

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 21, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion

I'd like to interrupt proceedings for just a moment to introduce our guests this morning. I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery on my right where we have 60 pupils from the Pre-vocational Training Centre at the Fort Osborne Complex. This is an upgrading class under the direction of Mrs. McInroy. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you this morning.

Introduction of Bills.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli) introduced Bill No. 19, The Transit Grants Act.

MR. JOHNSON: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the proposed Bill to the House.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I wonder if I can ask the Minister when we will get the Bill in front of us, and is it possible to have it before we adjourn for the week-end?

MR. JOHNSON: I'll make a statement before Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, on that point, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that the Bill I introduced on behalf of my colleague the Minister of Transportation should have been preceded with the message that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has recommended the proposed Bill to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: That will be duly recorded. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Was the question put, Mr. Speaker, on the Medical Services Insurance Act, first reading? I'm afraid I didn't hear.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommends this proposed Bill to the House. I move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Regulations Act, and that the same be now received and read a first time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: As I understand, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor recommends the proposed Bill to the House.

The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) introduced Bill No. 14, An Act to permit The Town of Flin Flon to make a Grant to the Grey Nuns of Flin Flon General Hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or to his Deputy, seeing he is not in his seat. Has the Government of Manitoba received any communications, either written or oral, from the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg regarding the application of the Tartan Brewery to obtain a variation of the zoning regulations in the additional zone in the parish of St. Andrews in Manitoba? Or in respect of sharing any of the revenues derived from industrial assessments in these additional areas or in that particular additional area?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the honourable member's question as notice.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education - I think. Has the Government of Canada invited the Government of Manitoba to send a representative of this province as a member of the Canadian delegation to the Conference of Francophone countries in Kinshasha and Niamey, and if so, who was the delegate, and if not, why was nobody appointed?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . assume that the honourable member is referring to the conference that was held in January or February.

MR. VIELFAURE: That's right.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, we did receive a formal invitation from the -- it came from the Prime Minister to the province asking Manitoba if they could send somebody to the conference. There were two conferences; there was also one in Niger that was held a month later. The one that he refers to, the invitation that we got to it was rather late in the day and we weren't in a position to send anybody on that short notice to go to it. That was the primary reason.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Has Manitoba a member on the Franco-Canadian Commission, and if I may elaborate, this Commission, it is my opinion, was established pursuant to an agreement signed between France and Canada in 1965, but my question is: has Manitoba a member on the Franco-Canadian Commission?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'd be willing to take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs; in his absence I would direct it to the second minister for that department. Is the government aware that the Hudson Bay Route Association, which supports the development of Port of Churchill, will be meeting very soon with Transport Minister Paul Hellyer? And my second question is: will the government have a representative at this meeting?

MR. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Would the Honourable Attorney-General be prepared to advise the House of the nature of the correctional courses that are now being given over in the Norquay Building to various individuals from provincial institutions like Headingley Jail, Portage la Prairie and so on and so forth? I might say that I saw the Reverend Cox here this morning. He had a class giving instruction to, and I'd like to have some information as to the nature of the course that is being put on before your estimates are brought down, or before the estimates of the Minister in charge of correctionals.

MR. LYON: Mr. Cox is the director of in-service training for the Corrections Branch, which is part of the Department of Health and Social Services, under my distinguished colleague the Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'll direct my question to him then.

MR. JOHNSON: I will get the information for the honourable member. Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, I wish to take this opportunity to inform the House that I'm advised this morning that the Bill respecting the Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act will be ready for distribution at noon today, or shortly thereafter, and there's a section in that Bill, under section 24, dealing with the matter of assignment and I felt it important, as the members will have the Bill over the weekend, to hear my statement that it is not the government's intention to -- not contemplated to permit general assignment at this time, and I want to inform the members that it is my intention to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council regulations which will permit assignments by insured persons only in respect of medical services rendered in conjunction with the teaching of medicine. It is my view that this type of regulation will enable the Faculty of Medicine to continue, with the minimum of dislocation, its work in teaching and will resolve a problem that has produced serious concern to the University, the medical profession and the government. And I will look forward to explaining this further, and detailed as members so wish, plus the other contents of the Bill at second reading on Monday.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is it right that the Medical Association has offered to the government that they would not extra-bill if those opting out of the plan would be paid in full directly by the Commission, and if so, doesn't that automatically mean that they are working within the plan? This has been in the news quite a bit lately, and I can't see what the difference is, and I wonder if the Minister would clarify this.

MR. JOHNSON: I think the clarification is that the medical profession -- and this came up very late and recently in the development of this plan -- the medical profession have stated that where assignment, and the patient has the right of assignment, and that is accepted, that represents payment in full for that patient.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions that I want to direct to the Minister of Health in connection with the statement he just made. Could he provide us with regulations, federal regulations under the medicare legislation passed in Ottawa? Then, secondly, does the federal legislation require a separate assessment branch here in Manitoba of their own, that they will not recognize Manitoba's medical insurance people who might assess the accounts? Will there be a separate group assessing the accounts?

MR. JOHNSON: I'm not sure what my honourable friend means. For all intents and purposes we have been working closely with the Federal Government on several matters of the accounting of the plan, which has to be approved by them - that is, the plan has to be state-operated as one of the conditions of sharing - and the Manitoba Medical Service, which served our province for so long is being utilized as the paying out agency, but we have satisfied the federal authorities that the accounting system and the method of distribution and payment of claims is satisfactory.

MR. FROESE: On the other questions, could he provide us with regulations under the federal Medicare Act, because I think I would like to check a few things out in connection with the legislation and the regulations that will be coming forward in Manitoba. The information I had was that the federal authorities would not recognize certain provincial people who assessed the accounts. They were not satisfied and they wanted to assess these accounts on their own.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health would permit a question? Is there going to be any provision in the Act which precludes assignments to doctors who opt out, other than the ones that you have just mentioned, that is the university training hospitals? Precludes. Prohibits.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, the government feels it must give direction to the corporation in this regard, and when you see the Bill you will see that the whole matter of assignment is going to be left up to the government from herein by regulation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Health could clarify the statement he made regarding the acceptance of assignments in the case of the university teaching clinics. Will the monies be payable directly to the doctor or to the university clinic?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe their mechanism of accounting will be that they'll be paid to the -- an internal arrangement will be made whereby the doctor rendering the service in the university clinic will arrange the method by which the monies reach that service, between the corporation and the university, in conjunction with the faculty.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask: That, then, would be up to the individual doctor to decide to make the transfer or not; is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: If the case is a case that is generated through the university clinic, or casualty or whatever way, the case -- the patient is coming, say, to the hospital with no doctor, is allocated to a doctor. That goes into the teaching unit. Or you may go to the university clinic and say you want a certain doctor there. If the contact is in the clinic, then this power of assignment prevails for that clinic group. A teaching position -- admitting a patient from downtown is not included. This power of assignment would not be extended to that area.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, that does clarify that substantially. One other supplementary question. Then is it contemplated that in those cases where the assignment will be acceptable, that it will be assigned by the patient to the clinic, either through the medium of the doctor but in any event to the clinic?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . the bookkeeping, I think the corporation must pay it to the doctor who assigns it to the teaching group. It's identified specifically at that point from the corporation. I'll have to get the details, but as I understand it, there's no problem. They've been working this through the social allowance group of patients for some years now and it's a continuation of this arrangement; and the clinic group, the university clinic of course, with everyone having their own physician now will have to be competitive for patients for teaching and they will make their own arrangement with respect to the unit itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health just to clarify the previous statement that he made with regard to the intent of the legislation. Are we to understand that the legislation will leave it in the hands of the government

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . by Order-in-Council to either accept or reject assignments, and that it's the present intention of the government to reject assignments except in the case as indicated.

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

MR. GREEN: The fact is that the legislation will permit you to change that intention next week without coming back to the Legislature. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, we're taking the power of doing this because in the future we will have to keep examining the matter. I will have more to say about this at second reading, but generally we have the responsibility of making this plan work and we're going to take every step that's necessary to put that in our power.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . the Honourable Minister says that's going to be covered by regulations. Will the committee be furnished with a copy of the regulations at the time the Act comes up for second reading, so that we'll have a clear understanding as to what we're voting for?

MR. JOHNSON: The regulation of importance at this time will be the regulations defining a clinical teaching unit and the arrangement therein, and that is in the process of being written at this time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Is that the only regulation you're going to have regarding assignments, or is the Act going to preclude other types of assignments?

MR. JOHNSON: . . . preclude other types of assignments at this time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It will preclude other types of assignments.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Doesn't the Honourable Minister feel that a question that is certainly a question of principle, and an important principle in this bill such as direct billing and assignment, should be discussed by the House and not left in the hands of the government? We've that amendment here before us. What are we asked to approve? Something that could be changed the next day? This is a question of principle . . .

MR. LYON: I'm afraid my honourable friend is debating on the Orders of the Day. He will have ample opportunity to express his views when the bill is before the House. The Minister was merely trying to facilitate and answer the enquiries of the members this morning by making a short statement on the Orders. There'll be ample opportunity to debate his statement at second reading.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . answer my question, Mr. Speaker? There was a question I asked him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, when the honourable member has the bill in front of him and we have second reading on Monday, I'll do my best to . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: He shouldn't have answered any then.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the report that we received about a month ago from Gillam, is the Minister satisfied that the unsafe working conditions that prevailed at the time have been corrected, and if they haven't been corrected is the Minister considering legal action against the companies?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour) (Flin Flon): The answer to the first question is "yes" and that answers the second question.

MR. BOROWSKI: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As a result of this action there were 57 workers dismissed from the job. I understand the company has refused to meet with the men to discuss this grievance and I am wondering, this seems to be a violation of our Labour Act. Is this Minister prepared or is going to take legal action against these people for violating the Labour Act?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to my honourable friend from Rhineland that I'm sorry that his earlier request of February 28th for a copy of the Wootton report and other documents was overlooked. I must assume responsibility for that and I express my regrets. I have given instructions that the secretary of the committee is to be in direct touch with my honourable friend, provide him with a copy of the Wootton report at once, and consult him about such other documents as he may want.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wanted to advise the honourable members of the Legislature that the government in the near future will be bringing in legislation to amend The Public Schools Act to allow for treaty Indians to run for the position of school trustee, as well as being allowed to exercise their franchise as resident electors in school board elections. Legislation to accomplish this will come in two parts: that providing for resident electors to become school trustees in areas where this is not now possible, and that allowing, at the discretionary power of the Indian band and the Minister, the reserves to be incorporated into a school division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there is a resolution requesting this change, which we welcome, on the Order Paper, I wonder whether the Minister will now indicate whether it's the government's position to also vote in favour of the resolution so that the record will show as to how the matter came about.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on the first part of the question, I imagine that matter will be before us probably very shortly; and the second part of the question, it didn't come about by that means.

MR. SPEAKER: I must say the mood of the House augurs well for the rest of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, RESOLVED that this House doth concur in the Report of the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders with respect to Manitoba Regulations Nos. 121/67 to 145/67, both inclusive, and Nos. 1/68 to 25/68, both inclusive, received by this House on the 4th day of March, 1969, and also in the recommendations made therein.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: . . . the usual resolution, or the motion for concurrence in the report of the Statutory Orders Committee with respect to our annual review of regulations. This matter has been reviewed by the committee and the committee has recommended that the changes mentioned in this report be concurred in by the House. I would ask the House to support this matter since the changes were reviewed by the members of the committee on the advice of the Legislative Counsel and represent the work of the committee with respect to their review of regulations for the past year. This is the same resolution that has been presented each year with respect to the report of this important committee in its annual review of regulations, and I think it is deserving of the House's approval.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, not having my notes with me, I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well members, we're dealing with an amendment here and you all heard the amendment last night moved by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party and seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, dealing with the reduction of the salary of the Minister to 98 cents. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we need not direct our remarks completely toward the amendment before us but that we can discuss matters of the department, and I take it general matters, under the Minister's salary. I have a few things that I would like to raise at this point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe I can advise the member. I think the field is wide open here,

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd) so you don't need to be limited in your discussions, providing you stay to . . .

MR. FROESE: To start off with, earlier in the session I directed questions to the Honourable Minister in connection with the Pembina River Basin development and he referred me, and he also mentioned that further discussion and a further statement would be made at the time that he would be dealing with his estimates. I was looking forward to this and I heard nothing in his remarks in his opening statement on this very matter. I feel that this is of great importance to the people of southern Manitoba and we would like to hear something of what is going on. Is a treaty in sight with the United States government so that work can begin on this project? I think these are matters that we would like to hear at this particular time, and I do hope he provides us with further information so that we can debate the matter properly. Also, will there be further studies required? At a meeting last fall, when members of the Red River Water Commission met with the members of the Cabinet on this matter, there was discussion that further studies might be required, but if at all possible that these probably could be avoided because this would mean further delay in the matter, and certainly I would like to hear from him what is being done, whether we can proceed without any further studies and so on.

We heard yesterday by one of the speakers in connection with the Fish Marketing Board. I am not particularly involved in the matter of fish marketing, but I remember receiving a brochure, I think a year or two ago, in connection with this matter, giving an outline as to how such a board should function and how it would be set up. I would like to question the Minister. Is this to be a co-operative venture or does this mean compulsory marketing? Because I feel that the word "co-operative" should not be mixed up if it means compulsory marketing. Then, too, I just question the feasibility or the real workings of such a board, whether it can be brought into effect and whether it can do a good job; and when such a project could be brought in, have they got any figures as to what the overhead might be for such a board and the cost involved, because we find with some of these other provincial co-operatives, like the Honey Co-op, my goodness, the overhead that the producers have to pay for this organization is terrific, and I'm just wondering if a similar thing can happen in the way of the Fish Marketing Board, whether it is such a good thing after all. I'd like to debate the merits of this thing once the information is properly before us. I do not have great faith in these type of boards. We also know from the Wheat Board the cost of overhead is very large and can be a great burden on the producers, so I certainly would like to hear some more facts on this matter and a projection, if they have one, as to what this board could bring about.

A further matter has to do with the matter of mineral royalties. I note from the report that we have on Page 42, we find two paragraphs on the matter of mineral tax division and they're very brief. It gives you an account of the amount of revenue or tax collected in the year '67 and how much was received, but then the second paragraph goes on, and I quote: "A total of 63 assessments was made under the Mining Royalty and Tax Act. Revenue received for the fiscal year 1967 - 68 was \$2,206,156 compared with \$2,455,604 received during the previous fiscal year, a decrease of ten percent." I recall that we passed legislation in this House whereby certain concessions were made to industries that they were getting, would be a relax on the tax imposed for expansion. Is this ten percent completely there as a result of expansion, or has production gone down and that this is also a reason, a contributing factor in the amount of revenue that we are getting? Is this completely because of the expansionary effect on the industry? This I would like to know because we have further expansion going on, as the Minister has indicated in previous statements, and that International Nickel up at Thompson is also expanding. What can we expect in the way of revenue for the current year and also how much, roughly, have we received during the current year 1968-69? I think this would be valuable information, to see just where we're at and what is happening.

I also note from the report on Page 39 that the price of these metals has gone up. The '66 figure for nickel shows 85.70 and in 1967 it was 94.40. The same holds true for silver. Silver shows in '66, \$139.90 and in 1967, \$173.40. These are considerable increases. What is the present situation now and can we not expect greater revenues as a result of these increases in methods? Then, too, I think the Minister made the statement that there were further explorations, and just how much is being spent dollarwise in exploration here in Manitoba.

A further matter that I would like to have some information on and that has to do with the ARDA projects in the Interlake. Members will recall the contract, the agreement that was made with the Federal Government involving some, what was it? - 84 or 90 million dollars to

(MR. FROESE cont'd) be spent in the Interlake area over a period of years. Could we hear from the Minister a more current report as to what has been done to date? What improvements have been made as far as the land in the area? What about schools? Schools were involved too because we know that the unitary system was brought into this area largely as a result of that agreement, and what improvements have we made in the schools in the Interlake as a result? And also general improvements, other improvements that might have been made as a result of that agreement during the last year or so? I think this is a matter that I would like to see much more current information on because the reports that we get are just about a year old and do not give us the current situation that might be in effect at the present time. Then, too, how much of that money has already been spent and how much will be spent for the current year and for what purpose, so that we have a clearer picture of what is taking place in the Interlake and how these ARDA agreements and contracts are working out and whether they are providing the benefit that they were hailed as would be brought about as a result of the agreement?

Mr. Chairman, these were some of the matters that I felt I would like to hear further information on. The discussion has centred around the matter of the hydro project and the South Indian Lake to a greater extent in the last day or two since the estimates are being discussed in this committee, and I for one listened with interest. I remembered quite well, too, when the matter was first introduced into this House some years ago, when the Utilities Committee met and we had quite a lengthy discussion on the whole matter. I do have the transcripts from those meetings. I just brought them down yesterday. I haven't had a chance to look through them. I was going to read up a little more on them so that I would know exactly what I was going to speak of when I did speak of the matter. I will check into these more fully than I have up to the present time. But if I remember correctly, Mr. Chairman, our attention was directed to the Phase I at that particular time and Phase I is outlined in this report that was put out on the Nelson River investigations and is dated at May 27, 1964, and then there's another date, November 30, 1965. I guess that was the official date that the report was made public. And I find the cost of the Phase I listed on page 35 of that report and it goes on to show that the estimated cost in total would be \$305 million. The Kettle site minimum nominal firm, capacity 855 megowatts, I think it was, \$143 million. Then the transmission lines another \$114 million, the Churchill River Diversion 20 million, and the Lake Winnipeg regulation control at Warren Landing another 28 million. They add up to 305 million.

We were also given information during those hearings as to the cost of hydro that would be produced, but it was based on a different interest figure, and the interest figure used at that time I think was something like 5 1/2 percent. Now we know that the costs of interest have risen very considerably and I would like to hear from the Minister just what does this do in relation to the cost of power that will be developed at this station. On page 31 it mentions the rate of interest assumed for Manitoba development is 5.5 percent and the load growth beyond 1970-71 is assumed to be 6 percent. So 5 1/2 percent was the interest rate, I think, figures into the venture and the cost at that particular time.

The report also contains the maps and various graphs of the whole project. We know that the South Indian Lake, as it is referred to, I think is probably the most northerly of the total development and therefore probably leaves a false impression on people that this might be quite a ways south but, according to the map, it is north of the Kettle Rapids project - northwest to be exact. No doubt there will be a full discussion on this whole matter when the bill comes in but, as far as the cost of power and some general information, what the interest factor will do to the rates, I think these are matters that we should be discussing at this time and have a fuller discussion on. Right now it seems to me that the whole matter is so emotional that proper discussion is probably and can so easily be biased, and that probably, instead of discussing the whole matter at the time the bill comes in, that we discuss general matters during the estimates of this whole deal. Also how much of the financing of this whole development has already been arranged? How much of the borrowings has been done and how much more will be needed? How much more will the total development cost as a result of increased prices on the commodities that have to be bought and that go into the venture?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the honourable member like to ask the question of the Provincial Treasurer, or Minister of Finance? Is that not under your department, Sir? Manitoba Hydro.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was about to say to my honourable friend that I would want to examine his questions after we rise. I'll be prepared to provide information on

MR. EVANS cont'd) that subject. Perhaps the most convenient time would be my estimates because the Manitoba Hydro does report through me to the House. I'll be glad to provide any information I can in answer to these questions. He won't need to repeat them. I'll refer to the questions he has asked in this committee and be prepared to deal with that matter then. I remind him also that there will be an opportunity when the utility comes before the Public Utilities Committee, that is the Standing Committee of the House, at which time any information I've not been able to provide in the House can be supplied by the Hydro officials.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought it would be wise to correct that at this time. I think the only thing, the purpose that our Honourable Minister has at this time is in the licensing, giving the go ahead to Manitoba Hydro on this particular project, nothing to do with the Manitoba Hydro itself.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I realize this and I thank the Honourable Minister of Finance for taking notice of these questions and getting the necessary answers if and when he can. However, we will be faced with the decision to give approval to the bill when they ask us for the matter of the licence to do certain things which is part of the total development, and if we had some of this information certainly I think it would help us to make up our minds as to what should be done, and therefore I threw out the matters that I did this morning, because we will be developing a considerable amount of power and at the time that we had the discussions in committee there was mention of export, probably to the U.S., to the neighbouring provinces, and the rate that was indicated at that time seemed to be favourable, at least, as far as the neighbouring provinces were concerned. I wasn't too sure in connection with exporting power to the United States because of the high cost of transmitting and so on, that this might not be too favourable and I wondered just how this would affect the cost of power as far as exporting power is concerned.

Then the matter, the way we've read it in the press, that if this whole area is being flooded, certainly there is a lot of growth on the whole area. Has the department considered clearing the area that will be flooded and what the cost would be of clearing that area? I remember going down east when they flooded certain areas - oh, where they made the channel on the St. Lawrence - and they were flooding certain areas out there, and everything was cleared out and it was quite costly to clear out. On the other hand, though, if you do not clear out the area, all the bush and the brush that is there and the trees, they naturally have to die, they drown, and as a result you will have all this trash on the lake and it will remain there for years and years. So these are some of the arguments that are being put forward, that we are just ruining the area as far as for fishing purposes and sporting and so on. Perhaps, and most likely, surveys have been made as to the cost of clearing the area and how large an area actually would have to be cleared. I note from the maps here, I think they give us the areas that would be flooded so that no doubt the Department will have some general information available for us along that line, and I for one would like to hear more of a general statement covering the whole matter so that we'd have more information on our hands to make an intelligent decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK: Mr. Chairman, before I go into the various fields I had anticipated to discuss under the estimates of the Honourable the Minister, I would first of all like to make a few comments with respect to the amendment before us. I think it is deplorable for the Minister to stand up in this House in the afternoon and, in reply to a question posed by the Honourable Member for Portage when he first brought to the attention of this House that he wasn't sure whether or not the Minister had made reference to South Indian Lake at that time, the Minister saw fit to rise to his feet and say in reply that he would be more than happy to discuss any aspect that comes under his estimates, only a few hours later to return to this House and reverse his original position and inform us that the bill will be before this House and at that time there will be ample opportunity to discuss every aspect with respect to the South Indian Lake.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit to you and to the members of this Assembly, as well as to the people of this province, that this government has spent public money, the money that belongs to the people of this province, to provide the reports that we are seeking. The information should be made available to all these members of this House as well as to the people of this province so they would be in a better position to assess the situation and vote more intelligently on the bill. The honourable member, the present Minister of Mines and

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) Natural Resources, was the campaign manager for the First Minister when he was seeking, or had aspirations for the leadership of the Conservative Party. At that time, one of the main slogans they used was that he will be promoting further communication between the people and the government. And we have here a situation today where the government is not willing to make available the information that the people of this province had paid for. And I, too, would like to register my protest in no uncertain terms to the Minister on his behaviour on this matter.

I think, too, I would like to reiterate the statement made by my honourable leader, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, when he requested the Minister resign his position. The greatest justice he could do to the people of this province would be to tender his resignation early. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, that the first year we were here after the 1966 election we had a dilemma with respect to the Potato Marketing Board, the Vegetable Marketing Board. This was circus number one. The second circus occurred last year when the Minister who was in charge of Agriculture procrastinated with respect to the Turkey Marketing Board and I dare say that, although he was collecting money from the respective turkey producers of this province, the people were not, or the producers were not receiving any benefits. I guess the First Minister figures that in order to relieve the honourable member from the dilemmas he had encountered in the agricultural estimates, he would give him a more suitable portfolio, that of Mines and Natural Resources. And heaven behold, what happened? Almost within days after accepting the new responsibility of a new department, we had another chaotic situation occur with respect to the handling of the South Indian Lake matter, and the Minister has the gumption to get up in this House and he says, after telling the people of this province that we will take this matter for further discussion into the Legislature, only to get up and say, "Well, I won't talk on the estimates but you will have an opportunity to participate fully in discussion when the bill is brought before this House." And, Mr. Speaker, what are we, as members, to do in this House? If you recall a few days ago, when I posed a question which was first brought to the attention of this House by the Honourable Member for Roblin in his speech in moving the Reply to the Address from His Honour, - the Throne Speech address, he brought to the attention of the Honourable Minister the fact that there were serious problems with respect to predators in his area, and he urged the government to make an announcement with respect to a program that would alleviate this problem. Needless to say there was no action brought about of this, so a few days later I posed the same question to him, because a lot of the beekeepers in my area were very concerned in that respect as they had to order bees for the coming season, and my honourable friend didn't have the courtesy to get up on his feet and reply to my question. But who do you think came to the rescue? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry. And what do you think he told us? He says, "let's not waste time asking questions; we will have ample opportunity to do that while our estimates are being discussed." And now we are in the estimates, and the appropriate estimates, only to have the Minister get up and completely ignore the fact that there has been a predator problem, even though he had indicated in his annual report for the period ending March 31, 1968 - and here is a paragraph which clearly indicates that the department and the Minister was fully aware of the fact that there have been numerous complaints in the past with respect to the predator problem, and I would just like to read a paragraph from Page 31. "There was an increase in complaints of bear damage on the fringe areas of agriculture and in recreational areas. Their activity has necessitated intensive control measures for the protection of human lives and property."

Well, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, the people in that area - in the Swan River - Dauphin valley area and in the Roblin area - were so perturbed over this aspect that they saw fit to call a public meeting to which the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources was invited. I happened to have the privilege of also attending this meeting, and I need not repeat to my honourable friend some of the strong feelings that were expressed at that meeting with respect to this problem, and yet the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has saw fit to completely ignore that aspect. - (Interjection) - All right, I'm awaiting your announcement with respect to an appropriate program to cope with that problem, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, there are other areas that I would like to register my protest in, and one of them is the handling of timber limits in the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve, which is a provincial park, and until a few years ago the settlers of that community were entitled under the then prevailing legislation to go in and cut some lumber to maintain and build their farmstead buildings. In 1966 or 1965, whichever year it was, the Act had been somewhat revised, and

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd) . . . since then the settlers in that area have been denied that privilege. I'm not going to take time with the committee at this time to argue the pros and cons of that legislation, however, it is my understanding that there is a clause in that Act which would cope with special situations, and if you recall back in 1966 we had a storm go through the Wellman Lake area in the Duck Mountain and it came right clean through from the west, through the mountain, to the Pine River area, on to the Fork River area, and on to Lake Winnipegosis, and in its path it not only tore down all the trees but demolished farm buildings and every thing else. At that time we applied to the department for some special consideration that the settlers would be given an opportunity to go and get some lumber out of the Duck Mountain Forest Reserve to reconstruct or replace some of the urgently needed buildings, and I'm sorry to report that there was no favourable action taken by this department and this government.

Last fall there had been a further request through the Municipality of Ethelbert to the department that some consideration be given again in view of the fact of the problem that the farmers had been experiencing in storing grain. They thought lumber would be a cheaper way of putting up - if they got it from the mountain - would be a cheaper way of putting up storage facilities than buying prefabricated grain bins, and again I regret to register the fact that no favourable action was received from the department. And I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, but that is not my purpose at this time.

I'm happy to hear that the Minister has full intentions of implementing, of bringing in to this House legislation which would bring about the Fish Marketing Board for Manitoba in conjunction with the national Fish Marketing Board which we are about to have enacted. I must also say that although he had made mention of the fact that Manitoba was a driving force, that force must have been very small if it took all these years to bring it about.

He had also mentioned the fact that he didn't know what happened to the herd of buffalo that was released up in the northern area. I wonder whether or not he now has any information.

I would also like at this time to say a word or two on the drainage problems about which I spoke earlier in this session in the Pine River area. I brought it to the attention of the then Minister of Highways, now the Honourable the First Minister, and some three years ago - two and a half years ago now - he had promised that there would be some assistance given to the people in that area to provide adequate drainage in the newly cultivated land areas. Since, we have received very little assistance and it is of fair amount of importance that some assistance or some program be brought about and drainage facilities be provided on a planned orderly basis in that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I almost haven't got the heart to take a few strips off the Minister's back because he's such a nice guy really. I've met him and his wife at the Lieutenant-Governor's Ball the other night and I told him that after meeting him that I'm going to find it very difficult in this House to say anything bad about him, and I'll really try and restrain myself because I think there is enough experts on this side of the House to look after him.

The main reason I get up to speak, Mr. Chairman, is because first of all it's my constituency; and secondly, it's our money that this government is spending, whether it's \$600 million or a billion dollars; and the third reason I feel I should speak on it is for me a main point, because this action and this forced permanent relocation affects 600 economically and politically defenseless people. Now it's easy enough to say, "well what the heck, they're just Indians living in a bunch of shacks" - and they are shacks, you and I wouldn't live in them, and maybe the government takes the position that by moving them they're doing a big favour. Maybe they are, I don't really think it's for me to say or for the Minister to make that decision. They have a defence counsel, and the last position I heard when I attended Hydro hearings in January, the position their counsel, in consultation with these 640 Indians living in these two communities, is they won't move.

Well, let's say we all agree with this, the position the government is taking. What are we going to do, or what is the government going to do if these people refuse to move? Are they going to bring in the police or the army to move them? If we're to believe the newspaper reports coming out, they said very clearly they're not going to move, so I think this is something that he should look at before we discuss anything any further, even if all of us agree. Let's say he brings out these facts that he claims he has, these secret reports, and this side of the House has an opportunity to look at them and we all in our wisdom decide this Minister is not

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) incompetent, as our Leader suggested - certainly he's not less incompetent than some of the other ministers in the front benches - but we all agree, we get these facts and we all agree that the Minister was correct and they're going to go ahead with this scheme, and the Indians refuse to move. What's going to happen? I think he should take a long look at this before he decides to make any decision, whether it's inside of the House or outside of the House.

Last night there was some questions asked of the Minister to give us some information on this thing. He gave us some figures, and one of them - and I think it's an outrageous figure - has to do with the water supply to Churchill. In my notes I have here he claims there's sufficient water after this diversion takes place, in other words after 80 percent of the Churchill River water is diverted to South Indian Lake, that there is sufficient water to service a hundred communities the size of Churchill. Is this correct? The Minister isn't answering so I assume it's correct. Is this assumption based on the present usage of water? In other words, they buy it by the gallon and there's no toilets or sinks so obviously they don't use very much, or is it based on the assumption that we're going to have water and sewer? The Federal Government has allocated X number of dollars just this past few months to put in water and sewer in the downtown area, and I don't have to tell anyone how much more water is consumed when you put baths in homes and toilets, so are his figures based on the premise that we're going to continue to use or buy water by the gallon and use it like it was whisky, or is it based on the fact that we're going to have water and sewer? And assuming his figures are correct, - and I have no reason to argue because he hasn't given us any facts - he says that there's no problems there. If there isn't any problems I don't see any reason why he can't get up in the House and tell us, because the people in Churchill are really concerned. I think it's unfair for him to cause these people all this anxiety when he knows full well there's no problems. Why don't you tell them?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): I have.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, last time I was there they were very concerned and they're still agitated by it, and then including your member, your former member that sat for Churchill, he was out there and he condemned this government soundly. And he was one of -- or he had the confidence, I assume he had the confidence of the government, maybe he didn't - maybe that's why he quit, I don't know - but he was down there and he said he wasn't aware of it, and the people to this very day are concerned because they're going to lose their water. This is really their main concern. They're concerned about other things of course, but the water problem is their main concern, and if you have some information, by all means give it to us or don't give it to us. Tell the people in Churchill because they're really the ones that are concerned. As I understand the situation on the water, as far as Churchill is concerned, 80 percent of it will be diverted leaving 20 percent. Now normally this 20 percent is a lot of water, but when you realize that this river, the bed is on glacial till, there's anywhere from 10 to 700 feet of glacial till, and once your water table drops you've exposed banks - maybe 50, maybe 100, maybe 200 feet - banks that are built up of mud and glacial till. So in the summer time, every time it rains it'll wash the glacial till into this river, so it will be mud. Even if you're correct and the water is there, nobody is going to drink it; it's going to be unfit for drinking. In the winter time it's going to be so shallow it will freeze solid. So you may as well take 100 percent of the water; the 20 percent is wasted.

The other thing they're concerned with, there's a lot of fish in this river and they use it for fishing - the people that live there and I guess some tourists come up there and fish. But the other important thing is that the fish that live and breathe there, then they swim out into the ocean and the whales live on this fish. Now, if you take this away they feel - and maybe they're wrong, and if they are wrong perhaps you can reassure them - that the whale will die out because they will have nothing to live on.

Going further down the Churchill River - I'm leaving Churchill for a moment - into Southern Indian Lake itself, we've seen quite a few figures given out on the cost of it and the effects of it. I've attended the hearings in January, the Hydro hearings which the Minister was down there, and I've heard figures and facts given by experts, seven of them in a row, and the Minister is well aware that not one of your people, whether it's from Hydro or from your own department, got up to refute these things. Now, they had a scheme called a low level diversion. Have you looked at the scheme? If you have looked at it, instead of having this argument - everybody's mad on this side and they're calling you all kinds of things and thinking badly of

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) . . . you - why don't you give these figures on here and let these experts - we're all experts, we think we are - let these experts decide, and on that basis we can have an intelligent discussion, whether your scheme of high level diversion, which will destroy two villages, destroy all the fishing and the minerals that are there and the hunting and fishing that the Indians now have, if we get this thing on the table, all of us I'm sure can decide whether this is a good scheme or it's not a good scheme.

Now leaving South Indian Lake and going to a community that I'm vitally concerned with because I live there, they're going to divert all this water - and the figures again that I've seen brought in by these experts at this Hydro hearing, the volume of water will be increased by 13 percent flowing through the Burntwood River. Now, the first thing that's going to happen to our community is it's going to wash away the bridge - and maybe it's a blessing because it's a first world war relic as I'm sure you're aware of. We've been asking for a bridge for a long time and this is one of our main accident areas, so probably the only beneficial effect of this flooding, if it goes through, will be the washing away of this bridge and then we'll get a new bridge.

The other effect it will have on our area is that it's going to flood all the docks, all the fishes flow, and certainly it will. The docks are built there, land is there, two other airways have docks built there, and they have shacks built. One of your departments has just put up a new building there, the Department of Transport - or one of the departments in any case. All our camping facilities, our docking facilities, our fishing areas are right there because it flows within 300 feet of the town. This is one of the two areas we have. Paint Lake is one of them, and I mentioned the other day that it's badly looked after, under-serviced, and it's not being developed properly. The growth is so fantastic in Thompson that you put in a fireplace and there's 50 people waiting to cook their wieners on it. They're starting to do this at Burntwood River, which is right by the town again, and when you raise this river - and of course I'm no expert and I'm sure you're not, you have to depend on the people who give you this information - but you don't have to be an expert to realize when you increase the volume of water over a river bed by from 5 to 13 times, it is going to rise. And the question is just how much will it rise. Will it be 13 times, or 13 feet or 15 feet or 5 feet? I have no idea but we're concerned in Thompson.

One of the things that bugs us is that you didn't, or the Minister previous in your department didn't have enough courtesy to tell us about it. You know, the first I heard of this was reading it in the Winnipeg Free Press, and this is one of the reasons I got out of the campaign and took a plane and flew down here to attend those hearings. This was the first time I'd heard of it. We have a mayor in town that belongs to your Party and he was just as shocked as we were; he wasn't aware of this. Now here you're bringing in some legislation that is going to affect the whole north, that's going to flood the richest area, that's going to vitally affect all of us in Thompson, the third largest community in Manitoba, and you haven't the courtesy to even tell us how it is going to affect us. I think this is wrong. I heard one of the members say you're a rookie Minister and you haven't learned your job. Well, I'm a rookie too and I hope that the Ministers and the people on this side will bear with me if I make mistakes, but the mistakes I make aren't going to affect anybody except myself and maybe it will reflect on my Party, but the mistakes you make, because of your bungling or incompetence - and I'm not saying you're incompetent - but if you are and if you do bungle these things here, they're going to affect the whole north, and they're going to affect the rest of Manitoba to a tune of \$600 million or maybe a billion dollars. And this is not something that you could change overnight or next year; once you've made this decision, spent this money, put in these dams, it's flooded forever. As far as you and I are concerned, that's it, this is the end of it, and this is a very serious matter.

Going back upstream on the Burntwood River, there's a lot of mining claims; there's two other lakes there that are presently being polluted by International Nickel by dumping from their pit operations. They're sucking up the dirt and the muck and they're pumping it into this lake, and it's polluted it completely so that we've lost two lakes in there. This is going to back up into there; as a matter of fact, it's going to come through these two lakes that are already polluted, and I don't have to tell you what's going to happen when you get all this volume of water coming down. The narrow river bed is going to spread out and is going to lift all the debris that's collected there for the last hundred years, thousand years, or whatever it may be, the dead wood, the leaves, everything is going to come down our river. We have to drink that

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd) water. One of the effects will be of course the plant will be flooded. They're going to have to build a new water treatment plant, but the water treatment plant, although it may filter out chemicals that are harmful, it's not going to filter out the colour, so if nothing else it's going to affect our water supply to the point where we won't be able to drink it. Have you considered this? If you've got something to tell us, tell the people in Thompson what you're going to do. Where are we going to get our water? There's enough water in that river probably to supply Winnipeg, but I'm sure you wouldn't want to drink it; I know darn well we're not going to drink it. Where are we going to get our water from? And Churchill faces that same problem. Where are they going to get their water? I realize that the Minister speaking yesterday was bragging about the fact that there was 100,000 lakes in Manitoba, and I'm sure there is, but if you've ever flown over this area, and I have, I've flown over this area, and this area, as you know, is swamp, muskeg and permafrost. There's little depressions every half mile, or every mile, depending on the area, little depressions, and you choose to call these things lakes - and I suppose if you use a slide rule or a yardstick, this type of yardstick, they are lakes - but the fact is they're little depressions where the permafrost melted out, the bottom dropped out, and you get a small pool of water there. There's no fish in there; even weeds won't grow on it, and this is what you 100,000 lakes consist of - absolutely useless, or mud puddles. This is what Churchill is surrounded by, and within 50 miles of Thompson this is what we have. So when you talk about all these lakes, it's meaningless. They're absolutely useless for fish or for drinking water.

So these are some of the things that I hope you can answer, and again more for the people up there than here, because the boys on this side, the politicians, maybe they're just trying to give you a hard time; but those people are really concerned. I'm not suggesting these people aren't concerned, I'm sure they are, but maybe for different reasons. We're concerned because it affects us, for selfish reasons. I hope you'll forgive me on this side; I don't want to impute improper motives. I won't say any more in this area because maybe the Minister can answer some questions or maybe he'll table some documents and we'll all go home happy.

So I'll move into another subject, with your permission, and I hope you can give me some answer on this. One of the things that I talked about during the campaign is the need for a mining inspector. Now I think you are aware of the fact, as the Minister in charge of this department, that all the mines of any consequence, outside of the one that's in Bissett that you're having difficulties with, are up north, yet your mining inspectors sit in air conditioned plush offices over in the Norquay Building. Does it make sense to you? All the mines are 700 miles away and the experts and the people who enforce the Mining Act are sitting over at the Norquay Building. How would you like this Legislature to be in Thompson, and all you politicians had to hustle up there once a year or every time there was any problem. This is how ridiculous it is to have the mining inspectors sitting here in Winnipeg while all the accidents, all the people that are killed, maimed or crippled for life, are 700 miles away.

One of the suggestions I make to you - and I'm not saying this because this is one of my election promises, I think everybody agrees that this is necessary - because if you at your earliest possible moment talk to your people in there - and I don't suggest that you move out the whole department, it's not necessary - send an inspector, install a resident inspector in Thompson that'll be responsible for the Thompson mine, Pike Lake, Saub Lake and any other mines. And I hope, because I'm sure you do, there will be other development at Wabowden and maybe other places, the potential there is unlimited in that area, that you will at your earliest possible moment take one of these inspectors and install him in some office in Thompson - we'll find space, I'll rent you my basement if you can't find office space because it is difficult to find, there's no question about that - set this man up in there and let him look at it, and when somebody gets killed or somebody gets hurt, the inspector jumps in the car and he goes over half a mile, he inspects it, we don't have to shut down the whole level. And this is what they do. They shut down the whole level in the mine; nobody can come in, nobody can come out until an inspector can get on a plane - assuming that there isn't a storm - that he can get on this plane and fly all the way to Thompson and go down into the mine and inspect it. I think this is ridiculous and I really think that you should give it serious consideration at the earliest possible moment to get a man in there. I had the same recommendation from the compensation officer. I think this goes under the Department of Labour, and I'll be making the same recommendation to him. The men employed there are employed in an industry that there's a lot of accidents, so this is again the place where the man should be to look after the claims.

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.)

The last item I'd like to touch on, and I'll do so only briefly because I've got a feeling that this is not going to end today or maybe even next week, so I think I'll have another opportunity to talk about this. This has to do with the return we get on our natural resources. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, you're right, it's peanuts to what we should be getting. Looking at your book here, "Province of Manitoba, Department of Mines and Natural Resources for the year 1968," I noticed that the total revenue from the minerals in the province is \$183.00 -- (Interjection) -- \$183 million, and the return to us, or to the taxpayers through your department was somewhere around two and half million dollars. If I'm wrong you could correct me, this is the figures that I -- I'm not an expert at reading these things here, I'd do better with a financial sheet. -- (Interjection) -- I'm a shareholder too, a very small one.

So just looking at those figures, doesn't it seem to you an awful small return for precious, irreplaceable, natural resources, especially nickel, copper and aluminum and potash, we've got lots of. You can close the mine down tomorrow, it's not going to make any difference. Nickel is in short supply, has been in short supply, and in just reading International Nickel's report during the last two weeks, they tell us it's in such tight supply that they're selling their nickel on an allocation basis, and I suppose they do it on a preferential treatment to their old customers. I know the American government buys, by their law, 25 percent of the total production of INCO from Canada and possibly all around the world. Here we have a metal, but there's no question what type of taxation you put on the people, there's no question you'll drive them away because they can't go some place else. You don't have it down here, they don't -- there's two places in Canada they mine nickel, Sudbury and Thompson. So here we have a . . .

MR. LYON: What about Lynn Lake?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, when I say Thompson, I'm talking in that area. I realize it's 200 miles away but it's in my constituency. -- (Interjection) -- Well, all right, we'll give Lynn Lake the recognition it deserves.

Mr. Minister, I can walk down the beach and pick up a piece of driftwood and I could sand it down and shellac it and sell it in my shop, and I have to pay a 12 percent manufacturer's tax - 12 percent. On top of that I got to pay income tax which starts for a working man, or a businessman if you're not incorporated, at 15 - or is it 13 percent? One of the two. You're not using anything that's worth anything to anybody. You can pick up driftwood until hell freezes over or South Indian Lake is flooded, whichever comes first, and it'll probably be the same time. In any event, the point I'm trying to make is that things like this here you have a tax of 12 percent, yet according to your own figures all these people are paying is about a cent or one and one half percent. Does this indicate to you as a fair return for a precious, priceless, irreplaceable resource? Do you really think that's a fair return? I don't, I think we're being robbed blind, and we're being robbed because this government - and not you again, but your government - when the present Attorney-General when he was the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources had the colossal gall in 1966, right after the election, to introduce legislation in this House - and this happened at the very time that they increased heating, hydro and telephone tax by five percent - in that very same session he cut the provincial share of the mineral tax by 50 percent, and it was ridiculously low at that time. He cut it by 50 percent, so the company today -- and I don't really -- as the honourable Member for Inkster will have to wait for the other one -- (Interjection) -- Right. I'm not blaming the company for taking advantage of this thing here. I can't blame them either, because this was a deal given to them. What the company's done since that time, they will turn around and after they sink a shaft the federal government gives them a three-year tax holiday. This government on top of that has given them another three-year tax holiday by cutting their mineral taxes for the first three years in half. I don't know how many other provinces have this type of sweet deal, but I know this one has it and I think it's wrong. So the company, not satisfied with this big chunk of the pie, what they're doing now - and this is the reason there's so many mines opening up; I worked underground for six years so I know what I'm talking about - they will turn around, they will sink one shaft over here and they mine the nickel for three years income tax free and they get their provincial tax cut by half. Three years later when they've not run out of nickel but when they've run out of this grace period, they'll turn around and they'll go half a mile away - they could conceivably go to the Chairman's chair, that far legally - and they'll sink another shaft, and in this case they have sunk a shaft half a mile away. The shaft maybe cost them half a million dollars, but by sinking this hole, this symbolic hole a half a mile away,

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) they have taken the federal government for a ten million dollar ride and they have taken our government, you and I because we're both taxpayers, they've taken us for I don't know how many million - you can figure it out yourselves - for three years, they got all that at half price.

Now that period is just about running out now, so they turn around and they moved over to Birch Tree. I know every time there's an official opening the government goes to great pains to get out and stick out its chest and say, under our administration we're opening another two mines this year. Aren't we great guys? — (Interjection) — That's right. So now they've opened the Birch Tree mine and they're going to get another three year tax-free holiday from Ottawa - and it's not your fault, that's Ottawa's fault - but your fault is that you're allowing this theft by consent to go on. After they open that they're going to go for another three years, and you know what's going to happen after that? They're going to sink another symbolic hole another mile away, and conceivably using this system - and it's a very neat one, I wish I could do it in my business - they could turn around and mine that area for the next twenty or 50 years, and with the odd exception of finding an ore body too far removed, the odd exception, they could turn around and mine all that nickel out - and we're told this is the second largest ore body in the world - they could mine all that nickel out giving us peanuts, and I suggest to you those figures in that book, Mr. Minister, are peanuts; they're an insult.

So one of the first things I would recommend to you that you should do, provided you don't really take the advice of my honourable Leader and resign, if you stay on, my advice to you is to sit down with these companies, or sit down with your people and figure out a sensible and equitable way of taxing these people. Charge them on a basis of that driftwood - 12 percent. I have a shop in Thompson and I buy lumber from a lumber yard , and I take nickel ore and I mount it on there and I may stick a pin on there, one of my pure nickel medals or anything else, and I have to pay 12 percent manufacturer's tax. I've already paid the sales tax on that piece, and the manufacturer's tax on that piece of lumber to start with. I got the nickel free, there's piles of it laying there when they developed the mine. The pin I put on there, the tax has been paid on it; the medal that's put on there, the tax has been paid on it; but on top of all this I still have to pay 12 percent. Does this seem reasonable to you? — (Interjection) — They charge for the glue too, that's a fact. Well, you think that's funny, but it's a fact, they charge for everything. The cost of the glue is included in that 12 percent, so if it's fair enough for us little guys to put a 12 percent tax on, what about the big guys? It's bad enough robbing us here with your consent, but it's all going to New York. At least if it stayed here maybe the government could take the money and put it into low cost housing or lower the interest rate, but it's all going to New York. They sell the nickel all over the world, a lot of it finds its way into Viet Nam. I understand this is the reason there's a shortage of it because there's a war on and a lot of nickel is used in the war effort. But the money, when the nickel is finally sold, it doesn't stay in this country, it doesn't help us, contrary to what some newspapers or some politicians try and tell us, it does not stay here; it goes to New York, so it doesn't do our economy any good. The only thing that stays here is the wages, and after you're through with your taxes and sales tax there isn't much wages left. That's a fact.

So, Mr. Minister my suggestion to you is, and I'm very serious about this, that you should sit down with your Cabinet and with your backbenchers — I am darned sure that they don't like to see an American company come in here and steal us blind, because and this is what they're doing - and figure out an equitable system of taxing them. I know you can shake your head and say, well if we do this we'll be higher than the other provinces and the guys are going to take off and they're going to develop a mine some place else. Well, normally you could say this, but in this case you can't because it's nickel. There's only a few places in the world where there's nickel, and if it's there no company is going to leave a gold mine because the taxes went up by 50 or 100 percent. No company's going to do it. They're making \$160 million, and I suggest to you if you took ten million of it, and that's little enough, they're not going to pack up and say, "O. K. you wise guys, you're so greedy, keep your nickel, we're going some place else." They won't do it because it's one of the few places they've got it. They made a deal in Greece, in New Caledonia and in Indonesia, and you know how stable the governments are over there. We have one of the most stable democratic governments in the world right here. There's no risk for any investor coming in here; he doesn't have to worry about somebody overthrowing the government, saying O. K. we'll expropriate you, we'll take it away. There's no risk of this. This same — (Interjection) — pardon? I can't hear you. This same company, Mr. Minister,

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) has just signed a deal in Australia - they tell me it's quite socialized in Australis - but they signed a deal in Australia where the government is reasonably stable - it may be as stable here - they signed this deal with the Australian government to mine nickel. Do you know what they're paying over there in mineral taxes? About twice as much as here. And Indonesia, where the government could be overthrown any day, they pay three times as much mineral tax. And they're still in there. They just signed a deal recently. So it's not a question if you raise the taxes up you're going to drive out these industries and you're going to discourage exploration. It's nonsense.

MR. ENNS: What are they making in wages in Indonesia?

MR. BOROWSKI: I don't know, I haven't been there.

MR. ENNS: Well find out. -- (Interjection) --

MR. BOROWSKI: No, I certainly don't. When I was talking about paying as much, I was talking in terms of American dollars because this is how Inco operates. They're paying three times as much tax. -- (Interjections) -- The Honourable the Attorney-General is very clever with his socialist bit and Marxist bit, and of course that's his business. He can talk about that and I've heard of his regime being called Fascist. You know, he can turn around and call us anything. I'll call him right back. He's got nothing to smile about. He's the guy that's responsible for making that bloody deal three years ago giving away our mineral resources.

MR. LYON: I've never heard called fascist by anarchists.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you very much. I'll think of an appropriate name for you later on. But this is that same Minister -- (Interjection) -- I'm really degrading myself to his level by indulging in this ridiculous mud-slinging. But this Minister has got a lot of nerve because he's the one that sold the people of this province out on this mineral tax and he should be ashamed of himself. He should leave the House -- not resign, just leave the House.

The last thing I want to say, or I think somebody else wants to say, and maybe the Minister would like to answer some of the things. Our Leader brought in a motion to cut your salary to 98 cents. I'm not sure that I'm going to vote for it because I think you're worth more than that really. Should this motion go through, I'll make the undertaking that I'll pass the hat around the House so you could live. Thank you.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Churchill made a suggestion that there should be an inspector from the Department of Mines and Natural Resources placed in Flin Flon, Thompson or Lynn Lake for convenience' sake. I want to refresh your mind, Mr. Chairman, that I went one step further during the debate on the Throne Speech. I felt that the entire Department of Mines and Natural Resources should be moved to Flin Flon or Thompson. If this government is continually talking about decentralizing, this could be the prime example, and the entire department could be moved up there. In one way, it should be moved up there because not too much is happening in the southwest part of the province.

I want to ask the Minister a question. I realize he wasn't the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at the time but the situation at St. Lazare regarding the potash: there were many rumors circulating at the time, in 1966 and 1967, when they put down 16 holes and tested it. I want to ask the question of the Minister: was there sufficient potash there for a mine? And I know that the answer is yes, so the second question would be: why was that mine never developed? What was the true reason for a mine not being developed in St. Lazare?

I also want to make a suggestion to the Minister regarding the elk hunting season. The farmers that are surrounding the park have continually complained that in many instances they are providing the feed for these animals throughout the year and when the time comes for a licence they make their application like everyone else does in Manitoba, their names are tossed in the hat, and they may or may not be one of the 600 people that are fortunate enough to receive a licence. My suggestion to the Minister is this: that the farmers surrounding that area, the park I'm speaking of, should be given two weeks' notice and be given the opportunity to make an application for a licence two weeks before the official date closes for accepting these licences, and then they should automatically be given a licence. And if there are 50 of them or 60 of them, they automatically get a licence and the Minister only has 525 further licences to issue. I think this would be a fair way of doing it. I've discussed the situation with many of the farmers in that area. They would be satisfied with this way. They are prepared to take their chances if they don't apply for the licences on the advance date, then if they still want to apply for one they're prepared to take a chance on their name coming out of the hat. But I think it's a good suggestion and worth consideration and I hope the Minister will consider it.

The second suggestion I would like to make to him on the same situation is the fact that many people apply for a licence year after year and never have an opportunity to have their name drawn. What I would like to suggest at this time is that if I apply for one this year and I'm fortunate enough to have my name drawn, I'm eliminated automatically next year. I can still make my application and if there are under 600 then in all probability I would receive a licence the second year, but if there were over the 600 I should be eliminated in that second year and would not be eligible until the third year. I think, in view of the fact that the Minister has probably 1,200 to 1,300 people apply annually, that this would be a fair suggestion to make to him.

The fourth thing I wanted to mention, and I think that the Minister's Department should receive some criticism in this area; if you recall, I brought up the question of the starving deer in the snowstorm around Rivers and southwest Manitoba, and there was even the suggestion made that it was a frivolous question. But I want to point out to the Minister that this was a very very serious question in the eyes of the game and fish people in that area. As a matter of fact, I was not here but I read in Hansard where the Member for Turtle Mountain brought up the same situation. The point I want to make here is that no co-operation was received from the conservation officer in Brandon. When the situation was reported to him he suggested to the people that it couldn't be as serious as what they were telling him and that maybe they should get some skidoos and make some tracks for the deer and this would give the deer an opportunity to follow the tracks and get their own feed. So fortunately there was a good game and fish organization in that area and I think they recruited about 15 to 20 skidoos and they did do this, but they were very very disappointed in the fact that the game and conservation officer couldn't find the time to come out and organize his own suggestion in view of the fact that the game and fish officer can be there repeatedly through the summer, and in winter he can be out on the ice checking the fishermen, but he couldn't find time to come out when there was a serious situation. I think that it's up to the Minister to write a letter to the game and fish association in the Rivers area apologizing for the actions of his conservation man and

March 21, 1969

(MR. DAWSON Cont'd.)... compliment them on the excellent job that they did do in rescuing these 60 deer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Oh, pardon me. The Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): ... quite willing to let my honourable friend try and justify the fact that he should have his \$15,600 rather than 98 cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe -- I have a little announcement to make. Maybe if you'd mind taking your chair. We have students in the gallery. Maybe I should make -- I was hoping the Minister of Health would arrive before I made it because they are students from his constituency. I sent word out -- but I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery to my right. We have 70 students, Grade 8 standing, of the Arborg Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gula and Mr. Steinowski. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister for Health and Social Services. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now I'm not going to say very much at all about South Indian Lake because we have been discussing that now for three for four hours and I confess that I don't know too much about it. In fact, most of the members here are complaining that they, too, are short of certain facts and figures. However, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that disturbs me a little and makes me wonder somewhat is a newspaper story that appeared in last Saturday's papers, both of them I believe, announcing the bids that were tabled for the Missi Falls Dam, and the thing that makes me wonder what is going on is that the lowest bid, the lowest by 5 million dollars nearly, was a single company bid whereas all the other bids were from groups of contractors -- that is, contractors that elected to group together in order to make a bid. Now it's not surprising at all if there's 5 million dollars spread on a hundred million dollar project, but it is surprising when there's a 5 million dollar spread on a twenty million dollar project. And another surprising thing is that the highest bid was made by what company? The company apparently that is now based at Gillam, right on the site.

I'm quoting from the Free Press now. It says, "The highest bid for the job came from Kettle Constructors of Gillam, Manitoba, at \$25,300,000." Well, immediately you wonder what is going on when a company that's sitting right at the site has the highest bid and another company - and the only single company - nowhere near the site at all, bidding for, in this case, 8 million less -- 8 million. It suggests to me that these multi-companies are doing a little bit of monkey business, for the sake of another adjective that I can't find at the moment, and I would like my honourable friend to explain or attempt to explain why there should be this great difference.

Now, to get back to the motion that is before us - and there is a motion before us isn't there, Mr. Chairman? - in respect to whether or not we should pay the Minister 98 cents or \$15,600, and there's quite a difference, quite a little bit of difference, and surely to goodness we will settle this before 12:30 so the Minister can have a reasonably quiet, pleasant week-end. Because it would be terrible if he had to have this on his mind for the entire week-end and his family wondering whether they were going to be fed for the ensuing year. So let's get this thing settled. But I'm still at a loss, Mr. Chairman, to know whether I will vote for the 98 cent motion or not. Not for the same reason that the motion was put, but for an entirely different reason.

Now you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that about two weeks ago - in fact it's over two weeks ago, on March 3rd last - I got an Order for Return from my honourable friend's department, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, in respect to certain questions that I had asked for; and question no. 1: What year the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed Authority was established? Do you remember that one? And you said it had never been established. Well we thought we had it established ten years ago when we got a letter from the then Minister of Agriculture saying that we were now in fact an authority, and I read that letter from the late Errick F. Willis. Now this whole subject matter of the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Watershed project is a very disappointing one for the people that reside in that watershed. And the watershed, as my honourable friend knows full well, is not a small little patch of land. My honourable friend will recall that in March 1958 a very,

(MR. SHOEMAKER Cont'd.).... very good paper was put out by the government of the day, entitled, "The Whitemud Watershed", and on the first page it says, "The watershed area encompasses approximately 1,635,000 acres of land." So that's a fairly large garden patch, Mr. Chairman. It is about one-twelfth, I think, of all the arable land in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, to point up how frustrating that this whole subject matter is to the people concerned, I think I read the other day, upon receipt of this Order for Return, a letter from the Deputy Mayor of Neepawa to the Whitemud Watershed Committee tendering his resignation from that committee. And I don't know whether I read it again but I think it's worth reading because it does -- the Deputy Mayor is speaking for everybody in the whole Whitemud River Watershed, I'm certain, when he made this statement, so I will read it and if I have to table it, fine and dandy. Dated December 24, 1968, Neepawa, Manitoba. "Dear Sirs: I have asked the Mayor to place a new representative from town council on the Whitemud Watershed Committee. It is with some regret that I feel I must resign as chairman. It has been a real pleasure working with other members of this committee from the various municipalities. There perhaps has been some progress towards our goal of an over-all watershed control in our area. At some times it has been most frustrating trying to get action. Mr. Nebbs and myself..." - and incidentally Mr. Nebbs is the ag rep at Neepawa - "Mr. Nebbs and myself met with the Minister, Mr. Enns, this past summer but could get no firm promise from him. It now has been more than ten years since the first plans were prepared and I suggest that unless the Manitoba Government takes immediate action the project will once again become dormant. Your committee has gone as far as they can go and now must leave the next step to the Provincial Government. The watershed organization at the municipal level is in the go position and only needs the co-operation of the provincial authorities. May I take this opportunity of wishing you every success in 1969 in this and all other endeavours you may plan. Signed, Homer Gill, Chairman."

Now this committee, as the letter points up, was first established I think in 1956 and then they -- Mr. Hutton, he did quite a little bit of foot work and leg work on the subject and came out and met with municipal men on two or three different occasions, as did the late Mr. Willis when he came out and read the letter stating that we were now in fact an authority (although my honourable friend says that we are not yet one) but, in the course of 12 years, nothing has really been done. Now it is true that about four years ago, yes, four years ago right about now, the government decided to designate certain waterways in the Province of Manitoba and to say to the municipal men that as of that date, that what they called number 3 and 4 would be taken over and become the responsibility of the government, and that the smaller streams of one or two origin would become a municipal responsibility.

Now the municipal men, when they received this letter, and I'm referring, Mr. Chairman, to a letter dated April 20, 1965, that went out to all municipalities in the Province of Manitoba, and I'll read the first paragraph: "I am pleased to inform you that effective May 1st..." - and this is signed by George Hutton - "I am pleased to inform you that effective May 1, 1965, we will designate a system of provincial waterways in your municipality. These waterways will include the artificial water control works of the third order or higher, in accordance with the policy described at the municipal convention in November, 1964, and subsequently discussed at a joint meeting of the councils in your area." Now this gave new hope to the municipalities when they got this, because they said, well, at long last the government are taking over complete control of all works "of the third order or higher". That's what they said, so then that really meant that the government had the responsibility in this whole field of looking after works that were to be planned in the whole watershed area. Nothing has yet been done - that's four years ago.

In the Throne Speech on page 2 - right at the bottom of the page - there's an article there. Has my honourable friend made an announcement yet? Perhaps he has, as to the plans that he has in mind when he refers to this paragraph on page 2, of the Throne Speech. "My ministers inform me that renewed efforts must be made to prevent loss of productivity in our agricultural base as a result of soil and water erosion. You will be asked to consider legislation which will enable municipalities to deal more effectively with this matter." That is the same verbiage, nearly, as was in the Throne Speech 10 years ago - nearly the same. But now there's a new word been added. It says that "my Ministers inform me that renewed efforts must be made." Now they "must" be made. Well, let's hear what my honourable

March 21, 1969

(MR. SHOEMAKER Cont'd.)... friend has in store for us. And I will nearly have to wait until he makes his decision to know whether or not I should vote for this amendment that's before us. If he can come forward with a bright, forward-looking program for the Riding Mountain-Whitemud River Water Shed and assure the House that he now does in fact intend to do something in this whole area, then I may say he deserves his \$15,600.00. But, if he says we're going to do exactly the same as we did last year, or if he says we're going to do 10 times as much as we did last year, I think I'll vote for the 98 cent deal, because they haven't been doing anything there at all. So, Mr. Chairman, he now has 30 minutes in which to tell us of his wonderful plans and I will bend both ears and see what he has to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, since the last speaker has already dwelt on the subject that I was going to raise later on in the debate, I might as well bring it forward what I had to say, because he will be replying on this very matter.

Mr. Chairman, drainage is very important to the people in rural Manitoba and especially where you have the problems of flooding and so on. In my particular riding we have had troubles in connection with drainage - and real bad ones too - because of the escarpment that you have just west of us from Morden running southeast to the U. S. border, and this is causing the flooding problem. Now, a certain amount of work has been done on the Hespeler. I think this was joint action with the Federal Government, that they provided certain funds toward this project, and this has been progressing and further work is being done right now on the project. They've constructed a number of bridges along the upper Hespeler where they're going to construct a double dike which will certainly help and eliminate future flooding on the Hespeler. As a result of this new construction on this Hespeler, which is a number three drain and which qualifies for federal and provincial support, certain matters have arisen as to the future maintenance and upkeep and repairs once this floodway has been constructed, and I asked the Minister of Transportation as to the government's policy in connection with future repairs and maintenance of these bridges, because there is a question here as to whether they are a part of the provincial road system or whether they are a part of the drainage system, and the reply that I got is not clear, in my opinion. He refers to the authority that does the developing, but Mr. Minister, I would like you to give us a clear and precise statement on this matter as to what the municipalities' role will be once the construction is completed and that in future years, when repairs and maintenance costs will arise, who will have to bear the costs of maintenance in connection with the bridges and the road crossing this channel. This has been a matter of dispute between the two municipalities in my constituency and has been dealt with to some extent by the municipal boards, but I feel that we should have a clear statement from the government on this so that when we are questioned in connection with that policy we'll have a definite answer to give these people and to give them the right and proper answer.

Then, too, this can cause large expenditures in the future, not in the immediate future but some time in the future when these bridges will deteriorate and repairs will have to be done. These are rather large bridges and the cost can be quite heavy for a municipality to bear in later years. And therefore I would like to hear a reply from this Minister just what is his department's responsibility in this connection, and also the authority that was referred to by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, who is in charge of constructing the channel, what responsibility they will have in the future in connection with maintenance, and what is the responsibility of the municipalities concerned in this connection as well.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I won't attempt to really respond to my colleague or my friend the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, other than to say that he did indeed wound me with his resolution. You know, Mr. Chairman, there is a degree of status to being a dollar a year man, or at least there used to be in government service, but the 98 cents cut deep. But I make it very clear to him, although he has made it very clear to me that he doesn't accept this, that any advice that I give with respect to when is and when is not the proper time to discuss the issues of Southern Indian Lake, I certainly wouldn't presume to tell him when that time is, with his years of experience in the House. I simply state, as I have stated, that I'm bringing a bill into this House and will discuss those matters at that time. I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that in keeping some semblance of order to the estimate debate, that I should attempt to respond to those questions that are specifically relative to my estimates.

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.)

The Honourable Member from Rhineland rose first thing this morning to request me about a further progress report, I suppose, on the Pembilier Dam project. I can report to the honourable member that just as recently as a week ago, as he is aware, that I met with the federal Minister of Foreign Relations or External Affairs, Mr. Sharp. As he is aware, there is a fair amount of negotiating to be done with the Washington or American authorities on this project. I was down, accompanied with the Director of Water Control, to underline the position that the Manitoba Government takes with this regard in that we fully support this project and are quite prepared to sit down and will, in fact, be sitting down with the federal authorities to enter into active negotiations very shortly. He makes some further remarks with respect to the fish marketing legislation that is going to be placed before this House. I would inform him that this is going to be a Crown Corporation, not a co-operative, and I think that probably answers a fair number of his other questions that were related to it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, as I've indicated, there will be a bill introduced, hopefully perhaps next week, on the fish marketing matter which will give the honourable member and other members of the House an ample opportunity to look into the actual details and workings of this corporation. It is, of course, a federal corporation that will work under federal law. I suppose the federal legislation is available to members; I don't know whether I have sufficient copies but I would attempt to make some available to the members opposite so that they can consider jointly as we are considering our provincial legislation, which in fact is enabling legislation, allowing us to work with the federal board.

He directed a question to me, Mr. Chairman, that possibly is understandable, although it was misdirected insofar as that I am not the Minister responsible for FRED or ARDA. My honourable colleague the Minister of Agriculture retains that responsibility, but I accept the fact that it may be somewhat confusing to the members opposite just where some of the responsibilities lay for some of these programs. I'm pleased to give him, as a resident and member from the Interlake, a very brief outline of what in fact is taking place to the specific development program that he referred to in the Interlake.

As we all knew at the time we entered into that agreement two years ago, it was a most ambitious and challenging kind of program where we're attempting to do, you know, a great deal more than simply improve the physical facilities of the region, and I must say that with the experience that I have, firsthand living in the area, that I think we have every reason to be pleased with the manner and way in which the program is moving forward. One of the factors in that part of the country to considerably improve the total economic health of that region was the matter of getting further utilization, or making better utilization of our land. To that end the program was devised to encourage development of land for better pasture use or even for cropping use, and some 70,000, 80,000 acres of land have been cleared in this relatively short time in the Interlake, and farmers are taking crops off; they're growing better forage; our cattle production has increased considerably in that portion of the province, and I think all members will recognize that that's a most desirable trait when -- unfortunately I can't make the claim for the province or the cattle population of the province as a whole, but in that particular region, in the last four or five years, our cattle population has increased by some 136, 140 percent, so we have some rather significant gains. And this is the kind of thing that the program is, in fact, doing, not to mention the improved drainage works that are coming along, although I know that with some impatience from my Honourable Member from Fisher, who would like to see it advanced a little more rapidly, but again our difficulty is, we start at the mouth of these important streams whether it's the Fisher or the Icelandic River. But I think for those of us who are resident in the Interlake, we have to acknowledge that at least we are now, you know, getting the active participation of government in helping us to redevelop that area.

The significant portions of the program are the social aspects of the program. We've had some of the most successful manpower type courses, upgrading courses, farm management courses, a great number of these -- fishing courses and so forth, throughout the Interlake, and this constitutes a good part of the program. I think if the honourable member would await the report that my colleague the Minister of Agriculture would be bringing down shortly, or perhaps during the course of his estimates, he can deal with these matters in more detail.

He makes a question that he rose just at the latter point here, about whose responsibility of maintenance, bridge maintenance and so forth, it is on our provincial waterways. I'm

March 21, 1969

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.). . . assuming he was referring - I didn't catch the first part of his question - I'm assuming he was referring to our large waterways such as the Hespeler and so forth. These are provincial responsibilities, both the matter of bridge construction and the matter of maintenance, until such time that perhaps after our Premier has entered into a new tax-sharing arrangement with the municipalities or so forth, that some of these major responsibilities may in fact be shifted. But certainly the No. 3 provincial waterway drain is our responsibility, both maintenance and the construction of bridges.

The Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains, again I -- pardon me, just before I leave, the Honourable Member from Rhineland had a number of questions relative to Hydro, Hydro costs relative to interest rates and so forth. I'm not competent to answer these questions. My colleague, I believe, indicated that he would be prepared to answer those questions that he could, and I might also suggest to him of course, and as the Minister of Finance has suggested to him, that we will be having the utility people before us at committee stage and it would seem to me a rather appropriate time to delve into these matters at that time.

When the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains arose it was a little difficult for me to recognize whether I was still in the department that I am or whether in fact the suggestion had already taken place that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party suggested the other night. We were into turkeys and into potatoes and a few other things, and I admit that they do bring back a few memories from a few short years ago, and finally he got to fish. He did express interest in fish. I seem to have a difficulty with having marketing boards follow me through different portfolios and I will be presenting to you this marketing legislation on fish. I again make the general comment to the Member from Ethelbert Plains that there will be the widest opportunity to discuss the details of the fish marketing board legislation at that time. I don't have the Bill before me or the notes that I would have normally prepared to discuss that matter.

As the member is well aware, we in government are, and have been concerned and very much aware of the problems of predator control with respect to bears in his particular portion of the province. We may have some divergence as to how we should possibly handle or correct or improve this situation. I have a tendency, supported by the department, that rather than engage in any mass slaughter program which might solve the problem quickly - it can be done, we can hire helicopters and planes and shoot 400 bear or 500 bear overnight, but it's rather repulsive to me - I would rather, particularly when recreational use by those who like hunting perhaps can do the same job for me, and we receive a dual benefit here, that is providing a recreational outlet for those who enjoy this kind of hunting and at the same time helping to reduce the predator control problem in that area.

I'm not quite certain that we can accept the total responsibility that he is placing upon us, and indeed maybe my own colleague here from Roblin, with respect to the bears, because as both members are well aware, within the confines of the municipalities the municipalities have specific responsibility in this regard and a fair amount of latitude as to what they can do in terms of predator control. We do attempt to assist them as much as we can in the various programs that we have. The problem of course, and we recognize it, is the fact that you are adjacent to provincial parks or provincial lands which in a way act as a reservoir or breeding ground for the bears to come out of, and I think that resulting from meetings that we had in that area we're certainly prepared to sit down and work out some of the difficulties that we have. But I resist, at first chance at any rate, the suggestion that has been made that we involve ourselves in a mass indiscriminate slaughter program to rid us of this problem. I think we have not really fully explored all the other areas.

I should point out to the honourable member that just this week I've opened an early spring bear season in that part of the country, and one of our problems is to get more hunters actively participating in this sport. Many people that I've spoken to are unaware of the fact that bear is a big game animal that can be shot virtually any time of the year in Manitoba under our flexible regulations, and I know that perhaps if I speak to my honourable colleague the Minister of Tourism that he should make this fact known in his promotion programs in the American midwest or across the line, that again we can take the multi-use approach - a word that I'm afraid I'm going to hear a lot of - with respect to our resources, and rather than enter into indiscriminate extermination programs, provide a recreational outlet, provide a tourist dollar, provide a general economy out of - and making out of an adverse situation something that is of some benefit to the community as a whole. I'm certainly prepared to work, as I think

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.)... I've indicated to the group when I met with them in this fall or early winter.

He makes some further comments with respect to our handling of our timber quotas and timber resources. I think at best we have to recognize that our timber resources, our forestry in this province, require the most diligent and careful management. We, by no stretch of the imagination, can fool ourselves into believing that we are in the same situation as some of our other provinces, particularly in the east or west coasts with respect to our capability of producing timber, so that it behooves us to manage those resources that we have in the best way possible, and I know that there are some very exciting possibilities or developments that are going to take place in that portion of the province, particularly on the Duck and in the Swan River area, that the members of the House will be hearing about probably in very short order.

He goes on to discuss his drainage problems in his constituency, and of course my understanding and concern for farmers with respect to drainage is I think every bit as much as his. I would have to point out that he made a particular point too, that he is talking about drainage and the necessity of drainage in some of these new land cleared areas, that is the land development that is taking place in that part of the constituency. I know that there are many areas in the province, many arable farm lands in the province who are still on the waiting list. If I might say so, the Honourable Member from Rhineland, his land or his farming land is still -- we can't by any stretch of the imagination say we have completed our work in that area. What I'm trying to suggest is that there is possibly some priority of existing and established farmlands for us to complete our drainage problems in before we can bring the full brunt of our action or attention to some of these new lands that have been developed just recently within a year or two or three. It's a question of priorities.

Now my good friend and colleague from across yonder, the Member from Churchill, and I must say at the outset I'm pleased to see that the independent spirit which somehow dwells in the breast of those members from the north has not changed because of this to there. I mean he left us with the suggestion that he may not vote with his Party on a particular instance - my salary. Well there really isn't too much change. We were sometimes in doubt as to what might take place here from time to time, so that I make those remarks at the outset to those that he made to me before I attempt to answer any of his questions.

Unfortunately, I cannot take as lightly the other portion of my remarks because I am very concerned that it is irresponsible, to say the least, to impute and to attempt to arouse or to cast in an indiscriminating manner all kinds of dire predictions and results which he readily admits he doesn't know anything of.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well tell us.

MR. ENNS: I will tell you. Which he does admit he knows nothing of, to communities such as Churchill, Thompson or other areas that he's mentioned. Now there's no question, we all know what the situation is at South Indian Lake, and I'm referring specifically to his remarks and he started at the mouth of the river at Churchill. I tell you now, and I told you last night, that the town water supply of Churchill is not in jeopardy and will not be in jeopardy, and that they will have adequate water supply in the Town of Churchill for a community 100 times that size with sewer and water.

MR. CHERNIACK: Prove it. Where's the proof? How do we know?

MR. ENNS: Take the words of your honourable Leader - "trust me".

MR. CHERNIACK: No. Let's have the information.

MR. ENNS: This is a statement of fact. It happens to be so obvious that it's inconceivable. I know the honourable members opposite would like to impute all kinds of motives on those of us sitting on this side of the House, and they have done so from time to time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. ENNS: gentlemen to impute upon us that we would unilaterally allow a community that we hope, particularly with recent federal announcement and joint federal-provincial programs and so forth where we are embarking on a multi-million dollar perhaps sewage and water program in that area, that we would consider for one moment the curtailment of the supply of water to this community. Gentlemen, again it's a matter that we can discuss at the time the Bill is before us.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Do you have any expert opinion to support your statement, and if so,

March 21, 1969

(MR. CHERNIACK Cont'd.) . . . could that not be made available to us to ease our minds?

MR. ENNS: I don't have the notes before me, but to the best of my knowledge the half million people of Winnipeg are supplied by some 400 cubic feet per second through our conduit from Shoal Lake. There will be some 4,000 cubic feet per second going downstream the Churchill River after . . . development has taken place.

MR. CHERNIACK: Do you have any supporting material?

MR. ENNS: Most certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could we have that available for us and for the people in Churchill?

MR. ENNS: You can do better than that, you can get it from the mouths of the experts at the time the committee sits.

MR. LYON: He just told you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Told us what? His expert opinion?

MR. ENNS: So, Mr. Chairman, again I'm attempting to stay within the confines - and I know your task is difficult in keeping the committee to the subject matter before us, namely my estimates - let me then go back to the particular comments that my honourable friend the Member from Churchill made with respect to the estimates.

He made specific reference to mine inspectors and the need for mine inspectors to be located in the north. I might inform the honourable member that I had a pleasant luncheon last night, or yesterday, with members of the union people from the northern mining communities at which we discussed at considerable length some of the programs or some of the same thoughts that he has brought up here. There are some problems related to having a mine inspector on site; it's not quite the same as having a mine inspector in the larger areas. There's a problem of coercion from both sides, and I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Churchill would be the first one to suggest that it would be difficult for a mine inspector to resist this within the confines of a one company town situation or what have you. But I suggest to you that the department is concerned about this. I think that we are cognizant of the rash of accidents that have taken place of late. I'm sorry to hear that these have taken place. It always has to be a concern not only to me but also to the Minister of Labour, and I'm quite prepared to discuss in concert with the Minister of Labour some of these specific matters. I think, Mr. Chairman, I'll resume my resumé later on.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could take advantage of a minute to table the Return called for by the Honourable Member for Lakeside of the salaries which are, as of March 20, attaching to senior permanent positions in the government, including all deputy ministers.

MR. LYON: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has made progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 12:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.