

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 p.m., Wednesday, March 17, 1976

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 20 students of Red River Community College, the Elmwood Extension, who are under the direction of Mr. Ranville. This School is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, the Minister of Public Works.

We also have 70 students, Grade 11 standing of the Churchill High School under the direction of Mr. Sabesky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Osborne, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate and Internal Services.

And we have 60 students, Grade 5 standing of the Prendergast School under the direction of Ms. Agnes Zizzy. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you here this afternoon.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to schedule the following committee meetings. The ones that I mentioned yesterday have already been circulated.

Public Accounts, Tuesday, March 23 at 10 o'clock; the Committee for the selection of the Ombudsman, Friday, March 19, that's this Friday, at 11:30 a.m., that's during the House activities. I don't think that that will affect too many members. Public Utilities for the Manitoba Telephone System, Tuesday, March 30 at 10 o'clock; Public Utilities Committee for Manitoba Hydro, Tuesday, April 6 at 10 o'clock and Tuesday, April 13 at 10 o'clock; and then Public Utilities Committee again on Tuesday, April 20 at 10 o'clock for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation or, if necessary, for the Hydro, but hopefully the Hydro will be dealt with in two meetings.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Leader of the Official Opposition) (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. It's in regard to the report that the Winnipeg Hydro rates are to be raised, perhaps tonight, by the City Council by 20 percent or roughly the same as the Manitoba Hydro rates were raised. I wonder, first of all, if the First Minister can indicate to us whether or not the city is not bound by the Provincial Government's decision to go into the Anti-Inflation Program of the Federal Government, to submit their hydro rate increases for Winnipeg to the Anti-Inflation Board under the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I can't of course help it if that's my honourable friend's interpretation, it certainly is not my interpretation. It's a matter of policy and decision-making by the City of Winnipeg. I believe that they have also indicated that as a matter of deliberation and policy they are adjusting their water utility and steam heat rates and they are perfectly competent to so do.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the second part of the question was whether or not they were not bound by the Provincial Government's decision. I refer, Mr. Speaker, if I

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . may to the First Minister's press release January 9th, '76, put out by the Government News Service. It says that Mr. Schreyer explained that the agreement would cover virtually all the entities which make up that part of the public sector in Manitoba which is under Provincial jurisdiction. These include Provincial Government department agencies; Crown corporations; Municipal Governments and related bodies; School Boards, agencies which are largely funded by the public sector such as Universities, Hospitals, and the like, and the question, Mr. Speaker, then is whether or not this is going to be binding as the First Minister has indicated on the city to submit their proposed rate increases for these utilities to the Anti-Inflation Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I've indicated before, Mr. Speaker, that it is open, that has been the understanding, subsequently confirmed and reconfirmed, that it is open to the Anti-Inflation Board to review and pronounce on anything germane to the operations of our economy and our public sectors and agencies and that certainly remains in effect. Beyond that there's no reason to interpret anything beyond that into the matter.

My honourable friend is clearly ignoring the fact that under the guidelines it is open to constitutionally elected governments, at whatever level, to make decisions with respect to revenue requirements, taxation levels and rates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the Manitoba Hydro rate increases have been put in the hands of the Anti-Inflation Board to assess.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, approximately two weeks ago, perhaps two and a half weeks ago, thereabouts, by way of covering letter and attached documentation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask the First Minister a further question on this. If in fact the city is scaling its rates to simply match those of the province, when in fact it was indicated earlier that the real increase in costs to Winnipeg Hydro were something less than 10 percent, Winnipeg Hydro, not Manitoba Hydro, but they are now going to take advantage of the 20 percent or so taken by Manitoba Hydro on the basis of their costs, whether or not this isn't a breach of the intent of the anti-inflation measures.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it could be that on the other hand to do otherwise might have been a breach of common sense. Given the fact that the City of Winnipeg, according to their own best judgment faces revenue requirements in the order of \$16 million plus, and in any case has also decided that steam heat and water rates shall be at such and such a level, I would daresay that was open in the City of Winnipeg to have adopted an alternative course which is by the way provided for in the City of Winnipeg Act, that the equalization of rates could be done by way of census or by way of changing the city rates to the Manitoba Hydro rate. Either course of events in our view, Sir, is within the provisions of the City of Winnipeg Act and is best done by the judgment to the City of Winnipeg itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

HON. RENE TOUPIN (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, may I get leave from the House to make a non-political statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Minister.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask Members of the House to join me in congratulating young Scott Pearce who actually achieved what we consider to be one of the greatest awards in Austria in placing first on the one metre, placing second on the third metre, and placing third on the tower, and was selected the outstanding diver made at the

## NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . World Age Group Competition in Austria. I wish to bid Scott Pearce and all other Manitobans there the best of congratulations on behalf of all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the Honourable Member for Gladstone that I would have a response in connection with an Order for Return he had requested. And my memory was correct. It is Canada's position, that while negotiations are in progress pertaining to a possible DREE cost-sharing agreement, under the DREE Manitoba General Development Agreement, all Federal-Provincial correspondence and related documents are confidential and not for public release. Further details will be available when the agreement is signed. That's expected very shortly. This is the position of Canada, when the Address for Paper was accepted, it was on the condition that there would be the consent of both governments.

ORAL QUESTIONS Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister indicate whether his department has received any reports or complaints from consumers concerning the fact that since the last rate increase in natural gas, that the quality of that gas has declined substantially so that far less heat is produced per cubic foot than was previously the case?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. IAN TURNBULL (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, that is a very serious allegation, and although the department has not advised me of any complaints that they have received, I will check with them. And I should advise the member that the Public Utilities Board would normally be the recipient of complaints about service provided by natural gas companies as it is the organization that regulates the operation of that distribution system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether the Public Utilities Board as a matter of course undertakes any testing or evaluation of the quality of natural gas when rate applications are put forward before it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

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

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have one final supplementary that perhaps the Minister might also take as notice. And that is whether the basis upon which rate increases are supplied according to cubic foot as opposed to the B.T.U. qualities, if that's the standard practice across Canada or whether Manitoba in fact is the only province that does that kind of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce or to the First Minister. I wonder if he would be in a position to indicate whether there has been any new developments with respect to the Polar Gas Pipeline and the research with respect to the pipeline coming through northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Polar Gas Pipeline consortium or group, as you may call them, are still pursuing the idea and they are yet to file an application with the National Energy Board, I believe.

We have had a number of conversations with that group and there has been some correspondence, we've been keeping tabs on it. I might add that there are some serious differences of opinion about the technological capacity of the polar line group to deliver the gas as they think they might be able to deliver it to southern markets.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the Minister is in a position to indicate whether

## ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . in the discussions that have taken place at this point, there is an indication that the pipeline would likely go through Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question was answered perhaps last year, but the advice we get is that the most efficient, the most economical route is the route that indeed would go west of Hudson's Bay and certainly right through the spine of Manitoba. This is the indication that we've had.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. It deals with the same series of questions. I wonder if he can indicate whether any further or additional representation has been made to Ottawa recently with respect to the Polar Gas Pipeline and its location in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, certainly what my colleague has said is my recollection and understanding as well, as indicated to us by the senior people of Polar Gas and the Polar Gas consortium. Since that time we have made it a point to make the Federal ministers aware that we were aware of this rather important information from Polar Gas, and thus far we have no reason to believe that the Government of Canada would be willing to introduce a political pressure element, if that's what my honourable friend's suggesting, in order to offset the hard facts of, you know, of \$2 billion, of differential in cost.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to indicate whether his government has monitored the activities of the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec in connection with this activity with respect to the Federal Government.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Industry is in a better position to respond specifically to that question than I. But I might indicate to the Honourable Member for River Heights that I had discussions with the Premier of Ontario on this very matter some time ago and we agreed to keep in touch with each other in the event of any significant change in events or in probabilities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable the Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: By way of one additional supplementary. I wonder then if the First Minister is in a position to indicate that there's an agreement with the Premier of Ontario that the location should be in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I don't understand the purport of that question. I mean for the Premier of Ontario and I to agree where the Polar Gas Line should be would be very nice but I'm sure that wouldn't settle the matter for once and for all.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We've had enough. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. I wonder if he could indicate to the House how many of the northern lakes that are open for commercial fishing this summer would not have any ice stored on them at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

HON. HARVEY BOSTROM (Minister of Renewable Resources and Transportation Services) (Rupert's Land): I'd have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker, and try to obtain an answer for the honourable member.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, at the same time then I wonder if the Minister would take as notice and give us some indication of the number of licensed fishermen that may be affected by the not having any ice . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. My first question is, I'd like to ask the Minister what are the qualifications for the farmer to receive this Great Grasslands Game, that he sent out to . . .

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister doesn't care to answer that question then I'd like to ask him how many of these Grassland Games forms were sent out, were distributed to farmers in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I don't recollect the arrangements with respect to the distribution of that particular game but I think that that was answered during the Estimates and if the Member for Rock Lake wants to know it he should read Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, then I would like to ask the Minister if he could indicate the cost - and I don't think that was ever given - what was the cost of distributing this game to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba? What was the cost to taxpayers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we had just completed the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture where a number of members put several questions with respect to that particular project and which were answered at the time. If they are not satisfied with those answers then perhaps I can elaborate on those things that I have not already answered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. In rotation, the Honourable Member for Lakeside will get his turn too.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. I wonder if the Minister of Labour can confirm that the members of the teaching profession come under the provisions of The Employment Standards Act concerning maternity leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I'm going to run the risk of what happens to some Cabinet Ministers in Ottawa if they dare even to mention anything about a decision that a Judge may make or may not make. I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that I should take a chance and if I am putting my head on a guillotine I'm perfectly prepared to do so in order to answer the question of my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Answer please.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. But I did think first of all, Sir, that I had to preface my answer with a plea to sanity in this House. I believe my honourable friend, Sir, is referring to a judgment of the Court of Appeal that was revealed today whereby there is an indication that professionals should not become candidates for maternity benefits. It seems that those in the professions should be excluded from becoming mothers and entitled to maternity benefits according to the judgment, in my opinion, that was brought down by the Court of Appeal yesterday. However I do want to say directly to my honourable friend that I have the matter under advisement as to whether or not the decision of the Court of Appeal as to whether or not professionals should have babies, I have under advisement as to whether or not it should be referred to the Supreme Court to see what their judgment or wisdom is or I am considering possible changes in The Employment Standards Act to make all women equal be they professional or non-professional.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister clarify the position of the teachers at the present time and if he cannot clarify can he undertake to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member is asking for a legal opinion and he realizes that's out of order. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia rephrase his question.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if he cannot clarify the position can he undertake to advise the House if he will be bringing legislation to make the Act clear in this respect.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't know precisely, Mr. Speaker, whether my friend is asking me whether I should investigate into the condition of the professional women or not but certainly I will investigate the matter fully as I indicated a moment ago to have equality, within sexes as well as without.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I really rise on a point of privilege at this time. Whether you were or were not aware of it I was attempting to move into a position of detente with the Liberal Party of Manitoba. I had come very close to indeed supporting a bill that the Member from Fort Rouge spoke on and I thought I had a deal with the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege please. State your matter of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Well, my matter of privilege, Sir, is that I don't think it is for you, Sir, when there is no other member standing to decide who asks the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The procedures of this House are that a person has to catch the Speaker's eye. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia - and I don't have to make an explanation of who I pick but I will in this instance to satisfy the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia stood up much prior to the Honourable Member for Lakeside. It was the third time he had stood up and I caught him at that time. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am never one to argue the decisions as laid down by the Speaker, by the Chief Magistrate of this Assembly, except that I am sure that the members of the Fourth Estate will have been the objective witnesses that will have seen that I was the only person standing at that particular time when I was attempting to get your attention, Sir.

Now my specific question to the Minister of Agriculture is and my only reason for this privilege is, because, of course, when you interfere in this way with the gist of debate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is debating the point. Would he get to the question or I will have to ask him to sit down. I may go a little further. If he recalls - I am going to remind the honourable members I have a reception and if he doesn't behave himself . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, you have struck home. You have struck home. My questions will be precise. They follow on the heels of the Member for Rock Lake. I merely wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture: what cereal do you have to buy to get the game--(Interjection)--Whey spelled W-H-E-Y - and how many have won the prize so far?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it might be a good idea to incorporate that game in a box of whey that may be available on the Manitoba market.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a clarification from the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs. If I heard him correctly this young Manitoba athlete Pearce, I think he said that he was competing in Austria. My information is that it was in Melbourne, Australia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation and Cultural Affairs if he has any idea of why this young athlete had to borrow money to compete in Melbourne, Australia at those springboard events?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to stand corrected. I only hope that one day I am able to correct the honourable member's French.

On the second part of the question I'd like to indicate that the bridge financing that was made possible to those athletes hopefully will be covered by a formula that was

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) . . . . announced by the Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Last week he took as notice the question as to whether Manitoba would have a watching brief on the constitutional question of the Anti-Inflationary Board and the Guidelines that will be referred to the Supreme Court by the Federal Government. I wonder if he can indicate whether a decision has been made on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, not as yet. This is something that will be discussed no doubt on Cabinet Agenda, perhaps next Wednesday. No decision has been taken as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Corrections. Can the Minister confirm the fact that at the Manitoba Youth Centre children under the Child Welfare Act are being detained in association with children who are alleged to also be delinquents, which is against the law of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

HON. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Minister responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitation) (Winnipeg Centre): If that has been alleged, Mr. Speaker, I would rather deal with that question and others of that kind during my Estimates.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister be prepared now to answer or confirm whether in fact that children being detained at the Manitoba Youth Centre on some claims are being expected to stay there upwards of 55 days awaiting forensic or psychiatric assessment or treatment.

MR. BOYCE: Well if the member has a specific case that he would like me to look at, I'd be only too happy to do so, Mr. Speaker. The people who are detained under the Child Welfare Act are under the administrative responsibility of the Director of the Child Welfare Act. The operation and facilities under my jurisdiction - if he has a specific case he'd like me to look at, I'd be glad to look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well let me restate the question then, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether the staff and officials of the Manitoba Youth Centre have compiled a report containing statistics which indicate that juvenile offenders which are brought to the Manitoba Youth Centre are on average staying in that centre for upwards of 55 days awaiting assessment for psychiatric or psychological or forensic assessment by the staff there.

MR. BOYCE: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON (Wolseley): . . . the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the Rent Stabilization staff going to be located at the new government offices at 397 Kennedy? And if the answer is yes, is there any connection between the suggested seven year lease and the length of time the Rental Control Program will be in force?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the privilege of the House just for the moment, I'm sure this is non-controversial.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was a historic event when we had an Irishman as the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, the late Honourable Errick Willis, that our desks were adorned by shamrocks and plants, and it was a very welcome added attraction to the Assembly.--(Interjection)--I only wish my honourable friend would desist for a moment out of courtesy to what I am going to say, and I doubt whether that would even penetrate the head of my honourable friend. But apart from that, I do want to, despite the Honourable Member for Lakeside, to draw to the attention of the House another very charming piece of evidence that we have of Erin go bragh, I

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . believe it is said in Irish, that we have today in that one of our girl or lady pages is adorned with a green corsage. I refer to Colleen Bruce who is celebrating her birthday today and she is a product of the Old Land. So while we may not have the shamrocks of Errick Willis with us today, we have a very charming attractive young lady.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of further sums required for the services of the Province for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1976 and recommends these Estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the House Leader that the said message, together with the Estimates accompanying same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, while the process of distribution of the Estimates of Supplementary Supply are being distributed it would be timely to take that time to elaborate by way of introduction that the Estimates being now distributed represent the Supplementary Supply requirements for the current fiscal year and are required generally to cover unforeseen costs that are not met through already voted supply or special warrant. Honourable members will note the greater part, the bulk of the amount of \$6 million here is accounted for principally by the Department of Health and Social Development in the order of \$4 million, or roughly two-thirds of the total. The Department of Highways is also facing the requirement because of higher costs in the maintenance program and to some considerable extent, higher costs with respect to construction materials.

The costs of paving material, I mention as an interesting aside but it is relevant, the cost of paving material it was calculated by the Government of the Province of Ontario, and we face generally the same phenomenon increased in the order of magnitude of 40 percent last year. The authority that is represented in these estimates, and which is hereby being requested, is required for the purposes of operations to the end of the current fiscal year 31st of March, 1976. So there is some degree of urgency attaching thereto.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see no fault with the Province of Manitoba looking to the Province of Ontario for leadership, but I do say this, that in the Department of Highways that the Minister here has to absorb some of the blame for the mismanagement that has occurred in his department and the fact that he has not so far fully explained to this House why some of the expenditures in his department have not met with the current Estimates that he has provided to this House in the past year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Community College's division. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if I can ask the First Minister before we deal with the specific resolutions, if he now is in the position to indicate to the House the total amount

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . of money that the government will be spending on its expenditures for this fiscal year, adding together the amount voted last year, plus all special warrants, plus this amount, and whether on the basis of that he can then indicate the percentage increase over the total amount of the previous year of government expenditures. That information must be available, and I think it's important in understanding that the total amount of government spending and being able to assess this year's Estimates and the potential Supplementary Estimates and Special Warrants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can give my honourable friend the information by way of numbers and then he can do his own arithmetic calculations if he is preoccupied with percentages, which I personally tend not to be preoccupied because they can be misleading. In any case, Sir, the information is as follows: That the amount voted by way of Main Estimates at the beginning of this fiscal year was in the order of \$1,030,000,000 rounded and there are Special Warrants in the order of 50 to 55 million, and the Supplementary Supply which is before you in the order of 6 million. I might add further that that taken by itself would be misleading because there is lapsing. I repeat there is lapsing of significant sums which must be subtracted from the totality of the main, plus Warrants, plus Supplementary Supply, and that lapsing, Sir, I cannot give a definitive figure until the books are closed on the fiscal year, which is 31st of March, plus 20 days. So the definitive figure on lapsings will be available on or about the 20th of April.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I think though that the First Minister will acknowledge that while he may not want - I mean arithmetic can be left to us and they may not be concerned about percentages, and he may leave that responsibility to us, it's very difficult for members on this side in dealing with the coming year's budget, or coming year's Estimates and in dealing with the representations by the government of the percentage increase to effectively be able to judge the accuracy of the presentation, if in fact we're not seized of all the information, and as a matter of fact the First Minister himself is not seized of all the information, because--(Interjection)--No. I appreciate that. I understand that he isn't. My point, Mr. Chairman, and the point that has to be made, is that so the hullabaloo that takes place when the Estimates are presented.--(Interjection)--No. It's a hullabaloo on the part of the First Minister as to what the actual increase of spending is, has to be judged on the basis of what was actually spent, the Special Warrants, the Supplementary Estimates, and an understanding of what is going to be netted in the budget as opposed to actual expenditures that are shown in previous years. All I'm simply saying is that rather than deal with this in sleight of hand, it's very difficult for us, and we can make the arithmetic, but I would say to the First Minister, that it would appear to me that based on his first presentation on the Estimates when it was presented, that the percentage increase over the previous year is substantially higher than was represented by the government at the time that the Estimates were presented. That in effect when the books are closed and we are in a position to make that judgment, and we are always a year behind, we'll find that the information, albeit is not as accurate as first suggested, although I would think the will on the part of the First Minister is for it to be the kind of percentage that he is suggesting, and I think that that is important in understanding fully the government's program of expenditure.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not as though I am wanting to quarrel vociferously with the comments made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition - there is validity in his observations - but nevertheless, the fact remains that while he would like to make much of the quantum of Special Warrants, I would make the following two observations to him.

The first is: That of all of the totality of Special Warrants and Supplementary Supply, the greater part of it relates to three things, one being the Cow-Calf Program, which was an emergency program, and that I believe accounts for in the order of 18 or 20 million in one fell-swoop; and the other has to do with the Department of Health and Social Development, which is something we can go into; and the other has to do with the Highway Department.

Now if one takes those three factors into account, then the aggregate of Warrants

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . and Supplementary Supply will compare very favourably indeed with any other jurisdiction in Canada, and certainly in relation to the Government of Canada itself. We, as I tried to point out in the Address at the conclusion of the Throne Speech Debate, that in per capita terms we have no reason to feel that we are following a pathway of expenditures that somehow is less provident than our sister provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there are so many figures going back and forth here, all we really want to do is get some sort of idea as to whether when you add up all three of these, is it significantly over what you estimated last year because when you tabled this year's Estimates it appeared that your Estimates of expenditure were substantially under what you had estimated a year ago. If we add all of these up, does it appear to put it over that amount of what you estimated a year ago, and be over certainly what was indicated a month ago, but perhaps not a year ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't fault the Leader of the Opposition for that observation, because that is the apparent but superficial observation that one would necessarily draw. The fact, however, is that the simple addition of the three figures leave out of account, or does not take into account: (a) The lapsings - in other words the under-expenditures of certain appropriations in all the departments; and (b) it does not take into account the revenue side of the ledger.

So I am merely restating now that we fully expect, in fact, I can give an interim report now that there will be a significant amount of lapsing, but I cannot give you the final figure until the books are closed on the fiscal year. I hope to be able to do so at Budget time because that will be just a week or a matter of days before the very, sort of pro forma of last day closing of the books; and also I say we have revenues that are above estimates of last year. So that our net final line position is really not much different than we forecast last Budget time, and indeed would be more favourable were it not for the Cow-Calf Special Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would now acknowledge that, and I realize that it cannot be done precisely, but I think that he would be very much aware of the parameters, but if we were to compare last year's Estimates with this year's Estimates, taking into consideration the past pattern of Special Warrants, including the Supplementary Estimates and including the lapsing factor, that in effect the Estimates of this year are more likely to be an 18 to 20 percent increase over the Estimates of last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, particularly if you ignore the lapsings. --(Interjection)--Beg pardon? Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend knows the rules of parliamentary proprieties and budgetary proprieties as well as I, and if he is trying to force me to give certain final line figures that are traditionally and historically and appropriately given at budget time, well I can't prevent him but I certainly do not want to be allowed to lead myself into that kind of a trap.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I think now we should get onto the detailed Supplementary Estimates of current expenditures and ask members to confine their debate to the items under consideration. Community Colleges Division, Red River Community College and other expenditures \$351,500--pass. (b) Assiniboine Community College and other expenditures \$29,000--pass. Resolution 1, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$380,500 for Colleges and University Affairs--pass. Resolution 2, Education, Financial Support - Public Schools. (a) School Grants and other assistance \$500,000--pass. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent of the Minister to explain why he wants this extra half million dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): This, Mr. Speaker,

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . . is because of an under-estimate that I have in a number of departments, or branches of the department, and it's not limited only to one.

MR. GRAHAM: Perhaps the Minister when he talks about a number of departments could tell us for which departments that he wanted the money.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The \$713,600, the \$500,000 is on grants, and the \$213,600 is in the operations of curriculum development and child development services.

MR. GRAHAM: Will the honourable member confine his remarks to the \$500,000. That is the requisition we're dealing with.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what I want to deal with. The Minister referred to \$213,000; I wasn't interested in the 213. Can he give me exactly why he wants the \$500,000 in this particular appropriation?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated a moment ago, to pay the balance of the grants due and owing the School Divisions in accordance with the formula which was established for the current fiscal year, as outlined in the regulations, and an Order-in-Council passed by Cabinet.

MR. GRAHAM: Can he indicate which school divisions received which moneys?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, there's many ways of handling this. One could continue writing out cheques as long as the funds last, and leave one school division \$500,000 short, or one could take \$500,000 and divide that by 48 and send each school division that proportion of the amount less.

MR. GRAHAM: Is the Minister indicating that all of the 47 divisions received an equal amount?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm not saying that at all, Mr. Speaker. I'm merely saying that to pay the school grants due and owing the school divisions this year, we need an additional \$500,000.

MR. GRAHAM: Can the Minister indicate how much he wants for each school division?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I just finished explaining that this could be done in a variety of ways. One could continue writing out cheques, school division by school division until one is short \$500,000 in whatever school division. It doesn't matter. The fact of the matter is that to make the final payment - my department has done its calculation - to make the final payment for the current fiscal year it is found that we need an additional \$500,000 at the time when that payment falls due for this fiscal year.

MR. GRAHAM: Well, the Minister can indicate all he wants that it doesn't matter, but I think that it does matter to the people in Manitoba that half a million dollars is going to be asked for in an appropriation, and I think it is only fair for the Minister to indicate to us how much he wants for each school division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Honourable gentlemen should not put each other in an impossible position. If it is a valid question, and I suppose it is, I'm sure it is, at the same time my honourable friend the Member for Birtle-Russell can appreciate full well that the Minister cannot be expected to indicate what each of 47 school divisions are receiving to the penny. That is something which could be undertaken to be provided to my honourable friend by way of a sheet. It would take a full page to list it, and that could be done, but not just off the cuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may, once again, a final payment has to be made. The calculation of the sum total of the balances owing to the school divisions was made, and it was found that to make those payments there is need for an additional one-half million dollars to make the final payment of the school grants to the school divisions of the Province of Manitoba. So therefore, I cannot say to the honourable member that there is one particular school division that is a half-a-million dollars short. We need a half-a-million dollars to make the balance of the grant payments to all of the school divisions of the province.

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

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the Minister of Education, but when he is asking the House for a special appropriation over and above everything that he has calculated, and he wants an additional half-million dollars, at least he can tell the House what he wants it for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have just completed telling the honourable member that school grants have to be paid in accordance with the grant formula, which I had announced in the House last year, in accordance with the grant formula that is spelled out in regulations, and to make those payments to the school divisions, based on the number of teachers, based on the number of pupils enrolled in the schools, based on all the other factors that are taken into account in the calculation of school grants, there is need for an additional one-half-million dollars.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I do not deny the Minister the right to ask the House for an additional half-million dollars, but if he wants an additional half-million dollars at least he has the courtesy to tell the House what he wants it for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the payment of grants to school divisions. The teacher grants, the textbook grants, the transportation grants, the student-equalization grants, the whole host of grants. Administration grants, special education grants, the whole host of grants that we make. A final calculation was made and it was found that as per our last year's Estimates we had under-estimated by one-half million dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Now I would caution the honourable member not to become repetitive because we're having this same question over and over again. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister wants an additional \$500,000 to send 250 students to Taiwan I will understand it, but he hasn't told us that. He told us that he wants half a million dollars but he won't tell us what he wants it for. All I ask is that he tell us what he wants it for. If he wants \$10 million or \$200,000 for the Winnipeg School Division then I will understand. But he has not told us what he wants the half million dollars for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I'll try again. I'll try, but more slowly. This is not to send either 10 nor 20 or 100 or whatever number of students to Taiwan or wherever it is that the honourable member would wish to see students being sent to. It is nothing of the sort.

This is for the payment of the regular grants that we pay to all school divisions as I had explained to the honourable member; the teacher grants, transportation grants, student equalization grants and so forth. We totalled up the amount that we required to complete the payments for the fiscal year for the school divisions of the province and we find that we're half a million dollars short. That's what the half million dollars is required for.

So it's not for one particular purpose, to send somebody somewhere or to buy some piece of equipment or whatever. It's for the payment of the regular grants that are paid to all school divisions.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, then I think that in the light of the answer given by the Minister of Education I will now ask him how much he wants for each school division in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. HANUSCHAK: For all school divisions? Yes. I suppose what I could do, I suppose I could take the \$500,000 and divide that by 230,000 and so I need about two dollars and a few cents per pupil, multiply that times the enrollment in each school division. That may give the honourable member some indication. Or I may prorate the whole thing and relate it to teacher grants, transportation grants and so forth. But it's not a question of there being a balance owing to any particular school division. There's a payment to be made to all school divisions and we need a half a million dollars to make the payments that must be made. And it could have arisen for a variety of reasons. In some school divisions there may have been a population increase or there may not have been a decrease that we may have anticipated or transportation costs may have been higher or whatever. All of which contributed toward the need for an additional half million

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . dollars. But it isn't for any particular school division. It's to make the payments, to make the balance of the payments for all school divisions. It's really quite simple, Mr. Chairman, an application of the basics of the 3Rs.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is very simple and it is to meet the basics of the 3Rs. But his very own Deputy denies the right of students in this province to the 3Rs. So then I ask the Minister again to be specific. How much money does he want for each and every school division in this province. At least if he wants money, he should have the courtesy to tell us what he wants it for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the final payment that's to be made is the one in accordance with the regulations and the regulations do spell out when the grant payments ought to be made to the school divisions, if they're made at certain times of the year and it's also spelled out in the regulations the percentage of the annual grant that's to be made at each point in time. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that those regulations I do not have. If the honourable member wants to know what portion of the school grants are due and owing now or shall become due and owing by the end of the month I'll be able to provide the honourable member with that information. I would also like to suggest to him that it's public information; it's contained within the Executive Council office, it's as approved by order-in-council in the House and that would indicate the number of dollars that have to be paid out as a final payment. I am sure that the final payment will probably run in several millions of dollars. I'm sure there'll be at least, approximately at least \$10 million or \$12 million. I'm sure it'll be no less than a tenth or a twelfth of the total grants for the year. No doubt I'd be able to give the honourable member an itemized statement showing him the exact amount that will be mailed out the end of this month.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection whatsoever to any member of the treasury bench coming before the Legislature and asking for more money. But I still say, Mr. Chairman, that when a member of the treasury bench comes before this Chamber and asks for more money he had better tell us what he wants it for.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would want to answer the honourable member but I really am afraid that if I do attempt to answer him, for the fourth or fifth time, that you would no doubt rule me out of order. Because I doubt very much whether you would allow repetition to that extent when I've already answered the honourable member's question at least five or six times.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 2, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$500,000 for Education. Pass? The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Chairman, in the announcement made by the Minister in respect to support for the school divisions on Monday, we have some over-view of the total amount of money involved and to my knowledge there has not yet been any announcement as to the mill rate for the Foundation levy. I wonder if the Minister can at this stage in this debate give us some indication of whether there has been the striking of a mill rate for this 1976 Foundation levy. Last year it was three mills on farm and residential property and 33.9 on commercial property. Can the Minister tell us whether this mill rate will remain the same or whether there is a change for this year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I appreciate the honourable member's concern, Mr. Chairman, and I'd be happy to provide that information to the honourable member and in fact to all members of the House at a proper time. But I'm sure that you're aware, Mr. Chairman, that we are presently dealing with the Supplementary Estimates of Current Expenditure for the Fiscal Year ending March 31, 1976. And what the honourable member is referring to is for the Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1977. There'll be ample opportunity to debate that, Mr. Chairman, at a more appropriate time.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, what I am looking for really is some indication from the Minister when this information is likely to be available. We can determine pretty clearly from the extent of the announcement as to the grants for 1976-77 that the Special levy on property will be increased substantially and it would certainly be helpful

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) . . . . . to have some indication from the Minister when the public, when the taxpayers will know what the mill rate will be under the special levy for the coming year.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has been in this House long enough to know what the purpose of the question period before Orders of the Day is for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

Resolution 2, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$500,000 for Education--pass.

Resolution 3, Curriculum Development and Special Studies: Child Development, Financial Assistance \$213,600--pass.

Resolution 3, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$213,600 for Education--pass.

Resolution 4, Health and Social Development: Community Operations Division, Personal and Community Services, Child and Family Services, Maintenance of Children \$1,262,800 - The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm just wondering how they could have been out this far in their Estimates. It seems to me that this is a rather large expenditure to have come out in your Supplementary so I wonder if the Minister could clarify this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister for Urban Affairs) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I'll try to respond. As I recall this is due to the increase in per diem rates which are paid out on behalf of wards of the Director of Child Welfare and they'd be paid to group homes, to foster homes to cover both wages, increased costs of lodging, food and clothing as well and this could not be foreseen. No one knew exactly what the increases would be when the Estimates were struck so that during the course of the year this is the increase that took place, as I say, to cover the cost of providing for children who are wards of the Director of Child Welfare.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,362,800 for Health and Social Development - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Under the Income Security Programs, Social Allowances, I notice that there is a figure there of \$2,100,000. I wonder if the Minister could explain that particular figure.

MR. MILLER: I'll try, Mr. Chairman. The reason for this would be the indexing that occurred October 1st. The indexing is the mechanism whereby we try to adjust the social allowances paid to reflect the increase in the cost of living. The figure would not be known until just prior to October 1st. It is based on Stat Canada Cost of Living or CPI figures so that it wouldn't be until August or September that we'd have this information and it was as a result of the increases in the cost of living that this adjustment had to take place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$3,362,800 for Health and Social Development--pass.

Resolution 5, Inter-Regional Operations Division: Community and Institutional Services - Mental Health, External Agencies \$54,600 - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Again, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have some explanation on this \$54,600.

MR. MILLER: Again, Mr. Chairman, I think - I'm not sure in this case - this is to external agencies and therefore again it would reflect the increased costs faced by the external agencies. It could be for increases in rent during the year; it could be for per diem costs; it could be for salaries paid to external agencies which were not foreseen to the extent that it took place when the Estimates were first drawn up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--pass; (c) Community and Institutional Services - Mental Retardation, External Agencies - \$457,000 - the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could explain this \$457,000 and tell us if there were any improvements made on the mental retardation program.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd just as soon just limit myself to the dollars involved. This reflects increased costs in wages. As members know an amount is estimated on what wage increases may take place and in the case, of course, of provincial employees that is then adjusted in the Estimates, in your printed Estimates. In the case of external agencies - this would be St. Amant, the facility at Ninette, Pelican something or other, and this would be the costs of the operating of those two facilities and the increase in wages which they were faced with after they had negotiated with their staffs which wasn't known again at the time that these Estimates were drawn up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, the consideration of the Supplementary Estimates comes along at a proper moment because I think the questions that have been raised in this House in the last few days, that I've raised in the last few days, concerning the relationship that the government is establishing with agencies, particularly those in the mental health field, on the transfer of property is one that I think can properly be raised at this time. I have with me, Mr. Chairman, copies of agreements.

This one is with the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded, the Steinbach Branch, which is an external agency that provides workshop treatment for the mentally retarded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that item should be discussed under Health and Social Development. The Estimates will be coming up shortly.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, are we not dealing with Health and Social Development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are now dealing with an additional expenditure and would the honourable member confine his remarks to the additional expenditure before the House. The additional expenditure is not for new programs; it's for programs that already are in place. The Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Supplementary Estimates deal with expenditures involved with the programming in this area of community and institutional services, particularly mental retardation. I have a question that relates to the operation of those institutions and I feel that this would be the proper time to raise it. I think that that is the right occasion.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. I was about to rise, sir, when you did raise the point of order on your own sense of proceedings which I concur with, sir. I am supporting your observation of procedural order. I suppose strictly speaking the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge can argue that since this is Supplementary, that it is therefore by extension logical to discuss or to ask questions on a given aspect of the departmental operations. More precisely, however, I believe that the long standing understanding has been that we deal with aspects of departmental operations that give rise to the need for the Supplementary Supply. My honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge will have to use his best judgment as to whether he is really dealing with a broad general policy matter which clearly then, sir, you are right, should be dealt with under the Main Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. I think there might have been a valid case for attempting to debate Supplementary Estimates prior to the change in the rules.

At the present time however, sir, we do have the opportunity to examine at length the departmental Estimates. There's going to be no restrictions on that kind of an examination. So I would also agree with you, sir, that the proper kind of examination at this stage would simply be to determine why the increases are necessary in each of those particular departments. And I think that kind of question or that kind of debate may be properly in order. But anything in addition to that would be more properly

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . related to the main Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Just on the same point, Mr. Chairman, I agree with you and the Honourable Member for Morris and my Leader that it may be appropriate for my honourable friend the Member for Fort Rouge to discuss this with Interim Supply rather than Supplementary Supply, Supplementary Supply being additional moneys required to perform the services that were agreed upon in the budget, or subsequent to the session last time, and the matters that apparently my honourable friend was raising deal with the future, which can be considered either under main Supply, as suggested by the Honourable Member from Morris, or under Interim Supply if such is required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5(c) Community and Institutional Services, \$457,000--pass.

Resolution 5. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$511,600 to Health and Social Development--pass.

Resolution 6. Corrective and Rehabilitative Services: Administration, Other Expenditures, \$12,500.00--pass. (d) Care and Treatment of Adult Offenders (2) \$100,000. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could elaborate on the Other Expenditures, the \$100,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrective Services.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this Other Expenditures when considering Supplementary Supply, it is my impression that this is by and large that which falls in the area in the past year. It's within that type of expenditure. I'm sorry, I was out of the House for just a moment. If I could get my Main Estimate Book I could give the member a better answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that this is a considerable amount of money and it's just listed as "Other Expenditures." Now . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: In order to allow the Minister to get his bearings on the matter, I would suggest that, there's ample precedent for it as well, that we merely hold this particular resolution in abeyance, go on to the next, and then come back later this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I then refer honourable members to Resolution No. 7. Highway Maintenance and Construction aids to Cities, Towns and Villages, Work in unorganized Territories, etc. (a) Maintenance Program - \$1,330,000.00. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Thank you. I'd like to ask the Minister, what is the additional amount for, or is it just the general increases that went on throughout Manitoba in this last while, or is there some particular project that you're going to work on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Minister of Highways.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Highways) (Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, this amount does not deal with any particular project, it involves several things. One of course in particular is the horrendous increase in asphalt and of course the amount of calcium chloride used because of the ice conditions last fall and spring, much more so than we have used in a number of years. Also the regular maintenance program in order to keep up to our standards, that cost a lot more money, as well as the general increase in salaries, and what have you, we found that we needed to acquire that sum of money.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that this is what the Opposition has been saying for some time that due to the inflation that's gone on over the years, that the Highway budget itself hasn't really increased proportionately to the cost of doing the work. So it's quite understandable to us that it should be this much, and in fact I will be hoping to see that the Minister would even get more money in his budget because roads are - a place where you don't waste money, it's really an investment so that the people of Manitoba can save money.

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there was a tremendous increase in the amount of calcium chloride used in treatment of highways for ice in the past year. Can the Minister indicate how much more treatment was required for ice in the past year than in any other year in the Department of Highways?

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I said there was a tremendous increase only in the use of calcium, I said there was a tremendous increase in the price of asphalt. But there also was an increase in the amount of calcium used. I can't give the honourable member the breakdown of these figures at the moment but I certainly will try and see if I can do that during the Estimates of my department.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Highways if in this \$1,330,000, if in that figure there is not in fact some work that was not on the program of the department but which was undertaken in the past year without tender, without the priority of the department, but because of political expediency and political . . . Mr. Chairman, if the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. BURTONIAK: The Member for Birtle-Russell is making certain statements which are definitely untrue, and I would like to correct him on this and tell him that there were certainly none, and I repeat, none at all, none of the roads that were ever constructed were - were those that were in the program and had nothing to do with politics.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, then I would ask the Minister if the tendering procedure that was carried out by the Department of Highways included the calling of tenders for the construction of the road on the 41 Highway from the junction of 42 and 41 into the Village of St. Lazare.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this type of a debate would fall much better during the Estimate review of my whole department rather than on this. I am not able to give the honourable member just off the cuff answers on specific items that he has in mind. I certainly would be prepared to do that during the Estimate review.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on this particular item it is indeed I think possible, more so than with respect to most, to be quite precise about procedural order. There is an order here of 1.3 million and without knowing specifically, I am confident however that this has nothing to do with any altercation about a road into St. Lazare. And as such, it is therefore - the latter is divorced from the particular item before us.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if the road that I mentioned was included in his Estimates for the past year and if the appropriation was set aside for that, and if that was the case, then were tenders called, and who was the low bidder on the job?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: Here again, Mr. Speaker, of course I am not able to tell the honourable member precisely on a specific road, a specific contract. If the honourable member wants to pursue this a little further I'll be glad to invite him to my office and we'll discuss that.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing here additional funds that were required by the Department of Highways for the past year in their operation, or maintenance as the Premier is fully aware. I want to bring in the question of maintenance because in the past year I have had conversations with the Minister and brought to his attention the question of maintenance on construction that has occurred, and the fact that there has been no attempt at maintenance by his department on new construction on roads that have in effect virtually isolated communities in my constituency, without any attempt that maintenance be provided until it has been brought to the attention of the Minister. And, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about one and a third million extra dollars, over and above the expenditures of his department, I think the Minister has the responsibility to answer to the House for the extra money that he wants for his department.

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if the honourable member is just being confused - was being confused. I want to refer the honourable member to the line, the line is taken out of the whole heading and we're dealing with the Maintenance Program of \$1,330,000, not with new road construction. Order please. That is the way I read it.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, on the point you make. It says, highway maintenance and construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The program that we're dealing with is (a) Maintenance Program.--(Interjections)--Order please. ORDER! Order please! I want to read again for the honourable members. There is a heading here and there is a subdivision, and that is what we're dealing with. It deals with (a) Maintenance Program. \$1,330,000.00. Now would the honourable member confine his remarks to the Maintenance Program and not to highway construction. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Minister have a point of order?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the confusion lies within the Department of Highways and not on this side of the House.

MR. CRAIK: The Member for Birtle-Russell is absolutely correct in his last comment because the opening sentence says, "highway construction" as well as maintenance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. But that is the heading of the appropriation that we're voting on. What we're dealing with is (a). The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify one thing because when the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell says there's confusion in the department, I think there's confusion in his own mind. Because Maintenance usually in most cases is done by our own branch, our own Highways Department, we do not tender in every case for maintenance. The maintenance is what it says, maintenance, and is done by the Department of Highways' own crews in their own districts.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, then may I suggest to the Minister that until members on this side of the House petition the Minister to get something done, there is nothing done. And yet we find that we're asking for an additional one and a third million dollars. And yet under his own guidance, his department seems to be rudderless and aimless in their approach to maintenance and construction in this province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate some advice from the Minister as to how far that maintenance program extends with respect to the total category that we're looking at. The category includes a metropolitan street system and grants for urban transit. That is included in the general category. The particular appropriation that we're voting relates to an item entitled "Maintenance Program." And I would like to know to what extent that maintenance program that we're dealing with here extended to the metropolitan street system and to the urban transit system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I want to point out - I'm sorry the Minister of Urban Affairs is not here - but that as far as the city street grants are concerned, urban transit, and so on, these grants are made through the Department of Highways but they are in our estimates and our budget but the negotiations and approval is done by the Minister of Urban Affairs. So if the Minister of Urban Affairs were here I think he could probably answer the question fully, better than I can.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister of Highways suggesting that the Minister of Urban Affairs will be able to tell me how much of that appropriation went to maintenance of the metropolitan street system and the public transit system, and if so, perhaps we could have a further deferment akin to the one that was granted a few moments ago while we wait for the Minister of Urban Affairs to reach the Chamber.

Is the Minister of Urban Affairs in the view of the Minister of Highways able to tell me how much of that went to the metropolitan streets system and the public transit system?

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: I would think that he would be able to if he were given advance notice. I'll bet he'll probably look it up. I can't speak on behalf of the Minister of Urban Affairs whether he knows the answer off the top of his head or not, I don't know.

But here again, Mr. Chairman, the Highways Department Estimates will be coming up shortly and I think that we can pursue that and give the answers properly and precisely at that time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. A point of order has been raised by the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Point of order is simply this that all of these items have been approved during the last session, and all that is represented here in the Maintenance Program is an overrun of expenditures on approved programs. So it's not as if there's something new that has to be answered. These were debated fully at the last session.

Now I don't think that it should be expected that the Minister at this stage then redebate all of those questions that were raised or the appropriations during the last session. I think that that is properly a matter of debate for the coming session in that the same item will again appear. And we have to appreciate that we're dealing with Estimates and there is a final figure at the end of the year and this is what is before you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's attempt to clarify the situation but I don't see that there is any point of order. I didn't raise a point of order or a point that I would suggest could be approached from the perspective of a point of order. What we're dealing with here are Supplementary Estimates in the amount of one and a third million dollars for Maintenance, as the Honourable the First Minister says. But for maintenance of what? The appropriation category covers the metropolitan street system and the urban transit system and all I'm asking is how much of that one and a third million dollars went to maintenance of the metropolitan street system and the urban transit system and why? Was it for subsidy for the transit system in the face of a loss? Was it for street clearing and snow removal on the metropolitan street system that exceeded earlier budgeting estimates or precisely what? I don't think that that's an unreasonable question and I don't think that it points to a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe any of this amount, which is an over expenditure in the Department of Highways, relates to the transit grants nor to the per lane mile maintenance because that is a fixed amount which was paid last year and it was included in the Estimates. The transit grant was an estimate and I gather did come in on target. So this would be for costs incurred in highway construction and maintenance outside the city.

MR. SHERMAN: I would like to thank the Minister of Urban Affairs and acknowledge the light that he has shed on the questions, Mr. Chairman. We understand now that what we're looking at here is a one and a third million dollars in additional expenditure that went on highway maintenance, not on transportation facilities within the metropolitan area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7--pass? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I want to get this point clear. I understand that under the appropriation that this amount is spent and the Minister is saying it is spent on maintenance. I want to again ask if there were construction programs that were undertaken during the year, major programs, that were not included in last year's Estimates but were undertaken later in the year after the Estimates were drawn up and by which there would be a requirement for funds either by Special Warrant or by Supplementary Estimates that we have before us here now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, I don't know, maybe it's St. Patrick's Day, that's why it's so difficult to get the points across.

A MEMBER: Aw come on.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, once again we are dealing strictly with

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. BURTNIAK cont'd) . . . . maintenance and maintenance alone. This has nothing to do with any construction or whatever. We're dealing with the extra money that's needed for proper maintenance all across Manitoba including the City of Winnipeg per lane mile and all of the maintenance on our roads in the province, PRs and PTHs, whatever. That's all that's all about.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister then, if he had a road program that was undertaken that wasn't outlined in last year's Estimates and the program exceeded a half a million dollars, a construction program that wasn't outlined at the time, would he not be aware of it at this point, a program of that size?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that really it ought not to be regarded as something undue, the fact that in the Maintenance Program Estimates for the entire Province of Manitoba that there should be an additional requirement of \$1.3 million. What is involved after all, Mr. Chairman, in highway and road maintenance but for the large part snow clearing, but for the large part the gravelling and the grading of roads which means, sir, Caterpillar units - I shouldn't use brand names - motor graders. Motor graders burn diesel fuel; diesel fuel went up the equivalent of \$2.00 per barrel over the last year and as a consequence the per gallon price of diesel fuel some time in July or August must have undergone a significant change putting it at a marked higher cost than it would have been back in December and January when Estimates were being prepared. So that the Leader of the Opposition being an engineer would appreciate particularly some of the very tangible factors involved here.

A MEMBER: Wages went up too, Ed.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can buy what the First Minister is indicating here but my question, following on the topic of the Member for Birtle-Russell, was whether or not there were major construction programs - and I would call a construction program in excess of \$500,000, a half a million dollar program, it could even be smaller than that - were any of those undertaken during the year that did not appear in last year's Estimates but required money either by Special Warrant or by Supplementary Estimates to cover that topic. Maybe the Minister could indicate whether there were Special Warrants or what sort of size of Special Warrants were undertaken by the government to cover construction programs not included in last year's Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that question could be asked under the Estimates of the Department of Highways. It's coming up. Order please. I'll recognize the honourable member in due course. I'm making a ruling. It has also been pointed out that in the motion on Interim Supply that this question could be discussed. Now I think that we should stick to the item that's under discussion and that is Maintenance.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, this particular piece of road was in the program two years ago and was deleted. Subsequently we have not seen it in the Department of Highways Estimates. We're talking about some \$800,000. The road obviously has been built. The Member from Birtle-Russell has travelled over it and he's asking how it was built and where did the money come from. We have not seen it in the Department of Highways Annual Estimates and we're not seeing it before us - in fact that's what we're asking, whether it's contained in the Supplementary Estimates before us or whether . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. Order please. We are dealing with Maintenance and Maintenance is in my knowledge of the dictionary definition, is maintaining something that is already built and construction is something that is being built. And we're dealing with maintenance. Order please. The honourable member.

MR. ENNS: Well then I would ask for the definition of this sentence: "Highway Maintenance and Construction."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. ENNS: "Highway Maintenance and Construction."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I will explain it to the member if he was out of the House. Order please. What is here, and I'll read it out:

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) . . . . "Highway Maintenance and Construction, Aids to Cities, Towns and Villages, Work in Unorganized Territory and Operation of Ferries - Construction and Maintenance Grants Relevant to a Metropolitan Street System Established by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and Grants for Urban Transit. (a) Maintenance Program." That is what we're dealing with. That is just a heading. The sub-heading is what we're dealing with. "The Maintenance Program." The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there is only one heading (a). It calls for the entire appropriation of \$1,330,000 and that appropriation (a) includes Construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order. That is not the way that the Chair reads this. I'm sorry if you and I read something different, perhaps we went to and took different 3Rs. But in my estimation and reading it means "Maintenance Program."

MR. ENNS: When do we get to Construction?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You get that in the Main Estimates. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak about maintenance for a moment. Mr. Chairman, I don't see anywhere in this appropriation where it mentions provincial roads but the Minister has indicated that maintenance of highways does include provincial roads. What I'd like to know from the Minister is how does he arrive at an over-expenditure of maintenance on provincial roads when he has never denied that there has been a reduction in maintenance of provincial roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Chairman, this is the whole picture, the whole province. There's no separation here of provincial roads, PTHs or whatever. It's the whole picture. What we're dealing with here - I hope that this will satisfy the members opposite - is that we had, to go back to last year's Estimates, we had \$21,436,800 under Highway Maintenance and maintenance alone. That includes, provides for maintenance of Manitoba's primary, secondary road system to an acceptable and economic level, provides for the operation of highways, road maintenance, fleet, warehouse systems, the whole thing. And the amount was \$21,436,800 of which we're now asking for another \$1.3 million.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, another question. I would ask him why there is an over expenditure in the maintenance of the provincial roads when the provincial road grading system has gone down. There has been a reduction in maintenance. The First Minister says that the cost of the labour went up. Sure the cost of labour went up. But let him give me a comparison between the increase in the cost of labour and the reduction in the maintenance on the provincial roads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What we have here is a difference of opinion between two honourable members. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, then may I ask the Minister if the amount that is included here covers the cost of the water that is presently flowing into the Village of St. Lazare because of the new construction that occurred in the last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1,330,000 for Highways--pass. Order please.

We will now go back to Resolution No. 6. The Honourable Minister for Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I must apologize once again to the members for being out of the House for a few moments. Why I wanted the Estimate Books for this year was to add together the expenditures which were asked for in the Main Estimates last year to which this is relative. This is of course the shortfall and it is approximately 10 percent of that which was authorized by the House last year. Most of it of course is relative to inflation.

But to my honourable friend from Rhineland who posed the question in the first instance, there are some things which we hope to improve to better operate the programs to which these funds are allocated. For example, relative to the member's constituency and that's the Member for Morris. I'm having staff look at the efficacy of spinning out the food requirements of the institutions to see if there isn't some way of allocating more of the purchasing to that area. I think that there is a saving to be gained and also at a

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . . . definite advantage for the vegetable growers in that particular area. I would hasten to add, Mr. Chairman, though that this can only be done, not to prejudice the policy of this government and prior governments, to put things out to tender.

One other perhaps picky point - but it does demonstrate some of the inefficiencies that can creep into systems perhaps - one of the things that was drawn to my attention that they were ordering, you know block ordering of Old grade of cheddar cheese rather than Mild and there's a 20 cent price differential in that.

The total sum is spread over the whole ministry, all the programs and purchases and all the other things which are accounted for under each sub-appropriation in the Main Estimates to the total of that particular amount.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Are we given to understand on this that this \$100,000 is mainly going towards the food for institutions to cover up some of the inefficiencies in these departments?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Ouch. I didn't say cover up. I admitted to something which perhaps could be considered to be inefficient and I don't fault my member for taking advantage of that. But nevertheless in candor, there are always improvements and I appreciate the questions of my honourable friend because this is how governments should be run. Because if we didn't have an effective opposition perhaps we might lose sight of some of the efficiencies which we could put in the system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Other Expenditures, \$100,000--pass. (3) External Agencies, \$16,200--pass.

Resolution 6, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$128,700 for Health and Social Development--pass.

Resolution No. 8, Affiliated Agencies and Activities: Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, (1) Salaries, \$23,000--pass? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister could tell us why the increase is necessary. I notice that we had spent almost half a million dollars last year with this particular department and we spoke on it during the Estimates and debated that particular expenditure last year at this time. From what most of the members on this side of the House can see is that basically all this department is doing is turning out literature which they take from Statistics Canada. To spend half a million dollars now on this particular facility to just glean information out of Statistics Canada I think is rather a waste of money and I think in this time of restraint when we're all trying to show a little bit of restraint the Minister could definitely cut down on this particular expenditure.

As I said, we're looking at half a million dollars and we really can't see the fruits of the labours of this particular organization. Maybe they're doing a lot of in-house work, but as far as the general public of Manitoba is concerned there's no way that we can justify this kind of money. So I would like the Minister to tell us at this time why he needs some \$43,000 and \$23,000 in salaries. I was wondering, I think there's enough bureaucrats around right now that we don't need any more expenditures along this line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye made reference to one report only of the Bureau, that is the Statistical Digest which I believe he was referring to. The increased expenditures noted here, if I might talk both about Salaries and Other Expenditures because they're intertwined, relate as I understand primarily to two other reports, two other statistical tabulations. One is the Northern Prices Survey which is an ongoing survey of pricing of food costs in a number of communities primarily in northern Manitoba. There are a few in the south but primarily in northern Manitoba.

Secondly, it relates to a quarterly tabulation of credit unions in the Province of Manitoba. And the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the costs of utilizing the computer for

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . tabulation has increased beyond expectations of the previous year. In addition publishing costs have increased, I'm advised in some instances, by 65 percent. And in addition with regard to the actual collection of pricing information in the north there has been a substantial increase in transportation costs of the pricers, that's the individual people who go about to the various communities getting prices from retail establishments. And as we all know the price of gasoline has gone up enormously, and so on, and so these are the reasons why there is this additional amount of \$43,800 being requested at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you. I wonder if the Minister would not agree with the few comments I made. We seem to be duplicating a lot of the stuff, and especially in the digest, and I don't know how exactly the digest is being sent out by the department, if they're sending it out upon request, or if they're just sending it to a certain mailing list that they have. But I notice there's a lot of duplication in there, and I think that maybe the Minister should sit down with the people from his department and make sure that the studies and the reports that they're sending out are their own reports and not just merely turning out the stuff that Statistics Canada already presents to us.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that digest is the only report that is turned out by this agency which relates to data published by Statistics Canada and other agencies. The point was that we would gather statistics relating to Manitoba and that they would be useful for all concerned. However, I believe the bureau is undergoing the exercise of seeing how extensively it is used, and so on, and it is possible it may be eliminated, but that is a very small part of the activity of the bureau; the bulk of it is compiling data that is not compiled anywhere else. The bulk of it is providing statistics both for the public and for various departments. I might mention, for example, the Northern Prices Survey is utilized by Manitoba Hydro in their Estimates of Northern Living Allowances. For example, I use that just as one minor example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can't help but pass comment at this point because we've all of us as members have been receiving the statistics as they come out from this bureau over the last couple of years. There is a notification here that is provided by the Bureau that I think might be worth looking at. One of the comments that's made in here is that, it says: "This year the Association is planning an extensive seminar program with the hope of establishing a dialogue amongst those with specific knowledge in specific topics related to statistics and those who would like to become acquainted or make use of that statistical topic."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I question whether the justification is very clear for increasing the amount of money justified by this group that comes on so strong, comes on so strong with their intended program, Mr. Chairman, "Specific topics related to statistics and those who have a statistical topic of particular interest." Mr. Chairman, this group also is known as the Statistical Association of Manitoba formed by, I suppose, the backbone of the Minister's department, more affectionately known as SAM. Mr. Chairman, S-A-M, SAM begs the question after this period of time, maybe we should be looking at sacking SAM for the amount of value that we're receiving out of the statistical reports that are coming to us. I think any group that is started up should go through a tenure period to determine whether in fact they're performing or contributing to an essential part of the province's requirements. And I think that in a year of restraint, in particular in a year of restraint like this year, this group ought to be looked at along with all the other groups that have been formed in recent years to determine whether, in fact, they are contributing an essential sort of government service to the people of Manitoba. I think there may be some doubt as to whether or not SAM . . . because anybody can set up a Statistical Association of Manitoba, but obviously in their literature they indicate here that they've been part of it. So I would suggest to the Minister that we ought to look pretty closely; I would say that this added appropriation certainly may be questionable.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that the government is and has looked very carefully at the budget of this agency, as indeed we have of all departments this year. I do want to make sure though that

## SUPPLY - SUPPLEMENTARY

(MR. EVANS cont'd) . . . . honourable members are not under any illusion that the so-called SAM organization, the Statistical Association of Manitoba - which incidentally I've never heard of until you've just mentioned it. I didn't know such an organization existed. I hope that the honourable members do not think that that is a government organization or sponsored by this government in any way, at least not to my knowledge. I don't want to be held responsible for any material put out by a private organization as though that is a statement by . . . Well I'd like the honourable member to table it or send me a copy, because that is not a government document.--(Interjection)--Well I'm not aware of it. I'm not aware of it. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I think I've given the explanation of the costs that relate to two particular surveys, namely, the Northern Prices Survey and the quarterly publication of Credit Union Activity in the Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 8(1) Salaries \$23,000--pass; Other Expenditures \$20,800--pass; Resolution 8. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$43,800 for Industry and Commerce--pass.

Resolution 9, Tourism and Parks Division (a) Provincial Park System Grant Assistance \$212,000--pass; Resolution 9. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$212,000 for Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs--pass.

SUPPLY - INTERIM

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing with Interim Supply. I'll read the Resolution. Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$282,403,300 being 25 percent of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1977, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1977--pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered and passed certain resolutions and requests me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have a request, a proposal to put to honourable members opposite, by their leave only, and that is if they would be prepared to advance this one further stage by way of going into Committee of Ways and Means.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable First Minister have leave? (Agreed)  
The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I believe at this stage then, Sir, it's a case of moving the usual motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS - SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Supplementary Supply. Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1976, and that the sum of \$6,683,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the companion piece, and that is that again, Sir, that you now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and this would be by leave of course.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS - INTERIM SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interim Supply. Resolved that towards making good the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1977, the sum of \$282,403,300 being 25 percent of the amount of the several items voted for the department and as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1977, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund--pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted a certain resolution and directed me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Morris, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the sort of logical place to conclude the process for today would be to ask leave to introduce the bill for first reading, have the bill distributed and then have consideration of second reading on another day. So if that's agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave. (Agreed)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SCHREYER introduced Bill 33, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1976; and Bill 34, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1977.

MR. SPEAKER: Having completed this area of business we now go into Private Members' Hour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - RESOLUTION 6

MR. SPEAKER: The first item is Resolution No. 6, proposed by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, amended by the Honourable Minister of Mines. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition has 14 minutes.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that the resolution - I spoke on it back some weeks ago and at the time we didn't have the amendment, it wasn't distributed at the time, so my remarks were addressed to the main motion. I've been looking at the amendment to the resolution and trying to decipher just how badly it emasculates the main resolution. I have to confess that I'm not absolutely sure just to what extent it does at this point. However, I want to point out that the elements contained in the main motion by the Member for Fort Rouge are the elements contained in most environmental impact statement requirements in jurisdictions primarily in the United States who have a little more experience with writing out or spelling out the requirements of environmental impact assessments or statements. So there's nothing that the government should feel that is unusual about the requirements being asked for by the Member for Fort Rouge, and I don't feel that the government should have any great reticence about adopting the requirements that are being asked for here. Because it's usual practice to not only assess the impact created by large projects, it is also common to ask for the mitigation measures and it's also common to ask for the alternatives to the proposed action. All of these are a logical sequence that have been developed in the United States, I think first of all by the Atomic Energy Commission who were some of the first people to get involved in spelling these things out, the AEC in the United States, and environmental impact assessments is a term that's actually been more common to Canada rather than environmental impact statements. So I don't feel that what was being asked for in the prime resolution here would put an onus on the government that would be very hard to live with in comparison to those requirements being put on in other jurisdictions.

One of the major things that has happened in the U.S. law that should be examined closely in Canadian law in this field, is the more clear rights for class action to be taken on issues that are an environmental nature, and I think you would find that if the law in Canada was changed, you would see far more activity being taken in regards to having an examination done of projects that have a potential for undesirable environmental impact. However we've gone along on the basis in Canada so far that provisions for class action would not be in the best interests. However, without that right and without any clear requirement for them to prepare an environmental impact statement, you find that the lines of responsibility are much fuzzier in Canada than they are in other jurisdictions. I think it's rather strange that - perhaps not strange but noteworthy, that environmental concern runs almost parallel to affluence. You find that countries that have achieved a high standard of living automatically almost progress into a stage where they become increasingly concerned about environmental impact.

It was found in the Stockholm conference that was called by the United Nations and chaired by one of our more notable Manitoba products from Oak Lake; that at this United Nations conference in Stockholm, they went into it with great hopes because countries like the United States generally had gone through the evolution, and the Scandinavian countries too, through the evolution of reaching a point where they could consider committing a certain portion of their gross national product to doing more intensive environmental studies. But it was interesting, the main outcome of the Stockholm conference was, while world-wide environmental controls were advocated by the developed countries, the Western world countries, there was a tremendous reticence by the countries that were the have-not countries, regardless of their political strife, regardless of their philosophical position; almost to a "T" the have-not countries opposed this sort of a move, and you can almost see this verified by what's been happening in Canada.

We have here, we had a very high and rapid rise in environmental concern in the last ten years, primarily in the last six or eight years, because we've reached a point of affluence I think in Canada where people's thoughts could be turned to environmental protection and measures such as that that weren't directly tied to just the straight economic factors. But it was interesting to note that as soon as the energy crunch hit, when people started becoming concerned about bread and butter items, the whole environmental concern that was developing about non renewable resources and all these other

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . things went into a tailspin, and most notably you could cite the case of the Trans Alaska Pipeline. This project was stalled for a period of two or three years strictly by the fact that Americans who started it were not experiencing an energy crisis and they had reached a degree of affluence where they could turn their thoughts to environmental protection; and a significant sector of the American Society became extremely concerned about this, moving into a pristine undisturbed area of Alaska and using the traditional yardsticks of economic development, they wanted to see a closer examination of what that impact would be by doing this tremendously large project. But then the world crisis in energy struck when the OPEC countries decided that they would tighten up on prices and exports and then the tremendous surge of interest arose in the United States to get the oil line in through Alaska so they would become less dependent on the world supply of oil from other parts of the world. And the environmental issue at that point went into a descent and it's continued in that direction as long as the energy crisis has been a matter of concern to American interests.

So it seems, Mr. Speaker, that we need the environmental concern road in the first place because of the degree of affluence that we have achieved in the western world countries, and as soon as our affluence is threatened, we tend to back away from any clear-cut mechanism of providing environmental protection. I think it's worth noting that you often hear that under a Communist country such as Russia that environmental protection of course can be programmed by the state. That of course, Mr. Speaker, isn't exactly the case. The environmental protection measures that were exercised in Russia with regard to the development of Northern Pipelines were nowhere near as extensive as the environmental research input that has gone into pipeline studies and oil development studies, drilling programs and so on that are going on both in northern Canada and in northern United States.

We can't look to, as we do in some cases, some people are prone to suggest that our environmental problems arise from the aggressiveness of the private sector. Mr. Chairman, a portion of the private sector puts amounts of money into environmental research, like has gone into it in the northern parts of Canada and the US in the last six to eight years, and it's done for purely practical reasons, is that they realize they must prove to the affluent society that they're going to have to measure up in their environmental planning as well as in the straight technical and economic sense. And they've done that, as I pointed out last May in the study that went on in northern Canada. The private sector moved in and spent perhaps \$25 million on environmental studies to determine whether a pipeline could be laid up the McKenzie Valley, and turned around one sunny day and found that the Federal Government was pushing through a highway which had a tremendously greater environmental impact, pushing a highway along the same route without ever taking cognizance of the fact that there would be any environmental impact. So that again would indicate that there is some requirement to put the onus of responsibility on the government to make sure that they do these things. Not just on the private sector who sense they have to do it to gain public opinion to prove to them that there is or isn't, make the changes that prove that there aren't undesirable or avoidable environmental impacts on a project - not just that sector which does it for reasons of the practical necessity of proving to the government and to the people that they have to do, there needs to be a mechanism that forces government into doing the environmental studies. This, Mr. Speaker, I suggest is necessary, despite the fact that the environmentalists in many cases are not giving us specific answers that we want. But unless the onus of responsibility is put on governments to start monitoring their own decisions, we're going to be in the position where we're just not going to get adequate environmental protection.

So Mr. Speaker, it brings us down to the question here, I didn't feel that what the Member for Fort Rouge was asking for here was at all unrealistic, it's simply - not simply, but it puts down essentially what has been happening in other jurisdictions outside of Canada, namely to specify a given procedure to force government into the position of doing environmental impact assessments the same way that any citizen logically asks the private sector to do themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

RESOLUTION 6

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, if there is no other debate on the bill, I'd like to have a moment or two to close debate if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member can't be closing debate because there's an amendment on the floor.

MR. AXWORTHY: Oh. May I speak to the amendment then?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I think I stated the basic reasons for proposing this resolution in my opening remarks, but the Minister of Mines and Energy and presumably Environmental Protection made some fairly extraordinary statements in his response and in the presentation of his amendment, and I really think it deserves a response. Because I think that in part it is misleading; and secondly, if his particular philosophy is the one that is current in the treasury benches, the government benches, then I have serious doubts about the health of the democratic spirit that is existent amongst those people.

To begin with Mr. Speaker, the Minister makes the case that the commitment that he expressed last year of that the government would undertake environmental impact statements is being fulfilled by the order that he has sent around that impact statements be prepared by different provincial agencies. What he does though, Mr. Speaker, is one of those interesting examples of legerdemain of which he and others in the government are famous, and that is the requirement for impact statements are discretionary. And if an agency of government, let's say for sake of argument Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is deciding to build a new town, let's say in a community that may be 30 miles north of Winnipeg on the east side of the river, and they discover that their plans and projects are such that it would have negative dilatorious effects against that project, it is discretionary whether they have to make it public or not. They can simply do their study and if they find out it doesn't suit their purposes, suit their interests, there is no requirement under the present government position to make that a public document and make it available for public view, which I find quite extraordinary. What's the point of having them?

It is simply a matter of once again having an internal document for internal purposes, that if it does happen to reveal major discrepancies or abnormalities then it simply is buried once more into one of those chambers or capsules that we put radioactive destructive materials in. It goes against the very essence of the purpose of environmental impact reports, which is to ensure that there is public awareness of, first that the project is taking place and what the consequences are; and the evaluations that have been done in those areas where impact statements are operative show that the major influence that they have upon the civil servants, upon the agencies, upon the government doing them, is the very fact that they know that they are going to be made public, that they will have to bear up under public scrutiny and will have to bear up under public examination. And so the positive results of an impact statement is the discipline or imperative that it puts upon planners and administrators and civil servants preparing large projects to make sure that they undertake a full assessment of all the consequences and the alternatives, and if there is no requirement to make it public, then there is no requirement to be as careful or as cautious or as forthcoming as it would otherwise be the case. So in effect what the Minister announced is really nothing. It may have some internal use. I suppose if the Minister of Corrections wants to find out what the Minister of Housing is doing, I suppose he might have access to that document, but no one else would have if it didn't happen to be the consideration of the government that they should make it in any way public. So, Sir, to say that they've taken a major step, I just think is really nonsensical, it makes no sense to talk about an impact that is discretionary and non public. So that would be one question where the amendment proposed by the Minister simply doesn't bear out because it is not a proper protection or adequate surveillance.

The Minister also said, well you know - I mentioned the case that the value of this thing has been demonstrated in part through the operation of the Garrison Diversion debate that has gone on in this province for the last two or three years - and he said, well we knew about the Garrison Diversion many years ago. But the point is this,

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . Mr. Speaker, no one else did. And it wasn't until there was a release and dissemination of the public document of an impact report prepared by the agency in the United States that the Manitoba public itself was aware of the problems and the consequences which then resulted in the ability of members of the opposition and public interest organizations to put some pressure and some heat upon the Provincial Government to take a proper stand and a more rigorous stand in relation to American authorities. So the very evidence that we need to support the application of an environmental impact on our province, I think, is the Garrison Diversion, and the fact that it did become a public document, because up to that time it had simply been a matter of communication between different levels of government, again totally removed from the public view and the public observation. So the Diversion was a good example where in effect the American legal requirements for impact were utilized by the Canadian authorities and the Canadian public to protect their own interests. It would seem to me that if the value of the report could be seen on the Diversion, then it would seem to be almost all so obvious that we should apply the same kind of restrictions to ourselves in our own jurisdiction.

But, Mr. Speaker, we discover why the government doesn't want to do things like that in the final remarks that the Minister of Mines and Resources makes, and I refer to page 637 of Hansard, March 4th, because when you really cut to the bone, you get to where the Minister of Mines is really at along with some of his colleagues. He says, "I'll tell you why I don't want to do these things, because I don't want to be run by a bunch of minorities." Then he goes on to say that after all he is the majority; he is the man that's elected; he is the government. Why should he be put upon by these minorities. I've heard the Premier talk about these sort of vexatious environmentalist groups, heard the Minister of Housing the other night say that he is tired of dealing with all these citizens' organizations and it really reveals a disturbing state of mind that exists upon the members of this government; that they have really forgotten somehow what government's all about. Government is there to serve all kinds of groups and minorities because everyone, Mr. Speaker, in this society is a minority. There is no such thing as some monolithic majority that sort of marches in unison behind the NDP banner.

The fact of the matter is that everyone in society belongs to a minority at one time or another and one of the very basic requirements in our society is the protection of minorities. The way you protect them is to make sure they have information and know what's going on.

I think that when I say that I am disturbed by what I heard the Minister say and others of his colleagues, black and white repeated, it simply means that they are acquiring that - who was the old French King that said "L'etat et moi" - that somehow they have adopted a notion that they represent sort of "the" public interest, and realize that government is far less a superior thing than they think it is, and that a great deal of humility - a good dose of humility would stand them in good stead. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that when government starts saying the things that I heard come from the Minister of Mines and Resources and from the First Minister and from the Minister of Housing about their disinclination any longer to deal with the minorities of this world, to deal with these vexatious public interest groups, these citizens' organizations that are acting, as they see it, in sort of an interfering manner that will simply complicate the role of government and make things less efficient. When I started hearing words like that, then it really disturbs me about the style and quality of government we've got. Because increasingly those are the tones of authoritarianism that are beginning to be expressed. Not in the violent forms that we're used to hearing it but in the forms of increasing indifference to the public voice, increasing skepticism that somehow you don't have to listen to people any more because after all aren't we the fount of all wisdom, they say. Don't we represent the general will, the public interest or however they're describing it?

It is that which even makes it more necessary to have things like environmental impacts. Because when a government reaches that stage where it no longer seems to have a sensitivity or responsiveness to the voices of minorities, of whatever kind or

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . character, when it reaches that stage then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the requirement is to build in much more serious and much more deliberate protections and guarantees against the rights of people and the rights of minorities is so paramount that this bill becomes something more than a technique or a piece of machinery for better environmental protection. It becomes much more serious than that. It becomes a way of protecting the interests of a large number of citizens in this country. That is what I find to be perhaps the import of the remarks made by the Minister of Mines, that maybe no longer are we debating simply a way of improving or upgrading the ability to protect the environment.

I think we are also talking about an attitude of mind, about the way government works, an attitude of mind towards the rights of people in a society to have information, to be able to protect themselves, to have the opportunity to know what's going on and to be able then to use whatever means is available, whether it's in the courts, whether it's speaking to individuals who are elected to represent them, whether it is taking ads in newspapers, whether it is marching on the front steps of the Legislature; the very fact that those are fundamental rights which, in effect, are almost being disregarded by saying I don't want to deal with these minorities any more, they're just getting in my way. I mean the rights of minorities, you know, really disturb me. --(Interjection)-- Well, I refer the Minister to his remarks. I refer the Minister to Page 637 of Hansard, March 4th, 1976.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I would like the honourable member to read those remarks and compare them in Hansard with what he has just said. I never said I don't wish to deal with minorities and I don't care about minorities. I show much more care for minorities than the honourable friend has.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be a point of privilege afterwards, but let me read then the Minister back his own remarks. --(Interjection)-- If the Minister is able to be quiet long enough I'd be glad to read back his own remarks to him. So he says, and I quote from Page 637. He says: "The part which I question is the part which seeks really to suggest that these things are best handled by minorities rather than by governmental authorities. Because what the legislation does, Mr. Speaker, is that it enables a minority group which has not been able to get its voice heard in the councils of government to remove that activity from the councils of government and put them into the hands of the court where they feel that they would stand a better chance," which no one had said, of course.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. AXWORTHY: But no one had said that this should go to court. "Mr. Speaker, when one is a minority this looks like an attractive thing, and I am happy to state if consistency means anything, that I was just as strong against the Bill of Rights when I sat in the opposition" - and that's an interesting remark in itself - "as I am against it now that I sit in the government. I accepted the fact that in order to move in a certain direction one has to obtain public support for your position; that if you do not have public support for your position that it is wrong to seek" - and the syntax is kind of mixed up here - "to have that minority position pushed onto the majority."

And why not, Mr. Speaker? The point is, isn't that what minorities do? Isn't it the right of every minority to have the access to information so that it can convince those who are not in a majority or who are other minorities, to have that right to know what's going on so that they can make their case in whichever form, by whichever techniques that they want. Well, because the tone of the Minister's remarks are saying, I'm tired of these minorities. I don't want to be dealing with them any more, and I'll read on further.

MR. GREEN: I never said that I am tired of minorities. The honourable member has read a remark which says exactly the contrary and I have never said that I am tired of minorities.

MR. AXWORTHY: . . . the words are there and it comes out very clear, and then he goes on to say: "I've had it stated worse, Mr. Speaker. I've had people come into my office and say, 'You are not the public, you are the elected representative, you do what I tell you.' And it comes down to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the elected

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . . representative is the last one who is able to put a public position because he is the elected representative. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that were the way it was, then I'd prefer to be the guy coming in and saying, you do what I tell you, rather than being the Minister. I mean what's the point of it? So I suggest that this desire for legislation, this desire for a pattern or a law which is supposed to declare as to how the government will act comes from really an attempt to foist the minority position on a majority."

So, Mr. Speaker, the kind of mind and attitude that sort of suggests that these minorities are going to somehow be pressing the poor Minister as he cowers in his office waiting for them to kind of bludgeon him into submission at his desk, simply suggest to me that that kind of attitude of mind is the disturbing part. That the government in fact should be welcoming minorities into their offices, giving them the representation, providing them with the information. But they can't do it, Mr. Speaker. There is no way that those minorities of whom the Minister is so apprehensive have any ability to do it if, in fact, they don't know what's going on. How do they find out what's going on? How do they find out? They find out, Mr. Speaker, by ensuring that when there is a project which is complicated, which is detailed, which has a great deal of requirement for knowledge and skills, then that knowledge must be shared, that information must be disseminated. It must be made available, otherwise there is no basis for countermand, and we simply all then must blindly take the word of the Minister as he represents that majority which, in fact I don't think he represents the majority, I think it's 42 percent. Then we must simply take or accept his word for what's going on and have no recourse by whichever minority we're in to know what the alternatives may be.

The fact of the matter is, and I think the Leader of the Opposition made the proper case. He said that only large organizations with massive amounts of resources have the ability to undertake the kinds of technical studies to really determine and discern what the problems are and what the consequences are.

One of those agencies, Mr. Speaker, happens to be government. It is government itself, which is oftentimes the body which transgresses as much or more as anybody else, as anybody in any other sector. Under the present law or the statement that the Minister made, that in fact we're allowing that agency which has the potential of being one of the most serious transgressors to have a discretion whether it's going to allow the information to be publicly made available or not.

So there again the old question of acting as judge and jury. We'll give you information if we think it doesn't bring a bad light upon us. So there is the illogic and the irrationality of the present position and that is why I think it is a requirement under statute that Environmental Impact statements not only be constructed and be required but also be made publicly available, subject to some control whether it's the Clean Environment Commission or by whatever other kinds of means are decided. Therefore, then let the public, that range of minorities, do with it as they will. If they want to attack the Minister in his office, fine. If they can find some basis for going to court, even better. I think that the requirement for class action is a reasonable suggestion and one that should be looked at. Because the fact of the matter is we live in a new age; we are in an industrial society where we are in danger of spoiling our environment unless we are able to provide even more useful kinds of protections and guarantees than simply try to resolve and deal with this method by old methods. Then I think, Mr. Speaker, we are limiting ourselves, tying our hands, and in the meantime doing something very dangerous to the way government works in this society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Corrections.

MR. BOYCE: Well, that's my act to take my shoe off. Maybe we can ask the Minister of Mines to contain himself for a few moments but I can understand his reaction.

The Member for Fort Rouge in his presentation, you know, makes the best case to demonstrate why the Liberal Party in the Province of Manitoba is in the position that they are, because he is certainly out of touch with the people of the province. There is a difference in philosophy between the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party. But one thing that there is a common understanding of is that we are still in the age of

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . .parliamentary responsible government.

Now I for one on any occasion where an incursion of the American system into the Canadian system, how be it so subtle is presented to this Legislature or any other legislative body in the country, will caution people that we accept the "bastardization" of our system at our peril. Even the terms that the member uses, "file an impact study" is an American term that is required.

I would go back, Mr. Speaker, to the case before I became involved in politics. There was a case before the House that was being considered whether the hydro electric development of Northern Manitoba should entail a flooding of a particular part of our province at some specific height, 35 feet, 50 feet, and the New Democratic Party at that time asked the government to look at the ecological and other environmental impacts of this particular venture. But never once did they suggest as is being suggested by the Member for Fort Rouge that they wait until all the evidence was in. They said that the Conservative Party was the government and they should accept the responsibility of discharging their decisions and be willing to answer to the public for it. Until the Minister of Mines as I recall it - maybe I'm wrong - introduced a particular bill in the House at which time they asked the Legislature to become part of that responsibility and then the people in the opposition said, give us the evidence on which you're asking us to make a judgment. Because this is what responsible government is all about, is the acceptance of the responsibility of making judgment. I don't care what kind of system you develop, somebody ultimately has to decide.

I said facetiously yesterday in another regard that everything in the universe is "causely" related. That happens to be an apriori fact. That is true. That is the way it is. But somewhere in the human operation of things we have to make decisions on when all of the reasonable evidence is being considered.

I digress just a moment. On this argument I will support the contention or the argument that the Garrison Development will probably be a better thing because of the opposition and the testing of the hypothesis and evidence that was submitted for the continuation of that program. Nevertheless somebody all the way along the line of that thing has to make judgment and will have to accept the responsibility for it.

Now the Member for Fort Rouge chides the Minister of Mines for saying this is what responsibility is all about. I hadn't planned on entering this debate, Mr. Chairman, until he used such terms as "evidence," "indifference," "minorities" and all the rest of this in a mode of argument that really made no logical sense if people assume that this is still a province which operates within a federal system of responsible government. And this is what the people expect us to do. Now the Liberal Party in the Province of Manitoba still wants to maintain that if we sit back on our cans and wait until all of the evidence is in, that some infallible program will evolve. This is not true.

If somebody wonders why productivity is going down in relationship to our total gross national product, one of the reasons is inflation is a cause, certainly - but one of the causal things is we keep adding things which have to be taken into consideration in the cost of production.

Now I worked for a while for a large paper company and one of our jobs was to monitor the effluent into the . . . and the Sacramento River systems and caution the company how to better control it so that the biological demands of the rivers weren't depleted. All of the things that we did entered into the cost of that particular paper. And not making this as an argument that we shouldn't do that which is suggested by the member. But nevertheless, how much will the traffic bear?

You know, I digress and maybe it's an abstruse point in this particular argument. But you know before we got so darned clean about things, people used to eat dirt. Now all of the antibiotics that they bring in, where are they found? They're found in dirt. Penicillin, aeromiacin, all the rest of it, they come out of dirt. You know perhaps we're getting over-cleansed in this particular area. Some people want to live in a biological test tube. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's not be so darned naive and let's not kid our people that we can develop this kind of society because we cannot.

The indifference I don't know, I think that I am just as interested in the affairs

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) . . . . of people as the Member for Fort Rouge. I never accused anyone else in this House of being indifferent. I've always said that I figure the members of the Conservative group and the Liberal group - you can read my remarks over the years - and I've said that they are just as interested in people as I am. But if the Liberal group is happy with staying in oblivion and going further down into oblivion, you know, this is fine with me. It used to kind of bother me when I first came into government. The Minister of Mines stood up one time and he told the Conservatives some of the mistakes that they were making, but they continue to make them so I don't get so nervous. The Member for St. Johns in this particular session mentioned a few things that tactically they may be wise to accept politically. But I don't get nervous any more because people don't really listen to that kind of argument.

But if there's anything that the Liberal group has done in Manitoba is to add to the confusion, that if I can muster ten people then you muster 20, then I muster 30, then you muster 40. You know, we can go on forever on this type of thing. We have one base document, with several interpretations of it. For example, you have the King James version, the D . . . version of a particular document that arguments have gone on for centuries, how these things should be interpreted. And each side in each group musters their experts and they continue on the argument. The final judgment on how any particular group survives within that kaleidoscope of opinion is what the people themselves decide.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people in our province have more sense than the Member for Fort Rouge gives them credit for, because as long as he pursues this particular argument, I see no particular political threat from the Liberal group because the people in the Province of Manitoba expect to elect responsible governments who will make responsible decisions, and every four or five years they get their choice to turf them out if they're wrong.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, after listening to one of the junior ministers I felt I had to get up and say something, I just couldn't stand it any longer. I don't know where he got his lessons in democracy, but Private Members' Hour is for any member of the House to present a resolution, and usually it's to put forward an idea for discussion. According to my friend only certain people can make these suggestions; only certain people are allowed, in his opinion, to make suggestions for discussion.

The whole import of the resolution is that people have the right to know what government is doing in certain areas and in this area it's about environmental impact, and what government actions are going to . . . what they do, and what the impact of the action is, and the right for people to know. And through the information that the government have these groups - minorities they've been called, usually they are - can decide on the evidence that the government has whether or not that they should oppose, or whether or not that they should ask questions or seek more information. My friend is suggesting that it shouldn't be that way at all, that they know better. They have the information and they know better and they will do what is right for people, in their opinion. And they want no one else to interfere with their decisions. And his argument, I just can't follow it, it's such a ridiculous argument.

The resolution is asking for the government to open up and give information. Their leader campaigned on that platform in 1969, that the people have the right to know certain things, and here we have one of their Ministers saying they don't have the right to know, we know better. --(Interjection)-- You inferred that, you inferred that. You said that the Liberal Party, the small group had no right to be bringing these questions like this, that you know better. It's a lot of nonsense. And we're saying through this resolution that government information should be made available, be made available to people who are interested in any particular facet of government business, and that's all the resolution says.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I've listened to the Member for Fort Rouge and now to the Member for Portage la Prairie, who really tried very hard to justify the

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . . comments made by the Member for Fort Rouge, but I'm sorry to say to him it was a good effort, but it just doesn't hold water. No one questions the fact that people have a right to know, and that's what this is all about, and that's why members are here, and if they want to know they ask through Orders for Return, and they do. And Estimates come up and they ask questions, and detailed questions. And I know, I've been through it very recently, as recent as last night. And that's what it's all about, and that's what a democratic form of government is all about, and that's what the government is all about, and that's what responsible government is all about.

And what we're hearing is what's going on in the United States now, which is an entirely different constitution, set up in a different way, where they use the courts. They use the courts very consistently and you get a very militant group, call them mug minority, or any otherwise, a militant group, especially a knowledgeable militant group, then they will launch and take advantage of every legal device, and there's lots of them, to hamstring, to forestall, to prevent, and fight it from court to court to court and eventually they may lose. In any case what does happen, whatever is being planned it simply drags on and on for years.

You know, the member made a statement that it was because of the intervention suddenly - no, because of an environmental impact statement published in the United States, that suddenly we became aware that there was something going on in the Garrison Dam. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Fort Rouge, before he ever got to this House, the government was aware that there was going to be a diversion. The government recognized because there are technical and knowledgeable people in Manitoba, recognized that there could be a danger to Manitoba waters, it could have an effect on them, and before the honourable member ever got here steps had already been taken, through the Government of Canada, to advise the American Government that the Manitoba Government was concerned. As a result of that studies were made, environmental impact reviews were made, and as a result of those studies, because it was all triggered from here, as a result of that the evidence then came forward. Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. If the honourable member would like to delude himself into thinking that he and some people he's associated with suddenly discovered America, good luck to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Would the Minister agree that under the American Protection Agency Law that was passed in 1969 it is a requirement of all American projects to submit environmental impact statements, so it had nothing to do with the actions here and that under law they are required to prepare such environmental impact statements.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the law in the United States may require it. What I'm saying is that in 1970 the action was initiated on the Canadian side and not on the American side. They might be still studying it to death for all that I know if it hadn't been for the intervention from this side of the border. That is a reality.

Now the fact is that this government has agreed that there should be environmental impact review process to deal with the contaminants, contaminants to the air, land, the water, and we're doing that. But on the other hand I just cannot accept the thinking that a group of people, who for whatever reason because they have a different attitude, they have a certain concept because of their own attitudes towards something, should be able to stymie almost indefinitely and fight down to the point where they can go to the courts, seek an injunction, get an injunction, and then what happens, 57 people go on this side, not the ones that are elected, but one Judge will then deliberate and he will make the judgment of what it shall be.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the judiciary, I'd rather leave it to the elected representatives in a democratic system than to the judiciary.

At least we are responsible for our actions in the sense that we have to account to people; we have to get on the hustings and account; we have to answer charges from across the way; we have to answer to our own constituents. And he talks about meeting with minority groups and meeting with others. I don't recall, and I think others will bear me out, no government has been as open and available to all groups in this society than this government that exists now in Manitoba. We have been available to minority groups, majority groups, you name them, we've been available, sometimes overly so.

RESOLUTION 6

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

And I'm not taking away anything from former governments. They too when approached and somebody wanted to meet with them, whether it was an organization, or what have you, I don't doubt that the former government also met with them and heard their complaints. And on the basis of what they heard they felt they had to modify something, I'm sure they did, I know we have, and we are very conscious of it. We have bills introduced to the House, they go into Law Amendments. You know, Manitoba, as a matter of fact, is probably one of the most democratic legislatures in Canada. I've talked to other legislators from across the country and they sometimes wonder at how we get anything done here. We go to Law Amendments or out of the House in Committee with everything, but everything. Everything is scrutinized. Anyone from the public can get up there and it doesn't matter, and I've heard it said, "He's come, he's got a right to speak; you can't deny him the right to speak," and he speaks, no matter what the bill is, major, minor, inconsequential, it doesn't matter. So when the member talks in terms about authoritarian, etc., etc., I totally reject it; it's a bunch of garbage, it's nonsense. It isn't worthy of him.

He talks about you've got to protect the minority. Of course, you have to protect the minority, but you also have to protect the majority from the tyranny of the minority, and the maneuverings of a minority. If you follow the thinking of the member to its logical conclusion, you end up with almost everything in the courts and the courts will decide in their wisdom whether or not this is right or that is right, or that study is adequate or not adequate. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect --(Interjection)-- I listened to you, now you listen to me. No, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I'm fed up. Point of privilege? All right.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his matter of privilege?

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, there is no mention whatsoever in that resolution of any reference to the use of the courts, of the judiciary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the member's resolution and his speech leads to one conclusion, one conclusion, that's the only way it can lead is one conclusion. It has to end up that way and the fact is, and the fact is the American, if we look at the American model we know where it ends up. It ends up exactly where I said it was going to end up. It will end up in legislation, enshrined, enshrined in such a way that it can be challenged in the courts and then you go through the whole judicial procedure..

So, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect and respect to the Member for Portage la Prairie, no one is denying the rights of people to know. We have a Legislature, we have people elected, the Opposition is here for that purpose, the public has access to the Opposition, it has access to people on this side of the House as well as that side of the House, and I'm satisfied that people not only have access, they avail themselves of that access, they take advantage of that access. And when things occur which they want to question, they will question. The reference was made to the Hydro in northern Manitoba. Let's not kid ourselves, there was an awful lot of talk on that one, a lot of groups came forward. The members of the Legislature elected at that time, and they were in this House at that time, were deluged by people seeking information. They in turn got up in this House and they sought the information. They asked for it through Orders for Return and for tabling of documents, and so on. They asked for it and got the information which they needed. And they kept persisting until they did get it, and that's really what a responsible government's all about, that's what parliamentary democracy is all about. And I'm simply not prepared to accept that we somehow tried to copy or emulate what has happened in the United States. You know we're going through a phase. I think, as everything else, things work in a cyclical way. The pendulum has swung and today there is a great deal of concern about the environment. And that perhaps is because there was so little concern in the past. But you can go overboard in these things as well. The pendulum could swing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will have ten minutes the next time we get to this resolution.

The hour being 5:30 p.m. I am now adjourning the House and the House will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon. (Thursday)