

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 16, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland) introduced Bill No. 21, An Act to amend the City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona) on behalf of the Honourable Attorney-General introduced Bill No 25, An Act to amend The Mortgage Brokers Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of any other bills by any other member?

MR. PAULLEY: One moment if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY on behalf of the Attorney-General introduced Bill No. 26, An Act to amend the Real Estate Brokers Act for first reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield) on behalf of the Minister of Highways introduced Bill No. 4 An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act for first reading(second reading Monday next.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I direct my first question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder, Sir, if he could indicate to the House whether or not it is his intention to sign the pledge, the boycott, restraining from eating meat on Tuesday and Thursdays of every week that is currently being circulated by a local broadcaster?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, let me say that I would be prepared to consider that kind of venture if I could get a greater degree of credibility from my honourable friend on the whole question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. Is he going to sign the pledge?

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been answered. The Honourable Member for Lakeside

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs. Is the Minister of Consumer Affairs going to support the current boycott that is being introduced into this city and in this province, the consumption of red meats.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James); Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Acting Leader, I mean Leading Actor of the - Her Majesty's Official Opposition, I would like to point out to him that all in society have a concern about the escalation of food prices. Our department has sent out letters to many organization inviting them to submit their suggestions their representations to us so that we in turn can make effective representation to the committee which is sitting in Ottawa on this question. If the honourable member wants to, like all other interested citizens, me to convey that concern about the cost of red meat prices, I will do so.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate and concur with the Minister's answer. I can then assure my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: The question is this that, I can assume that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. ENNS: None of the Minister neither the Minister. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ENNS: . . . of Consumer Affairs nor the Minister of Agriculture, will support the boycott.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member is making a statement which is contrary to our rules, and he well knows it. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT(Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the Minister of Agriculture indicate the volume of pork that is being imported into Manitoba from United States in the light of the present situation of all that importation of hogs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate that in recent times, well in fact for some time, there have been exports of pork out of Canada to the United States, and there have been imports from the United States by Canada, and in recent times the statistics are about balanced. We ship out as much as we bring back in, and so on. So that I don't know what relevance that particular question or answer would be to my honourable friend.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, my question was: could the Minister indicate what volume is being imported at the present time and what relationship then has it with our . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question would be better asked by an Order for Return. The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. I.H.(Izzy)ASPER(Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Environmental Management or the Universities and Colleges Minister. Is the University of Manitoba still dumping raw sewage into the Red River?

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, the rivers of Winnipeg were required to be cleaned up over a phased - in period, which I can't recall, with the inception of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg --(Interjection) -- by 1974, the Minister of Colleges and Universities tells me. I believe that in the ten years that has elapsed that there has been a remarkable change from what existed previously to what exists at the present time but it is still not the case that all sewage in Greater Winnipeg is received, is receiving secondary treatment. --(Interjection) --Under construction at the present time.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister. Is the date 1974 that date when the university will no longer be dumping raw sewage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Universities and Colleges.

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Colleges and Universities)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, 1974 is the date when all the major sewer lines connecting all areas in Greater Winnipeg will be completed and by that date the campus at the Fort Garry site will of course have been tied in. It may even occur this year.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would that broad plan that the Minister has just referred to include the stopping of dumping raw sewage from Headingley Jail or has that been completed, the correction of that problem? --It being out of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: . . . I'll have to take that question as notice. I can tell the honourable member that there are many other areas in Manitoba where there is not yet secondary treatment of sewage disposal --(Interjection) -- The primary treatment, yeah.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources. Are there any accruals of interest included in the losses shown on the statement of income expenses of the Manitoba Development Corporation deficit of 13 million?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I'm not sure I got the question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any accruals of interest included? The large part of that loss reflects interest which has not been paid by the Churchill Forest Industry Complex. Another large portion of it, by far the other largest portion of it includes reserves put away for doubtful accounts. I would think that the figures are roughly 50-50 in that respect, approximately \$7 million in each area.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary. Is that interest up to date, is that the interest?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, up to the date of the issuance of the statement. I mean

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . not the issuance of the statement but the date that is referred to in the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the Minister, or his department, directed district welfare offices not to open up files to anyone including MLAs outside of the departments? This directive was some excess of a year old. And if the answer is no, is the Minister contemplating rectifying this misunderstanding, especially re the Brandon offices that I discussed with him some days ago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Virden for giving me advance notice of this two-part question. The answer to the first part of his question would be that the policy of the Department of Health and Social Development has been before 1969, as well as after 1969, to allow only authorized personnel access to files of recipients, and only when such access is necessary for work related to the well-being of the recipient. Any exception of this rule must be approved by the Minister.

Part (b) of the question. The Honourable Member for Virden made an inquiry in the Brandon office, which he related to me, concerning a recipient in Virden. The staff at the Brandon office discussed the matter with the honourable member and it seemed that the situation was resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned. During the conversation the honourable member requested to look through the file of the recipient and the staff refused because of the above policy. There does not seem to be any misunderstanding at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs. Has the government made a decision on its position in regards to the Winnipeg railway relocation study?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: When will the government announce its policy?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I believe, I believe, Mr. Speaker, before the government should be in a position to make a decision on this matter, there are other levels of government who ought to determine their position first.

MR. PATRICK: Will the Minister give assurance to the residents of South Winnipeg, in particular Fort Garry, that the railway yards will not be located in the residential part of that city? --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Order please.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Did he, in light of the answer to the question posed by the Member from Virden, did the Minister authorize the giving of a list of children of families on welfare to a Mrs. who was holding a Christmas Party for them this past Christmas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this information wasn't authorized by myself. It could have been delegated by someone else, but I have no recollection of making such an authorization.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley, Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Will the Minister indicate whether or not there has been any change in the, I think it's \$3 million contract between Flyer Industries and B.C. Hydro for the sale of 60 transit buses. Has there been any change in that contract?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources is the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Development Corporation and I believe he might be able to answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take notice of this question but in doing so I will warn the honourable member that I may not be inclined to answer it. I'm not intending

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GREEN cont'd) to answer on the internal day-to-day transactions of corporations that happen to receive money or have equity, or where the Crown has equity positions in them. There will be a report made by the Chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation to the Economic Development Committee during the course of the legislative session.

MR. ASPER: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister has taken the question as notice, perhaps I might add these supplementary questions as notice also. The question then being, has Flyer Industries given British Columbia Hydro notice that it cannot meet delivery of the contract, and has B.C. Hydro indicated the possibility of demanding a change or cancellation of the sale?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am now almost certain that not only my indication -- I will take it as notice -- but I am not going to deal with the internal day to day affairs of corporations to whom the Development Corporation has borrowed money, or in which the corporations have equity. That will not be a subject on which I am going to readily answer on Orders of the Day.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, I guess my question would be to the same Minister as House Leader. Is it then the government policy not to give the House information on government company operations until a year after in effect the year is closed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, when a question arises which I consider is one which the House should have some knowledge of, as a matter of ministerial discretion I'll make that kind of an answer. The questions that the honourable member asks deal with the internal day-to-day administration of a commercial corporation. That I will not answer but the House is certainly entitled to the information; they will get that kind of information in the same way as they get answers from Hydro, in the same way as they get answers from the Telephone System, and in the same way as they previously got answers, in the previous year, when the Chairman of the Development Corporation appeared before committee.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. It relates to the Ilford God's Narrows winter road. It is a fact that no significant amount of freight has gone over this road to God's Narrows this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON MCBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, the road to which the honourable member refers to is open and has been open for quite a number of days now and it's up to the freighters, Mr. Speaker, to make full use of that road now it's open.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Supplementary question to the Minister. Is it not a fact that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The question is argumentative in that phrasing.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'll rephrase the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Has the Minister's department paid out approximately of \$95,000 for the construction of this road?

MR. MCBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the department has paid for the -- has not yet paid out the full amount for the construction of this road, but is paying for the construction of this road and this road is now open. The department can't force the freighters to get on the road once it's open but I understand they are making every effort to make full use of it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister give the reasons as to why the God's Narrows Indian Band is flying in freight at \$14.00 a hundred?

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, through you to the member for Portage to Sigfusson of the Hudson Bay Company, I can't answer that question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Attorney-General who, while not occupying his seat, maybe is within earshot. Can the Honourable Minister indicate to the House whether or not his government has today received notice of yet another lawsuit against this government by Mr. Sigfusson with respect to the construction of northern roads or . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MACKLING cont'd). . . . people that have interests in making noises about lawsuits. I don't know that the government is being sued, maybe the honourable member has some information that I'm not aware of.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Will the Minister be tabling a report in this House from the Office of Statistics Manitoba ?

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

MR. EVANS: I'm sorry, whether I-- I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether I heard the whole question because of the nose around me . To therefore I would ask the honourable member to repeat it.

MR. PATRICK: Will the Minister be tabling a report from the Department of Statistics Manitoba to the members of the House.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, to date the Bureau of Statistics has not engaged in any general statistical surveys. They do receive statistical information from the Statistics Canada Office in Ottawa. However, I can mention to members of the House that that same information is published and is available, at a very nominal cost, I might add.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Minister can tell the House then what is the number of employees working for the Department Statistics Manitoba, and what is the cost of this department.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that is really a subject for an Order for Return. I would indicate however that there are a number of statistical surveys that are under way pertaining to matters which assist in the administrative operation of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I did want to make it clear to the House in response to the question from the Honourable Member from Lakeside, who I note is not in his place now and is not in earshot, that it could be that someone in my department has been served with documentation and I'm not aware of it, but I'm advised by my colleague that there is some currency to broadcast that there is a lawsuit involving Mr. Sigfusson and the government.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Has the government made a decision on the request by the City of Winnipeg to acquire, or have turned over to it, the 19 or 17 homes that the Government of Manitoba owns in the vicinity of Grace Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I have no knowledge of such a request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: If the request . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ASPER: . . . has gone to the wrong Ministry . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . check it out.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Minister takes the question as notice, would he take the supplementaries as notice also. In view of the fact that I have received a copy of that request, when might we expect --(Interjection)-- I don't have it with me otherwise I would -- when might we expect a decision by the government and a question that I think can be answered; have renovations started on Grace Hospital, and if not when will they start ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. -- Did you call me, Sir? --(Interjections)--

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Very well. I am totally aware of the Minister of Education standing up but he was late getting up. The Honourable Member for Swan River was up first. Now I have -- order, please -- I have no desire to debate the issue. The Minister of Education can make his reply now if that's his desire.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the first part of the question of the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party is concerned I will peruse the letter in which purportedly there is some requests made of the government, and if a decision must be made by the government then it will be made, and at such a time if the honourable member need be advised he will be advised of it.

Insofar as the second question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Urban Affairs is not involved in the renovation of any building in any part of the City of Winnipeg.

A MEMBER: Even in Wolseley.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if the Minister will confirm or deny that the pork contract to Japan was made at the December market price of pork?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wonder when honourable members opposite would learn to listen when information is given. The other day I had enunciated the policies with respect to that sale. I gave specific information as to how the prices were arrived at, namely by formula over a three-year period, and that that formula is a moving formula in which case it means that the price will change every couple of months, or whatever the time period is, over the next three years, in order to reflect the changing markets throughout the world. So that there is no one price, and my honourable friend ought to appreciate that it would be impossible either on the part of the Hog Producers' Marketing Board or on the part of the buying company to agree to a fixed price for that long a contract, for that long a period of time in advance; so that members opposite should be a little more responsible rather than playing games on this one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Would he make available . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . to the members of the House the position papers that are referred to in the Report of his Department on Page 67, Mental Health in Manitoba a Five-Year Plan, Mental Retardation in Manitoba a Five-Year Plan, Social Indicators of Manitoba and Mental Health in the '70s.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice and I'll peruse the reports and look at the advisability of tabling these reports in this House.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I took a question as notice yesterday from the Honourable Member for Crescentwood and this was in regards to OAS, DIS, pension increases. The question was: will old age pensioners receiving welfare get the full benefit of the increased pension, or will their welfare payments be reduced by that amount? The answer to the question Mr. Speaker, is that the combined effect of rate increases for items such as food and clothing, the increased cost of actual rent and health services, and the planned increase in personal allowance for old age pensioners, will be to increase the social allowance benefits to old age pensioners by at least as much as the Federal increase in the old age pension. Thus old age pensioners on welfare will receive the full benefit of the increase in pensions and beyond.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Will the Minister be introducing any housing assistance legislation for low income families or for first-time home buyers during this session?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, legislation, if required, will be introduced. It's my understanding that such legislation may not be required, that the program in fact may be carried out by the province not necessarily by means of legislation.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Welfare. In view of the general approval of the Minister's program when he announced the use to which Grace Hospital would be put, the old Grace Hospital, could he confirm that renovations have started and when they might be completed?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party this question would be best put to the Minister of Public Works.

MR. ASPER: It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that the -- in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that discussions between myself have been with the Minister of Health, and he now delegates the Minister of Utilities to answer, would the Minister of Public Utilities --(Interjection) -- Public Works, correct, Public Works . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The honourable gentleman will sit down. The question is the same. Would the Honourable Minister answer if he wishes. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to attempt to answer that question since renovations are the responsibility of the Department of Public Works. We have been renovating Grace Hospital for a number of months.

MR. ASPER: To the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister indicate when the construction, or the tearing down process, will be completed inasmuch as the streets are covered, or rather blocked through the rubble and the fence built at the north end of the hospital.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take that question as notice to get a more precise answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister in charge of Water Control and Conservation. We have on our desks a list of the Water Resources Branch major projects for 1973-74 which lists 40 programs, principally drainage. I wonder if we might expect the program in regard to water conservation for the Province for 1973-74.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is a subject which has been discussed at various times during the estimates. The drainage program which has been produced is the major reconstruction of drains, which is the traditional program which has been given to the House so they have particulars on it. It isn't intended to be a description of everything that is being done in the Water Resources Branch and doesn't include the programs for drainage maintenance and the other matters that the honourable member referred to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. Can the Minister tell the House what is the number of government vehicles insured for the Brandon region but are exclusively used in the City of Winnipeg in a higher cost region?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. An Order for Return would be more appropriate for that question. The Minister of Universities and Colleges.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on Monday last the Member for Emerson, who is not here but he will read it in Hansard, asked about how many full-time teachers are involved in teaching students in the IMPACTE Program at Brandon. The answer is there are approximately 64 teachers involved in the field training of students.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Could he tell us whether the figures given by Hydro for levels of water in Cross Lake are monthly means or peaks, if he knows, or if he could take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the information I believe is contained in a concise form in the program Regulation of Lake Winnipeg which was distributed to the honourable members. If he is indicating to me that that is not the case, then I will take the question as notice and get the answer for him.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate to the House and to the hog producers of Manitoba when he intends to make the Hog Producers Board a democratic organization by proceeding with the election of members rather than by Ministerial appointment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is argumentative in that form. Does the honourable member wish to rephrase it?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. GRAHAM: Very well, Mr. Speaker. I just ask the Minister when he intends to call for election of board members?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Well again, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that there have been procedures under way for some time that will bring about his very desires and some members have already been elected and others will be elected very shortly. And let me remind honourable friends opposite that this is the first time in the history of that particular marketing board in which case they are going to be allowed the election of their own officers, notwithstanding the fact that it was run by a dictatorship for ten or eleven years during the term of office of my friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. Is there any cars that are insured in the Brandon region but are used exclusively in the City of Winnipeg?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: It seems to me that that question is identical with a question that was posed to me last week. I am as interested as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia in the answer to that question, and I indicated at that time that I would be taking the question as notice and that we would be attempting to obtain the information.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources. Can he inform the House whether the government has received a report from the Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists which has just concluded a survey and can he also indicate whether Manitoba's increase in reserves is that of the -- seven times what was previously said to be the reserves, the potential reserves in Canada.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll have to take the question as notice.

SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: There's a question under Orders of the Day, written. Orders for Return.

MR. GREEN: Neither the questioner nor the person to whom the question is directed is here so perhaps we could let that matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the matter stand? (Stands) -- (Interjection) -- There is no point of order. Would the honourable member like to raise one?

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, could we have the question read?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that all of the members of the House can read at least I hope they can. There is no sensitivity about the question. The Member who is putting it, and the person to whom the --(Interjection)-- well, Mr. Speaker, if the members of the House wish the question to be put in another form we are prepared to answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, there is a point of procedure here, or point of order. Questions of the Ministry according --Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to contain the stentorian ejaculations of the Member for Radisson, so that somebody else can speak in this House. Mr. Speaker, according to the rule that was adopted by the Rules Committee, when a person wishes to submit a question, just a plain question on the Order Paper, all that is necessary is that question appears on the Order Paper, it need not be read into the record. The answer need not be replied verbally, the answer will reply on the Order Paper at the time when the Minister is prepared to answer the question, and then it disappears off the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct, Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Thompson. The Honourable the Attorney-General wish to answer the question now? Very well.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for return. The Honourable Member for Thompson.

ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . didn't quite understand the point that I made. The answer appears written on the Order Paper, not verbal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker I understand that the Attorney-General wishes to have the first Order for Return held over until Monday, Could I proceed with the second Order. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the Honourable Member introduce it so that we can properly hold it over.--(Interjection)-- No. Very well let it stand.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertland

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

1. Number of jails or other penal-type institutions under Minister's jurisdiction.
2. Number of staff at each institution.
3. Number of inmates at each institution in 1972.
4. Number of inmates given day passes at each institution in 1972; How many inmates were given day passes more than once in 1972.
5. Number of weekend passes given at each institution in 1972.
6. Number of inmates being chauffeured or using other transportation going to university or other schools.
7. Number of early paroles given in 1972.
8. Number of early paroles violated in 1972.
9. Number of weekend-pass violations in 1972.
10. Number of day-pass violations in 1972.
11. Number of times prison guards assaulted by prisoners in 1972.
12. Number of returning prisoners caught bringing drugs, liquor into institutions in 1972.
13. Number of prisoners escaping from police or prison guards while attending sporting events, etc.
14. Number of homebrew stills found in any of the institutions in 1971-1972.

A MEMBER: For medicine.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return is acceptable and will be answered to the ability of the department.

SECOND READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: Second Readings.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I notice the Honourable Member for Swan River has Bill No. 2 in his name. I wonder if he would object if somebody else wishes to speak.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, there would be no objection on the understanding of course that he would allow the bill to stand in his name.

MR. SPEAKER: Anyone wish to proceed on Bill No. 2 The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently there isn't anyone that is desirable of speaking at this time, so therefore Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Resolution 82(a) (1) The Honourable Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just so that I don't leave it to the end as I have in two previous interjections into the debate, Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish the sentence that has caused the Minister of Mines such consternation, and which has allowed him or persuaded him to misinterpret my intention. In doing so, Mr. Chairman, I point to

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR.ASPER cont'd). . . . the fact that at the time the statement was made about the, or was begun to be made about people leaving the department, I had previously, going back to Page 588 of March 13th Hansard, been talking about a series of independent contractors or government agencies, the Environment Commission, the Environment Council and the University Study Group, which had been thwarted in their work in my opinion. There then was a very lengthy interjection which does appear in Hansard, Mr. Chairman -- the interjection took some moments as I recall it -- and at that point I went on to an entirely different subject as I intended, and the Minister has interpreted the statement as being a continuation of the same point. I have consulted my notes Mr. Chairman, I have them here, and so that there is no doubt as to what I intended, even though I have said several times in this House that the inference the Minister took was not a correct inference. The point I was making was that in the past few months we have seen a number of very valuable people, who have given long service to the department, leave the department, and I started to speak of the former Deputy Minister Winston Mair. I spoke, I was going to refer to Bob Wallace who was the deputy as I understood but is not --(Interjection) -- Yes but no longer the -- the Minister says he's the Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs. What I meant was that he is no longer in the Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: He used to be in Planning and Priorities.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Robert Etting who was the Chief Wildlife Biologist, and Robert Andrews who was the Sport Fishing Supervisor, and I believe had something to do with Sport Fishing Planning, and what I had proposed Mr. . . .

A MEMBER: You forgot Dr. Peter Warner.

MR. ASPER: What I was proposing, Mr. Chairman, and do propose, is that these people --(Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we might have the Minister confine his remarks to answering on the record as opposed to from his chair. What I was proposing, and do propose, Mr. Chairman, is that many of these people along with a list that I intended to read would be of some value to us in considering the whole project that's under discussion, and my suggestion was and is, that the Public Utilities Committee be allowed to interview these people or question them and have them brought forward for discussion, and when I had asked, or was about to ask, when the interjection occurred, was that the Minister would give some undertaking in his response that he would have the committee authorized to hear these people and allow us to discuss it with them.

Now Mr, Chairman, returning to the thrust of what I was saying before the last speech by the Member from Riel, I've talked about our concern over the export of power and I had stressed, and I regret that my friend from Riel misinterpreted and sought an opportunity to make a speech about economic nationalism, but I had stressed that this was not economic nationalism nor was it anti-Americanism . . .

A MEMBER: Political opportunism . . .

MR. ASPER: . . . and the Member from Riel and the Member from Lakeside expressed the view that this is political opportunism. Well, Mr. Chairman, the subject of economic nationalism has been dealt with very extensively by me in writing, as a writer for many years prior to coming into public life, and it will be well known by anyone who has bothered to re-search my position on the subject that when economic nationalism was first touted, particularly by the then Minister of Finance in 1963 federally, Walter Gordon, that I publicly and in writing in many occasions disavowed and disowned that kind of policy, and do so today. We are not economic nationalists we are pragmatic about the use of our resources. The point we made, we the Liberal Party in Manitoba, our policy is, and was and remains, on this issue that where you have a resource renewable or non-renewable that isn't a relevant term, you do not bargain it away unless you are making an exceptional deal, and we said we want to know that deal before we approve the project if that's one of the cornerstones of the project and it appears to be. It's not opportunistic to suggest it, it just happens to be good plain business sense because there are two approaches we take. The First, and foremost, is what is the deal? What kind of a deal are we going to be making? Are we going to be making a good deal? Secondly, the practical problem of getting the power back, and it is, as I said, the penultimate in naivete for my friend from Riel or anyone else in this House to suggest that if we enter into an agreement to provide power to the United States and the expiration of that time comes 15 years, or whatever is suggested and the Americans still require the power, it is very difficult to get the power back and particularly, particularly, Mr. Chairman, when the Americans would be able through other

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd). . . . devices to bring pressure to bear on the Canadian Government, on other provinces -- and I want to deal with my friend from Riel particularly, because I want to imagine for this Chamber the wildest possible circumstance; the wildest possible circumstance is that his party would be restored to office and Mr. Spivak, its leader, the Honourable Member for River Heights, is the Premier. Now bear in mind the scenario. A few weeks ago the Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party proudly announced that his strategy for winning the next general election included the bringing into Manitoba of the big blue machine from Ontario, the Progressive Conservative Party apparatus of Ontario, and I concede that his president Mr. Graeme Haig reputedly that a few weeks later, said no, we will not import the talent of Dalton Camp, and so on. But, Mr. Chairman, let's assume that it happened, because that's what Mr. Spivak apparently wanted. Now had that happened and the 15 years of power elapse, and there's the Honourable First Minister, Mr. Spivak, getting a phone call from the First Minister of Ontario who says to him, you know your 15 year contract with the United States is up and the United States wants to renew and you won't renew because Manitobans need your power. However, you remember back in 1973 when we sent the Big Blue Machine in to help you form that government, you became indebted to us, Mr. Chairman, and under those circumstances it is not unlikely, nor is it unknown in Canadian History, for the Province of Ontario on a political basis to say the Americans are saying to us that if you take the power away we will renegotiate the autopac between Oakville, Windsor, and Detroit, and the Americans are saying to us in Ontario that if the Manitobans don't give us the power, that we need, that we will cut off other tariff protections, we'll renegotiate landing rights for airplanes, and so on. And so that is the kind of pressure that I'm concerned to see not be ever imposed on the Province of Manitoba but a more pragmatic . . .

--(Interjection) --

The Member from Osborne say, "and you'd buckle under the pressure". Under those circumstances I respond to him; I have given the possibility that Mr. Spivak is the First Minister of this Province, and I suggest Mr. Spivak would have little option, given the fact that he was so willing to bring in the political support from Ontario. Now, but what are we going to use this power for if we are producing it for export? We can say to the U.S. if you need our power for your industry then locate your industries in Manitoba, create the jobs in Manitoba not in North Dakota, and if in the wildest possibility we go ahead with the project and export power to the United States, what are the Americans going to do with it? Well I suggest to you this is what they're going to do with it, Mr. Chairman. They are going to write as they did a few days ago, sorry a few weeks ago, January 16, 1973, from Moorhead, they are going to write Manitoba businessmen and they are going to say, "Relocate your industries in the United States. Build in Minnesota because we can give you all kinds of tax concessions, grants and we also have very cheap power." And, Mr. Chairman, I ask what power are they referring to? Their power or the power we sell them to permit them to induce our industry to leave, our jobs to leave and go to Minneapolis, or Minnesota, or Moorhead, and this is why we're concerned, not because we are economic nationalists, but because we don't want the United States trying to attract our jobs, our industry, our manufacturing into the United States, as we have lost some to the United States, with our power, and that's our concern; and that's why we again reiterate, we make no judgment that there should be no export; we say we want it to be the subject of proper public hearings as the whole project ought to be, and that is part of the project.

Now Mr. Chairman, there were a number of points made by the Mines Minister that obviously time doesn't permit in the debate because we are running into the 15th or 16th hour, and I frankly have despaired of this debate producing much of a change in the Minister or in the government approach. The Minister continues in his response to set up straw men and debate issues that have not been raised, and we have not been able to come to grips with the real issue that we've tried to raise, the idea of public hearings before a major commitment is made. Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion that there is no solidarity amongst the Liberal Party on this issue and that the Minister delighted in pointing to the fact that the Liberal caucus was not supporting the point of view --(Interjection) --

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that's the kind of a statement which must come as a point of privilege. I never said that the Liberal caucus was not supporting the Leader. I said

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . that the only one who has spoken on the question is the Leader of the Party and I have not heard the positions of the other members.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, if that's what the Minister meant I certainly took the inference that he was suggesting that he said in this House only one man, only one man opposes what we're doing. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Chairman, then there is no point of privilege because what I said is exactly that. And I am now saying to the Minister, that the Liberal Party has caucused the issue, that the position I articulate is the position of the Liberal Party, its caucus and its nominated candidates. And that position, should there be any doubt about it, is exactly what I said in the beginning of this debate. There should be a halt to the project and full public hearings, and let's get to those public hearings now.

Those public hearings ought to be not by the Public Utilities Board or the Public Utilities Committee because obviously it has become - its lost its members from Crescentwood and Osborne who had shown some sympathy toward the idea of re-examining the project. We believe the public has become confused by the debate rather than having had an elucidation, therefore, the conflicting experts who on all sides of this issue have something to offer, should be brought into an inquiry, a public inquiry, and independent inquiry.

Now I have some doubt as to the Minister of Mines approach to independent inquiry, but so that there's no doubt about it, our position is, public hearings, followed by a value judgment - and that's what this boils down to, a value judgment - by the members of this Legislature who just like in 1969 - and I'm paraphrasing the Minister - have had a lot of technical material thrown at them, a lot of conflicting opinions thrown at them and none of us are experts, none of us have the technical expertise with which to judge it unless we are able to put the people into one room and hold the hearings. Normally I would agree that the Public Utilities Committee should make the decision in the hearings but because of the experience I've had in the past year watching how the government members behave in these committees, their attitude to suggestions that come from outside their own ranks, I am not prepared to see the hearings be of a Public Utilities Committee nature.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question.

MR. ASPER: I'm almost through and then I'll be happy. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question we keep posing to the Minister: What if you're wrong? What if you do this environmental damage? What if the economics are wrong? What if the experts who are saying that there's a better way, what if they are right and what if you are wrong? The answer he gives is not satisfactory, Mr. Chairman. It's a very dangerous answer. His answer is: Trust us, we know what we're doing, we've looked at it. If that isn't his answer, his second answer is if you don't like it, if we are wrong, if you can persuade the public of Manitoba that we are wrong, they'll throw us out. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that is an irresponsible answer because, because Mr. Chairman, he is not indemnifying the people of Manitoba, he is saying that if we have made a mistake the people will throw us out. Well that's not good enough because the damage will have been done. You can't unflood. And, Mr. Chairman, this is not a dollar's issue only. We have enough -- (Interjection) -- I'll be through.

A MEMBER: I didn't hear the word. Can't what?

MR. ASPER: Unflood.

A MEMBER: Un what?

MR. ASPER: U N F L O O D. Unflood. The question Mr. Chairman, is that we do not have the information on which to make the judgment. We do not know enough to proceed and the government's posture is if we create a colossal bog, a stagnant sewer in the north, if we spend between one and two hundred million dollars that was unnecessarily spent -- and I don't say that that is the case, I say that there are those who do say that though -- and if we're wrong spank us, throw us out of office he says. And we say, if you adopt that principle then there is very little left to the democratic process. There is very little left in the responsible government process because the government could say, we're going to also institute fines, penalties, inflicting irreparable damage on a community and if you don't like us throw us out. We say no that is not the modern democratic process. Your indemnity isn't any good. And I go back to the example that we started with and I ask every member of this House to consider the CFI affair of 1969; because we are now holding public hearings we are now spending millions of dollars to inquire into, and even ask the question: was the project

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) viable? We're even asking the question: how should an MDC operate, how should we have done it? Mr. Chairman, if we had had those hearings before the barn was burned down I don't think we would be in the position we are today. I don't think so, and I don't think any member of this House really believes we would be. And that's all we're asking for, so that there is no confusion of our position, public hearings before a major decision which will be paid for by future generations. That's all we're asking for. It is not unreasonable and we urge the government to consider its position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words on the department. A few days ago we received a progress report No. 1 and No. 2 put out by the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill and Nelson River Study Board and I think that this report, especially Report No. 2 should be read by all members of this House. I think it should be read not for what it says but really for what it does not say.

Mr. Speaker, on page 25 there's a chart. This chart tells us that a whole series of studies are in progress, it tells us that most of these studies were started in the middle of the year 1972, whether they deal with water quality or fisheries or wildlife or recreation or social economic evaluation, tells us that none of these studies are finished.

The Member for Wolsley referred to the CFI fiasco catastrophe and to the attitude or the spirit of secrecy that surrounded the whole thing. I'm afraid that there is somewhat some measure of the same attitude present today. I know that the Minister of Mines and Resources styles himself as a somewhat self-appointed benevolent dictator for all our welfare.

A MEMBER: Who said that? Is that nice to Sid?

MR. ALLARD: I cleared it with the Minister before I used it. I'm afraid, I'm afraid that the role of a benevolent dictator is not always a pleasant one for those . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of privilege and so there be no misunderstanding. I didn't style myself as such, I said that if the honourable member wishes to do so that was his concern. So I don't want to leave on the record that I have accepted that term as my description of myself. But I certainly don't like to stifle what other people say.

MR. ENNS: A point of order . . . just for further clarification, it was my thought perhaps that the Minister was going to protest to use of the word "benevolent" in that context.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I thought that I had cleared with him the use of the word "benevolent" as related to . . . dictator and that he had agreed to that part of it, and I added the word "self-styled" because he had agreed to it.

CFI was a fiasco because too much secrecy surrounded it, Mr. Speaker. There is a tunnel of cement in Toronto that cost some hundred or two hundred millions of dollars. It goes nowhere, starts nowhere and they're trying to figure out whether to make a canoe course out of it or a trysting place for the lovelorn. I don't know what they'll finally settle on. But it seems to me to be an example of something that started out with the general approval of a population and which slowly built up resentment because of changing values. I wish to state that I acquiesced, I agreed to the notion of ten feet of water added to South Indian Lake, and I still believe that there is reasons to go ahead with the project.

What I am becoming increasing concerned with though is the lack of information that is available to the general public. And when I say available to the general public I wish to make it clear that I don't believe that 20 reports which pile up two feet high is information available to the general public. I would suggest that there is not three members of this House who have read those reports. -- (Interjection) -- The Member for Thompson says not one member has read those reports, so we are left at the tender mercies of Hydro. I am afraid that Hydro has a parti pris in this particular subject. They have a slant, their purpose is to produce hydro, to produce it cheaply and that is a good thing. On the other hand, I am wondering who is responsible for the natural resources for the recreational value, for the wildlife and at this stage I happen to believe that it is the Member of Mines and Resources.

Now I wonder what the Minister of Mines and Resources -- and I'm not saying that his decision is necessarily wrong -- but I'm wondering how he arrived at a decision on the value of the water quality that would be destroyed, of the fisheries, of the wildlife, of the recreation and of social economic evaluation of a number of other subjects, of the question of forestry, if he did not have these reports. But this chart tells me simply that these -- the flow chart tells me that the reports are in progress and were started some time in the middle of 72

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) and there was a mapping report that was available, a report on archaeology and there is a continuing study on shoreline erosion as it refers to Lake Winnipeg.

I for one, who was a member of that government when such decisions were taken, were not really fully aware of the implications in terms of downstream destruction of nesting grounds of wildlife let's say on the Churchill River. I certainly was not really aware of the results of erosion on the Rat and Burntwood rivers and how it would affect the lakes along the way. I was certainly not aware that there would be four dams on the Burntwood River I must confess and I think that this was a changing situation. One moment Hydro said there would be one, then two, then four and it effectively means that the whole Burntwood River will have water controlled and raised on it and that you are destroying the whole shoreline of these rivers and lakes along the way.

I do now go to the point of the Member for Wolseley in suggesting that hearings should be held and the whole thing should be held up. What I am saying though is that the Minister has a responsibility for collating and putting together in simple language the total picture as it is seen by the government, both in terms of the Hydro costs benefits, etc., and in terms of the resources, the wildlife, etc., and to do this very quickly and to present it to the public in a way that can be understood by the public. Present all the arguments, the whole picture and then those who oppose it can then start shooting at it. I don't think that they necessarily -- you know if the government says a decision is taken, then fine, but give us the reasons, the public has the right to hear all these things. We don't live in a dictatorship, however much I may think that the Minister has tendencies towards being a dictator, but I think that we have the results of that kind of a tendency in that we don't have the facts before us.

As I said, the Spadina Expressway was decided upon, was went ahead with and then when people saw what was happening they stopped it after it was all built. Are we going to end up with dams built, with all the money spent and with no water in it? Well would anyone have believed that that canyon, that cement canyon in Toronto would exist today the way it is, after all that money has been spent. Five years and ten years ago no one would believe that, but today people say for the environment we're willing to put up with that kind of a waste of money. What I'm concerned about is with the relative, the changing of values of the environment on the one hand -- the value people put on the environment on the one hand and on the other hand on cheap electricity, and it may be that at one point the weight balances in favour of the environment in this project, and I think that we should have all the parts before us insofar as it's possible. I find it difficult, you know, to read a report of this nature and to realize that decisions of such magnitude have been taken with so little information in that area that is becoming so important.

I refer to one point -- Mr. Chairman, an example of this is that I have been told that the east channel of the Nelson River will not be controlled. People of Norway House have been told and believed that the east channel of the Nelson River would be left to flow freely. I open this report and I am told, and I see Manitoba Hydro has informed the Board of preliminary plans to construct control works by which to regulate flow in the east channel of the Nelson River. This is absolutely contradictory to what I have been told by Hydro, to what I have heard many places and to what I believe the First Minister has said. Now, something is very odd. It gets to be a little difficult to follow and even to believe what you are told.

I must say that I share the Member for Crescentwood's concern about in-House studies Mr. Speaker. I find it difficult to see how civil servants can give, you know, with the pressures they would be under in terms of their careers and all the rest, is carrying it a little too far to feel that they would put the proper weight, when it's always a matter of judgment, the proper weight on the relative merits of any damage or anything that is done.

It seems to me that at this stage we are left with Hydro's assessment of what happens plus some studies that have been started and are not completed. I'm afraid I don't think that Hydro is really one of the agencies that I would put at the head of the line if I had somebody to depend on to protect the environment.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told that this project will cost something in the neighbourhood of \$3 billion before it's over. I am wondering what the people of the north, you know, the isolated communities who will be affected in one way or another, in some way, by this -- the change in the environment, what Hydro is willing to put aside for their benefit. Three million dollars would be one-tenth of one percent of the cost of the project; 30 million would

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ALLARD cont'd) be one percent of the project. I'm sure that 10 percent is probably the effective waste factor in the whole thing, which would be 300 million, at least 10 percent. I'm just wondering what they can look forward to. So far, certainly in terms of information, they have received little; Hydro has made little effort to communicate effectively, and I repeat communicate effectively, with the people of these communities, has left it to the Department to do this, and I think this is unfortunate. I think that when Hydro takes on a project of this magnitude it should feel responsible for communicating effectively with the local people on a continuing basis. They have not set up the structure to do this, so I'm just wondering whether we're going to end up with three million, 30, or what, in terms of compensation.

You know, the question of Easterville comes to mind where the money that was supposed to be spent for the people at Easterville, something in the neighbourhood of 20 percent was used for a dike to protect the community, the new community. Government sent in one man to pacify them and charged against their -- the funds that were set aside for them, their compensation, charged against their compensation, his residence and a number of other things. It seems to be a very peculiar way of doing things. It seems that there was money there and the people didn't know how much exactly; they didn't know what was being paid out in what way, and there was a board here made up of government employees who were responsible for the pay-out of funds, and the local people didn't know what was going on. They ended up with having something like one-third of it used for control structures for water around their community. How this is supposed to compensate them God knows.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the "benevolent dictator" who is responsible for the department convince his colleagues, perhaps start by convincing himself, that the people of Manitoba have a right to know what is going on, have a right to know very quickly because the thing is developing, and that ultimately the will of the people of this province will prevail, but it would be a shame if we had another Spadina Expressway on our hands and we had some dams that weren't worth a damn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to give a few views of my own very very briefly. From a working man's angle or a peasant -- I would like to deal with the natives first, and I'd like to say this that, and I'm going to commend the Conservative Government for this. We built a school in Cranberry Portage, some \$2 million, to keep natives off these reserves, off the settlements, and introduce them to a better way of life. Now what you're saying is, leave them where they are. And I travel my constituency, and my areas are very very poverty-stricken areas and the best thing in my opinion is to move these people to a better environment. But all of a sudden South Indian Lake becomes a glamorous place, they seize on it, the slobberers, leave them, leave them there. The best thing that could happen to those natives is to flood. I think those natives would be disappointed if we didn't flood. They wouldn't have it so good after we flood, and it's the wrong thing. But anyway I'm not going to deal with that too long.

But fishing is very important to me; I spend a lot of time fishing, and listen to the experts and they stress the point that the jackfish will predominate. The whitefish will deteriorate. And then they say tourism. To the American tourist a jackfish is worth at least \$10.00 an inch, so they counteract one for the other, whatever is to their advantage to push their point. They go in to the beaver and the muskrats. The beaver is the worst dammer there is; that's their trade, to dam. And now we're going to protect them, again counteracting the argument. In the fish port it's a well known fact that in a beaver dam with exotic fish, trout, rainbows, they pack these places, the best fishing spots are in beaver dams. And then they say they will drown the muskrats and the beaver; they will drown them they will get rid of them. -- (Interjection) -- I'll speak, Peter, you just keep quiet. -- (Interjection) -- Well the flooding would be two feet per year and muskrats and beaver will naturally have more sense than people were saying. They would go to shore. And like where there are geese and ducks, ruin their nesting grounds; they won't be able to breed. Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been married for 32 years and I never found that a problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, these governments never never listen to working people. -- (Interjection) -- never did, and they won't listen to me, but you don't have to flood, there's no need of flooding. There's no need to buy power from Saskatchewan. There's no need for thermal; no need for atomic. I'll give you the perfect solution. I would suggest this to you very

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. BARROW cont'd) seriously, that we would harness the Liberal Leader's tongue and that would generate enough power for all of Manitoba, enough power for export to the States, and even enough power to run your \$2 billion monorail. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

. continued on next page

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. Johns): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments and I'm sorry that both the Member for Rupertsland and the Member for Wolseley are not in the House, and I hope that what I say will be of sufficient interest to them that they can read it in Hansard.

Firstly, I'd like to commend the Member for Rupertsland for his reasoned statement of this morning. He expressed an openness of mind, a willingness to learn, a desire to learn, and a concern about those areas about which he knows more than I, but which I think we all share. And I think that the way that he put the problem in his own mind is the way it sits with many people, and of course this matter does require more discussion, more explanation. The comparison with the Spadina Expressway is not of any great value; there is no question that decisions are made on occasion which are proved to be unacceptable and money is lost.

The comparison with CFI is not quite the same in that in the case of CFI the people and the people's representatives never had an opportunity to learn what was planned. As a matter of fact I'm becoming more and more convinced that members of the Treasury Bench at that time knew very little about the background and the deal itself that was involved in CFI. I don't think there's any doubt but whatever information and advice that the government has accumulated in connection with the hydro development in the north has been given to all members of this House and to the people. And I feel that we have not been kept in the dark in connection with the various recommendations that have been made.

And I want to harken back to the 1969 period to the time when we were discussing the bill - I think it was No. 15 - brought by the Member for Lakeside in his capacity as Minister, and the simple position that we took, and different members of the opposition spoke in different ways, but in a simple way I think what we said was, that when you want the Legislature to make an administrative decision we want all the information which you have in order that we can indeed make the decision with as much knowledge as is available. And I think that that is the position that we argued most strenuously and refused to accept the recommendations of the Minister based on information that he alone had. And I recall that it may be as long as two years prior to the debate in '69 when I learned that there was a report presented by -- I thought it was Hedlin - Menzies but it turned out to be an offshoot of theirs, and I'm trying to remember the name of the report itself -- I'm sure the Member -- (Interjection) -- Transition in the North prepared I think by Van Ginkel and Associates, and I think they were connected with Hedlin - Menzies -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- well, Beaulieu. In any event I learned of that report, and I wrote to the then Minister responsible who was the Premier, Duff Roblin, responsible for the same -- I forget the title. -- (Interjection) -- No. Well it was the Nelson Authority but it had a different name, it was some sort of development group of which Scott Bateman was then the Deputy Minister, and I wrote to Mr. Bateman as an MLA, and I asked for a copy of the report, and it took some time and a little correspondence before I received a flat "no" from Mr. Bateman, and the letter said something to the effect that on instructions from Mr. Roblin he was informing me that this report was not available. I then filed an Order for Return asking for the report, and I believe the Order for Return was accepted in that there were certain questions asked like, the cost of the report, and that question was answered, but the question as to the production of the report was denied on the basis that it was not government policy to file that report and make it public. And that was the situation until we came into government and did make that report public along with so many others.

So that our position at the election time, and I repeat it only because it will take a moment, was that we were not prepared to make a decision on the northern development, and particularly the flooding of South Indian Lake, until we had all the information before us and our pledge was that we would have a thorough investigation made before a decision was made. And regardless of what the present Leader of the Liberal Party says, it was clear then that the Liberal Party took the position that they would not flood but -- (Interjection) -- for the high level diversion. The Conservative Party was very clear, they were proceeding with the plans as they were at the time.

Now one of the first tasks we undertook -- members will remember that the summer of 1969 was a busy summer for all of us, and the session itself was a busy session for all of us, especially on this side where we were not only carrying through the Estimates of the

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. SAUL CHERNIACK cont'd) previous government for the year, but we were also bringing in our Medicare shift of taxation into income tax. Members will remember the debate and the time that was taken. But concurrently with that we sought out a person that we thought had the capabilities of understanding both power requirements and ecological considerations, and we found Mr. Cass-Beggs, and I for one, and I believe the entire group on this side, were very pleased with the fact that we had a man who not only knew about power development, cost of power, power engineer and hydro-electric power in the main, but also had a broad approach on the humane aspects of the effect of what one does -- if there is anything that we must always remember, it is that we should judge the possible effects of the acts that we undertake to do today -- and he impressed us as being a person who would do that. And at that time, and I believe, both prior and since that time, I don't think that members of our party, and I am sure that the party itself, never accused Hydro itself of being wrong in what they were proposing to do. On the basis of the responsibility of Hydro that they were to produce power at the cheapest rate for the benefit of the users of Hydro, what they were planning was clearly the cheapest thing that could be done to bring in power from the north.

What they did not take into account were all the costs involved in the consequences of what they were doing. And they were never told to look at that. That was not their responsibility. Their responsibility was to bring the plan that would produce power as cheaply as possible. They were never instructed to study the ecological damage, the effect on human beings, the effect on tourism, the effect on the natural resources of Manitoba. And it was that task that we gave to Mr. Cass-Beggs, that he start inquiring into those other aspects, and in doing so to take into account methods by which we could achieve power production and achieve power production at the lowest overall cost taking into account these other side consequences. As one of the first firms involved was Underwood-McLellan who had done work on the northern river courses and they were given that very specific instruction, to study that aspect which had never been studied before. And I don't fault Hydro for not having studied it, because I don't think it was Hydro's responsibility to do so, but it was the government's, and the government then gave to Cass-Beggs the request that he investigate all possibilities taking into account all costs. We didn't tell him, do not recommend a high level flooding, or a high level diversion; we didn't say do that; we didn't say don't do that; we didn't say, refuse to consider any flooding all we said to him is, we don't know, we are not experts, you are. Gather together whatever team you need in order to study all these factors which were not studied previous to our election and then come up with your proposal. And that he did. And I think we've pretty well accepted his proposal after all the other studies were brought about, Underwood-McLellan and the others.

So that I believe that we did start with a completely open mind on the question and our mind was gradually brought to a decision-making stage when all the reports came in and all the reports will never be completed I'm sure. I'm sure there will never be a time when one can say, this is definitive, there is nothing else to investigate. But governments and people and decisions that are made by people in all their activities, take into account all the possible known factors and the projection of what may be the result when we find out later what the unknown factors as they become known -- that's not a good sentence grammatically but I think one can understand what I am trying to say -- and as we make decisions we try to adapt and adjust to facts as they become apparent to us. I think that we have acted in a responsible way and yet we do know that being responsible means making decisions, and those decisions that are made hopefully are the best decisions that could be made at the time with a full knowledge. And I think that we are doing that.

Now, Professor Lansdown is it? comes along with a report and you judge it. You don't accept it either, you look at it, you consider it, then you make your decision. I believe that the Member for Rupertsland has been going along in that kind of development of thought and as matters arise, concerns occur - and they occur to all of us -- but in the end the government must make a decision and mustn't forever delay and delay. We did in 1969 delay, we stopped plans that were being developed; we said until we get at least an interim report from Cass-Beggs we will not do certain things and then we gradually arrived at decisions. It's taken over three years, but decisions have to be made. If decisions weren't made as life goes along we probably wouldn't be sitting in this democratic process of discussing. As matters develop then mistakes are made but in the end progress is made too, and I think

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) decisions have to be made.

I was amused to listen to the Member for Wolseley develop the thought that you hold hearings, you don't make decisions, you consider, you think, you plan, you consider again, you hold hearings, you discuss further. The fact is that he has made a pretty good living out of the practice of law. I have made a pretty good living out of the practice of law, and I can assure all members present that we would not have been able to carry out our professional requirements if we weren't making decisions based on our most expert opinions and knowledge and then saying to clients, do this, this is our best advice.

I don't know if the Member for Wolseley would confess that he may have given wrong advice from time to time. I will confess it and I believe every lawyer in his time has given advice which turned out later to have been wrong, in retrospect; but nevertheless decisions have to be made and I believe that from the success of the Member from Wolseley in his profession that he probably has made many more good recommendations than bad ones. But when he says to us, suppose you are wrong, then he must have, if he practised law, have always had to say, well if I'm wrong I won't give you the advice. The fact is he's given advice all along and so have I and so have all other decision - makers and every one of us in our daily lives have made decisions and if we were wrong, we of course had to pay the consequences of it; but you don't refuse to make a decision because you may be wrong.

I think that this government has a record in the short time of some three and a half years of having made some massive decisions and having had the guts to carry it out. It was the Member for Lakeside who gave us credit for guts in the situation regarding Unicity, and I believe we were right, but certainly it's not a smooth flowing operation yet. But the fact is decisions had to be made, we had the guts to make them, we have the guts to try to substantiate them, we do have the guts to present all our information for public review and for discussion.

I'm sorry the Member for Wolseley thinks that discussion that has been taking place in this Chamber has not been helpful. It hasn't been to him, because he isn't convinced I spent more time in Opposition than I did in government and I felt that in Opposition I accomplished some fairly good steps in convincing the people and the government in making decisions and in arriving at decisions and I don't think that he recognizes his role in opposition adequately if he thinks that he's only doing a good job and everything he says is accepted by government. Discussion itself is useful. But the one thing that he does which I think is damaging is this question that he raised about the civil service. I think that an attempt to sow thoughts of discredit on civil servants is damaging and I think that he has been guilty of it ever since he became a member of the public scene.

You know, I recall that a couple of years ago I felt that the Leader of the Official Opposition was doing damaging things along that line and I think it was inexperience. I think that having been introduced into politics at the level of a Cabinet Minister he didn't quite realize the responsibilities of opposition as well as of the government side, I remember him asking a Minister, sometimes he does now, but I think he has learned a good deal in the last few years, he would ask a Minister now which member of your department did agree with exactly what you're saying, who was he, what did he say, which member of your department did not agree, did you consult Mr. So and So, who I know is somewhere in your department, and I think that was wrong, I think that in opposition, as well as in government, one doesn't bring in opinions, personal opinions, actions of the civil service. They are entitled to the cloak of protection of anonymity, and I do say that I think the leader of the official opposition has learned, and it is a learning process, you do have to learn how to act in that regard, I think that his manner in this respect has improved considerably. So I have to say that if the Leader of the Liberal Party remains a member of the Opposition for some period of time, and certainly he would only have an opportunity to be in Opposition -- and we will try to help his not being there at all -- but if he does, possibly he too will learn. But I think that his explanation today was so lame, so absolutely lame on the question of finishing the sentence which he started on March 13th.

You know all he had to do was start the sentence in order to show how lame it was, but he didn't start the sentence, he only tried to finish it today. But look at what he said. He says: "I express the opinion that he who disagrees with the Minister mysteriously, suddenly disappears, and I suggest Mr. Chairman, that it is in no way, in no way an impropriety for

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) me to suggest that a member of his staff having seen this parade of dismissals would not be somewhat intimidated" -- then there's an interjection, and the Member for Wolseley told us today that it was a very lengthy interjection. I have yet to see Hansard skip a lengthy interjection but that was his recollection. He says "that a member of his staff, having seen this parade of dismissals would not be somewhat intimidated"-- (Interjection)-- and he says "the Minister's honour is satisfied, Mr. Chairman". And he says "Mr. Chairman, in the past few months we have lost a Deputy Minister, Winston Mair".

Now in what connection could he possibly have thought of it except in the question of having been intimidated, having felt somewhat intimidated. "So we lost a Deputy Minister, Winston Mair and we have lost Bob . . ." -- and I didn't know who Bob was until he named him this morning -- we have lost Bob Wallace, a man who has been a public servant, he was Deputy Minister of Agriculture under the previous government, he was Deputy Minister, well he had that rank as Secretary of Planning and Priorities under the prior government. He continued as Secretary of Planning and Priorities for some lengthy period of time under this government. He then moved to Deputy Minister of Mines and Resources, a man, one of the senior civil servants in this province, and now our government having created a Department of Northern Affairs, he became Deputy Minister of Northern Affairs, (same rank, same pay I - well I'm sure), a man who has not been lost to government, and already the Member for Wolseley prepared to mention his name, and did, and mentioned a series of others. Now all of those in the context of his introduction about intimidation, and now I think-- and I'd have to check Hansard to check just what he said-- I think he said that he somehow wanted the opportunity to call them and question them. Mr. Chairman, it is incredible, and I can only attribute it to one of two things, and maybe both. One is complete inexperience and an inadequate realization of the responsibility of a member of the legislature to involve people who cannot really answer for themselves and shouldn't be required to. Or the other one is his absolute disregard for the propriety of concern for people like that.

Now he's made all sorts of statements outside of this House for which he's not really accountable in this House. Fortunately he's had to account for things he said in the House and he said enough in the House to make him always accountable to the extent where he is being interrupted, he is being corrected, he is being taught how to conduct himself in the House. I wish somehow we had the opportunity to teach him how to conduct himself outside of the House, because there he makes even more extravagant and wrong and misleading statements and innuendos. I harken back in my mind to the speech that I think was made on his behalf before he was a member on the question of the Auditor-General, where I believe that he was throwing discredit on the integrity of the person, not of the job, and I remember rising here and rejecting that as being unfair to the person. And the next thing I saw was that out in the outer world, not part of this world, he made some remark of saying "well even if the salary and position of the Provincial-Auditor is protected by legislation where he is only subject to reprimand and change by the Legislative Assembly, the government still can control him because they do control his expense account and the kind of a car he gets." That's reported in the newspaper, suggesting that -- I think I'm even quoting but I may be wrong, but at least suggesting out of this House that the government could give him a six or seven year old car rather than the more up-to-date car that Deputy Ministers get. He said that, and that is so discreditable, both of government, both of anybody who is responsible in government and of course of the Civil Service itself. I really think he has to learn to control that flow which the Member for Flin Flon would like to harness. I'd like to harness it myself; not for the benefit of power production but for the benefit firstly of the self respect that I think the Honourable Member for Wolseley ought to have. And secondly, for the respect he ought to have for other people in our community who are not able to get the space and the public exposure in the media that the Member for Wolseley succeeds in getting time and time again.

He has to learn the rules but he also has to learn how to behave himself in a society which has people who cannot really answer for themselves. I'm not trying to defend people in this House. They can look after themselves, but people outside of this House and the people who are not allowed to speak out, the civil service, should not be exposed to his kind of innuendo as I think he displayed on March 13th, which I don't think he helped today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82 (a) (1) The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I haven't taken part in any of the Hydro discussions at the session to date. I spoke on an earlier occasion and then the clock ran out and I wasn't permitted to finish my remarks. At that time I didn't dwell on any aspects of the Hydro development but I am interested in the agreement that was made by the province and the Government of Canada. This was done away back in February 1966 and there was an Order-in-Council passed on the 31st day of March 1967, I think confirming that, and I'm just wondering on the various points in the agreement whether they are being lived up to, whether there are any disagreements with the federal authorities on any parts of the agreement -- and I hope the Minister listens because I would like to get comments from him afterwards -- because the agreement certainly is the basis of the whole thing, because this has been entered into and this agreement covers many aspects of the whole deal. Certainly it covers the matter of transmission lines, it covers matters of finance, on the transmission lines and it also covers matters of sale of energy and so on, and I for one, would like to know whether there has been any disagreement with the Federal Government on any parts of it as to interpretation and so on. Because if we go through the agreement we find that there is provision made here for capital additions and capital modifications under this agreement including interest. Have any changes been made in this respect? Certainly the interest figure mentioned in the agreement of something just over five percent, 5 - 5/8 percent, the cost of the money has changed to a large degree. Are we held to this particular interest rate or has there been modification and has there been agreement with the federal authorities as to the change, and who pays the cost?

It also covers the matter of supplementary agreements that can be made between Manitoba Hydro and Atomic Energy of Canada which is the authorized party for additional or supplementary agreements, and have any supplementary agreements been made subject to this master agreement, because Manitoba under the agreement is charged with measurement of electricity and the financial administration and control. I would like to know whether -- and what kind of additional agreements have been made if any by the two parties named in the agreement to act for the province of Manitoba and for the Government of Canada.

There is the matter of sale of power. It says here under Section 17, "Manitoba shall use its best endeavours to sell energy, other than firm energy -- and then in clauses -- hereinafter referred to as non-firm energy to markets inside or outside of the province and the net revenue arising from the sale of non-firm energy carried over the transmission facilities or portions thereof shall be distributed between the parties in such shares as Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and Manitoba Hydro may determine." I would like to know just what agreements have been reached if any as to the division of revenues or profits from the sale of such additional energy. I notice later on, from this particular agreement that we are to receive reports from the Government of Canada on various items and under Section 19 it says "Canada shall furnish Manitoba with a statement disclosing the particulars of the capital cost of the transmission facilities and accrued interest thereon". What rate of interest are we paying on those particular -- (Interjection) -- yes, I asked the question before, there is room for modifications and I wondered whether the additional rate is still being applied on the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish -- on a point of order. I'm not raising the point so that the honourable member will stop asking questions, but I want him to know that he may be wasting his time because I am not the Minister to whom Hydro reports and these things do not fall within my jurisdiction. If he wishes to continue speaking go ahead on the specific understanding that he knows that I will not answer those questions during my Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is well taken. Would the Minister restrain himself to the Mines and Resources . . .

MR. FROESE: Well if the answers will not be forthcoming in the Estimates of his department then there is probably no point in raising the matter at this particular time. However, the whole thing has been discussed by other members, not particular to the agreement but certainly other aspects have been raised such as the matter of sale of power and so -- and there has been discussions from both sides. -- (Interjection) --

MR. GREEN: . . . discourage proceeding with the discussion of what took place yesterday as to whether our resources should be affected in order to provide sale of power

SUPPLY- MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) to other places or whether the power project is proceeding consistent with those things which the Department of Mines and Resources are responsible for. But if he's talking about the specific financial arrangement made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba through Manitoba Hydro relative to that agreement, those are not matters which fall within the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister is right on. Would the Member for Rhineland confine himself to the Department of Mines and Resources. --(Interjection)--

MR. FROESE: I don't think we should be prevented from discussing it.

A MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. FROESE: Certainly the matter of sale of power is important and I think when --(Interjection)-- yes, but when we go ahead and construct transmission lines, and this has been done right to the U. S. border, and I take it the same as the case with the other neighboring provinces.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well the Honourable Member for Rhineland will have an opportunity to deal with that aspect when we come to the right department.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't wish there to be any misunderstanding on either your part or the Honourable Member for Rhineland's part with respect to my position. It certainly is, I believe, legitimate for the honourable member to discuss whether we are wrongfully affecting our resources, water resources and other natural resources for the purpose of selling power to the United States which then enables him to discuss whether it's a good idea to sell power to the United States. The only thing that I said that I couldn't answer and wouldn't during my Estimates is the specific arrangements made between Canada and Manitoba with regard to interest rates, etc., referred to in the agreement that he's talking about.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed I'd just like to draw your attention to the gallery where there are members of the Board from the North Winnipeg Community Action Center. On behalf of the members of the Legislature, I welcome you here.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES cont'd

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussions and the debate that has carried on at this particular session with this whole thing, some of the things seem to me they have been settled long ago, and that are contained in the agreement. This is why I bring out the agreement at this time. I don't necessarily mean that the Minister has to reply because I feel -- under Section 27 it says, "If the parties are satisfied that the power and energy from the station is or is likely to be in the excess of the immediate needs of Manitoba and that there are or are likely to be markets available for such power and energy outside the province, Manitoba shall seek to exploit such markets." So I think a lot of these things are laid down in the agreement and while I will not pursue the matter further at this particular time -- so we will have an opportunity naturally to ask the representatives of Hydro on some of the points that I have an interest in.

There is mention made of a review committee, I don't know whether this has been established, whether it's functioning and I certainly will at the proper time then ask for some of the reports that are mentioned in the agreement that are to be given by the federal authorities to the province and vice versa.

Leaving that subject matter then, Mr. Chairman, I did comment the other day on the matters pertaining to drainage which come under the Minister's department and I want to thank him for some of the work that has gone on in my constituency over the past number of years, especially in connection with the Dead Horse Creek, the Rosenheim Coulee and the Hespeler Floodway. If I take the amounts that were spent on the Dead Horse, in '71 it was 2.4 miles of \$245,000 and in '72 this was \$293,000, a matter of four miles. I forget the amount that was approved here last year, I haven't got the table with me, but I now find that we have the Dead Horse Creek, work will be continued for another five miles under the proposal that was distributed, for a total of 250,000 and I appreciate that. In fact, they are expecting a dry year this year and I think this would be the ideal year then probably to proceed a little further, because if we go another year at five miles a year I think the crunch or the worst part of it will have been taken care of on that particular creek. So in that particular area, the government certainly can look forward to that, not too many years will be required and not too much more money will be

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. FROESE cont'd) required under this particular ARDA program for that particular creek.

I find however on the Rosenheim Coulee which is also my constituency that we have a much lesser amount allocated for this year, and it says here on the Rosenheim Coulee located near the western limits of the Rural Municipality of Rhineland, the 1973-74 program will involve investigations along the upper reaches west of Gnadenthal and construction of one crossing. And the estimated total is 78,000. This is much much more than was previously allocated to the project in previous years and I certainly would like to know from the Minister why the cut. Are these investigations really needed and is this the reason for cutting down the program on the Rosenheim Coulee just to have these investigations? I certainly would like to know from him on this matter because this is one drain that has a considerable amount of erosion with it and I feel that we should hurry a little more on this particular drain.

I would thank him for the Hespeler Floodway which has now been completed. Here, too, I think the problem certainly from the escarpment just south of Winkler has now been taken care of and I think this is of a tremendous value to the people in the area living downstream and along that area and I would like to compliment the government for completing this job. However, I would still like to appeal to the Minister to look into the matter of the Upper Buffalo Channel. I think work needs to be done on that one. This is water coming in from the States on that one and that is a real problem. There have been some very hard feelings on this between the people on both sides of the border and I feel that the sooner we can do something about it the better. Maybe the Minister has something to offer on that as to the negotiations that have been carried on on the whole matter there on the Pembina so that something might be in the offing. If there is I certainly would like to hear from him on it.

And then on the Rosenheim if he can do something further to what is planned I'd certainly appreciate spending a little more money on that one particularly, because as I mentioned, the erosion problem that we have to contend with on that one.

So, Mr. Chairman, so much for the matter of drainage. There are other minor drains that need attention, but the major ones are being dealt with and while I'd like to see much faster progress I certainly appreciate what is being done.

I did ask some questions the previous time I spoke and I don't think the Minister has replied to them so I do hope when he does reply that he will cover some of those points as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82 (a) (1). The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I do rather suspect that there are members who feel that they'd like to get to another department and I can tell them that I share their anxiety but I do have some responsibility to answer some of the questions.

The Member for Rhineland said to me I didn't answer his previous questions. --(Interjection) I've been trying -- yes. The Minister of Labour that I should write and I will undertake, no I think it's a good suggestion that those people who I've not been able to answer as fully as they like perhaps I'll try and get them written answers on the pertinent questions.

With regard to the Member for Rhineland, I've been answering people while they've been in the House and I think that most of the times that I've got to the floor you have not been in the House and therefore I have not been able to answer.

A MEMBER: He's bawling you out, Jake.

MR. FROESE: I don't think I should let that go. The only time I was absent was yesterday afternoon and I attended a funeral.

MR. GREEN: Well it's the only time, Mr. Speaker, when I got to my feet either there was something that was immediate or I wasn't able to get to the honourable member.

The Member for Morris asked a question and he wasn't here and I tried to answer him off the top of my head and got myself into some water difficulties which I shouldn't have. It was dealing with the development in Sanford, was it? The member is correct in all of his facts and I believe that the Municipal Board decision was not based on anything else, or at least not that I am aware of, other than the departmental recommendation which was to the effect that this is a flood plain based on the fact that there is a 100 year flood danger on that area. Now the Honourable Member for Morris is smiling. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this kind of information is given in every single area, it must ultimately be acted upon by the Municipal Board. We have a responsibility to give it. And although a 100 year flood sounds remote

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) perhaps to the Honourable Member for Morris, the difficulty that we are in is that the people sell lots, purchase it, then the 100 year flood comes but it comes next year, and then the people say to us, why did you permit this kind of thing to happen without at least warning. And the other thing that I have to tell the Honourable Member from Morris is that a 100 year flood doesn't mean that it'll happen every 100 years. It means that it can happen two years and then not happen for 200 years. It is merely a flood area on the ratio of one in a 100 years which the department has the responsibility to tell the Municipal Board about. And if we didn't, the Member for Morris might have a better case against me, he may come in and say, why did you let that subdivision go without telling them there was a 100 year flood . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: I simply want to direct a question to the Minister and ask him if he could then advise me why the Department of Education saw fit to build a building of considerable magnitude in an area that was in precisely the same district.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I was going to get to the honourable member's question. The Department of Education didn't ask us and the Department of Education did not get a subdivision from the Municipal Board and it's as simple as that. --(Interjection)-- Yes, it was the school board, the Minister is saying, the Department of Education. The local school board did not ask for that information, there was no subdivision requested, they could go ahead and build a school but they cannot go ahead with a subdivision without appearing before the Municipal Board. When they appear before the Municipal Board the Water Control people come down and they give them the information, and this is flood plain type of information.

Now you permit that subdivision, people buy the homes, as you say, the man wants to subdivide, he's got buyers for all the lots, the buyers buy all these lots and two years later when that 100 year flood comes, they say to the province what the Sam did you do in not telling the Municipal Board that this was the situation. So although I referred to it possibly as being a bureaucratic statement made to the Board, it would seem that it's the only responsible thing to do. Now perhaps the Municipal Board should reassess as to whether that is sufficient frequency, 100 years, to cause the stopping of a subdivision. That's a hard thing for me to deal with at the present time but I do want to confirm to the honourable member that apparently what occurred, his facts are correct, that there is no way in which the department can do otherwise than to make that presentation to the Municipal Board.

The Honourable Member for Rupertsland made a speech today which I regarded as a sincere contribution to the debate on South Indian Lake. I want to tell him that the dilemma which he poses is an unanswerable one, unless you are prepared to answer the type of criticism that you have made today, the dilemma with regard to proceeding and having studies. What had occurred, Mr. Chairman, is that many studies were made with regard to Churchill River diversion, they culminated in the application to proceed with a licence in 1968. We then went to the Legislative Session in 1969 followed by the change of government in that Autumn. At that time we asked for an ecological assessment to be made, and the honourable member is right -- can't be quantified. But when he says can't, let him understand that that word is an absolute. There is no way of ever quantifying so you have to do the best you can. It might be done in relative terms.

Underwood-McLellan were asked to do a report of alternative diversions, given the ecological losses. They did such a report and it was received. They indicated in the report itself the weaknesses of this type of procedure. But they gave the government, together with the subsequent task force report, sufficient information -- which was by the way a report which was inter-disciplinarian -- sufficient information to say that if you proceeded with flooding at the 30 foot level that your ecological damage is roughly \$40 million -- and I'm quoting from memory -- if you proceed at the 10 foot level, where we are now, your ecological damage is roughly \$10 million, and that takes into account fishing, trapping, wildlife, the upper, the lower Churchill, and all of the areas that are concerned.

Even though that report is relatively unsophisticated it becomes the basis upon which you decide whether or not we can make a decision in principle or at least it became -- when I said it becomes I didn't leave room for argument. There is argument. But it became for us the decision upon which we felt we could proceed given -- and choose the best plan. On that basis we chose Lake Winnipeg regulation and the Churchill River diversion at a maximum of 850 feet with the intervening time to be used to see if we can get any lower than that. As is

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) happens we are told 847; I choose to always view the most pessimistic program rather than the most optimistic, so I say we are going ahead as if it's 850 and if we get to 847 that's a bonus, that we're not going to look at it optimistically, we look at it pessimistically. Now when that decision is made the various disciplines in government said, despite the fact that that's the government decision, the Underwood-McLellan Report is admittedly unsophisticated, and it would be wise now that we are going ahead to conduct further studies to get more sophisticated information and so that while you are proceeding with the program you can make such modifications or changes as are necessary to make sure that you maximize whatever benefits you can get out of the program, and you minimize whatever defects the program promises, knowing that both of these things can happen.

For instance one of the obvious things is that on Lake Winnipeg there is benefits in reducing the water level by two feet. So you -- how can these be maximized? There are also possible benefits from more water rather than less water. How can you make use of that situation? There are problems, admittedly, and never has this government said that there are no problems. We admit that they have been included in all the computer runs at \$10 million, so we can't say that there is no ecological problems. So what can we do? How much clearing should take place, which is what McTaggart-Cowan was asking for. Now if the honourable member says that these studies sort of have an adverse effect on what the government is doing he is forcing governments, if they want to resist that kind of suggestion -- and I make it plain to them I'm not worried about it so I'm not trying to resist it -- to say well we won't conduct studies, therefore people will not be able to point out problems that we are discovering while we are proceeding. Now that would be an irresponsible thing to do and therefore I tell my honourable friend that the dilemma is from the government exercising an abundance of caution, an over-abundance of caution, which is a good thing to do and we make no apology for it. When people start using that over-abundance of caution to question the program itself they have a debating point but, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm concerned they do not detract one iota from the rightness of the course that we have taken in commissioning the study despite the fact that the program has been proceeded with. And we said that to everybody on Lake Winnipeg and we say it to the people in the other areas.

With regards to compiling information and giving the public more information. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have never said that because we are not going to hold hearings to decide whether we will or will not proceed with the project that we don't intend to have the public fully informed as to what is going on and there will be -- as yet to be decided -- means of making that communication. We said that with regards to Lake Winnipeg regulation, and we used the Water Commission procedure as a means of making that communication. We published the Lake Winnipeg regulation program which detailed what would happen in each area. We disseminated it, I think that that is the kind of compilation that he is referring to. Perhaps that will have to be considered with regards to the diversion program itself. So there is no hesitation, Mr. Chairman, no hesitation at all on the government in trying to provide as much information as it can. If everything else fails for mere selfish reasons alone, it's an excellent thing because we have no hesitation about our rightness in the program and therefore being willing to communicate, that is certainly not a problem with us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: . . . submit to a question? Would the Minister agree that first of all whilst being adequate in its day nevertheless the Underwood-McLellan Report was relatively speaking, in terms of economy, somewhat rudimentary since first of all Underwood-McLellan's expertise is in the field of engineering; and secondly, would he not agree that the relative merits of ecology today, the relative value as related let's say to the cost of hydro, has somewhat changed in favour of ecology as the concern of people has grown?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Chairman, I really am not able to answer the honourable member in the affirmative. Underwood-McLellan first of all did their study in 1969, the fall of 1969. They didn't do it with their engineering people; they had considerable input from those scared, timid, pleasing departmental people who gave the Honourable the former Minister of Mines and Resources much information which was not hiding anything as to what were the concerns in connection with this project. You know, that really bothers me to hear it suggested that somehow the biologists, the water engineers who are working in the government service, conservationists, are less concerned than others. They're not less concerned. They make

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) their positions known without fear or favour and it is up to the political people to take whatever advice they get and deal with it. As a matter of fact I would say that if there's anything that the staff people are afraid of, that would bother them, is if they haven't made aware to their Minister the problems that he is going to be faced with, that that would be their first concern. And therefore they would be more attuned to telling him that you're going to get into this difficulty, that difficulty, or another difficulty, than perhaps somebody else who does not have that departmental responsibility. So I'm not worried about the scientific integrity or independence of the people that we have on our staff.

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to read for the honourable member - maybe this is a good time -- they talk about objectivity and independence. I want to read what Bob Newbury, who is a scientist who I respect --(Interjection)-- well if you don't want to hear it I want to read it anyway.

MR. ALLARD: But I have never discussed -- it wasn't a question of objectivity but of relative merit in the public view.

MR. GREEN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, here is a man who is working in terms of reference of a study which says, we want you to maximize the benefits, minimize the problems, ascertain what the problems are, for a program that we are proceeding with. In the agreement it says, --government is going to a maximum of 850 on Lake Winnipeg -- on South Indian, and regulating Lake Winnipeg between 711 and 715. Mr. Newbury who is completely unemotional, completely objective, and you know this nonsense that science is any more objective than history is just ridiculous. There are subjectivities in law; there are subjectivities in mathematics; the whole theory, the Newtonian, the Copernican, the other theories which were supposed to be clinically mathematical all depended upon assumptions, and therefore assumptions are a subjectivity in themselves, and they apply to science, they apply to religion, they apply to history, they apply to politics, and Mr. Newbury is not beyond them. And the people in my department are not beyond them, and I am not beyond them. If anybody is subjective, I am subjective, that's right. And I make no pretence about it. But is -- are the others -- I say that I'm in politics and I'm fighting the position. The other people pretend that they have no axe to grind and they are purely objective. Now that, Mr. Chairman, is just a bunch of nonsense, and I'm going to read what Bob Newbury published in an article which went across Canada in what is a so-called scientific publication, and I've just taken out of it, Mr. Speaker, statements which are not anything but factual. In other words they are not opinionated statements, they're statements referring to facts, which I will admit because the honourable member is smiling, are themselves capable of subjectivity. But in this area both terms of reference will be the same, so to that extent they will be objective.

Caption under the photograph, and it's a pamphlet which was distributed across this country published by the Canadian Nature Federation, here it is. You know this is first of all an objective scientific title, "The Destruction of Manitoba's Last Great River." That is a, you know, a real scientific analytical, clinical title for a discussion of what has occurred. The destruction of Manitoba's Last Great River with a picture of debris and of course I don't know where this river is from, they may be the natural debris, I really can't tell you. But let's look at what is said in this pamphlet. The caption: "Valley of the Lower Churchill. If the proposed diversion is approved by the Manitoba Government this portion of the Churchill would cease to exist, that beyond the dam this portion of the Churchill would cease to exist. The Churchill River" -- and this is the fact or what I say is the fact "The Churchill River in this reach would only cease to exist if nil flow occurred. Such is not the case. Flows will average 8,300 cubic feet per second with winter minimums of 1,500 cubic feet per second. These flows are analogous to present flows of the Red River of southern Manitoba."

So one would say that the Churchill River ceasing to exist means that it will be the same as the Red River.

"2. The lower 200 miles of the Churchill River would be completely cut off and receive significant flows only at midsummer when normal high water would overtop the proposed Missi Falls Dam. The fact. The flows between the Missi Falls Dams are quoted in Item 1 above. It should be noted that the flow at Missi Falls will be in excess of 3,000 cubic feet per second, 40 percent of the time.

"No. 3. The utilization of an entire river by diversion rather than in steps or stages along its own channel has never been done before in Manitoba or anywhere else in Canada.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Fact: The Komino project constructed in the 1950's for the aluminum reduction plant at Kitimat, B. C. diverted an easterly flowing river westerly via tunnels through the mountains into the Komino power house. Other diversions for power"

--(Interjection)-- The honourable member worked there, so he knows about it. And then it is a fact, what I'm saying is correct. They diverted an easterly flowing river westerly.

A MEMBER: And punched a hole through the mountain to do it.

MR. GREEN: That's right. "Other diversions for power are at Ogoki and Root River diversions in Ontario."

I'm not going to deal with every single one of them, Mr. Chairman; there are some that are very very interesting.

Statement No. 9 -- the Member for Lakeside will be interested. This is what Bob Newbury says, Mr. Chairman, about the hearings.

"The hearings were adjourned without a recommendation and in February lawyers representing the South Indian Lake and Granville Lake communities sought and obtained an injunction to prevent Hydro from proceeding unless the hearings were properly concluded. To circumvent the injunction the government introduced Bill 15 in the ensuing legislative session."

Mr. Chairman, no injunction was sought; no injunction was obtained; there was no court -- if there was a court order made in that case it was to the effect that now that this matter is being considered by the Legislature the hearings should not -- the court hearings should not proceed. No injunction was ever applied for; they applied for what we call a writ of prohibition, prohibiting the Minister from proceeding. No injunction was ever ordered. What had occurred is that after the legislative session ended the Minister undertook himself not to proceed with the diversion unless he gave 14 days notice to the other side. That's all he undertook. But no injunction was applied for; no injunction was issued. It gets better, Mr. Speaker, as we go on.

"In a final move of arrogance on December 8th, 1972, the Minister responsible for granting a licence to Manitoba Hydro for the diversion, the Honourable Sidney Green" -- he's right about that -- "announced" --listen to my announcement -- "that no licence would be required, no hearings into the issue would be held, and no compensation to native communities would be necessary as it had been decided in Cabinet to simply grant permission to Manitoba Hydro to proceed immediately by an Order-in-Council. The legality of this move is now in question."

Mr. Speaker, it was never announced that no licence would be required. As a matter of fact a licence was applied for and a licence was issued. It was never announced that no compensation to native communities would be necessary and that the Cabinet had simply decided to grant permission to Manitoba Hydro to proceed immediately. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is probably the part that I feel most bitter about, the announcement that he said that I said that no compensation would be necessary, I made that type of announcement. This very objective, clinical, no axe to grind person, said that I said this as a result, Mr. Speaker, of the actual announcement which reads as follows:

"It should also be pointed out that the government has every intention of accepting the responsibility of seeing to it that no citizen in the vicinity of South Indian Lake is adversely affected by the implementation of the program. We have already indicated that such adjustments as are necessary to preserve the dignity of the citizens of South Indian Lake will be a public responsibility assumed by the government. The government's objective in fulfilling this responsibility is to create such conditions as will preserve the right of the people concerned to choose their form of life style. It is our hope that the question of financial compensation which we regard only as a final resort will be completely unnecessary. However it is also intended that any person claiming loss which they feel requires financial compensation will be given the right, given the opportunity, of presenting such a claim, and will also have the right to have such a claim adjudicated upon by an impartial non-government tribunal."

Now, Mr. Chairman, is it credible, is it credible to say that this man is independent, subjective, free from the hard terrifying fist of the Minister of Mines and Resources, and therefore what he says can be expected to be independent, clinical, non-tied-in advice as to what the government should do. Mr. Chairman, there is a better one still, a better one still. It has now been learned . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 12:30 I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.