

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. Douglas Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	10 Red Robin Place, Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Harry E. Graham	Binscarth, Manitoba
BRANDON EAST	Hon. Leonard S. Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON WEST	Edward McGill	2228 Princess St., Brandon, Man.
BURROWS	Hon. Ben Hanuschak	11 Aster Ave., Winnipeg 17
CHARLESWOOD	Arthur Moug	29 Willow Ridge Rd., Winnipeg 20
CHURCHILL	Gordon Wilbert Beard	103 Copper Rd., Thompson, Man.
CRESCENTWOOD	Cy Gonick	115 Kingsway, Winnipeg 9
DAUPHIN	Hon. Peter Burtniak	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ELMWOOD	Russell J. Doern	104 Roberta Ave., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	Gabriel Girard	25 Lomond Blvd., St. Boniface 6
FLIN FLON	Thomas Barrow	Cranberry Portage, Manitoba
FORT GARRY	Bud Sherman	86 Niagara St., Winnipeg 9
FORT ROUGE	Mrs. Inez Trueman	179 Oxford St., Winnipeg 9
GIMLI	John C. Gottfried	44 - 3rd Ave., Gimli, Man.
GLADSTONE	James Robert Ferguson	Gladstone, Manitoba
INKSTER	Hon. Sidney Green	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
KILDONAN	Peter Fox	627 Prince Rupert Ave., Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Hon. Sam Uskiw	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
LAKESIDE	Harry J. Enns	Woodlands, Manitoba
LA VERENDRYE	Leonard A. Barkman	Box 130, Steinbach, Man.
LOGAN	William Jenkins	1287 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Warner H. Jorgenson	Box 185, Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Ian Turnbull	284 Wildwood Park, Winnipeg 19
PEMBINA	George Henderson	Manitou, Manitoba
POINT DOUGLAS	Donald Malinowski	361 Burrows Ave., Winnipeg 4
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Dr., Portage la Prairie, Man.
RADISSON	Harry Shafransky	4 Maplehurst Rd., St. Boniface 6
RHINELAND	Jacob M. Froese	Winkler, Manitoba
RIEL	Donald W. Craik	66 River Rd., Winnipeg 8
RIVER HEIGHTS	Sidney Spivak, Q.C.	1516 Mathers Bay, West, Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	J. Wally McKenzie	Inglis, Manitoba
ROCK LAKE	Henry J. Einarson	Glenboro, Manitoba
ROSSMERE	Hon. Ed. Schreyer	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	Jean Allard	119 Provencher Ave., St. Boniface 6
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent L. Desjardins	357 Des Meurons St., St. Boniface 6
ST. GEORGE	Bill Uruski	Box 629, Arborg, Manitoba
ST. JAMES	Hon. Al. Mackling	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ST. JOHNS	Hon. Saul Cherniack, Q.C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ST. MATTHEWS	Wally Johannson	471 Home St., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Jack Hardy	11 Glenlawn Ave., Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	463 Kingston Crescent, Winnipeg 8
SELKIRK	Hon. Howard Pawley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SEVEN OAKS	Hon. Saul A. Miller	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SOURIS-KILLARNEY	Earl McKellar	Nesbitt, Manitoba
SPRINGFIELD	Hon. Rene E. Toupin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
STURGEON CREEK	Frank Johnston	310 Overdale St., Winnipeg 12
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Manitoba
THE PAS	Ron McBryde	56 Paul Ave., The Pas, Manitoba
THOMPSON	Hon. Joseph P. Borowski	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TRANSCONA	Hon. Russell Paulley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
VIRDEN	Morris McGregor	Kenton, Manitoba
WELLINGTON	Hon. Philip Petursson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
WINNIPEG CENTRE	Bud Boyce	777 Winnipeg Ave., Winnipeg 3
WOLSELEY	Leonard H. Claydon	116½ Sherbrook St., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, September 16, 1969

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might indicate to the House the order of business for this evening insofar as the paper is concerned. It would be our intention first of all to call Committee of the Whole House dealing with third readings; then consider the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Toupin; then consider the proposed resolution standing in my name regarding the sittings of the House; to consider the adjourned debate on my resolution referring bills to the Law Amendments Committee; then go to second readings on Page 13 of the Order Paper; following that, if we don't run out of time, to go into Committee of the Supply.

I trust this will be satisfactory, so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole . . . -- (Interjection) -- You have it all? Okay. Fine.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: No. 4, The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act; No. 5, An Act to amend The Pipe Line Act; No. 6, An Act to amend The Gas Pipe Line Act; No. 7, An Act to amend The Real Property Act; No. 8, An Act to amend The Insurance Act; and No. 11, An Act to Adjust Certain Benefits arising out of the Operation of the Group Life Insurance Plan for Public Servants; The Transit Grants Act; The Financial Administration Act; and The Provincial Auditor's Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're first dealing with Bill No. 4. Section 1--passed; Section 2--passed; Section 3, there is an amendment - that Section 3 of Bill 4 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof a separate line thereof the following words: "but in any case before the expiry of 24 hours after the person was taken into custody."

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Chairman, was this an amendment that was made in Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, there was an amendment at Law Amendments.

Section as amended--passed. Section 4--passed; Section 5 (1), a motion from Law Amendments that Section 5 of Bill 4 be struck out and the following section substituted therefor: "Exemption from liability. 5. No action lies against a peace officer or other person for anything done in good faith with respect of the taking into custody of any person or the release of a person under this Act." Amendment--passed. Section 5 (1)--passed. (The remainder of Bill No. 4 was read section by section and passed. Bills Nos. 5, 6, and 7 were read section by section and passed.)

Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Insurance Act. Section 1--passed; Section 1, subsection (2)--passed. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could take these page by page, by leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee agree to take these page by page? (Agreed.). The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, just perhaps with the proviso that it's understood that the amendments, or any attached amendments thereto, are those that were made at Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh yes, of course, Mr. Chairman. There were no amendments to this Bill. That's why I suggested it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill No. 8 was read page by page and passed; Bills Nos. 11 and 15 were read page by page and passed. Bill No. 22, pages 1 to 29, was read and passed.) Page 30-- The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On Section 73 (1), dealing with the Debt Retirement Reserve, it states here three percent set aside for general purpose of debt outstanding. I'm not sure whether

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) this is the proper section that I was going to amend or not. I think we are past it. I'm sorry - I was a minute or two late. I would move that the word "three" in the fourth line of Section 73 (1) be struck out and the figure 10 inserted. The motion that I'm making is that I feel that the amount that we're setting aside to pay off our debt is far too small.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could the honourable member indicate which section he's speaking to, please.

MR. FROESE: 73 (1) Line 4, the word "three" that the word "three" be struck out and the word "10" inserted. This would have the effect of setting aside an amount equal to 10 per cent of the indebtedness to the Reserve for Debt Retirement, and I feel that this would be setting a good example to the people of this province because I do not believe and do not subscribe to long term borrowing and I don't feel that we as a government should be indebted in our direct debt the way we are at the present time. I think we should hurry up, clean up our debts and stay free of debt as a province, because we will find . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I hate to interrupt the honourable member but if he's going to go on for any length of time I should point out to him that this is a money item in the Bill and that it cannot be introduced except with a message from His Honour, and I assume that the honourable member does not have a message from His Honour, therefore the amendment is not in order.

MR. FROESE: Well certainly I can speak on the matter . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe the honourable member is in order to speak but not to propose an amendment.

MR. FROESE: Well, you did not object to the motion when I proposed it. As I've pointed out, that I do not subscribe to the matter of the province going deeper and deeper into debt and this is exactly what this government is proposing to do. One of the first bills that they passed in this House was creating more debt. We passed a bill which authorized the government to borrow some \$310 million. Not all of this will be direct deadweight debt, as we call it. Some of it, probably the bulk of it is going to the utilities, such as Hydro and Telephone which are self-liquidating, but nevertheless we were also borrowing for the purpose of general operations. I recall also that we're setting aside \$50 million for the Development Fund but there were also other items which contribute to the direct debt of the province and we're only setting aside, with the three percent, probably something like six million in a given year towards debt retirement, and I feel that this is insufficient, that the amount should be much larger and that we should try and clean up our debt as fast as possible. One reason is also the high interest rates that we have to pay today; the interest rates have increased very much over the last year or two and any new borrowings are costing the province and the people of the province a lot of money. Therefore it's my intention that this section be amended so that we would reduce the debt at a much faster rate and set aside more money to the Debt Retirement Fund for this purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, we've heard the honourable member repeat today what he's repeated in previous years. He himself has admitted that the larger amount of the moneys that have been borrowed in this Session under the Capital Supply is self-liquidating. I do not subscribe to his ideas and I am not prepared to make a change from the previous government's policy which we have accepted in the past and which at the present time we still accept and that is the three percent as being the amount set aside as being acceptable at this time. In the future we will certainly be prepared to reconsider, but at this stage this Bill is substantially, and I'd say basically the same as was presented by the previous government. We were satisfied with it at the last Session; we are satisfied with it now.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there is one point, though, that I question at this time and that is, that as we as members do not have a right to amend an Act or a Bill of this type the way I was proposing to do, I feel that as members of this House, especially as Committee of the Whole, that we as members have the right to amend, even sections of this type, and I would like to have this matter clarified at this point.

MR. PAULLEY: May I refer my honourable friend to Beauchesne. In all of the proceedings in the Houses of Parliament and Legislative Assemblies this is a historic provision; it is traditional. And, complain as my honourable friend might, he doesn't really, Mr. Chairman, need any clarification. I refer him to Bourinot, Beauchesne and May, and all of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) the authorities who have preceded those of us in this House.

MR. FROESE: Just what section are you referring to?

MR. WEIR: If . . . look at our own rule book, if he used the term "consider the advisability of" he'd be quite in order.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. But actually, if I may, Mr. Chairman, on the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I'm sure we're on even keel on this. "Considers the advisability of" in third reading is not a normal practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable member would have the right to amend a bill normally in the Committee but not a money bill.

Page 30. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: . . . not -- so there's no purpose in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: (The balance of Bill 22 was read page by page and passed.) Bill 23 - The Provincial Auditor's Act. Section 1 (a), subsection (1)--passed . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the Law Amendments Committee approved of the amendment to Section 7, which appears on Page 3, and I would suggest that Pages 1 and 2 could be submitted for approval, but on Page 3 I point out now that Section 7 has been amended by the addition of subsection (3), and if members of the committee would like to hear it read I'm prepared to read it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I think we're prepared to see it proceed in the fastest manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 1--passed; page 2--passed; page 3 as amended . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On Page 2, on Section 4 (c) -- I'm sorry, that's not the proper section. I'll have to wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. (The remainder of Bill 23 was read page by page and passed.)

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered Bills Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 22 and 23, and wish to report the same without amendment.

IN SESSION - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILLS Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 15, 22 and 23 were each read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now call the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Toupin.

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation, WHEREAS The Landlord and Tenant Act was enacted in 1931, and except for the revisions made for the purposes of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1940 and the Revised Statutes of Manitoba, 1954, has not been varied in any material way since 1931;

AND WHEREAS it has become increasingly evident that abuses of the rights of Tenants and Landlords have taken place for which there has been inadequate protection provided by the laws of Manitoba;

AND WHEREAS various proposals have been made for amendments to The Landlord and Tenant Act;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that a Committee of the House review The Landlord and Tenant Act and consider proposals for amendments thereto;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed at this session be authorized to review The Landlord and Tenant Act and to consider any proposals for amendments thereto that might be submitted to the Committee;

AND THAT the Committee hold such public hearings as it may deem advisable;

AND THAT the Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation and to report at this session or the next session of the Legislature on the

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) matters referred to it by this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the House.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance,

THAT, for the remainder of the Session, the House have leave to sit in the forenoon from 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., in the afternoon from 2:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., and in the evening from 8:00 p.m., and each sitting be a separate sitting, and have leave so to sit from Monday to Saturday, both days inclusive, and that the Rules with respect to the 10:00 p.m. adjournment be suspended, and that the Order of Business for each day shall be the same as on Thursday.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if you would now call the adjourned debate on my proposed resolution dealing with . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, at the start, on discussing this resolution, may I say that I appreciate essentially the unanimous support of the House in agreeing that this matter could be set over for me to speak on at a later date. I really don't blame you, Sir, because I heard the same static that I'm sure you did in terms of the voice vote the other day, and some of it's from the front benches, and I really appreciate the fact that this matter was allowed to stand over. I'm a little surprised that the matter wasn't called at the first opportunity which was, if I recall correctly, either Thursday or Friday, in order that these bills could have been before Law Amendments Committee on Monday, yesterday, when we met. Notwithstanding that, that's just one of the elements of surprise.

The biggest element of surprise is having this kind of a motion from the person that presented the motion, Mr. Speaker; the individual that over a number of years, and particularly in the last session or two of the House, had complained, complained bitterly about the fact that other committees of the House, other than Law Amendments, haven't met as frequently as they should have. And I don't stand here to complain. I intend to vote for the motion to allow all of these bills to go to the committee, but I did want to register this surprise and to say that if this had been the will of the government, I'm surprised that we didn't have an indication of this a little earlier before the committees of the House were established, because we went to particular pains, in our group at any rate, to put the individuals on committees that they were interested in. Now we find some bills going to Law Amendments Committee on the understanding that the distribution of bills would be such that they would go to the committees that they were intended to go to. Now we find some of those people who are interested in particular bills won't have an opportunity to vote for them.

Any one of a couple of alternatives would have been satisfactory to us. To have included all of the members of the Legislature, sum total, for this session on Law Amendments Committee would have been satisfactory, and set up the other committees as they are set up for in-between sessions and the other committee work that is required, or to have had a Special Committee of the Whole to sit outside of the House to hear representations, so that all of the members of the House for whatever purpose would be in a position, not just to discuss and not just to listen, but to vote on all of the things that were of their particular interest. But I am surprised that there doesn't seem to have been enough forethought on behalf of the government to, at the time the committees were being set up, to recognize the fact that they wanted all of the bills to go to Law Amendments Committee. And I'm not objecting to it. The only thing I object to is not having had reasonable notice reasonable notice that a consideration in the

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) representation of our committee structure could have been looked after by our group, and I presume for the group on the other side, but because we're reasonable people, because we're reasonable people on this side, there's only one man, there's only one man in the House Leader's group that doesn't sit on Law Amendments, outside of you, Mr. Speaker who don't sit on any of the committees. So that, Mr. Speaker, the reasonable position of the people on this side of the House in adopting the committee structure that there was to provide the majority that the government needs in committee and to recognize the participation of the Independent and other members of this House, I believe that really we've suffered a little bit as a result of having been reasonable in the early stages only to find, only to find that others have a better representation in this group than we have, and that we have people that in terms of voting capacity only - and I admit it being voting capacity only - we have more people have to sit out from Law Amendments Committee, I think if you add them all together, than the Liberal Party, the Government and the Independent people together, and we have accepted this as a matter of making the House structure work because we do believe in the democratic system and we do want to make it work. But we do think that the government might very well have considered talking to us about it, and I must admit to not having heard about it before until it was presented on the floor of the House by the House Leader opposite, that no prior consideration was able to be given to it by people on this side of the House. Had it been a suggestion, a reasonable suggestion which - you know, the suggestions from this side are always reasonable - might have been accepted by the government and we wouldn't have been in the position that we are now.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to do at this time is to protest the highhanded way in which the government have seen fit to move into Law Amendments Committee all of these bills, and to forget all of the things that they've said in the past about the reasons and the need for the other committees mentioned. This isn't to say it's all right, Mr. Speaker; the Minister of Transportation, he can pay the rent for his hall some time, and we'll let him have a chirp in too. He sits there all day and complains about things from this side of the House when things are piped in here and piped in there. All I can say is it depends from which side of the House it comes, whether it's reasonable or not in view of my friends opposite. But, Mr. Speaker, I must object on this occasion to the manner in which it was done, for all of the reasons that the Honourable House Leader has used in past years, without repeating them, and believe me I could. I'll refrain from doing that and say that I intend to support the motion. I intend to support the motion to allow the work of the House to proceed in a proper way, but I regret very much, regret very much that prior consideration hadn't been given to the manner in which things could be worked better from this side of the House and maybe better consideration given the interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my protest is not in the same vein as that of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition can register protests. I think I have much better grounds for a protest than he has when he complains about not being represented well on committees, because I checked out 14 members just at random and I found, out of the 14 members, there were two that were sitting on three committees, the Honourable Member for Churchill and myself. The next group sitting on four committees, four members were sitting on four committees, two of those were Liberals and the other two were on the government side; then the next group, on five committees there were seven members that sat on five committees and one member that sat on six committees. This is out of 14. . .

A MEMBER: Who was that?

MR. FROESE: The Honourable Member for - oh I forget - Johannson - Wellington? St. Matthews. I don't care so much just who the members are that are representing five or so, but certainly this just shows up that to complain at not having representation, certainly the Member for Churchill and myself have much stronger reason to complain. I indicated to the House Leader certain committees that I would like to be on. My first one, I think, that I mentioned was Statutory Orders and Regulations. I'm not even on it. The reason I registered for that one certainly is because certain reports go to members of that committee, and if you're not a member of the committee you don't get that report; therefore, I feel that I want to be on that particular committee. Then, too, as you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, if you are not on the committee you cannot make amendments in committee -- (Interjection) -- the Honourable Member for La Verendrye says I can't even make them in the House. Well, I wasn't

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) able to tonight, but in most cases, at least if you are in committee, you are able to make amendments and in this way you are prohibited from doing so, whereas if you are larger groups, you still have someone who can propose those particular amendments that you want to, and therefore you can speak on them and they are voted on. So that if there is reason to complain, certainly I feel that we have much stronger reason to complain on this side as some other members would have.

I have no objection to the particular motion that is before us, that these bills be referred to Law Amendments at this point, because I think this would speed up the work of the House and I think this is what certain members want to, but, as I pointed out, I certainly protest that I have been dropped from too many of the committees and, as I pointed out, that much of the material that ordinarily comes to a member of a committee does not come to us as a result and I will not get the necessary information that I require as a member, being an only member of my party.

Then, too, I have been referred to as an Independent, and I'm not an Independent - I think honourable members know that; that I am a member of a political party in this country and I would like to be recognized as such.

MR. WEIR: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes, if I can answer it.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member figures that he is deprived in any greater sense on any committee than the Member for Virden, the Member for Brandon West, the Member for Pembina, or the Member for Gladstone are in terms of the Law Amendments Committee.

MR. FROESE: No, not in respect as their personal membership on a committee, but as a group; they certainly have colleagues in the group that can present those necessary motions.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to speak against the motion. I feel that governments have certain rights to make decisions, to place them before the House, and it is now apparently their decision to put all bills to the Law Amendments Committee. Originally I would have had no objection to this, but I feel there was a little bit of bad faith on the part of the government when they put the other parties to the trouble to form committees. The whips met and the House Leaders met to decide the ratio of each committee and, as the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition has said, he agreed at that time in good faith that these committees were going to be operative this session and now we find that apparently they are not, and I consider that a little bit of trickery. If it isn't trickery, well I would like some members of the front bench to get up and explain as to why they took this course of action.

In the Throne Speech I recall the First Minister making special mention of the fact that he intended, it was his hope and he intended to strengthen the committee system of this House. Well, this is diametrically opposed to what he said in the Throne Speech and I am willing to be broad-minded and listen to his reasons, but so far there has been no reason whatsoever. We find that all bills are being put through the Law Amendments Committee and it was just a farce enacted when we set up the other committees for the Session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . my friends opposite.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, is my friend showing some deference to us for a change?

MR. PAULLEY: If no one else wishes to speak, I feel impelled to say a word or two following the remarks of my honourable friends opposite, and I'm surprised, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, to hear the remarks of my honourable friends opposite. What the government is proposing in this instance is nothing new to this House. It had been done by the former administration, and for the honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party to accuse us of trickery goes beyond, in my opinion, all due bounds, and I'm surprised to hear, because one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, of the complaints of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is because we were too generous to the Liberal Party in allocation of membership on the committee, and this is one of the complaints that we have received from my honourable friends of the Conservative Party. We tried to be fair . . .

A MEMBER: To everybody but the Tories.

MR. PAULLEY: Everybody but the Tories. It reminds me of a former Tory who sat in this House, by the name of Wally Miller from Rhineland, who accused by letter after letter that everything was done except for the constituency of Rhineland, and we are hearing that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) today from my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland, who bitterly complains because he is not on every committee in the House.

I want to say this too, Mr. Speaker, that every member in this House, that every member in this House has the right to attend and to speak at any meeting of any committee of this House, and my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland knows it, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that my . . .

MR. FROESE: On a point of order. I didn't say that I couldn't speak; I said I couldn't pose any motions.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. That's right. And if that was extended to every member of this House in every committee, we could have 57 motions at every committee and my honourable friend knows it, and for my friend the Member for Rhineland to come here tonight and complain bitterly because he hasn't had the courtesy of this House, Mr. Speaker we have been overly courteous and so was the previous government. In every report that is tabled, the honourable member who does sit in this House as an Independent member has been given the courtesy, and if my honourable friend is not aware of his position in the House, may I refer him to the rules of this House which only recognizes a political party in this House as one having four representatives, and my honourable friend knows it. If he doesn't know it now, it's about time that he did.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm a member of a recognized party. If he doesn't recognize it, that's up to him, but certainly our party had candidates in the field and has had candidates in the field for the last number of elections. Surely he cannot say that I am an Independent. I'm not.

MR. PAULLEY: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, may I say to my honourable friend, to use his own terminology, that if our party, namely the Social Credit Party, didn't elect a member to this House, would he expect the same courtesy for his party as we are giving him now, because it just doesn't jibe, and my honourable friend knows it. My honourable friend knows that he has received more privileges as an Independent than any other Independent that's ever sat in this House. It was never given to a former Independent who sat where the Honourable Member for Charleswood is now sitting, a fellow by the name of Bill Kardash of the Communist Party. He was never given the courtesy that is being given to the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I can tell him that I received more courtesies from the previous government, as far as committees are concerned, than from theirs.

MR. PAULLEY: Very well, but I reject completely the complaints of my honourable friend. My honourable friend who is a loner in this House, is sitting on more committees than any other member complained of by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside says he's a friendly guy. May I suggest that we are all friendly guys in this House, even the Member for Lakeside, but the complaint has been made that we did set up the committees and they are not being called. I'll accept that. I'll accept that, but I want to say to my honourable friend that it's not entirely correct because there was a resolution accepted just this evening, Mr. Speaker, introduced by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that will put to use one of the committees of this House to sit in between sessions, to consider the Landlord and Tenants Act. There's another one that I understand will be meeting - the Committee on Elections and Privileges. The Committee on Municipal Affairs that has been established. The Committee on Statutory Regulations.

MR. WEIR: Will the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Certainly, my friend.

MR. WEIR: Let us say it this way: how is your hearing?

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. WEIR: How is your hearing, for the first question. Well, Mr. Speaker, the second question would be: did he hear me say that the Law Amendments Committee might have been made up of 56 members of the Legislature, excluding the Speaker, for this session, so that all members would have had a privilege to attend and vote, and the other committees could have been distributed for the balance of the session. I can only assume from the comments he has made, Mr. Speaker, that he is hard of hearing.

MR. PAULLEY: Well it may well be, it may well be, but I want to say to my honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) friend that his proposition is nothing new because I made it in this House and it was rejected by the administration that the people saw fit to get rid of on June 25th.

MR. WEIR: Was there a motion sending all bills to the committee?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, definitely. Here it is right here, on April 4th of the journals of 1966-67.

MR. WEIR: Oh, that's two administrations ago.

MR. PAULLEY: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I know we could argue this all night but it is not my purpose so to do. On April 4, 1966-67 journals, the Honourable Mr. Lyon, the Honourable Mr. Lyon who was the House Leader of the Conservative Party, God bless him and rest his Soul - politically that is - he moved a similar resolution as I have moved -- (Interjection) -- Yes, and so were his colleagues of the day, every jack one of them, including the former Speaker -- (Interjection) -- That's right, and maybe I'm out of my mind in attempting to appeal to reason to my honourable friends opposite but, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition because he says he is going to support this motion. I appreciate . . .

MR. WEIR: I thought you hadn't heard that too, the way you were talking.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, I heard that and I appreciate it very, very much. I appreciate the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party's remarks that he is going to go along with this reasonable approach of the government to go into Law Amendments, so I am assured of a majority. I recommend to the House that this motion pass.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, if we may go into second readings on Page No. 13.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 32, An Act to amend The Mining Royalty and Tax Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments to this Act will provide for the revenue aspects of the Mining Royalty and Tax Act to be administered in the Department of Finance under the direction of the Minister of Finance. At the same time matters that are contained in the Act not related to revenue will continue to be administered by the Mines Branch under the direction of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Amendments are provided to make it clear that the information obtained for the purposes of the Act is confidential. The appointment of mines assessors has been simplified. I haven't checked to see whether this Act is identical with the one which was proposed at the last session but I am informed that in substance it is, and that the purpose is only to accomplish that purpose which the previous government had wished to do and that is to transfer the financial aspects from the Department of Mines and Resources to the Department of Finance.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that debate on this bill be adjourned. I certainly have no objection if anybody wishes to speak on it at this time.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 34, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act, for second reading.

MR. PAWLEY: This bill would be referred to Law Amendments Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points in respect to this Act. First, I would point out that this Act is in the same form as the Act and it's identical to that bill which was to be proposed to the last Session of the House dealing with the same matter.

First, I point out that in Section 23 of the bill there is a transfer of the administration of the applicable sections of the Act from the Civil Service Commission to the Management Committee of Cabinet. Management Committee has been administering the pay and classification system and is responsible for carrying forward the negotiations with the Employees' Association but wherever a legal connotation exists Management Committee activities must be formally ratified by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission no longer has the resources to adequately judge these matters referred to it for ratification and the process therefore is administratively and legally most anomalous and could lead to difficulty should controversial issues arise in the area of staff relations.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is provision in respect to this Act for a reduction from 60 to 35 consecutive working days as a maximum period that may elapse before an employee who is carrying out all the duties attached to a position carrying a higher classification is entitled to receive the rate of pay attached to that position, a decrease from 60 to 35 days.

Thirdly, there is a reduction in respect to the probationary period under which a civil servant will work under probation, from one year to six months.

Fourth, a major change in respect to the Bill is a request and the result of a number of discussions that took place with the Manitoba Government Employees' Association and representatives of the previous government was in respect to compulsory arbitration. The situation prior to and at the present time is that in the event of a dispute involving members of the Manitoba Government Employees' Association and the Government, a dispute that cannot be resolved in the final analysis is decided by the Lieutenant-Governor, in fact the Cabinet or the Government itself. This is rather a farcical and bad situation and it is proposed here that the matter of dispute between the civil servants and the government in the event of a dispute that cannot be resolved between the two parties would be referred to binding compulsory arbitration by a third body and that this finding by the third body would be binding on the parties to the dispute.

We're very fortunate in this province that we do have a civil service that acts most responsibly and does in fact place the interests of the civil service of the province first and foremost in their dealings and relationship. They themselves have requested this; they are not asking as the federal civil servants have obtained, a right to strike; they are quite satisfied with this provision; and in view of their responsibility and their fairness of approach the government certainly concurs with this request and recommends it to this House.

There is other technical and minor changes proposed in the Act. One change will permit

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) departments to undertake adequate disciplinary measures in the case of staff dispersed throughout the province, removing it from the area of the Civil Service Commissioner. This is an improvement over the prior Act.

These are the main areas: One is the reference of certain powers to the Management Committee up to now exercised by the Civil Service Commission. Two, the reduction in the probationary period from 12 months to 6 months. Thirdly, the reduction in the period of time from 60 to 35 days that can elapse before an employee is carrying out all the duties attached to a higher position and on that pay. And the provision dealing with compulsory arbitration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: On Page 11, 49 (a), could he give us a short explanation of what the transfer of powers are from the Commission to the Executive Council.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Liberal House Leader, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: answer the question. . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: speak. I was asking a question of the Minister.

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

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, one of the first problems that I was faced with when I assumed the responsibility of this Ministry was a problem which was brought to the attention by the Comptroller as to interpretation of the Act in relation to the manner in which the Leader of the Official Opposition and the Leader of the other Opposition Party were to be paid; and also the question arose because of the fact that in both cases leadership conventions had been held and there was a change in leadership which could not have been recognized by the Speaker, and indeed there was even a question as to whether or not there was a Speaker from the time that the House prorogued until your election, and the purpose of the first two pages of this Act -- oh and I should say that when the problem arose I immediately, well as soon as I could, communicated with the leaders who were involved in the problem and that actually meant the former and the new leaders of the respective opposition parties including the former leader of the former opposition party, and in no time at all the sense of what should be done was agreed to by all and there was unanimity as to the understanding of what was the right, the correct interpretation insofar as logic dictated it. Therefore, the first two pages of this bill deal with clarification should the occasion again arise when the situations that have taken place might again take place and we feel that the amendments as drawn by the Legislative Counsel on the first two pages should take care of what was an unclear situation during the change in government or prior to that.

The last page makes the obvious provision that at this session the amount payable in indemnities to the members shall be as determined in the estimates rather than in accordance with the Act and I think we've discussed that. I'm under the impression there was general agreement with the reduction and this makes it possible that that shall be carried out in accordance with the law.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: say a word to say that I have no objection to the Bill. I appreciate the circumstances under which it's presented and maybe even with its passage some of the leaders of the parties will start to be able to get paid and their wives and families will be able to eat. But that's neither here nor there, Mr. Speaker. I think that it appears to be in a position to put things together in a reasonable way to carry out what was the intention I think before.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party, that debate be adjourned.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to indicate that the Clerk advises us that this would be dealt with in Committee of the Whole when it passes second reading - this Bill.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and 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 Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dealing with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. Resolution 72, 1, (a). The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I recall last day when we concluded discussion on my estimates because of the time factor, I was on my feet and I hadn't completed answering a number of questions and a number of very important pieces of advice that were mentioned for my reference, for the reference of the department, and as I said then I am most appreciative of many of these comments that were made.

I believe I was about to elaborate on the question of the Pembina Dam. Concern has been expressed by two members, the Honourable Member from Rhineland and also the Honourable Member from Pembina. I apologize to the Member from Pembina because I believe I referred to him mistakenly as the Member from Emerson and this of course is in error. The question of the Pembina Dam as I indicated last day is being actively considered and that it along with a number of other irrigation projects in the Province of Manitoba are being reviewed by the government and I expect that we will be making a submission to the Federal Government early this fall.

Apart from the question of the Dam of course there is the question of adequate water supply in this area and I'm also pleased to report that the Department has a number of plans in mind which we trust will enable that area, the area around Winkler in particular and other towns in that area to receive adequate supplies. I understand that there is an existing network in the Winkler area and that there is a Winkler aquifer that might be expanded. It's possible that the Morden Dam should be raised and it's possible that we should negotiate with the City of Niche in the United States for additional water.

Well, if I can pass on then to the Member from Churchill, who unfortunately isn't in the House. I believe he gave us a lot of advice. I don't think he had any specific questions in particular in mind. He mentioned the importance of mining and more investment and also stressed the need for adequate exploration. I can assure the honourable member, although he's not here he may read this in Hansard, that this government shares his concern and indeed we intend to look into the question as to how exploration in the Province of Manitoba may be stimulated. Reference was made to the Port of Churchill. I personally believe that this is a very special case, development of a town, that is confronting the people of Manitoba and I believe that there is an obligation, a serious obligation on the part of this legislature to do all they can to assist in the development of this port.

The matter of water was also raised by the honourable member, stressing the importance of this commodity. I'm sure all members of the House would agree with me that water is becoming a more important asset as time goes on and perhaps it's becoming one of our most important resources. Fortunately in Manitoba we have a plentiful supply, we are in a basin, waters flow to us from the East, from the West and from the South, and possibly we are one of the most fortunate areas with respect to water supplies in the North American continent. This is something we will become increasingly aware of as time goes on.

Naturally the Honourable Member from Churchill is very concerned about adequate attention being paid to the development of the north and he stressed this in no uncertain terms. All I can say in reply is that this government is prepared to meet his challenge of northern development through the implementation of a northern task force and of course through the study and possible action taken on the Transportation Commission Report which was recently tabled in this House.

Passing along then to the comments made by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, with respect to the aesthetic qualities of various waterways, I suppose he was particularly concerned with the Red River and the Assiniboine River. We indeed share his concern on this and I believe the - although it is not in this department any more, the Department of Tourism and Recreation will be actively working on the question of improving the banks of the river sides for parks and recreation purposes.

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)

The Honourable Member from Swan River also had a number of comments to make. He made some reference to the use of trainees, I believe, people who had been in certain provincial jails and that this was a good idea that we should use them. I believe, however, that this is a matter for the Attorney-General's Department but I believe that there is good reason to think that we can expand this type of program. However, it is definitely in the Attorney-General's Department.

The question of Wildlife - a number of items on wildlife were raised. I would like to say something in one respect - that is about the early moose and elk seasons. I wish to point out that during this time of the year, the so-called early season, the animals are in the best condition, that they may be "called" by the hunter, the weather is good and meat spoilage does not necessarily have to be extensive. On this last point the spoilage of meat can be kept to a minimum by the wise application of a few rules known to many hunters and a booklet on the subject may be obtained from the Conservation Extension Branch of my department. In view of the limited moose and elk hunting opportunity available in Manitoba I feel that we should continue to provide the privilege of hunting in the early season.

There were a number of other members who raised questions in the area of wildlife and water control and I choose to answer all those relating to wildlife first of all and then go on to some of the questions on water control, even though I may go back to the same member. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia raised many, many questions relating to wildlife. The honourable member suggested the planting of feeding areas for wild deer, particularly in the south west, because of the severe situation experienced last winter. While I'm informed that feeding areas have some, but very limited, unfortunately, value to wild deer, the weather problem experienced occasionally by deer in Manitoba is more often associated with temporary deep snow conditions than it is as an actual scarcity of food. In other words, the food may be there but unavailable because the deer cannot travel to it or cannot find it. This was the situation last winter for the most part I am informed. The aim of the department in deer management is to control deer population through sustained annual harvest by sportsmen so that their numbers do not exceed the carrying capacity imposed by winter food unavailability. We must accept the fact that we can have too many deer in terms of winter food supply and that the best overall plan of action is to maintain numbers that are compatible with their winter environment. Even then in any particular winter we may have problems, but when so, the best local action is often to make roads for the deer to the food supply.

The suggestion was also made that waterfowl hunters should be allowed one or two mistake ducks. Our approach this year, the approach of the department is that we in fact have no season on canvasbacks or redhead ducks but that one bird will be allowed as a mistake bird in the bag. Hunters are therefore expected to shoot no canvasbacks or redheads but will be allowed one in the event of a mistake. No mistake mallards will be allowed in addition to the four per day that can be legally shot. However, I would have all members of the House rest assured that our conservation officers will exercise good judgment and that unnecessarily harsh action will be avoided.

Duck numbers, particularly those of canvasbacks, redheads and mallards are below those that we would like to see and therefore we have to be very particular in this connection. For this reason the season starts later this year than is usual for southern Manitoba and a fairly rigid approach is necessary to the enforcement of bag limits. Hunters are asked to co-operate insofar as it is possible for them to do so.

The honourable member also made a suggestion that all waterfowl open on the same opening date in any particular area. Well this will in fact be the case this year. The season on all duck species opens in southern Manitoba on September 29th.

A point was also made that deer seemed scarce on the east side of Lake Manitoba and that this is related to predator activity. Our surveys in wildlife management studies indicate that deer in the Interlake region suffered from a severe winter 5 to 6 years ago at which time their numbers decreased appreciably. Since then, they have been building back slowly. Predator control activity directed against wolves was sharply increased last year. An estimated 40 wolves were killed in the central Interlake, most of them in the fringe area bordering on agricultural land. Our objective, the objective of the department will be to control wolf numbers in that region, but not to exterminate them. We feel that wolves along with other wildlife species have a place in the ecological scene within Manitoba.

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)

The honourable member also suggested that farmers should receive preference in the elk draw around Riding Mountain National Park and it was asked what the harvest was last year. A questionnaire determined that 233 elk were harvested by 600 permit holders. The majority of those elk were taken during the later season. Only 33 of the elk were taken by Winnipeg hunters; the remaining 200 were shot by residents from other parts of Manitoba. A considerable number of the permittees I am informed actually resided within hunting area 23. This year we propose to issue 1500 permits and fully expect that most of the farmers around Riding Mountain National Park will receive a license in the draw. If this does not occur we will consider further changes for succeeding seasons.

The honourable member suggested that a bear hunting season be held in the fall. I would like to make this comment: a fall hunting season for bears has been in existence for two years. An increasing number of hunters are taking advantage of this hunting opportunity I am pleased to report. Still another suggestion - upland birds are scarce it has been suggested and the question was raised as to what investigations are being made and what are the results. Almost complete failure in upland bird reproduction occurred last year, that is 1968, and as a result, fall numbers were well below what hunters anticipated. However, very low mortality occurred over winter and we are happy to report that a higher rate of reproductive success occurred in most areas this year. As a result, unofficial counts indicate that sharptail and ruffed grouse numbers are generally higher than last year. Good hunting success is anticipated in those areas. However, a word of caution is in order: finding the bird and getting your bag limit is still up to you.

And the last question - the honourable member is very well versed in the problems of wildlife and hunting and so forth. The last question, and I have lost track of what number it was, was raised regarding private hunting preserves. I am informed that regulations are now in existence permitting the establishment and operation of private shooting preserves. One license has been granted so far and I am given to understand that two or three more applications are being considered by entrepreneurs in the Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg areas.

I would like to pass along to questions asked by the Honourable Member from Brandon West. He expressed concern about the danger of moose extinction in the north. Our surveys indicate that high moose populations exist in most areas of good habitat throughout northern Manitoba. In fact the problem is less one of possible extinction than it is a need to harvest more moose. Annual surpluses of moose exist in many areas that are not within easy reach of hunters. Good conservation would suggest that greater access is required to harvest these surpluses. In the last three years, for the information of the honourable member, hunting opportunity has been greatly expanded throughout most of the moose range in Manitoba to provide sportsmen the opportunity to partake in those harvests. Regular surveys are undertaken so that the status of major moose populations is constantly under scrutiny. No game preserves are therefore required at this time.

The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie raised the point that the Delta Marsh be created a provincial park. Unfortunately I don't believe he is in the House but he, too, may read this in Hansard, if he is still interested. We are presently considering a proposal to have the Delta Marsh established as a wildlife management area and managed for the production and utilization of water fowl. I think this will be good news to a lot of duck hunters. A very detailed report has been compiled which is presently under study. We recognize the value of the area to wildlife and to the citizens of Manitoba and we will take whatever feasible steps are required to maximize that value and to retain it for future generations.

Passing away from some wildlife problems into some other areas, I go back to a question raised by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia again. He asked about the sale of Crown lands. He said that many farmers who wished to extend their units had not been able to buy Crown land. I have several copies of a publication entitled "Manitoba Crown lands; their acquisition, tenure and utilization". I think this publication will answer many of the questions of the honourable member and I would be pleased to try to answer any further questions he may have after he has had an opportunity to read this over. I have several copies here and perhaps the page might like to give a copy to the honourable member and any other members of the House that may be interested in this document. I repeat it is "Manitoba Crown lands; their acquisition, tenure and utilization".

The Honourable Member from Rock Lake asked me to look into measures to improve the control of the level of Rock Lake. I am informed that my Water Control and Conservation

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) Branch is studying the problem at the present time and is preparing recommendations to the government.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West was concerned about the flooding problem on land owned by Mr. John Campbell of Willow Creek. For the information of the honourable member, the officials of my Water Control and Conservation Branch have been in contact with Mr. Campbell. I understand that the Branch was prepared to divert water away from Mr. Campbell's land but a petition was received from people concerned about how such a diversion would affect Willow Creek. This I am afraid is a perpetual type of problem in water control. What pleases one group or one party is many times detrimental to another and it's a matter of resolving the problem to some happy compromise. Very often this is possible but it's not always possible. The Branch is now looking at this aspect of the problem to make sure that we don't create additional difficulties and I believe Mr. Campbell has been made aware of this.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West was also concerned about erosion of dikes originally constructed by the PFRA in the Assiniboine Valley and I am pleased to report that our engineers have looked at this problem, but I am informed that the dikes are a municipal responsibility now.

The Honourable Member from Brandon West also asked about the use of a dam on Plum Creek to control water levels in the marsh. I can inform him that I met recently with a large delegation to discuss this very problem and the Water Control and Conservation Branch is now working on Plum Lake with a view to activating the dam, improving Plum Creek and then maintaining the water at levels appropriate for wildlife. Although it is recognized that wildlife benefits in this area are primary, my Water Control Branch is also trying to insure that water levels will be satisfactory for the farmers affected. I might add that the delegation that I have referred to was made up primarily of farmers. They are quite concerned about the wildlife usage and their suggestions are in keeping somewhat with our own views and in effect it's a compromise situation I think that we are confronted with and I think this problem is going to be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both interests in this particular case.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland asked about the progress on the Canada Land Inventory Program, the availability of maps and the amount of money still to be spent on the program. I have some information for him at this time which I would like to relay to him and for the information of the members in the House. A total of approximately 57 million acres of land are included within the inventory area of Manitoba, 57 million acres of land are in this inventory area, and from July 1966 until September 1, 1969 the Department has completed field studies, maps and reports on the following areas:

Agriculture, 40 million acres. In other words, we've done field studies, we've got some maps; we have reports pertaining to agriculture. Out of the total of 57, we've covered 40 million. In the case of Forestry, out of 57 we've covered 35 million. Each of these figures is out of the total of 57 million.

In the case of recreation, 45 million acres have been completed. Sport fish, also 45 million acres. Wildlife, 35 million acres, and present land use mapping, 35 million acres.

The publication of this data, I would inform members of the House, is the responsibility of the Federal Government which has commissioned the program. In other words, this is a joint provincial-federal co-operative endeavour. Most of the Manitoba information gathered to date is in the process of being reproduced, although several maps of agricultural capability are now available. If the honourable member wishes to obtain these, or if he wishes information on a specific piece of land, I'm sure the Canada Land Inventory Office will be pleased to assist him.

As for the amount of money still to be spent on the program, I can inform the honourable member only that the program is to be completed by March 31, 1972, and that the amount of money to be expended is currently the subject of negotiations with the Federal Government.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland also asked about the purpose of Southern Indian Lake geological investigations. This was a detailed item in the estimates. I'd like to give him a bit of background on this. During 1968, the geological survey of Manitoba commenced a three-year program of geological investigation in the Southern Indian Lake area. The area was "flown" under contract during 1968, and the geophysical data obtained, while very significant in itself, was of great assistance in planning deployment of our field parties. In addition, available geophysical data was sold to the public on June 27 -- this is 1968. The release of this data, together with the Sherritt-Gordon announcement of copper zinc

September 16, 1969

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) mineralization in the Rusty-Ruttan Lake area, resulted in major staking activity and illustrates, we believe, the importance of the geological survey of Manitoba activities in the stimulation of mineral exploration in the province. It was not possible to obtain qualified field mapping personnel, unfortunately, required for the ten field parties. However eight parties were put in the field. These parties have just returned and, although it is too early to form any concrete opinions, we believe that the first year of field mapping has met all expectations. As far as the money spent on this program, I believe the honourable member will appreciate from my earlier remarks that all accounts have not been received, therefore no accurate accounting can be made. As he knows, the amount of \$499,500 appears in the estimates, however.

The honourable member also asked what monies are being spent in connection with the Red River Floodway and what the costs of maintenance are. In 1969 - 70, it is estimated that \$170,000 will be spent on the Red River Floodway for engineering, seeding and weed control, property and excavation - that's \$170,000.00. The Federal Government will contribute \$101,250 of this amount and the province \$68,750.00. The province will also stand an estimated \$100,000 for maintenance of the Floodway.

The honourable member also asked questions respecting prairie water resource plans - that is, federal estimates for prairie water resource planning in Manitoba, and a number of other questions relating to water control drainage program. Unfortunately I haven't yet got the information but I will provide that hopefully in due course.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland also asked for a complete list of drainage projects for 1969 - 1970. I understand that the Information Services Branch is currently preparing a release on this which should supply this information to the honourable member and for members of this House.

Passing on to a particular question with respect to Bissett, I believe the honourable member has expressed concern on this matter during this session of the House - this is the Honourable Member for Rhineland again - and I have some information which I could pass along at this time which may be of some interest to the member. Possibly for the interest of other members of the House I might give some background. This is with reference to the San Antonio Gold Mines Limited. This is the mine in the Bissett area, and I think this is what he's concerned with. I may be wrong but I think this is what he's concerned with. As members know, the mine was placed in bankruptcy by a receiving order dated July 5, 1968. On November 28, 1968, the joint trustees in bankruptcy sold the mine assets with certain exclusions, for an amount of \$185,000 to Messrs. Greenwood, Bowlen and Dickson. On January 23, 1969, the joint trustees in bankruptcy entered into agreement with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources whereby provision was made for repayment to the province out of the sale proceeds, the balance of the loan remaining unpaid at the date of bankruptcy, together with outstanding default interest and including costs incurred as a result of previous receiving order in 1966, totalling in full almost \$75,000.00. This agreement also included provision for the payment of cost incurred by the former trustees under the original loan agreements amounting to \$9,127.46. Under the agreement with Messrs. Greenwood, Bowlen and Dickson, the purchase price is to be paid to the joint trustees in bankruptcy. I just might say, without going into a lot of detail, the purchasers have met their financial obligations to date and the Province of Manitoba as a result has received payments from the trustees in bankruptcy in effect.

The balance owing - that is, the current status of this loan account - the balance owing to us now is \$19,603.18. The current status at the mine - I might add a couple of comments on this - the original surface hoist which was burned has been replaced with another and is now operational. Secondly, in order to provide access to the lower levels of the mine, it will be necessary to make three internal shafts operational. The initial steps in this program have commenced, I'm informed. And thirdly, the owners state they intend to prepare the mine for examination by interested parties.

Well, I'm not sure whether I've answered all questions that have been put by honourable members up to now, but I think I have surely covered the bulk of them. Again, I would repeat that many members did make suggestions and I'm happy to receive these suggestions; it's part of my educational program in learning the ins and outs of this very diverse department. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside,

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while I've done this personally I would of course like to do it publicly and that is to congratulate the Minister on the assumption of this portfolio of Mines and Natural Resources which has to be one of the most challenging in government - and I'm sure he would agree with me - which will afford him the opportunity of working with an excellent staff. I had also indicated to the Minister privately that it wouldn't be my intention, in speaking to the estimates of his department, to unduly delay the proceedings.

I have the privilege of being reasonably familiar with the estimates and I commend the Minister for bringing them forward in largely unchanged manner. They're good, conservative estimates of a good, conservative policy program, which I applaud. Essentially, I suppose, that would have been the essence of my contribution to his estimates at this time. However, in the intervening time, we have had of course a very significant statement read to us the other day by the First Minister and which involved very closely the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, as the action that had been contemplated involved the Minister directly as the person responsible of having the jurisdiction for the issuance of a licence to Manitoba Hydro, and the subsequent action on the part of the House Leader and other members of the government opposite, that leave us to believe at this stage that the government has in fact no intention of affording us any opportunity to discuss with the experts - and I would like to say this in a way that is both non-insulting to the Minister and yet factually in the sense that I'm sure that he'd be the first to agree, and we on this side have been the first to accept the answer so readily given by the Ministers opposite, that they have had hardly an occasion to acquaint themselves with all the details of some of the more complex problems facing them, and we've been prepared to accept it. Certainly I've been prepared to accept that position; it's a very understandable one. However, on the very important question of redirection of how we use one of our most generous supplies of resources, mainly water, for the purpose of generating hydro power in this province, there are a vast number of questions raised by the First Minister's statement and indeed a tremendous number of unanswered questions and information hopefully to be supplied by the Minister with respect to the course that the government has chosen to follow.

Now if we are not, Mr. Chairman, going to have an opportunity of speaking at Public Utilities Committee, of speaking to these experts, then I would have to deduce, Mr. Chairman, that even the action tonight which, concurred in by our group, would seem to be a further indication that the government of the day has no intention of embarking on any committee work other than that already indicated by the government, namely the Law Amendments Committee, at which bills presently before the House will be dealt with, and I am well aware that the First Minister is possibly going to remind me that the course chosen by his government is quite different to the one that we had contemplated in the sense that we were asking the House to make a decision in bill form, or in approval of a bill, and that for that reason it's entirely within the executive authority of the Cabinet to make their decision as they see fit without particularly making it an issue in the House. I would have to remind him that it has been of long-standing tradition in this Legislature to have the Public Utilities Committee sitting whenever any questions of importance relating these - particularly these two important public utilities that we have, namely the telephone and the hydro system, are under in any shape or form discussion. We call the committee together when the rates are discussed, when expansion of its program is being discussed. We have just recently, without too much fuss or fanfare, agreed to the supplementary capital estimates which included vast sums in the neighbourhood of \$200 million for hydro alone, at that time, of course, without having the information that the First Minister gave us Monday last that in fact a new course, a new direction was being set in the province with respect to hydro electric development. Surely it would have been quite within reason for us to ask questions, or call at that time for the Public Utilities Committee to meet so that we could delve into the manner and way in which this \$200 million was going to be used. But Mr. Chairman, I feel that unless the front bench or the House Leader, who is just now entering, is prepared to indicate to me or to this side at this point that the Public Utilities Committee will meet, I'm certainly quite prepared not to prolong unduly the debate on the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' salary, and proceed with the estimates in the relatively good time that it has been possible to do up to now. But we have received no assurance from the opposite side that we are going to be given that opportunity, and there are a tremendous number of questions raised.

Firstly, of course, the whole debate on South Indian Lake issued around the availability

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) of and indeed the quality of the information that was being given on the whole project, and I, in a brief statement yesterday in response to the Minister's statement, indicated to the House, and I speak specific to my friends on this side of me too about the fact that I would still like to ask what specific information do they have now that they didn't have in their hands when I released to all members of the Legislature this summary of the natural resources and the people of the Churchill River diversion area. Furthermore, I would have to ask the honourable members to cite me one specific case of pertinent information that they now have that, with the distribution of those reports, that wasn't contained in the rather lengthy transcripts of the public hearings that were held, on which occasion my then Deputy Minister, Mr. Mair, submitted himself to first of all issuing a statement and lengthy questioning - I believe in all it's some 70 or 80 pages of type in the transcripts which were made available in advance before the Session was called -- or pardon me, the actual transcript was given at the time of the Session but the hearings were public; they were well covered, as the First Minister has already indicated, by the press; and I make the point only saying that this information obviously was not enough, because many of those who opposed the scheme opposed it on the basis that they didn't have enough information. Many of them that opposed the scheme, even from the members opposite, indicated to us that they were not necessarily opposed to the high level diversion project as such, but give us the additional information, give us the additional facts and we may even go along with the project. Now, for some strange mystical reason, we've given this government -- I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that shows how serious the question of a credibility gap can really be, because obviously we had lost it somewhere.

I gave them the information; others, experts, gave them the information; it was given to them in transcript form -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, when I refer to my Deputy Minister, my then Deputy Minister Mr. Mair, I refer to him as an expert, and if he wants to challenge that position, if he wants to challenge that position that is of course his prerogative, but I would assure you that in the field of resources the Deputy Minister that we're privileged of having serving in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources is eminently more qualified than the outside expert that this government brought in to deal with a field that we are supposed to be lacking in information. Now it wasn't a question of getting more Hydro engineering information, it wasn't a question of getting more data to add to the four, five million dollars worth of information we already had, what we were lacking - and I have to admit it myself - what we were lacking was some further information or further proof, or further estimation in those areas of the natural resource field areas and the humanistic value and so forth, and I submit on that basis the contribution made by the outside consultants hired by this government made no significant contribution.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

But that's not the point, Mr. Chairman. The point that I am making is that my honourable friends, what is left of the remnants of the Liberal Party, even my good friend of the Social Credit Party, my good friend in the Social Credit Party - he's not an Independent man at all. I know that he's a man of strong mind and strong will but he's -- I fully accord him the position of being a member of an official recognized party - that is, in my eyes anyway - but I find very strange noises coming from them in the sense that the 65-page booklet that was delivered to them a few days ago by this government has now satisfied them completely that they now have the information that I or this government refused to give them, and I am only making the point, Mr. Speaker, that that information was all there, it was all there in essence and much more -- you could read it in 22 pages, that I distributed to every member of this House and that was available to the press and, in that manner, to the public at large in Manitoba. -- (Interjections) -- That's not the point, Mr. Chairman, now, on the strength...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit two questions? Is it not a fact that your government refused Orders for Return asking for the document to be tabled?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the government refused Orders for Return on the same basis that that government and that First Minister, that is leaving the hall right now, is refusing Orders for Returns that we are asking for, simply because they were of a privileged nature, inter-departmental, that involved aiding the executive branch of government in arriving at a decision.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . a second question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. JOHNSTON: The second question then, Mr. Chairman. Is it not a fact to the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to whom I address this question, is it not a fact that he did not release his condensed version of the report until after the Winnipeg newspapers had on their front pages - and how they got them I don't know - had reasonably accurate reports published which your government refused members of this House?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, that is not a fact. The actual date that this was released was roughly on January 12th, in that area, just at the days of the hearings, the public hearings. This was well in advance of the Session. It was at the time of the public hearings when this particular document was released to those present, and in fact this was part of the statement that was read into the public record by the Deputy Minister at those hearings. However, I accept the question as I will, from the Liberal House Leader, as notice. I will verify the actual date of when the story appeared in the press - I know which one he is referring to - and the date this was released.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I think I have been reasonably lenient in permitting questions. I think that you, as an orator yourself, will appreciate the fact that when you are about to get into the swing of things, one has to have the opportunity of having some continuity in one's speech. However, much more serious in the announcement about Monday, now that we have decided not to flood South Indian Lake and only flood Lake Winnipeg, does anybody for one minute suggest, or do these honourable members beside me here, who were so insistent about information, are they not expressing any concern about the humanistic, the resource values that are going to be jeopardized to some extent in the course now being suggested by the government? Do you mean to say that it was dead wrong when I suggested flooding out a muskrat and it's quite all right for the present government to suggest flooding out a muskrat, because . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. EVANS: It has not been suggested that we flood Lake Winnipeg. No one has suggested that.

MR. ENNS: Well I think the wording used in the statement, in the statement used by your . . .

MR. EVANS: It's the reverse. We hope to control flooding.

MR. ENNS: The wording used in the statement of your consultant, Mr. Beggs, is that it's unlikely that spectacular changes will occur on Lake Winnipeg. I believe that was the reassuring terminology used, that I am sure will reassure so many that live in and about that great body of water.

MR. EVANS: But you will admit your previous statements were correct.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, more important, these are things that I don't have information of, but I certainly would want to have the opportunity - as we provided the opportunity, and you know, when you think about it, and I think even the Member from St. Boniface will agree with me (we don't always agree), but you know, you can't accuse this government of not having given you fellows a fair day in court at these committee hearings . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege . . .

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I thought you didn't want the job of Speaker. Is this a challenge that I'm issued, because I think that I am ready to accept this challenge, that we did not get a fair day in court. The former Minister said just a minute ago that they refused to give an Order for Return, to accept an Order for Return - isn't this what you said - for the same reason that this government did, and did you think you were right then?

MR. ENNS: I think I'm dead right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well why are you asking for the same Order for Return now?

MR. ENNS: Because we are not getting access to get the information through the committee meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I would simply ask my honourable friend if he would not regard it as fair, fair procedure, if we gave the assurance, as I think we would want to do, that before any license is issued on any kind of water diversion scheme, before any bill is passed, such as you attempted to pass, that you would have access to the experts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Order.

MR. ENNS: This gets down to the real gut issue . . . the non-realization on the part of those who now have the responsibility of government, who do not and cannot appreciate what the failure to proceed with the development of the north, the failure to provide an additional and surplus power for this province's needs, the failure to comprehend what this means to the portfolio that he should be very interested about as the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I think also we certainly have to know now at this stage, not later on, because I accept the premise put forward by the First Minister that when such a future license or future course is being suggested, that surely we would hope -- I think we set the precedent that we are going to have very wide and far-reaching public hearings and full discussion. However, you have made a decision not to do something. We are all aware to some extent of the inclinations of the course already set to some extent, and I think we have some -- we should be given some consideration to have answers given to us as to what in fact the consequences are to the Manitoba people of reversing the decision, of reversing a decision that was made by a former government in that area. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That's what we're here for.

MR. ENNS: Right. I'm glad you said that because, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that I answered the same way and this was the problem that I got from this side.

MR. PAULLEY: With all due deference to my vociferous friend, may I indicate to you, Mr. Chairman, that the rules of the House. . .

MR. WEIR: Wouldn't it be your parliamentary friend?

MR. PAULLEY: Parliamentary friend? Not very parliamentary tonight, my honourable friend. I move that the committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, directed me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. DOERN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 o'clock. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow (Wednesday) afternoon.