

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY of MANITOBA
Wednesday, March 2, 1977

TIME: 2:30 p.m. OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 28 students, Grade Nine standing of the MacKenzie Junior High. These students are under the direction of Mr. Conrad Artbes. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Dauphin, the Minister of Highways.

We also have 32 students Grade 11 standing of West Kildonan Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Paul Ruta. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, the Minister of Finance and Urban Affairs.

We have 25 students, Grade Six standing of the General Vanier School, under the direction of Mrs. Hebert. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

On behalf of the honourable members, we welcome you.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HONOURABLE PETER BURTNIAK (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this time table **The Annual Report for 1976 of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HONOURABLE BILLIE URUSKI (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table **The Eighteenth Annual Report of the Municipal Board for the year ending December 31st, 1976.**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table **The Annual Report for the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31st, 1976.** This is the official copy and additional copies will be made available for all MLAs.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK: I have a question for the Minister of Finance and would ask him if he can indicate from his department's assessment of the current year's financial affairs, whether the actual spending in the current year will be close to the Estimates that were tabled for the current year's expenditure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be appropriate in this particular circumstance, since I was Minister of Finance at the time of the tabling of the last Estimates, that in thumb-nail sketch which is, I gather, what the honourable member really desires is an approximate summary, that last year at the time of the tabling of the Estimates it was indicated book estimates of 1176 that during the course of the year was with all of the contingencies and exigencies, that there are special warrants and, on the other side of the ledger, lapsings. The net effect of it all is that when a forecast last year for a budgetary deficit of the order of \$12.8 to \$30 million, that it will likely be — we don't close the books until the 20th of April, my honourable friend will appreciate — but a rough approximation would be in the order of, it would certainly be in the range between 12 and 18 — it will be probably in the order of 18 or 19.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the First Minister. Can he give us some idea on the total amounts of the Special Warrants for the year. Special Warrants for the year.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, here I certainly defer to the Minister of Finance, but again, to convey information of an approximate nature I would say Special Warrants in the order of 40, lapsings in the order of 20 thereabouts.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can ask the First Minister or the present Minister of Finance if the province's books close April 20th when we can expect a preliminary statement with regards to the current year's performance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HONOURABLE SAULA A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't give a definitive date on when that might be. The end of the fiscal year is March 31st but the books, as I say, don't close until April 20th. I'm not sure how long it would be before some preliminary statement of the actual final accounting would be made. It would be a few months.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, to be more specific, might I ask the Minister if we can expect a statement before sometime in June?

MR. MILLER: My crystal ball isn't that clear. I can't tell him it will be before June or after June but

certainly there'd be no intention to not make that available if, in fact, the information is available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C.: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder if he can indicate where the amount of \$3,028,306 referred to by the provincial auditor for the Department of Northern Affairs, the Churchill Prefab Housing Plan where that amount has been paid out? Was it paid out in last year's estimates? Is it estimated for this year or is it to be paid out of Capital Supply?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance

MR. MILLER: I'm not quite sure what reference the Member for River Heights is making. I'll take it as notice and if he would indicate what page or what he is quoting from it would help in my finding what the answer is.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it was on page 22 of the Provincial Auditor's Report; it refers to \$3 million of the deficit for the Churchill Prefab Housing Plan.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Thank you Mr. Speaker. To the Minister responsible for the Motor Vehicle Branch, will the Minister be attending the mass meeting of the tow truck industry protesting his ten mile limit and new licensing which will be held tonight. This will mean undue hardship on people who need to use a tow truck.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the Minister of Highways. I would ask him, in light of the tragic accidents which have occurred at the crossing of PTH 12 and the Greater Winnipeg Water District Line and the same type of hazards existing at the Greater Winnipeg Water District Crossing at Hadashville, will the Minister inform the House whether his department will be installing railway crossing lights at these two intersections?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: I, Mr. Speaker, am not aware of very many tragic accidents there. I believe there was one or two perhaps over the years but I would also like to inform my honourable friend that if lights or stop signs or whatever is installed that does not guarantee there will be no more traffic accidents as a result of this action. We have had that experience as well. But I am not aware of any tremendous amount of accidents there at all.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister will confirm that the installation of these lights is the responsibility of the Manitoba Department of Highways.

MR. BURTONIAK: We have at times on certain occasions discussed these matters with the railways, whether it be CNR or CPR or any other as you refer to this particular railway in that area and we have at times, installed stop signs at the railway crossings but usually that is also the responsibility of the railway.

MR. BANMAN: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if in light of the blind spots at these particular crossings, if the Minister will have another look and see if his department can't install these lights?

MR. BURTONIAK: . . . Sir, with regards to the blind spots, I presume that the honourable member is talking about some bush or whatever along the railroad track, that certainly is not our responsibility. I would suggest that my honourable friend talk to the railways.

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

HONOURABLE RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could with leave submit a Return to an Order of the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member have leave? Agreed.

MR. DOERN: . . . by the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, with relation to his Annual Report which he tabled yesterday for the Manitoba Energy Council Secretariat. Mr. Speaker, the question to the Minister is, if in addition to the reported intervention regarding the McKenzie Valley Gas Pipeline application to the National Energy Board having been made in 1975, whether it's the government's intention to intervene now before the decision of the National Energy Board is made in 1977, in view of the fact that a third alternative pipeline for the McKenzie Valley is now before the NEB.

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

HONOURABLE LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, we are doing whatever is prudent and efficient. In this case we are watching very closely, we're monitoring, in fact I am suggesting that it is not necessary to intervene in each and every case before the NEB. This is important we realize but we are watching it very closely.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, my further question to the Minister is, whether or not the implications to the ProVCanadian gas to the Southern part of Canada, is not of sufficient importance for his department to be considering intervention to the NEB in the next few months?

MR. EVANS: Yes, I must check the records but I believe, technically speaking or legally speaking, we have filed a legal intervention, or we've given notice and if and when required we can present a supporting brief in the interests of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce responsible for transportation problems. I wonder if the Minister could tell the House whether, in view of the closing of applications to provide ferry air service on February 28th, whether he has been advised if Air Canada is an applicant to provide those services?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have not been advised, I'm not aware of any advice in this matter.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, further to the question of the provision of ferry air service, has the province been approached to support any or all of the applications that had been submitted to the Canadian Transport Commission?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we have not been formally approached or indeed I believe, I don't recall any informal approaches made by any carriers to the province for support.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, is it the intention then of the Minister, for his government to support any particular applicant in this decision of the Canadian Transport Commission?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have as the honourable member knows, intervened on behalf of a Manitoba carrier if there is only one Manitoba carrier involved in a particular case but when there is more than one Manitoba carrier, I don't believe that it is fair or prudent for us to favour one particular carrier over another and, in this particular case, I believe the honourable member's aware that there are more than one, there's more than one Manitoba carrier interested in these prairie routes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I wonder if he can inform the House if Allan S. Wiley is still on the board of directors of the Public Insurance Corporation.

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Wiley resigned from the board some time ago.

MR. BLAKE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister can now inform the House who the replacement is on the board, or if one has been made.

MR. BURTONIAK: At the present time, Mr. Chairman, no replacement has been made but as soon as one is made it will be announced.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs. In view of the projected transit deficit in the City of Winnipeg of close to \$19 million, can the Minister indicate at this time what the projected portion of the provincial cost-sharing of that deficit will be?

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time indicate that. This will be made known when the Department of Highways Estimates are being dealt with because that amount is shown in the highway department estimates.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether he has or his staff has had meetings with the City of Winnipeg to discuss the fall-off in transit use and the resulting additional costs because of the fall-off in volume.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, not specifically on that. We've been made aware of the fact that there has been a fall-off and there was a fall-off immediately following the strike of last winter and the recovery of the transit riders has not been as complete as it might have been.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Urban Affairs indicate whether the proposed south-west corridor project has reached the stage where a decision will be made this year on implementation, and can he indicate, as part of that, what the province has offered in the way of support for vehicles or forms of transit on that corridor project.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, phase one of the report is completed. It's a tri-level study. As you know the federal government is involved as well. There will be a phase two of the study itself before any implementation is done. The province a number of years ago indicated to the City that they were prepared to contribute considerably to new modes of transportation and depending on the nature of the corridor and what would be used, then it might qualify under that condition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I posed a question to the Minister of Agriculture yesterday but, because of his absence, I posed it to the First Minister. But I believe to get more confirmation on this question I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if anyone from his department is making a full survey via telephone to farmers and asking them how they are going to vote on the up-coming referendum.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW, (Lac du Bonnet): Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether anyone is, but there have been no instructions to do that kind of thing from my department.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, to make sure that I understood the Minister's answer, is he telling us that no one from his department has any instructions to carry out this survey.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply tell the Member for Rock Lake that I have no knowledge of such an event taking place and surely there have been no instructions for it to take place.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable, the Minister of Labour, and I would like to ask him whether he can assure this House that several hundred operators, the Manitoba Telephone System comprising Local 435 of the IBEW are not being deprived of their rights under the Manitoba Labour Relations Act in their efforts to change union certification.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY, (Transcona): Really it's difficult to answer that question precisely. There are provisions under the Labour Relations Act for employees, from time to time, to change their representatives. I am knowledgeable of the fact that there is an effort being made in some quarters within the ambit of the Manitoba Telephone System for a group of employees, I believe called the Independent Employees Association, to take over certification which is presently held by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House or undertake to investigate and advise the House whether there has been harassment and intimidation applied to prevent the workers in Local 435 from doing the organizing necessary to effect a certification majority vote?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, many of the points or parts of the question asked by my Honourable friend, the Member for Fort Garry, were directed to my colleague, the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System by the Member for Assiniboia the other day.

I am aware of the fact that there is a considerable amount of disgruntlement with some of the employees and whether the word harassment would be applicable or not, I am not quite sure but I want to say in open candour to my honourable friend, a request was made of me to have an investigator look into certain allegations of possible coercion or possible violations of the Labour Relations Act. I appointed an investigator so to do; he has reported to me that there were three employees involved in one instance — there were really two — that supervisory staff may have through inadvertence, or some other reason, indicated what could be construed as violations of the Labour Relations Act. Apologies were directed and accepted by two of the three parties concerned and the report that I received, Mr. Speaker, indicated that the matter should be considered that no further action should be taken. I merely want to indicate to my honourable friend that in accordance with our Labour Relations Act, regardless of the fact that it was a Crown Corporation involved, due action was taken. Now, I mentioned that as one instance; there is another, one that is under consideration at the present time involving a relative of the group that is attempting to become the bargaining agent as against the Electrical Workers Union. I think the only thing I can tell my friend, again trying to be candid, is that that has not been proceeded with.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's full and candid answer and I would just ask him one further supplementary. In line with the action that he has already taken, can he assure the House that it has been made abundantly clear at MTS that there are specific opportunities and rights for organizing on a decertification and certification question which must be vigorously observed.

MR. PAULLEY: I agree with my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, and I think I indicate to him and also to the House that as far as the Minister of Labour is concerned, he does not hold as sacred any Crown Corporation and give them any absolution of adherence to the laws of the Province of Manitoba. If the violator is a Crown Corporation or the Civil Service of Manitoba as far as that part is concerned, we are prepared to see that the Act is adhered to and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is only fair for me to say, hopefully the message has gone through and I believe that it has.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines, I direct my question to the Honourable the First Minister. It has to do with the reported \$6 million plus loss of the government-owned paper mill at The Pas. In view of this past year's loss, is the government considering either a temporary closing of the plant or a permanent closing of the plant?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I should indicate that the amount of the loss is not exactly unanticipated. There has been full disclosure and ample opportunity for discussion of this matter in depth. It really doesn't lend itself to any short question and answer situation. I would invite the honourable member to pursue that particular point at the time of the Estimates. Certainly there is an important public policy issue involved and there might as well be full knowledge of all of the facts and they are multiple.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Since the Minister of Labour has now received a report in the dispute at MTS, can he indicate to the House if

in that report it is indicated that management has been involved in any way or taken sides in this dispute?

MR. PAULLEY: The report that was made to me, Mr. Speaker, I believe could not be construed as management as such taking part in the desires of the employees between one union and another. It was really by inadvertence that one of the supervisors — a supervisor not of high status, I may say — inadvertently made some remark that was not normally proper but there is no indication at all, Mr. Speaker, of any favouritism of management, as such, one way or the other.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate that there was anything in the report with respect to monitoring conversations and would the Minister be prepared to table the report or was it a written report?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I would not be prepared to table the report because it is a confidential report given to me . . . — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm only adhering to the law of the Province of Manitoba when I make that statement, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that particular portion of The Labour Relations Act was enacted by the previous administration of the Province of Manitoba so I'm trying to uphold their law, but in the spirit of openness on a confidential basis, I would be prepared to discuss the matter further with the Honourable Member for Assiniboia whom I have found to be a reasonable, understanding individual.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General. I am wondering if he can confirm the fact that a member of the Attorney-General's staff was forcibly taken in for identification as a member of the picket line blocking those who were entering Griffin Steel?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: If the Attorney-General could confirm whether the member of the Attorney-General's staff was picketing during normal office hours in which the member would be working in its appropriate . . .

MR. PAWLEY: The appropriate disciplinary action has been taken because it was during office hours.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Attorney-General can indicate at what point a decision was made for appropriate action to be taken.

MR. PAWLEY: When it was brought to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights. Last supplementary.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder then if the Attorney General can indicate whether there was more than one occasion in which the individual upon whom disciplinary action was taken, was, in fact, forcibly taken in for identification as a member of the picket line?

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

MR. SCHREYER: Well my point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the Honourable Member for River Heights is — I'm not suggesting deliberately but he is creating a difficulty for you, Sir, in that the rules are very clear as to the extent to which there can be supplementation to questions and that if he presumes to run a new string of questions *de novo* but of the same subject matter, then of course that is in effect a thwarting of the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Attorney-General could indicate to the House when he was first informed of the action of the member of his staff.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: I was first informed in connection with the taking in of the individual in question on Tuesday morning.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Attorney-General. Considering that a member of his staff has had some direct now, can the Minister indicate whether the report he has received will now enable him to take some action in either levelling charges or issuing guidelines for the role of the law enforcement officers at the picket line?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, when the appropriate recommendations are made, then appropriate action will be undertaken. Up to the present time recommendations have not been made.

MR. AXWORTHY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister indicate whether, in fact, any charges have been laid against those who have been detained by police at the picket line?

MR. PAWLEY: No, they have not.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable, the Member for Fort Rouge, asked a question with respect to whether or not there were any special plans of an emergency nature being formulated for implementation by Manitoba Hydro, given the premise of my honourable friends

question that there was serious drought condition and a worse prospect looming. I believe it was within a matter of twenty-four hours thereafter that most of the watershed was blanketed with a precious six inches to ten inches or more of snowfall with high moisture ratio and I can, in very few words, advise my honourable friend that there are no emergency plans of a special nature other than the standing contingency plans which, hopefully and with increasing probability, will not have to be implemented.

I could also answer in reply to a related question asked by some honourable member whether any plans were being made with respect to the purchase of blocks of power from north-western Ontario or Saskatchewan. I have to advise my honourable friends that in recent months there has, in fact, been the obverse of that in the sense that Manitoba Hydro has through its tie-lines and interconnections been wheeling power for Saskatchewan from the United States, and that in fact there is no prospect of significant blocks of power being available from either the immediate east or the immediate west of us, for reasons that those neighboring utilities are, if anything, in as strapped a position, indeed north-western Ontario more so, than here.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the First Minister for announcing to the House how another Act of God has once again saved Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. AXWORTHY: I'd like to ask a question of the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could confirm the fact that the diversion channel, particularly in the Red River portion, is only working at a fraction of its capacity and that there is not water flows going through that particular diversion at the time and why.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I perhaps should not say this but since my honourable friend has just displayed a certain amount of egotism I would say that there is no difficulty on the part of this government, I suppose he would be otherwise, to readily admit that when it comes to Acts of God we are all at His mercy, and that indeed it does take an Act of God to remedy a problem of this kind which, in another sense, was created by the Almighty, and we can take neither credit nor blame for either of that on either side of the coin because the drought conditions — there is one of ninety years record. Having said that I say to the honourable member with respect to the diversion channel that I find it passing strange that he should be concerned about the inadequacy of the very same diversion that he and some of his colleagues were so desperately trying to block entirely only a few short years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Before we proceed I would suggest that the honourable members, when they are placing their questions, place the questions with no opinions, with no remarks that will engender debate, and then we'll get the question period over with much simpler. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assume that instructioning also includes any theological references, as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Certainly, it always does.

MR. AXWORTHY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, now that the Minister has not answered the question whether he could indicate whether in fact the Red River Channel as part of the diversion plan is working at only a fraction of its present capacity and the reasons why.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the reference to theology is concerned I readily admit that my theology is Anglican and therefore perhaps too conservative for my honourable friend. The second point I make is that with respect to the operations of the diversion channel, the diversion channel is operating, I indicated in this House, in reply to the Honourable Member for Riel, I believe, at, as I recall, at 11,000 CFS and that indeed it is the same diversion channel which some of my honourable friend's colleagues were trying to block three or four years ago and more.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he has the information requested by the Leader of the Opposition at about the same time as the other question, asking for this winter's costs for the import of power from the United States.

MR. SCHREYER: That is somewhat more detailed, Mr. Speaker, but I have undertaken and will supply that information. I only ask my honourable friend's indulgence that in the event that I do not do so by week's end that he remind me next week. He will have it for certain on the 15th of March when Manitoba Hydro's annual report will be before the committee. But just to assuage his curiosity I would tell him, for example that — hell he knows this, it doesn't lend itself to any neat capsuled summary in that there are different kinds of blocks of power and Manitoba Hydro has been following the strategy of buying power, for the most part, on Sundays and holidays from the United States when surprising as it may seem, even though the north-western and mid-western United States was suffering a severe energy shortage in the months of January and February, on week-ends and on holidays they had electrical surplus at rates in the order of 8 mills was purchased then and which enabled the ponding in our various forebays and reservoirs and at 8 mills is cheaper than producing it loco thermal because coal is in the order of 14 mills, at East Selkirk, for example.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct a question either to the Minister of

Northern Affairs or Renewable Resources. It has to do with the 250 thousand subsidy that I understand the government is once again providing for the assistance in moving fish down to the Transcona plant. Has the federal government shown any willingness to share in that subsidy? I knew that there were discussions about that last time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): No, Mr. Speaker, they have showed no willingness to participate. We are, in fact, contacting them again to try to get some assurance from them but to date they have steadfastly refused to participate.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I just have a question for the Minister of Education concerning his estimates that are to be considered this afternoon. Does he have any plans to table the report of the Department of Education before that debate begins?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HONOURABLE IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I have planned to table the report of the Department of Education within the statutory requirements provided for the tabling of the report. It is my understanding 15 days is the time limit. It will be tabled before 15 days.

MR. AXWORTHY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the House Leader I address the question to perhaps the First Minister or the Deputy House Leader, if in fact there is any plans to put off consideration of the Department of Education estimates considering that we do not have the last years report on that department.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's question poses a problem but, I believe, I can only make a reasonable assumption here, that he will not want to frustrate the business of this House in the sense that any specific or even general concerns he may have, he will have ample opportunity to communicate them in this Chamber and the Minister of Education is competence personified, he will be able to answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Wolseley wish . . .

MR. WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Moved by myself and seconded by the Member for Charleswood.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We haven't got into Orders of the Day, I thought the honourable member wanted a question. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River than that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information related to the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour wish to interject?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, if you don't mind Sir. In order to expedite the business of the House we have taken a look at all of the Orders for Return, and unless they want to fall into the category of future debate, we are prepared to accept them unless any of my colleagues wish to raise objections. So if it is satisfactory to you, Mr. Speaker, I indicate that on behalf of the government acceptance, with those very minor caveats.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I think this requires a little bit of clarification because my honourable friend, the Acting House Leader has suggested that they are prepared to accept all of the Orders for Return, unless some of his colleagues don't want to accept them. Well then in that case if there is one exception I think that particular Order for Return should be read into the record. There is no necessity, indeed there is no right on the part of the Opposition to transfer them to debate if they are accepted. If they are accepted, they automatically are taken off the Order Paper. So if my honourable friend will indicate which one of the Orders for Return that is not acceptable, that one will be read into the record and then the Member who proposed it can determine whether or not he wants it transferred for debate.

MR. PAULLEY:Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague the Minister of Agriculture has a point to raise in respect of one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of acceptability but rather clarification. It's an Order standing in the name of the Member for Morris, the fourth Order. I would like to know whether he wishes that we include within that order the purchases of the Agricultural Credit Corporation, because it speaks of "The Department" but the MACC is a Crown corporation. Is it his expectation that that is included or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Yes, I would want all of the lands purchased by the department of Agriculture, either by the MACC and that could be indicated in the Order for Return, or for other purposes.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? Acceptable. Therefore I declare all the Orders for Return

acceptable that are on our Order paper.

ORDER NO. 1: On Motion of Mr. McKenzie an Order for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information related to the Department of Health and Social Development's fitness and amateur sport program:

1. (a) The amount of money that has been spent to assist fitness development for Manitobans in each fiscal year since the creation of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate.

(b) The amount of this money that has been spent directly by the Department of Health and Social Development.

(c) The amount of this money that has been spent through sport-governing bodies.

(d) The names of the individual organizations which have been beneficiaries and the amounts of money received.

2. (a) The amount of money that has been spent to assist the development of amateur sport in Manitoba in each fiscal year since the creation of the Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate.

(b) The amount of this money which has been spent directly by the Department of Health and Social Development.

(c) The amount of this money which has been spent through the sport-governing bodies.

(d) The names of the individual organizations which have been beneficiaries and the amounts of money received.

ORDER NO. 2: On Motion of Mr. Jorgenson Orders for Return:

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

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Department of Renewable Resources & Transportation for

(a) Resource management

(b) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 3: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969 how much land has been acquired by the Department of Mines, Resources & Environmental Management for

(a) Resource development

(b) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 4: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Department of Highways for

(a) Highway construction

(b) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 5: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Department of Agriculture for

(a) Agricultural purposes

(b) Other than agricultural purposes.

ORDER NO. 6: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs for

(a) Parks and Recreation

(b) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 7: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Department of Public Works for

(a) Public buildings and parking

(b) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 8: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

Since 1969, how much land has been acquired by the Manitoba Housing & Renewal Corporation for

(a) Housing

(b) Land assembly

- (c) Land banking
- (d) Other purposes.

ORDER NO. 9: On Motion of Mr. Bilton an Order for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return for the period 1975, 1976 and 1977, showing the following information:

The per diem food costs per inmate at:

- (a) Headingley Correctional Institution;
- (b) Brandon Correctional Institution;
- (c) Dauphin Correctional Institution;
- (d) The Pas Correctional Institution;
- (e) Portage Correctional Centre for Women;
- (f) Manitoba Youth Centre;
- (g) Manitoba Home for Girls;
- (h) Manitoba Home for Boys;
- (i) Adult Detention Home;
- (j) Bannock Point Rehabilitation Camp.

ORDER NO. 10: On Motion of Mr. Enns Orders for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

- (a) The number of persons that accompanied the Minister of Agriculture on his recent trip to Cuba.
- (b) Names and positions of these persons.
- (c) Number of pounds of black beans sold.

ORDER NO. 11: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

- (a) The number of pounds of black beans purchased by the Manitoba Agricultural Marketing Commission.
- (b) Total cost to treasury re the purchase of this crop.
- (c) The total amount in pounds and dollars sold to date of this crop.
- (d) Total storage and other handling costs to date.
- (e) Number of producers involved.

ORDER NO. 12: On Motion of Mr. McGill, Orders for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information related to the Department of Education's computer network project:

1. The total cost of the computer network project in each fiscal year since inception of the program.
2. The contract expenses with Cybershare Limited, directly attributable to the computer network project, in each fiscal year since inception of the program.
3. The number of computer terminals which have been rented and the total rental costs in each fiscal year since inception of the program.
4. The total telephone transmission line costs in each fiscal year since inception of the program.
5. The number of students who have directly benefited from the computer network project in each fiscal year since inception of the program.

ORDER NO. 13: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

1. (a) The name of the present Director of the Native Education Branch in the Department of Education.
(b) The date on which the present Director was appointed.
(c) The Civil Service Commission reference number with respect to the competition held for this position.
2. (a) The names of the individual persons who have previously held the position of Director since the formation of the Native Education Branch.
(b) The names of the individual persons who have been Acting Directors since the formation of the Native Education Branch.
(c) The dates of the time period in which previous Directors or Acting Directors of the Native Education Branch have held their appointments.

ORDER NO. 14: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information:

1. The name of the present Director of the Evaluation, Research and Policy Analysis Branch in the

Department of Education.

2. The date on which the present Director was appointed.
3. The Civil Service Commission reference number with respect to the competition held for this position.
4. The previous involvement and formal training of the present Director in the field of elementary and secondary education.

ORDER NO. 15: On Motion of Mr. Wilson Orders for Return:
THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

1. The total cost to date of the new Gull Harbour Hotel complex.
2. The total advertising budget to date for the said complex.
3. The number of people hired to date.
4. Their job descriptions and salaries.
5. The date the Gull Harbour Hotel advertising commenced.

ORDER NO. 16: THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following:

1. The cost of operating the Rent Review Board up to December 31st, 1976.
2. The number of people employed in this branch.
3. The number of people employed by contract under this program.
4. The number of rent review officers hired in 1976.
5. The number of rent review officers who were not residents of Manitoba prior to taking up their positions with the Rent Review Board.
6. The number of complaints dealt with in the year 1976.

ORDER NO. 17: On Motion of Mr. Graham an Order for Return:

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

1. The number of acres of land purchased by the Province of Manitoba for the use of the Dept. of Highways under the 1975-76 Highways Program listed as: Acquisition of Right of Way, PTH No. 4, a distance of 27.4 miles between PTH No. 21 and PR 607 (Foxwarren).
2. The number of acres of land purchased by the Province of Manitoba for the use of the Dept. of Highways under the 1976 - 77 Highways Program, with a cutoff date of Dec. 31st, 1976, listed as: Acquisition of Right of Way PTH No. 4, a distance of 27.4 miles between PTH No. 21 and PR 607 (Foxwarren).
3. The names of the persons from whom the land was purchased in each of the two programs mentioned above.
4. The average price per acre paid for the above mentioned lands.

ORDER NO. 18: On Motion of Mr. Wilson an Order for Return:

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

1. The final total cost of construction and furnishings of the Woodsworth Building.
2. The total yearly estimate of operating costs of the said building.
3. The location and total square footage of the office of the Minister of Public Works.
4. The total cost of furnishing the Minister's new office.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader, The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources have a problem?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, by leave I would table a return to the Order No. 2 that has been placed before the House today.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Agreed.

MR. BOSTROM: This is a return an Order of the House, No. 2 by Motion of the Honourable Member for Morris and these are the lands referred to in the Order.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable House Leader,

The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, just before the Acting House Leader puts the Motion with respect to Supply, I would like to with the House's indulgence and your indulgence, Sir, just give notice that as is our long custom here, there will be occasion to speak to two motions of condolence with respect to two former members of this House, now deceased. So, if I may, to give notice to the Honourable Member representing Osborne, representing Elmwood and to Members of the Opposition, that I would propose to move Motions to that effect on Monday next.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we will have second reading of Bill No. 12 stand. Then, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the

Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee to consider 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.

SUPPLY - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, William Jenkins: Order please. Order please! I would refer Honourable Members to their Estimates Book, page 20 Resolution No. 48 (a) Minister's Compensation and Salary and Representation Allowance. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, having been the Minister of Education for five months and one week I welcome the opportunity this afternoon and in the, I hope, weeks to follow to have an adequate and full-ranging debate about public school education.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to introduce my Estimates this year with the image created in my mind by my father some many years ago. He is a veteran of two wars. He is a veteran, in particular, of the First World War where he saw a great deal of action and he used to tell me the story of the British Troops going over the top, as they called it. I must admit, being a new Minister, coming up first with the Estimates of this department, I feel a bit as if I'm going over the top to face the Opposition. However, Mr. Chairman, I should remind the Member for Lakeside that my father in 1914-18 was on the winning side and we did win that war.

I hope that in the hours of debate that will follow, we will have the opportunity of having a debate on education in the public schools which does not forget the past, which does forget the present and which does not ignore the future. I believe that education, in the public schools in particular, is fundamental to our democratic society. I think that it is incumbent and is the duty of the legislators of the province to make sure that their debate on education, that their debate on how children are to be educated really deals with the significant issues and deals with them in a straightforward truthful and open way.

I think that in the past there has been a tendency to become embroiled in issues that are hardly of consequence for the education of children, issues that are picayune, issues that are not the kind of issues that I believe we should debate in the legislature. I look for a new debate, a new debate on education, a debate at the policy level, a debate on the direction that education should take in this province.

I do so because education is clearly a responsibility of the provincial government under The British North America Act. In other areas of provincial jurisdiction, such as telecommunications and consumer affairs, which I happen to be familiar with, there is always the problem of encroachment on federal jurisdiction or vice versa, federal government encroaching on provincial jurisdiction. In this area of public education however, it is clear where our responsibilities are, it is clear what we should be doing in this House. A new debate then which will set, I hope, both the tone for our educational system in the province of Manitoba over the next few years and, I hope, will give this government some guidance as to how it should try to influence education in the province of Manitoba over the next four to eight years.

Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that I think needs to be addressed by this legislature is the issue of curriculum. The issue of what it is that we want our children to be exposed to in our schools. What it was, as some members opposite might say, what it was or is that we want to learn them. I think that there is an issue here that needs to be addressed, society should determine what it is that is taught in the schools. The Department of Education and even the total educational system does not lead in this regard, it is society and through the elected legislatures, the government that should reflect the wishes of that society.

What should be taught in the schools then, Mr. Chairman? It has been clear to me, ever since I was in school and through my career as a teacher and through my last few months as Minister of Education, that the "what" of education should clearly be based on teaching computational skills, teaching children how to read and teaching them how to write. I have never understood, Mr. Chairman, the debate or so-called debate about the teaching of these particular skills. To me, no teacher who is experienced and qualified and educated can teach anything, for any length of time, without transferring to the students, to the school pupils the ability in those three basic areas. So I start then on the premise, on the assumption that these skills are being taught in our schools.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that every person who graduates from school, be it in grade 11 or grade 12, is not going to be fully qualified to undertake a career in journalism or to undertake a career in, for example, report writing for, let's say a government or a large corporation, or to undertake speech writing for a political party. They are not going to come out of the school system fully qualified in this regard, indeed those skills of reading and writing in particular, are skills that should be polished and brushed up at the University level and if the University is not doing that, then I suggest to the professors there that it should and they should.

I think that these three areas then, which are commonly referred to as the basics, are the assumptions upon which we can build our debate on the Estimates of the Department of Education.

However, Mr. Chairman, there are many who would debate, of course, what the basics should be and although I make certain assumptions and I believe, from past debates in this House that members of the Conservative Party make certain assumptions about what the basics should be, some would challenge whether those indeed are the basics. There are some who would say that there are other subject matter that should be taught, that are perhaps even more basic. For example, Family Life Education, some would argue, argue is as basic as important as reading and writing. Some would argue that consumer education is as basic in a consumer and technical society as is reading and writing and computational skills. Some would argue that there are other subject areas, Canadian content, for example, that are as important as reading and writing and computational skills.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be perfectly clear about this, these other areas may indeed be necessary, these other subjects may have to be taught in the schools, but they only have to be taught because the home and the power of the family and the home on the education of the child is not as powerful as it should be. I believe that the school system, if it can teach students in it to read properly and write properly, that those children in turn will be able to acquire for themselves all the information they need to know about family life education, about consumer matters, about Canadian history, about theological matters as were mentioned earlier during the question period and indeed about anything else. The

The problem with this approach, Mr. Chairman, of course, is that as I say, in some homes, in some environments, the child does not have the kind of encouragement that is necessary for that child to participate in the learning environment in the school and to take everything that it is possible to take from that learning environment. Why is this so? It is so for a number of reasons. It is so because there are definitely more children in school today than there have ever been in school in the past.

In the mid 1950s the number of students finishing grade 12 as compared to those who entered grade 9 four years previously, was about 25 percent. In the mid 1970s the number of students finishing grade 12, as compared to the comparable student population that entered grade 9, was approximately 75 percent, an increase of 50 percent. In other words, Mr. Speaker, in approximately the last twenty years, there are 50 percent more students who start grade 9 finishing grade 12.

Now why is it that I mention these particular statistics. Well, the reason should be obvious to members. When I was in school and I'm sure if they search their minds they will remember themselves their own school experience, where students for one reason or another did not finish, never mind grade 12 they didn't finish grade 9, some of them 50 years ago didn't finish grade 6. That was, in many cases, not a deterrent to them by the way, many of them did very well for themselves in business and in other activities. But the retention rate is higher. Those students who in the past did not finish Grade 12 dropped out. Those students who would have dropped out a few years ago, are still in the school. If you take a statistical sample of their particular talents and abilities, you will find that the sample will show the same number with roughly a high degree of ability; the same number with a medium degree of ability and the same number with a not-very-high, or low degree of ability. It is pretty obvious that if you are going to keep more students in school, not all of them are going to be as refined a product in terms of the Three R's, as I have described them, as were those students who finished Grade X11 twenty or perhaps thirty years ago.

Mr. Chairman, we have in the last eleven years, eliminated from the school system a number of screening devices. I call them 'screening devices' because they were precisely that. The school system twenty years ago was designed for pretty clear purposes; it was designed to enable students to go to university, that was primarily the function of our school system twenty years ago or more. If you had a student who was highly verbal; who had skill in computational matters, that student went to university. That student had to get past certain 'screening devices' though. He had to take a second language right through from roughly Grade Seven through into university. That student had to pass departmental examinations in Grade 9, Grade 11 and Grade 12 in most subjects. Those screening devices have been removed. It is my understanding that the universities have removed the requirement for a second language. It is my understanding that the previous administration indeed began to eliminate the departmental examinations in 1968. The core curriculum, therefore, has been somewhat altered over the last twenty years. We still have courses in the reading area, in the writing area and in the computational areas. Indeed, I want to mention in some detail what these are.

I want to mention what these are because the Department of Education, the government of Manitoba and myself had been admonished by an editorial writer of the Free Press, who enjoys the luxury of anonymity, to follow the example of the Ontario Department of Education. The Ontario Department of Education led by its Minister, some months ago, decided that what it would do is re-introduce at the departmental level, more required courses or core curriculum, if you will. Mr. Chairman, even with the change back to more required courses made in Ontario, they are still behind us in terms of the number of required courses for graduation out of Grade 12. The editorial writer was simply not accurate in suggesting that we follow the Ontario example.

It's my understanding that the educational system in Manitoba has been a bread-and-butter education in the public schools, not simply under this administration, but under the previous

administration and the one before that and I think that the educational system we have provided has been relatively good for our students and I will get, in a few minutes, to why I think that is still the case.

I have in front of me, Mr. Chairman, the Administrative Handbook for Manitoba Schools, I just have a few pages from it. It talks about High School program requirements for Manitoba. "For requirement for High School graduation, each student is required to select from among Department of Education developed courses offered by the school, a core requirement of at least ten (10) credits, distributed as follows: English — at least one credit at each level of the high school program; Science — at least two credits; Mathematics — at least two credits; Canadian History — at least one credit; Geography of North America or Canadian Geography — at least one credit; Physical Education — at least one credit." That is the core program, Mr. Chairman. As it says here: "Department of Education Developed Courses." That is the core. To my understanding, that core is more in number than that now required by the Ministry of Education in Ontario.

This province, Mr. Chairman, has never been as trendily progressive in education as has Ontario; it just simply has never been the case, not in the last eight years or the last eighteen years or the last twenty-eight years. It has been as I said, a bread-and-butter education. That's the core curriculum. I think that we need to address ourselves as to what that core curriculum should be. Should it continue to be these subject areas? Should there be changes in these subject areas? That's what we need to address ourselves to and I challenge the members opposite to do so.

I believe, Sir, that the Department of Education over the last while has attempted within its administrative structure and through the professional associations and associations of trustees in Manitoba, the Department has attempted to address itself to the on-going continuous, progressive, positive re-evaluation of curriculum.

Indeed, the Department has under its auspices, three program development committees; one for the elementary years; one for the middle years; — I'm speaking slowly, Sir, so that the Member for Brandon can make notes — and one for the senior years. They are chaired by people knowledgeable in education. The positions on the committees are filled by people knowledgeable in education; people that come from the Manitoba Teacher's Society, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents, from the Department of Education and from other areas representing lay people.

Those committees are now at work; they will be and are revising the curriculum in, as I say, meaningful, constructive and positive ways. I look forward to the work that they will be undertaking. I have met with them all, in some cases more than once. I have met with them to find out more than intellectually what I can from reading briefing documents what they are doing, where they are at, how they feel about our school curriculum, how they feel about the Department of Education, what they believe we should be doing in the future. Perhaps the one committee that has a program planned that members would be interested in is the Middle Years Committee which will be sponsoring a large conference on the middle years program at the end of April of this year.

The whole purpose of the departmental thrust in this area of curriculum development is to ensure that there is as broad a cross-section of the community involved in curriculum formulation and development as is possible. Now there are certain practical limits to that but I believe that to be the thrust. They are working, I think some of them are working extraordinarily hard, in order to produce for the children in our schools a curriculum that meets the needs of those children, a program that meets the needs of those children, a program that will enable the parents to have confidence in what the Department of Education is providing in the schools. That's the core curriculum, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that there needs to be, and I say I believe advisedly, that there needs to be some emphasis, clearly, on the three basics as I have described them. I believe as well that there is need for greater emphasis on Canadian content in our schools. We have in our core curriculum, as I read it to you, Canadian History, at least one credit for one of the total of ten, but I believe, Sir, that this country in order to preserve itself, especially now, needs to educate its young people about what this country is, where it has come from and where it is going and there is only one place that that can be done outside of the home and that is in our school system. I am not advocating here a chauvinism to be taught in the schools, an excessive patriotism to be taught in the schools, I am advocating, though, a good, hard course in Canadian History, one that gets across to our young people all of our history, all of our history. I do not believe that as in the past, as in the past, there should be a de-emphasis on certain elements of our history. I do not believe as in the past twenty or thirty years ago, that we should ignore the history of the working people, or the history of the trade union movement, or the history of the Indian people, or the history of the Ukrainian people in this province; I believe it should all be taught and it should all be included in our core curriculum with regard to Canadian history and Canadian content. I will be addressing myself in more detail to this later in my Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, it's pretty obvious that although we speak of the core curriculum and adjusting it to the needs of the students, that it will not be very effective if, when the students get to the school, they don't have the energy to carry out their studies. So there is need in order to make sure that the curriculum works, there is need for the teaching of some other matters which apparently are not

communicated in the home, such as the teaching of nutrition and good eating habits. It sounds pretty basic but a child, no matter how good the curriculum is, no matter how good the teacher is, no matter how elaborate the school is, no matter how much money has been spent on visual aids, the child isn't going to learn anything if he is sick, if he is tired and if he is hungry. So it's pretty obvious to me, and I hope even to my Conservative friends opposite, that indeed we need to try in some way to get across to our young people the idea of what a good meal consists of, what a good meal consists of because clearly, some of those children don't know and they don't know either because they are not learning it in the home — for whatever reason — or they are so influenced by that insidious advertising on T.V., that they believe that junk food is what they should eat rather than good steak, black beans and eggs.

A MEMBER: If he's got cholesterol, he'll have a heart condition.

MR. TURNBULL: Well, whatever else it is that makes up a nutritious diet.

I believe, Sir, that if you go back in our history, you will find that there were very vigorous, healthy people from the farm even yet in this House whose background happens to have consisted of eating beef steak, eggs, butter, cream and other things such as that. I don't know why it is that they haven't, as the Member for Fort Rouge suggests, had cardiac arrest, I don't have any idea. I would suggest to the Member for Fort Rouge from his high-class city riding with his university job that the reason that they haven't had cardiac arrest by eating that food on the farm is because they work so damn hard on the farm. It's quite simple and they burned up the cholesterol and those who weren't working on the farm were working often on labouring jobs in the city or they walked to work, like my father did, to work twelve hours a day, not an uncommon experience forty or fifty years ago. That is why, for the Member for Fort Rouge, they did not suffer from cardiac arrest because they ate what normal Canadians would consider to be a nutritious diet.

The core curriculum, Mr. Chairman, is not going to be effective either unless — and this is basic — the children are in school. We've had compulsory education in this province since 1916 and I don't want to make valued judgements one way or the other about the debate that surrounded the introduction of compulsory education in 1916, but I do want to make it very clear and it's obvious, that the child isn't going to learn anything unless that child is in school.

Now, compulsory education, Mr. Chairman, I believe, is one of the fundamental reasons why this country enjoys a high standard of living and a high degree of affluence. Again, I don't want to put any value judgements on those but we do enjoy it compared to other countries. I think that our educational system is one of the reasons for that, plus, of course, the energy of the people and their ambition.

There has been in the last while some discussion — I suppose that's the term one can use for it — about attendance in our schools. Mr. Chairman, attendance in school has always been a problem, I only have to look at some members opposite to know that it must have been a problem, but I think that it is important to recognize — I think it is important to recognize — that the School Attendance Act places responsibility for attendance on the School Boards. The responsibility for ensuring attendance does not rest with the Minister of Education. I wouldn't mind taking a little stint as a truancy officer, if that's the old term, and going and rounding up a few kids and getting them into school, I think it would be a good idea, I have people on staff, by the way, who did just that and did a good job at it too. Nothing wrong with it.

However, under Section 9(1) of the School Attendance Act, the machinery for attendance rests with the board. Section 9(1) of that Act requires the Board to appoint an attendance officer and Section 9(2) gives the officer appointed the necessary powers and Section 14 gives the board authority to make regulations to direct the attendance officer in carrying out his duties.

I may as well continue with this, Sir, there is another section if my annotation here is correct, Section 21(37) outlines the steps to be taken and procedure to be followed in laying a charge and prosecuting under the Act. Mr. Chairman, did you know that if a guardian or a parent is found to not be requiring his charge or child to go to school, that the guardian or parent can be put in jail? I find that hardly an efficacious way of dealing with non-attendance at school, Mr. Chairman, but nonetheless that is the law. I think that there is need for some review of how attendance in our schools is being carried out, of how it is that the attendance officers appointed by the various boards do in fact go about their duties. I want, again, to make this very clear, that it is their duty and they should carry it out. Mr. Chairman, I'm under the impression that very few divisions actually employ attendance officers as such. Winnipeg No. 1 does, and these are full-time people I understand and some of the other divisions employ people who do work as attendance officers. I think it's important, I think that there is need for some additional review of this. The department already has underway and has distributed to divisions a compilation, a compilation of information about attendance policies in the various schools and this is being sent to all Superintendents, Secretary-Treasurers of our school divisions. It lays out the policy in this way because the policy, of course, is as I have said in accordance with the Act, a decentralized policy. It is based on what school division elected trustees wish to do and what the administration in those divisions wishes to do.

There may be need here to not only review but to continually survey and monitor what the divisions have done by way of carrying out their duties and responsibilities under the Act. I think that if there are students who are not in school, that they should be got into school. However, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that if they are got into school they should just be made to sit there, or forced to sit there, while nothing happens. Clearly the curriculum needs to be modified in some way to meet the needs of such students.

I don't know what the history of my friends opposite has been in the public schools and I don't really want to comment on it but I do know that in the past, twenty years ago at least, twenty-five years ago, the school curriculum was not very relevant to a large portion of students, to those 50 percent that I mentioned at the beginning my address who did not continue through grade 12 in the mid 1950s. Some of those students needed a more relevant curriculum and they got it in the late 60s and early 70s and it's important that what goes on in the school when the children are brought there if necessary, is relevant to where those children are; otherwise, Sir, I don't think you educate. That is not education to lead someone to the classroom and leave him there. I think the department has in the past few years, undertaken various programs which have been designed to make some of the curriculum, some of the poor curriculum and some additional parts of the curriculum a little more relevant to some of those students.

There are school initiated projects, student initiated projects and although the department for whatever reason, malice or just sheer misunderstanding, although the department has been criticized for those programs, I believe some of those programs have been meaningful for students. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that no teaching can go on unless the interest level of the student is maintained if not aroused. The interest level should be aroused at home, it should be aroused at home and one of the problems of the debate, the incredible debate that has occurred with regard to public school education in this province, is that it has been based to a large extent on what has occurred in some other place, what has occurred in Los Angeles or Toronto or Kenora or Minneapolis or Florida and that kind of information is not particularly relevant to a debate on education here.

There is every need, I believe, to have a sensible debate, a rational debate, based on our experience in Manitoba to the extent that that is possible. The debate that has been occurring, I believe, has not encouraged parents to support their children in the school system because I believe what happens is this, that there is a debate, that there is a criticism of our school system based on some report that is published in Los Angeles. It appears in a newspaper here, people read it, they interpret it as meaning the school system, wherever that may be. The parents then who perhaps, for one reason or another, are not all that oriented towards reading, writing and arithmetic then say well, look at this article in the paper here, this article is critical of the school system, obviously the school system isn't doing its job; their child picks up that attitude, goes down to the school and says, in effect, "Well why should I perform, my parents don't think the school system is doing a good job anyway and if I don't perform, my parents won't blame me, they'll blame the school system."

Mr. Chairman, no education will occur of the child unless the child has the support for getting an education from the home. No education will occur unless the child has the support of parents or the guardian, to be in school. No education will occur of the child unless that child has, in the home, some discipline. A lot of individuals, Mr. Chairman, seem to think that discipline is a word that shouldn't be used by anybody in education. And I can see why they think that. I believe they use or hold the word discipline in disrepute because they identify that word with beating the child.

Some of you may recall, certainly I do even from my youth, seeing a movie called How Green Was My Valley. Any of you remember that movie over there? It was replayed on TV awhile ago, How Green Was My Valley. Do you know, in that movie, and the reason I said it, in that movie a child was caned until he could hardly walk, he wasn't caned on the hand as the Member for Swan River seems to indicate, he was caned on the backside and I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that unless we have very very unusual circumstances, that that kind of discipline really will encourage a child to learn very much. One can say that that is a woodshed type of discipline and one can imagine the reaction of the members opposite if I was trying to teach them about the principles of democratic socialism or social democracy or socialism, if I was trying to teach them the principles of that learning and I took a cane and beat them across the backside, now can you imagine what their response would be? It's tempting. You know in years gone by, in years gone by people used to take horse whips into the Legislature occasionally and when things got out of line they just went across the floor and whipped the guy who was giving him a little trouble. I wouldn't — (Interjection) — yeah, they'd say ouch all right.

I wouldn't advocate that kind of discipline in these schools, I call that woodshed discipline, taking a child out behind the woodshed and beating him until he finally agrees with your point of view. That may be necessary in certain very unusual circumstances where it has been clearly indicated by the teacher, when it will happen and under what circumstances. But the majority of children in our society, Mr. Chairman, believe it or not, are intelligent, are sensitive, are responsive and what is

needed in the way of discipline is not beating, what is needed in the way of discipline is just pure simple respect. Respect of the student for the teacher, respect of the student for the teacher's expertise, for the teacher's special body of knowledge, for the teacher's skill and respect, to finish this, respect of the student for the teacher, for the teacher's respect for the child. In other words there should be a mutual respect there, some would call it a rapport and that rapport is based not on beating children, it is based, quite simply, on a classroom environment that enables the teacher to carry out his or her duties, in other words, to teach. And that environment quite simply can only occur if the teacher can keep the interest level of the students at a meaningful level. That's when learning will occur, that's what teachers have to do and they can only do it if the core curriculum required by the department is meaningful to those students and they can only do it if the other non-core curriculum is meaningful for the student.

This is not a new pedagogy or pedagogical theory as members opposite and particularly the Member for Fort Rouge I'm sure are aware but, nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, it is often ignored in the kind of reporting that has occurred about education in this province.

Mr. Chairman, there are a great number of other issues that we need to discuss with regard to teaching. There are, for example, the problems that I believe have arisen as a result of the abolition of departmental examinations. I will not advocate a return to departmental examinations as we used to know them in the past. It so happens that I believe I benefitted from that system of examination. I mean, one has to do some work sometime in school and the departmental examinations were for me, when I really poured it out. I hope the Member for Brandon has got that noted. But the departmental examinations had many many faults. The Member for Fort Rouge believes that the departmental examinations are a system to be condemned, which is just . . .

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will sit for a moment and ask the Member for Fort Rouge whether he in fact supports departmental examinations or does not and then I would like to have the floor again, if that may be permitted.

MR. AXWORTHY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in response to the Minister, the point I was trying to make in my interjection was that if he was using himself as evidence about the efficiency and effectiveness of departmental exams it certainly raises a major question in my mind in that he, himself, is the living proof that perhaps we should reconsider any support of departmental examinations if he's the best that they can produce.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy I allowed the Member for Fort Rouge to make those comments. That's precisely the kind of low-level debate that at the beginning of my address I tried to admonish members to avoid. That is precisely the kind of nonsense remark that I just don't think that we need to engage in, in the legislature. The fact is that departmental examinations are not a system that I would want to return to. I happen to have found them of benefit to myself, and the Member for Fort Rouge, for all his smugness, I'm sure found them of some benefit to himself, as well.

I think that the system of examinations that we have in our schools needs to be, in some way, developed so that we can insure ourselves over time that the educational system is performing in such a way as to be of benefit or to indicate that it is of benefit to the students that are in that educational system.

How to do that is not something that can easily be dealt with. How to do it will take some time and it will have to involve those who are engaged in teaching in our schools. Evaluation, though, is necessary because I believe the Department of Education needs to have information about the performance of students in the school system.

Mr. Chairman, of those many other topics that could be mentioned during my opening remarks on these estimates, which I am trying to keep general rather than dealing with specific items, I think that we have to consider, in this debate, which I hope will be meaningful, I think we have to consider the working environment of the people who are in our schools and by people in the schools I mean the students. I think it is important that schools be clean, that they be well-ordered, that the students conduct themselves with reasonable behaviour.

I think it is important, too, when talking about people in the schools and work environments to recall that there are a great number of teachers in those schools whose working conditions are perhaps less favourable than others who have never taught might think. I believe the teachers in this province, the vast majority of them, spend hundreds and hundreds of hours doing work related to their students and their school which is quite outside what they are on contract for, and outside what they are paid for. I believe, Sir, that many, many teachers spend time moving children from the home school to athletic events, soccer games, what have you, basketball games, gymnastic events. I believe that there is a great deal of activity that teachers do voluntarily, voluntarily, that is not recognized by members of the legislature or by the public at large. And I think it's time that we thought about those working conditions and debated them in this House. Because I would like to know, I would like to know what the members of the Conservative Party have to say about the working conditions of teachers. I would like to know whether they think a teacher is someone who should be in the school at 7:30 in the morning and leave at 6, and then prepare lessons for two hours after 8

o'clock at night, four or five nights a week. Or whether they think that, perhaps, the teachers do work hard enough and should be left to bargain, through the collective bargaining process, their particular working conditions.

I would like to know if the Member for Brandon West believes that the working conditions of teachers should be legislated. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Conservative Party believes that teachers should be required to bargain on a regional basis or whether they should be allowed to continue to bargain as they do now on the basis of locals within school divisions. And I ask that question, Mr. Chairman, for a very simple reason. Eight years ago I remember so very well, the then Minister of Education and a representative of the Conservative Party who believed that there should be regional bargaining for teachers, who wanted to take away some of the rights that teachers had to bargain with their employers, namely the school divisions. And this issue, I understand, has arisen again. This issue of regional bargaining. And I want the Member for Brandon West to address himself to it when he speaks because I think it's time that the Conservative Party put themselves on record, this year, or for some time anyway, about what it is they stand for in education apart from simple negative attacks on the decentralized structure of education that we have in this province. I'd like to hear them say what they stand for, where they stand, and what they really believe in.

I believe that education is far too important in our democratic society, far too important in our democratic society, to have the kinds of remarks, to have the kinds of lack of position, that are often made and taken by the Conservative Party. So I suggest to you rather than making remarks that twits would make, get up and make remarks that can be interpreted as meaningful for education in our society, which is after all a democratic one. It is a society that people have striven to achieve. It is a society that has left behind it the kind of elitism that I believe many Tories would want to re-establish because I believe that, in many cases, those who criticize the school system, the public school system, are those who either come from a private school or wish they had. And the private school system is, after all, more elitist. So let's hear it. Let's hear what it is that you stand for. Do you stand for an elite school system which screens out students or do you stand for a democratic system which enables, or should enable, every child to obtain an education. I would like to know. My government would like to know. My party would like to know. The press would like to know, and the public would like to know. I think it's time that you came out from behind the bushes and made clear where you stand on education.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. In accordance with the rules we will now move to Resolution 48(b) General Administration: (1) Salaries \$928,600. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We understand that we're moving to . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think maybe it needs to be clarified, some of us may be hazy. I suggest that we go back to the Minister's salary subsequently. But he makes a statement and then we go down the line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg the House's pardon if they're not aware of that. The way that we have been dealing in the past we go on to the next section in the resolution and come back to the Minister's salary at the tail-end of the departmental The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL: We appreciate that the detailed examination of the various positions which the Minister has put to us today will be undertaken during the final debate on his Estimates when we do debate the Minister's compensation but I think it would be only polite for the official opposition to recognize the Honourable Member for Osborne in his new role as Minister of Education and simply to acknowledge the explanations he has given relative to the spending estimates of his department that he has put before us. Mr. Chairman, we have some sympathy for the new Minister of Education. Really, he's not new except in the sense that this is his first appearance in the House in this ministerial responsibility . . .

A MEMBER: I have more sympathy for his department.

MR. MCGILL: . . . but he does have some sympathy from this side in that he is moving into a department that has been one of considerable disorganization and problem during the past year or two. You know, Mr. Chairman, we were indeed rather encouraged by statements that the Minister made in the Press following his appointment to this position, we were encouraged because the Honourable Member for Osborne has been a teacher, he has had experience in education. He didn't hesitate to present some of his views rather quickly although they were at variance with those being presented by his Deputy Minister.

But Mr. Chairman, other than statements of intention which he reinforced today in the opening sentences of his remarks in which he committed to the record in the Throne Speech when he, for his department, said that as a lasting and meaningful learning experience is one that's based on a command of language and a facility with computational skills and he went on to say that his government would continue to make available to the public schools the greater proportion of the financial resources required for the provision of a basic education to children living in all circumstances and in all parts of the province. Well these have been the statements that have been encouraging to the people of Manitoba who, I think, might have been understandably impressed and

come to the conclusion that there was a new day dawning for education in Manitoba. But Mr. Chairman, other than statements of intention, there is no evidence to suggest that we have taken a new direction or that he will indeed improve the educational system. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, there is evidence to support the belief that education is the same rudderless ship wallowing in rough waters and it's making quite a lot of splash but no forward progress. Mr. Chairman, the evidence is abundant for this view. Reports from the employees of the department, indicate that morale is even lower than it was a year ago. Mr. Chairman, they told us then that they could go nowhere but up;

A MEMBER: It's a lie.

MR. MCGILL: . . . that they had reached the bottom and that they would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

MR. JORGENSON: On three occasions now the Minister of Education has uttered an unparliamentary word and I think that he should be compelled to withdraw that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Honourable Minister for Education, I think the remarks that you were making from your chair are unparliamentary and I'm asking you to withdraw them.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I agree that the remarks would be unparliamentary if the Member for Brandon can prove what he said; if he can't then he's the one that should withdraw his remarks and not me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm asking the Honourable Minister to withdraw that remark.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, then I must rise on a matter of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. There is no point of privilege. I am asking the honourable member to withdraw the remarks that he made from his chair.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I am advised by those with great parliamentary experience that in deference to you I should withdraw the remarks that I spoke from my seat.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for reconsidering his judgement of those statements which I had made and for the record, Mr. Chairman, I'll simply repeat that reports from employees of the department indicate that morale is even lower than it was a year ago. Many employees working under severe strain must expend much of their time and energy in maneuvers in an attempt to ensure their own survival. Mr. Chairman, the Minister according to his public statements, has found it necessary to put his Deputy Minister under restraint and that, I suggest Sir, is a tactic scarcely designed to promote smooth operation of a department.

A MEMBER: What else have you written down? got

MR. MCGILL: The Deputy Minister of Education made a temporary escape from the confinement applied to him by his Minister when he spoke in Banff, Alberta in October of 1976. That was after the present Minister had assumed the Education portfolio. The Deputy spoke in company with his colleague, a Mr. Dave Barrett, one who was a leader of the same in the Province of British Columbia for a period. But Mr. Chairman, both speakers, the Deputy Minister of Education from Manitoba and the former Premier of the Province of British Columbia, were playing the same old tune and one that Manitobans have found increasingly discordant and completely out of rhythm with our times. Sir, the Minister appears to be controlling publicity about the department but is he indeed controlling his department? Mr. Chairman, it's an open secret that the Minister's Deputy Minister and his Assistant Deputy Minister have been at loggerheads for some time, even to the point where following a threatened or actual though brief resignation, the Minister was required to intervene. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder are the most senior officers in the Department using their time to engage in a power struggle or are they working with the single purpose in mind of improving education for the children of Manitoba?

A MEMBER: A good question, Ed. Well put.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Chairman, further evidence that the Minister has his hands full driving his own team is that its reliably reported by employees loyal to the cause of education that the Minister frequently by-passes both his deputies when he wants sound advice.

A MEMBER: That's a smooth operation. .

Employees state that they frequently receive instructions so contradictory that they are unable to take action. They state that there are really three departments of education; The Minister's Department, the Deputy Minister's Department and the Assistant Deputy Minister's Department.

Mr. Chairman, let me just quote the contradictions that are still appearing even though the Minister has muzzled his Deputy Minister in respect to public statements of educational policy in Manitoba. This is from the Calgary Herald of October 16th, 1976. "And the Deputy Minister of Education for Manitoba says the current back-to-the-basics movement could set education back twenty years. Dr. Lionel Orlikow told educational administrators at a conference here Friday that the opinion swing is extremely serious because educators are being forced to re-examine the concept of the three R's when education is ready to take off in many different things."

Well, Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to reconcile the assurances given the Province of Manitoba by the Minister with those statements made by his Deputy Minister claiming that Manitoba studies indicate basic skills are increasing in students. He said, "Parents in that province have been

Wednesday, March 2, 1977

overwhelmingly positive about what's happening in the schools. We haven't communicated well enough with our communities," Dr. Orlikow told the administrators. We haven't defended the troops. He said, "There is a growing allegation that teachers are irresponsible and incompetent."

Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the Deputy Minister would get that impression because it's never been the position of this opposition that there was a criticism of the teachers in their profession. We are saying that the Deputy Minister has apparently missed the criticism which was directed to his Minister and himself in the way in which the Department was not providing the kind of direction and encouragement, the kind of achievement level evaluations that were so necessary to assist the teachers.

It again, Mr. Chairman, is an abdication of responsibility by the Deputy Minister when he says, "We are going to decentralize everything." The teachers will have curriculum and everything and if any criticism evolves, if any problems come up in our educational system, who's to blame? Not the Deputy Minister, the teachers because he has given them all of the responsibility. Well, that position was certainly not a position which this Opposition even suggested was anywhere near the truth. And he says further, the standardized tests, which the Minister himself has agreed, he would like not in the form necessarily of the departmental examinations in which incidentally, Sir, he did so well. And I congratulate him for that. It is of great interest to the House for us to know that he did, but the Deputy Minister says that these standardized tests are not the direction in which we should be going by putting, as he describes it, all our students through the same academic hoops.

Well, Mr. Chairman, what we would like to hear from the Minister is not so much what he has said on more than one occasion about his support for core subjects of language skills and computational skills. We would like to know how he reconciles that philosophy of his and from what I heard this afternoon, there was not a great deal in his positions that we would find particular fault with but we are wondering how we can possibly run a Department of Education when there is such a basic difference in philosophical positions between he and his Deputy Minister. We are wondering whether the Minister is paying lip-service to the kind of levels that we would like to see.

The Deputy Minister keeps talking of back to the basics. It's never been the kind of words that we would choose. We don't think that education has ever been away from the basics. We would like to see that education somehow reinforce the importance of those basic subjects.

The Minister would like to discuss what other subjects should be part of our core educational program, and we have already made one recommendation to him and our reply from our Leader was that we should consider very seriously the introduction of French as a language of training in the — I'm sorry, instruction in the French language in the primary schools. We think that the way in which we can really achieve a lasting understanding and a lasting resolution of the difficulty with two languages in our country would be one in which this core subject might be introduced. So, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could call it 4:30 at this stage.

MR CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour being hour for Private Members now having arrived. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report progress and asks 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 for Point Douglas that the report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Logan, seconded by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas the report of the Committee be received. Agreed? So ordered.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Hour, on Wednesday there are no Orders for Return for debate or papers, therefore we go to Private Members' Resolutions.

The first resolution is the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Rouge.

Whereas the United States Government promised the Canadian Government that they would abide by the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, specifically, Article 4 and not pollute waters crossing the boundary, to the injury and health or property in Canada; and

Whereas the U.S. Government promised the Canadian Government that no construction potentially affecting water flowing into Canada will be undertaken unless it is clear there is no injury to health or property and whereas, since the promise, construction has taken place on those project features of the Garrison Diversion Unit that will affect Manitoba adversely. Specifically the wintering dam portion of the Lone Tree Reservoir complex; and

Whereas, even though the International Joint Commission Study Board and its technical

committees have recommended major project modifications to the Garrison Diversion Unit no final assurance now exists for Canadians that these modifications will indeed be undertaken; and

Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to continue to demand of the American authorities a delay in construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit until the International Joint Commission comes up with its recommendations and until accompanying guarantees of implementation from the U.S. Government are given that their obligations under the Boundary Waters Treaty are upheld.

Be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of setting up a special task force on the Garrison Diversion Unit to present a comprehensive review of the severe harmful effects this project will have on Manitoba to the International Joint Commission public hearings.

Be it further resolved that a special task force on the Garrison Diversion Unit will ensure that every community potentially affected by the completed project knows the dangers involved; that every community potentially affected by the completed project knows what actions must be taken to lessen the harmful effects; that all industries, community organizations and private citizens be made aware of the potential harmful effects of the project, if completed.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie, seconded by Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the Resolution as read. The Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, some people may well say, well what is the point of the resolution now, after the Prime Minister's visit to Washington and after President Carter's response in stating that construction would be halted on the Lone Tree Reservoir and the construction halt would be enforced until the International Joint Commission's Study has been assessed. Now, we know the Study won't be completed until June of this year and we also know that the American Government will take some months to at least assess and study that report. But Mr. Speaker, we also are aware of very strong forces in the United States who are determined to get this project back on track, and they make no bones about it whatsoever. They have made public statements; they are raising a war chest of one-half million dollars; they are enlisting congressmen and legislators from other parts of the United States other than North Dakota because, as we know, their congressional committee system encourages a type of help one senator or one congressman to another for help that had been given in the past

So in other areas completely. I think it is incumbent that this Legislature discuss this Motion and hopefully act upon it — pass it and act upon it. The latest report from south of the border if I could quote from yesterday's Free Press and the headline of the article is: "Campaign on to Block the Diversion." One of our American friends, John Burdick of the Citizen's Committee for Natural Resources, told reporters — made some pretty tough statements that should cause alarm up here if we think that we can now sit back and rest assured that everything will come out well in the end, especially when President Carter has put the freeze on construction for a short time. This is what John Burdick said about what is happening in the United States. He said, "the Carter decision strikes at the heart of an alliance of powerful bureaucrats, pork-barrel congressional committees and influential water development interests," stated Burdick "These forces are now gearing up for a confrontation to save pet boondoggles. Blackwelder predicted that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House will restore funds for Garrison and many other projects in their own recommendations to Congress, guaranteeing intense vote fights. Congressman Tom Bevill of Alabama, Chairman of the House Appropriation Sub-committee on Public Works, has already announced that he will push for full funding of the nineteen projects." Of course, the Garrison is one of the nineteen. "North Dakota Senator Milton Young, the senior Republican on the Senate Appropriations Committee has vowed he will fight to have the Garrison reinstated. He also said that legislators from all the affected states are trying to arrange their own coalitions to save their own particular projects. Congressmen who have never heard of Garrison may be willing to vote for it in return for support of their own projects."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to do a little fighting or public discussion, if you will, on this side of the border. We just cannot afford to stay silent, leave it all to the IJC and leave it all to the federal government in Ottawa. We, as Manitobans, have to and must continue to make it known in Washington and in Ottawa how serious this project is for Manitoba and for all time to come. If I can review some of the actions that have been taken in the past four years, in October, 1973, the Canadian government requested the U.S. government to institute a moratorium on further construction of the Garrison diversion project until the governments could reach an understanding that "Canadian rights and interests have been fully protected in accordance with the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909." Mr. Speaker, that request was denied, but two promises were made. One promise made was that the U.S. would abide by the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, specifically article 4 and not pollute waters crossing the boundary and to quote the Act "to the injury of health or property in Canada." The second promise that was made: "that no construction potentially affecting water flowing into

Canada will be undertaken unless it is clear that this obligation will be met." Mr. Speaker, since those statements were made, construction has carried on on the Garrison unit, diversion and specifically construction on the Wintering Dam portion of the Lone Tree Reservoir complex, has been taking place up until the Carter freeze of some days ago. Furthermore, the Committee on Government Operations of the U.S. Congress in its findings released in July 1976 stated — now this is July of 1976 — "that construction continues on the Lonetree Reservoir, even though" and this is their words in their report — "even though under the presently authorized project plan, it potentially affects Canada." Well, Mr. Speaker, that's coming pretty close to making an outright admission — very close to making an outright admission — and that's made by a committee of the U.S. Congress. Findings of the government Operations Committee, coupled with the announced delay of the IJC's

full report until June 1977 prompted the Canadian government on October 12, 1976 to send the U.S. State Department yet another request in an attempt to bind the American government to the promises given in 1973.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can sit back and wait, that we have to take action here in Manitoba. And I think that the meeting tomorrow with the Governor of North Dakota between a legislative committee of this House, an ad hoc committee, I think the Premier of this province should make it very clear to the Governor of North Dakota and his delegation that we are not interested in compensation, we are not interested in being paid lump sums or paid for future damages, we are interested in maintaining a pure and clean water system. If that cannot be done, then other methods will have to be taken. I hope the Premier will say to the Governor of North Dakota that we expect our federal government to stand by the 1909 Treaty with no exceptions — with no exceptions — because we only have to look at what happened to the Colorado River in the late Fifties and early Sixties where a diversion was made there and the Colorado River goes down into Mexico; assurances were given under the various treaty rights with Mexico; a huge cash settlement was accepted by the Mexican government — today, the Colorado River as it affects that part of Mexico, that area of the country is turning into a desert. The alkaline and the salt is useless for irrigation . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Is not my honourable friend going down to the meeting tomorrow to meet with Governor Link? The questions that he posed as to what the Premier should be doing tomorrow, I'm sure that his presence there may even be more influential than some others that will be at the Conference and can be suggested at that time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question of the Minister of Labour. If I have the opportunity as a member of the delegation I will repeat every word I can — perhaps not verbatim. I will make no hesitation about where I stand, but I am not the Premier of the province. The Premier of the province's word carries great weight. I know if one legislator from North Dakota said something about what he would like to see happen, that doesn't necessarily mean that's what's going to happen back in the State of North Dakota. So all I'm asking is that our Premier as the Premier of this province, and who happens to be the Honourable Member for Rossmere, Mr. Edward Schreyer; if it had been any other premier, I would ask him to do the same thing. I will be there and I will use whatever small eloquence I have to state the case as I see it and, Mr. Speaker, my case is that we want the Treaty of 1909 honoured in the spirit as well as the letter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Member from Portage. Did I understand him correctly, is he now not espousing the policy that was indicated by his colleague, the Member for Fort Rouge; is there any indication that they still take the position of taking the U.S. government to court in a U.S. court? Has there been a change in that position?

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the resolution while quite lengthy doesn't mention that and I'm not talking about that; and I would think legal advice would have to be taken there, whether or not the government of Manitoba should go into court down in the United States. — (Interjection) — Well, I think he suggested that Manitoba should do that; but in any event we have a temporary halt. We have made gains. Some forces on the American side wish to take those gains away. They don't want to wait for the study of the IJC and they don't want to wait for the American government to assess those studies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on the honourable member's resolution. I must say that I agree with his sentiments with respect to the position he takes, that the position that the Manitoba government should take is that there should be no wavering on this issue and that is that we should not be talking about compensation; that we should be putting forward the position that in fact we are completely and unalterably opposed to this project.

All of the studies that have come out so far, all of the comments that I have heard on the Garrison Diversion project indicate that there can be nothing but harm for the province of Manitoba. That includes the entire Souris and Red River basins, the Lake Winnipeg drainage system right to the

Hudson's Bay. So that the kinds of effects that this diversion, if fully completed, will have on Manitoba will be disastrous, Mr. Speaker.

The fishing industry, for example, in Lake Winnipeg would be completely wiped out according to the reports that I have seen. If any water at all from that diversion channel is placed into the Manitoba system there is a danger for the rough fish species, in particular the "Gizzard Shad" which I understand is in the Missouri River basin. That fish, Mr. Speaker, has a way of multiplying which would wipe out the entire whitefish industry on Lake Winnipeg and there are interconnecting waters with Lake Winnipeg and the Nelson River Drainage System that would probably cause this kind of pollution, this kind of fish variety to get into the entire system in Manitoba because of the interconnecting waters.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to the position of the Manitoba government I believe that the Honourable Minister of Mines has taken the correct and appropriate action in this respect. He has followed the normal government channels through the Department of External Affairs to have the province's concern raised to the government of the United States, and we are hanging the claim for our protection on the International Boundaries Agreement which states as follows:

"Waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing against the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other."

Mr. Speaker, if we can make the United States government live up to that agreement then we will have protected the waters of Manitoba from the waters of the diversion of the Garrison project.

From the beginning of the protest of the Manitoba government which started on January 14th, 1970, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources wrote to the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicating our position and requesting that the federal government protest the Garrison Diversion project.

The Canadian government proceeded to send a diplomatic note to the federal government of the United States advising them of our concerns and requesting the protection of the Boundary Waters Treaty. The United States government responded by assuring Canada that no construction affecting Canada would be proceeded with until they were satisfied that the Treaty was not being violated. We have that assurance in writing from the government of the United States. In spite of this assurance from the United States government however, we continued to dialogue with the United States authorities and obtained confirmation from their own sources as to the difficulties which could be encountered to Canadian waters, if the project proceeded to the point where the Souris and Red River drainage systems would be affected.

We received a very important assurance from the State of North Dakota that if it were determined that violations of the Treaty would occur then the project would proceed without the use of the Red or the Souris Rivers. The assurance was given in November of 1974 in a *communiqué* which states as follows, and I'll quote from that *communiqué*, Mr. Speaker:

"The start of construction on the McCluskey Canal, the second of the three major components of the Supply Works, followed in 1970 and is now more than 70 percent completed. The Lonetree Reservoir scheduled for December, 1975, is the third major component. The construction of none of these three principal supply works predetermines the areas which are to be irrigated since these works are necessary for any irrigation to take place. Thus, present construction does not necessitate use of the Red or Souris Rivers as recipients of return flows.

"Utilization of these waters for return flows is conditional upon compliance within the Boundary Waters Treaty. Current estimates by the United States Bureau of Reclamation are that the construction is projected to be left for the East Oaks area, which area affects the Red River, in March of 1977, with first waters being applied to the irrigable areas in the spring of 1980.

"Construction is not projected in the Souris loop area until after 1980. These dates represent the earliest times at which final decisions for construction must be made in the areas to be irrigated."

I must point out, Mr. Speaker, that in that quote you will note that the Lonetree Reservoir, although it is proceeding as the honourable member has suggested, it is not proceeding to the point where it is affecting the Red and Souris River basins.

When discussions with the various officials in the United States reached the point where it was apparent that no agreement could be reached, the matter was jointly referred by Canada and the United States to the International Joint Commission. Manitoba took on the responsibility and appeared before the IJC presenting its position with regard to the program and also presented scientific evidence as to the harmful effects in our province.

The Winnipeg Tribune in commenting on our appearance said and I quote, this was the headline in the Press: "The Commission was impressed with our presentation." Manitoba representatives participated in the Study Board which subsequently was released in January of this year, and this report more than confirmed the fears which we had indicated, that in fact if the Garrison Diversion project is proceeded with, it would have disastrous effects to the waters of Manitoba. The government of Manitoba intends to make further appearances before the IJC in its next series of meetings which are to commence in March of this year.

We are of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the policy and the program that we have pursued is one which, whether ultimately successful or not, will achieve the most favourable results. We've never had alternative policies suggested to us which we felt would be more advantageous. We have received many suggestions as to courses to follow and I will point out some of the positions suggested from the various sources that they were recommended.

First of all when the Manitoba government made this position known to the federal government of Canada, and the government of Canada communicated with the United States and received the assurance that the federal government would not allow the construction to proceed beyond the point where they would be breaking the Boundary Waters Treaty Agreement, we suggested to the federal government that this was not good enough. That a commitment not to violate a Treaty was not good enough. That we would get caught up in discussions and disagreement and confrontation over such words as "pollution" and "injury" and that these words that are used in the Treaty, could be and would be the subject of dispute between ourselves and the government of the United States. This proved to be, in fact, correct.

It was also urged on us by various groups, including the Liberal Party in this Legislature, that we sue the United States government. We suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would have been a disastrous course to follow. Such action would have been fatal to our position in Manitoba because it would have taken the matter out of the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission and it would have put it into a court in the United States and we would have had to fight in their country. . .

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Renewable Resources is not stating, in fact, what the position of this Party has been. The position of this Party . . . **MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Order, please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to debate his particular point later. The Honourable Minister. **MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, various things are suggested at various times by various members of the Liberal Party and this is one point that was brought up in debate by a member of your party. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this would have been a disastrous position to follow for the reasons that I have stated. It would have also prevented us from obtaining co-operation and concurrence of scientific authorities in the United States who have been supportive to our position.

Mr. Speaker, it was also suggested to us by various environmental groups that we ally ourselves and actively support groups in Canada who wish to join with groups in the United States who were urging a "Stop the Garrison" program in the United States. We pointed out, correctly, that it would be fatal to our position to be involved in the internal politics of the United States, and that we would only oppose the Garrison insofar as it affected the Red and the Souris Rivers.

It was also suggested to us, Mr. Speaker, that we campaign actively in the United States against the Garrison. Also here, I can say that nothing can more demonstrate the short-sightedness of such a policy than that which occurred when eleven MP's who represent various constituencies in Manitoba presumed to advise the State of North Dakota as to the wisdom of the resolutions before that House. These MP's only succeeded, Mr. Speaker, in endangering our relationship with the American legislators and, having seen the error of their ways, apologized.

Mr. Speaker, as recently as about a month ago it was suggested by the Leader of the Liberal Party that we demand a guarantee of compensation from the United States authorities. I'm glad to hear, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie take a different position today, in that we are not going to demand a guarantee of compensation, because the very request for compensation of that nature would be an admission that we are accepting that project. And, Mr. Speaker, we cannot accept that project. We will not accept that project.

Recently a Manitoba Member of Parliament went to the United States and indicated that, for all practicable purposes, Canada should accept the diversion and demand full compliance with the International Joint Commission's Report's recommendations concerning modifications. This also could have the effect of undermining the position that the Manitoba government will be taking before the IJC and represents another attempt by persons not elected to govern this province to speak in the place of elected representatives. We have correctly resisted adopting this position.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the actions and policies adopted by the Manitoba government so far have been correct and it will achieve the best success in this matter.

In commenting briefly on the contents of the resolution submitted by the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that it is my information that the construction of the Wintering Dam that he refers to, which is a portion of the Lonetree Reservoir Complex, is actually required to prevent surface connection for waterflows into the Souris River basin. So that the continuance of that project is not endangering the waters of the Manitoba environment.

And I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that the report of the International Joint Commission Study Board is only one phase in the commission's review process and it will not report to the governments until after the scheduled public hearings in March. At which time, I have mentioned, that the Manitoba government will be again presenting our position very emphatically before that Study

Board.

The government's concern, therefore, will not undertake any formal discussions or negotiations based on this initial report.

The construction of the Lonetree Dam which is mentioned in the Cheyenne River would, I must point out, provide a direct connection from the Missouri River basin to the Hudson Bay basin in Manitoba and we must certainly protest the completion of this Lonetree Dam.

I might point out that there was a delay in the tender call on this project as a result of the Canadian note of October, 1976, that in fact it would indicate the Canadian government is making good efforts in insuring that the Canadian concerns are being raised and pressed to the attention of the U.S. government, and a most recent announcement by the President of the United States is certainly welcome in that it will again give us hope that this project will be changed and modified so as to protect the waters in Manitoba.

I want to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Mines is presently preparing an overall review which will present a consensus of the concerns of all government departments, including my department, on the report of the Study Board. This review will include comments on the recommendations of the IJC Commission as well as additional concerns which were not covered in that report. These will be used as a basis for Manitoba's presentation at the hearings in March.

With respect to the idea of a special task force, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Mines and Resources made information available to the municipalities in the affected area or the area that potentially could be affected by the Garrison River Diversion prior to the IJC hearings in 1975. Their presentation at the hearings, I'm told, represented a broad spectrum of municipal resources organizations, universities and private individuals which certainly demonstrates a pretty wide public awareness of the problems that could be present in Manitoba as a result of this diversion. I might say that in my opinion, a special task force such as the Honourable Member is proposing, may in fact cause these private individuals and groups to sit back and wait for that special task force to make their points for them. I would say it is better for the Manitoba government to make all of the information available to private individuals, groups, organized associations who wish to make representations before this committee and let them make their presentations in full force that they would have just as much or more impact as having a special task force which would simply maybe take away from the reports that would be coming from private individuals and groups. I certainly commend the Honourable Member for his concern here and I share his concern, I simply do not agree completely in the way he proposes to approach this problem. I believe the Manitoba government is doing the best and following the best course of action in this regard and will continue to do so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think we should re-name this Resolution or this debate the Gizzard Shad Debate because that's the one term that brings everybody to arms and it's the one term that describes the major concern of diversion of the waters of the Missouri River into Canada by way of the Souris River.

Mr. Speaker, I find some danger in debating biological issues and other technical issues in the Legislative Chamber because none of us are experts in these matters and we've all experienced some pretty serious contradictory information with regards to matters characterized probably by the issue of the Gizzard Shad. This, by way of introduction, started out as a very very major concern that had most of us up in arms back a couple of years ago when we had the prospect of this southern creature coming in through, you know, something just short of the Loch Ness monster crawling up the Souris River and on into Lake Winnipeg molesting the people on the beaches of Lake Winnipeg. But, Mr. Speaker, the next encounter was to be advised with no doubt at all by the American interests that the Gizzard Shad was in fact a warm water fish and was never found north of South Dakota because it couldn't live under an ice cover so they poured cold water, if you like, on the argument of the threat of the Gizzard Shad.

Now I don't think that any of us as a result of the contradictory information are in a very good position to assess really what the true facts are about the environmental impact but, Mr. Speaker, I think that there are some things that we can do as legislators and that is to look at, on the basis of our own experience and the activities of committees that act on behalf of this Chamber or act on behalf of the community generally whether they are set up by the province, the federal government or the local government, what the committees are empowered to do. The position taken by the government, which was a reasonably legitimate position if taken in isolation and the position expressed by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was that the greatest thrust should be put into ensuring that this became a federal issue and that the federal government in responding to it would set up in conjunction with the American interests, the IJC, to examine and protect our interests. Now, we all know that that part of it was successful and to that extent, I think the strategy was a good one. The IJC was established; the IJC has now reported on some of its technical findings and they have essentially reinforced the concerns that were expressed by the environmental interest groups and others who they motivated to get into the argument. They have reinforced the fact that there is very likely to be

considerable environmental damage and environmental threat that goes well beyond concerns even the of two years ago, that is, very direct threats, now that people understand and that is the impact principally on Lake Winnipeg and on the fishery of Lake Winnipeg and so on.

Mr. Speaker, Speaker, then we move on to the next major step in the whole affair and that was the cancellation of the Garrison project or suspension of the Garrison project by the President of the United States. Now our first reaction to that was: great, we've suddenly reached the plateau where we want to be and the joint efforts not just of the Liberal Party who immediately jumped up and claimed all the front centre stage, because of the joint effort between the provincial Liberals, the Federal Liberals and this great thrust which brought this about. Mr. Speaker, I would even give credit to the government that their strategy was correct and I would like to think that our pushing and thrusting and the twenty-man group that went down to examine the Garrison for two or three days and coming back and hammering at the government as a responsible opposition should do, brought about that sort of total thrust, including the Liberal Party, that brought about some action at the federal level. So I think it's one good example of where the democratic process brought about a good result. So it brought about the IJC.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is now that we find out that the President's suspension in the United States which really created a general euphoria very temporarily may be very short lived. We find that he suspended 18 projects of a similar nature, that there is a growing very strong lobby in the United States that would see probably congressional action that would make the President's ruling really ineffective and then we're back effectively to Square One at the mercy of the IJC and we probably are putting too much faith in what the IJC can do. I want to read you their terms of reference that seem to be fairly clear I think if you look at them closely. Let me quote from their Annex 1 of the IJC reference which says, "to report upon the trans-boundary implications of the proposed completion and operation of the Garrison diversion unit and to make recommendations as to such measures including modifications, alterations or adjustments to the Garrison diversion unit as might be taken to assist governments in ensuring that the provisions of Article 4," that's the injury to health and property, "of the Boundary Waters Treaty are honoured."

Now really what it says, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation that I think probably is a very valid interpretation is that really what they're going to do is measure the impact and recommend modifications. It doesn't say in there that they will rule on whether it's acceptable to Canada or not, it's really an instruction to them to examine the impact and recommend modification. Well, Mr. Speaker, that being the case, where does it put us back here in Manitoba? We've now gone around full circle and I think it's back on our desk again. We're back faced with the problem that the government has not provided, despite the Minister's comments here a short time ago about providing information to all the different interest groups, we still haven't got an impact statement developed by this government and that's what the other part of the argument has been over the last two or three years. What is the assessment, by this government, of the environmental threat? The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has, not exclusively but relied very strongly on the position the American interests are threatening our waters, it is up to the American interest to prove to us that they are not going to damage our water. Well, that's not good enough, Mr. Speaker, because the momentum behind that project is such that if we stick with that position and stick entirely with reliance on the IJC, we are committed simply to accepting their water, cleaned up through some treatment at the border so that they are of an acceptable water quality level. A water quality level, Mr. Speaker, which we were embarrassed by when we visited the Garrison Project because when we were faced with the question, "What are your water quality standards?" we couldn't tell them that we had water quality standards and we still don't have water quality standards to go by in Manitoba.

So here we are, we're in an unmerciful position of relying on the IJC that predicted the action in the States is going to be that the Congressional interests are going to be stronger than the Presidential suspension, what will prove to be a temporary presidential suspension. So we're back on these terms of reference which, Mr. Speaker, say only basically that they are to examine the environmental impact and then to come back and recommend some form of correction. Mr. Speaker, I think that it really puts us, at this point, of saying as a legislative group that our only position until we get further information is that we cannot accept. Not only can we not accept polluted water, we can accept into Canada no new water period. That's the only acceptable position on the basis of the information we have right now that we can take.

Now, what else can we do as a group in Manitoba, left at the mercy of the IJC, with terms of reference that really, I don't think, allow it to say or in anyway open the door for it to say, "you cannot divert any water into Canada out of another water system." Well, Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference will not lead the IJC to look at that as an alternative recommendation, there's already the suggestion that they can clean it up with a certain investment. I think that our only position here can be — we can't make their decision for them — our only position can be, at this time, that we can accept no water into the system, the watershed system that we now have, that is new water, be it clean water, be it polluted water, be it any other kind of water, the watershed of the Missouri; and the threats that are

being presented, which I acknowledge are threats because we still don't have the hard data required from the government in its impact study — the only position we could possibly take is to say no water. That's the only position that it's fair for us to be forced into making a decision on.

Now, the question is on this resolution, does —(Interjection)— Well Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Watershed is a very very large watershed as everyone is very familiar with. The argument of the pro side of diversion says that the Missouri water is really not strange water because before the last ice age the Missouri River and its head waters flowed into the Hudson's Bay, they came right through this part of the country. They didn't go into the Atlantic Ocean, they came across the country from the foothills the same as the Saskatchewan River did, paralleling it and further south coming through, ending up here, and the water system that is now Lake Winnipeg was one time fed by the head waters of the Missouri River but the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that the . . .

A MEMBER: Ten thousand years.

MR. CRAIK: Well, 10,000 years is really only a very short time geologically or biologically, but the problem is, according to environmentalists, that the new watershed that was entered into which goes south, has allowed the feeding of the gizzard shad if you like, up into the Missouri and that we can't go back and accept the theory that you can accept the head waters of the Missouri because they have been changed by the migration back-up from south. Whatever it may be, Mr. Speaker, the only feasible position that we can take, I think, at this is that we can accept no water, no new waters into our system because of the vulnerability now, not just to the health and property aspect, but also to the economy of Manitoba as well as the environmental impacts on the rest of the system, the Red River, Lake Winnipeg and the rest.

Well, to make a long story short, Mr. Speaker, the resolution doesn't say exactly that but the resolution presented by the member from Portage la Prairie does give us an opportunity to get the point across and I think it would be valuable to at least help reinforce the position which expresses our concern, to pass the resolution today and let the members that are going down to meet with the legislators tomorrow at the Peace Gardens to take with them the wishes of this legislature which, although this may not express exactly what we want, at least expresses the fact that we are seriously concerned and at this point have no position that we can possibly take and I would like to go even further and suggest that we cannot accept not only polluted water, we cannot accept any new water into the watershed system in Manitoba.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those comments, we intend to support the resolution on the grounds that it can help at this point to bring some acknowledgement to the critical nature of this issue and not let the people of Manitoba fall into the uncertainty or the certainty that something is going to be done that is going to protect their interests because neither the IJC terms of reference, nor the lack of studies of this government would indicate that we should have any reason to be complacent. It's still a battle, Mr. Speaker, to protect our interests in Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, I trust that we can have this go to a vote before the end of the hour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order please. The Honourable Minister wish to ask a question? The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Riel indicated that he would accept no new water, clean or otherwise. Do you take the same position for any other projects that may be on a joint basis being discussed or implemented between Canada and United States on border waters? Such as the Roseau — (Interjections) —

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll only point out that the watershed system that is being joined in here through the Missouri makes very very substantial changes to the flows and to treat the question directly, you have to look at the regional area serviced by the watershed that may be joining in. This government and the previous government made a decision to join the watersheds of the Churchill and the Nelson which, had their there been a border between the two, an International border, it probably would have brought about the same type of examination. However I think it's safe to say that the watershed system of the Churchill, that it services, is pretty similar to the watershed system serviced by the Nelson, the Saskatchewan River system and so on. There would not be a problem in that case I would presume. However, this is a different matter. We already have the environmental proof, thanks to the American work that we are facing a problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise to say that I appreciate, our group appreciates the position taken by the Honourable Member from Riel concerning his support for this resolution because, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the intention and objective of presenting this comes to really what the whole issue is about and that is that it is very much a political issue. In that sense the Member from Riel said, that it is very difficult to talk about biological environmental things in the political arena. He is not quite right. In this day and age there is so much which is environmental and biological that impinges on the political that for good or for bad legislators are forced to take a stand. And our issue is this, that in the State of North Dakota, that legislature and those members are busily

mobilizing support, holding meetings, spending money, raising funds, all designed to provide for a mobilization and pressure upon their *confreres* in Washington to get that project through. The point of this resolution is for us to do a similar kind of thing in our own province so that we can clearly communicate and telegraph to those same people who are going to be making that decision that we don't want it to happen. I think that when the Minister of Renewable Resources says that the government here has always done the correct thing, I would agree with him. But sometimes, Mr. Speaker, the correct thing is not enough. Sometimes you have to be tough and sometimes you have to be unruly and sometimes you have to be mad and simply being correct and proper in procedure might be okay if you are a debutant going to a ball but, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to a ball on this one. We are in a hell of a political fight and if these guys across there don't recognize it, then I think we're going to lose the problem. And that's the point of this resolution, to make sure that the politicians in this province have the guts to stand up and say there will be no more water and there will be no more construction and that furthermore, the people of this province will have a full acquaintanceship with the facts so that they will know what's going on; the big industries along the Souris and the Red and Assiniboine which will no longer be able to manufacture; the Campbell Food plant in Portage and all the rest of the food processing plants which will totally go out of business if this thing is allowed to go ahead; the fishing, the wildlife, the hunting, all will disappear and dissolve and yet we are simply concerned more about being correct than we are about being right. And, Mr. Speaker, that's the point of the resolution. Let's be right on this one and let's make sure.

So when the Minister says look, those Liberals are suggesting we should take some legal remedies, as if somehow that was akin to pushing your grandmother down the stairs in her wheelchair. The fact of the matter is that we simply suggest to this government that they use every arsenal at their disposal and one of the things that they had at their disposal was the fact that there was legal action being taken in the United States courts by the State of Minnesota and several other states, by the Audubon Society and by the wildlife groups down there and we simply ask them to examine the option of putting on . . . brief in to the Federal Circuit Court in Washington to indicate and ask for an injunction. The Minister was not right in his statement and I wish he would get his facts straight once in awhile about what we do say. If he understood what we are saying then he might be better able to undertake the action that we should be getting into.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I would believe that a vote on this particular issue, if I felt that those gentlemen opposite would vote for it, would be absolutely necessary. I'm going to ask them if they are prepared to vote for it and I'll sit down and be quiet so we can get a full resolution and go to that meeting tomorrow. But, if it simply means that they're going to talk this issue out and go through their minuet and their little dance again trying to protect their record or their posteriors, whatever it may be then we shouldn't let it go to a vote because we can't show the legislators of North Dakota that somehow we don't have the guts to stand up for our own province the way we should. On that basis we should keep this resolution alive and hopefully after their meeting they'll do it.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply put to them that that's the kind of option they have. Are we prepared to go down there tomorrow with this kind of resolution in our hands and say that's where the people and legislators of Manitoba stand or are we simply going to do as the Minister of Mines has done, standing on his tippy-toes and being correct for the last three years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you Mr. Speaker. After hearing that dissertation from the Member for Fort Rouge, although I didn't see the program, I saw the preview of it. He sounds more and more like the CBC on the Garrison Diversion Project, "Get your guns out boys and we're going to stop them at the border." We have to get whatever arsenal is at our disposal." Now, if anyone that is representing people of Manitoba is suggesting that we should go down to the border and say, "Look you fellows down south, you stop or we're going to deal with you in whatever means we've got possible" — I presume that the honourable member, I hope he is not suggesting that we take up arms against the U.S. — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: The Member from Fort Rouge used the very words, that we should use whatever means and arsenal at their disposal. Now what is he really saying? Is he saying, as he said before, that the Government of Manitoba should go to the U.S. and sue the U.S. Department of Reclamation? — (Interjection) —

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. URUSKI: And if the Province of Manitoba went to the U.S. court and the U.S. court or a judge in the U.S. court ruled against the Province of Manitoba or whoever would take that injunction, then what would the honourable member say? That this government has sold our rights down in the U.S. court. That's what he would get up and say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member will have an opportunity to continue next time. The hour being 5:30 the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.