it of course applies directly to the high-level diversion, some of the information would be available, would be useful rather for other kinds of diversions and therefore it is not all wasted. I would suggest of course, and we believe that the high-level diversion would be a costly blunder, that surely it makes good sound economic sense to minimize your losses. If you have spent a few million dollars or a couple of million dollars or whatever it is, and you find out that you're proceeding along the wrong course, to save a couple of million dollars and engage in a very drastic mistake would be utter folly.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside took the trouble to read from the sentence on Page 14 respecting the diversion of the Churchill River. However, he failed to read the couple of sentences that follow. He stated, "Any decision" - and this is from the Cass-Beggs Report- "Any decision to continue with the development of the Nelson River as the main sequence of power projects must also include diversion of water from the Churchill River." And he says, well therefore you're getting other diversions. But this is the whole point. We recognized this from the beginning that we want to make full use of our hydro-electric potential and there is going to have to be some kind of diversion, or diversion of the Churchill River into the Nelson, and this is the essence in effect of the report.

But let me read on in the report: "It would appear to be essential to discover and design a scheme which will leave the regime of the river," - the member was talking about other types of flooding - "but which will leave the regime of the river and the natural environment essentially unchanged. The availability of regulations for Lake Winnipeg would make it possible to adopt a scheme which did not provide much storage, indeed to withdraw water only at times when the flow was in excess of a certain acceptable minimum value. It is suggested that the various schemes that are available, and others that may be discovered, should be reviewed with the conservation aspect of primary consideration." So we are concerned that there not be any kind of excessive flooding. -- (Interjection) -- Right. But the point of it is we wish to minimize such changes.

Reference was made to the transmission line being constructed to the south. My information is that this is going ahead, and the honourable member is correct, the intention was first of all to import some power from the south and then possibly subsequently to export power. I was pleased to hear the member for Riel mention the fact that Canada has had a history, or made reference to this at least, that Canada has had a history against the export of power, the philosophy being that we need power for our own industrial development and there's no great virtue in exporting a very prime resource. Therefore, I would make no apology for not exporting power. Let's use it all here if possible. The economic development of the great manufacturing heartland of Canada, namely in Ontario and Quebec, was based on electric power and we had a federal policy for years which negated any export of electric power.

The statement was made, reference to an opinion expressed by an official of Hydro earlier on in this year, that if the high-level diversion was not proceeded with then we can't justify the Kettle, but again I repeat the essence of Mr. Cass-Beggs' suggestion is that we can find a suitable alternative diversion that will provide us essentially with the same amount of water, and if this is the case then I suggest -- in fact this is what we're looking at.

There was an idea expressed - just to give you an example of this, let me quote one paragraph on Page 15 to give you an idea of some other diversionary scheme. "However, there would be a distinct advantage in any diversion that would direct the water into the Saskatchewan River above Grand Rapids so that it would pass through Grand Rapids and Kelsey plant in addition to Kettle and the proposed downstream developments." Here's a bonus. "One significant objection to the Sturgeon-Weir River project in Saskatchewan, namely that it would worsen the conditions in Lake Winnipeg, would not apply once the regulating works were constructed." But here's an example of where you're going to get more use out of your water, not less. You're going to put it through two additional plants. "The volume of water available, assuming the virtual closing of the Island Falls plant," - this is in Saskatchewan - "would be less than the diversion that might be permitted lower down the Churchill, but it might prove the more economical per cubic foot diverted. Moreover, a further diversion might be developed on a smaller scale east of the South Indian Lake area so that the two together constituted the desirable, permissible diversion."

(MR. EVANS cont')

Passing along to another detail, a question was made about expenditures on the geological investigations, and indeed as the member correctly pointed out, the Member for Lakeside, this three-year program was initiated in the anticipation that a portion of the outcrops would be flooded. At the time the decision to map was made, this area was not of an otherwise high priority and probably would not have been mapped for another 10 or 12 years, so this is in a sense a correct assessment. However, I would remind the honourable member that there was a discovery made by Sherritt Gordon, and this Sherritt Gordon discovery and the resultant staking rush has changed their priority to one of very high up on the list. -- (Interjection) -- We will.

Well, as I said, there are many, very many questions that are raised and I really don't have time to answer them all. I'm very pleased that my friend the member from Churchill raised the point about public opinion being against the flooding, and indeed this is true. I've talked to several MLAs, I've talked to people in Thompson area and this is the public opinion. In my opinion, the Mayor of Thompson is definitely in the minority on this because I understand he had an opposite point of view. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the honourable House Leader was saying that I had better go.

I have many other points to bring up. Let me just make this one concluding remark at this time. The Member for Riel referred to pollution, you know, that we've got these wonderful waterways and so on and we didn't want pollution and so on. I would suggest that by extending the area of South Indian Lake, by flooding the South Indian Lake area we are in effect creating perhaps the largest man-made swamp in the North American continent, and this indeed is a form of pollution.

He refers to the people and so on. He expresses his great concern for the people, but if he were up at South Indian Lake as I was and talked to the people, he would perhaps feel a little differently about them and not think that they are, or perhaps imply that they're pieces of chattel or what have you that can simply be shunted around for their own good. I suggest the democratic approach is to let them make their own decision on it and that is not to force them, not to in effect shift six to seven hundred people by a very arbitrary act and to disrupt the sociological, the psychological fabric of the community, and this is something very essential. We've never argued with the technical merits of the high level scheme as such proposed by Hydro and we give them full credit for that. No one has ever argued with that, but there's a matter of value judgment. The Member for Lakeside said, where are the additional facts? Well there are some additional facts but there's also a matter of judgment, and this judgment is based upon values, and I suggest that the people of Manitoba elected this government, this party, which had values that were in keeping with the twentieth century, values which said that no longer is the single use approach to resource development adequate. -- (Interjection) -- We have a multi-use approach and . . .

A MEMBER: What are the multi-use approaches? Name them.

MR. EVANS: . . . is one resource. People is the first resource.

A MEMBER: What are some others?

MR. EVANS: Recreational uses. I might add that the South Indian Lake committee had extensive conversations and discussions, detailed discussions with experts in recreation, in biology, in sociology and so forth, and there are many other values that are involved. As I say, Sir, it's a matter of values, and we have a sense of concern for people, for the conservation of resources, and we are concerned about electric power development and economic development in general. And based on this we have made a judgment and an assessment which I think is in keeping with the interests of the people of Manitoba.

Now I've got other information respecting the cost and this is something which is rather detailed. It brings the comparative costs of the so-called high level and the low level into present day values and giving a very conservative estimate of resource costs, and on that basis - and I'll be glad to discuss this subsequently - you cannot prove that the high level, strictly based on these cost estimates bringing into present day values - and my engineering friend across the way knows what I'm talking about - you cannot prove the high level is necessarily cheaper at all. Well, I'm sorry, I have to leave today. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered a certain resolution, directed me to report progress and beg leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the honourable member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now call second readings on the adjourned debates.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings on the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition)(Minnedosa): . . . have it stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: . . . this bill and the next one, and I would ask the indulgence of the House to have the matters stand.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree to allowing this to stand for this time, but may I suggest to my honourable friend that he be prepared as soon as possible in order that we may get these bills into committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable . . .

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the honourable member from Portage, he asked a question of me last night and just prior to my answering it it was interrupted by the motion to adjourn by the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and I would like to answer the Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . if my colleague intercedes at this particular time, it may be tantamount to closing the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm wondering if the honourable Minister could not find opportunity at some other point on the Orders of the Day to make his comments.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would like the same indulgence on this one, please.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) Is it the intention of the Honourable House Leader to proceed with . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . the Bill standing in the Honourable the Leader of the House -- of the government, I should say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 38. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER presented Bill No. 38, an Act to amend The Election Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should make a brief explanation as to the contents and purpose of Bill 38. It is to do two things relative to The Election Act. One is to reduce, to lower the voting age minimum from 21 to 18 years, and one can go into quite a long discourse as to why we feel that this is a desirable course of action, but inasmuch as the question as to whether the voting age, the minimum should be 21 or 18 is a matter that has been much discussed and debated in this House, in other provincial assemblies and in the federal House for the past ten years and more, I feel that it is unnecessary to do so just at this time.

I might add for purposes of background information, however, that it was originally our hope that we would be able to take some guidance from the Federal Government in this respect and I believe that that is a position that is taken by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition as well. My understanding of his position, which he may want to elaborate on at some later date, is that he does not oppose necessarily the lowering of the voting age but that perhaps it would be better to await guidance from the Federal Government's actions. But my understanding is that the Federal Government does not have it in mind to make any change in this respect very soon and we have decided that there's really no point in waiting.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be said as a matter of fact that there are now five provinces, possibly six, that have taken legislative action to lower the voting age from 21 downward. I believe that in British Columbia and Alberta the voting age has been set at 19, that is to say minimum voting age; in Saskatchewan it is 18; in the Province of Quebec it is now 18; and in New Brunswick I understand it is 18. By taking this action, and assuming it gets the approval of this House, Manitoba would then be the sixth province to have a voting age

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . somewhat lower than the age of 21.

The other provisions of Bill 38 have to do with incapacitated voters. We believe that it is desirable to make it easier for those who are handicapped or incapacitated to exercise their rights as citizens, to exercise their franchise. We do not believe that this is an expensive nor difficult change to administer and accordingly we recommend it to the House in this bill.

All the other provisions of the bill are simply consequent to that change and really I do believe that it is not a very controversial matter that we are putting forward here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if you would now call the adjourned debate on the resolution of my colleague, the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may we have leave to have this matter stand?

MR. PAULLEY: Next would be the next resolution, the adjourned debate on my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate, feeling just a little badly about the torment I'm going to have to take, because being a man that considers himself to have pretty good patience, to be reasonable in most regards, I must admit to having come to about the end of my tether, about the end of my tether in the operation of the House and the manner which we've been subjected to from the House Leader in particular and some of the other members on the other side. I think this is the final straw that proves the high-handed attitude of the government in relating the other members of the House to taking part in the work of the House. We've had several indications which I really didn't comment on very greatly, although I did make a few remarks last night about one of them - the Attorney-General in Law Amendments Committee, when he indicated it was his judgment that the committee would adjourn at 12 o'clock, for instance, and normally these judgments are arrived at by the committee rather than by the Chairman, and it's not very often, it's not very often there's any objection to the committee's chairman's suggestion, but generally speaking the courtesy, the common courtesy of allowing the committee to arrive at the conclusion is one that has been carried on in this House ever since I've been in it, and I expect for a long time before that.

The government's response in a voice vote that we mentioned earlier, and the discussion we had last night, is another indication, and now this, Mr. Speaker. And I'm not opposed to the principle of the resolution. This resolution contains within it an effective tool for improving on the work of the House when it's introduced at the right time, and at the right time I would have no objection at all, but to have it introduced as was done last night by the House Leader, without any explanation, although I gather he went to the trouble of explaining it to the press a week ago that their assumption was that it wouldn't be brought in unless the government found that the Opposition was obstructing. The quote of course, the indication of what he said is that there's really no regulations that cannot be imposed during estimates debate, and he will use it whenever he feels there is a need.

Well, it's my view that ever since the rules changed putting in an 80-hour limit on estimates, that the imposition has not really been required because the time when the imposition was required was when there was no limit on estimates, and all that could happen with opposition parties was to wear them down and give them an opportunity when we were going 133, 134 and goodness knows how many hours. So I don't really think it's a matter of imposition in that field that is required at the moment, but I do think that at a certain time in the Session, to be able to advance legislation with reasonable notice, like having the 48 hours' notice all occurring within a single day, and if it takes more time it doesn't hurt the work of the House in any way because experience has been if there hasn't been time to consider one's position, the matter could be stood, although much legislation could be advanced in a hurry where people were prepared to discuss it and pass it, and it has been that useful tool. But what do we have here, Mr. Speaker, being brought in at this stage of the session? An effort -- well, it's not an effort; it would have the result of cutting off Private Members' days at this point in time. This is in keeping, Mr. Speaker, with the remarks of members opposite that they didn't really think

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . . we should be talking about any resolutions at this Session anyway, and so I suppose it's in keeping with that at this stage of the game.

But the other thing that it does, it has the effect, being brought in before the budget, of cutting the budget debate to two and a half days approximately instead of eight. That's a neat little trick coming in at this stage of the game; a budget coming in and if this was passed it would have the net effect of having eight sitting days in about two and a half days - in about two and a half days, Mr. Speaker. It would reduce the opportunity of the members of this House to talk on the budget for more than about two and a half days.

But where are we now and how would it improve the work of the committees? Well, Mr. Speaker, we've been in this House for about five weeks - I think it will be five weeks tomorrow. Law Amendments Committee has sat two mornings. We sat one afternoon with agreement in the House at the government's suggestion. We sat another afternoon and evening in the House to meet the convenience of people from out of province in Law Amendments Committee. There's still, Mr. Speaker, I think some 16 bills before the committee and much representation to be heard. No difficulty in filling the mornings if we so desire. As a matter of fact, we could have had some of those mornings filled in the past if there had been any desire to work in the morning and work longer hours. So that it's not necessary to have the House sit, Mr. Speaker, to be effective and effectively use the morning hours in the work that's before us at this session of the Legislature.

And where are we in the House? We're not behind in legislation. We don't have an awful lot of legislation that needs being brought forward in a hurry. I think we've maybe got three or four bills on the Order Paper. I think that if my arithmetic is right, if my arithmetic is right we have one more bill that we can expect from the government side, that to do with City of Winnipeg tax fees or what have you. If the indications in the arithmetic from members opposite is accurate, this is the amount of legislation that we're talking about. And we have quite a number of departments of estimates to consider in the House. We have ample opportunity of filling the time effectively and efficiently in the operation of the House under the rules. And those rules are there, Mr. Speaker, for a purpose. Sometimes in the House as we consider these things, you're left with the impression the rules are for the Opposition, but the rules are there to provide for the efficient and the orderly means of carrying on the business of the people of Manitoba through this Legislative Assembly. And I don't want to get myself in the position of looking as though I disagree with this instrument, this tool, when it's used towards the efficiency of the work of the House, because I don't. I agree with it. I would consider some amendments to it maybe at a later stage when I think it could be effective, but I can say, I can say that the only thing that it can do, being introduced at this time, is to effectively muzzle the opposition, particularly in relation to the Budget Speech that I understand we're to get tomorrow evening.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I intend to oppose it. I know friends opposite can railroad it if they like. It's one of those things that agreement could be reached, I'm pretty sure, at most stages of most sessions, when the thing could be brought in effectively and without any opposition, but I must say that at this point in time that I have to oppose it and I'll oppose it as strongly as I can at this stage, Mr. Speaker, because until such time as it will improve the efficiency of the House and give us every opportunity of studying the work of the House, presenting our thoughts and ideas as elected members of the Legislature and working in what I think is the interests of the people of Manitoba in a positive, not in an obstructionist fashion, but in a positive way, then I have to oppose it until that time comes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the following resolution, that

WHEREAS The Municipal Act has not been completely revised since 1933 except for the revisions made for the purposes of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1940, and the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1954;

AND WHEREAS there have been various amendments and changes in The Municipal Act during the last thirty-six years;

AND WHEREAS the officers of The Department of Urban Development and Municipal

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . Affairs together with the Revising Officer have for some time been engaged in preparing a draft revision of The Municipal Act and a Bill respecting Local Authorities Elections;

AND WHEREAS at the Second Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature a resolution was passed authorizing the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to consider the draft revision of The Municipal Act and a Bill entitled The Local Authorities Elections Act;

AND WHEREAS at the Third Session of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature a resolution was passed authorizing the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs to consider the draft revision of The Municipal Act;

AND WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs has, from time to time, reported in respect of the draft revision of The Municipal Act and the draft Bill respecting Local Authorities Elections;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs be authorized to consider the draft revision of The Municipal Act and the draft Bill respecting Local Authorities Elections;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs appointed at this session consider the draft revision of The Municipal Act and the draft Bill respecting Local Authorities Elections and report to the House at this session or the next session of the Legislature with any recommendations in respect thereto;

AND THAT the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs have power to sit during recess after prorogation to consider the above matters.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the subject matter of the next resolution is under advisement so therefore I would like to move on to the resolution on Page 4 standing in my name.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order . . . that the next resolution is not under advisement?

MR. PAULLEY: I pass the next resolution, Mr. Chairman, as is my right so to do.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education and Youth, the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature adopted a resolution that the government consider the advisability of establishing a Special Committee of the Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and the licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable;

AND WHEREAS at the First, Second and Third Sessions of the Twenty-Eighth Legislature Special Committees of the House were established to examine the statutes and regulations regarding professional associations and the licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable;

AND WHEREAS the Special Committees never completed their consideration of those matters and made a final report in respect of those matters;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to establish a Special Committee of the Legislature to examine and consider the matters;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of the Legislature composed of the Honourable Messrs. Mackling, Miller, Toupin, Messrs. Allard, Beard, Bilton, Boyce, Craik, Desjardins, Doern, Johansson, Molgat, Sherman, Spivak, Mrs. Trueman, and Mr. Turnbull be established to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and the licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, and to examine any Bills respecting professional associations introduced in

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . the previous three sessions of the Legislature and not passed, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable;

AND THAT the Committee hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable;

AND THAT the Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and to report to the House as this session or the next session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the House.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, that

WHEREAS, at the Second Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba constituted a Special Committee of the House to examine, investigate, inquire into, study and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians and denturists in the provision of dental services consistent with sound health policy, and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto;

AND WHEREAS the Committee held a number of hearings and made a report to the Legislative Assembly on the 31st day of March, 1965;

AND WHEREAS by resolution passed on the 5th day of April, 1965, at the Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature, the Committee was reconstituted with similar terms of reference;

AND WHEREAS on the 4th day of April, 1966, at the Fifth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature, a report of the Committee was received by the Legislative Assembly;

AND WHEREAS no legislation has been enacted pursuant to the report of the Committee;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable to establish a Special Committee of the House to make further examination, investigation and inquiry into the contents of said report and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of the House be established consisting of the Honourable Messrs. Cherniack, Green, Mackling, Messrs. Fox, Henderson, Jenkins, Johnston (Portage), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), and McKellar to examine, investigate, inquire into, and report on all matters relating to the determination of the proper role to be filled by dental technicians, denturists, and other persons providing dental services consistent with sound public health policy and to make such findings and recommendations as are deemed advisable with respect thereto;

AND THAT the Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and report to this House on the matters referred to them at this session or at the next session of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the House.

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

#### PRIVATE BILLS

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it would be convenient now to call the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 30, an Act to incorporate the Brandon University Students' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon West, Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. WEIR: The Honourable Member for Lakeside is out of the House. If anybody else would like to speak, why I'm sure it would be okay. If not, I wonder if it could be allowed to stand in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed.)

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I question whether it would be convenient at this time to enter into Private Member's Resolutions. We have the abbreviated Order Paper before us at the present time which I'm sure may be inconvenient for members of the House. That

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . . being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and that the House was now adjourned until 2:00 o'clock Thursday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned. If the Chair just may explain, you may recall that I've given you notice of the fact that the photographer will be in tomorrow to take the photographs of the Legislative Assembly and he requires about a half hour, and in order to get the mace on the table the bell will have to be rung and the Sergeant-At-Arms will have to bring the mace in and thus to make the photograph complete, so hence 2:00 o'clock.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Assembly would give leave to the change in the hour for that purpose. As far as we're concerned, it's agreed. (Agreed.)

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned.