

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, June 5, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a). The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wasn't quite finished just before we recessed for the lunch hour. I requested at that time that we be provided with the amounts that each division has asked for in their budgets. I'm sure the Minister has the information by now that could be made available to honourable members. It is of interest to us and it would give us a better idea of assessing the various divisions and their operations. I think I mentioned the tax credit item before in the Estimates - the nine million figure - and I hope the Minister does elaborate on that, the difference between this year's allocation and that of last year's. Whether this is completely made up of the tax credit legislation that is before us at the present time.

When replying before the Minister mentioned that the quality of services provided in the non unitary divisions didn't measure up to those of the divisions and he referred to certain services not being provided by the multi district division. However, I feel that the services that we are providing in the multi district division, whichever we are providing, are as good as those in other areas and I don't think we have to take a back seat and that as a result of that that we are not entitled to the increased grants. And talking about dropouts before, the Minister mentioned dropouts, I didn't use the word dropouts because I didn't refer to dropouts, I referred to children who never have attended public school in the city here and there are such, I know of them and this is what I had in mind before. The Minister mentioned the one-room school. I, too, didn't refer to the one-room school because there are so few left. I think there is only two left as far as I know in Garden Valley so that I certainly didn't make reference to the one-room school at all.

I would like to know from the Minister the basis of financial support to the technical schools, their operational costs? Has this been fully decided on? Is the total cost of operating the schools being borne by the government or is a certain amount taxed on real property of the divisions to pay for the cost of operating? I would like to know the basis on which these schools are being operated and what percentage comes from where, because the last session this apparently hadn't been fully decided on and I think it was mentioned that full agreement had not been reached for the new technical schools that were being built and to be brought into operation. I mentioned the Hutterite schools before, the Minister never made a reply and I am still interested to know just who is running them? Is it the official trustee? Are they being run by the division boards and are they getting the same grants as other division schools? What is the score on this?

One item that I would like to deal with and we might as well, I think, deal with it under this item. This has to do with teachers' pensions. Last year I think I mentioned that I feel that teachers should be able to get a pension at an earlier age. I think we're requesting too much ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre on a point of order.

MR. BOYCE: Teachers' retirement is under an item already passed, 53 (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point's well taken. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I realize that that was in a former resolution but I don't think it does hurt to make reference to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 53 (d). We've already passed the item.

MR. FROESE: Well if the members don't want to hear anything on this particular item, I will have to let the thing go unsaid but I feel that teachers should be able to retire at an earlier age. I would suggest that 25 years should be sufficient and that ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would refer the honourable member to our House rule - 62 (2), I believe it is.

MR. FROESE: Well in that case, Mr. Chairman, I'll wait for the Minister's comments...

MR. CHAIRMAN: 64 (2), pardon me.

MR. FROESE: ... on the various questions that I posed. I think I've covered most of them, but before I sit down I want to make one final comment and that is that with the grant that we're providing for the city schools especially now under Unicity, this is really divisive and this government is dividing the people in this province and on that basis they I guess want to conquer. I don't subscribe to that principle, I feel that if we do give relief, we should provide it for all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, what resolution are we on? 55?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 55 (a). School Grants and Other Assistance.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I just have a few questions. I wanted to speak on Planning and Research, I guess I missed that. But my question is that the Minister I know was asked to get some figures on cost of education, I wonder if he could tell us what percentage of the total cost of public school education is financed through property tax or by way of property tax? What portion or what percentage of the total cost of education is financed through the property tax. I think there's some varying percentages bandied around by many people and I would like to get it straight from the Minister to see what percentage it is.

The other question I would like to ask the Minister on this resolution. What measure is the government taking to obtain greater equality of financing particularly in rural areas, financing education. There's also a problem that what programs does the government intend or does intend to implement through some people that are disadvantaged in rural areas. It is my understanding that in some rural areas the opportunity to elect options as many of the students have in the larger centres, they have not the same options as they would here in the secondary schools. I believe it was mentioned just the other day that in some schools there's only one or two students taking French in a total high school unit. This almost sounded unreal but are some of these programs such as French and certain science courses phased out because enrolment is small, or what is the reason for it. I would like to perhaps have the Minister answer those questions and can he tell us, has there been any action taken or what has happened to the Core report that I know the government - has been made public some time ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of brief questions I'd like to direct to the attention of the Honourable Minister. One regarding centralization of the primary and public school system in rural Manitoba especially my constituency and also Pelly Trail. I'd like to have an understanding from the Minister what is the policy of the department regarding the closing up of the primary school in St. Clara, as an example, where the kindergarten class would be some eight or ten, twelve children which when you try and transport these children to Roblin some 30 miles distance you'd find that only two children would be interested in pursuing education at the kindergarten level.

Also, meetings were held by the parents in the area and I have had the honour of attending one of those meetings. The parents are very happy with their present school system and they are in fact using a parochial type of system there that they're very happy with. At the moment I don't know whether Roblin has empty space, the reasoning for it, but they have some understanding from the Board that they are to be phased out and those children are to be moved to Roblin.

The other one that comes to my attention is the one in a village where I live, the Village of Inglis where loud and clear it came through to the students and the parents in the area that these children will be transported to Russell. Is this the continuing policy of the department that the schools will be centralized and closed up, what's going to happen to the buildings when they close the doors?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. If I just may go back to some of the questions that were put to me before we adjourned for the dinner hour. Yes, the Honourable Member for Emerson asked me whether there was a change in policy re our building program, and in fact you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable member asked me essentially the same question several days ago and at that time I replied to him with the negative that there has been no change in policy. And the answer still remains the same, that there has been no change in the policy re capital expenditures. Whatever the duties and responsibilities of the Building Projects Committee, the Public Schools Finance Board may have been in previous times they have remained unchanged, completely unchanged; responsibility is still theirs.

But may I also add, Mr. Chairman, that both the Building Projects Committee and the Public Schools Finance Board no doubt consults with other branches, with different individuals for advice in assisting them in making their decisions, and this they are doing, and that exactly is the function, the role of the Planning and Research Department within the Department of Education, to offer that type of advice to other branches. Not to make decisions but to offer whatever statistical data may be required, whatever other information may be required of

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . them, but not to make the decisions. Decision is still made by the two groups which have always made such decisions. That has remained completely unchanged.

The Honourable Member for Emerson indicated that he's somewhat fearful and he referred to the Planning and Research Branch as being controlled by people of good academic understanding but less of a practical, too much emphasis on statistical analysis, and therefore he'd use the Planning and Research Branch with some apprehension. He fears analyses being made from an academic point of view, and then he went on to make reference to rural areas in Manitoba of a declining population.

Mr. Chairman, we are well aware as I'd indicated before the dinner hour of the need for the provision of school facilities within the sparsely populated areas of the Province of Manitoba. At no time, at no time had I or anyone speaking for government or for my department given the people of Manitoba anything to believe that it is not our intention to provide school facilities within those areas. In fact we're doing that very thing, as we have been over the last three years, and of which the honourable member is well aware of a school in his own riding which he and I attended the opening ceremonies a couple of months ago. And the same is going on in other parts of the province. We're very much concerned about the need for proper school facilities in the Interlake area and at Gypsumville and various other communities where the population is sparse. But at no time, I repeat again - I repeat it for the honourable member's benefit - at no time had we ever indicated that it was not our intention to provide schools in such areas. No.

Of course in deciding the type of school that we're going to build, the size of it, the facilities that are going to be provided within it naturally only dictates of common sense would indicate that you know that we ought to take population into account, that we ought to take the type of program that is desirable, that is suitable, that can be offered in such communities, into account and that in turn may have some bearing on the amount of space that's provided. But never, and I say that most emphatically, but never have we ever said that we would not provide school facilities in those areas.

Then the honourable member -- now I'm trying desperately, Mr. Chairman, to limit my comments to the resolution before us because some members did stray somewhat to a couple of items which have already been disposed of, but as this may apply to this resolution and perhaps to others before us, when the Honourable Member for Emerson speaks about not keeping teachers informed of what the Department of Education is doing, what it plans to do, I'm happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that both the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and the Association of School Superintendents are well aware of the fact that they could arrange to meet me to discuss whatever issues are of concern to them, as the saying goes, at the drop of a hat. This they have done on many an occasion and there has been I'm happy to say very very close liaison between myself and the organizations that I've mentioned and of course anyone else in any way interested in education, be it teachers as individuals, principals and school boards. Over the last eight or nine months I've had the privilege of meeting with well over two-thirds, probably about 75 percent of the boards in the Province of Manitoba personally on their own home ground, in their own division, to discuss problems and issues related to education. And the survey that the honourable member is referring to is one means that I am using to learn of the present day needs and demands, wishes of the people of the Province of Manitoba with respect to education. What do people really want out of our education program today. Various individuals this questionnaire is being sent out to form part of the sample, and the teachers have been notified by me what this is all about.

I'm sorry I haven't got it with me. If the honourable member wishes to check with the Manitoba Teachers' Society and the Association of School Trustees you will find letters in their files in both offices from me indicating to them the nature of this program.

Now as this may relate to the resolution before us, Mr. Chairman, and insofar as the function and role of the Planning and Research Branch in this particular area, I'm also happy to say that there is a very close liaison - a very close working relationship between the Planning and Research Branch of my Department and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees and of the Teachers' Society. In fact when the honourable member speaks about education costs, of course, we are aware that there is need for improvement in the financing formulae and I have indicated to the honourable member earlier this afternoon the steps that we have taken to rectify the inequities and we are moving ahead as rapidly as we can in that direction.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)

But there is one other area that is equally important and perhaps even more. That it's not just a question of providing school divisions with dollars and cents. School divisions are getting to be big business operations in terms of planning an education program for the school division, a well coordinated educational education program to make certain that you're making maximum use of the time of every teacher on your staff, in terms of making maximum use of the building space that you have to work with, in terms of making maximum use of the school buses that you have to transport the students and so forth. And school divisions themselves are asking us for assistance for guidance and at the present time staff of Planning and Research and the Manitoba Association of School Trustees is in the process of holding workshops and seminars with Secretary-Treasurers and Superintendents to assist them, to assist them to become better managers, to provide them with the guidance and counselling to equip them with the necessary skills to run a most efficient school system in their divisions. That again, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say the Trustees and the teachers and the Superintendents find most welcome.

The honourable member also spoke of library grants. Well at the present time, and I'm sure the honourable member is well aware of this, that there are a variety of types of libraries in the Province of Manitoba. There are libraries within the school system, there are those outside the school system and some in the same community, and very much in line with what I have suggested and with what my predecessor, the now Minister of Universities and Colleges Affairs, had advocated during his term of office, that we ought to, and so has the First Minister that we ought to make maximum use of the school facilities, that it do become a community utility and not a public utility as it were, that you only use it on and off at the flick of a switch or the turn of a tap, but that it be used as much as possible of each and every day of the year. This I am happy to say is happening; increased use of school buildings is being made, and in line with that, Mr. Chairman, it is also our hope to coordinate the library efforts within each community. To avoid unnecessary duplication of expense and also to develop a plan whereby in some communities where you may have two or more small libraries we could develop some comprehensive system of library service out of one or more centres, but anyway as long as it's an integrated co-operative effort in terms of providing library services to the community. And in that way that is the first step that we are taking toward improving the library facilities in the Province of Manitoba.

The Honourable Member for Riel asked me a number of questions. He wanted to know what are the estimated, and I take it -- and I'm sorry that the honourable member isn't here -- but I take it that he is referring to the estimated costs for the forthcoming year when he asked for the total costs of the public school system. The budgeted costs, the total costs for this year are about \$197.8 million. And of that, of that the provincial share, the total provincial share is \$104.7 million. The taxpayers' share is the difference between the two minus the tax rebate, minus the tax reduction, which for this year is about \$12.5 million. The Honourable Member for Rhineland was wondering about why nine million in this year's estimates and three in the last. Well the honourable member knows that for this calendar year that three million was paid out of last year's estimates and the balance out of the estimates that are now under consideration, thus leaving a net cost to the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba approximately \$77 million. Which is the school expenditure by and large charged against real property. With the further means to ease the tax burden on the taxpayer via the levy differential between residential properties and business.

So in other words, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that education costs have gone up and having incorporated the means of easing the tax burden on the local taxpayer, the provincial and individual share of education taxes has not changed to more adversely affect the taxpayer and still remains at about, roughly about 56 percent province and 44 percent charged to the property owner.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland also - yes he asked the total cost of education, in fact a couple of honourable members asked that question and the Honourable Member for Assiniboia did and I believe I've just answered it. The Honourable Member for Rhineland wished to know, wished information on the \$221,000 interest charge on loans for advances on grants and he wanted to know whether there is a set date for this; and he also wanted to know the total budget and enrolment for each division. I regret that time did not permit us before we adjourned for the dinner hour to obtain clarification on this because there is a difference

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . between selecting the enrolment date at the beginning of the year, end of the year, or the average enrolment for the year, which I'm not quite sure. Anyway, and with respect to total budget for the forthcoming year I'm sure that the honourable member is well aware that a budget is an estimated figure and school divisions may spend that amount, they may spend less. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, at the present time for the purposes of dealing with my estimates, not having clarification on those points I was unable to provide the honourable member with the information, but I would be glad to oblige him at a later date.

Advances to school boards, Mr. Chairman, are paid eight times a year: April, May, June, July and then again in October, November, December and January. In each case an amount equal to 15 percent of the annual operational costs is paid, and this is provided for in the regulations. To make these payments 75 percent of this is from Provincial Treasury, 25 percent we must borrow on the market. Divisions must apply for these advances, and to put ourselves in funds to make these advances to the school divisions that is what costs us that interest amount. And I should also point out to the honourable member that the Foundation levies which are paid on the 15th of March and the 15th of September, and on occasion we do receive those payments somewhat earlier, and they are fairly substantial amounts and hence it is to our advantage to invest those funds even for short periods of time, even if it's a matter of days. On sizable amounts when you're dealing with millions of dollars honourable members will appreciate that the net result is one of significant return to us by way of interest. The interest rate would no doubt vary from time to time, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. FROESE: . . . interest you're charging vary . . .

MR. HANUSCHAK: The interest rate? I'm sorry.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted. I was asking him is the interest rate that is being charged on these monies that are quoted in the back page?

MR. HANUSCHAK: There is no interest charge, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FROESE: There is no interest charge?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No. The Honourable Member for Rhineland also sought information re grants paid to technical schools, Mr. Chairman, or in fact he wanted to know what the policy is. All grants are under the Foundation Program and the per pupil grants, \$325.00 in the vocational-industrial courses and \$125.00 per pupil business education start-up grants. This is to assist the schools in getting on their feet as it were. And yes, in addition to that there's an over-all general grant \$25,000 being made to each regional vocational high school in the first year of its operation by reason of the fact that here is a facility built and equipped to accommodate a certain number of students and it takes a while for a school to be filled to capacity and therefore \$25,000 for the first year and \$15,000 for the second year of operation as the enrolment increases.

The honourable member also asked about Hutterite schools. Well Hutterite schools in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, are nearly all in school divisions and hence are under the administration of the division in which they are located. The divisions receive grants for them the same as for other schools. The lands owned by the Hutterite colonies are levied taxes the same as any other land. There is one Hutterite school operating in the Garden Valley division and there are five Hutterite schools I believe -- there are five other Hutterite schools in the Province of Manitoba which have chosen to remain private and hence are not in receipt of grants.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked about the Core Report. The interim report was published and the final report has not yet been completed. Are any courses phased out because of low enrolment? Well this happens on occasion in all schools. The City of Winnipeg is as good an example as any. Practically every high school at one time in the City of Winnipeg offered Latin. Today I'm not sure whether in more than one or two schools here -- I believe there's only one high school in the Winnipeg School Division offering Latin. The same happens to other courses. And similarly that happens in other parts of the Province of Manitoba, that if the demand isn't there then of course some other course would have to be substituted therefor.

Insofar as programs for disadvantage is concerned, I had dealt with this before the dinner hour, Mr. Chairman, when I spoke about the Child Development Services which formerly was with the Department of Health and Social Development and now will come under the jurisdiction of my department to enable it to work more closely with the school divisions and offer -- work more hand in hand as it were with the administrative and teaching staffs of our schools in the Province of Manitoba.

Now the Honourable Member for Roblin asked what is the policy re the closing of schools.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd) . . . . Well I'm sure that the honourable member is well aware that according to the provisions of The Public Schools Act the trustees have the power to determine where schools shall be located. That's one of their duties, one of their responsibilities. But I may also add, Mr. Chairman, that this matter is one of grave concern to me. This as well as other matters, the question of finance, administration and so forth, and as I had indicated some time ago that it is my wish and my intention rather than do as has happened in some jurisdictions where a Provincial Government simply imposes a ceiling, simply imposes restrictions on what a board may or may not do, I would much rather work co-operatively with a school division in an attempt to assist them to resolve their problems and I've given some examples of that earlier. Because of my concern about the closing of schools I have asked the superintendents of school divisions, and chairmen, to report to me the schools that they intend to close for the forthcoming school year and all school divisions have responded -- I think practically all have to this point, I will have to check. I do have a recollection of having received many reports, well over two-thirds or three-quarters, so I would suspect that practically all have responded. And I can say this, that the school boards share this concern with me because it becomes a question of you know recognizing the fact that here is a community with a school that was very much a part of it for many many years and one with which the people of the community identify themselves with on the one hand. On the other hand the opinion of the board and the administration may indicate that it may be more efficient, that there may be an opportunity to offer an enriched program in a centralized school, in a larger school, and one must weight one against the other. Different boards have handled this matter in different ways. Even different boards have handled this matter in different ways in different parts of the same division . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has three minutes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . so this is a matter that one cannot lay down general - I don't think I could lay down general guidelines of what would apply right across the province. Every case has to be dealt with on its own merits. Some take into account the distance to the next nearest school, the enrolment, the wish of the community, the make-up of a community, various sociological factors of that type and many others in determining how to handle matters of that type. This is the way in which we are proceeding in dealing with the problem of closing of schools in some communities.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I've covered most of the points raised by honourable members up to this point in debate.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that it was not my intention to become involved in the debate that has progressed so far with regard to the Estimates of the Minister of Education, but when we find the Minister of Education stating that school trustees are asking the department for guidance and they are asking the department to equip them with the necessary skills, and the Minister is telling us that the proposed salary negotiations for the coming year, and we all know that most of the school divisions in the Province of Manitoba follow very closely on the lines of the settlements that are involved in the biggest school division in the province namely Winnipeg, and he tells us that their salary negotiations were settled in the neighbourhood of six percent plus -- pardon? -- 5 - 6-1/2. Mr. Chairman, all I can say to the Minister is this - balderdash.

Everyone in the Province of Manitoba knows that the total cost of teachers' salaries in the next year will increase about ten percent, and when the Minister talks about five to six and a half percent increase he forgets about the increments, he forgets about the increase in the number of teachers that are going to be involved in the teaching process in the province. And when he talks about school trustees turning to the department for guidance, I would suggest to the Minister that he listen to the school trustees rather than have, as he says, school trustees turning to the department for guidance, because the school trustees are the ones that know the problems that exist in the Province of Manitoba. I would suggest that the Minister is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Manitoba when he suggests that the school trustees are looking to the Minister of Education for guidance.

Mr. Chairman, education in the Province of Manitoba is a very serious matter. It involves the biggest single investment that the people of Manitoba are asked to provide in the Estimates of this government. And unless the Minister of Education and his department and all other members of government are willing to listen to the people who are vitally concerned with education, and not just to two or three factors in that education system, I would suggest

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) . . . . that we are heading for real serious trouble. I would suggest to the Minister that he listen seriously to the people who represent the taxpayers in the Province of Manitoba, in the persons of the trustees who are just as much concerned with education as any single man sitting in this Legislature, or any single individual existing in the Province of Manitoba, because they are concerned with two factors: No. 1, providing the best system of education that money can provide; and No. 2 is providing the maximum amount of money that is feasible to provide the services that are required.

The trustee is caught between the finaglings and the directive issued by the Minister of Education and the dictates that are required of him by the ratepayers who are the people that have to provide the money, because much as the Minister wants to say that government is providing more and more of the cost of education, the taxpayer is finding that irregardless of how you cut the pie, it's the taxpayer that's going to pay the money. So everything that the Minister has said so far to my mind and to the majority of the people in the Province of Manitoba, has just been so much icing on the cake, skating around the circumference of the pool, and the unwillingness of the Minister to get into the crux of the matter and that is the value that the taxpayer is going to get for the money that he is investing in the system of education that exists in the province today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't in when the Minister gave the replies regarding the grants to the public school system. I would gather from the figures that I have collected that we don't have a breakdown - breakout of the grants under the Foundation Program included here? The \$104.7 million is the total amount of provincial grants I would gather to the public school system. The other question that applied was the breakout of what portion of that was Foundation Program grants. And then if it's available could we find out what amount of the Foundation Program Grants were from provincial sources and what percent from the property tax, the Foundation levy.

While the Minister is looking and as long as I can get the figure if he has it available - I don't believe either, Mr. Chairman, that we got any reply regarding the grants under the Shared Services Program and if possible we would like to get that too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for the information that he did give but it didn't satisfy my needs in connection with the regional schools. I wanted to know how the operation of these schools are financed, and he replied that there is a \$325 per pupil grant and also \$125 business education grant plus the \$25,000 grant for the first year in getting it established and another \$15,000 the second year. But is there a per pupil fee charged to the students enrolling? If not, how are the budgets met for these schools? Is there a levy passed on the properties of the division that has the home division of the school or do all the monies come from the Provincial Government to take care of the cost of operation of these regional schools?

I still haven't got a clear picture of how the operations are financed and I would like to know that, so that when I'm asked by other people so at least I have the information and I can tell them.

I was quite interested to hear that in connection with the advances paid and for what the monies were spent in the public schools finance board report, he says that these grants are made on request. I'm just wondering how many of the divisions do request and how many of the divisions do know about these advances if they're interest free? Being in a multi district division the local school districts aren't aware of all the functions of the division boards and just how much of these prerogatives are being exercised. Therefore, I would ask him the question: how many of the divisions avail themselves of this privilege?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I regret that the Honourable Member for Riel wasn't in his seat earlier, shortly after 8 o'clock, but some of the questions that he had asked were answered then. Insofar as the grants or the cost of the Shared Services Program that amount is \$97,000.00. I do not have a per school breakdown on that. Now insofar as schools which have private or parochial schools which have gone public as it were, which have become part of the school division system, then in the case of those schools we do not have a breakdown of the first school, no more than we have a breakdown on the operation costs on a per school basis of any other school in any division.

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd)

Now with respect to the breakdown of the \$104 million: salary grants are \$71.5 million; maintenance, administration supply grant \$23.25 million; transportation grant 9 1/2; capital - it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that I have given these figures earlier in the day. However, I'll run through them again because I have a recollection of having recited all of these figures. Total capital including debt servicing is \$22.5 million; textbooks, reference material 2.9; vocational 1.75 - these are all in millions; per pupil grant 4.25; interest - and then there's finance board administration interest charges totalling to practically about three tenths of a million dollars \$310,000.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked two other questions, one with respect to advances. All school divisions know about it, nearly all apply as the need arises; but the honourable member realizes of course, that I'm speaking of unitary divisions. With respect to regional schools, regional vocational high schools, how they're financed. Over and above the regular grants, the \$325 for Vocational Industrial and \$125 for Commercial, Mr. Chairman, that's over and above the regular grants that are paid to all schools. There is no per pupil fee charged, they are financed out of regular grants and the residual costs from the divisions within the region supporting the particular regional vocational high school.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, made a number of observations re our education program of today. He suggested that I listen to trustees and if the honourable member had been listening to me a short while ago, I thought that I made myself quite clear that I do listen to trustees when I indicated to the honourable member that I have met with about three-quarters of the board for the Province of Manitoba and have discussed their issues with them, their problems, priorities. They spoke to me, not I to them and I listened to them. I can assure the honourable member that I understand the trustees' language probably just as well as the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, -- (Interjection)-- perhaps so. I do not wish to ...

The honourable member suggests that I'm pulling the wool over trustee's eyes when I made reference to the fact that trustees are looking for guidance and assistance, and if the honourable member were to care to inquire of the office of the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, they would confirm the statement that I have made. And again if the honourable member had been listening to me earlier when I made it very clear that we have organized management seminars jointly, the Department of Education together with the Association of School Trustees, and I'm sure that it is not the intention of the Executive of the Association of School Trustees to pull the wool over the eyes of its own membership, Mr. Chairman. This was at the instigation of the School Trustees and it is this type of assistance that they find most welcome because as I - at the risk of being repetitious, Mr. Chairman, but I feel that I must emphasize this point, and I've made this earlier, that the school boards of today are well aware of the fact that operating our school system has got to be a big business operation requiring the application of expertise which may be somewhat strange and unfamiliar to many of us, and therefore they welcome the opportunity to work jointly with us to assist in resolving the day to day operational problems facing our school divisions.

Now I'm not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, just what the - and the honourable member didn't go on to explain - what the finaglings of mine are that he referred to, but I'm not quite sure what the word means, so therefore I will not bother with it. But in closing, may I again repeat that the school trustees and the superintendents are most willing and happy to have the opportunity to work together with us in drafting plans and procedures for the efficient operation of our school system.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: I wonder if the Minister in the next few minutes could tell us, as I have asked him before, which grants to school divisions have been increased in the past three years?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Which grants have been increased in the last three years? Mr. Chairman, that point was made at least 50 times during this session.

MR. GIRARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the answer is obvious. There has been no grant increase in the last three years and here we find a Minister who is propagating, or at least presenting the kind of fact that would convince the teachers of Manitoba that this government with its representation of teachers is doing the most possible for the educational system of Manitoba when the fact is that through rebates in taxation they find it cheaper to buy votes than to do something constructive about education.



MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if before we close off if I could ask the Minister about one of the answers he gave me regarding \$134 million this adds up to. Which of the figures given is the Foundation Program which is what I was basically after because the figures that he gave me add up to more than 104.7. Is the 104.7 the actual Foundation Program?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Seventy-five percent of that is the provincial share which is about \$102 million and the Foundation levy is 34 million.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, one further question. On the shared services grants, or financing, \$97,000 that's for this fiscal year. Does it include buses, books, teacher grants to the particular school divisions involved, and any rental of space?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, that just covers the Shared Services Agreements and there are no grants over and above that, just merely the provisions that are contained in the agreements.

MR. CRAIK: What features of the Shared Services Agreement are included in the \$97,000.00?

MR. HANUSCHAK: It varies from school to school, Mr. Chairman. By and large it's the provision of instructional services that the private or parochial school is unable to offer its students, shops, home ec., ... arts.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, ... what of those four items I mentioned are included in this figure? Does it include the supply for books, transportation, teachers from school divisions and space, plus shops?

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, Sir. The other items that the honourable member has mentioned are grants to divisions, not to private or separate schools.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 9:00, the last hour of every day is Private Members' Hour. The information to members. There's 20 minutes left in this Department and two more departments to go completing the first run through the Estimates. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Osborne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

#### SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go on to Private Members' Resolutions.

On Monday last night when Notice of Resolution 19 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was called the Honourable the House Leader, the Minister of Labour rose on a point of order. He cited the rule of anticipation and argued that the Speech from the Throne had announced the intention of asking approval to a modern Labour Code dealing with industrial relations and labour standards.

I wish to thank all the honourable members who contributed to the discussion on the point of procedure. The point was made that the mentioning of a subject in the Speech from the Throne should not preclude the matter from being raised and debated in the House. The Chair wishes to indicate there is validity to that view.

The resolution in question is worded specifically and refers to Notice to Workers re lay-off in case of technological change. There is also indicated clear intent in the Speech from the Throne to proceed with the enactment of a Labour Code.

The connotation of Labour Code is very broad and general. The Chair considered it not in the best interest of the Assembly to invoke the rule of anticipation, subject to a procedural appeal from any honourable member.

This is the proposition we have before us now in that the House Leader raised the point of order.

In respect to anticipation Beauchesne, Citation 131, states:

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)

"In determining whether a discussion is out of order on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

The Anticipation rule, which forbids discussion of a matter standing on the Paper being forestalled, is dependent on the same principle as that which forbids the same question being twice raised in the same session. In applying the Anticipation rule, preference is given to the discussions which leads to the most effective results, and this has established a descending scale of values for discussions -- Bills, Motions, Amendments, etc. Thus a Bill must not be anticipated by (or more shortly "block") discussion of a motion, amendment, or subject raised on another motion. Any substantive motion standing on the Paper blocks the discussion of an amendment, etc. An amendment on the Paper blocks the raising of its subject in debate. The abuse of blocking motions is obviated by the direction given to the Speaker to have regard to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time."

Determination of the question therefore revolves around three issues.

The first concerns the subject matter of the resolution being encompassed by the Labour Code. The Honourable Minister of Labour in presentation on the point of order indicated opportunity for debate will be available on this matter.

The second issue is the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time. An affirmative assertion has been indicated by the Honourable Minister of Labour when he spoke to the point of order.

Finally, we apply ourselves as to what takes precedence. The Throne Speech and the assurance of the Minister indicates a statute which would be by way of a bill.

Beauchesne indicates a descending scale of values starting with a bill.

May I therefore indicate to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, under the circumstances, the Chair must decline the Resolution 19.

..... continued on next page

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: We therefore move to Resolution No. 1 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Riel. The members that have spoken to that one are: the Honourable Member for Riel, the Honourable First Minister, the Honourable Member for Pembina -- (Interjection) -- Yes?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I presume that if I speak now I'll be closing debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Correct. The Honourable Member for Thompson and the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Unless otherwise noted by the Clerk, I think those are the members that have spoken on No. 1. The floor is open. The Honourable Member for Riel will be closing debate.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, in speaking as the final speaker on this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Does the Honourable Attorney-General wish to address himself to this motion?

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member was closing the debate I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I so indicated. The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this resolution deals with the whole question of the viability of Lake Winnipeg regulation as put into perspective with all of the plans and proposals that were under consideration for the development of the hydro-electric potential of the waters of our northern rivers. Now I don't want to reiterate argument that has already been advanced in this House in a very effective, and I think very persuasive way, by the Premier and my colleague in caucus, the Member for Inkster among others, who have already spoken on the question that's embodied in this regulation -- on this resolution, I'm sorry. But I do want to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, because I think the people of Manitoba haven't received in the reports that have been carried in the press some of the weight of the argument that I think has to be advanced in respect to the practical problem that this government was faced with and some of the basic rationale for the change that has now been brought forward. When we came to office the whole question of hydro-electric development for the Province of Manitoba had in large part been decided, had been decided, Mr. Speaker, by agreements entered into by the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada through its Crown agency, Atomic Energy of Canada, and the die had already been cast for the development of hydro-electric power on a massive scale. Many countless hours of thought obviously had gone into the development of the energy source that was available to the north. It wasn't therefore a question of if or when we would be in a position to proceed further with hydro-electric development, but it was a question of how and on what basis. The fact that commitments had been made for this very very expensive direct transmission energy line meant that there was really no turning back on the part of this administration from the commitment that had been made by the previous administration in respect to the scale of the development of hydro-electric development in the north, and the Premier, and I associate my few remarks with him, has indicated and I echo that statement, I have no basic quarrel, Mr. Speaker, with that commitment to develop the hydro-electric energy source of the north when one compares the probability of the kind of environmental damage that this universe is faced -- with which it is faced on the basis of the search for resource energy there can be no question but that the extraction of energy from a renewable resource in the cleanest possible fashion lends itself, and must commend itself to our approval. But the question had to be at what practical cost? So there was no question, Mr. Speaker, that we were committed. Whether we wanted to or not we were committed. We happen to concur that the commitment to develop these resources was a sound one.

The open question was how do we develop that tremendous resource. Now there was no question but that experts and politicians, and I use the word "politicians" in the most favourable sense. Politicians in the past had said that we are fortunate in being the recipient of the flow of fresh water from across this continent into this province and that is a renewable asset which we cherish and which we will be able to use in the decades ahead. We have waters that flow into Manitoba from the United States, from Saskatchewan and Alberta, and from the foothills of the Rockies into the Province of British Columbia. And these are our heritage.

And there's no question in my mind but that previous administrations had wrestled with the question of how can we utilize Lake Winnipeg? How can we utilize this tremendous reservoir of water power? But the question kept coming back to the engineers time and again that it was inconceivable that we would be able to use this resource. Why? Because of the simple

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . fact that there was a hard rock shield at the north end of Lake Winnipeg that made the outflow of the waters of Lake Winnipeg a very torturous and slow ordeal. And the experts had said that there's no way you can utilize the waters of Lake Winnipeg at reasonable cost, because what it meant, Mr. Speaker, was a tremendous cost of coring out this hard granite-like rock at the north end of Lake Winnipeg for a period of miles in order to get a reasonable flow of water out of Lake Winnipeg. Now that was cold hard scientific, or engineering, fact. And that was the basis on which decisions had been made to reject any possibility of rational economic use of Lake Winnipeg water for hydro-electric development purposes. That was a geophysical fact that was accepted by everyone who was concerned about the rational use of the waters of Lake Winnipeg.

But, Mr. Speaker, because this government did not want to face the terrific flooding, the terrific ecological change that would be necessary in the diversion of a fantastic flow of water from the Churchill River into a very constrained and unpredictable system of the Rat and the Burntwood Rivers we asked the experts, are you sure? Are you sure that there is no way that what has often been considered is not at all possible? Is it not possible that the thoughts that have been evidenced in the years past of the utilization of Lake Winnipeg could still not be realized? Are you absolutely certain that this constraint of the use of Lake Winnipeg water, this water reservoir is impossible, and is so real? And so, Mr. Speaker, further engineers went north and they spent time drilling, and they drilled hither and yon, and lo and behold what did they find? They found that it was possible to cut through channels, not through bedrock, but through clay and gravel. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, that what we are doing now is not foraying miles of channel out of rock at fantastic expense. A huge barge is literally taking Lake Winnipeg water, washing it into the sand and gravel, drawing it up and pumping it miles away from the channel that it is cutting. A very efficient, economical system of channeling out a path for Lake Winnipeg water. This was a major engineering breakthrough and it is fundamental, it is fundamental to the basis that now we can use Lake Winnipeg water reasonably, economically, and in good engineering planning to maintain the kind of flow that is necessary through the Hydro electric plants along the lower Nelson River.

The Honourable Member from Riel waves his hand in disgust, because he regrets, Mr. Speaker, he regrets - I don't know how sincerely - the fact that when he was Minister of Mines and Resources, they had not carried out that kind of study to insure that the facts that had been presupposed were in fact so. Because, Mr. Speaker, that previous Minister and the Ministers before him, and the engineers, had assumed that what they had observed was an impervious rock barrier at the north end of Lake Winnipeg and I say, Mr. Speaker, and the people of Manitoba don't realize the significance of that engineering breakthrough. That, Mr. Speaker, is the key to the economic use of Lake Winnipeg waters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have some mutterings. Mr. Speaker, some of the members opposite are famous for their mutterings. Some of the sounds they make from the bottom of their seats are like music to my ears, because they are far better than what they say when they are on their feet.

Mr. Speaker, in practical examination of the situation it is obvious that the Opposition now realizes that they have lost the case in respect to the alternative development of hydro electric power in the north. With Lake Winnipeg regulation we not only get the advantage of being able to utilize that vast reservoir of water, which to many was a nightmare. The constant level was certainly not below 715 feet. In the last decade it has been far in excess of 715 feet on many many occasions, is so now, and likely will be in the years to come, and what's proposed, Mr. Speaker, is not only the utilization of Lake Winnipeg water for a source of power, which had been long dreamed of, not only by honourable members in the past but certainly the honourable, the former Honourable Duff Roblin, the Premier of this province who referred to Lake Winnipeg as this vast reservoir of possible power. I am sure the Honourable Member for Riel dreamed of finding the answer to the utilization of Lake Winnipeg, but the answer eluded them because they didn't have the geophysical information. Now that that information is available, that development can take place; not only will the benefit of hydro electric power from the water flow that is now available on a constant basis or will be, but there will be the advantage of a draw down in the level of Lake Winnipeg which will have an effect of reducing the magnitude of flooding of Lake Winnipeg so for the Honourable Member from Riel and others who have spoken to constantly harangue and try to cloud the issue that it was basically a lack of knowledge on the part of the Honourable Member for Riel, and the people for whom he was

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . responsible and related in this Legislature, that prevented a responsible usage of Lake Winnipeg water for development purposes. That's a fact, and the honourable member has to wrestle with that one. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that these facts that are fundamental to the development and use of Lake Winnipeg for the purposes as indicated ought to be brought home to the people of Manitoba and I hope that certainly the press will take note that they have not highlighted, they have not indicated to any great degree, the fact that that physical fact changed remarkably the utility and the economy of utilizing Lake Winnipeg in, not only in regulating but in utilizing its waters for Hydro Electric power.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments since this matter under consideration vitally affects my constituency. Now, Mr. Speaker, since the government's recent announcement that Hydro will opt for the 850 feet maximum flooding level at South Indian Lake, in combination with Lake Winnipeg regulation, and since this combination would provide the necessary flow for the proposed Hydro installations, this resolution in my opinion represents a last ditch attempt to satisfy the flood mania, or penchant, that has beset members on the opposite side of the Chamber ever since they first tackled this problem. In particular I refer to the Honourable Member from Riel who has repeatedly attempted to urge this government to inundate the Indian community on the shores of South Indian Lake as to cause a complete reassessment of their whole established way of life and the relocation of the entire community.

Having failed in this attempt the Honourable Member for Riel now is urging this government through this resolution not to regulate Lake Winnipeg but to go for the 850 foot level at South Indian Lake. What satisfaction does this possibly give him and what form of madness is this? The present level of Lake Winnipeg is approximately 717 feet - I believe the latest is 716.4 - in that area above sea level and it is also two feet above the maximum proposed in Lake Winnipeg regulations. It is known that with wind effect shoreline erosion could be quite extensive to lakeshore cottage owners. And what about the damage to the ecology of the plant life and green life, and other types of life along the lakeshore, and the effect also of the continuous high water level is having on the fishing industry.

Last week -- (Interjection) -- I'll come to you later. Last week a young boy fell off the Gimli breakwater into the lake with its present high water level and when a six year old jumped in to save him he was drowned. Now this was quite unfortunate but this morning I heard on the news that the other one also lost his life. Now I know that with the proposed regulations the water level would have been much lower. At this time of the year it would have been approximately three feet lower and as a result had regulations been in effect, these deaths could have, or might have been averted. The level of the water at that point with regulations would have stood at only about less than a foot.

A couple of weeks ago during the oral question period the Honourable Member from Morris showed his complete lack of concern with the high water level now existing on Lake Winnipeg by placing it on a par with a question requesting the height of the water on the Red River. "I ask you to consider the eligibility of the import of these earth-shaking questions", he said in a jocular vein. I on the contrary would like to see the members on the other side take this matter quite seriously. It is a serious question and certainly it should not be treated with the contempt that some of the people on the other side of the House have shown today.

At the moment the dredging equipment has now arrived at Playgreen Lake and work will shortly commence. Let's hope that there will be no lengthy interruptions or delays.

-- (Interjection) -- Yes, having failed, having failed to destroy a viable Indian community of South Indian Lake and flooding forever thousands of acres of virgin Manitoba land, this resolution is in fact asking us now to consider the possibility of flooding large areas along the shores of Lake Winnipeg, of permitting a high water level on Lake Winnipeg, combined with wind effect, to continue its destructive action to further disrupt and complicate the lives of everyone living along the lakeshore.

I say let's have done with this penchant for flooding and show more concern for the welfare of the citizens of this province. Since the maximum benefit in Hydro and conservation of our environment will result through raising the level some seven feet on South Indian Lake, a rise insufficient to seriously effect the settlement, and because this necessitates the use of Lake Winnipeg as a reservoir to supplement the flow from South Indian Lake, and further because one-half foot of storage on Lake Winnipeg is approximately equivalent to four feet storage

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) . . . . on South Indian Lake, I am fully in support of a plan being sponsored by this government as the most reasonable and the most considerate of all the factors involved, including the economic factor, and so I unequivocally oppose the intent both actual and implied of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Pembina has already spoken on this motion.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question -- oh, the Attorney-General has gone out. I wanted to ask him before.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I just want to say a few remarks on this resolution and perhaps qualify my vote, which way I intend to go.

I find myself in somewhat of a dilemma because I am sure that members of the House will recall that the Liberal Party took a very strong position some three or four years ago to the high level of flooding. Since that time I have also listened and heard the Leader of the Opposition state to the government, don't make the same mistake as we did when we proceeded to go with the high level and you're proceeding now with the flooding, or building controls, on Lake Winnipeg which will be very costly. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition did have a point when he stated that the government should not make this same mistake as the former government did when they planned to go to the high level, which would have I understand flooded some 750,000 acres of land in the area of South Indian Lake and also another 350,000 on the Rat River as I understand it.

Now I don't know if the government, if they proceed with the diversion of Churchill into the Nelson, do they also really need the controls on Lake Winnipeg and do they need a reservoir? That's the first question I have. I know that the Lake Winnipeg residents, most of them have formed an association and they have taken a strong opposition --(Interjection)-- or Victoria Beach, to the control of Lake Winnipeg, and my question is surely some of these people have consulted engineers and very technical people and they must have some idea what the control of Lake Winnipeg will do to many of the residents in that area.

My other question is, also that the other day I heard the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro state that it is their intention to export very large amounts of energy to the midwest; he said not just immediate United States but deep down into United States. Well my question is, are we really building power for our own consumption in Manitoba, or are we building power for export? And if we're building power for export we may be in somewhat of a problem that we're establishing policy provincially for export of energy, because I'm sure any long duration for export of power will probably meet very strong opposition from the Federal Energy Board, which I understand has jurisdiction over export of any energy, be it gas or power, to any other country which involves a large amount of export of energy. So I couldn't too well understand the Chairman of the Energy Board and I didn't have the opportunity to ask him a question because the meeting adjourned last - the Public Utility Meeting at 12:30, and there was no time to ask him this question. But I think it's an important question because it appeared to me like the chairman himself was setting policy for export of energy in this province, and if that's the case then I think we really may not have that permission and would not have the right over the jurisdiction of export of power.

Now I know that we have been told that the controls on Lake Winnipeg will cost anywhere between \$56 million and before we are finished it may be much higher, it will probably be somewhere between \$56 and \$100 million. Is the cost justified to build controls on Lake Winnipeg? We are told by some engineers not only politicians, but engineers that I have had an opportunity to talk to a couple of them, and I will admit to the House I know very little about the technicalities and the energy power because during the debates in the House a few years ago I did not get involved in the debates at the time, so I was not acquainted with all the factors that I probably should have been. But I am told by some engineers that we will not be able to store the amount of water that we'd like to on Lake Winnipeg because I am told that if we start to store water in the early spring, be it May or June, that just no one, no one will be able to use the recreation potential and facilities of Lake Winnipeg, and really in my opinion we are very fortunate in this province, if anything we are very fortunate and particularly the City of Winnipeg that we have the Whiteshell, that we have the Lake Winnipeg. I think that Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba is probably - that very few other provinces can claim the kind of natural resource and recreation potential that we enjoy at the present time. I know that --(Interjection)-- Yes. Well I said fortunate in having the recreation potential that we have such as Lake Winnipeg, Lake Manitoba and the Whiteshell, because I really believe it really has something to offer to the residents. If you go to some of the other Canadian cities really you have very little, even the City of Calgary the nearest lake you'll find is perhaps 100 miles, and so I feel that we're fortunate and it would be really I think a disaster if we would destroy the recreation potential, the recreation possibilities on Lake Winnipeg, because, again let me say, I've talked or had an opportunity to talk to some of the engineers, and in fact some of them that had worked on this project for one of the firms, and I am told that they will not be able to

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . store much water for the simple reason that if we start storing it early in the spring it will kill the recreation potential; if we start storing it, say, in July and for the rainfall that we'll have say part of July and August, we'll collect very little of water that will really be useful for the reservoir and storage purposes. So for these reasons, as I say, I agree completely not to go to the high level flooding of South Indian Lake. On the other hand I'm not fully convinced that we need at this time to have controls on Lake Winnipeg. I say if we need them sometimes in the future, be it 20 years from now, or earlier or later, let's review the whole situation and see if it will give us the kind of storage that we're talking about now.

But I'm saying to the First Minister if we're thinking about exporting energy what was stated by the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro I believe that perhaps we're going in the wrong direction, in fact we may not have the permission from the Federal Energy Board to export the amounts of power that he talked about because he talked about large, extreme large amount of power from huge sums of money to be exported to the deep south, or he mentioned I believe midwest far -- in fact he stated much further south than we were talking before and --(Interjection)-- Because I believe - I'm sure the Member for Pembina should get himself acquainted that the Energy Board has restrictions on the export of resources and power, be it natural gas or hydro. But for these reasons I want to qualify; I am prepared to support the resolution because I have not been convinced that we need regulations on Lake Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words and the reason is to somehow bring my witness to bear on the situation. I have for the last three years represented the constituency that overlooks the lake, much of its circumference. I have heard a great deal about representation by dwellers or residents around the lake. Quite frankly I've never had a representation from a permanent resident on Lake Winnipeg. Now I don't know if that's because they don't feel it's worth coming to see me or some other reason, I'm not sure. --(Interjection)-- It's true that I've had some representation from the area of Victoria Beach by residents of South Winnipeg. Now this I can bear witness to, but I have never, and I repeat, I have never had representations by residents, permanent residents, on the lake about the question of flooding. Now I have heard the subject repeated ad nauseam and I would like some time to know who is doing this representing. I've sat in this House and I've heard it time and time again and I'd like to have some member of this House tell me who's doing all this representing. People are being quoted as "they" and "residents on Lake Winnipeg" and "blah, blah, blah" but no one that I can ever put my finger on as one of my constituents --(Interjection)-- Yes. I have stated that the residents of Citoria Beach have made a great many -- have made representation a great many times. It's interesting that they're about 20 feet above the level of the lake where they have their houses there.

So I thought I'd set that straight, Mr. Speaker, and I'm willing to be enlightened by any member of this House who would like to clarify the subject for me. I hear the statements about representations from residents and I feel very ill because obviously you know the question of my usefulness comes into play. Why was I not approached on the subject --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Lyon was not at Norway House as far as . . . Certainly the residents of Norway House made no representation; those at Berens River made no representation; those of Bloodvein made no representation, and I would like to hear, find out who it is that's making these representations about flooding on the lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Rhineland wish to speak on the motion?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I, no doubt, when this matter comes to a vote will have to take a stand or else - unless the motion doesn't come to a vote and I still think that sooner or later it will come because the mover was going to close debate already.

I have listened over the years to the various debates in the House on this very subject and some of the things have been said that I have trouble reconciling. The resolution before us has quite a number of whereases and one of them is this: "Whereas the present program being pursued by Manitoba Hydro is at variance with the basic intent of The Manitoba Hydro Act". And another one: "Whereas the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro is unwilling or unable to provide frank and complete answers to questions relating to added costs." Then in the resolved part it states that this Legislative Assembly request the government to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the honourable members would co-operate



(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . and carry on their conversations someplace else so I could hear what's being said by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was going to refer to the resolved part which states that this Legislative Assembly request the government to prohibit Manitoba Hydro from any further work on Lake Winnipeg regulation until such time as a thorough independent and unpolitical review is completed to show: 1. The cost of regulating Lake Winnipeg documented by sound engineering and environmental evidence. (b) The expected power benefits year by year for the next five years. (c) The true comparative costs of all economic alternatives of northern Hydro power development.

These are the three basis points in the resolution and I'm not sure whether we have got the facts on all of them to date. If I recollect correctly the Lake Winnipeg control, not this last year but in earlier times, was mentioned as supposed to cost a hundred million. Now we find that the figure is 56 million. --(Interjection)-- Well am I not correct that in the initial stages 100 million was quoted? This --(Interjection)-- Well no, I didn't say that you said it, Mr. Premier. But this is the understanding that we had in earlier stages that the cost would be around 100 million, and this is what I recollect and I have to check back on what has been said in previous years in order to substantiate that figure. But that figure still sticks in my mind.

Mr. Speaker, then too we had the brief, or the presentation by Mr. Cass-Beggs to the Committee on the Manitoba Hydro development and it refers to the 850 foot level that is now accepted for South Indian Lake, and there are still some questions too on that particular one in connection with clearing. Clearing costs are to be quite high. The figure given here is \$400.00 an acre. This seems very high to me. Maybe the costs are that high but the figure certainly sounds very high to me. And is it the intention to proceed on the basis that we are not thinking of clearing the area in total when we talk of the 850 foot level? So these are questions that come to my mind.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we were also confronted with figures by Mr. Cass-Beggs as to the requirement that will be of monies for capital purposes that will be required by Manitoba Hydro for the next ten years, and these are very very high indeed. In fact I think the total runs to 1,350,000,000, and while the amounts are not quite as high during the initial years it starts off I think with 98 million for the first year, 86 million the following year, and by 1975 we'll be needing 83 million. Then it continues on, 51 million, 73 million, in '78, 116 million; in '79, 163 million; in 1980, 225 million; in '81, 233 million; and in '82, 221 million. This is what hydro is projecting in their planning and I am almost aghast when I hear of these Crown corporations planning without regard in my opinion as to the costs involved, that we are just going to be here as legislators and forever providing the Crown corporations with oodles of money, whatever they request, and whatever their planning planners are planning for. To me I guess I'm not of that school because I feel that even though plans may be made that certainly to --(Interjection)-- Maybe we're different kinds of people that we don't like to think of spending those large amounts, and year after year without any intention of stopping in between some time and giving us a breath, or catch our breath, and meeting those expenditures, because when we talk of this one billion three for development of hydro over the next ten years, we must also think of the interest rates that will continue to accrue on this total amount. And the rates are quite high now as they are and we find that from the report that Manitoba Hydro is paying very substantial amounts of interest right now on the development that they have made to date, and with these projections certainly we're running into higher and higher costs.

From what we heard from the Chairman, Mr. Beggs, that our transmission lines to the south are inadequate to handle larger amounts of export power and the same applies to the facilities to the south of us. The receiving lines are inadequate to receive larger amounts of power into the southern areas so that further increases in costs will have to be met also in transmission lines.

I have felt for quite some time that with this enormous development and amounts of money that we are spending on hydro that we as members of this House should visit the north, and visit the area so that we'd have a better understanding as to what is being contemplated. Surely these large amounts of money being spent warrant a trip down to satisfy ourselves because those members that come from the north, those members that have been there, certainly they can speak with more authority, and with better vision and enlightenment on this subject, having seen it and are able to make a better assessment of what is being proposed.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

Then we are now embarking on this control, Lake Winnipeg control. How long will it take before it's going to be completed? I don't think a completion date has been mentioned so far. Is this going to be completed in a year or two? By the amount of money this certainly could be completed in two years but whether the project as such lends it to completion -- (Interjection)-- Oh! I was also interested in the area that is going to be flooded and I find now that if the high level area was taken into consideration as proposed in the first stage, this means -- at least from the information that I've got -- that 750,000 acres of South Indian Lake would be flooded in addition to the 550,000 square miles of lake already there. And it also would mean another 350,000 feet of flooding on the Rat River system, and this is on the high level. Then on the medium level I'm informed that we would still have the 550,000 square acres of lake on South Indian as original, and we would add another 190,000 square acres, or acres of land that would be flooded by the medium level, plus 200,000 acres on the Rat River system and this I understand is what is being proposed now and will be proceeded with - or is it low level? In the low level I understand there will be 70,000 acres flooded in addition or onto South Indian Lake and another 200,000 on the Rat River or South Indian. So the area that will be flooded naturally is very much smaller than the high level, so that if clearing will be done naturally the cost would be very considerably smaller than on the high level, and certainly from what we heard in past years, when they talked about the high level and not in terms of clearing, that the lake would be just one lake of brush and silt and it would take years and years to disappear. According to the report by Mr. Beggs the intention is though to clear the area when we are talking in terms of the low level.

However, Mr. Speaker, certainly the resolution, what it is requesting in my opinion is not unwarranted as far as information is concerned. If the Member for Riel feels that this information hasn't been submitted to date - and he's more knowledgeable than I am, by far, on this subject - why does the government hedge or can this information not be produced? I think I would like to hear valid arguments in that connection before I vote on the issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel will be closing debate.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I'll be starting to close debate at least on this. I think, Mr. Speaker, in the most valid comment that almost everyone in the House could agree to on this topic, is that there is a great diversity of opinion on it, which has been evident not only through this resolution but through the many other debates and the committee hearings that have gone on during this session. That we can agree upon.

But from there on in, Mr. Speaker, we have difficulty in agreeing. And the reason we have difficulty in agreeing, Mr. Speaker, is that the arguments have not been boiled down in most cases into clear-cut alternatives and the reason is of course that the topic is very technical. I want to quote from a statement by the First Minister to indicate why there is such a misunderstanding on much of the information that has been issued. In this statement, the First Minister said, "I must say that in strictly arithmetical or mathematical terms it would have been possible to proceed with Churchill River diversion only if we had been prepared to agree to a 30-foot flooding of Southern Indian Lake and a 55,000 cfs per second flow forced through the Rat and Burntwood system". Well, Mr. Speaker, almost anyone reading that of course comes to the impression, although it doesn't say it, comes to the impression that the only alternative to Lake Winnipeg flooding is to put 30 feet of water in South Indian Lake.

Of course this is not the argument at all. There is nothing that could be further from the truth than to say that the alternative to Lake Winnipeg flooding is 30 feet of water in South Indian Lake.

The first major and priority complaint and request that we have, Mr. Speaker, is that the diversity of opinion is allowed to speak for itself before a proper forum, and in the three years that this debate has gone on, or the two and a half years since the government changed, or almost three years, the difficulty has been that the knowledgeable people that we know exist on this matter have never been provided with the proper forum where their views could be brought out before members of the legislature, and many of us, including myself have at times been forced into the position of attempting to appear as expert witnesses and none of us should be put in that position as members of the legislature; but surely everyone in this legislature all 56 members must realize that the opinion that exists on both sides of this question is perfectly valid. At least we assume that there is good valid opinion coming out of Hydro, although personally I have questioned some of the moves that have been made by the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro. I think that 56 members more or less would agree that much of the

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . opinion that must exist on the other side of this question is also valid. It must be valid because the people that have been making some of the noises on this can hardly be accused of doing it for political reasons. Some of it must be being made for perfectly objective reasons. And I know that the government and the First Minister has now reached the polarized position where even he is having difficulty in admitting that this might be true.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the request of members of the legislature to allow these people to appear before members of the legislature? We had a list that can be expanded to dozens of people, many of whom could be considered as being experts and many of who collectively would appear on both sides of the question and all with something to add, but none of these, Mr. Speaker, have been allowed to appear before any form of a formal tribunal on this question at a time when a very critical direction is being taken by Manitoba Hydro. Probably the most critical decision that has ever been made with respect to natural resources, not just Manitoba Hydro but the most critical decision that has ever been made in this province with respect to natural resources is being made this year, so the members of the legislature --(Interjection)-- well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Labour sums up the typical attitude of the government when he says "Balderdash and rabble," it's the typical attitude of this government, they've got closed minds. They came into power trying to give the image that they were going to be an open government and listen to all sides of the question and now when valid argument is presented to them we get the very standard remark, very standard retort that it's either balderdash or rabble or garbage, or everybody's stupid on the other side. The First Minister says it, other members of his Cabinet say it, you know --(Interjection)-- yes, sows at the trough - typical type of argument, Mr. Speaker, probably a first for this legislature to have a government get into such a defensive position of using that kind of language.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.