

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock Thursday, March 8, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 120 students of Grade 9 standing of the Steinbach School. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Jacob Siemens, Ben Klassen, Art Wiebe, Abe Peters, Victor Isaac, and Mrs. Kathy Peters, Miss Helen Lowen and Garry Giesbrecht. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports. The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Highways for the year 1971-72.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee for the year 1972, and included in this report, Sir, the proceedings of the seminar on the Public Sector Industrial Relations, held in March of this year; and I would also, Sir, like to table the Annual Report for the year 1972 of the Workmen's Compensation Board of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Milk Control Board, the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation and the Manitoba Credit Unions Annual Report, and the Annual Report of the Co-operative Promotion Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other reports? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, as indicated yesterday, I'd like to table the progress report of the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill and Nelson River Study Board for the period ended December 31, 1971. This is the report, Mr. Speaker, that was indicated that I previously perhaps said that I didn't have. The other report which I correctly indicated to the Members I only received on the day before yesterday is the progress report of the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill, Nelson River Study Board for the term ended December 31, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? The Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Department of Education for the school year ending 1972, and this report contains the annual reports of the Collective Agreement Board, the Advisory Board, and the Teachers Retirement Allowances Fund Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion -- the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Manitoba Development Corporation for the year ended March 31, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate to this House whether land control legislation of the British Columbia type is being contemplated by the province.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, of course we have had under study and consideration problems with respect to land use and land taxation, particularly insofar as the area on the periphery of growing urban centers is concerned. If

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) a policy conclusion is reached it will be announced to the House in due course.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether it is likely that this will appear in the guidelines for the 70's to be prepared by his government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, again the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is anticipating. The guidelines documents referred to will be tabled in this House during this session in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder, Sjr, if he can assure ranchers in the Province of Manitoba presently leasing Crown lands for the purposes of grazing and hay-making that there is no change contemplated in the procedure, or in the terms of the lease that are existing at the present time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is no present intention to change any of the leases and, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that the province has not changed any lease during its currency that I'm aware of in any event.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. I wonder if he can indicate to the House whether the government will be undertaking pilot projects for a guaranteed annual income in this calendar year.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): The provisions are that we will undertake the projects this fiscal year.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Health and Social Development could indicate how many projects will be undertaken.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, hopefully that the specifics of the projects will be given to the House, hopefully during the consideration of my estimates.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Minister of Health could indicate the criteria upon which the project areas have been identified by . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I do believe that that question could quite easily be answered during the estimates. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. In view of the tax collecting agreements that Manitoba is part of on death tax, has the Government of Manitoba been advised that the Province of Prince Edward Island has retroactively terminated its death tax legislation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there was informal notification given to me of that fact. However, Mr. Speaker, it's no secret that we do not regard that kind of action as exemplary because it would result in a proportionately higher levying of taxation on those on lower incomes, less able to pay.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the First Minister, or the Minister of Finance, also been now notified that the Government of Nova Scotia has announced its intention to abandon the tax?

MR. SCHREYER: There has been some indication of that fact, Mr. Speaker. I have had conversations with the Premier of Nova Scotia in the past with respect to problems of attempting to maintain Succession Duties Taxation in the face of opposition from those with louder voices.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, my question follows the guidelines of the question that was earlier raised by my leader. Has Dauphin been selected as one of the areas for the pilot project in the guaranteed annual income scheme?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in the position to indicate the affirmative or in a negative manner at this stage, and this will be part of the things discussed during the estimates of the department.

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

MR. ASPER: To the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd) Manitoba will have on either side of it the Province of Alberta and the Maritime Provinces not levying death tax, does the First Minister and Minister of Finance not consider our competitive position in attracting industry and capital for development impaired?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are of course a number of factors entering into all this analysis. The fact remains, however, that when my colleague, the former Minister of Finance, the Member for St. Johns, introduced the legislation, it was introduced in a form and passed in a form which provides for exemption of up to \$150,000, and in the case of the direct dependents and a surviving spouse, up to \$200,000 exemption, tax free, before the first cent of Succession Duty Tax is collected. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, we do not feel that the continuation of that Succession Duties is in any way inimical to the public, the general public interest. Then too, Mr. Speaker, we are reminded of the fact that the province of British Columbia, which is even more adjacent to Alberta, does have a provincial Succession Duties Tax and had one of its own for many years, and yet the Province of British Columbia manages to out-pace Alberta in terms of population growth, if that's any criteria, and in terms of industrial formation.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear. Hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. I would like to ask him whether the government has reached a no adjustment decision with respect to Manitoba Medical Association fees for 1973?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member is quite aware, the estimates for all departments have been tabled before the House and the assumption of the MMA that there are no funds available within those estimates to allow for a revision of the premiums is an assumption. I indicated to the press, and I'm now saying to the honourable members of the House, that the government is open for discussion with the Medical Association for fee revision. Even if there wasn't an amount provided for within the estimates it doesn't fore-close negotiation with the MMA.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise the House as to how the government intends to keep those lines of possibility and negotiation open?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and/or his officials are in constant negotiation, in a sense, with the MMA and other members of the medical profession. There is a negotiator appointed by the government to discuss fee revision with the MMA and this is on-going.

MR. SHERMAN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister or the First Minister received a request from the Manitoba Medical Association for an early meeting to discuss negotiation of a fee increase?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I can only answer for myself. The MMA have asked, have indicated that the fee structure is to be reviewed with the government or its negotiator and this will be done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): The Minister said he could only speak for himself. Does that mean that he cannot speak for his department?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I believe that the Honourable the Minister of Health was referring to answering for himself, answering for his department, and not answering to that second part of that vipers question that was asked by the Member for Fort Garry. How could the Minister of Health answer on my behalf as to whether I received a letter in the last 24 hours or 24 minutes? In any case, Mr. Speaker, that last question is indicative of the kinds of questions that my honourable friends like to put from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake. Order, please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, surely the Opposition is entitled to ask a question and get an answer. Surely it's not necessary for us to be lectured by the Premier when the question isn't to his liking, and surely we have a right . . .

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. That is not a matter of privilege. I believe the Chair is trying to be fair and listening to all sides. Unfortunately I was distracted for a moment and didn't hear the question. Possibly it was my error. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege was that the question was asked whether the Minister spoke for his department. Sir, that is so clearly sarcastic and frivolous that I felt it did behoove rising on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. Order please. Order, please.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wish to draw the attention of the honourable members to the loge to my left where we have a former MLA, Mr. W. B. Scarth, who was the former MLA for River Heights. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here today.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I continue on the question of privilege raised by the First Minister and he has accused me of asking frivolous questions. The Minister of Health said that he was speaking for himself only. It is perfectly proper for me to find out whether he is speaking for his department or whether he is speaking for himself. It's a generally known rule and I would not have asked the question if the Minister had not said that he was speaking for himself. It's a generally known rule in this House, Sir, that he speaks for his department.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Order. That is not a matter of privilege. I repeat again, a question under Beauchesne's 171, citation 171(a) says, "A question, oral or written, must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain epithets, innuendo, satire or ridicule," so therefore the matter of privilege is closed. The matter of privilege is closed. The matter of privilege is closed. Does the Honourable Member for Fort Garry have another question?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd)

MR. SHERMAN: Well I suppose it could be another question or a point of order, or a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The First Minister referred . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The debate in respect to the other matter just now has been concluded, and I will not entertain any more argument or debate on that particular point. New question.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes I have another question, and I'll direct it to the First Minister and it won't be vypercated. It will be direct to him. Has the First Minister received a request from the officers of the Manitoba Medical Association for an early meeting with him to negotiate an upward revision in fee structures?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, would agree that it is always easier to answer questions that are not vypercated; the last question was straightforward and accordingly I can advise my honourable friend that of course there have been communications between the Medical Association and my office over past months, and the question of fee schedules has been a matter of considerable negotiation between a negotiator on behalf of the Province of Manitoba and the Medical Association.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the First Minister received a request within the past 48 hours for an early meeting within the next week to re-examine the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, such a request may have been received by my office. It has not been brought to my personal attention as yet, if in fact it has been received by the office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Can he inform the House when the new Manitoba Youth Centre will be open for business?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Youth Centre in Tuxedo will be open for treatment

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) hopefully by the end of March.

MRS. TRUEMAN: My second question is for the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Can he tell us whether the government is still trying to meet the zoning regulations so as to secure the necessary building permit for this completed building?

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works) (Elmwood): I'm glad that the honourable member asked me that question. Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly complicated question. Basically . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, there was a problem involved in that the re-zoning application was complex because the property was on the borderline of the two communities of Winnipeg and Tuxedo. There were meetings held in regard to a zoning application, there was discussion with civic officials, and the implication was clear that the province should proceed in spite of the difficulties. The contractor has the obligation to take out a permit. More currently, I might point out that the city staff and the province have a practical working agreement at the administrative level and if you want the answer to your technical question, "was a permit ever issued?" the answer to that is "no", but it is "no" because of all the complexities of the issue, and as my honourable colleagues have said, it was not required at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Has construction started on the provincial government building on Broadway?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government's new office building has been under construction for at least a month, we have excavated and we are driving piles, and we are proceeding at full speed ahead.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government obtained the necessary permit for the construction of this building?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, we have gone through all the committee stages; we have gone through the three by-law readings; we have received, according to Councillor Yanofsky and other councillors, pre permit permission. In fact, in fact we do not have a piece of paper, which I do not regard as necessary in regard to that project.

MR. PATRICK: Then it would be correct to, -- what I understand from the Minister, that the government has not a permit at the present time.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Does the Minister intend to take any action concerning the failure of the City of Winnipeg to comply with the provisions of the Barbers Act?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have drawn to public attention that the City Council of Winnipeg have flouted the laws of the Province of Manitoba in not passing a by-law in respect of barbers. -- (Interjection) -- Of course it's a shame. Of course it's a shame that they do fail to observe the laws of Manitoba. I referred the matter to the Attorney-General's Department as to whether or not the Crown or the Barbers Association should take legal action for a violation of a law of the Province of Manitoba by the City Council of Winnipeg -- and I repeat that -- I'm advised by the department that it may be advisable for the Barbers Association to undertake proceedings against the City of Winnipeg, and I want to assure the Barbers Association if they require any financial support I will personally give it to them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Vital. A supplementary question.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure if the next question should go to the Minister of Finance or the First Minister, but could he tell the House if there will be any increase in the provincial grants to municipalities this year?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think perusal of the Estimates of Supply that were tabled here just the other day will show that there is provision for an increase in the amount of revenues to be made available by the province to local government in Manitoba. And then of course, in addition to that, as I've indicated already on at least two or three occasions including yesterday to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, given the fact that the Federal Government has indicated an increase of revenues to be transferred to Manitoba and a number of other provinces, that all of that additional revenue from the Federal

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . Government will be passed on. The precise way in which it is passed on is yet to be determined, but it will be in one form or another ultimately to the citizen of Manitoba in his role as a municipal or a local government or school division taxpayer. The precise format of that has yet to be determined.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, I direct my question to the First Minister, and in view of his answer I wonder if he could possibly -- he may want to reconsider the answer he's given to the question. The question, as I understand it, was whether there would be additional money given to the municipalities and the indication of the Premier was that the present Estimates would include additional sums. I believe the present Estimates . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, my question to the First Minister: the Estimates that have been tabled in the House, do they or do they not include additional sums over and above the unconditional grants given in the previous year, and if not is it the intention to bring that in the supplementary Estimates to be presented to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that perusal of the current Estimates tabled will show increases of transfer of revenues from the province to Health, local government, i.e., municipalities and school divisions. There will be additional revenues available or moneys available brought forward in supplementary supply but in the latter case it is yet to be determined as to the precise form that this passing on of this revenue to the taxpayer will take, whether it will be in the form of a direct passing on to the citizen in his role as a taxpayer or to local government budgets and such, but the ultimate effect will be the same.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the First Minister. Then will the First Minister indicate whether it is the intention of the government only to pass on the amount to be forwarded by the Federal Government or will there be additional sums above that?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, clearly -- clearly the Honourable Leader of the Opposition should know that the amount of money that is being transferred from the province to local government and local government and local real property taxpayers as individuals will far exceed the \$10.8 million in question, but the precise amount of that is yet to be determined.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question and in many respects I am rephrasing the question to the First Minister. Is it the intention of the government by way of supplementary Estimates to only deal with the amount of money that, as a result of the change in the budget of the Federal Government, will be given to the province?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is now wanting to know the amount of supplementary Estimates, and that, Sir, I have no intention of giving him at this time for the reason that we do not have that final amount yet calculated.

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

MR. ASPER: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health. Is it correct that he sent a letter, or through him the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission sent a letter to all senior citizens in Manitoba, advising them that as from April 1 this year there would be no further premiums for Medicare hospitalization?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, that's true, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: My supplementary question is, does the Minister -- does the Minister intend . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: . . . much longer I will be. Does the Minister intend to bring this change in by regulation or by legislation?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised by legal counsel within the department that legislation will be required. We can deal with it either way, really, according to the instruction that I got this morning, by regulations or by legislation and it will be discussed by the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. ASPER: Can the Minister explain to the House, or indicate to the House, why he has adopted the unusual course of announcing legislation as having been enacted before it's even brought to the House?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the question, the line of questioning is becoming argumentative but, assuming that it is not, I believe that the best way to answer my honourable friend is to point out to him that the increasing levels of taxation requires a money bill of this House. The reduction of taxation does not, and of course we have, I think, a number of examples in past years, perhaps the most recent of which was the announcement of the, what, 22 million-dollar Medicare premium tax reduction in 1969.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he advise the House of the government's position with respect to off-shore mineral rights in Hudson's Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: Policy question.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if I may with your permission . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: The Honourable the Member for Riel knows that it's rather a complicated administrative matter, also complicated in policy terms as well, but even if I were in a position to give him an answer it would require considerable detailed elaboration. I'd be glad to discuss it with him in some other format than in the question period.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I can possibly refine the question. Is it the government's intent to recommend to the Prairie Economic Council or the meeting of the four prairie provinces that a position be taken to the Federal Government advising that jurisdiction for off-shore minerals come under Federal?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, basically what we have indicated to the Government of Canada is basically along the lines of what my honourable friend is suggesting, that is to say that we do not join with those provinces -- there are a few -- that wish to have the Federal presence in these things recede -- you know, withdrawal, retreat -- and to have the provinces take on most of the advantage of any potential royalties and revenues from off-shore oil, so that I don't believe there is any disagreement.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, then if I can ask the question, is the province taking the position that they are prepared to forego claim to rights in Hudson's Bay or to pursue rights in Hudson's Bay off-shore in lieu of the Federal Government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I must indicate to the honourable member that again he is contravening our rules. A question, oral or written, must not multiply with slight variation a similar question on the same point. The honourable member has asked it three times now. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the First Minister in his capacity as Minister for Utilities. In view of the fact that Mr. Bateman, the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro, has issued a power shortage warning if certain developments don't proceed by '75 on the Nelson system, could he tell us why the Manitoba Hydro is taking full page ads encouraging the use of electricity for heating of homes, which is the most high usage use of electricity.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: There are a number of inaccuracies in my honourable friend's question and I will have to deal with them in my answer. No. 1, the ad that my honourable friend refers to is a full page ad, I admit, but it is run by I believe 10, 11 or 12 private wholesale electrical distributors. Manitoba Hydro has nothing to do with that; it is not the sponsor of the ad. No. 2 -- (Interjections) -- Manitoba Hydro . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: No. 2, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba Hydro has adopted the policy for the past approximately one year, slightly less than that, to discontinue its former practice of advertising, promoting the consumption of electrical heating, winter heating of homes; and No. 3, I am not the Minister of Utilities.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my next question to the Minister of Utilities. I'm sorry, I thought the Minister was the Minister of Utilities.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . if I may, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, the last part of my reply was put in a half bantering way. I should explain to the honourable member that there is -- there hasn't been, I don't believe,

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) for about four or five years now a Minister of Utilities as such. There is a Minister reporting for the Telephone System; there's a Minister reporting for Manitoba Hydro; and the Minister of Consumer Affairs reports for the Manitoba Public Utility Board. But I believe that change was made in 1968 -- if not in '68, in '69.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I apologize, I thought I said the Minister for Utilities, meaning the Minister responsible for reporting for utilities. Also I apologize for attributing this to Hydro, I really do. But my next question, my next question relates to the Hydro house organ, if that's what it can be called -- the publication sent out to every Hydro user -- and on Page 1 of Volume 12, No. 11, they are actively promoting their Churchill diversion to the Nelson River, and I ask the Minister if this is a correct use of Hydro . . . to promote . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The matter is not relevant to the procedures of this House. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. I asked this question yesterday and I'll repeat it today; he said he would take it as notice. Can the Minister now inform me as to the decision of the Commission in regards to the placing of the veterinary clinic at Cypress River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I did indicate that when I received the information I would inform my honourable friend, and I have yet not received that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for Hydro. Could he inform the House whether the government has instructed Hydro to charge more per unit for increased consumption of electricity as a discouragement to the over use of it by the ordinary user, and if they have not, are they contemplating doing this?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm convinced that it's an important and serious question, but I don't know whether it's the acoustics of this Chamber or whether it's my hearing. I apologize; I didn't quite hear the full import of the question.

MR. ALLARD: I ask the Minister whether the government had instructed Hydro to reverse the policy of charging less per unit as the consumption of electricity increases, had instructed Hydro to change its policy to one of charging at least as much or more for the ordinary user of electricity.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was correct. It is indeed a very profound question and very very important, but it is one that I couldn't possibly answer in a matter of one minute, even five. I can only say this to my honourable friend, that the pricing policy of Manitoba Hydro is similar if not identical to, I would venture to say, every utility operating on this continent and perhaps in the western free world in that there is volume discount. Now maybe we are coming to a point in time in human history when given the problem with fossil fuel rate of consumption, given the present estimate of proven reserves and how long they will last of the various forms of energy, that perhaps we should indeed be thinking along the lines that my honourable friend is implying, but for the moment we have done two very modest things: No. 1, we have requested that Manitoba Hydro take under policy advisement the desirability of discontinuing the promotion of electrical heating, and that has been done after consideration by Manitoba Hydro; and No. 2, we do have at least the beginnings of a policy of no volume discount, at least that much, with respect to diesel units supply of energy. But insofar as main system supply, no. I would ask my honourable friend to take it upon himself to follow that line of questioning with the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro when the Utility Committee meets lundi prochain.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Highways. Is the Minister satisfied that Dauphin should be selected as one of the pilot project areas for the guaranteed annual income supplement experiment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIK: Mr. Speaker, I think that that question was asked or some similar question was asked the Minister of Health. I think the Minister of Health has indicated that

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) the question will be discussed during the Estimate period and therefore I cannot elaborate on it at this time.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister satisfied that Dauphin should be selected as one of the areas?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Satisfaction or dissatisfaction doesn't make any difference to the rules of this House. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I direct a question at the First Minister. I wonder, Sir, if the First Minister can indicate to the House whether or not there are any discussions going on at the present time with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec with respect to the extension of the boundaries into Hudson's Bay for purposes of defining offshore mineral rights more clearly in the future in that area.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there have been communications. I believe that the Minister of Mines and Resources may be in a position to indicate now, or by way of taking this as notice as to the extent to which he has had communication with his counterparts in Ontario and/or Quebec relative to the question of Hudson's Bay and offshore mineral right boundaries. I can only advise my honourable friend that the matter is as broad as it is long. If as a province in Confederation -- well, Hudson's Bay isn't very deep, but, Mr. Speaker, what I mean by that is that if as a province in Confederation we would like to see a substantial federal presence with respect to offshore mineral rights and royalties, vis-a-vis the ocean coasts, then the same thinking has to apply vis-a-vis the salt water inland sea of Hudson's Bay. The details, my honourable friend, are readily available. They can be tabled and I believe my colleague did table them at one time.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there has been correspondence which I'm prepared to table for my honourable friends. I did not regard it as secret correspondence; as a matter of fact I believe I sent copies of this correspondence to people who have asked about it. And there have been discussions with the provinces of Ontario and Quebec which desired that the Province of Manitoba get together with them and bring pressure on the Federal Government to establish a policy that offshore mineral rights belong to the provinces. The position that the Government of Manitoba took was that the offshore mineral rights belong to the people of Canada. On the other hand he said that if that position is not accepted we would demand most favored province treatment, to use a term which is frequently applied in international law, and that he would be prepared to negotiate all positions between that and provincial rights. We also indicated that as far as Manitoba concerns we construe the boundaries of Manitoba insofar as Hudson Bay is concerned, if it is an inland sea which is in dispute, to be most favorable to the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister. Will the Committee on Economic Development be meeting this session to hear Professor Kierans on his report?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any present plan to do so but certainly on reflection it seems like an excellent suggestion, and accordingly this matter will be processed in the way in which all similar requests for a Standing Committee of the House being convened is treated. I would hope to have a more definite reply for my colleague within a matter of a few days.

MR. GONICK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could the Minister describe to the members of the House the activities of John Morrisseau at South Indian Lake? What is he instructed to do there?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON McBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs) (The Pas): The person mentioned, Mr. Speaker, has a contract with the Department of Northern Affairs to be a Community Development Coordinator for the community in that area.

MR. GONICK: A supplementary question then. What specifically would a Community Development Officer do at South Indian Lake? -- (Interjection) --

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the appreciation of the Opposition for the program under discussion. I think the explanation and detail of this program, Mr. Speaker,

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) would be better dealt with under the budget of the Department of Northern Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege?

CORRECTION

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Yes, Sir, yesterday when I was addressing the House on the urgency motion there was a report resulting from that speech in the Free Press and I would like to correct one figure, Sir, if I may. They did cite a figure of \$27 million as a figure that I had attributed as a book value of the assets of the City of Winnipeg; that should have read, and I did say, \$1.7 million.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Has his Department completed its work and set up speakers in Rooms 256 and 245 and connected them to the public address system of this House, and if so what was the cost?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: I think if the member wants that kind of detail he will have to submit an Order for Return.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary then. Could he just tell us whether the job has been done.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. Has the Honourable Minister of Labour used his good office in an attempt to assist the elevator construction strike to come to an end?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have accumulated over the past four months a considerable amount of correspondence between the negotiating committee of the union and the Department of Labour in Ontario under whose aegis the conciliation proceedings have taken place. And while on holiday in Toronto I also was in direct contact with the Ontario Department of Labour in reference to the strike that has lasted all too long.

I may say to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that this is a most peculiar type of strike, that while we have under our various provinces the direct jurisdiction, under our provincial laws involving this strike it is one of those types of operation that is more national in character than it is provincial. And it has been the desire of the management and the union that they have a uniform application of an agreement even though it is individually provincial.

Yesterday I was in touch with the western -- or the day before yesterday, Sir, -- I was in touch with the western representatives of the international brotherhood concerned to attempt to get him and the local authorities to agree to a meeting to be held yesterday or today in Manitoba to see whether or not we might be able to have a breakthrough in the resolving of the dispute in Manitoba. Unfortunately, unfortunately -- (Interjection) -- does my friend wish to ask a supplementary question? -- unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the desire of the local officials was such that they preferred the negotiations to continue down in Toronto. It's my understanding; we're hopeful of a breakthrough today or tomorrow.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wish to -- (Interjections) -- I thank the Minister for his statement but perhaps he can tell the House, if he hasn't got the information if he will take it as notice, can he tell how many work hours have been lost in Manitoba up to the present time as a result of the strike?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I haven't totalled them but there are about 70 employees involved in the dispute insofar as Manitoba is concerned and that the strike commenced on September 7th of last year. I am sure my friend is a mathematician and he could figure out exactly how many hours that it involves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd) Health and Social Development. Has his department received a letter from Antoinette O'Boyle of The Pas Day Care Centre requesting provincial assistance in the running of her day nursery?

MR. TOUPIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've received a letter from Mrs. O'Boyle, I believe today. I've met with the lady about a year and a half ago and I've discussed the requisition with officials of my department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation. Will the Minister tell the House how many senior citizens will be delayed in their occupancy of high rise apartments constructed by MHRC as a result of the elevator strike?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister responsible for Manitoba Housing & Renewal Corporation) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that the honourable member gave me no notice of the question I'll have to take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Public Works. Could the Minister advise us whether or not the washroom facility on Memorial Park site has been let by public tender -- the contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOERN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, and I think there were six or seven bidders.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Attorney-General; it relates to the question of the ownership of the offshore mineral and oil rights in Hudson's Bay. I wonder if the Attorney-General can indicate whether the government has an opinion or is in the process of obtaining opinion of independent counsel as to the ownership of mineral and oil rights in Hudson's Bay and as to the outside limit of the provincial border.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Mines, Resources and the Environment certainly communicates with my department directly and they engage counsel from time to time, and I'm sure they're better able to -- my honourable colleague would know the precise answer to that question.

MR. GREEN: The question has been under discussion for some time, I would think prior to this administration even taking office, and the positions and the legal positions all reflected the same course of opinion throughout. As the honourable member knows, there was a Supreme Court of Canada decision on this question, that there is considerable legal dispute as to whether Hudson's Bay is an inland sea or whether it is offshore. The advice that the department would have had at the time and the advice that we have now is that Manitoba should proceed on the position which is most favorable to the people of Manitoba, which is good legal advice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable First Minister state his point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's at all helpful to my honourable friends and to the House to save time, I would suggest that the specifics of the matter are best obtained if my honourable friend were to file an Address for Papers for all communication between the two Crowns, or between the Crown and the right of the province and the Federal Government, and then you'd get the details.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the reply of the First Minister but I'll address a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has the government in the current situation, in the last period of time or is it contemplating the obtaining of independent legal advice other than from the Attorney-General's department, of the ownership of the minerals and oil rights in Hudson Bay and the extent of the provincial border.

MR. GREEN: There has been no contemplated change in the government's position in this connection. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we do not regard Crown counsel who may be employed directly for the Provincial Government as being less independent than Crown counsel who get a cheque from the Provincial Government to their offices.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister who is responsible for the Management Committee of Cabinet. (Interjection) Okay. Is it still the practice of the

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ASPER cont'd) government to direct government employees wherever possible, while they are travelling on government business, to stay at hotels that offer the government a discount ?

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

MR. GREEN: To amplify a previous answer, when I was referring to independents, I was referring to independents insofar as their legal opinions are concerned. They of course are less independent with regard to government policies questions which do not affect their legal opinions.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . advise the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party that the chairman of Management Committee of Cabinet is the honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. ASPER: . . . Minister of Education in his capacity as the Management Committee Minister, is it the practice of the Province of Manitoba, the Crown, to direct Government employees when they are travelling on government business to stay at a group of hotels in the province that offer the government a discount ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we do provide members of the public service with a listing of hotels offering the most favourable rates.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the Minister then advise the House the process that was used to select that list of hotels at which employees of government are directed to stay, as outlined in a memorandum of April 28, 1972 listing those hotels to Ministers, Assistant Ministers and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, experience.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister assure this House that all hotels and all motels in the province have been given an opportunity to be put on the discount list ?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the House Leader. Are copies of reports such as the study that was just tabled on the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill and Nelson Rivers, being made available to legal firms in the city ?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not that I'm aware of.

MR. FROESE: Well I'm sure that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. FROESE: The question is, are they sold or are they handed out free ?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the general practice is to make public government reports by having them tabled in the House. Certain copies are then made available to the Leaders of various parties and then certain copies find their way to the provincial library. As to whether or not a report is considered of such public interest as to deserve publication and sale, that is a matter of judgment which in my present judgment would not apply to the reports that I filed today. However, I could be wrong -- it may become a best seller in which case we would proceed in that way.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. Will he make a copy of that study available to me ? I'm prepared to pay for it.

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been . . . Order, please. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that sometimes the rules are bent a little bit to treat with favour people such as the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

MR. ASPER: The question is to the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Can he confirm that a general approach to all the hotels and motels in Manitoba has been made, offering them or making them aware of the fact that they can be on the discounted hotels list for government employees ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Honourable House Leader, this list was prepared on the basis of experience of those employees in the public service who had

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . occasion to stay at various hotels throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether government employees are allowed to stay at hotels owned by members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's a rather unusual question but it cannot be ignored. I don't believe that as a matter of public policy that would be desirable, necessarily. Certainly, certainly if there is someone on this side of the House, on the government side of the House that owns a hotel, I shouldn't think that any member of the public service ought to feel under any sense of obligation or direction to stay there whatsoever, nor for that matter should it apply to the other side of the House. I can tell my honourable friends as a matter of general policy, that the determination of the policy as to what hotels would be stayed in was something that was arrived at after a canvass by members of the staff of the public service from which recommendations were received in which we took a decision. Further to that there was a policy, for example, with respect to transportation that *ceteris paribus*, let the cheaper mode of transportation be used, and that economy class be used rather than first class, etc. etc.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, since the First Minister has undertaken to answer the question or broaden the answer to the question, I'll direct this to him. Will the First Minister assure this House that every hotel in Manitoba . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker . . . (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. SCHREYER: My colleague the Chairman of Management Committee of Cabinet heard the question. I believe he's taken a note and will reply.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for Lakeside. (Stands) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, Resolved that the Report of the Special Committee of the Legislature appointed to consider the Rules, Orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and allied subjects received by this House on Monday, February 26, 1973, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House for consideration and thence be forwarded to the House for concurrence.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the previous resolution.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is the Committee ready to consider the resolution before the House? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before I get started I hope the House Leader stays in the House for just one second. I just wish to apologize to him for making an error last night and I stand to be corrected, he was correct, and I just wanted to let him know that as far as Rule 88 subsection (4) that I stand to be corrected and I apologize for giving criticism where it was not due. However. . .

MR. GREEN: I thank the honourable member for the gracious way in which he has put that. I want to indicate that before I made the point I implored the honourable member to let me ask him a question so that I could tell him what was occurring rather than debating the point, but I thank him for the apology. I regret that it happened.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. FROESE: In connection with the revision of that same rule and to deleting the words "or debate" which will now provide for debating on Third Reading of bills. This particular rule as it was up until now, actually was in conflict with Rule 36 (1) (e) and therefore it is only proper that we eliminate these two words from the Rule 88. However, I wish to move on to one or two other items and I want to raise the matter of the immunity of members in this House when speaking or addressing the Speaker or the Chair.

According to the report that is before us, approval will be given for direct broadcast of statements made in this House, and how will people be able to understand or to ascertain which statements were made inside the House, which statements were outside the House, when they are broadcast? Are there going to be precautionary measures taken in this regard, because members have immunity when speaking in this House but not so outside this House, and I wondered whether the committee has taken this into consideration and what they have in the way to answer. Is there going to be an extension of the immunity of members when speaking, and when the speeches are taken and broadcast over radio or telecast over TV, when taken directly from the House?

Then, too, what about the editing of tapes? Is the Speaker still going to be charged with this responsibility? Will the people in the TV and radio media be allowed to edit tapes taken from recordings of this House? What about if only a partial or part of a statement is aired putting it completely out of context with what a member originally said or intended to say?

These are all possibilities and not only possibilities, these are very likely to happen, and I would certainly like to hear from some member of the committee on this very matter because it's very important, in my opinion. I for one feel that it is important and I should have some answers to this.

There is another matter that I wish to raise and this is the matter of discrimination against a private member. We have the discrimination against a private member of this House within our rules as we have them today. It seems to me that we are worshipping a party system rather than to recognize our democratic system. I believe in democracy and I feel that all members should have equal treatment in this House. Just yesterday a ministerial statement was made by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and I got up - I was not recognized by the Chair because he pre-judged that I was going to speak without asking leave of absence, or he didn't even allow me to ask for leave of absence. The Minister of Public Works got up and when he saw that I had already risen he sat down, but the Speaker just said that I was not entitled to speak and that was it, and he recognized the Minister of Public Works. What is this? Is this treating equal here? Surely enough the Speaker should be courteous enough when a member gets up that he be recognized. Well I don't care whether this reflects on the Speaker at this particular time because he was prejudging the case, and I think when we discuss the rules these things have to be brought in, they have to be brought up for discussion, otherwise how will you air them?

Further to that, when we take a look at Rule 19 (4) subsection (4), it does not refer to recognized parties in this House when we deal with this particular matter. It says, "A spokesman for each of the parties in opposition to the government". There's nothing mentioned here of recognized parties and I am not considering myself an Independent, I am a member of a recognized, of a party in Manitoba, a political party in this province as we have in other provinces. And, Mr. Chairman, I feel very slighted when I hear ministers of the Crown getting up, making statements, and then being unable to rise and raise a point. The particular statement that the Minister made was a good one and I wanted to congratulate him on it, because the tourist trade that we get from the United States, I bet the largest amount of it comes right through my constituency. That's where we have the two ports of entry and one of the major ports of entry through which most of the tourists come into Manitoba, and I thought I really had something to contribute at that time, but I wasn't even recognized by the Speaker so that I could ask for leave to make a contribution at the time.

Certainly I feel that we should not allow the party system to go that far so that members of this House - that they should not have the right to get up and to speak and to make their wishes known. Certainly they represent constituents of this province like any other member does and we should have the right to voice and make our voices known representing the people

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . that we have in our constituencies.

A MEMBER: All of us, Jake, all of us, not just one or two.

MR. FROESE: And I'm sure that I'm not only the only one in this House here that thinks this way because I'm sure the Liberal Party when they were in this House last year, with not a sufficient number of members in this House to be recognized a Party, they ran into the same problems time and again. And I am sure that they will support this view that something has to be done and that all parties all members of this House should have a right to comment on such statements and have equal privileges.

There's another matter that I wish to raise. This has to do with the bills that are being presented and I feel that all bills should be debatable in Committee of the Whole right here in this Chamber. The way it is now, the way the rules are now this is not possible. The only way you can do it is to propose amendments and that way the bill will come back into the House for consideration. And sometimes you would want to debate a bill after it's gone through one of the Standing Committees, changes have been made, or even if they haven't been made, you want to make a point and you're not able to do so because the bill will not be brought back in here to the Committee of the Whole so that members can do that. I feel this rule should definitely be changed so that we would all have an opportunity to debate bills, points, not only members of a particular standing committee.

I had one other point to raise but I don't think I'll do it at this particular time. I think I'll wait with that one until some time later. In the meantime, yesterday I raised a point that we should have two standing committees in addition to the present ones that are already in the books, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that Rule 70 sub clause 1 be amended by adding and inserting after the words "economic development" in line 16 two new lines, "education, health and social development."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, we've heard the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, before we deal with any substantive debate I believe that there may be a point of order on the amendment itself.

MR. JORGENSEN: Somebody wants to raise a point of order on the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just going to question, Mr. Chairman, whether the motion is properly in order, whether or not the subject matter that the Honourable Member for Rhineland wishes to raise should not be referred to the Rules Committee for its consideration, because we have propositions before us emanating from the Rules Committee for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole, and that the only reason that they are here is because the House in its wisdom at the preceding session of this House constituted a Committee on the Rules of the House to consider amendments to those rules and, as a result of that, the Rules Committee has now made its report to the House and then by formal motion those rules were referred to the Committee of the Whole for adoption or rejection of those propositions that emanated from the Rules Committee itself.

I can appreciate the points raised by my honourable friend from Rhineland but procedurally I think that it has been established in this House that where the committee report is before us for consideration in the rules, the Committee of the Whole, that any further expansion- and I mark that, Mr. Chairman - any further expansion must be referred back to the committee whose report we are receiving, and of course because we're in a separate session and also because the rule applies that when the special committee makes its report technically or effectively it is without authority, and we would have to reconstitute the committee of the rules to consider the point raised by my honourable friend. I think that it must be done that way.

There is another methodology that could be used rather than the Committee of the Whole House if my honourable friend desires so, and that would be by a substantive motion appearing on the Order Paper for the setting up of a different committee or different committees or adding to them, that being debated - and I would imagine that even that normally would be referred back to the committee on rules for its consideration and thence come back to where we are at this time. I don't know if my honourable friend from Morris would agree the general position that I am suggesting is the proper one, but I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the manner in which we have dealt with similar subject matters in the past.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland on the same point of order?

MR. FROESE: Yes, on the same point of order. Early in this session I brought in an amendment and at that time I was informed by the House Leader that I should bring in an amendment at the time that this report was going to be brought in and further to that, Mr. Chairman, on previous occasions when reports of this type were submitted, amendments were made. I remember Rule 68 when that was brought in, a new rule, there were quite a number of changes made and certainly this is quite in order to bring in an amendment of this type at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on the same point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I would acknowledge that I may have said something like what the honourable member has referred to when he introduced his previous motion. I said that there would be opportunities for him to make this kind of change to the rules and I may have used the report of the Rules Committee. If I did, Mr. Chairman, then I was probably wrong. It doesn't preclude the honourable member from making a motion in an appropriate way. It is also true that we have amended the report and, Mr. Chairman, I myself had certain proposals with regard to amendments to the report but those are amendments to matters which are in the report themselves and related to those matters, not the introduction of new committees. So I would think that the fact that I may have said this doesn't preclude, Mr. Chairman, your ruling on the point that has been made and I think quite properly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on the same point of order?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order I rise to support the Member for Rhineland in his contention. He is not a member of the Committee so therefore he can't take an action in committee. He can speak on a debatable motion and make an amendment to the motion. In our rule book, Rule 36, debatable motions are anything standing on the Orders of the Day, and we have the Committee of the Whole House, or the Committee report is now before us, it's on the Orders of the Day. And also the concurrence and report of a standing or special committee. Now surely a member of this House must be able to make an amendment to a motion that is before the House properly, so I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I take into account what the Minister of Labour has told us that if a motion is debatable then the motion is also amendable. This is common practice in this House, there is nothing new about that at all, and to say that the Member for Rhineland's only recourse is to have the subject matter sent back to a committee which he is not on, is really not democratic nor is it, I think, covered in our rule. And I believe our rules cover the fact that when a motion is debatable and we have it on two occasions that this motion is now being debated because it's on the Order Paper and because it's up for concurrence, that an amendment is in order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, my recollection of the rule - and I was not able to put my hands on it immediately - is that an amendment can be made to a report only dealing with those matters that are covered by the report itself. I don't see anywhere in the report where we have recommended any changes to Rule 70 and for that reason I regretfully must say that I think that the Member for Rhineland must find some other way of bringing in the amendment that he seeks, by a substantive motion for one. My friend from Portage asked what other way and I say by a substantive motion, and that can be done quite easily by a resolution of the House. He has never taken advantage of the Private Members' Hour. There's an opportunity to bring that kind of an amendment in and there are other opportunities. I don't want to belabour the matter, Sir, but I believe that if we're to keep within the terms of our rules, I don't think - and I've argued this position before so I feel that that I'm consistent in this position, I've argued it against my honourable friends opposite as a matter of fact - that amendments to motions or amendments to reports that are in the House can all be made in dealing with those matters that are contained within the report or within the particular bill that is brought before the House for amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thank the honourable members for their opinions on this. It is my opinion and my ruling will be that the motion is out of order, that all that we have before the Committee of the Whole House at this time are the recommendations that the Committee has

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd). . . . made to the House for adoption, and any amendments that would be pertinent to this resolution that is presently before the House are the only ones that would be in order. I must regretfully rule the motion out of order.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Chairman, then I challenge your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

A MEMBER: Does the member have support?

MR. FROESE: I don't have to have support in committee.

A MEMBER: He doesn't have to have support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, can you not call for a vote in committee first?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chairman's decision:"From the Chairsmn's decision no appeal should be made to the Speaker. In a case of an appeal to the House it is the duty of the Chairman to leave the Chair immediately and report in writing the point of order on which he has decided. The Speaker must then submit the matter to the determination of the House in language reported to him and put in the question that the decision of the Chairman shall be confirmed."

IN SESSION

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, while in the Committee of the Whole House the Honourable Member for Rhineland presented an amendment to the resolution presently before the House adding an amendment to Rule 70 (1) adding two new Standing Committees of the House, namely Education, and Health and Social Development. I subsequently ruled the motion out of order since it did not deal with the resolution before the Committee of the Whole House. The Honourable Member for Rhineland . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Shall the ruling of the Committee be concurred in?

. . . continued on next page

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: We have heard once again the perennial speech from the Member for Rhineland, in which he complains bitterly about his inability to communicate to his constituency in this Chamber. I had occasion, I had occasion during the last few months to go through Hansards in some detail to determine how many people spoke and on what subjects they spoke, and I think if one were to go through carefully the time that the Honourable Member for Rhineland speaks, about four times as much in this Chamber as any single member. I reject completely his claim that he is being muzzled in this place. He speaks on almost every subject that is raised in the House on every occasion; and for him to stand here and say that he is denied the right to speak is nothing short of a little bit far fetched.

Secondly, when the Rules Committee met, the first question that I -- on the three occasions that we met, the three or four occasions that we met this past year, the first question that I asked the Clerk of the House, has Mr. Froese been notified of this meeting so that he can be here, and on each occasion he said "yes". Now the fact that the member was not at the committee meetings to hear what went on certainly is not the fault of the committee, or the fault of the Clerk, or the fault of this House. He had that list; he said it's not his fault; of course, who else is it? He had that opportunity of attending those committee meetings and hearing what was going on, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, or Mr. Chairman, if he had attended those committee meetings, a lot of the straw men that he raised during the course of his remarks would not have been raised. He asked a number of questions concerning the report of the committee, and I want to deal with two or three of them. Then during the question period today he asked if Room 245 and Room 256 which is the TV and the press room had been wired for sound and if they'd been wired for sound at the expense of the government, and yet just like last night, just like last night, he failed to read the report in such a way that he could understand what was in it, and in this report it says that the committee had recommended that these rooms be wired for sound at the expense of the news media. And that's pretty clear in the report, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland on a point of order.

MR. FROESE: The Member for Morris raises the point that I asked a question. I have a perfect right to ask that question during the question period because these recommendations haven't been adopted by this House.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, you see here again . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . he says that the recommendations have not been adopted by the House, and if you will go to the Legislative journals of 1971 and read the reports of the committee that was submitted to the House at that time, on the 13th of April, and subsequently adopted by this House, he will note -- and for his benefit I will read the particular section to him -- the honourable member says I don't have to read it, that he can read it -- -- well, I wish he would understand it when he does read it, so that he wouldn't be wasting the time of the House raising issues that are very clear in the reports.

"The committee would be willing to make facilities available to all media.

"Secondly, the radio and TV media be requested to prepare recommendations or proposals or the requirements for the technical facilities which would be referred to a committee chaired by Mr. Speaker".

Those recommendations were to be dealt with by the Rules Committee, and that's exactly what happened. The news media appeared before the committee; they submitted recommendations; and the committee accepted their recommendations, and subsequently on order of Mr. Speaker, concurred by the Rules Committee, permission was given for the news media to install at their expense the facilities that they now have in the radio and the television rooms. -- (Interjection) -- You know, the honourable member is getting awful rambunctious lately. He used to at least have the courtesy to sit and listen to other people speak, as I had the courtesy to listen to him through about an hour of his speaking, raising as I said "straw men"; raising issues that were pretty clear in the reports, which he failed to understand because he didn't read them correctly, or he chose not to understand them. My honourable friend has raised the question of the immunity of members; that was dealt with in the report by the Attorney-General, and if he'd read that report he would get his answer to his question.

And he raised the question of -- of all things, wire tapping. It's going to be -- it would be quite a thing, Sir, if somebody were to come into this Chamber and wire-tap this place and

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) have the sound go outside. Now that would be a criminal offence. The fact that people are allowed to come into the Chamber and listen; the fact that the news media are broadcasting what is going out of this Chamber, it seems to him that it would be a great crime if somebody were to wire-tap this - - I wonder why anybody would want to wire-tap this place if the sound is going out anyway.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member raises this bogey man every time - every time there's a rule changed, but I have never seen him at one of the Rules Committee meetings, and he's been invited to attend them so that he can sit in and listen . . .

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . to what is going on.

MR. FROESE: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland on a point of order.

MR. FROESE: In previous years I have attended many of the meetings that were called. This last session I had previous commitments, I couldn't come; and now when I do come in I have to do that at my own expense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry, that's not a point of order.

MR. FROESE: . . . when I have attended them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris. - - (Interjection) - - Order, please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee were given the responsibility of considering a number of matters that had been referred to it during the course of the last session and they're raised by different members whenever a matter arose in this House in which there was some doubt as to what the ruling would be. I went through the Hansards, picked them out, and they were brought before the attention of the committee, and we dealt with them, and they are contained in this report.

My honourable friend has a perfect right to disagree with some aspects of this report, and I am certainly not going to deny him the right or suggest that he hasn't got the right to disagree with the report, but to disagree with sections of the report simply because of a misinterpretation of the report as he did last night, and as he did on a few other sections of that report, is stretching the imagination a little bit too far, and I wish my honourable friend would take the trouble to read the report and understand it carefully before he stands up in this House and criticizes those things which are not in the report itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Is it the will of the committee to proceed?

If you will go down about two-thirds of the way on your report of the committee: "Your committee recommends the following amendments to the rules of the House:

(a) That Rule 65 pertaining to the allocation of time for debate of departmental estimates be amended by deleting subsections 2, 3 and 4.

All those in favour of the . . .

The Honourable Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there's no mention here that the other sections will be renumbered. I think we should add that to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rule 65 . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that. What we have done when we have adopted the Rules Committee report is we have asked the Clerk of the House and his staff to bring back the new rules as they would read with the changes and then that has been accepted as the new rules - - I think that there has been a motion to that effect - - then and after the - - I would ask the Clerk to look at last year's procedure - - what we did is adopt the report; the Clerk went and wrote the new rules and brought them back, and then they were passed as new rules. But I certainly have no objection to the renumbering although it goes without saying. . .

MR. FROESE: I think that's only common sense

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the will of the House that the subsections following be renumbered?
MOTION carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b), that Rule 88(4), sub (4) be amended by deleting the words "or debate" in the last line, and renumber the subsections I imagine.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your committee recommends the following changes in practice and procedure: (a) that the resolution suspending certain rules of the House commonly referred

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) to as the speed-up resolution be rephrased to ensure that the report stage of any bill reported by a standing or special committee will not take place prior to one full calendar day following the receipt of the report. Is it the will of the House to adopt the motion? All those in . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland,

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, this is definitely an improvement over the previous situation. However, certainly this will not need the specifics of another rule which requires a 24-hour notice for amendments and so on. I don't know whether that is taken care of.

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

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get what my honourable friend was referring to. The new situation really is a suggestion that if and when the rules are amended during the course of the session, that the amending motion take into account that on a report back from committee, amendments are premitted when the report back from the committee comes to the House; that certainly the amending motion should see to it that there be at least one calendar day between committee's report and the report to the House, so that there would be sufficient time to make those amendments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, there is a provision and I think it's -- I'm not sure whether it's in Rule 88 which deals with the processing of bills where you have to, in order to bring a bill into Committee of the Whole for discussion that you have to give notice of amendments within certain hours, and I'm just wondering whether this will provide for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that this rule here -- to me it's very clear. When we go into speed-up that the rules of the House be suspended and each sitting be considered as a separate sitting; technically what we say there is that that is considered as a period of 24 hours for the purpose of the conduct of the House. What this recommendation is saying that when we're under speed-up insofar as the report stage of a bill that the speed-up of the suspension of the rules will not apply at the report stage in respect of a bill, that it shall be a calendar day and not a separate session day, which is technically 24 hours, and you can have 48 hours in one day under the suspension of the rules, under what we call speed-up. So this is an advancement I would suggest to my honourable friend, so that that 24 hour's notice in respect of reporting of bills from Standing Committees will be a calendar day not a report this morning under speed-up and handled this afternoon. That is really what this is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the rule I'm referring to is 88, subsection 5, which says not later than 24 hours prior to the consideration of the report stage. Written notice is given of any motion to amend, to be considered or restore any clause in a bill, notice shall be printed on a notice paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: But, Mr. Chairman, that's what I'm trying to inform my honourable friend as to the intent of this. We realize that Rule 88(5) makes provision for the 24-hours, but under the speed-up resolution it reads that the rules of the House be suspended, which includes 88(5), and what this recommendation from the committee . . . to say that notwithstanding the suspension of the rules it still must be a calendar day notice in respect of the reporting of a bill from committee. It's an improvement, it overcomes the point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommendation (a) passed. (b) That the Hansard personnel be instructed to pick up all remarks, interjections, etc., made during the course of the debate and record the same in Hansard whether or not the name of the person making the remark is known.

MOTION presented and carried.

(c) That the format of Hansard be changed and more use be made of separate headings, for example "Government Bills", "Questions", etc., to indicate the business under discussion. MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d) That concurrence resolution be read by the Speaker rather than by the Clerk as has been the practice in the past in order to eliminate confusion.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That completes the report of the study of the resolution. Committee rise. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature appointed to consider the rules and orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and allied subjects received by this House on Monday, February 26th, 1973, and has directed me to report the same without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if I had the leave of the House I would move that the report of the committee be concurred with. If there is a problem then I won't make such a motion.

MR. FROESE: I think that it should be delayed.

MR. SPEAKER: Is leave granted? (Agreed.) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. FROESE: I asked that it be delayed.

MR. GREEN: I understood that, Mr. Speaker. I just would like the Clerk to see to it that the motion is on the Order Paper for tomorrow, I suppose, and that in the meantime that the Clerk's office draft the new rules as has occurred in the past, and I assume that there being only two rules that are changed that that could be ready for tomorrow, and any motion that is necessary to incorporate those rules be also available by tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural 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 Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it was agreed that the lead-off department on consideration of Supply would be that of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, my colleague, the Minister.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

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

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In introducing these estimates, Mr. Chairman, I believe that some broad overview would be desirable to start with. Before giving that overview I think that I would like to introduce to the honourable members by way of merely identification, the present members of the staff of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and indicate that during the last period of twelve months there have been changes within that department, particularly at the deputy minister level. It was with regret that the Department of Mines and Natural Resources lost the services during the year of the former Deputy Minister, Mr. Winston Mair, with whom I developed an excellent working relationship, and who decided to leave the government services of the Province of Manitoba to go to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in Ottawa, where he is specializing in work relating to northern development. Mr. Mair when he was here had a strong bias concerning northern development and devoted many months of his time to the northern working group and I think found the drive to be solely confined to that type of work irresistible in terms of his future, and therefore moved to Ottawa where he had been a former civil servant.

The next deputy minister on the staff during that period was Mr. Bob Wallace, who is now the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs, and who served for only a short period. I want to express my satisfaction and my gratitude to these two excellent civil servants who I believe gave excellent service to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

The existing deputy minister, Mr. Chairman is a gentleman by the name of Jim Cawley. Mr. Cawley is a former Deputy Minister of Mines in the Province of Saskatchewan. He is regarded by the entire mining community of Canada as being one of the more accomplished people in his field. After leaving the Saskatchewan Government service he did individual work for various people and subsequently was hired by the Saskatchewan Mining Association to be their executive secretary. He was retained by the Manitoba Government on a consultant basis for approximately a year prior to being induced to come to the Province of Manitoba to be the Deputy Minister, and I believe that Manitoba receives an excellent civil servant in the person of Mr. Cawley. As I have indicated he has worked both for the public sector where he was very highly regarded, not only by the people for whom he worked directly but also by the other provinces who he came into contact with; he was also very highly regarded by the private sector and was hired by them, I repeat, as the Director of the Saskatchewan Mining Association. I think that during that period he also did private consulting work; and I want to introduce his name to the Members of the House since he is taking on these duties for the first time.

In addition to the Deputy Minister, Mr. Speaker, I want to single out for mention the excellent service that has been given by the various assistant deputy ministers, most of them being with the government service for many years, and some of them having recently been hired. The ones who have been members of the Civil Service for a considerable period of time are the Assistant Deputy Ministers, Mr. Gobert, Mr. Pout, Mr. Collinson, Mr. Webber, and Mr. Webster; the more recently hired Deputy Minister is Dr. George Bowen who is the Deputy Minister in charge of the Environmental Protection Branch.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that I should go beyond the deputy and the assistant deputies in mentioning the names of the staff and singling out their performance. In doing so, I don't wish it to be in any way construed as not giving recognition to the entire staff of the department who have performed in a manner which has been in every way satisfactory and who have given loyal, dedicated and, I think, service beyond merely putting in time, far beyond that, to the people of Manitoba not only during the last year but in the case of some of them for many years in the past.

Now with regard to the Departmental Estimates themselves, Mr. Speaker, may I say that broadly the Estimates do the following things: they maintain with inflation, the ongoing program of the department as it relates to resource management, as it relates to water resources, as it relates to administration, as it relates to the water management resource development, and all of the other areas; that the only increases that could be found or substantially the only increases that could be found within those items of the departmental program would be the normal salary increases and the normal increased cost by virtue of inflation. There have been no reduction in the tempo of the department with regard to those items.

The figures that are shown on the Estimate sheets show a slight reduction but they do not show this reduction because of any reduced activity. The reduction comes about for reasons that can be explained essentially in two areas:

1. That certain programs which were one-shot heavy expenses in the last year are not recurring, and therefore they are coming out. An example of that type of expense, Mr. Speaker, is the Saskatchewan Nelson basis board payment. We made a payment last year of \$800,000 that had accrued over several years. That payment terminated our responsibility to the board. It does not recur this year so it represents approximately a million dollar . . .

There are reductions in FRED funds, Mr. Speaker, where FRED programs have terminated amounting to roughly \$1 million. These programs having been completed, they do not recur and therefore one would have to show an appropriate reduction in the estimates.

Items of this kind, Mr. Speaker, and I would be prepared to detail them more closely if members wish, would result in reductions of \$3,900,000.00. They don't all constitute activities which have ceased but some of them are taken over by Manitoba itself and will be related in the capital expenditures of the department rather than in the current expenditures of the department. So there is that much in reduced expenditures which doesn't result in any reduced activity.

Now the increases, Mr. Speaker, in the activities of the Department can be picked out fairly readily as follows:

1. There is a very substantial increase in the Environmental Protection Branch. The

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) last year's figure is shown on the Estimates as two million one, this year's figure is roughly \$3 million. The big reason for those increases, Mr. Speaker, relates to the change in the structure of the Environmental Commission which last year became a quasi judicial body which considered matters coming to it from the department and putting the onus of environmental administration into the Department itself. What has occurred is there have been, and this was occurring under the old system even more, that there have been numerous backlog of cases due to lack of inspection capacity, lack of capacity to draw what proper regulations should be, lack of research capacity, and that deficiency will go someways towards being corrected with the expenditures which are put into this year's estimates.

I should warn honourable members that it is not going to make up for the problems in this area that probably the increase would -- double that increase would be necessary to really do the kind of job that is necessary but in line with budgetary constraints and necessities in all departments, the department had to be satisfied with moving halfway this year and probably will have to make a similar jump in the next year.

2. Another increase, Mr. Speaker, which is not reflected in the current expenditures, but which will be reflected in the departmental activities as a whole and which I should allude to, is the program which the department announced and which was referred to in the Throne Speech relating to the purchase by the public of recreational lands, and this is something that has been commented on by various members in the House.

I must confess to the members of the House that this program did result from considerable public attention being drawn to another area, or to a related area. I think it was early in the fall of this year that we received considerable notices, considerable letters, delegations from the Wildlife fraternity generally and hunters in particular, complaining about the fact that certain people in Manitoba were charging hunters for the purpose of getting access to their lands. This problem was compounded, Mr. Chairman, when it was complained that certain land owners had decided to make a commercial enterprise of this of their facilities by charging for access rights in one of two forms. One, by merely forming an organization and saying that anybody wishing access to their lands would be required to pay a fee for that; or secondly, involving themselves with groups of people or agents who told the public that they could provide access to their lands by being contacted, and I believe that Dialathon Organization was one that was under harsh criticism. We received numerous delegations from the people concerned, Mr. Speaker, and were unable to come to a satisfactory arrangement insofar as they were concerned with regard to formulating a government policy which would deal with this question in a manner which would be satisfactory to all concerned -- and in this case, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that I hold no brief for the commercial enterprises who through the giving permission or access rights through their lands at a fee are making a commercial enterprise out of it, that was not the problem at all.

However nobody could suggest a way, Mr. Speaker, of dealing with this problem without in some way infringing upon what are the normal rights of ownership in land to people in the Province of Manitoba. The government position was that everybody in the Province of Manitoba had equal rights with regard to access to their lands, that's whether one lived in the city or the country, whether one was an American or a Canadian, if he owned land he had a right to say who went on that land. He also had a right to say what the terms and conditions of entry to that land were to be. -- (Interjection) -- Well the Honourable Member for Thompson says, does that include home-brew making? I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that access to the land for the purpose of home-brew making, you know, it's kind of technical as to whether legally that is complicity with home-brew making. But there is nothing illegal about hunting and a person coming on -- if the honourable member who has a farm, who has some farmlands, wants it to hunt on his land would have a right to do so. He would also have a right to invite me to come on his land to hunt. He would also have a right to say to me that you can come on my land to hunt provided you are a nice boy. He could go further and say, "you could come on my land to hunt provided you pay me \$5.00," and that is where the difficulty has arisen; that every person has a right to say what access there will be to his property and what conditions that access will take. Nobody has the right to sell the wildlife of the Province of Manitoba. The wildlife of the province belongs to the public and nobody has a right to sell that wildlife.

A MEMBER: What about fishing?

MR. GREEN: The honourable member asks a question about fishing, and I hope I am

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) going to answer it correctly, but I believe that those farmers who have ponds on their property, and plant trouts in those ponds, have a right to say to somebody who wishes to come and fish there, "I will let you come on my property if you pay me a fee." I believe that that is their right. If they can do it with fish that they have planted in a trout farm, I assume they can do it with fish that would be in a natural stream, provided that they had ownership of that stream. They couldn't sell the fish but they could sell the access to their property.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the subject was complicated by the fact that there are people who have decided to make a commercial enterprise out of it and before one attacks the commercial enterprises, there are also people who gather together in very exclusive clubs, buy sections of property and say that only people who belong to our club at a fee of so many dollars will be permitted on this property to hunt. And there appeared, Mr. Speaker, to be no reasonable suggestion as to how one would deal with the property rights and deal with the access rights at the same time. There was a suggestion put forward by these people which involves a law which was passed both in Alberta and Saskatchewan which says, and I paraphrase: that nobody shall by barter or any other means directly or indirectly sell hunting rights. The difficulty with that, Mr. Speaker, is that it doesn't open up hunting rights on farm property in the Province of Manitoba and the Federation admitted to me that their concern is to not have more farmers post their land but have more farmers give them access. And if you tell the rural person in Manitoba, or if you tell the Member from Thompson, that he is required to let people on their property, then the chances that he posts that property are much greater than if you try to let him work this out with the people who are going to go on his property. And my conversations with the people in Saskatchewan, and I don't think I spoke to many in Alberta, is that this has resulted in more posting of land. It's true it may have eliminated some commercial enterprises but it has resulted in less hunting land being available, not more hunting land, because the rural person who is told that you cannot sell this says, "well if the government prohibits me from selling it I'm posting my land and no hunters will come on my property and that's all there is to it."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we feel that the main problem in this area is really the availability of recreational land and the Province of Manitoba has attacked this problem in the following ways:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba government since it's been in power with minor exceptions, our general policy is that we do not sell Crown land, that Crown land belonging to the public of Manitoba is retained by the public of Manitoba.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we do not permit people who are leasing Crown lands to restrict access to those lands to hunters provided they behave reasonably.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we have available and make no charges for access to Crown land, and the availability of Crown lands. Crown lands suitable for hunting as against private land suitable for hunting, is roughly 55 percent 45. The 55 percent of the land that is suitable for hunting is Crown lands, 45 is private lands. So we say to the hunter that on the Crown lands you are your own landlord, that you own it -- which to my mind is an excellent situation -- and therefore you are entitled as of right to go and hunt on that land. On Crown land which is leased the landlord cannot restrict you, provided you are behaving in a reasonable manner; on private land if you can make an arrangement with the owner of that land, whether it be a gratuitous arrangement, whether it be a financial arrangement, that is something which is left to the two private people involved whether it be a farmer, a commercial enterprise, or a private club which says that only people who belong to this club can hunt on this land.

Now those three things, Mr. Speaker, are the manner in which hunting land is made available to the citizens of Manitoba, and we agree that it is not sufficient, that it could lead to vast commercial hunting operations as land grew more and more scarce, and we have undertaken to see that this will not happen. We will see to it, Mr. Speaker, that it will not happen by now involving ourselves in a land recreational and purchasing program. What the province intends to do is put a million dollars a year -- at least that is the immediate figure -- into the seeking out the identification of good recreational land which would be available to the general population as is the other Crown land; and as a priority, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at sites where Crown land is available but it is so situated in proximity to private land as to

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) really be very much inaccessible to anybody except the private landholder, and where that situation exists we intend to see to it that corridors, or other means of access -- and I am not talking about road allowances, I am talking about availability of land adjacent to the public lands, adjacent to places to which the public has access, so that people of Manitoba will have at least available to them their existing Crown land. In addition, Mr. Speaker, sorry . . . I didn't hear the honourable member.

MR. ASPER: The question was, will this be done by purchase or by expropriation.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it will be done either by purchase or by expropriation, and in that regard I want the honourable member to know that there is a section in the Wildlife Act -- I don't know whether I've named it properly -- which has been there for some period of time -- I don't think that we enacted it -- which gives the public exactly this right to expropriate, to purchase, land belonging to the public for the purpose of making it available to the public. The honourable member knows full well that a letters patent issued by the Crown is in reality philosophically a long-term lease, that it does not establish a right of that person as against the Crown except the right to be compensated should the Crown take that land back. And what the Crown is saying, because that letters patent goes from the Crown to that person, it is really given to him as long as the Crown doesn't want it. The Crown has the perfect right, since the Legislature is supreme and has done so in many areas, to say that it will take that land back into the public domain and it will compensate the person for the rights which he has lost by virtue of releasing -- (Interjection) -- Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that the honourable member has posed a very good question, that the public hopes that that kind of right will be used in its benefit, and used judiciously; and in this case, Mr. Speaker, what we are suggesting is that we will see where it is in the public interest that certain lands be owned by the public rather than by a private individual. And, Mr. Speaker, that poses the question that if somebody is using acreage of land for no other purpose, or even for the major purpose of selling hunting rights on that land, it becomes then a question of what is the judicious thing to do. Is it the judicious thing to do to say, "Well if that is all you are using the land for and seeing that the wildlife belongs to the province we feel that we should own it rather than you owning it." And, Mr. Speaker, I have no qualms at all about posing that as a very judicious question because I think it is a proper consideration, and far more proper, Mr. Speaker, than saying that you an American are not permitted to charge somebody to go on your property, in which case we have to find out what his nationality is; or you as a non-resident Canadian, and then we have to find out where he lives six months of the year, or where he lives the other six months of the year, are not permitted to sell hunting rights; because that's the way it was first posed that there were a group of Americans who had bought up Manitoba lands, and I think that the figures that were given were 60,000 acres, and that Manitobans were not being permitted to hunt on these properties. We think it is a problem, we think that the way of handling that problem is making land available to the people by making them the owners of the land and then it will be available in the same way as the Crown lands are available. There are certain problems. . .

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the Minister a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Could he indicate whether they've arrived at a policy in regard to foreigners, whether they are Americans or others?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the government . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Pursuant to our Rule 65 the 30 minutes allotted to any member, 65, subsection 8 or 7 pardon me, has expired. Is it the will of the House to grant the Minister leave to continue. (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the honourable members. I'll just continue with these items and then I'll -- this particular item and wait for the introduction of other things as time goes on.

But the question was asked, does the government at the present time have a policy with regard to ownership of land in Manitoba? At the present time anybody can own land in the Province of Manitoba, at the present time. There are various jurisdictions that have enacted or are thinking of enacting non-resident disqualifications, or other type of disqualifications. The Government of Saskatchewan I think last year posed the possibility and put a bill before the Legislature -- I don't think it ever was enacted. I think subsequently it went to committee and

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) then for public hearings of some kind - - suggesting that nobody other than a resident of Saskatchewan be permitted to own land in the Province of Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, I hope I don't get myself into subsequent trouble by saying that I think that that is a very very unwise type of legislation. I think that to exclude other persons from owning land in the Province of Saskatchewan, to exclude a Manitoban from owning land in Saskatchewan is the ultimate in economic nationalism. You may as well then exclude the people who don't live in the north from owning land in northern Manitoba, excluding people who don't live in the south from owning land in southern Manitoba - - (Interjection) - - Pardon me?

A MEMBER: What about non-Canadians.

MR. GREEN: Yes. Now the next proposition that is posed is, well a person should have to be a Canadian to own land in Canada, in other words, that the Saskatchewan rule would be satisfactory if it said non-Canadians rather than non-Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that I'm going to get myself into difficulty on this question because there will be people who say that that is eminently reasonable. I can say that my own personal bias has been that you should not have laws which deal with nationality in that way. First of all because they do that exactly, a person could live in Canada for many years and not be a Canadian. There are many people who own land in Canada who are not Canadian. So then they'll say non-resident Canadians, and then you have to figure out where he resides, and then you have to start tracing who really owns the land. I have some friends in Los Angeles; the Member for Wolseley the Leader of the Liberal Party has friends in Los Angeles; they may own land; because it is a law that they can not own land here they will have to put the land in the name of the Leader of the Liberal Party's sister or daughter or wife or husband.

A MEMBER: He wouldn't do that.

MR. GREEN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, he would do that - - and I'll tell the Honourable Member for Thompson something, he would do it too - - because I have seen it done, Mr. Speaker, and this type of thing is really in my view a very difficult question, but I will not take a firm position on it; I indicate a personal bias against that type of economic, that definition, but I can tell honourable members that there appears to be a wave of opinion to the other way, and there may have to be a national land policy. I'm not saying that there wouldn't be. The Honourable member has another question.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I'm finding the speech very instructive and that's why I rise again. Would the Minister take the time to explain why then his government has brought in legislation restricting non-resident ownership of certain shares in certain kinds of companies, financial institutions, and that sort of thing?

MR. GREEN: The honourable member is referring to legislation that had to do with trust companies that was brought in last year. Is that correct? I recall the legislation. I can tell the honourable member that I do not remember a great deal about it, perhaps that's a terrible admission for a person who was sitting in the House when it was passed. I was not involved in it. I have indicated to the honourable member in making my remarks that although I have this personal bias in that direction that there appears to be a wave in the other direction and that sometimes it is possible for an honourable member to go along with something that he doesn't necessarily agree with 100 percent. I did that for my honourable friend's benefit with regard to lotteries and indicated it in the House. So I do not take a firm position on it; I merely say that I think it's difficult and my own personal bias is to try and get by without it.

In my mind the difference has never been - - the distinction has never been as to whether it's going to be Canadian or American, Canadian or Manitoban or Saskatchewan. In my mind the difference has been always as to whether it's going to be public or private. And if it is not public then I have never cared who the private person is because I don't regard a private Canadian as being something greater than a private American. I do regard the public of Manitoba as being more important than a private Canadian or a private American; but it has never been a great concern of mine, perhaps that's why I was never . . .

A MEMBER: . . . a Manitoban have no more right than an American, and I'm not a greater . . .

A MEMBER: Can Khrushchev?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would say that if the people of Manitoba permit property to be purchased in Manitoba, that that should not be restricted to Manitoba, that I would think

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) that that would be a very bad rule, and I don't think that I am going to amplify it further at this point. I have indicated that in my opinion the difference has been whether it has been held publicly or held privately, not whether it's been held by Monsieur Allard or Monsieur somebody else living in the Province of Quebec; that that has not been a terrible consideration in my mind with regard to land ownership, or ownership of a share of a company.

MR. ALLARD: Would the Minister accept a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Then the Minister is saying that he would disagree with the policy that they established in Mexico where they insist on a percentage of Mexican ownership in any enterprise?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Mexican government insisted that the public of Mexico own a -- if he is then saying that there be a percentage number of Canadians who are owners of the International Nickel Company of Canada, if he is saying that, then I tell him that there appears to be a wave in that direction and that I do not take a strong position on it; but I do not believe that it does for those people who pursue it the good that they say, because International Nickel will very soon -- as a matter of fact I believe that Johnny McCready has already announced that we now own over 50 percent of the shares are -- Canadians now own over 50 percent of the shares of International Nickel. Who are those Canadians? They're Canadian individuals and Canadian companies. Those Canadian individuals may be trustees for American barons who live in Texas. And there is no change, there is no change, so if my honourable friend wants to know what you do by laws, I am telling him that it is a very difficult proposition.

Now, I've over-stepped my time; I indicated that I would answer on this particular question. I'll try and conclude my remarks so other members can get in on the Estimates. What I've indicated that with regard to the Recreational Lands Program is that the Province of Manitoba is going to pursue a ownership program; that the public now has perfect access to the lands that they own; they have perfect access to the lands that they own and that they lease to other people, that their problem lies with access to private property; that we will look towards increasing the public domain in the area of recreational lands, particularly where public property is inaccessible because of its proximity to private property; or -- and I pose this as one that we would look at carefully -- where private owners are using land in such a way as to sell hunting rights exclusively, using it for the purpose of commercial enterprise, and where that occurs we would look judiciously upon whether that land should not be taken into the public domain. Now I haven't introduced the entire Estimates, but I know my honourable friends -- there will be other occasions on which I get to my feet, in the meantime I'll stop at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak on the Estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Management, and by way of introduction would also like to pass comment on the Minister's department and the capabilities of the people in the department, some of whom I've known over the years.

I think particular mention should be made of the Minister's former Deputy Minister, Mr. Mair, who was a very unusual man and we've been very fortunate in having him the last few years and now it's the Federal Government's good fortune to have him in their service as well.

One of the particular characteristics of Mr. Mair that was always such great importance I think in which were -- his strongest characteristic was how he could have survived in the civil service for as many years as he did and still retain the degree of imagination and ingenuity that he did up to the time of his present age, and he is nearly at retirement age; and it's one of the very rare characteristics of the man that he was able to have a very wide-ranging imagination, and a very extremely and capable manager to boot, and those characteristics are difficult to find regardless of where you find the person, in the civil service or in any other structure where a person spends a long time portion of his career.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a number of topics that are of great importance in this department. The very important one of the planning for our mineral resources of course has been brought forward by the recent report, better known as the Kierans Report and which will come under, I am sure, considerable debate in these Estimates. However some of my

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) colleagues will be referring directly to this and I don't wish to deal at length on this particular topic at this time, although I would point out that I think that it is perhaps the most important issue in the department that should be debated by the Legislature at this particular session. I want instead to refer almost exclusively to the departmental responsibilities associated with the Hydro development project.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking earlier on this particular topic I wasn't aware at that time that the government was going to take quite the position it has on this particular issue, particularly in the justification of action that the government has put forward for the development of Hydro. It's very difficult to separate the responsibilities of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and those of the First Minister on this particular topic, so with your patience I expect that I'll lap over from one to the other because it's impossible to do otherwise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I - perhaps we'd better have some points of order on this subject so that there be some understanding. I believe that the proper break then is that the Hydro economics of the question are the proper responsibility of the Minister to whom Hydro reports. The effects as they affect the environment and possibly the question as to whether the departments or the government, through my department, have given sufficient consideration to these effects are probably the authority of my ministry, but I do not think we should have a debate on the Hydro economics of the issue in this department. I think we had the same trouble two years ago and I make the point now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. I think the honourable member under the department - - (Interjection) - - I think that we have to stick relevant to the resolution that is before us, and that is Resolution 82(a) (1) which is what we are discussing at the present time which is the Minister's compensation and salaries.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, if I can be helpful - - we are discussing the Minister's salary, his general responsibility in the department, the major responsibility that he has as the Minister being responsible for the issuing and the regulation of our major bodies of water, which certainly includes Southern Indian Lake and Lake Winnipeg; the further responsibility of the Water Commission and so forth, and its actions. Then I think also the precedence has been well established in this Chamber on this particular subject matter that if the Opposition so chooses to devote its time, you know, in discussing this very important development issue, there's ample precedence for that having taken place on previous occasions. My inclination would be, Mr. Chairman, to suggest to you that the issue of Hydro development and the responsibility of this department in that development is such that it would give the very widest of latitudes to any member wishing to discuss that.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I am really not trying to hinder that. I am suggesting, and I suggest it as a guideline, whether the department has given sufficient consideration to the effects of the Hydro program in terms of what is occurring is very broad and perhaps we should wait until the arguments arise before we get into them. What I said is that the sheer Hydro economics of the program as to how many kilowatts are produced and the value of the kilowatts is something which doesn't fall within this department, and I think that that is the only caveat that I put. Perhaps we should proceed and wait till I feel that there's a definite over-step.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I assure the Minister that if I do get into the area of economics to a degree which he doesn't appreciate, it's probably partially because I've always found that he has in the House exercised a degree of intellectual honesty on most matters, that sometimes it's better than others exhibit in the House . . .

A MEMBER: Flattery will get you nowhere.

MR. CRAIK: . . . that I've always found that when he does, when he does preach what seems to be acceptable limits of intellectual honesty it's by omission and not by commission. And, Mr. Chairman, that cannot be said of all people in this House; and if I do get into it it's that I sometimes feel I can get answers from the Minister if I can get him cornered adequately so that he can't dodge them. So if I get into that area in attempt to get answers that I may feel I can't get from others, and I include the First Minister in that category.

Mr. Chairman, it is going to be difficult in some areas to avoid associating the two, because for instance here in this document here for instance, it talks about \$50 million for the

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) control of Lake Winnipeg, and then subtracts an amount from that which is a contingency of an estimated resource value increase rather than a resource loss. So you see it's going to be difficult to separate the two.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, let me speak to the issue that I think has to be clarified here. The point at issue at this point with regards to the matters that come under the Minister's jurisdiction are those associated with the environment. Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all point out that the government has some explaining to do with regards to the efforts it has made at environmental protection in all of the matter of the Lake Winnipeg, and primarily with regards to South Indian Lake. And by saying that, Mr. Chairman, I do not want the interpretation to be put on my remarks that were put on from some remarks at the university in which it was suggested that I was advocating that this project on the Churchill River be halted. That is not the case, Mr. Chairman, I'm not advocating that the Churchill River project be halted. The point that I attempted to make, and I attempt to make again, is that we have called for environmental hearings, and other hearings over the last couple of years, particularly with respect to Lake Winnipeg, but not only with respect to Lake Winnipeg, so that what has been very evident, logical, fairly well documented in cases, cases on both sides of the question which are being aired publicly but are never being brought to scrutiny; and that is purely the case at issue and I see no political reason and no logical reason why the government does not open itself up for the sake of its own well being as well as for the public interest, open up a form of hearing so that these opinions can be brought forward under as far as possible cross examination. Now if you're going to have a full blown hearing, a legal hearing, is certainly implies, that a hearing has to have the power to make - recommend certain courses of action after judgment is made.

The other type of hearing which I referred to, and refer to again, were the types of hearings that we asked for last year in this House which was a hearing by the Public Utilities Committee, and that, Sir, is a hearing that we're asking for now. The contracts have been let on Lake Winnipeg; the contracts have not been let on South Indian Lake, with the possible exception of some clearing contracts. What we're asking for, Mr. Chairman, is the right of the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee to call these people before the committee so that even we as ordinary MLAs who have now been exposed to this project for so long can at least ask what we think are at this point valid questions on the topic.

Mr. Chairman, we're all at one time and another put into the position of making decisions that make us try to appear as experts - - and this is where the misconception and the misinformation gets out to the public - - because none of us are. But certainly as members of the Legislature, having been exposed to this topic for so many years as we have been, we certainly all have the ability to ask the right question of the people if they're brought forward. We know for instance we can certainly ask the question and I do not intend to make this a political issue any more than is necessary - - I'll write the questions out.

We know for instance, that there certainly is a cloud hanging over the firing or the non-renewal of the contract of the people at the university. I know for a fact that Dr. Newbury who was involved, is one of the very few people who has expertise in the business of riverbank scour. I know that there will be great - probably a lot of difficulty finding another person in that field of technology, at least in the Province of Manitoba. I think that he has been outspoken; I think others have been outspoken; but I'd like the opportunity, and I think many others would like the opportunity to force him to defend the position that he has taken in public, and I think that goes without saying for all of those who have written the letters to the editor and the very long articles, and have been quoted by the media, as saying for instance that you could abolish the Churchill River and not affect the cost of the total project by more than ten percent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you have a statement like that come out from a person whose credentials are good, but it is a flat bald statement such as that - - what is the public to do but to accept it as a matter of fact. They don't question his homework that he's done, his research that's gone into it, so it becomes a statement of fact that the public possibly begins to believe. But can you - what does ten percent of the total cost of the project mean? It may be in terms of capital cost but it certainly doesn't mean in terms of the operating costs that are differences that will be incurred by abolishing the Churchill River diversion - - and I don't know what the difference is but I'd like to ask what they are. I can phone the man up and ask him and probably end up getting it, but he has said it publicly. Now I'd like to ask him in a hearing what he means by a statement that the abolition of the Churchill River from the Nelson River changed

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) your cost by ten percent. I don't think that really, that anybody who has sat through Public Utilities Meetings over the last two years, can believe that, and I don't think it matters which side of the House we are on; I don't think it can be believed.

Now it's all tied in again with the - it's an environmental issue but the environmentalists are into the economics, so how do you divorce the two? But right now, the public is very - - well everybody knows they are extremely confused on the matter and don't have any idea about what's going on, the technicalities of the issue; the Leader of the Liberal Party has realized it as a, among other things I think, has the potential of being a good political issue and maybe he feels strongly about the economics involved as well, although he's kept himself pretty well dedicated to the environmental issue. Others of us have been more concerned about the economics. I think that the public generally has assumed 1. There's environmental damage; and 2. That there's been an over-expenditure of money. We maintain there's been an over-expenditure of money. We're concerned about the environmental matters but we've taken the position that the diversion is a fact of life that there are going to be environmental costs, and we don't know of any other energy producing source that does not create environmental costs.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we have is a situation here where we are asking that we have hearings, and the priority in this is an ability by the Public Utilities Committee to have those hearings themselves, and I'm sure that we're all prepared to put into the hearings the effort which will get out the answers as validly as possible to the public. I don't envy the people that want to submit themselves to come before those hearings because I'm sure that there will be a serious cross-examination from all sides of the question represented in this house.

So that's the least, and at this point it's certainly the most practical. But again I repeat that there is not enough evidence at this time that the whole project should be halted, and I admit in saying that that as a Member of the Opposition, and I say this for all of us on this side, I don't think that we have the access to the information that government has and perhaps government has information which we can gather from that type of a hearing as well.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, with regards to the Minister's Department that I seriously question at this point whether environmental management should be a part of his department. I think that the department has grown, it's very large; it has a budget of \$25 million now. I think that the Minister, and particularly the redirection of the department has taken a direction which is more interested in economic development than it is in environmental management. To a certain extent they are compatible, but to a much greater extent they are in conflict. And I suggest that it's important that the Department - consideration be given to splitting it so that the environmental management portion falls more into the biological field and less into the inorganic field as it - - which appears to be the direction it's taking. I don't think there's any question that the Minister, and particularly the new Deputy Minister, are preoccupied with the mining side of the activities in the department. This is in no way a criticism of the capabilities of these two people. I think that that is where their interests lie, and I think that the best long-term interests of the province would be served if the department were split with the environmental aspects, biological aspects, being given their own headway and the people in this department would as well feel that they could direct themselves with more esprit de corps if you like, towards the dedication which they have trained themselves for.

A MEMBER: Are you suggesting another ministry?

MR. CRAIK: The Member asks, Mr. Chairman, if I'm suggesting another ministry. I'm not suggesting it any more than I am combining it with another ministry. I suggest that the Mines and Resources aspect has become sufficiently large, and in sufficient conflict with the new emphasis being put on environmental matters that it should either be created into a new ministry or a reshuffle of other ministries to take it in.

Now as you know the Water Resources Branch has moved around from department to department for years and has ended up in Environmental Management and this, of course, makes it an even much larger department than it was when it was when Water Resources was in Highways.

Mr. Chairman, let me now refer to Lake Winnipeg specifically. The issue here, as far as we are concerned, is primarily the economic issue. We were led to believe that there was a question of environmental costs or benefits on Lake Winnipeg. The former chairman of the Manitoba Hydro indicated to the Public Utilities Committee that there would be \$2 million per

MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) year in benefits resulting from the project. The project at that time was indicated to be a cost, a total of 50 -- to cost -- the controls for the Lake were to cost \$50 million. Mr. Chairman, it was generally accepted that this was the costs for the project with some additional costs for power aspects of it. The total of these, Mr. Chairman, and I refer you to the Jenpeg information that was filed in August, 1971, showed a cost figure which would put it in the vicinity of totally of \$100 million. I would refer also, Mr. Chairman, to a correspondence which was written by Mr. D. L. Campbell June 28, 1971, and I can refer you to much other documentation with regard to Lake Winnipeg in which he said, "to waste the \$50 million" and he puts in quotation marks "and I predict it will greatly exceed that estimate on this scheme" -- "is bad enough but to have such a sterile investment costing us huge amounts of money every year, instead of a viable and remunerative development that would generate profits as well as energy and thereby make it possible to keep our power costs the lowest in Canada, is tragic".

Well, Mr. Chairman, we had cost estimates after that of \$56.5 million; and then we had the Attorney-General stand up in the House last year and say that they had had a great breakthrough, technical breakthrough at the north end of the lake that showed up a lot of clay and no rock and we, subsequent to that, had a reaffirmation of that from the then chairman of Hydro, who indicated that yes, in fact, the contracts had come in on that particular aspect at a cost lower than what was expected. So we had great hopes, Mr. Chairman, that the \$56.5 million that the government had indicated we were in for, might be realistic . . .

A MEMBER: Even reduced.

MR. CRAIK: Even reduced, Mr. Chairman, and then we find that the costs have gone totally to \$177 million . . .

A MEMBER: Ungabelievagable!

MR. CRAIK: \$177 million and, Mr. Chairman, if you go into the documentation further there's a cost system study done by this government -- (Interjection) -- following the statements taken from Mr. Cass-Beggs report in 1969 in which he recommended the Lake Winnipeg control -- a study was done for Manitoba Hydro by this government, published in early 1970, which said that out of all the possibilities that existed, in all the sequence studies, Lake Winnipeg regulation, despite everything that's been said by the First Minister, who tries to imply every time he stands up, that in fact Lake Winnipeg regulation was advocated by the former government -- Mr. Chairman, it was looked at by the former government -- despite all that was said by the studies done by this government, which said that Lake Winnipeg regulation was not in the picture, either from a technical, and certainly not from an economic point of view, because the studies done by this government said that it might be feasible about 1990, providing the cost did not exceed \$50 million. Mr. Chairman, in spite of that, all that evidence, the government without a complete evaluation of the resources -- the resource studies were not begun until 1971 -- despite all that the government went ahead, led the House, whether deliberately or otherwise, to believe that this was a project which would be less than \$100 million, went ahead with it and within a matter of months, in November 1972 announced that the total cost had now risen to \$177 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has got a point that he feels is very strong and I appreciate that he wants to put it, but I even without stopping him from talking, within my estimates I hope that he doesn't expect me to be dealing with the costs of a project which is being built solely by Manitoba Hydro which is an agency which is not responsible to me. Now I really feel that there is no way of stopping him in what, I repeat, he thinks is a good point. I only want him to know that I'm not going to be able to deal with matters which are not in my department.

A MEMBER: Let him go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. GREEN: Sir, rather than debate the points of order I prefer him to continue but I cannot answer him . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, when the Minister does avoid discussing it, I'll now know that it is not intellectual dishonesty by omission.

MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, now I do rise on a point of order. I thought that I had put the point of order in such a way that there could be no question at all that it would not be discussed, but is the member honestly saying that it was in - that it is within the purview of my estimates to discuss moneys being expended by Manitoba Hydro, estimates that they met in a project that they are constructing.

That is the only thing that I said that I wouldn't answer and I really believe that to term that kind of answer as intellectual dishonesty is unfair to the position which I previously put which was to say, you're in full flight, go ahead, but I am not going to be the Minister to answer, it will be the Hydro minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken. The estimates dealing with the expenditures of Lake Winnipeg Regulation do not appear in the Estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, the aspect that is important with regard to the Minister's direct responsibility then are the controls on Lake Winnipeg with regard to water levels. We have had already in this session some debate as to whether or not the controls as indicated that they would be a year ago, and better, are in fact valid in the claims made by the government. At that time they indicated to the populace in their various meetings that they held that the controls were 711 to 715. I have asked the Minister during this session as to whether or not he's prepared to revise the statements made at that time because there is every evidence from the report that has come out from the Manitoba Water Commission, the late Mr. Cass Booy of the Water Commission . . .

A MEMBER: He's not dead yet . . .

MR. CRAIK: . . . late of the Water Commission, Mr. Chairman, that in fact the controls on Lake Winnipeg are going to be such on basis of all the evidence that they have, that the levels for Lake Winnipeg will be above 715 feet more frequently under controlled conditions than they would be under natural conditions, from about the end of July on through the fall and through the winter period. Mr. Chairman, the Minister has his opportunity to answer this.

A MEMBER: I will.

MR. CRAIK: The people that are concerned on Lake Winnipeg are people that are concerned in the late summer and in the fall from the high water action on Lake Winnipeg.

Well, Mr. Speaker, - - (interjection) - - The Minister says it's not true. That depends on who you're talking about that goes to Lake Winnipeg. If you're talking about the property owners on Lake Winnipeg, they are concerned about periods that are different from those that go in July for their holidays only.

A MEMBER: That is correct.

MR. CRAIK: So, Mr. Chairman, let us clarify the matter: those that have a vested interest in the Lake Winnipeg area have a very valid reason because the Water Commission Report states that if interpreted correctly, the levels will on average be higher.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The time being 5:30 I am going to leave the Chair. The Honourable Member has three minutes when we resume this evening at 8:00 o'clock. I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 this evening.