

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 25, 1969

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable members turn to Page 16 of the Order Paper? The adjourned debate of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, the motion before us deals with the matter of concurrence in the regulations that were referred to the committee, I think a year ago, and which have been dealt with in committee and whose report you're now dealing with and asking for concurrence in. The regulations are a large part of the legislation that is being established each and every year. This is a copy of the previous year's regulations which we're dealing with, it's a large volume in itself. Actually it amounts to about the same amount as the legislation that is being passed by the Legislature and to me it always seems that we're passing the whole thing with one motion, that probably we're not checking sufficiently into the various regulations that are being passed under the various legislation that has been enacted over the years. And when I come to look at some of the regulations that are being enacted under the legislation I almost rebel.

I am referring to the regulations passed under the Natural Products Marketing Act, of which we have had three regulations passed. Others have been repealed and new ones have been brought in. The regulations are Regulation 101 from 1967 which is included and plus two supplementary regulations that were brought in. These dealt with the setting up of the new Vegetable Marketing Commission. And, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that, what was it? - two years ago, when we had the Baron Commission investigating the whole matter, and brought in a report. Subsequently we had a vote which was government conducted and supervised and which refuted and rejected the matter of a Vegetable Marketing Commission, by not receiving the necessary vote required to carry, and the Minister at that time had sufficient backbone to reject the matter of bringing in a new commission under the legislation.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt my honourable friend on the point of order because he's usually well within the rules, but I wonder if perhaps on this motion he is perhaps straying beyond what the motion is. The motion is to concur in a report of the Regulations Committee which contains three items. My memory doesn't serve me that well that I can recall whether one of the items deals with vegetable marketing and the long checkered history of that matter, but . . .

MR. FROESE: I can assure him that it is.

MR. LYON: I think my honourable friend is tending to stray a bit far from the report that we're trying to have concurred in.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, we've passed the report that was considered by the committee. We're now dealing with concurrence of the regulations. -- (Interjection) -- And the regulations.

MR. LYON: No, no, no, no just the report.

MR. FROESE: No, no.

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, the motion that we have before us is to concur in the report of the Committee on Statutory Regulations. It does not deal with concurrence in all the regulations. We neither require nor need my honourable friend's approval for that.

MR. FROESE: Well, I would like to know what concurrence means in that, Mr. Minister, if it is not assenting to.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest Mr. Speaker, if I may take in the point of order, I believe the Honourable Member for Rhineland is quite within his rights the way he is discussing this subject, and I would suggest to the Honourable the House Leader that the conduct of the House is in your hands and it appears as though you've had no objections at all and I would suggest that the Honourable Member for Rhineland be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opinions of the honourable gentlemen and their efforts toward assisting the Chair and I feel that I can count on the Honourable Member for Rhineland to keep within the limits of the rules. I must, however, point out to him that it does distinctly say that the House do concur in the report of the Standing Committee, which isolates it to the report itself. Would you not agree? However I leave it to the good judgment of the Honourable

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) Member for Rhineland to use his

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems rather odd to me that we would pass regulations the number of what is contained in this report and not have a chance to speak as members of this Assembly on the matter and . . . Well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to remind the honourable gentleman that maybe I should have the copy before me that he has in front of him in order that I might be able to give him a little guidance. But I don't have it, so therefore again I say I'm depending on him to keep within the rules and he may proceed.

MR. FROESE: If I feel that some of the regulations that are passed are not within keeping with the intent of the Act, certainly I have the right to discuss this matter in the House, especially under this resolution and this is exactly what I'm trying to do, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out that here we had had a commission report, we had had a vote in connection with the Marketing Board, it was turned, and then we find that the Minister goes ahead and sets up a new marketing commission which evidently had been rejected and which in my opinion should not have been done. But it has been done and therefore I feel that the regulations set up under that particular board are much too wide and the powers given to this board are much too wide.

This, Mr. Speaker, does not only apply to this particular regulation, but I feel this is a principle that is probably also inherent in some of the other regulations when I mentioned the matter of no appeal. And this was considered in committee too, especially also in the Farm Machinery Committee that dealt with the artificial insemination, the director under that legislation has very wide powers and discretions, and no appeal legislation. There is no appeal that can be made to the Minister under that regulation. Then a Turkey Board was brought in and here the growers or producers with 500 or less were not entitled to vote. It was only those that had produced 500 or more, or more than 500 that received a vote.

There are a number of minor matters that I felt I would like to touch on in the regulations. For instance, we note that the producers growing four acres or less of potatoes do not come under the board, yet we find when they want to dispose of their product that they still have to go to the commission to get the necessary tags to put on their bags in order to sell them. So, what are we talking about. In one case we're saying you don't come under the board, in the next instance we say you have to come to the board to get their tags in order to sell their product. This certainly doesn't read clear to me.

Then, too, when the government established a new commission, why did they do so. Was it a matter of bailing out the former commission and the money that they'd stuck into that affair? I'm just wondering whether this did not have a bearing on

MR. LYON: I'm sorry to interrupt my honourable friend again on the point of order, but he is now discussing the substance of the regulation. The substance of the regulation was not even before the committee. All that is before the committee is whether or not a regulation or a series of regulations are within the authority of the Executive Council to pass, the legal authority. Whether the regulation is good, bad, indifferent or spotted like a tiger or a leopard is really of no concern to the committee at all. The only thing that is of concern to the committee is whether or not it is within the powers of the Executive Council to pass the regulation. My honourable friend is now dealing with the substance of it which I suggest is out of order.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend is so touchy, I will delay this matter and discuss it when we're discussing the agricultural estimates. I'm sure he will be hearing of me on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member from Rhineland for his co-operation.

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

MR. LYON: . . . now call Bill No. 33.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate, the second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Welfare. The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I had really adjourned this debate for some honourable member in this House, but after reading part of Hansard I think perhaps I would like to say a few words, although I intend to be brief.

There seems to have been quite a bit of confusion ever since Bill 68 started out and down the line to this amendment of Bill No. 33. I would just like to again mention a few things. I believe there are a few reservations as far as some of the elements or things entering concerning the municipalities. I feel that they were perhaps tired of being the collection agency in regards to collecting Manitoba Hospital premiums, and here we find ourselves, or a

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) municipality finds themselves in possibly an even more precarious position than they were before. I realize, as the Minister said the other day that under Bill No. 31 it will be our duty and I am sure that the municipalities will co-operate in this respect. And it isn't only the money part of it; it seems to me quite a few other things enter this problem. It seems to be quite a time consuming element as far as the internal work is concerned in the municipalities. It seems that right now with the hospital collections there were two official visits per year and two casual visits per year, and of course they always took a lot of time of some personnel in the municipality. I think there's even the element of some municipalities hoping that they're not going to go over this one mill of welfare and hope to control their municipalities as well as they can, although I realize that this is not controlled by council, the conditions in the municipality will control this to a greater extent, but I do believe that when the President of the Urban Association pleaded with the Minister and his group that another look should be taken at this problem, I think more consideration should have been given. I realize fully the comments made by the Minister when he says that we'll take a look at it for three months. This is appreciated, but I think he also has to take into consideration that if three months are taken into consideration a lot of these accounts as far as the municipality is concerned, especially with people paying their accounts in three or four or five different places in the same town or village, that quite a time can elapse before you really have proof of the one that is delinquent in paying his premium. So I was rather discouraged that the Minister did not see fit at this time to consider the Urban Association's plea to possibly take another look. However, I'm sure that as municipalities usually are they will go along with this and try it, but I think the Minister should keep in mind that this is more than likely going to cause problems that were not expected possibly in your group or in the Minister's mind.

Mr. Speaker, there's just one little item I wish to touch on, and I don't wish to go through this bill section by section, but under Section 27 I'll just read the last five words: "records until it has inspected them" Plainly the seizure of records taken by this corporation, the right that they have. I wonder, perhaps there should be a time limit set on this time of inspecting the records even if they may be found faulty or not. I think in most cases a municipality, or in this case possibly an employer's records, I think we already are running into a time and age when we have enough paper work to do as it is and perhaps the least the corporation could do is set a time limit on this just in case their corporation becomes too busy to release the records at some needed time that the employer wishes to use them. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have had a lot of confusion, as I said before, concerning the bill and the amendment now to Bill No. 33 since we started out. In fact so much has been said I sometimes wonder if all these things are necessary in politics or in carrying out a bill.

I was especially concerned yesterday when I realized that some of the members to the left of me here were possibly just about to the stage where they're getting carried away to some extent. I felt very sorry for the Member for Inkster yesterday. I've always thought that he's such a wonderful fellow and for a while I wondered if he would have enough elbow room to explain his point to the rest of the people in this Assembly. I for one think that he's a very serious fellow and he was serious in his deliberation yesterday and probably as being very serious, a very serious problem, we know this, but I cannot agree with the Honourable Member for Inkster when he was referring specifically to our doctors yesterday, when he shouts at the members of the this House and he says, "Let them set up their own hospitals," and I think I'd better read it because I may mix this up. On page 671 in Hansard: "And I am prepared to say that I will not do anything; if they want to be outside, if they want to practise their medicine entirely apart from what the legislature has enacted, I've said today, let them set up their own hospitals, let them not make use of the tainted socialist hospital money that they are getting and all the facilities that are in the hospital. Let them set up their own medical schools. Let's get into real competition with these rugged individualists. Let's fight them."

To me, Mr. Speaker, this is going too far. When I hear people talk like that, I become very sad - and I'm serious in this respect. It reminds me of how revolutions start. Probably these are some of the reasons that people have left countries during their time or maybe their ancestors, and I think the honourable member knows what I'm talking of. Probably the kind of thinking that we have in this House when these things happen at times is becoming marginal as to what kind of times our next generation can look forward to.

Mr. Speaker, I think our doctors deserve a different kind of respect than we have shown them in this House at times and I'm not referring, Mr. Speaker, I'm not referring to

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) . . . negotiations that should and must take place with them or with their association and this government. I'm not referring to that. I'm referring to the attitude that I feel I have detected; maybe I'm wrong but I feel that way in some of the statements made in this House that seem to lean away from the honourable and ethical people that I think they really are. But Mr. Speaker, that is not really the only reason I felt I had to say a few words tonight. When the honourable member shouts and says, "Let them not make use of the tainted socialist hospital money that they are getting," Mr. Speaker, this may sound very puny to a lot of you, but I take great pride in my grandfather being one of the ancestors that spent a lot of his personal time in building the Steinbach Bethesda Hospital and that was not with capitalistic or socialistic money. I take great pride in some of the people who have gone before us that have built these hospitals, not only the capitalist or the socialist, this includes the doctors, includes a lot of people, and I think that I have a right, as a member here, and I hope he didn't mean it in this sense, but I think it is time that when things like this are spoken, especially in haste, I think that we should possibly just recall and recollect just for a moment and see if these things are really that way. Mr. Speaker, are we really ready to try and destroy that kind of a spirit? I think the Honourable Member for Inkster and all of us are proud that we had spirits like this existing.

Then he went on and he said, "Let them set up their own medical schools." I'll go along with him part way on that one. Let's have more medical schools. I agree with him on that, but I do not agree that they should be set up and paid for by the doctors themselves. And as far as the rugged individualist is concerned, he is referring to -- or possibly I should say that I agree with him that we have had many real, strong, hard individualists. I agree with him and there were a lot of them -- I think he was referring to the doctors and they were. I just have to think back to a very short time of some of the doctors the way they worked in my own area, and I'm sure all of you members can think of some of the doctors the way they helped in this respect of progress in your area, and I say, Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that we still haven't reached that stage in Manitoba and I hope we aren't for many years, when he says in the last three words, "Let's fight them." I hope that he is not sincere in that either. I hope that we can fight with them, because I think that's what he really meant to say,

Mr. Speaker, somehow I have a feeling that this House is fairly well united as far as the Medicare Bill is concerned. I know there are many things that will be discussed between second and third readings and I think the bill will have no trouble in passing, but maybe we should not try to keep on disturbing so many patients that are taking this thing seriously, so many of the people that are involved, including our doctors, including the socialists, including the capitalists. I hope the Honourable Member for Inkster will not think that I am trying to attack him personally. I just want to let him know that I don't agree with his principles.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Did the Honourable Member for St. John's have a question?

MR. CHERNIACK: I would like permission, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member will agree to a question. I'm not clear from what he said whether he agrees with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface or with the Chamber of Commerce on the assignments to opted-out doctors.

MR. BARKMAN: I have . . . not discussing either of them . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you . . .

MR. BARKMAN: We could some time, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 33, which is an Act to amend The Manitoba Medical Services Insurance Act, this is an Act that was passed in 1967 and was fully debated at that particular time. I recall too well some of the things that were said and I too had my opinions and I thought I made my contributions at that time to this bill - to the Bill 68. Now we have a bill before us that will amend that particular legislation passed two years ago. You will also recall that Bill 68 was passed as a voluntary measure, that as far as the doctors were concerned they had the right to opt out or in, as the case may be. It was also a voluntary measure as far as the people of this province were concerned. They could subscribe if they wanted to, and they also need not subscribe if they didn't want to, and therefore I had no objection. In fact, I think I supported the government at that time on the measure. However, now we turn around and will make this a compulsory matter. Everyone under the Bill will be entitled to the services under the plan, but then later on they bring in a fee which will be

(MR. FROESE cont'd) compulsory to all. They will be required to pay a premium. Then . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question, just so that I can make sure that I'm not missing his train of thought. Is he suggesting that the 1966 statute that was passed by the House did not require every citizen to participate?

MR. FROESE: Not the way I understood it. Not the way I understood it. No. It was a voluntary measure at that time. -- (Interjection) -- Bill 68.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rhineland may proceed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, coming back to the bill that is before us now, it is mainly brought in in order to qualify under the federal Medicare Act which we are now trying to accommodate and also under which we will be getting certain benefits in the way of payments - according to the Bill I think it amounts to 50 percent. And I feel that this is rather a big carrot. We know that they intend to contribute something like \$26 million in the first year of operation of this plan. The total figure given to us is to be \$55 million for the first year and that the province will be paying the \$29 million. Now this is a big carrot but I think we should not be fooled into this because surely this is just a beginning and that the costs are bound to increase under this plan. We already have indications by people who call on us, telling us they cannot meet and will not be paying premiums. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a serious matter when people are hard-pressed as they are today for cash, and this will mean a further cash outlay at the end of each month. For each and every family, for each and every individual over a certain age, they will be required to make a monthly payment to this plan. This is an imposition on these people who have little means and are hard-pressed today, and I'm sure this includes many of the farm people of Manitoba today, who have very little or no cash to make such payments. In fact I had a phone call the other day stating that west of here, that the people - the farmers - were selling grain, oats at 35 cents, barley for 50 cents and wheat for 85 cents a bushel. Mr. Speaker, this is rock bottom, and these people are in dire need for cash, otherwise they would not be selling at these prices, but they have to have money. And now we are going to impose another measure on them whereby they will be required to make monthly cash payments to meet this obligation.

Mr. Speaker, another concern of mine is that we are creating another big bureaucracy right here in Manitoba and across Canada. I think once it's in full going that it might be even larger than the CBC, when you think of the total amount that is going to be spent on medicare across Canada, once you have the empire builders in there, each trying to get some Indians underneath him so that he can also be a Chief, when you will find that all the different aspects have to be researched, and in this way you will be getting a bureaucracy that won't be funny. When the matter was first introduced two years, a medical plan was considered would be costing the people of Manitoba \$14 million. Within two years' time the cost has doubled itself and we're not even in it yet. Just think what it will mean when we are in it and we have these people in there working and enlarging the plan. Not only will that be the case, in future elections you will see that different parties will be vying for the popular vote, promising people more services under this plan. This is almost a foregone conclusion that this will happen, and we know what transpired and happened in Great Britain, how the country is practically bankrupt as a result of the social services that were brought in there, and I feel that we cannot afford to enter this plan here in Manitoba. Then, too, the plan is of such a type that if controls or efficiencies are to be brought in, they have to be brought from the top down. This is similar to the school plan here in Manitoba. Once you create a pool and distribute from that pool, everyone wants a maximum service and the demand is there, that each and every one wants the maximum they can get from that pool.

Then, too, we find under the federal Medicare Act that the same will be up to review in 1973, and what is going to happen in 1973? Are we assured at this time that the Federal Government's participation will continue indefinitely, and to what extent? Will their contribution be smaller after 1972, or can we count on them to increase their proportion if the costs go up and keep on rising? I think these are questions that probably we should have an answer to if the Minister can supply them. This will not only be the case of this particular program. We know the many shared cost programs that are in effect today, and have been in effect, and when the Federal Government ceases to participate in them the province is left holding the bag, and it is sometimes very difficult then to carry on and make ends meet. And surely, I feel that we should know before entering this plan what is the situation. Will the plan be continued once it is entered in, and will there be

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . any changes in the criteria that is presently in the plan? The criteria could be changed in 1973 so that it might be more difficult for us to qualify or the grants might be lowered. I think these are items that definitely should be considered at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people of this province should have a right to vote on this matter. I feel that the principle that was used in establishing the new unitary school districts in the province should be carried on in this particular program as well. We used the referendum. The people had the right to indicate whether they wanted to accept that plan or not. This was a principle that the government of the day subscribed to. This is a principle that they apparently believe in, and that they're still believing in, otherwise the four referendums would not take place next month. So, Mr. Speaker, why not place the issue before the people of this province and let them vote on the matter? I indicated before that \$26 million is a big carrot. We had carrots hung before the people when they voted on the school plan. I think this is no different. This carrot is probably larger than the previous one. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a motion to that effect that the matter be placed before the people in a referendum and give the people the chance to cast their vote and make the decision. Surely enough we should have the confidence in the people of this province to make the right decision. I am sure that when the vote would be in that they would make the right decision and I doubt whether they would support the present government's program of going into Medicare. I know that the other opposition parties here to the right requested or demanded this two years ago but up until this time we have not been in it and I feel that we should put this before the people in the form of a referendum. I would therefore move, seconded by the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that Bill No. 33 be not now read a second time but that the Government of the Province of Manitoba consider the advisability of referring the matter of a compulsory Medicare program to a province-wide referendum for a decision.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take this matter under advisement.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. In view of the fact that the motion is being taken under advisement is it then the intention that nobody else can speak on the bill at this time or can the motion be taken under advisement and still have somebody else speak?

MR. SPEAKER: I feel that until I've made a decision with regard to that amendment there will be no further discussion.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Transportation, 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 Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste Rose): Mr. Chairman, before you place the question on the amendment that is before us regarding the Minister's salary I'd like to say a few words on this occasion. I had assumed that the Minister would make a rather full scale reply to the particular amendment that was made in the Minister's salary regarding the situation at South Indian Lake but he has decided to defer this presumably until second reading of the bill which we have had notice of. So I will not be taking a great deal of time on this occasion on that particular subject but I do want to make my position very clear once again.

I do regard the matter of South Indian Lake and the whole concept of the multiple use of our natural resources in Manitoba, the whole question of what is best for our people is a very major and important and serious question. I must confess that I was somewhat disappointed in what appeared to be a rather frivolous approach insofar as the amendment. I don't think that this question lends itself to discussions as to whether it should be a dollar for the Minister's salary or 98 cents and I'm not frankly happy about that particular amendment which seems to me to be making rather light of what I consider to be a very serious question, and I must say in fairness, Mr. Chairman, that I have some sympathy for the Minister. I have some sympathy for the Minister in that he has inherited a situation which he didn't create. I must say on the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . other hand that I was most disappointed with the Minister at the hearings that I attended here in Winnipeg on the South Indian Lake matter. I asked at that hearing for the Minister to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I'm convinced that the Minister should have been heard. I'm convinced that the Minister did a great deal of injustice to his departmental staff in allowing what went on at that hearing. I think he let civil servants take the brunt of a situation for which they were not responsible which was a policy decision of this government, and to do that is most unfair. I think the Minister let civil servants sit there on a platform, defend the position which they could not defend, because it was not a question that they could handle themselves, and that the only fair way in which this should have been handled is for the Minister himself to have taken that position. I fear that the Minister did grievous harm to the civil service of Manitoba in that question. I think it went far beyond just the matter of the two specific civil servants involved at that time. I think I stated then at the hearings that they had my total sympathy. Because I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have to accept that the civil servants must not be placed in that sort of a position. They cannot do their job when they are placed in a position like those two gentlemen were. And for the Minister to have allowed that to go on in my opinion was a most serious thing indeed. In fact, in my opinion, and I say again that the Minister did not create the situation himself but having found himself in that position he had no alternative but to accept the responsibility of his office and not hoist it on to someone else. And if he could not do that, Mr. Chairman, then the Minister should have resigned. That's the obligation of public office, Mr. Chairman. It's not always a light one, it is a very difficult one at many times but that's the obligation that comes upon us as members of this House; the obligation that the Minister accepts when he accepts to lead the department. And so, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment that's proposed although I say again that I do not like what seemed to me to be a frivolous approach. But I intend to support it because I think that the Minister insofar as his responsibility went did not live up to his responsibility. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it very very clear to this House and to the people of Manitoba that the responsibility comes upon all honourable members of that front bench across there because -- well when I say all, virtually all, because virtually all of them were members of that government when the decisions were taken. They were members of that government last year when the members on this side of the House asked for the full information, and we had the then Minister responsible, the now Minister of Transport, Mr. Chairman, who had the gall to get up in this House and say this matter was settled two years ago and you're just rehashing old straw. He had the gall to get up in this House and admit that he didn't really know if the university had been asked to make a study or not. He wasn't aware if they had. A man who is responsible for that department not knowing what the government had not or had done. So, Mr. Chairman, I feel a great deal of sympathy for the present Minister because he is accepting what is really a collective responsibility across there, what every Minister on that front bench will have to answer to to the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I will not go any further in this matter tonight. The Minister has chosen to leave the major debate for the time when he presents his bill. I accepted to do that. I wanted to make it very clear, however, what my position and that of my party is in this regard. What we want, Mr. Chairman, are the facts, the full facts. If we are going to be asked to vote on something we're prepared to accept that responsibility but on one condition only: that we have the facts on which to make a decision. At this stage the government has not given the facts. I challenge the Minister to insure that when the second reading of his bill comes up he does provide the full facts. At this stage, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the Minister has neglected his responsibility as a Minister in the course of those hearings; this government has failed in its responsibility to the people of Manitoba. I intend to support the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm just going to take a few minutes because the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the fact that the amendment was brought in in a frivolous manner and this gives him some misgivings and I want to remove any misgivings that he may have because certainly nothing that has been done up until now has been done in a frivolous manner. The Leader of our Party put it quite plainly to this House that it is a tradition in moving to express displeasure or a want of confidence in a Cabinet Minister to make a motion reducing his salary to \$1.00. That's happened year after year and perhaps it's reached the stage where it doesn't mean exactly what it's intended to mean. The Leader of this Party thought that the

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . matter was so serious that he would have to change that motion to impress upon the House and to the Leader of the Opposition and to everybody the seriousness with which this matter is being considered, and therefore the traditional motion of reducing the salary to \$1.00 was not satisfactory and he chose the figure 98 cents to impress upon the members of this House just how serious we do consider the matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, now that the various committees have been established by motion, I wonder whether we could not have the Public Utilities Committee called to meet -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the bill was passed today. The committees were established today. I just wonder whether we could not have a meeting called of the Utilities Committee where we could discuss this with the people from Hydro and that we could get all the pertinent information to the whole question before us. I would like to know from the Honourable Minister whether this could be done. If it can be done and if we can get the information that way I don't see the need then to support the resolution that is before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? The amendment is, motion by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains that Resolution No. 72 Section 1 (a) Minister's Compensation be reduced from \$15,600 to 98 cents.

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I didn't hear your final . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . declare the nays have it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Could you have a division please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members. Do you want the motion read for all those . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest Mr. Chairman, that the motion be read. There's been a lot of water raised from certain lakes since then it might be as well to reread it into Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I did read it just a few minutes ago but a number of members were not present so I'll read it again. Motion by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, seconded by the Member for Ethelbert Plains, that Resolution No. 72, 1 (a) Minister's Compensation be reduced from \$15,600 to 98 cents.

A STANDING COUNTED VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: 23; NAYS: 26.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Has the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources a right to vote on this motion as he has a pecuniary interest in the same?

MR. DESJARDINS: He gives his cheque to his wife.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Inkster. The main motion?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make some remarks on the Minister's salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: In originally speaking to the Minister's estimates, I confined my remarks to that area of activity which he chose to avoid, and since that time I haven't had a real opportunity of discussing some of the other aspects of his department, and I wouldn't want the House to get the impression that this is the only area that the Minister could be addressed about. I'm not speaking of criticism necessarily, but I believe that there are other areas of his department that I would like to discuss at this time.

I would like to particularly, Mr. Chairman, deal with the question of mining and some of the areas in his department which I feel the Minister has not dealt with, possibly because of his preoccupation with the consideration of South Indian Lake. I would like to remind the Minister that last year in the House there was considerable discussion about a resolution that was introduced by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition regarding the Precambrian Shield and the future of Manitoba and Manitoba mines and mineral resources, and this resolution was amended by our group; and there was considerable discussion as to just what was the best method to be adopted with regard to the exploration of our resources, and Mr. Chairman, this particular discussion went on right through the entire Session until finally, and in the last analysis, an amendment was introduced by the Honourable Member for Brandon. I've read the remarks that the Honourable Member for Brandon made with regard to his amendment, and I find that he had very little to say in the body of his speech, and again I'm not being critical but he had very little to say in the body of his speech which was directly related to the "Resolved" portion of the amendment, which called for, Mr. Chairman, the creation of a Precambrian institute in the province of Manitoba, and as I recall it, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not exact about

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . this, but I believe that that resolution was adopted by all of the members of the House despite the fact that it had been watered down considerably from the proposals both of the Liberal Party on the one part, and the proposals made by the New Democrats on the other part.

But, Mr. Chairman, the last proposal that was made was apparently found to be acceptable by at least the majority of the members of the House, and I'm inclined to think it was accepted by all of the members of the House. And, Mr. Chairman, I believe that, despite the fact that it wasn't introduced by our side of the House, that the proposal has considerable merit and is of considerable importance to the Province of Manitoba. I think that I indicated, in addressing myself to the Department of Mines and Minerals last year, that the Precambrian Shield, as it falls in Manitoba, should be the source of the greatest part of Manitoba's future wealth, that development in the Precambrian Shield in Manitoba is considerably less than the development of the Precambrian Shield in the Province of Ontario, and the experts in mines and minerals tell us that the probabilities of there being mineral strikes in any one part of the Precambrian Shield are equal to the probabilities of there being mineral strikes in other portions of the Precambrian Shield, and if we accept this, Mr. Chairman, and I'm sure the Minister does accept this, it would indicate that the Precambrian Shield in the Province of Manitoba can at least be developed to the extent that it has been developed in Ontario, which means considerable more development than has already taken place, and even in Ontario we are quite sure that the development has not reached its limit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that the people working in terms of the Precambrian Shield involve roughly geologists who are working for the provincial Departments of Mines and Natural Resources, geologists who are now working in the federal Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and I understand that there are 20 to 30 geologists in that department, about 10 - and I'm talking about at the Doctor's level - in our department, plus 10 people in the academic fields in our own university community, which indicates, Mr. Chairman, that there are about 40 to 50 people of high level geologist calibre who are working on the Precambrian Shield. But they are working in different areas. It's true their activities are co-ordinated to some extent, but we have some working in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources for the province; some working at the federal level in Ottawa; some working at the university level on campus. And the suggestion that there be a Precambrian Institute would do a great deal for the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, in several respects.

First of all, if the institute could be established it would have to be contributed to, to a large extent, by federal funds and I think that it's important that where we are talking about regional development and since we are in fact the site which is most proximate to the Precambrian Shield, that the province has an excellent bargaining position for insisting that if a Precambrian Institute is established, that it be established in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, this would have untold benefits and benefits which can't even be predicted in terms of the development that would take place in the province. First of all, Mr. Chairman, it would mean that Manitoba would be the centre of Canada - the centre of North America in fact - for geologists seeking to do important work in the Precambrian area, and this would mean that geologists all over North America would look to Manitoba as being the place where they could centre their activity. This would help Manitoba in developing its own exploration, and would co-ordinate, by having all of the people together, the work that is done by the people in these areas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that there are strong forces working in the Province of Saskatchewan, trying to have a Precambrian Institute established there, and this is something, Mr. Chairman, that apparently the province, if it's going to have, it's going to have to work for. And it would be a shame, Mr. Chairman, since we are the place where such an institute should logically be held, should logically be created, it would be a shame if we lost that institute due to any dragging of heels on the part of our department, especially since the Honourable Member for Brandon was the one who proposed that this take place, and since the honourable members on the other side all voted in favour of it. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the very fact that the Minister could introduce his entire estimates and publish his report without referring to the fact that there is work being done towards getting a Precambrian Institute established in Manitoba, would be an indication, Mr. Chairman, to me - and I hope that I'm wrong in this regard; I hope that the Minister can satisfy us - would be an indication to me that the resolution that was passed by all of the Members of the House is being treated

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . with apparently the same serious attitude as the resolution that the Honourable Member for St. John's indicated was passed unanimously by all of the members of the House and which related to the consumer affairs legislation which the House has failed to act upon.

So, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this suggestion was an important one, is still vital to the future of our province, has apparently been ignored in the introduction of the estimates of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I think that it would be a serious dereliction on the part of the government if we failed to have this institute established by virtue of the fact that the things that should have been done were not done at the proper time. We've spent a lot of time on these estimates, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not going to say anything more on that particular subject than what I have just said. I hope that the Minister will do all in his power to see to it that Manitoba - which is the logical place for the creation of a Precambrian Institute - does everything that is humanly possible to do, in order to see that the institute is established here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one other item of the Minister's department, and that is the question of just what Manitoba is doing in the area of research, marketing, and other progressive measures so as to make use of the rare metals that are available in our province. I think that the Premier of this province threw a very stiff and, I think, important challenge to us. For many, many years people in Manitoba have argued, or governments of Manitoba and people outside of governments have argued that Manitoba can't progress as rapidly as some of the other provinces because it is poor; it is poor in natural resources; and I think the Premier on his way back from the Constitutional Conference said something like - and I can't quote him exactly - but it was something like, "that there are no poor provinces, only provinces which haven't been developed to their full potential." I hope I'm quoting the Premier accurately. If it's not exactly his words, at least it's his meaning. He said that the provinces were rich; that if anything was wrong, it was the development of the provinces. And I admire the Premier's being willing to accept the fact that if there is underdevelopment it's because we have done something wrong, not because we live in a province which doesn't have resources which are to be developed. And I am speaking, Mr. Chairman, specifically of certain rare metals which apparently are found only in certain locations and which Manitoba is blessed with, that is metal such as tantalum, caesium, lithium and verilium. And I know that there is exploration in these areas; I know that certain mining is done in the area; but, Mr. Chairman, there will be no future for the real development potential of these resources unless there is research done into the areas of how they can be used.

Is the Minister aware, or is the Minister able to tell us that there is considerable government research being done into what these particular metals, which are distinct to various areas one of which is Manitoba, is there any research being done into what uses can be made of these metals which are found in Manitoba? And in particular, Mr. Chairman, is there any aggressive marketing program? I know that the Member for Brokenhead has discussed an aggressive marketing program for wheat. Is there an aggressive marketing program? Are markets being sought? Are there any steps being taken to determine what use can be made of these products, and if so, are there any progressive steps being taken to see to it that the products are delivered to markets which can make use of them? I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there has to be research both in the methods of extraction, which apparently are not the same as for other metals; I think that there should be research into the use that can be made of these metals: and I think that there has to be an aggressive marketing program. It's only with programs of this kind, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that the Premier's promise can be fulfilled; that we are not a poor province, we are a province possibly which hasn't developed at the same rate as other provinces, or we're possibly a province that has started from behind. But if we do do the job of making the best use of such riches as we have, then we cannot be even called a poor province but furthermore we wouldn't even be called an underdeveloped province. The Minister has said nothing, or relatively nothing. I didn't hear anything in his original remarks, other than the mining of tantalum, with regard to research being done in the use and the possibility of new markets for the sale of these metals, and I would like to hear what is being done in these areas which I think are of utmost importance to the future of the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)--passed; (c)--passed; 1--passed, Administration \$103,042.
Resolution 72--passed.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would meet the wishes of the Committee if we could now proceed with the resolutions to do with interim supply and supplementary supply?

MR. MOLGAT: No objections, Mr. Chairman, on our side. We haven't received any material on the interim supply as yet, though. All we have is . . .

MR. EVANS: The interim supply is really a proportion of the main estimates which are already in the Committee and, as follows the custom, it will call for two-tenths of those particular estimates. So the estimates themselves are in the Committee already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$72,931,292, being two-tenths of the amount of the several items to be voted for departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970. Passed?

MEMBERS: Passed.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, when we pass an item like we are doing right now by passing two-tenths of the budgetary amount that we will be passing at this particular Session, does this mean that any monies that will be used in the immediate period, is this all being borrowed? Or does this still come from revenues that are coming in as a matter of course?

MR. EVANS: No, the money does come from the regular sources of revenue. This is only interim supply until the main supply is voted, and then when the budget address comes in it states the way in which the money will be raised. This money will not be borrowed for this purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Schedule A. Further sums granted to Her Majesty by this Act for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1969, No. I - Legislation, Resolution 3, Comptroller-General's Office (a) Salaries. Comptroller-General \$1,222,00 -- passed:

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, is this an increment in salary, or is that the total amount on the . . .

MR. EVANS: The salary of the Comptroller-General must be voted by the Legislature and cannot be established as the other Deputy Ministers' salaries are established by Order-in-Council. When the government was reorganized there was an adjustment in the other Deputy Ministers' salaries, but the similar adjustment could not be made for the Comptroller-General, because his salary must be voted by the House.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department III Agriculture, Resolution 4 - Agricultural Societies.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why this increase of 4,000 is there?

MR. EVANS: I regret the Minister of Agriculture is not here. He is absent from the city on official business. The obvious reason is that the money voted in the last Supply Bill was not sufficient and these additional amounts have been awarded to agricultural societies in the meantime. This is the reason from a provincial treasurer's point of view. I regret I'm not able to give him the list of the items concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: I just wondered whether new societies were created or how -- it seems to me that the grants in this area are fairly stable. I recognize the Minister may not be in a position, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could at some stage -- or the past Minister maybe.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could be of some help to the Minister of Finance in this case. In the legislation dealing with the agricultural societies there are certain open ended grant systems built into the legislation. The estimates are therefore fairly accurate estimates but can never be completely determined. That is we don't know precisely if an agricultural society will accept the offers that are contained within the legislation to make certain improvements and the likes of this. We do not also know the full extent to the prize list for instance. This is sometimes determined by the number of entries in specific fairs so that there is some upward or downward revision in this particular case and I think this is possibly the explanation for the upward revision here.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I recall last year we I think passed legislation allowing for certain increases, and special increases in certain cases. I'm wondering whether this probably has not got something to do with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we could hold our questions anyway. When the Minister comes up to his estimates you can bring this to his attention on his salary.

No. 4 Agricultural Societies - \$4,000.00 -- passed. No. 9 - Grasshopper Control - \$1,000.00 -- passed. Total amount \$5,000.00 -- passed.

Department No. VII - Highways (including Water Control and Conservation). Appropriation No. 4 - Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects, FRED Program and Construction of Streets in The Established Metropolitan Street System - \$785,000.00 -- passed.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Chairman, perhaps the members would like some explanation of this item. The over-expenditures indicated with regard to highways result from the construction done on two particular roads. The expenditures were recoverable but because the estimates reflect gross expenditures only the revenue appears elsewhere and of course the expenditures have to appear on the expenditure side. The two projects in question were Provincial Road 482 west of the Shellmouth Reservoir and this money is recoverable from P. F. R. A. -- the amount in this item approximately \$600,000.00. The second project was the construction of the Fox Lake Road from Lynn Lake and is partially recoverable from Sherritt-Gordon Mines Limited, the amount being approximately \$200,000.00.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, while we're on that subject then of supplementary work, it seems to me that last fall a particular situation arose in the area of Point du Bois and a delegation came in after I think repeated letters to the Minister and the Minister and his deputy went out to specifically have a look at the area. I understand that they made two specific promises at that time - agreed to do two things. First of all - I'm referring now to Road No. 313. Section one and six-tenths of a mile west of Point du Bois townsite was to be done and then the section nine-tenths of a mile west of the townsite was to be done. I understand that the first was done in the fall in a quite satisfactory manner, but that the second really has not yet been done and that this is a very hazardous situation on this road. The people in the area are particularly concerned about the school buses which have to travel this route. Apparently it's a very narrow location; there is a very sharp "S" bend through a rock cut and I'm told that in spite of the Minister's agreement that the work has not been done. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what is the status now of this road?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, that matter I should perhaps just indicate does not relate to the items in this appropriation here. The shorter piece of work as indicated by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is a small distance but rather expensive because of the nature of the work. I'm aware of the discussions which took place and the matter is

(MR. McLEAN Cont'd.)... presently under consideration.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . my question, Mr. Chairman, that this appears to me to be an agreement by the department to go really beyond what had been in the original estimates last year, so in fact does come in my view properly under the discussion of supplementary estimates. Now I was under the impression that the work had been done. If it's correct that the second part of the promise has not been looked after then if one refers to this year's proposal the Minister does not include it. Because if you look at Route No. 313 and the present plan for construction in this coming year is 5.9 miles, Lee River to P. R. 315 grade and gravel. So on this basis then the work was not done last year as promised but nor is it the intention to do it this year because there's nothing in the estimates for the coming year. I wonder if the Minister could explain what the plan is.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Chairman, no, I'm not able to explain or not able to state what will be done because as I've indicated the matter is being looked at. There are funds in the estimates for this year which would take care of the matter if it is proceeded with. And when I say "if it is proceeded with" I'm of course very keenly aware of the discussions which took place and certainly not my intention to evade or not to carry out any arrangements that were made if they can in fact be carried out. With regard to the particular matter that is before us now, however, the work that was done last -- really in this current year there were funds -- in other words it was not necessary to ask for additional funds in order to carry out that work and it would be our view that in carrying out any further work in connection with that road does not need to be specifically mentioned in our program, it being, shall we say, a carry over from last year, an incompleting work if that was the understanding, and I believe it was, that it was to be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. 4 - Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, etc.
The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Transportation mentioned just two particular expenditures that accounted for the most of this money. Do I understand that the two projects that he speaks of cover the whole of this vote?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: 600,000 for the one recoverable from P. F. R. A. and 185,000 on the other one?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CAMPBELL: So actually there is nothing here dealing with the FRED program or the construction of streets in the Metropolitan area.

MR. McLEAN: That's correct, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$785,000 -- passed. No. XII - Public Utilities. Appropriation No. 2 - Public Utilities Board (b) Other Expenditures - \$35,000.00 -- passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Could we have an explanation for that amount, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Public Utilities Board is entitled to hire whatever consultants they wish for hearings and under the gross accounting system it has to be expended by this means although it is recovered later from the clients or from the people who appear in front of the Board. It's my understanding this sum was involved with the inquiry into the gas companies during the year in question, during this year just ended.

MR. MOLGAT: And will be totally recoverable from the gas company?

MR. EVANS: That is my understanding. Now, Mr. Chairman, if it suited the Committee perhaps we could continue with the regular work of the Committee of Supply until a few minutes to ten, which if it were agreeable we could ask the Speaker to come in and proceed to the Ways and Means resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we do that though I wonder if I could ask the Minister of Finance then for an accounting insofar as the total of the year. The total amount here that we're being asked to vote tonight is \$826,000.00. If one refers to last year's estimates, the detailed estimates of revenue and expenditures, the plan last year was to have total current expenditures of 377 million, the estimate was current revenue of 377.4 million, which showed an excess of revenue over expenditure of 711 thousand. Now we are voting an extra 826 thousand. In my records this would indicate that we ended up the year with a deficit of 110, unless, of course, the revenues in fact were higher. Could the Minister tell us how we did in fact end up.

MR. EVANS: The accounting for the year will be given in my Budget Address which I

(MR. EVANS Cont'd.) . . . hope will come within a week or two, but it isn't necessarily so that this extra expenditure would cause a deficit because there are lapses in the amounts voted. Amounts are not fully used in some votes and those amounts lapse and offset or provide funds enough to provide for expenditures of this kind in most cases. But I will not be able to discuss how the outcome of the year just ended until I reach my Budget Address.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this matter I would like to ask the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer if the additional salary that we have now passed for the Comptroller-General is included on the sheet that was given to us the other day or will this amount be in addition to what we have on that sheet?

MR. EVANS: I'm sure it's the current salary. The sheet that was distributed in Committee shows the salaries as of a certain date and I've forgotten what date that is.

MR. CAMPBELL: Of March 20th.

MR. EVANS: As of March 20th salaries were raised as of September 25th if my memory serves and consequently this is the amount required to make up the salary to the amount shown on my honourable friend's sheet and it does not raise it above that amount.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister just said that there were certain amounts or certain items that were lapsing from the estimates if they're not being used. This does not apply to capital items though does it?

MR. EVANS: No. My honourable friend is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: -- passed. Could someone guide me as to what follows?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we might now return to the estimates of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 20 - No. 2 - Mines and Departmental Services.

MR. ENNS: Just to reply very briefly to the remarks made -- (Interjection) -- my salary is passed? No my salary is not passed is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1 -- passed, 2 -- passed. (a) -- passed. 2 -- passed.
\$2,292,660.00. . . .

MR. MOLGAT: There's a whole series there, Mr. Chairman, which need some detailed discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well nobody's got the floor yet. If you don't take the floor I'll go ahead. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Because there seems to be a problem, I'm taking the floor. You were wrong in calling the total of the Resolution No. 73 because you only covered 2. (a) (1) and (2). You should now go to (b) and since I'm on the floor we're coming into Mines. I presume you're recalling (b). Well then may I ask the Minister if he is now in a position to inform us about any participating agreements involved in the Mineral Exploratory Act -- I forget the exact term of it, and the grants that have been given to finance exploration.

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

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Mineral Explorations Assistance Act, the purpose of the Act was to of course encourage particular development and exploration in areas that were not now receiving this kind of attention. There were in fact four grants paid under The Mineral Explorations Act by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. But I should further inform the Honourable Member for St. John's that agreements have been entered into which if completed, and we have every reason to believe they will be carried out, will result in a further 16 grants being made aggregating a total of some 222,637 thousand dollars. This is all in that area east of Lake Winnipeg where a designated area has been set aside. This area is not fixed or firm but this is the area that this Act has application to. Further to the comments relating to the precambrian centre raised by my honourable. . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to distract the Minister but we also -- I asked whether there were any agreements entered into, participating agreements as provided under the Act. And if not could he explain why not.

MR. ENNS: There have been under this program no development of actual mines created as such so that there is no -- there has not been an opportunity to enter into these participating agreements that he refers to that is also embodied into it.

MR. CHERNIACK: You mean there hasn't been any successful explorations under this grant?

MR. ENNS: That is correct. Now if I can just deal very briefly with the matter raised by the Honourable Member for Inkster. He dwelt at some length with the matter of the

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.) . . . Precambrian Shield. I should inform the honourable member that we have not just slept on this matter, we have entered into formal discussions with the various concerned and interested people in this area, with the university and others. We are hopeful in putting forward as strong a position as we can to the Federal Government to assist us in establishing this centre that he relates to. There is a concern that we have -- not as to its propriety in being located here in Manitoba, indeed we'll do everything we can to see that this in fact comes about -- but I have to point out the matter of priority of funds which appears always to be before us. The department is very actively engaged in a number of large and expensive study programs. We have a continuing responsibility and support to such organizations as the Canadian Conference of Ministers on Mines and Natural Resources which involves us in many different resource type studies, water seminars recently held in Victoria, pollution conferences and so forth. This is in fact, you know, a financial demand on us. I'm pleased that the department and this government saw fit to support the recently-established resource group at the University of Manitoba, headed by Dr. Saul Sinclair, and we are hopeful that this is an area where we can build in some of that research area, marketing research area, mineralogy research area. These are areas that I can't disagree with the Honourable Member from Inkster, that we should be playing a more aggressive role in. In addition to this, of course, the department is called upon to participate in some rather extensive studies, such as I already have mentioned in the House, the \$5 million Saskatchewan-Nelson River Basin study, along with many other associated studies that are concurrently going on. I don't have the figures immediately before me but I would rather think that the amount of funds expended by this department, if we add it up, the various research and study projects that we are currently engaged in, would be sizeable, and would indicate the amount of attention and concern we have with these matters. Specifically then, to the concept of the Precambrian Shield or the centre of the Precambrian Shield, this is one that has considerable enthusiasm within the department and one that I'm told that we are prepared to enter upon very meaningful negotiations with the Federal Government in helping to assist us in establishing this centre in the very next short while.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just on that last point, and I won't take up much more time. The Minister indicated that he is concerned with the budgetary involvement. My understanding is that if a Precambrian Institute were established in Manitoba, this would result - because of federal participation it would probably result in a net increase in monies coming into Manitoba by the fact of the institute being established. It would have to have certain physical facilities. This would mean federal funds spent in Manitoba. This is one of the things that Manitoba has not been getting, and considering the fact that we are the most logical city in terms of proximity to the Precambrian Shield, I think that the question of budgetary considerations would all favour us. In other words, it would be net income rather than net expenditure. And I would think that because the matter was put by resolution by the honourable member's deskmate, the Member for St. Boniface, that perhaps this could be taken from whatever place it sits in the pile of priorities, to the top of the pile, in view of the fact that it was given such expression of consent and approval by the members of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b) (1) -- passed; (2) -- passed; (3) -- passed; (4) (a) . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could give us an explanation for item (4), because there's some very major changes there. Project studies last year were \$55,000, next year \$122,000, which is a very substantial increase, and then of course the other one - Southern Indian Lake Mineral Investigations - one-half million dollars almost, which is a very sizeable item which I'm rather surprised to see coming at this stage when the government apparently is committed to flooding South Indian Lake. Isn't it rather late to begin the mineral investigations? Is this not something that should have been done long before the government made a decision to flood?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to item (4) - Exploratory and Development Investigations, it is largely made up of two additional geological teams working in the north that explains the increase in the amounts being asked for. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition, I appreciate probably was not in the House at the time that this matter of the geological mineral investigations at Southern Indian Lake were dealt with on other occasions. I couldn't agree less with him that the question of whether we flood or whether we do not flood has any particular bearing as to the mineral information that we're seeking

March 25, 1969

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.) . . . in that area. It may underline to him, though, the fact that the government and this department in particular is taking very seriously and not frivolously the matter at Southern Indian Lake, and that we are hereby indicating, in one specific area, this very same concern. In other words, we have embarked in a three-year geological study of that area which will equip this government with all the necessary latest and up-to-date information pertaining to the minerals in that area which will be available to us for future development, should that occur. The mining association, the mining companies are of course very much aware of this. They approve of the actions that we are taking. I also indicated to the House at that time that funding arrangements are being made through Manitoba Hydro to enable us to do in two or three years, or in three years, what normally would take the department 12 or 15 years to do. In other words, well in advance of any flooding prospects, we intend to have all the pertinent information that the latest equipment and methods can give us on this information. We hold the view, a view that seems to be substantiated by those interested in the mining industry, that the putting of 30 or 35 feet of water on top of something does not necessarily preclude the eventual utilization of any mineral resources that may be found in that area at some future date.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, if the Minister will refer me to the place in Hansard where the previous statement was made, I'll be very happy to go over it. But, Mr. Chairman, I must totally disagree with the Minister that this is the proper time to start this investigation, unless one accepts completely the idea that better late than never. And if that's the concept that the Minister's proposing to the House, then he has some basis for it, but to suggest to the House that this is the right time to start the investigations, is absolutely ludicrous, Mr. Chairman. It's quite obvious that before he had ever made his decision to flood and the government made the decision to flood, they should have made the thorough investigations. And to suggest that it's a simple matter now, if he finds some major mineral deposits, to then exploit them under the lake itself, I think is inaccurate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the same matter of Southern Indian Lake mineral investigations, what concerns me is, if there should be marketable mineral deposits in the bed of Southern Indian Lake, or of what may eventually become the bed of Southern Indian Lake, could the Minister indicate to us what would be the loss in terms of either inability to extract the ore because of water, or because of added cost in a process of mining the ore because of the presence of water over top?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking me a technical question and based on some assumptions that I'm not prepared to make. In the first instance, the assumption that specific mineral deposits will be found in that area, is something that only through the normal course of exploration and what have you, will determine. Furthermore, even if the mineral is there, which is in great abundance in many parts and regions of our province, still doesn't dictate that that will in fact be developed, and accrue in any beneficial way to the people of Manitoba. However, I'm told that - and it is significant at a time that we have mining experts jumping up in all directions in this debate - that the Mining Association of Manitoba, the principal companies that have been in the north for 30, 40 years, whom I've made a specific point of visiting, with respect to any concerns they might have about the loss of potential minerals as a result of this flooding, have expressed none to me. They welcome the geological study of the program that we are undertaking. We've indicated to them that this data will be made available as a matter of course, as part of our responsibility as the Department of Mines and Natural Resources to have this kind of information available to the mining community in this province or to anybody, and that they feel that this is more than adequate in dealing with the situation. The actual costs involved for extracting minerals below a layer of water, that's first of all assuming that it needs to be done through the water, whether it can be done adjacent to, to angle drilling, to new mining technology, what mining technology will be in the year 1980 or in the year 2000 when a discovery may be made in this area. It's very difficult for me to answer, but I underline the fact that you have not heard from our mining community, those who have been in the business, those who perhaps should be the first to express a concern, those persons who we are very often to accord the attitude of exploiting these regions for their own gain. You would think that it would be a fair assumption on the part of government to make that, failing to hear from these people, that there's some reason to believe that the concern that is being expressed in this particular

(MR. ENNS Cont'd.)... area, and I'm just defining it to this particular area of minerals, that we are obviously dealing more with press reports, with rumour, and with unsubstantiated concern that's being expressed by unqualified individuals.

MR. LYON: Committee rise.

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

IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Interim Supply. Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$72,932,292, being two-tenths of the amount of the several items voted for the departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1970, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1970.

Supplementary Supply. 1. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$1,222,000 for Legislation, Comptroller-General's Office, Salaries, Comptroller-General, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1969.

2. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum of not exceeding \$5,000.00 for Agriculture, Agricultural Societies \$4,000.00; Grasshopper Control \$1,000.00; for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

3. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$785,000 for Highways, (including Water Control and Conservation). Construction of Provincial Trunk Highways, Provincial Roads and Related Projects, FRED Program and Construction of Streets in The Established Metropolitan Street System, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

4. Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$35,000 for Public Utilities, Public Utilities Board, Other Expenditures, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising 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 to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the supply, with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses to the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, the sum of \$72,932,292, being two-tenths of the amount of several items voted for the departments, as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Passed? (Passed).

Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969, the sum of \$826,222, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Passed? (Passed).

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means have adopted certain resolutions and requested me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, the sum of \$72, 932, 292, being two-tenths of the amount of the several items voted for the departments as set forth in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970, laid before the House at the present Session of the Legislature, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Supplementary Supply. Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969, the sum of \$826, 222 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 7, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1969.

MR. EVANS introduced Bill No. 23, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1970.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if I have leave I would like to say that I propose now to distribute the bills. They will come on the Order Paper in the usual way on Thursday.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.