

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 15, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 40 students of the Manitoba School for the Deaf. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. Reeves of the Manitoba School for the Deaf and Mr. Don Krause, Mr. Fred Tucker, and Mr. Steve Leavitt, of the Saskatoon School for the Deaf. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

We also have 85 students of Grade 8 standing of the Lincoln College. These students are under the direction of Messrs. Zacharias, Bedar Wilson and Mrs. Nowak. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. There are two on the Order Paper the honourable members aren't present. Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Riel.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Can he advise the House whether the government has any information on or can provide information on a report done for the Federal Department of Indian Affairs Northern Development regarding the Cross Lake Community which indicates that the flooding of the community will be at the rate of 80 percent of the active area, it would be subject to flooding of 80 percent of the active area of the community periodically?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I do believe the question is stating an opinion and in that context it really isn't fair. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, if the question is in order I'd like to attempt to reply by simply indicating to my honourable friend that the information that I have in that respect is that any potential flooding conditions at the community of Cross Lake are not envisaged to be of any significance, that is to say, over and beyond what can be contemplated as natural flooding, and of course that is something which very quickly becomes imponderable. Insofar as the direct measurable effect of Lake Winnipeg regulation is concerned relative to flooding at the community of Cross Lake, I am advised that there is no significant such effect. There's been some concern raised with respect to the so called development line, or flood line, but that, Sir, I'm advised has to do with an effort to demarcate a line below which any development or building might be subject to flooding damage on a frequency of once in 1000 years. And so therefore, Sir, I think that my honourable friend to, to satisfy his curiosity with more precision would be advised to ask the chairman of Hydro at the Utility meeting next Monday or Tuesday.

MR. CRAIK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have access to or a knowledge of the report done by Van Dillen & Company for D . . . with regards to the Cross Lake Community?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, such a report, if in fact such a report has been forwarded, I would assume would be in the possession of Manitoba Hydro, and I will make inquiry.

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

MR. I. H. (Izzy) ASPER (Leader of the Liberal Party)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines. Has the interdepartmental task force that he said he would be setting up to study the Kierans Report, has that task force been formed?

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Not formally yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ASPER: Will the Minister be advising the House of the members of the task force once it's been established.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. ASPER: Will the task force be reporting to the Premier, or to the Minister of Mines, or to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet, or to this House? Will this House receive that report?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the task force will report to the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can he indicate to the House what the present population figure is of the community at Cross Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. RON MCBRYDE (Minister of Northern Affairs)(The Pas): Not offhand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct another question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister tell us what information he had, or on what information he based his statements on December - that he made on December 14th in his news release at that time, that indicated that the winter roads facilities for the hauling of freight to the north were nearing fully operational stage and is considerably further advanced than ever before at this time of the year?

MR. MCBRYDE: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of roads and some of them were completed ahead of normal schedule; some of them were completed behind normal schedule. All of them were completed, although the warm weather has caused the closing down of at least one of the roads.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. JEAN ALLARD (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs. Will he personally this weekend investigate the winter hauling setup in Ilford and specifically, the question of whether there is adequate machinery to do the hauling and not whether there are adequate roads, but whether the supply of machinery and . . . residents is adequate to do the work that is to be done?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Affairs has assumed the responsibility in the hopes of assisting northern residents by lowering costs in their communities; and we have assumed the responsibility for the construction of winter roads and maintenance of winter roads, and have contracted out with various persons and firms for this work, and done some directly ourselves. The freighting on the winter roads is the responsibility of the freighter who has the contract to haul the goods in. In the case of the Ilford road, the road is open and has been open for a number of days and we have been urging the freighters to hurry up and get all their equipment in there and get on the road with the goods. I understand they are doing this. My Assistant Deputy Minister will be in Ilford if not tomorrow then the day after, and we have a man on the spot there full-time, Mr. Speaker, to try and make sure things keep moving on that road.

MR. ENNS: A further question, Mr. Speaker, directed at the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can he indicate to us at this time the number of air contracts, or contracts let for the hauling by air freight supplies that are not now being able to be moved by the road method?

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I think I understand the full import of the question; if I missed some of it maybe he could ask a supplementary. Again the Department of Northern Affairs has assumed the responsibility for the construction of air strips and of winter ice strips so that the very largest planes could get in to these communities. I am aware on an incidental basis of a number of the air contracts that have taken place. I know that a number of companies have been hauling to various communities, and also which strips have been completed and are operational. I talked to one of the freighters yesterday in concern to the Island Lake Road and if the weather doesn't turn cold there will be some supplies that will have to be flown into that area. But the freighter is making his own arrangements to supply those goods by air freight.

MR. ENNS: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs, again relating to a statement that he made on December 1st from his own Information Services group. Can he indicate, or can he give the House any indication at this time that what he told us on December 1st that perhaps the cost of freighting the goods into the northern communities could be reduced from the 7.17 cents normally charged by the private haulers, would be reduced to perhaps as low as 3 - 1/2 cents as indicated in his release. Can

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) he - will the actual cost of the goods now being supplied to the north, is the cost being reduced?

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, with regards to that specific question the figures were quoted in that news release, were quoted in the possibilities of the road from Hole River or Wanipigow to Island Lake area, to the communities in the Island Lake area. When the road was opened it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, and again it's a contract between the freighters and the people who want the supplies hauled, that the rates were coming in at about half the cost of previous freight hauls. However, Mr. Speaker, with the unseasonably warm weather and if there's a necessity to haul in by air freight, then our original estimates of air freight costs would have been the same cost by air freight as last year's road haul costs. So that means that if there is some need to haul in by air freight, the cost will not be half the cost that it was last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Mines Minister. Can he tell us or can he indicate to the House more detail on the structure of the task force that he's establishing to study the Kierans Report indicating when the report will be - rather when the committee will be structured and indicate to the House whether or not he intends to make that report available to the members of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't indicate.

MR. ASPER: Is it the intention of the government to the Minister of Mines to make the Task Force report available to this House?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to make that commitment at this time. The Task Force Report to the government will be in the nature of a departmental report to the responsible political authorities. As to whether such a document is or is not released is, always has been, in the discretion of the political authority.

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister. Will the Task Force be composed exclusively of civil servants or will outside experts serve as members such as in the case of the Task Force on Post Secondary Education.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the intention was to set up an internal administrative task force for the purpose of considering a specific document which made recommendations to the government for mineral resources policy. It is not the intention to set up another wide-ranging commission to consider that policy but an internal task force to consider a specific proposal. What will be announced, and what will be made available to the House, and to the people of Manitoba of course, is the position of the government with respect to the Task Force once such a position is arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Northern Affairs, somewhat similar to the one I asked. In view of the very lateness of the season and the skyrocketing cost of an emergency airlift, would he guarantee to the House perhaps not only his Deputy, his Assistant Deputy Minister, but at least his Deputy, perhaps his own presence in Ilford, because the fact that little of the freight has been hauled in Ilford and there is something very funny going on?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, it's sort of in slight relationship to winter roads but I did have an appointment with my lawyer for Saturday; it's indirectly related to that. Mr. Speaker, if there are problems that are not solved or straightened out by my Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Thompson, and his staff that are on the spot there now, then I would certainly go up there and make sure but I have full confidence in them to straighten this matter out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Labour. In view of an announcement by the Ontario Government that it will impose compulsory arbitration to end the elevator strike joining B. C. and Quebec, would the Minister make a statement to the House with respect to the prospects of ending this strike, elevator strike in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to make an announcement insofar as the position of the Minister of Labour in Manitoba is concerned in respect of this strike. I just two minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, was in telephone communication with Ontario, and that is the reason I was delayed in getting into the House, in connection with this strike.

The Prime Minister of Ontario has indicated that he will bring about compulsory legislation introducing compulsory arbitration in respect of this strike when the Ontario Legislature resumes its deliberations Tuesday next.

I was speaking to the Minister of Labour for Alberta by telephone a few moments ago and there is provision apparently in Ontario, in Alberta Legislation for compulsory arbitration, which isn't the case insofar as Manitoba, is not now, and has never been, in respect of strikes dealing with - between union and management in areas such as the elevators.

The union, so I am informed, were prepared to undertake voluntary arbitration and binding with management insofar as the elevator strike was concerned. This was rejected by management. Management have stated that they were prepared to enter into voluntary arbitration, providing it did not interfere with management rights. What management rights in this particular incident or case would be I leave to my honourable friends opposite, and I would suggest that by that and the attitude of management it would mean providing --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I bow to the intelligence of the Member for Lakeside. If he doesn't want to hear the story then I'm prepared, I am prepared to sit down and not answer the question --(Interjection)-- All right it's agreed that I should sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West. Order, please. A supplementary by the Member for Assiniboia?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would be able to tell what is the total value of construction projects that have been delayed because of the strike in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I would suggest to my honourable friend from Assiniboia that if that is his only interest in this particular case, I suggest to him that he supply or produce an Order for Return asking for that specific. I was attempting, Mr. Speaker, before the interjection of Lakeside to give to the House the information that I think that the House should receive in respect of the elevator construction . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary. I thank the Minister for the information. Can he tell us the number of workers that are affected in Manitoba?

MR. PAULLEY: According to the records that I have 110, and incidentally the lowest strike record of any province except P. E. I. in the whole of the Dominion of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Mines. The Ontario Minister of Mines is reported in today's Globe and Mail as favouring the calling in the near future of an interprovincial conference of Mines Ministers to determine a national minerals policy. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister is: has he had any communications or any conversations with his counterparts in other provinces about the calling of such a conference to determine a national minerals policy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Mines Ministers of Canada met at the end of August, or the beginning of September, in that isolated island of capitalism in western Canada, the Province of Alberta; they then met, the Mines Ministers, in Toronto in November of this year. At the urgings I believe of many ministers, including myself, there has been a desire of the Mines Ministers to meet in a form other than the annual Mines Ministers Conference which, although they are very useful things, are heavily industry oriented -- I'm not saying that as a criticism I'm saying that as a fact -- and I presume that the Honourable the Minister of Mines in Ontario is now accepting the same attitude towards this question that I have been pursuing in the last 15 months. I don't believe that he has been in touch with me but I haven't seen my mail for the last two days for reasons which are obvious.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In view of the deep concern and distress that I found on a four-day visit to Ilford and Split Lake and Cross Lake and Thompson over the weekend on the question of the effects of the hydro development,

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. ALLARD cont'd.) could he tell the people of the north and the members of this House exactly what the government's policy is going to be in terms of possible compensation for certainly South Indian and Split, Nelson, Cross and Norway, and even the people of Thompson, who have some concern about what might happen . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there are of course a number of parts to that question, and I may say that they're all important of course. I believe, if I understand my honourable friend correctly, he is referring in the first instance to Cross Lake, the community of Cross Lake again, and Norway House, and the concern with respect to a development line or hydro line, floodline so-called. I can advise my honourable friend, as I tried to in response to the Member for Riel, that the so-called development line is of meaning only in the sense that it is intended as a guideline to the community below which level or line there ought not to be construction of any structure unless they were prepared to face flood damage of an estimated frequency of once in 1,000 years. And it has, you know, therefore little practical meaning. Perhaps the easiest way, Sir, is to simply indicate to the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland that the information given me from Manitoba Hydro is that the mean monthly level, the mean monthly level of Cross Lake at Cross Lake would be affected by three inches, three inches, and hopefully therefore in layman's terms, Mr. Speaker, it would be assumed that if the mean monthly level would be affected by three inches, then whatever would normally be constructed in that community would be constructed in any case bearing in mind that three inches, it should be three inches higher. And therefore it's of not much practical concern, Mr. Speaker, really. Now again I invite my honourable friend the Member for Rupertsland to pursue this specific at the Utility Meeting, whether he be a member of Utilities Committee or not. He can be there certainly as a member of the Assembly to pursue that point.

Now with respect to the much larger question of compensation, and I'm getting somewhat apprehensive about the rules, Sir, about the length of reply because the Member for Lakeside might object, but if I am given another 30 seconds, another 30 seconds, I would simply indicate to the Member for Rupertsland that it is certainly policy, self-evident and stated formally in the past, that the extent to which there is an impingement or a loss of revenue, of livelihood to residents at or around Southern Indian Lake, or any other part of the whole Nelson River development, the extent of loss of livelihood or reduction of amount of livelihood would be quantified and compensation would be paid, will be paid, in accordance with a formula in the case of fish and fur not unlike the formula used in agricultural stabilization policy. That's about the quickest way I can summarize it. Records exist for making the quantification of differential, Sir, and so that is a matter of clear policy.

With respect to any structural damage, compensation would be paid as well pursuant to adjudication or arbitration through county court mechanism or the same mechanism as applied in the case of Red River Floodway construction and the expropriation of 533 properties, etc., etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, I'd ask the First Minister if it is true then that what the line really means is that residents are advised as they've flooded once in the last 1,000 years, they may flood once in the next 1,000 years. Is that correct?

MR. SCHREYER: It is basically correct, in fact essentially correct.

MR. ALLARD: It is only advisory; it is not . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. SCHREYER: That is precisely correct.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs in his capacity as Minister reporting for Autopac. Is the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation going into the towing business, the tow truck business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister -- does the Minister have knowledge of a contract awarded to Stern GMC Trucks Limited for the supply of tow trucks to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear the answer.

MR. PAWLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I heard the answer, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House what business these tow trucks will solicit?

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the tow trucks in question, two in fact, that were awarded by way of an award from Stern Trucks to the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation just recently, are involved in internal towing involving the Panet Road salvage centre. Specifically they are not involved in police calls.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he advise the House whether he has set any meetings with the Council of Nursing Home Associations in reply to their request for such meetings over government policy, specifically over the question of admission control which is one of their big concerns.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, there was a meeting scheduled this morning at 10:00 o'clock. It had to be cancelled by both parties unfortunately. It's rescheduled, I believe, for next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Mines Minister. Will the task force that he's establishing on the Kierans Report, will it hold some form of hearing, or public hearings, with the possibility existing of the cross-examination of Mr. Kierans and the presentation of submissions to the Task Force which has been set up to advise the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that is not the nature of the type of task force that the government was intending to set up. It was an internal task force to give advice to the government on the Kierans Report. May I advise the honourable member that in the past three years since I have been Mines Minister I have had conservatively speaking, to use a bad word, at least -- well a dozen meetings with members of the mining industry at the private level, the university level, and the public level, and that there has been to my understanding more consultation and willingness of government to listen and discuss these things with that group than there has ever been in the past in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. ASPER: To the Mines Minister, Mr. Speaker. If the Task Force doesn't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The question is hypothetical.

MR. ASPER: In view of the statement that Ontario has called for a national conference for the development of a new national energy policy, will the Government of Manitoba place before this Assembly its position for debate by way of White Paper or policy document prior to attending such a conference so that that policy can be debated?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Mines Ministers have met once a year for the past 25 years I believe, maybe 22 years. They have also met consistently at various other occasions other than at their annual meeting; they have continually discussed national and provincial minerals policy. I can recall no time in the past when it was done or suggested that prior to a Mines Ministers conference, or a Health Ministers conference, or a Finance Ministers conference, that there be tabled the Manitoba position so that it may be debated in the Assembly. But what has occurred, Mr. Speaker, and apparently the honourable member needs some assistance as to when he can debate matters within the Assembly, may I therefore advise him that he has an opportunity to debate the mines policy of this government during the Throne Speech debate, during the Budget Speech debate, during the debate on Estimates, going into Estimates, by Private Members' Resolutions, and on other occasions, which I don't need to tell the honourable member because there are some debating secrets which I would like to keep for myself.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Mines. In view of the fact that he has said that the Government of Manitoba is in the process of formulating an energy policy and a mines policy, can he indicate to this House whether that policy will be made available to the public or to this Legislature prior to the conclusion of this government's term of office?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that if a new policy is reached with regard to mines that that policy would be announced. The fact is that the existing policy was announced

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) on previous occasions within the House, without the House, and, for my honourable friend's memory I put it again on the table, to the honourable members during discussion on the Minister of Mines' estimates. That policy then becomes a matter of public debate; and so that my honourable friend will have some idea of what the democratic process is all about, it is debated in this House in the many ways which I have previously suggested, and then it is debated, Mr. Speaker, at a thing that occurs every four years that they call an election campaign where the honourable members go out to the people and say, this is what we believe, and I presume that the Honourable Member for Wolseley will go out and say this is what they believe, and the public will choose for the next period of time, which can last as long as five years but which may be terminated at any period in between there if the government loses the support of the members of the parliamentary assembly, or if the First Minister for reasons known to himself decides to ask the Lieutenant-Governor to call a new election, that becomes the position of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. Before I risk my neck by returning to my barbershop, will the Attorney-General explain why his department will not prosecute the City of Winnipeg for refusing to comply with a provincial statute . . . the Barbers Act? --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General. Order, please. --(Interjection)--

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, after the answers have been given from the members opposite from their seats, I am now prepared to indicate to the honourable member that I too risked my neck when I had a haircut but recently and I know the concern of the barbers in connection with this matter. However my department did not refuse to launch prosecution but they recommended to me that it would be preferable if the Barbers Association themselves brought this action before the court.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage -- supplementary?

MR. TURNBULL: I have another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary?

MR. TURNBULL: No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Northern Affairs. With respect to the construction of the winter road system in the north, is it not a fact that the conditions for construction were more favourable this fall, or last fall, than for many years in the past?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: The answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is yes and no. In the early part of the season with the cold weather and little snow the conditions were quite favourable; in the last three weeks the conditions have been very unfavourable.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise the House as to when the Hole River Island Lake Road was available for travel and what was the approximate cost of building it?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would consult with his friend, our mutual friend, he might get some information. I can't remember the exact date that that road was opened, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister undertake to supply the information either during the question period or during his estimates?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I'll provide the honourable member with the information as to the total number of winter roads built, the cost of those winter roads, and the dates on which they were opened.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Labour could inform us as to whether or not the elevator workers are willing to submit their case to compulsory -- or binding arbitration rather?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. PAULLEY: I trust on this occasion that the Honourable Acting Leader of the Conservative Party will not prevent --(Interjection)-- Yes, you'll get the answer and you won't like it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable gentleman just state the answer.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will. And as I indicated I'm sure that the Conservative Party of Manitoba will not like the answer.

A MEMBER: Just give the answer.

MR. PAULLEY: Will you listen? The unions were prepared in Ontario to agree to voluntary binding arbitration providing that all of the points in dispute were under consideration but --(Interjection)-- Oh of course, I know how you stand in matters of this nature. But Mr. Speaker, the companies were not prepared to accept voluntary arbitration because as Mr. Tuff -- I'm not sure whether he's resident in Canada or in New Yprk, U. S. A. -- Mr. Tuff being the Chief Negotiator for the Elevator Construction Industry, stated that the companies will not permit arbitration or even collective bargaining on management rights; the companies turned down voluntary arbitration because they would not risk losing these issues. Apparently now, the Prime Minister of the Conservative administration in Ontario is going to impose, by legislation after the Session starts, which could effectively agree to the position taken by the United States dominated company that would not infringe upon such rights as the employees having an opportunity to say what their particular involvement in a collective agreement should be, and Mr. Tuff says that the union's main conditions were that all unresolved issues be subject to arbitration, and that several court charges pending be dropped, but the union is determined to preserve its members' jobs instead of prefabrication in the United States of America of elevators, the position that the unions in Canada have taken that their jobs are at stake, and in particular the members of the union in Western Canada, including Manitoba, are determined that their jobs will be protected; that they will have an opportunity under a collective agreement to decide whether the elevator components are made in the United States of America as against the jobs for Canadians, and that is the issue at stake at the present time. And if my honourable friends opposite would agree that the position of the union is untenable and that the construction component should be assembled in the United States, then I ask them to stand up in this House and so declare.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to indicate that a question, it is desirable that they be answered but they should not be debated, and I would ask all members of the Assembly to adhere to the rules in this regard. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Okay my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. How many senior citizens have been prevented from occupying high rise senior citizens' homes built by MHRC as a result of the elevator operator companies refusing to negotiate in good faith with their employees?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Minister of Labour could indicate whether or not the employees involved in this labour dispute belong to an international union?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Are you answering, or do you want an answer from me? You know, Mr. Speaker, sometimes my honourable friend from Lakeside there proposes a question -- you don't want to hear the answer? I'll give you the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would request that all members conduct themselves with some decorum. If they have further questions, they'll have the opportunity to ask them. If they wish to hear an answer and I would like to hear it also, I would appreciate if there would be no

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) interjections. I have enough difficulty with the static on this earbug without the remainder of the assembly giving me more. I would appreciate if everyone would conduct themselves gentlemanly and with decorum. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question of the honourable Acting Leader of the Conservative Party and I am pleased to inform him and the Assembly that the employees belong to the International Union . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside state his matter of privilege?

MR. ENNS: Yes, my point of privilege Mr. Speaker, is the incorrect reference to my person. I am the Deputy Leader of the Conservative Party.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I apologize to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I thought he was the Acting Leader of the Conservative Party and I withdraw reference to him being an actor, and suggest that his definition of his occupation may be correct as being the deputy leader of the party . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: My answer Mr. Speaker, is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson state his point of order.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is, that when the Minister is asked a question he should answer it instead of giving a lecture to the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Honourable Member for Thompson if I had of been allowed to give the answer, I would have, without interjection, and for his benefit and all other members of this House, I inform the House that the Union is represented by an organization by name, the International Union of Elevator Constructors, and that I am informed that the Union and its representatives in Canada have complete national jurisdiction over their operations in Canada without any imposition from the United States of America, which in my opinion is not the case with the construction companies themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour, and ask him if he realizes that his intemperate outburst has now cleared the gallery of Grade 4 students who were sitting there just a moment ago and . . . will probably receive another letter of censure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The question is very improper, I would hope the honourable member would think the next time he says it. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to questions asked earlier today by the Honourable the Member for Rupertsland and the Honourable the Member for Riel relative to Cross Lake elevations, I have given the information as best I can within the time permitted under the rules but if honourable members would like to have the full hydrographic data pertaining to Cross Lake levels -- I can't table this document, Mr. Speaker, but I would simply inform the two honourable members that if they requested, I believe, through the Department of Mines and Resources, and/or Manitoba Hydro, it will be made available. It is called "Program for Regulation of Lake Winnipeg". It has hydrographic data re Cross Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: My question to the First Minister is with reference to the report which he's holding up here which I had examined when he answered a previous question and I believe -- the question I would like to direct to him, is not the increase in level that he said is three inches shows on the hydrograph as being one foot? But the questions earlier --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, the report is right here and I spent the last ten minutes reading it -- but the question Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct further is, would the government undertake on behalf of the Members of the Legislature to obtain the report from the Federal Government that has been done with regard to the transportation relocation in Cross Lake, in view of the proposed flooding, or water controls, and provide it to them so that we might use it, if it's possible,

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) for the hearings next week.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, most definitely. If this document I have just referred to has not already been made a public document, and I believe it has been; I was merely informing my honourable friends that if they don't have a copy, or not one conveniently available, that they could request it. I believe it's already, however, been distributed.

With respect to this other report now that my honourable friend refers to, of course we will ask for the report and once we have the report I can assure my honourable friend, they will have the report. It's as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): I have a question for the Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister inform the House as to whether or not pensioners, old age pensioners, receiving provincial welfare will be getting the full benefit of the announced federal increase in pensions, or whether the provincial allowances will be decreased to some degree?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd rather take this question as notice and be more precise in the answer.

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked me a question regarding the Unity Bank and location of its head office, or an office in the Province of Manitoba. I believe he inferred that I had given a commitment to meet with its Board of Directors. I have now checked Hansard and I gave no such commitment. However, I can inform the members of the House that several months before the question was asked in this House that my deputy minister, acting on my behalf, was in touch with the shareholders of the bank during the time of hearings before the Federal Committee on Banking, while it was before the Federal House, in an effort to persuade them to have its head office in the Province of Manitoba. Unfortunately our proposals met with no encouragement, they were to of no avail, and in the meantime they have been incorporated with head office in Toronto. They have announced, the company has announced, that it plans to open five branches in its initial year of operation, and I believe Winnipeg was mentioned as one of the possible locations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. When did the Minister last meet with the executive of the Manitoba Mental Health Research Foundation, and did he at that time, or subsequently, make any commitment to give them part or all of the \$300,000 grant that they had asked for?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not met with the Board of Governors. I had my deputy minister meet with them, no commitments were made for any funds.

MR. TURNBULL: Could the Minister give the House a reason why no commitment was made?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all the estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development will be discussed in this House; and secondly, it is definitely a matter of policy for the government to decide.

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

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Industry. In view of the fact that Unity Bank announced the preference for locating its head office in western Canada and subsequently met with Premier Lougheed of Alberta, can he explain why he, or the First Minister of this province, didn't meet with the directors of Unity bank in order to try to convince them to come to Manitoba?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that type of a question requires an answer. I think we have made sufficient efforts to interest them in the Province of Manitoba but they have obviously had their minds made up. I understand the principal shareholders are members of the Liberal Party; maybe my honourable friend opposite might have had a little more influence than myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister. Order, please. The Honourable

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Member for Wolseley state his matter of privilege? Order, please.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege is this: I don't know who the directors of the Unity Bank are and I'm the Leader of the -- excuse me, excuse me -- and I'm the Leader of the Liberal Party, and if the Minister intends to suggest that members of the Liberal Party guide the destiny of Unity Bank, then it is incumbent upon him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. ASPER: . . . to prove that statement.

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

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as I recall the question, not the alleged point of privilege, the question was, why did I not meet with the directors of Unity Bank? The question was why the Minister of Industry or I did not meet with them. I believe that the Minister has met with representatives of the Unity Bank as he has clearly indicated earlier today. The Leader of the Liberal Party asks why I did not meet with directors of the Unity Bank as the Premier of Alberta met with them apparently. Now we understand that the Unity Bank has headquartered itself in Toronto as all good banks in Canada have done historically and it's -- the question is entirely academic, because had I met with them I am sure I would have met with about the same success as Premier Lougheed has done. The bank is not in Edmonton, it is headquartered in Toronto.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister. Is that the policy then of his government that he doesn't believe he can . . . so he won't try.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is definitely not. But the Minister of Industry and Commerce has met with representatives of the Unity Bank, officials of the department have met with certain representatives of the Unity Bank, but what is the point of the question, Sir, since it is admitted that in other provinces in western Canada such meetings took place and the Unity Bank, true to form with other Canadian banks, has headquartered in Toronto, no doubt on James Street or Bay Street.

A MEMBER: Like all true Liberals, eh!

MR. ASPER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry, since I may not have understood his answer. Could he tell us how many meetings took place between he and the president or the directors of Unity Bank?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in my answer very specifically what took place and I needn't repeat that, but I would also inform the honourable member, and reiterate, that while he asked the question last year, the bank had already been established with its head office in Toronto, it was already incorporated into its Charter, so the question was three months out of date at that time.

MR. ASPER: A supplementary. The reason I asked this question is because I thought we've had two answers, one from the First Minister and one from the Minister of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member not debate the issue but ask the question.

MR. ASPER: The question is, did meetings take place, and if they took place, how many meetings?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister inform the House whether he would consider issuing a temporary licence to operate a personal care home in Ninette Sanatorium?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: Not at this stage, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McKELLAR: . . . question. When can this House expect the tabling of the Clarkson Commission report on Mental Health?

MR. TOUPIN: Fairly soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. McGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Having been apprised of his willingness at all times to hold meetings on subjects of public

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) concern, would the Minister agree to meet a delegation from the Brandon School Board on a subject of public concern, namely the tender price for the Brandon Vocational High School some time within the next two or three weeks at his convenience?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN MANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I had met with the Brandon School Board on many a previous occasion. I'm well aware with the details of this particular matter. The Brandon School Division at the time of the letting of the contract was advised that the Department of Education through the Public Schools Finance Board will support to the extent of the lowest tender which appeared to have been proper. However, in its wisdom the Brandon School Division chose to accept the second lowest tender rather than the lowest one; and therefore the board was advised that if that is its decision, which is within its jurisdiction of course the question of awarding of tenders, therefore Brandon School Division will have to find ways and means of paying the difference. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that nothing further appears to have happened to have in any way changed this situation I am not all that certain as to what could be accomplished by any further -- by a further meeting or meetings.

MR. MCGILL: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister. In view of the fact that the Brandon School Board takes the position that the lowest tender was invalid, would the Minister not be prepared to discuss the subject with them at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is really argumentative. The Honourable Member for Morris.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I don't know how that particular question could be argumentative. He's simply asking if the Minister would be prepared to meet with them under new circumstances.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the honourable member will look at Hansard he will find out that there was a qualification placed in the question which makes it argumentative in my opinion. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I ask you to take particular note of some of the answers that are given that are far more argumentative than the questions that are being asked.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I appreciate the honourable member's concern and I can agree that possibly this is taking place. I would also assist the honourable member in helping me so that both the questions and the answers could be monitored so that they would all conform with our rules. I cannot monitor all of them totally. I must have the co-operation of all the members. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable First Minister on the point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For this particular occasion, and for future reference for the orderly conduct of this House, the Member for Morris contends that if a question is ruled out of order because it is argumentative, and Beauchesne does make reference to questions being ruled out of order for reason of being argumentative, he suggests that there is therefore a corollary to that that certain answers are to be ruled out of order for being argumentative, and there is nothing in the rules nor in citations of Beauchesne that I am aware of, that bears on that point. So if the matter could be taken under advisement, perhaps it is a point worth further elaboration at some future sitting date of this House.

ORAL QUESTIONS (cont'd)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Yes Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services and ask him when are the people of Vita going to get some definitive answers on their request which they submitted to your department over two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. TOUPIN: What requests, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GIRARD: The people of Vita, Mr. Speaker, requested consideration of building an extended care home and the Minister should be well aware of that.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is well aware of many requests from that area and all over the Province of Manitoba. Pertaining to the extended care home, it is under active review.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a supplementary question and ask the Minister approximately how much time the active review will be necessary?

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to yourself and to the honourable member who is asking the question, the request was made, I hazard to say at least ten years before we came in office. - - (Interjections) - - In answer, the people of the board that's composed in that area will receive an answer as soon as it is possible.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Could he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Could the Minister confirm or deny that the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood has asked for over \$90,000 of payment for construction of certain winter roads which were not authorized by previous contract or agreement?

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Northern Affairs has entered into a two - - three contract with the Me Ke Se Construction which is associated with the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood; and we are discussing with them also the possibility of work on some roads that were tractor train roads or are tractor train roads, bringing them up to standard where they could become a winter truck road.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: I have a question for the First Minister. Does he have word for members of the House with regard to Mr. Kierans presenting a - - discussion of his brief to the Economic Development Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I did convey the request that was implicit in my honourable colleague's question of several days ago. It's my understanding that Mr. Kierans will be in Winnipeg today, later today, and there will be some effort made to ascertain when he might be available. Of course there is also the necessity of trying to so schedule committees of this House so that we can proceed with sort of required and pressing House business, to make an effort to try and reconcile those two conflicting desires and requirements.

MR. GONICK: I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Resources. Has the Manitoba Federal Study Board initiated studies on the life style cultural values social and economic cost benefits and other aspects referred to - - in the terms of reference of the Study Board. Has that program been initiated yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The Chairman, barring any difference with regard to the actual words used by the honourable member, the Study Board is embarked on programs within the terms of reference of the Study Board with regard to social implications. Now just at what stage this has reached, I am unable to say but I can assure the honourable member that my impression is that the Study Board is moving on that particular phase of the study.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that an Order of the House do issue for return showing:

1. How many applications have been received by the Department of Labour for Remembrance Day work permits for each of the preceding three years, 1972, 71, 70?
2. How many Remembrance Day work permits have been issued by the Department of Labour for each of the preceding three years, 1972, 71, 70?
3. For each permit and application during the preceding three years, provide
 - a) location of business of applicant
 - b) type of business of applicant

ORDERS OF THE DAY - ORDERS FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept this request.

MR. SPEAKER: So ordered. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call the second reading of the bill which is on the Order Paper please.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 2, An Act to amend The Garage Keepers Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 2 is a relatively short Act and the questions of principle contained therein are relatively straightforward. The bill provides that a county court judge may extend the time for registering a claim of lien beyond the 20 days that is now provided in the Act. This therefore will provide flexibility in the otherwise rigid timing that is presently prescribed for the registration of liens. To this extent it will facilitate the garage keepers in securing their lien.

Further provisions make it possible for a person who has an automobile with a garage keeper to recover and take possession of the car upon his paying into court the amount of the claim that the garage keeper is making. Thus it will be possible for an individual who disputes the amount of the bill that a garage keeper may present him with to get recovery of his vehicle without admitting to the amount claimed. It will then be up to the garage keeper to commence action to recover the amount of his claim within 30 days. This again provides therefore for reasonable protection both of the garage keeper, who has a right, a garage keeper's lien, and also affords some reasonable bargaining power on the part of the individual owner of the car who might otherwise have to submit to full payment of the claim in order to get his vehicle and then bring an action in court if he disputed the amount of the claim. We think that this will work as a greater measure of equity in favour of both the garage keeper and the owner of the vehicle because there have been situations where there have been very, very serious hardships occurred without I'm sure any ill intent on the part of the garage keeper. Honest garage keepers have nothing to fear by this amendment to the legislation which will preserve their rights of lien but afford an individual owner the right of repossession providing he pays the money into court.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Riel that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable - - (Interjection) - - Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 82 (a) (1). The Honourable Leader - Liberal Party.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to continue the thread of the argument I was making two or three days ago when we ran out of time, and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I recognize that this subject seems to provoke considerable controversy and debate and some emotion perhaps, and that for my part, Mr. Chairman, I shall try to co-operate with you in hearing the debate through.

I had said, and I had dealt with the misinterpretation that I felt had been put on the letter that the Premier had tabled from Cass Booy and we had moved from there to the comment by the Minister of Mines that he was either upset or disappointed, or did not relish or encourage the idea that staff of government should be in some way able to participate in the debates in this House through having their words spoken by Opposition members, or something to that effect, Mr. Chairman. And I might say that it is a sorry state when members, or rather employees, or staff of government, become so frustrated that they find that they have to communicate, having spent many years in government service, and find that so many things are happening that are inconsistent with what they believe are in the best interest of the province. That may very well be, Mr. Chairman, the reason that the people have been prompted to speak openly, more openly, than they might otherwise with Opposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we engaged in quite an exchange the other night and the Minister has taken a considerable amount of time explaining the reason for the lack of presence of Dr. Cass Booy on the Water Commission, and I'm sure he would want, Dr. Cass Booy to have the broadest opportunity to express his point of view, as he says he is doing, and therefore I would encourage him to invite Dr. Cass Booy to the Public Utility Committee hearings and to be permitted to testify and make a presentation to it. This will certainly be raised on Monday. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister will deal with that in one of his frequent responses on this debate. The subject of whether or not he will, or that the government will permit, or the committee will be allowed to have not only the Chairman of Hydro, but those who take a different view than the Chairman of Hydro.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister of Northern Affairs for his retraction of the statement that had appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press in which he had indicated that I had said something about a low level diversion. I wanted that record cleared up because it is a fact that I have never spoken on this issue favouring a low level diversion, nor have I said anything but, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that there is now enough evidence from people of goodwill, people who have the best interest of this province at heart, and who have no political axe to grind, that there is a need for a new look.

Mr. Chairman, I differ from the Minister of Mines who said that he has not stifled or trampled upon, or muzzled debate; I differ from him in the sense that maybe not directly, but when I read off the list of people who had objected to this government, or objected to its position, and for one reason or another are no longer in government employ, the point I was trying to make was, how objective will the study on the environmental impact of the South Indian Lake flooding and Churchill Diversion be when it's prepared in House by employees of the Minister who have almost been told directly by the Minister of Tourism, Minister of Mines perhaps, certainly the impression one must get from the debate is that if you don't agree with the government and you work for the government, get out. That's basically what the Minister of Tourism said. And so therefore what kind of an independent report on the environmental damage can we expect from having fired the independent people, the University of Manitoba Study Group, and gone to an in-house employee task force or study group, because I regard the firing, or the dismissal, or the non-renewal, whatever we call it, of the university study group on the Churchill River diversion environmental loss as a very significant event, as a very alarming event, because we all had interpreted, certainly many of us believed that these people had been engaged because they would give an objective, independent report, because it was a controversial issue and that no one who was influenced by government, or dependent upon government for his continued living, would be called on because this university group was independent, or at least was more independent than an employee of the department.

Mr. Chairman, I believe -- I still believe, in spite of the protestations of the Minister, that there is a campaign of fear, whether it's deliberate or not. But people who disagree with the government on this issue, who have a point of view, have expressed to me their

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) concern and their fear to stand up and say, stop it there's a mistake being committed here. We want the public hearings that the Liberal Party has been insisting upon. And, Mr. Chairman, I don't understand if the Minister is so absolutely sure of his ground, that this is the right thing to do for Manitoba, why he continues to say, there will be no public hearings. Why if we are so mad, so insane, those of us who make the other case, does he not seize the opportunity to hold public hearings to discredit them? We don't think he can discredit them, but we don't say that we have all the answers either and that's why we want the public hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I'm reminded of the debate in 1969 throughout this whole piece. I wonder if we ever got the answer for example to a question that was put by the now Minister of Education, who was then in Opposition, the Honourable Mr. Hanuschak, who said in this House on March 25 th, 1969, who asked: "What concerns me is, if there should be a marketable mineral deposit in the bed of South Indian Lake, or what may become, eventually become the bed of South Indian Lake, could the Minister of Mines" -- and that was the former Minister of Mines-- "indicated to us what would be the loss in terms of either inability to extract the ore because of water or because of added costs in the process mining the ore because of the presence of water over top?" And we want to know the same thing today.

A MEMBER: I gave him the answer at that time.

MR. ASPER: We want to know, we want to know what inventory surveys have been taken, and perhaps the Minister will be able to tell us that, perhaps the Chairman of Hydro will, but we haven't been able to find out to date what resource exploration has taken place on the area that will be covered by water, and what economic costs may be suffered in the subsequent extraction of that ore, or the subsequent exploration of that ore? We want to raise -- draw attention to what the Minister said when he was in opposition in this House, on April 14th, 1969, because what he said then is precisely true of his government. He said, "There are some times when a democratic government because it has power will do things that it shouldn't do. It's happened in the past and it happens when a government gets into a box and this government is in a box." Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting that the Minister think of his own words because they apply now today more than ever to him and to his government. And he said at the same time, the same day in the House, "Mr. Speaker, we see some difficulty if the government pursues this program, and we say that they are in a position where they are psychologically incapable of looking at it objectively, and that's our main objection, that they have put themselves into a position where they can't exercise good judgment on this issue." And, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the position we're in today and I could do no better, I could offer no better advice to the Minister, as the advice in the same words that he offered to the then Minister, that they have psychologically put themselves beyond the capacity to make a reasoned judgment, a stubbornness, an intransigence that --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. ASPER: Question? The question is the use of the words "looking at it objectively" because the Minister in 1969 was concerned with objectivity on this issue but whenever offered objectivity on this issue today as the Minister, he seems to reject it. The University Study Group, an objective study that began objectively, is not being retained to carry on. An in-house group will do the study. The Environment Commission offered to hold public hearings. There are no public hearings. The Environment Commission -- sorry the Environment Council requested public hearings. They held a meeting and they made a judgment at that hearing that there should be full hearings, that the project should be stopped, and there should be hearings --(Interjection)-- Now I don't know what report the Minister got. My understanding of the Environment Council's position is that full scale hearings should be held. Certainly that is the position of the chairman, and that is the position of the vice-chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Premier made a great circus act out of tabling a series of studies in this House. But we ask, and we still ask --and we are not asking for further studies by the way -- he made a speech about how many studies do we have to have? And he pounded the table showing all the studies that had been done. We aren't asking for studies, Mr. Chairman. We don't want our position misunderstood. We want the authors of those studies; we want the people who say those studies are inadequate all brought into a room, sworn under oath by an independent inquiry, and given the opportunity to make their case, to be

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) cross-examined, so that the truth, that surely this House wants, will emerge.

We want to know where are the other studies, and if there aren't any, why aren't there? Where are the studies of alternative uses? Has the government studied them? Solar power, nuclear power. Have they studied a change in consumption patterns? If so, can we see that study? If not, have any values been put on the losses that may be suffered as a result of not having that information?

We're not asking for years of study be we do make the point that this government recently spent somewhere between one and two hundred thousand dollars, we understand, to advertise on radio and television to the people of this province --(Interjection)-- 600,000, an honourable member suggested 600,000. But whatever figure, to advertise to the people of this province on radio and television that this government in its generosity was going to give those people back some of their own money. Now that's a debatable issue, whether the government should have done that. But if we can spend that kind of money to tell the people that we're giving them back some of their money, surely we might spend a fraction of it, say 10 percent, in the holding of public hearings that would deal with the subject of spending up to \$200 million, not \$20 million as the tax rebate involved.

And, Mr. Chairman, I become very concerned now when I read that Manitoba Hydro, and I think perhaps members of government, may be saying, there is going to be a power shortage if we don't do this. There's going to be brownouts, power rationing. Mr. Chairman, I hear that kind of threat, that kind of intimidation with supreme contempt. That's the kind of blackmail where the ordinary Manitoban reads his newspaper, and reads with some authority that an official of Hydro or of government says that we can't debate this; we can't have public hearings, we can't delay this, because we'll be without power. You will not be able to have toast because you won't have a toaster that can be plugged into an electric outlet, or what have you. Mr. Chairman, we all remember 1969. We all remember the same veiled threats when Hydro said, government said, that if we don't do this high level diversion immediately, there will be brownouts, rationing, power failures by '72 or '73. Mr. Chairman, in the period intervening we didn't flood; we didn't do the project; we increased our power consumption by 36 percent, the vast majority of which wasn't for the people of Manitoba in the individual sense but was for industry, which might have been required to pay a nominal amount more for the power if we had used another source, and we had no brownouts, no blackouts, no power shortages, and the veiled threats were just that, veiled threats.

And it is this kind of thing that I would ask the Minister to instruct both the members of his government and the members of the staff of Hydro to stay out of this debate. The members of Hydro have no right publishing a pamphlet which went at public expense to every home where hydro power is consumed last month saying how necessary this project was. I don't have the pamphlet with me; I think I've given it to one of the other honourable members, but I'm sure the Minister is familiar with it. Excuse me. (Have you got the Hydro pamphlet? Have you got it here? okay.) I'll bring it in at a later point.

Mr. Chairman, we want to know what geological surveys have been made -- I don't mean mapping, I mean actual geological surveys. We want to know whether an adequate answer has been given to the question raised by the Honourable Mr. Hanuschak in 1969. And we want to know how the Minister reconciles what he said in 1969, again in his speech of April 14th with his present position. Because at that point he said, "In view of the difficulties which have been experienced with this project; in view of the fact that a government is willing, is committed to a program, is bound to look subjectively at its errors and not be willing to change them even though all the intelligent information before it demands a change. In view of those things we can't see how this government can look with objectivity on the question." And, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the case today. That this government would rather spend millions of dollars, or cause millions of dollars of damage, rather than concede that it may have made a mistake, rather than hold the public hearings at which another view may gain prominence. . . . with some veiled threats the whole \$2 billion project of the diversion we say is an unfair representation of the case.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we have the exchange that took place on the subject of, what are

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) we doing this for? Are we doing this for the people of Manitoba? Are we doing this for the industrial plant of Manitoba? Has the industrial plant of Manitoba been asked whether it's prepared to pay a higher price and make this concession, this gesture to the environment? Have we, or are we producing this power perhaps for export? And oh no we weren't. I understood the Minister of Northern Affairs to have said on television and he may correct me if I'm wrong, but that was what people who observed the show told me he said. That therefore is tantamount to having said it if people take that impression, that we are producing --(Interjection)-- Well the Attorney-General says I accept hearsay at any time. I don't know what, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General accepts that led him to the very peculiar course of conduct he followed in a recent criminal case, but that's another subject for another time.

A MEMBER: Well let's talk more about that.

MR. ASPER: Yes, we certainly will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . the debate. The debate is on Mines and Natural Resources, not the Attorney-General's Department.

A MEMBER: . . . the Attorney-General had no business interrupting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already called him to order.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, --- excuse me, how much time have I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. ASPER: How much time have I got, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Six minutes.

MR. ASPER: How much? Six?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh pardon me. You have more than six minutes, you have eleven minutes.

MR. ASPER: We were told that there was not going to be -- at least we were led to believe there was not going to be any export of power, and then we produced evidence in this House-- we were led to believe that we were not going to be producing power for long-term export to the United States, that at some times at peak periods with interchange, and so on, that we would have surplus, and we would of course market it, which makes economic sense. But then we had the evidence put before this House that a very reputable American magazine on the hydro subject was suggesting that there were negotiation for sale of 15 years of power, not surplus power, but negotiations to build the plant in advance to produce power for export and that there would be a 15 year contract possibly studied and at the end of the 15 years Manitoba would want that power back. Now, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of Hydro entered this discussion on Wednesday, March 7th of this year -- I'm referring to Mr. Bateman speaking at a public meeting of some sort, and he said, contrary to what we have been led to believe or what we surmised from the Minister of Northern Affairs' statement, that yes we are looking at the export of power. He said, "We are looking at the prospect of developing one of our hydro sites earlier to permit export of a block of power to an American utility. The economics of this looks very promising." Now, Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to know before we do this project, what are we doing it for? Are we producing power for the United States? And if that's it, please understand, Mr. Chairman, that I am not anti-American; that I am prepared to sell my goods to the United States if it will create jobs in Manitoba. But, Mr. Chairman, we have to be extremely careful when we start talking about selling power to a nation which is power thirsty, power hungry, and I'm talking about energies rather than political power, which is another debate, because what assurance do we have that we'll get it back when we want it. We want to know the details of any such negotiations that have stimulated this project or influenced this project in any way. Because I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that should we make a 15-year deal with the United States, at the end of the 15 years it would be the height of naivety to believe that it would be easy to get it back, and that's our concern. Because when we go to the United States 15 years later and say now Manitoba needs the power, give it back, and the Americans say, sorry we need it, and we say I know but we need it too and it's our power and the contract is 15 years, give it back. They say, that's right - General Motors or whoever it may be at Duluth or whoever it may be who is using our power says, that's right you're entitled to take it back. But we've made the point that suddenly Air Canada is advised that it can't land at O'Hare Airport any more. And

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) suddenly the Ministers in Ottawa are told, we want to renegotiate the autopac between Detroit and Windsor, and suddenly the rest of Canada leans on Manitoba and says, for heaven's sake you're disrupting our normal relations, serious economic loss will occur if these other events happen, give them the power. And that's why we want to know the details of that kind of a commitment before we engage in the project if that's one of its purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we express concern that the government is in its now typical pattern of proceeding without the benefit of law, whether it's building outhouses, or whether it's building buildings on Broadway without permit, again symptomatic of the roughshod treatment of any law or person who gets in the way of this government, is letting contract, proceeding with the project, even though it is axiomatic that you must have a licence from the Federal Government to divert the waters of the Churchill. And this government now concedes that it's a Federal jurisdiction by having applied for the licence. What, Mr. Chairman, will happen if the Federal Government receiving the application, the Premier assures this House that he had the authority or the Federal Government has always been committed to the project. How many ministers ago was that? And how many elections ago was it?

MR. GREEN: They had a contract with us . . .

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says the Federal Government has a contract with the Government of Manitoba. I read that contract. And no where in that contract is there nor can there be, nor can there be, a commitment by the Federal Government legally as to what it will do in the future.

MR. GREEN: That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. ASPER: You'll have your opportunity to dispute it. Now if the Federal Government having four more years or six more years of information, of environmental study, and of education as to public values on the subject of the environment, says we won't give the licence without a public hearing. There may be a public hearing at that level. And suppose that public hearing turns up evidence that the damage, the loss is greater than we expected, or that the public values involved have changed so the project makes no sense or less sense, or there are better alternatives, and suppose the Federal Government doesn't issue the licence. How many millions of dollars of contracts, damages, how far will we go before we find out whether we're going to have a federal licence? These questions have to be answered.

Mr. Chairman, there are disturbing acts of this government all through the piece. They are letting contracts, apending public money at a time when they race a lawsuit which if -- and there are other lawsuits that have been talked about, threatened -- a lawsuit which if successful has as its objective the stopping of this project, and if the project is stopped by the Court of Queen's Bench I don't know whether the Attorney-General will abolish the Queen's Bench or what he'll do, but we will have an injunction against the Province of Manitoba if the lawsuit's acceptable, and millions of dollars of damage will be suffered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney-General, point of order.

MR. MACKLING: In reply to the question and a point of privilege. The honourable member has taken great licence in his remarks and I think he's gone beyond the bounds when he suggests that the Attorney-General will abolish a court. I think he should withdraw that statement. He makes a lot of asinine statements that he gets away but he shouldn't get away with that one.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, a point of privilege. The Attorney-General's operations are so unique, if I may say, that nothing he did would surprise me and it's not beyond the realm of possibility that if the Court of Queen's Bench supports it he would abolish it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party -- for the honourable members information it is not within the powers of the Attorney-General or this Legislature to abolish the Court of Queen's Bench.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, the remark was made demonstratively as opposed to in seriousness. Mr. Chairman, there are studies tabled in this House last week that indicate that there is more damage to the town of Thompson through this project than we had originally been led to believe.

MR. GREEN: That is absolutely not true.

MR. ASPER: The progress report No. 2 dated December 31, 1972 of the study board

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ASPER cont'd) raises some doubt as to how, or questions, serious questions as to how the project will affect Thompson. For example, if there is protection required on the Thompson-Lynn Lake Highway, because of the flooding, has Hydro taken that cost into its account, and if so, what is the cost? If the Burntwood River is expanded to absorb a considerable portion of the Churchill River, as the plan calls, what are the specifics of the damage that the report refers to and what are the costs associated with it?

We have some information in the Underwood-McLellan report but we can't determine the basis on which some of that information was assembled. How much and in what way, what technique was used at arriving at these stated environmental and resource laws, and only by our ability to examine and cross-examine the people who prepare these reports, can we determine whether we should rely on those reports. The effect on the town of Churchill we don't know, but we know that if you stopped the flow of the Churchill or slow it down considerably, obviously more salt water from Hudson Bay will flow into the town of Churchill or through the Churchill River, and it's been suggested that the salinity will be increased for seven miles down the river.

A MEMBER: We hope so.

MR. ASPER: My honourable friend the Minister says that will keep the port open longer, which is a valuable thing, but what effect will it have on tides which -- you may have an open port but if you change the tide level you may have a port into which shipping can't come. We are not prepared to accept the "trust me" view that the Minister expresses. --(Interjection)-- I'm running short of time.

Mr. Chairman, it raises the question, the salinity in the Churchill River by loss of flow, as to where the town of Churchill will get its water supply. Will the water supply have to be moved downstream, -- or upstream rather? What is the cost and who is going to pay that cost? What impact will this have on the habit of the Baluga Whale from coming into the Churchill harbour or into the estuary? We don't know, nor does the Minister know. What effect will this have on the shitefish with the increased salinity of the water? Will they disappear, will they come back? We don't know. We don't know a lot, nor does the Minister or if the Minister knows, we are not prepared to accept his trust me concept. --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, may I have one minute to conclude the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member have leave?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, not to continue, just to finish his thoughts as ordinary members are often given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I am in the hands of the House. If the House wishes the honourable member to have extra time, then leave will be granted. Order! Does the honourable member have time to finish one sentence? I hear someone saying no. Leave granted? Leave is not granted.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member will have another opportunity because of the debate. Mr. Chairman, I want the honourable member to know that I was prepared to let him go ahead but this House is guided by the rules and any honourable member is entitled to say so.

Mr. Chairman, I want the honourable member to notice one thing. That he was not interrupted on points of privilege. And the reason that he was not interrupted on points of privilege is not because I exercised some additional restraint, it's because he didn't say that yesterday Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines strangled his wife and expect me to sit still. Today he spoke on how he felt about the program. He gave his arguments, he did not attribute things to me that I didn't do. And most interesting of all, Mr. Speaker, he didn't explain the point that he left off with, which I am sitting here patiently to hear.

He got into a discussion last week about all the people who had been kicked out of the way, you know one of them is Cass Booy, who he says was kicked out of the way. Cass Booy has been neither stifled nor kicked out of the way. He remains a member of the Water Commission. The other fellow who was kicked out of the way is Bob Newbury. It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that Bob Newbury who was against the program was taken on by the Department, but we get no credit for that. We took on an engineer who we knew was in principle against the South Indian Lake program, because we respected his judgment as an engineer. He was never kicked out of the way, even though the honourable member says that they are terrified of us. The problem arose, not because of Mr. Newbury's expertise and desirability on the program;

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) the problem arose because Mr. Newbury became heavily involved politically in the program. Which is perfectly legitimate, Mr. Chairman, and I make no argument about that, but when a person is working on a program which is designed to achieve certain things and becomes politically very much involved against the program -- and I use the word "politically" in its best sense -- then, Mr. Speaker, he really in conscience should say, "I'm sorry I can't work on this program. I am going to go out and fight it." And if the honourable member sees something unusual in that, then I repeat the example that I used to him.

If Inco had hired the University of McGill to prepare a program for it on how it can best get mineral resources out of government, and Eric Kierans was one of the McGill team and he said "yes, I'm working on this program but I think that the government should nationalize Inco, and I think that it's ridiculous for companies to get more out of government." The honourable member says that Inco would say, yes, Mr. Kierans, pat him on the head, continue to work on this program and we will renew your next contract. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely ridiculous. The honourable member would not behave that way if he was the First Minister, if he had decided that there is to be a tie-in between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, which is what Dr. Lansdown proposes, and he got a university group to work on this tie-in, and one of the members of the group in working on it said this tie-in proposal is ridiculous, that what they should be doing is flooding the Churchill River, and that Mr. Asper is an arrogant insane person for not flooding the Churchill River, then what Mr. Asper says is that his objectivity vis-a-vis the program is not affected. Now I really can't believe that the honourable member believes that. I just don't understand him trying to make that as a credible presentation to the government. But nevertheless, Dr. Newbury wasn't kicked out of the way, he was taken on to work on this program. When he decided, which is his right, that he wants to engage in a political campaign against the program, then, Mr. Speaker, I think the Department is entitled to review its position and say we would like the balance of it to be done in-house.

The honourable member says that he knows people who are afraid to say anything. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that there is a point which a civil servant can go to and apparently the honourable member has had a lecture in political science, I'll give him another one about the public service. My director of water works is sitting upstairs, his name is Tom Weber. He knows what the government position is. He knows what he is being asked to do for the government. He gives his professional opinion to us on everything that he is asked to do and the government makes the decision. He may disagree with it entirely, but he continues to give us his best professional advice and he has never been told otherwise. If Tom Weber said I'm going to give the government my professional advice but tomorrow I'm going to go to the Stop, Look and Listen program and preach against what the government is doing on the Churchill River Diver-sion I think he would expect to be told "Tom, that's fine, if you want to campaign politically against the program you have a perfect right to do that, but you cannot then be a part of the government whose policy it is to proceed with this program." Does that appear so unusual to my honourable friend? He says it is unusual. Well then everything, Mr. Speaker, everything that I know, then I know that when the Leader of the Liberal Party says if he becomes Premier of Manitoba and he has on his staff a minister of finance who is on his staff -- who is a minister of finance, who is a member of his staff, and he says that we are to have tax cuts \$24.00 a month to every family in Manitoba, then he says that the Minister of Finance can run around Manitoba saying the premier is an ass per. He says that that will not affect the fact that this man is his minister of finance or the deputy minister of finance. Mr. Speaker, is it credible, is what he is saying credible?

Now, Mr. Chairman the honourable member -- and I was waiting very carefully -- the honourable member said we lost a deputy minister. That's where the House ended on Tuesday. And he said, I didn't mean that the Minister kicked him out of the way, he had gone through this entire process, this person was kicked out of the way, that guy was shoved aside, and Mr. Chairman, we have lost a deputy minister, and I got up on a point of privilege and suggested that the honourable member was making the suggestion that I had gotten rid of my deputy minister for some improper reason.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

He said "you didn't even let me finish the sentence, you never let me give subject, predicate, verb and you are already raising this point of privilege". Mr. Speaker, he had a chance to finish the sentence, he could have finished the sentence, he could have finished the paragraph, he could have finished the story. He preferred to leave on the record his statement which followed all of these other statements of people being kicked aside, and the statement we lost a deputy minister, with the inference that somehow Winston Mair was scared out or kicked aside by his Minister, Mr. Speaker, that was the clear inference of what he said. He wanted to finish the sentence. He didn't finish the sentence, he left, --(Interjection)-- no, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to accept the fact that the honourable member will because I am now coming back to where in all honour he should have finished that thing which left a cloud over my position vis-a-vis my deputy, and he never. Because the honourable member is probably not properly described by the adjective with which I have to describe in talking in this House, because he never finished the sentence and he wanted to leave it that way, leave it in the newspapers and leave it wherever it was.

Mr. Speaker, it is not good for a cabinet minister to be asking for endorsements of his staff or to talk about his relationship with his staff, or to talk about whether the staff agrees with him on this issue or that issue, or likes him or dislikes him, because its irrelevant; and once a cabinet minister starts behaving in that way, then I say he ceases to be a proper cabinet minister. But the honourable member wishes to introduce that kind of thing in debate, and because Mr. Mair was, I think, a friend of mine, and because I phoned him and got personal permission to do so, and because the honourable member was willing to leave that kind of thing on the table without completing it, I have a letter from the honourable member, from the deputy minister, after he left the service, when it was no longer, as the honourable member describes it, necessary that he please me in order to make his living. Mr. Speaker it's not the kind of a letter that would be would be written by a man who does what the honourable member suggested by that inference which he refused to clear up, and I suggest that he refused it, Mr. Speaker, and we can draw this inference, knowing that he had left that thing there and he wanted it there.

MR. ASPER: Point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

A MEMBER: Now listen to whose got a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The leader of the Liberal Party on a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: The point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, is that the Minister is ascribing motives which apart from the impropriety of ascribing motives are not correct, and if I may take this opportunity to say to you Mr. Chairman, the issue that he raises will be dealt with satisfactorily.

MR. GREEN: I did not, Mr. Speaker, I said that we in this House, and if the honourable member will read my remarks he will find out the distinction between ascribing motives and saying that a reasonable conclusion can be drawn, which needn't be drawn or can be drawn. If the honourable member says that is we look at the Minister of Mines we can surmise from that, looking at him and listening to him that he beats his wife, I have no point of privilege, because everybody can look and they can make that inference or not. If the honourable member says the Minister of Mines beats his wife, I have a point of privilege, and that is the difference. And I said that the honourable member, the way he behaves leaves the inference or can leave the inference with all of the members of this House that he knew he made that statement, he had the opportunity of finishing the sentence, proceeding with it and his failure to do so can be taken as a reasonable inference that he intended to leave it right there, and there is no point of privilege. Because you needn't, the Member for Lakeside maybe doesn't agree with me, and I am making arguments, I'm not making charges. If I said that the honourable member did intend to leave that inference that is another point and I would withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, the honourable -- and again, it's distasteful, it has never happened in the seven years that we have been here that we've been engaged in this type of revelation, but I'm afraid that I have to. Yesterday I put on the table the inter-departmental correspondence between myself and the Commission to show that what had occurred in private was no different than what was said in public.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Now, Mr. Speaker, and only because Mr. Mair said go ahead and do it, will I read his personal letter to me, after he left the service, and when he didn't depend on pleasing the Minister to earn a living, which is what the honourable member suggests is the attitude of Mr. Tom Weber, Mr. Ness Mudry, Mr. Bert Gobert and all of the other civil servants, they're all here saying ahah to the Minister in order to please him in order to earn a living. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has something to learn. The Civil Service is made of sterner stuff. They will tell me what they think and they will know what government policy is and they will continue to tell me what they think but they will not go out and campaign politically because they understand what a civil service is.

Mr. Mair says "I cannot leave Manitoba without trying at least to express my thanks and appreciation for your leadership, and I think friendship over the period we worked together. I suppose we are both loners to some degree but I felt a very strong tie with you and felt we understood one another well. In any event, the period while you were my Minister was a highlight in my working years and I want you to know how deeply I appreciated and liked you". Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other remarks which deal with -- well, Mr. Speaker, you know, if the man felt that he was being intimidated and had to shut up and was not working with us I don't think he would have said "in any event the period while you were my Minister was a highlight in my working years and I want you to know how deeply I appreciated and liked you". I don't like reading this type of stuff into the record, but the actions of the honourable member have led to the kind of revelation that should never be required and he should not make the kind of charge which he knows requires that type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, there are other parts to the letter which are personal. If my honourable friend feels that I am somehow misleading or withholding information to him, I table the letter and he can read it all to see whether or not I've taken something out of context. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that a deputy minister whom we have lost because of some terrorism of the Minister would write that kind of thing.

MR. ASPER: Point of privilege. . . . Mr. Chairman, the words of the Minister are, I don't think that a deputy minister which we have lost because of some terrorism on the part of the Minister and that's where he stopped. Mr. Chairman, I have said, on the point of privilege, that I have never suggested nor did I say that the Minister, the Deputy Minister in question had been terrorized. If you look at Hansard, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, if you look at Hansard where this began --(Interjection)-- the Member for St. Johns is asking the Page --(Interjection)-- Tuesday, March 13, 1973. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page numbers are at the bottom of the page for the honourable members . . .

MR. ASPER: I'm well aware where the page numbers are, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Page 586, Mr. Chairman, carrying on 587, on the point of privilege that was raised by my honourable friend the Minister, there is a period, and after a very lengthy interjection that evening which is not reported in Hansard, the length, I began a new sentence, I began a new sentence in which I mentioned the name of the Deputy Minister and started to mention --(Interjection)-- I'll have to read the whole thing. --(Interjection)--

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if there would be any possibility for other members to enter into the debate while the Leader of the Liberal Party . . .

MR. GREEN: Maybe the honourable member will sit down, he really doesn't have a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: The point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, is this, that the Minister continues to state as a fact what I was going to say, when I have decided not to . . .

MR. GREEN: No, no, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, let me continue. All I said was that the honourable member started to say and did say, "how Mr. Speaker or Mr. Chairman, we have lost a deputy minister and"--(Interjection)-- exactly. That's all I ever said. I said that the leading up, Mr. Speaker, was about how this person was kicked out of the way that person was kicked out of the way, all of the people were running in terror from the Minister and then he said, after some . . . "Now, Mr. Chairman, we have lost a deputy Minister." I got up and objected. He said: "Let me explain, let me finish the sentence. No subject no predicate no verb." Am I quoting you properly? Mr. Speaker, I waited. The

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) honourable member had a half hour that was the last sentence that he made. I waited and I said that his failure to clear up that point where he was prevented from speaking the other day would lead to the inference, on my part and I think on many members in this House, that he wanted that statement to stand, that he wanted it to stand in the context in which he put it and he had no intention of clearing it up, that that is the inference one can draw. Mr. Speaker, there is --(Interjection)-- Well . . .

MR. ASPER: On the point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. GREEN: The honourable member says he never rises on points of privilege to interrupt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party on a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: In answer, Mr. Chairman, I said to the Minister that night that if this is the technique he adopts then we will correct him as he goes along. Mr. Chairman, the point on page 588 is dealt with when I said, "Mr. Chairman, I inferred no such thing." I have said on the record that I inferred no such thing. Why does the Minister continue to flog the horse.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would refer the honourable member to Page 96 of Beauchesne, bottom of the page. "A dispute arising between two honourable members as to allegations of fact hardly fulfils the conditions of a privilege question and if deemed to be a matter to be at once entertained it is more convenient to postpone other business rather than extend the area of privilege." Citation 154 of Beauchesne.

MR. GREEN: Listen to this. Let's listen to whether the member is wrongly being accused. You know, here is a member who is wrongly being accused. Maybe he'll listen too, maybe he'll listen to what he is wrongly being accused of.

"Mr. Chairman, I'm expressing opinion based on the following facts which I elucidated before. I express the opinion that he who disagrees with the Minister mysteriously, suddenly disappears; and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is in no way, in no way an impropriety for me to suggest that a member of his staff, having seen this parade of dismissals would not be somewhat intimidated. The Minister's honour is satisfied, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, in the past few months we have lost a deputy minister, Winston Mair and we have lost Bob --" and that was where the interjection took place.

Mr. Chairman, then he went on to say that I inferred no such think and he is now saying that he expects me to believe him, that he inferred no such thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was giving the opportunity to the honourable member to believe him. So I sat down and waited for thirty minutes for him to explain when he says he "inferred no such thing", and I said that as a result of the honourable member refusing to pick up from where he left off that I say this House can draw the inference that he meant to do exactly that, he meant the inference that the man had been kicked out of the way, that he meant the inference that somehow he had been intimidated, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, the Legislature to make that conclusion. They don't have to and that is not a point of privilege.

MR. ASPER: Mr. Chairman, on the point of privilege, I refer you to a previous ruling by the Speaker in the last day or two where he - or perhaps it was your ruling -- that where a member stands in his place and says something as a fact, that that is what he says is a fact, it is taken by this House as a fact.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I waited for the honourable member to explain what he meant and the fact is that the honourable member didn't explain. We're not now discussing facts, we're discussing inferences and I'm saying that the honourable member says he inferred no such thing. I am asking the gentlemen of the House on a subject matter which is not ascertainable about fact, to draw the inference. And I don't think that the honourable member has a point of privilege. But Mr. Speaker, lets deal with the -- and I say again that I regret that that type of thing has to be done but let's deal with some of the things that the honourable member has said.

He has said, Mr. Speaker, that when I was in Opposition I said that the Provincial Government was in a box, that they had to proceed. I said that they were in a box because they had called public hearings, that the public hearings were ostensibly to determine whether or not the program should proceed. In the middle of the hearings the Minister knew

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) that that wasn't a reasonable basis for him to have called public hearings, and I accept the fact that he says that it was accidental and that it shouldn't have happened. That's what he's told me outside of this House and inside of the House and I apologize to the honourable member if I'm revealing any confidences. I think he said it in the House when I asked him last year. That the notice was a mistake that it was never intended that the hearings would be involved in whether or not you have the Hydro project. The hearings were for the purpose of dealing with the results to the people and how those results would be affected. The honourable member is nodding his head. That then he said that no matter what the hearings decided they were going ahead, and I said that that is an improper hearing, that that is a fraud, that it appears that what the government wanted to do is hold a pretense of hearings and then do whatever they want to do. That is a harsh criticism and the Member for Lakeside knows that I'm entitled to make it. It is something that people can draw an inference from. And he will fight against it and I respect his right to fight against it. Then they brought a bill into the House. The honourable member doesn't understand the legislative process. They brought a-- he doesn't understand! Because -- Mr. Speaker, one of two things, either he doesn't understand the legislative process or he is determined that he is going to misrepresent it. They brought a bill into the House, the bill called for the granting of a licence. Though granting of a licence was ordinarily an administrative act, they said that they wanted the Legislature to grant the licence and I believe the reason was that they didn't want to be involved with the court hearing because the hearing was aborted and the best way to clear it up was in the House. We said if we are to be part of the administration we must be privy to the documents which the administration has when it makes a decision, and that if we are not privy to those documents, you cannot ask us to associate with you.

And that's when I said sometimes these things are done by a commission, and if, Mr. Speaker, that is the same thing as calling public hearings, if that's what my honourable member wants to represent then all I can say I differ with him. I say that if we brought a bill for you to pass this as an administrative Act, we would have to either give you something or give you a commission or give you some fact-finding board upon which to base your decision. But we have not brought a bill into the House, we have taken it to our own control, what the Legislature entrusted us to when they permitted us to do this by regulation, and that's something else that the Honourable Member for Lakeside I'm sure will disagree with me, although in this respect I don't say that he's given me information in this connection. That had he known that he could do the same thing by changing regulations that he was asked to bring a bill in he would never have brought a bill in, he would have changed the regulation. I firmly believe that that's what the Member for Lakeside would have done. Now he doesn't have to comment on it and I'm not asking him to.

But that was the circumstance in 1969, and because I said that the government was in a box then; does it logically follow that the government is always in a box, and that what said in 1969 applies at the present time. We have not brought a bill into the House. We announced a program -- look at the difference. We announced a program in September 1970. Rather than there being criticism of it there was no criticism of it. The criticism came in the Spring of 1971. And was the criticism of the program, Mr. Chairman, was the criticism of the program? The criticism was that we weren't flooding high enough or fast enough. --(Interjection)-- Well -- the honourable member says not him,

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: I must say that I have some respect for responsible government and the elected representatives of the people. There are some people in the community and I believe that some members would like to try to inspire them, who believe that governments are foul and evil and that by virtue of a person being elected to represent people in this House he can no longer be trusted. I have always, in opposition or otherwise, respected the democratic process and although I criticized the Roblin administration, I said that they were the representatives of the people and they had the right to govern. There are some people who say that the people and listening to the people means listening to everybody else except the elected representatives of the people.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)

Now we have the elected representatives of all the people of Manitoba, we announced a plan, the only criticism of the plan was that we were not flooding the Churchill River. There was one other criticism, the Member for Churchill did say that he hoped that we wouldn't have to proceed. But other than that, Mr. Chairman, all of the elected representatives of the people practically unanimously agreed that the program would have to proceed. The only difference was whether it had to proceed in association with Lake Winnipeg regulation or on its own without Lake Winnipeg regulation, in which case it was to go higher and faster.

The honourable member says we are not listening to the people. Mr. Chairman, is this also a public hearing? Is this an avenue for listening to the people, because if we are listening to the people then aside from one person I haven't heard a single other Liberal get up and adopt the position that's being pursued by the Member for Wolseley, the Leader of the Liberal Party, not the Member for Portage la Prairie, not the Member for Carillon, not the member for Assiniboia. The only elected representative of the people who has said that you should not flood the Churchill River, or that you should now hold hearings on this project which is seven years in the making and already decided upon and decided upon two years ago is one elected representative of the people. So what the Member for Wolseley said is that you should ignore 55 elected representatives of the people and go and hear people who are not the representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, what is public hearing? Is not this the most sophisticated form of public hearing that is known to the democratic process? Mr. Chairman, the honourable member would change the democratic process by having people elected, abdicate their authority and go hear people who haven't been elected and haven't got the guts to get in and try and get elected. Now I say that those people want to change the Churchill River Diversion, it's their duty to go to the place where the decisions are made and I would welcome the battle that's going to take place on the hustings with regard to these people. And I will - maybe not welcome, depends on how it goes. But I would accept a decision as being the way in which the democratic process operates.

The honourable member won't do that. The honourable member says that he is going to hold public hearings. Mr. Speaker, in his speech today he gave us 100 percent evidence that he will not hold public hearings. And I'll tell you, I'll tell you, I'll show you, Mr. Speaker, through his own mouth how he has said that. He said that the government shouldn't proceed because there was a lawsuit claiming an injunction -- and it's interesting that on the points of law his submission was the weakest. He's a lawyer. But on points of law his submission was the weakest. He said that there is a statement of claim filed for an injunction to stop you and you are proceeding in the face of that statement of claim. Every lawyer knows that anybody can walk in and pay what -- the fee used to be \$5.00 I guess when I was practicing, maybe we raised it to 10 -- file a statement of claim and request an injunction. And the honourable member is saying that if any citizen of Manitoba asks for an injunction regardless of how many years it will take to decide, regardless of the merits of the claim the project should stop. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the position put by the honourable member, and he doesn't deny it. If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, what happens when one citizen of Manitoba files a statement of claim enjoining the government not to proceed with the public hearings. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

MR. GREEN: What happens, Mr. Chairman, when one citizen of the public who disagrees with the honourable member and says that there should be a diversion and it should be held immediately. What happens when one person walks into the Court of Queen's Bench, puts down a statement of claim, and asks for an injunction restraining the honourable member from holding the public hearings which he has committed to hold for the people of Manitoba. Well he says, Mr. Speaker, by his own mouth, well if there is a statement of claim filed in the court, well then of course I will not proceed with the public hearings because there is a statement of claim.

And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member by inference says that with regards to every single aspect of Liberal program, that if somebody walks into court and files a statement

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) of claim and says that we shouldn't give this \$24. 00 reduction, then of course we will let the courts go through the issue of deciding whether we give the \$24. 00 decrease in taxes before we give the decrease, because somebody has raised it in court and until it's declared to be legal, of course it is illegal. Mr. Speaker, that is the most astonishing discourse on law that I have heard in all of my years in the legal profession. Everybody knows that the filing of a claim for an injunction does not affect the activity who receives the statement of claim and that's why -- and if I have to lecture again to the honourable member -- we have what is called an interlocutory injunction, or an interim injunction, which is another document which is filed after you file a statement of claim and suggests that the issue is so important that before this matter is decided an injunction should be issued to see what would happen, or as to whether it should be decided. And that's the only basis upon which an activity is halted. And if the honourable member doesn't know that then I inform him of it. If he knows it then he is misleading everybody in this House, and you can take your pick, Mr. Speaker. Either he is ignorant, or he is misleading, because it's one of the two. It can be no other way.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside wants to speak, I haven't finished but I think other people should get into the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I have had already the occasion to speak on the Minister's salary and on this particular subject. It's not my intention to dwell on it at any length, but rather very briefly for the public record correct a few inferences that in the course of the Honourable Minister's statements that have been made that I believe are nonetheless important.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that probably on this point we will agree, that my respect for the correctness in bringing matters before this Chamber and his are probably very identical. He suggested in the course of his remarks just a few moments ago that because a matter was one that could have been dealt with by the administration, or administratively, that therefore it may not probably come into this Chamber. I don't know whether he really meant it in that way, at least I certainly, Sir, while not arguing with his belief for the reasons that we brought a bill into this Chamber dealing with this very important developmental matter in the Province of Manitoba at that particular time might have been for various reasons, and I can concur that surely part of that reason was the one that he suggested. But, Mr. Chairman, let the record be very clear that the Progressive Conservative administration at that time makes no apology none at that time nor now, that this issue, this very important issue which is still before the people of Manitoba, was not one that didn't deserve or could not have been decided in this Chamber, by the capacity of this Chamber.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, there are occasions when as we watch with some interest the dialogue that goes on between the honourable members opposite and directed at those to our left, we have a tendency on this side of the House to indulge in some self-satisfaction or perhaps the reading of a nice book to pass the time away, but the situation isn't of course that simple. The fact that this government has a great deal to be concerned about and a great deal to answer for with respect to the kind of commitments, the kind of statements that were made throughout the course of this long debate, the kind of commitment to the full acceptance of the principle of approaching all this kind of development in a multi-use way rather than a single-use way. We were chastised and lectured about the necessity of bringing together necessary resource research data, recreational data all to enable them to come to the point of decision that they finally made which they had the authority to make back in September several years ago. We, Sir, have not been satisfied, cannot be satisfied, and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't think from this point of view neither can those who have expressed their genuine concern from an ecological point of view be satisfied that they have in any way, in any significant way lived up to the kind of lip service they gave to the necessity of this kind of action being taken at that time. In fact, Mr. Chairman, they now find themselves in all too many cases justifying their action on the basis of it not being any worse than our action. Mr. Chairman, that really isn't -- (Interjection)-- no, not any worse than our action. The First Minister uses that phrase quite often if you notice. Whether it is with reference to patronage in the civil service or something like that, the favourite phrase that seems to come from the other side is that "well we're not any worse than you were".

Well, Mr. Chairman, that really isn't the high hope that this government brought

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . to the people of Manitoba when they assumed office. And without getting us, being led astray and without us delving into other matters, particularly in this area, I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that they can-- I think it was proven in a few questions and answers exchanged here today that we really know to the extent that they themselves demanded a few years ago, the kind of information that should be fed into the process before a decision is made as to the total effects of the Lake Winnipeg regulation, as to the total effects on Cross Lake.

I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that despite what the First Minister said today with respect to compensation in answer to the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that this government has far from met minimal standards in assuring the people that are going to be affected as to the kind of compensation, the kind of treatment that they will have, they can expect and they can be guaranteed of by the government that is creating this imposition on them. Mr. Chairman, indeed in that respect they failed miserably to meet the standards that the previous administration set when they were prepared to enshrine in legislation, in a statute, the kind of fair treatment, the kind of protection for their civil rights, the kind of sensitivity that the government of that day was prepared to accept responsibility for for the wishes of the people that we knew we were affecting and were going to affect to a very great degree.

Mr. Chairman, these few remarks I simply wanted entered into the record at this particular time that although the statement is made from time to time that through an administrative fumbling of the ball a bill appeared into this House calling for the flooding of South Indian Lake, that that for some reason was not an appropriate way to tackle the matter or that for some reason it was not appropriate for the Legislature to deal with the matter. I know the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will probably reply to me and say that having taken that course you didn't give us the information that members opposite required to fully make that decision. That's again a subjective argument that we can argue back and forth.

A MEMBER: That's true.

MR. ENNS: When does one have sufficient information, when does one not have sufficient information. I just wanted to make the one very brief point, Mr. Chairman, that at no time do I as the Minister at that time, as the former Minister at that time responsible, nor does the Progressive Conservative Party who was at that time the administration, apologize, apologize for bringing a matter of great importance into this Chamber to have the elected representatives of the people of Manitoba make their decision known on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly see after listening to the interesting exchange between the Minister and the Member for Wolseley why the work at the courts is so delayed, when arguments can be repeated and repeated and repeated without the point apparently being made to the lawyers for the different sides.

I will deal with my position on South Indian Lake in 1969 and today at another time. In the few minutes that I have available now I would like to -- and I regret having to do this after the debate earlier today -- to criticize some decisions that I think the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Cabinet have made. I regret having to make this speech now because of the inferences that the Member from Wolseley made on Tuesday and which were refuted today by the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the decision which was made on April 1st - All Fools Day, Mr. Chairman - 1971 to transfer the Environmental Sanitation section from the Department of Health and Social Development to this Minister's Department, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, was an administrative mistake. And I say it was a mistake, Sir, because without, without -- understand me -- without wanting to question the competence of the Minister and without wishing in any way to question the integrity and competence of his staff, I think that the location of the Environmental Sanitation section within the Department of Mines really can lead not to the protection of the public interest, that is the interest of the citizens, so much as it can lead to environmental sanitation section perhaps being captured by the mining interests which the department in part serves. And I would like just to go over, to substantiate what I'm saying in a small way anyway, a case that arose last fall and which I have had the occasion to discuss with the Minister in private.

On September 5th I was trying to get some information from the government about

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd). . . . the water quality of Lake Brereton and other lakes in the Whiteshell area. Now at the time I was told that this information could be made available from the public health officers which of course were in the Department of Health; and I telephoned on September 5th asking for a complete report on all the water sampling carried out at Brereton Lake during the past two to three year period. The response to my call came from a Gordon L. Swain per an S. Blanco and was dated September 7th and they said that the information I desired was not available in this office and I would have to ask the Minister of Health for it.

Well I wrote to the Minister of Health, and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a portion of this letter, if I can just find it: "I telephoned an official of the Public Health Branch of your department and asked for the report on water quality compiled for Brereton Lake and the wells around the periphery of the lake. While he first told me, " - Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, " that this information could be made available without any difficulty I have received the enclosed letter from that branch which indicates that I must go to you for this information." That is direct to the Minister of Health. "So I am asking you for the water quality report on Lake Brereton."

Well having sent that letter I then obtained a letter dated September 25th from Dr. J. N. R. Scatliff of the Department of Health, copy of a letter sent by him to Mr. W. G. Bowen who was at that time A. D. M. Environmental Management Division of the Mines and Resources Department. And he said, "Mr. Turnbull has requested a copy of all water quality reports compiled for Brereton Lake and for the wells around its shores over the past two or three years. He would be glad to have this information as soon as possible for reasons which are well stated in his memo as attached herewith. We would be glad if you would make available this information passing it directly to Mr. Turnbull, Mr. M. Ward with whom I spoke this morning is already aware of this request." That was as I say on September 25th.

Well, Mr. Speaker, - Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, I cannot recall ever having got a copy of those water quality analyses and I think that for my part and for the constituents that I am speaking for it is not a laughing matter but a matter of rather serious concern for them. I haven't received those reports; I would like them and if the Minister has them or if his staff have them I would appreciate copies of them as soon as he can possibly arrange it. I have spoken to him many many times about this information and he has told me, Mr. Speaker - Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry again, - he has told me, Mr. Chairman, that the men responsible for that information are certainly now located in his department and responsible to him.

I did receive a copy of a memorandum dated October 23rd from Mr. Tom Weber to the Honourable Sidney Green which outlines the kinds of information that I think anyone would be aware of who read the newspapers in a diligent manner. And he does mention, Mr. Weber does mention in his letter that algae blooms on Lake Brereton and other lakes in the Whiteshell were caused by what could be called natural causes. And he suggests that algae blooms can be controlled by copper sulphate which may be sprayed over selected areas of the lake in a dry or liquid form. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to some people not attached to the government but who I regard as fairly competent in the field and they tell me that copper sulphate may be more damaging to the quality of the lake than the algae that's already in it, a point which maybe the Minister would like to deal with and at least clear up for my information if not for other members.

Now, there was another matter related to this case that I should also mention, and it really is one of bureaucratic red tape. I don't know if the Minister has ever read an author by the name of Franz Kafka who wrote a number of novels, one of which was called The Castle, and if the Minister can remember reading it he will know that the hero in this novel was presented with a situation which he could hardly comprehend, a situation where he was trying to get into the castle and couldn't manage to do so. And I feel in much the same position. I cannot comprehend what is going on in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, I don't seem to be able, I don't seem to be able -- I'm glad they are applauding me for my honesty at least, Mr. Chairman. I don't seem to be able to get the kinds of information I want. I cited one example already, namely the water quality analysis. There was also a problem with getting some information from that department about the damage done to the water resulting in fish kill.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd)

Now it is very, very difficult for a lay person either to get a sample of water you know from the lake to the appropriate and independent sources in the city here before the water of course is beyond the stage where it can be analyzed. I was trying to get from the officials of the Department some information about fish kill and what I found was that the administrative responsibility for the analysis of fish in the Whiteshell Park seemed to have fallen between two stools, neither the Department of Mines was responsible and could provide the information, nor was the Department of Tourism and Recreation responsible. And seriously, Mr. Chairman, it presented me with a Kafka-ish problem which seemed to be almost impossible to untangle. So I waited some months until his Estimates came up so I could pose the question to him. The information that I have received is that no one has responsibility for analyzing fish kills in the Whiteshell, that the Parks Branch wanted to take over all the biological analysis, if I can call them that, but they didn't have the staff and the Wildlife Branch was getting a second biologist and asked Tourism if they could do the work and Tourism didn't even reply. What their lack of reply meant of course is that I didn't get the information that I sought and my constituents who've raised this matter of water quality in those lakes with me, and the problem of fish kill are not assured in their own minds anyway, that the water is safe for swimming, that the fish are satisfactory for eating.

Now I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, there is a very simple and easy to obtain answer to the questions that I have posed but I have not been able to get those explanations and those answers and I hope that the Minister will get that information soon and that I'll have the information on the public record this evening perhaps.

Now, that, Mr. Chairman, is really my concern in saying that there seems to be a division of responsibility within the government that has resulted in even an MLA not being able to get the information when he wants it and in the form in which he wants it and I think that it does indicate the problems that a citizen has with getting the information that he wants. I really feel that the decision made on April 1, 1971 to transfer the Environmental Sanitation section to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources perhaps was made on the basis of the competence of the Minister and not on the basis of what administrative division would best suit the public, and I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the Environmental Management section will more and more become a section that caters to the interests of mining companies perhaps and is not a section that will provide information to the citizens and to their elected representatives.

I have another example, Sir, of a division of responsibility which makes it difficult to secure action on behalf and for the benefit of the citizens in my riding. At one time before the City of Winnipeg Act was introduced, Mr. Chairman, there was a group called the Rivers and Streams Authority and it was made up of civil servants from I think all three levels of, perhaps four levels of government before the Unicity Bill was introduced. Since the Unicity Bill was introduced and became effective I haven't tried to track down who is responsible for the erosion, for the control rather of the erosion of the banks of the Red River. I could point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the south border of my constituency is the Red River; that some of the residents in the riding have complained repeatedly to me of river bank erosion, which of course, I suppose one could expect on a river like the Red, but what they cannot I think be expected to expect and which I don't anticipate from a government which I am expected to support, is a lack of action to control river bank erosion.--(Interjection) -- The only flood that the Member for Lakeside seems to occasion in this house, Mr. Chairman, is not the flood of the Red River but the flood of his invective.

Mr. Chairman I would like the Minister to indicate to me whether in fact the Clean Environment Act was amended in such a way as to enable officials of that branch by Order-in-Council to delegate to the City authority for controlling river bank erosion on the Red or where the authority to control river bank erosion now lies. It isn't a responsibility that I have found easy to track down within the Provincial Government or indeed within the new city administration.

And finally, with regard to this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister why it is that nobody, no government official seems willing to act to prevent the erosion of the Red River around the old Elm Park bridge in particular and around by Woodward Avenue

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) where it abuts on the Red River.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think I should mention under the resolution on the salary of the Minister a request that has been made to me by several senior citizens. They have asked, and I have asked the Minister on their behalf, for a very, very simple, easily administered and inexpensive program, and one, Sir, that although I can appreciate his logic in not initiating, I cannot appreciate his lack of feeling for initiating the program. And it is simply this: That the old age pensioners in Manitoba be allowed to have a free fishing licence. It's a request that has been made to me, Mr. Chairman, I think that it is a request that easily could be met by the Minister's department and one that would please and make happy many old age pensioners and not cost the government very much in the taxpayers' dollar. (Hear, Hear)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines -- The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Mr. Chairman I just have a few comments to make on the estimates on the Minister's salary. I do want to refer to some of the matters raised earlier today. I hope in a somewhat different manner. I do want to refer to the study board affair and to the Minister's action - the study board's action in not renewing the contract, the second year of the contract with Professor Newbury and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I have followed the debate on the Churchill River diversion, perhaps not as closely as the Minister. I do know that Mr. Newbury, Professor Newbury is not a strong supporter of the Churchill diversion. I don't recall, but I could be mistaken, I don't recall him being an active opponent of the scheme in public. The Minister does present me with a book which Professor Newbury is co-author with.

My quarrel with the Minister is not in dismissing Professor Newbury because if in fact the Professor is not only against the scheme and actively engaged against the government's intention, I can certainly understand the government taking the position that he should not be working on this project. However I, do think it is necessary for the government to have independent sources of information on matters of ecology; that it is not correct for the study of ecological damage that is going to occur regarding the Churchill River which will be incurred by the Manitoba Hydro, that that damage should be then investigated and studied and anticipated by essentially the same administration, and that it is important, in fact essential that an independent agency be available to assist the government in determining the degree of damage and anticipating the degree of damage and so forth, and that if Professor Newbury has been actively engaged against the government's program, that it is essential that other individuals equally expert, independent of the government, be hired to do the task, I think that is a reasonable request that anyone concerned with the ecology and anyone who has followed similar kinds of diversions and damages and studies anticipations of damages by in-House teams, the conclusion is almost invariably that these in-House teams are not really objective with respect to the damage that is being perpetuated, because they are part of the same administration that is perpetuating the damage.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Member permit a question? Is he aware that it was in-House people that provided the Minister, the former minister of mines and continued to provide the Minister with all of the information which raised the concerns regarding the Churchill River diversion?

MR. GONICK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't suggest for a moment that it is impossible that in-House staff will raise problems for the administration. I simply say that when a project of such dimensions is being not only contemplated but going forward that there be every effort to establish an independent agency to assess the damage. I don't suggest that some degree of assistance is not available with in-House; I say that every effort be made beyond what is perhaps normal within the smaller kinds of projects of lesser import, that a greater effort be made to have independent judgment so that there can be no question that effort is made to assess damage and to give that kind of opinion to the government and to the public.

Mr. Chairman I have a few other points to raise.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member permit a question? I don't want to interrupt his but he did indicate he was going on to other questions. I just wanted a question of this member as well as the former speaker, the Member from Osborne as to whether or not he could answer me why if he's expressing his concern about the additional

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . you know, inputs that should be put into this major matter, why he for some reason has chosen not to be present or not to allow, no longer be a member as well as the Member for Osborne on the very important Public Utilities Committee which has of course the opportunity to examine these? --(Interjection) --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how such matters are determined in the Conservative caucus, but the matter is not entirely a voluntary one with respect to our caucus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

. . . . continued on next page.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. GONICK: Mr. Chairman, I do have a few comments to make and I'm restricting my remarks to the environmental matters not into the general debate itself which we will have other opportunities to examine. I'm wondering about, Mr. Chairman, the steps that the Minister has taken with regard to possible, possible damages to the population at South Indian Lake with respect to their livelihood.

If it is possible that commercial fishing will be damaged -- I don't charge that it will occur, I never have, Mr. Chairman, -- but if there is a possibility that commercial fishing will be damaged and their livelihood will be damaged, what alternative livelihoods are being considered by the department with respect to the population? Are there other lakes that are being considered as alternative areas for them to be relocated which will provide them with alternative fishing grounds? I have tried to examine with others who know the north much better than I if there are other lakes that are not now occupied and being utilized for fishing of a similar richness with South Indian Lake and they tell me that there are not such alternatives which are equally profitable from the point of view of fishing, but that certainly is an alternative which I expect the Minister and his department to be examining in case the damage will be substantial to commercial fishing and their livelihood will have been effectively removed.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to ask if there are plans to provide retraining in other areas, other than fishing perhaps, so that if fishing is not feasible on a commercial basis at the lake and if there are not alternative lakes available perhaps there are some other jobs that the population is being retrained for or that they could be retrained for and I wonder what preparation the department is making in respect to retraining programs.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that if there are such preparations that the retraining program will go beyond retraining them for chopping off branches of trees and such which is certainly much less skilled work than the kind of work they're doing now and there would certainly be a downgrading of their present kind of employment.

In Jenpeg I understand that where work is now proceeding that there are some native people, three or four percent of the work force as I understand composed of native people which is of course a very small percentage in view of the intentions of the government to make this work available to the northern residents, if that figure is correct. And I understand that the work is essentially unskilled work and that no real training programs are being provided. And I hope that we are not pushing our native populations from what is effectively a highly skilled occupation to a kind of dirt labour which our black population in the deep south in the United States was relegated to so many years ago. Because I hear, Mr. Chairman, and I don't say this with any relish, but I hear that our native people in the North are sometimes referred to as the northern bootblacks of Manitoba. And I hope that that will not be the effect of what we are doing in the absence of some kind of a serious retraining program as such that their livelihood will be improved upon rather than harmed. Sorry, did the Member for Thompson have a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Thompson have a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, the member mentioned some word that the Indians are ascribed to in the North. I want to assure him I have never heard such a word and if it is used it must be by the intellectual elite.

MR. GONICK: I'm sorry I didn't get the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Perhaps there was no question. Well Mr. Chairman, these are these are questions which I have which I hope the Minister will be able to respond to. I'm sure he would want to respond to them.

I have other points with regard to simple information which I think members of the House and the general public should have available, and it's related to the questions I've asked earlier. For example, I've looked to find information on such simple matters as how many people live at South Indian Lake, what are the age distribution, what is the sex distribution, what is the source of income by percentage, what proportion of their income is derived from fishing, what proportion is derived from hunting, what proportion is derived from welfare and so on. I think that kind of information should be available, I haven't seen it but perhaps it's available and I think it's the kind of information we should have now not after the damage is done; and I hope that that kind of report could be made available to members of the House.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GONICK cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, I do have other points to raise. I think they're more better raised at the time when the diversion itself will be debated and I'll conclude with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Would the honourable member permit a question? The honourable member during the Throne Speech debate indicated to the House that the government had an alternative plan to the Churchill diversion that he was aware of and that was well documented. Can the member explain to the House what this plan is, or would he be prepared to do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. GONICK: Well, I'll just say, Mr. Chairman, that the plan has been discussed in the House since I made that reference and it is the plan to integrate the Saskatchewan-Manitoba systems. I understand from the First Minister that Saskatchewan is at this time not willing to move ahead in this area and therefore there's no need for me at this point to refer to it again.

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

MR. GREEN: If I can just state a point of order. There must be some misunderstanding about the particular report that the honourable member is referring to, that when the statement was made it would appear that he was talking about a report that we had received and we were somehow keeping secret. That report was the report that was made to the Environmental Council publicly before we got it and it was a report not submitted within the government structure but a report that Dr. Lansdown thought that we should be interested in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't talking about any report, I was making reference to the statement that was made by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood to House in the Throne Speech debate that there is a documented plan or report . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . Mr. Speaker, exactly why I rose. That is to my understanding what he was referring to, because when he referred to it I was a bit stunned at the moment as to what is he talking about. I know of no report. But it was a report not made to government; it was Dr. Lansdown's report made to the Environmental Council, subsequently sent to us for our consideration.

A MEMBER: Filed by the Premier here.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Member for Crescentwood would indicate to the House now if there is some secret report or is that the report that he is referring to, the Lansdown Report?

MR. GONICK: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to take the opportunity to say that I had never certainly said and there was no inference that this report was a secret document that the government was hiding it. It was a public document; the government had received it; I felt that they hadn't seriously considered it. Apparently since that time there has been considerable discussions over it and as a result of that the Government of Saskatchewan has indicated that it is not particularly interested in pursuing it at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I just thought perhaps the Minister would not have time to answer, five minutes or so anyways, my speech will perhaps be about half that time, so I thought it would be of interest to him, I think about three years ago there was a certain constituent -- by the way I intend to express my feelings as far as the question that was asked by the Minister earlier this afternoon but not at this time. But about three years ago I think he then thought it was a constituent of Burrows but it happened to be a constituent of La Verendrye or from the Town of Hadashville where a person by mistake, a Mr. Steve Kushnarek, if he remembers the name from that time, and by accident he of course caught or was in possession of an animal by the name of fisher. Now I want to tell the Minister -- perhaps he's aware of it -- I want to first of all say that this constituent is perhaps a little bit different than some of my other constituents, and he's well described by the Ombudsman in last year's publication I believe, but he is thankful that the Ombudsman has made arrangements that this animal has been brought to a taxidermist and has been well prepared and he has permission that it will be put in the Museum of Man and Nature. The last time he came into the building here about a week ago he's very happy that all this has been done and he thanks the Ombudsman, of course thanks the Deputy Minister and I'm sure the Minister

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) is aware of it also, but now he wants to know if the intentions are as prescribed by these many people, when is it going to be put into the Museum?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, before 5:30 maybe I can express my happy surprise because I was not aware that that problem had been resolved and I don't think that the member should have any problems about having a constituent who is different because the constituent probably thinks that we have a Minister who is different, you know. There are all kinds of people to make a world and I would be the last one to criticize the so-called oddballs. Maybe the so-called oddballs know what they are talking about. That particular problem is one that resulted from the stringency with which we have to enforce our game laws. I'm glad that the thing has been worked out; I understand that the man had picketed me and picketed me personally for many many years.

Mr. Chairman, since I fought so hard for the right for these people to picket any place that they want to, I would be the last to stop him from picketing and if that's the way that he would want to make his point he has my respect for that. As to when it will happen, I admit my surprise I didn't know that the thing had been resolved so I can't give the honourable member an answer, but being so satisfied that it's resolved I'll do what I can to make it happen quickly.

Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that we call it 5:30. The honourable member may have just a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's 5:30, I am leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock this evening.