

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 p.m., Friday, May 28, 1976

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Jenkins): When the Committee rose at 12:30 we were on Resolution 4, Administrative Salaries, in the sum of \$278,800--pass - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: There's two items for compensation or allowance, (b) and (f), both the same. Could the First Minister indicate what the two items are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Couldn't we deal with that item when we reach (f), we're now on (c) Administrative Salaries \$278,800. Any discussion?

MR. CRAIK: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Pass. On Page 4, Resolution 4(d) Other Expenditures, in the amount of \$78,000 - the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to raise an issue with the First Minister prior to the adjournment of the House this morning and at the present time I would like to take the First Minister back to our Public Accounts' records on Page 200, where it refers to the Report of Amount Paid to Members of the Assembly, and here I want to confine my remarks to the Other Expenditures of Members of the Assembly, particularly those of the Premier and Ministers. I note in those figures the First Minister of our province in the '74-75 year received an amount of \$731.84 as an expense, which I presume is an expense of a member of the Legislature. I would think that as the First Minister of the province his expenses as the Premier would be far higher than the amount that is shown here. And likewise, maybe for comparison sake, I would choose the Member for Burrows, the Minister of Education, who is shown there as an expense of \$5,520. Now that is roughly 7 1/2 times what the First Minister receives, and I just want to know if he is doing 7 1/2 times as much work as the First Minister, or whether it costs 7 1/2 times as much to get the same amount of work out of the Member for Burrows as it does out of the First Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition wants to deal with that question that he. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Other Expenditures, (d).

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, well in that case in responding to the Member for Birtle-Russell, he refers to Page 200 and 201 of Public Accounts, I take it, and the only explanation that I could give in a way that is general and comprehensive as opposed to specific details, is that the Reimbursement of Expenses column that he refers to does not relate as he suggested it might to expenses in the capacity of being an MLA. These are strictly as Ministers of the Crown.

And a second point I would make is that - well the Minister of Education can speak for himself - I seem to recall that he was in the practice of allowing some of the departmental expenses to be charged to his office. For example, if a delegation from MAST or from the Teachers Society, if there was a seminar or a dinner meeting, and the hospitality costs had to be picked up, it was billed to the Minister's office rather than to the department, and that would account for some of the reason for a difference as between \$5,000 and \$700 in Ministerial Reimbursement of Expenses. The former Minister of Finance, I think, does concur with my general understanding as to how there could be that kind of a differential. For example, if the Minister and two or three of the senior civil servants from the department were to go to a conference in Ottawa, or an Inter-provincial Council of Ministers' meeting, and if there were certain expenses, as indeed there are, attendant thereto, this could be billed to the department or it could be billed to the Minister's office if he was in the practice of having it billed to the Minister's office. That would account for a lot right there.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, the only reason I raised the issue, I wanted to in my own mind try and assess what is happening here, because I sincerely hope that the Premier of this province is spending far more than \$700 a year promoting the goodwill of

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) the Province of Manitoba and attending to the expenses of his office that I'm sure far exceed \$700.00. The only reason I raise it is that I'm trying to find out what expenses are legitimately those of a member of the Legislature and what expenses are legitimately those of a Minister acting on behalf of the Province of Manitoba. There seems to be a wide range here of variety and I was just wondering if the accounting procedures have been fairly accurately kept. Because I sincerely hope that the Premier of this province is given far more than \$721, or whatever it is, to look after his expenses as the First Minister of this province. I hope that he carries out the operation of his office in a style that would far exceed that amount of money.

MR. SHERMAN: You've got to give up that bicycle, Ed.

MR. GRAHAM: And I hope that in doing so there is no problems with the accounting of the money. I think it should be very clearly stated - and this is the only reason why I raise it - that the expenses as a member of the Legislature I think should be kept separate and distinct from those of a Cabinet Minister -- (Interjection) -- Well that may be, but if that is the case, why is this column in the Public Accounts' report? That's all I ask.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Well of course we haven't in Public Accounts Committee gotten around to looking at these accounts as yet and therefore the question couldn't have been asked. But they've been there year by year by year, I don't know for how many years. The expense account that the honourable member is referring to is the actual expenses vouched for by the Minister for ministerial expenses, that's what that column is. An MLA is not entitled to charge up an expense account except such as is provided in statute or in the rules relating to travel to and from his constituency. Otherwise there are no expense accounts for MLAs. -- (Interjection) -- I said on committees, between sessions, that where they are; and during sessions, it's a statutory allowance for MLAs.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Well, Mr. Chairman, what has been stated by the Member for St. Johns just reaffirms some of my suspicions - not suspicions-(laughter)-they're not suspicions at all - they're concerns about the accounting procedures that are carried out. We do find - and I'm not saying this in a derogatory manner to any individual, but I pointed out two examples and I'll stay to those two. Does the Member for Burrows spend 7 1/2 times as much as the First Minister as a legitimate expense of the Province of Manitoba? There may be some on this side of the House that figure that it costs 7 1/2 times as much to get the same amount of work out of the Member for Burrows as it does out of the First Minister, but that is not the issue here, it is a question of accounting. I would hope that most of the expenses incurred by the First Minister in the province are carried under an item different than that that is listed here in Public Accounts. I would hope that the expenses of his office are legitimate expenses of his office and are charged to his office, not to himself as an individual member of the Legislature.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, this is an important point which should be clarified, and I think it's all very well to make snide remarks about mathematics. The important thing is that the expense charged is sent through the normal process as has been done for, I was informed, years before with the previous government, where the Minister's expenses for the month are usually totalled and sent in by way of vouchers. As I recall it, there has to be three copies, and I suppose that's part of the system of bureaucracy, they're getting three copies rather than one. There are several ways in which it is charged up. There are times when an expense, let us say a meal expense, would be charged either to the Deputy Minister's account or to the Minister's account, depending on who would be signing the bill. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if the Deputy is not there then maybe the Assistant Deputy is there; and if he's not there then the Minister will sign the bill and it will come in his name. If it's the Deputy Minister's it will come in the Deputy Minister's name; and that is how there could be a discrepancy.

It also includes the travel expense. In that case clearly the amount shown opposite the various Ministers is normally in the same grouping as that of the Premier who probably is the one who spends least of all because he is probably the most parsimonious of all his Ministers, I would guess that that may be a true statement. Nevertheless it is

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)indicated there, but it depends on the number of trips that are taken in any one year.

I know that if the member asked this question in Public Accounts, we would say, "Well sure, we'll turn to the Minister of Education and ask him to give a summary of the nature of his total expenses," and I would think that if he were here now he could give it or if not he could give it later. He certainly would have given it at the time when his Estimates were up for review, his salary and his expenses. The point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to make without in any way derogating to the right to ask the question, is the timing of when to ask the question. The item before you deals with the Executive Council and the Premier and not the various Ministers, each of whom of course are accountable to this House for their own earnings and their own expenses.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Member for St. Johns, I want to say that I attempted to raise it earlier, but at the suggestion of the First Minister he suggested I leave it until we reached this section in the Estimates. I did so because of the request of the First Minister, but at the same time, when this does come to the Public Accounts, I can assure the Legislative Assistant to the Minister of Finance that this question will be raised at that time. I would also ask the First Minister at this particular time if the expenses of Legislative Assistants are carried by the department or if they are the personal expenses of the individual.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the last point, the expenses that are involved with the Legislative Assistants would be shown and provided for in the salary and related administrative estimates of the respective Ministers' departments under Ministers' Salaries. And they would show up as well here in Public Accounts, if they put out cash and then billed, that would be reimbursed.

There's really nothing mysterious, Mr. Chairman, about the reason for certain differentials. To some extent it's a matter of personal habit. If a Minister pays for a given item of expense with cash and puts in a receipt claim, then when it's reimbursed it shows up in this column. If on the other hand the Minister has the bill in the first place billed to the department, then there is no reimbursement of the Minister since he has not put out any cash, and in that context it would not show up in this column. So that this column here, just looking at it by itself, does give a very unreal picture.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, on this point. The point has been made by the Member for St. Johns that in some cases the Deputy Minister carries and accounts for the expenses of the Minister when they're travelling together or on mutual projects together. The point raised by the Member for Birtle-Russell with respect to Legislative Assistants raises the question as to whether the Deputy Minister is carrying the expenses of Legislative Assistants. Are there any expenses of Legislative Assistants charged through the Deputy?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd be certainly most surprised if that were the case. In fact, under our Administrative Manual of Procedure, I believe that that would be impossible. Whether it be impossible or not under the Administrative Manual of Procedure, I'm quite confident that that is not the practice.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: As a Legislative Assistant, may I inform the honourable member and the members of this committee that a Legislative Assistant has to submit an accountable expense account sheet with relevant vouchers along with it, which goes through the same process as any other government official who has an expense account to submit. It goes through the entire process of the review by the Auditor and his department and through the paid section. It is charged to the department, not to the Deputy Minister, but to the department. But the one sheet that we now show in Public Accounts shows every expenditure made by a member of the Legislature and all moneys he receives in the various categories. I think that's relatively new, I don't think it used to be like that, but I'm not sure when it came in. But it is a summary of both together, because when the computer produces that charge it brings out all the expenses, all cheques paid to that

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) particular Member of the Legislature. Honourable members here may know that there have been occasions in the past when the Accounting Department discovered a payment made to an MIA which was not in accordance with the Act, and it came about just that way, that when the machine was asked to bring out all payments made to any member of the Legislature it produces all the accounts paid, and that's how the Legislative Assistants and all other expense accounts of MIAs show up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the First Minister could tell us what procedure is used when Legislative Assistants are being given cars from the Central Provincial Garage to be driven by the Legislative Assistants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that is not the case, with one exception, and that is with respect to a vehicle that is assigned to the Executive Council office which was established in Thompson. That is, as the member may know, and those on the other side who have been Ministers of the Crown know that for I don't know how many years there has been as part of the perquisites of office for Ministers, Deputy Ministers, the assignment of a vehicle. This was not extended as a general rule to Legislative Assistants.

I might take this opportunity to thank the Legislative Assistants for extending what is I believe a labour of love, since their emolument for it is a grand total of \$2,400 a year, but in any case hopefully it is the kind of innovation in our system, which we did not innovate in Manitoba but which I believe is worthy of retention at a modest level and presumably at a modest level of emolument for a year, \$2,400. The assignment of vehicles is not a general administrative rule, indeed it is the opposite, it is an exception and that is the cause of the establishment of the Executive Council office arrangement at Thompson.

MR. BANMAN: Do I understand the Minister right then, there's only one Executive Assistant driving a government vehicle? I understand there's a big Dodge Maxivan that's parked beside myself in my spot over there which the Member for Thompson is driving and then I also notice that the Member for Flin Flon is also driving a government Chevy with a government provincial drive sticker on it.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, the one exception is it's not a car, it's a van, and it has been assigned out of pool on a continuing basis. It really operates the greater part of the year out of Thompson.

With respect to the other vehicle the honourable member refers to, I can only assume that it must have been on a temporary basis out of pool assignment on the approval of the Minister of Tourism, otherwise I can't explain it, frankly.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the Minister could tell us if that vehicle is assigned to the member for his duties that he's supposed to be doing up in the Thompson area, is he then at liberty to drive that unit back and forth to the Legislature. In other words, it's here right now, shouldn't it be up in Thompson?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that during the session the honourable member is here, not in Thompson. The vehicle is assigned to him in his capacity as Legislative Assistant to the Executive Council. When he's here there's no point in having the vehicle there, and I don't know what more could be said about the matter. I'd add, as I've already indicated, that at \$2,400 a year I do not feel that we are doing Legislative Assistants any great favour. I believe that their assistance to the public interest is greater than the amount of dollars involved.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the First Minister could inform us if driving a big Dodge Maxivan like that around in southern Manitoba here when it's really not working at all isn't a form of conspicuous consumption.

MR. SCHREYER: If my honourable friend wants to talk about conspicuous consumption, I would say that there is a big difference as between driving a van type vehicle and driving a Buick or Cadillac, none of which my colleagues do.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a vehicle which is probably getting four times the gas mileage that particular unit is and it's parked right beside it and I just straighten that for the records.

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. SCHREYER: If my honourable friend is now referring to energy consumption, I would agree with him that it is not wise to continue to purchase and use vehicles that are above average, or worse than average I should say, in terms of miles per gallon. The only thing that makes me hesitate to give a commitment that we will trade those vehicles off is that I rather suspect that my honourable friend has a bias for a certain model or brand of car.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 4(d)--pass; Resolution 4(e) Government Hospitality and Presentation \$50,000--pass; Minister's Compensation - Salary and Representation Allowance, (f) - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, it is in this connection that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition was asking whether there is duplication or double counting as between (f) and (b), and the answer is that (b) is a contingency item which if not exercised means that the \$15,000 will simply lapse unexpended; and (f) is with respect to the Honourable the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (f)--pass; (g) - the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: I just rise on this particular item, International Development Program, and ask a simple question, whether or not any of the \$250,000 allocated to this program had to do with the development of the Art Exhibit that's about to come to Manitoba, in what form it comes?

MR. SCHREYER: Not a cent of it, Mr. Chairman. I think indeed that it would warm the heart of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside to know that of last year's appropriation, about \$125,000 went for the purchase of good Manitoba cheese which was transported free of charge by a public spirited, Manitoba-based interprovincial trucker - need I be more explicit than that - to the port of Vancouver, and there shipped at the expense of an international aid agency to Bangladesh and to some part of South America. And the remaining \$125,000 went on a matching basis with Manitoba-based volunteer international aid agencies which was then matched two for two by the Federal International Development Agency for quite a number of different programs of international aid, some of them sponsored for example by the United Church, some sponsored by the Canadian Mennonite Central Committee, some of them sponsored by other church groups and well-known international relief agencies. --(Interjection) -- Oh, yes, I'd mention that - definitely the Diocese of Rupertsland of the Anglican Church was also involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, one should perhaps never ask a facetious question in the House because it leads to more serious natures. But certainly if the First Minister allows me the privilege of using just a minute or two of the committee's time to indicate to him that all too often members of the opposition whose primary responsibility is to constantly act the role of the watch dog on government spending and to chastise the government where we think spending is flagrant and where it's being wasted or where it's being misplaced, but I for one, Mr. Chairman, choose on this particular item on the First Minister's Estimates to indicate to him some degree of support for a continuance and an enlargement of this kind of program. Surely, Mr. Chairman, most Manitoba citizens could understand much better money spent in this direction than when they read headlines - and I speak as an agricultural person - when they read headlines of hundreds of millions of pounds of food of one product and another, whether it's milk powder, or eggs rotting or being destroyed because of difficulties that we find ourselves in with over-production, that we should be using this kind of a program and this kind of approach to use the largesse that our agriculture community provides for us, particularly in the production of food. And that the taxpayers of Manitoba by and large would stomach expenditures in this item with a greater degree of tolerability than they would when this government decides to build buses that don't drive all that well, or build airplanes that don't fly all that well, or in fact do many other things.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me depart just for a moment from the traditional role of the opposition, that of chastising this government of wastefully spending the taxpayers of Manitoba's money, to encourage the Honourable Minister, the First Minister in this instance, to allow this particular expenditure under his jurisdiction to indeed grow in the coming years.

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, part of what the honourable member said I really must indicate I disagree with but I don't believe this is the right forum at this point in time to take issue with him - perhaps on another occasion.

I however want to thank him for his positive remarks with respect to trying to make some common sense application in a modest way of public funds towards the support of volunteer effort, jointly, for international distress alleviation. If the honourable member is so positively inclined, for which I again thank him, I think it's fair to assume that he would support perhaps some extension in principle of this to include not only such products as cheese, but perhaps the packaging of some of the several millions of pounds of so-called rough fish, which isn't rough and which is perfectly edible and the dispatching of it overseas. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(g) International Development Program \$250,000--pass; Resolution 4(h) Special Hospitality Grants - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, could the First Minister indicate what this new item is for?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, if it would be agreeable to come back to this, and could we carry on down the page and we'll come back to it. It will take a moment to find.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed? (Agreed)

MR. SCHREYER: Sorry, we've already retrieved the information. This is with respect to the special provision relating to the Royal Canadian Legion, given the fact that there is a special occasion, the 50th Anniversary Convention. This is, perhaps at the risk of giving more information than is even requested, it is the 50th Anniversary Convention, the Legion was formed in Winnipeg and this is the Golden Jubilee in the same city. It is estimated over 3,000 people from across Canada. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I trust that the First Minister's concern and hospitality to the Legion group is extended to considering pensions for people who fought in the war when it comes to consideration of Bill 54 in Law Amendments Committee as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We're not on pensions right now. The Honourable First Minister. -- (Interjection) -- We're not on the pensions right now.

MR. SCHREYER: I would have liked to have responded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member from Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this item I want to thank the First Minister for his remarks. I happen to be Chairman of Financial Planning for the Legion's Centennial Convention, and I would just like to add a rider that -- (Interjection)-- Golden Anniversary, I'm sorry - that since we requested this financial assistance we have found that the costs have inflated considerably, so I hope that should we come cap in hand after we tally up, that he may be receptive to increasing the grant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, even if we were all on both sides of the House so inclined, it would be perhaps without precedent to make a spontaneous amendment to the Estimates but I would assume that if it came down to that, that there's always the instrument of special warrant in which case I would hope that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition would not be questioning at least that part of the special warrant next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the First Minister if this \$15,000 is designated for some specific purpose or is it just a general grant to the Legion to be used for whatever purpose they want to. If the former is the case, where is the hospitality room?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I do have specific information on that, Mr. Chairman. The practice - and I believe it's one of some many years standing, I would think at least a

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) decade and perhaps more - that so and so much is extended as a hospitality grant towards all groups and organizations of a national nature which meet in Manitoba at convention, and the updated contribution, or hospitality grant, is towards the dinner, the main dinner at the convention. It is \$5.00 a plate, and because I've indicated this is an exceptionally large convention, 3,000, that is why it comes out to \$15,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(h) Special Hospitality Grant \$15,000--pass. Resolution 5, Planning Secretariat of Cabinet, (a) Salaries \$662,900 - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, a brief comment on this item. Frequently when oppositions are examining and being critical of government in their spending habits and overspending, the reply to that criticism is: Well that's fine but if you were government where would you cut? And I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the items that would come in for some cutting. This particular Secretariat was established in about 1968 and was inherited by the government, and inherited a staff at that time of a secretary and probably two or three people, and it's now grown to a budget of a million dollars. Mr. Chairman, this Planning Secretariat, which operates very much as one of the two wings of the Executive Council rather than departmental staff, can play both a positive and a negative role. The positive role is that it provides some staff directly to the First Minister and the Executive Committee to draw on. But the negative role is that it often operates in duplication to the staff people in the individual departments. And as a result there's a great deal of overlapping of expenditure and we know very well that in many cases the interests of the department and the interests of the Planning Secretariat aren't always in harmony and as a result, Mr. Chairman, not solely for that reason but for reasons of economy, our position has been that with good strong administrative people at the top of the various departments, a Planning Secretariat can play a much less significant role than what is called upon it by this government. And our intention would be to look, I say, with perhaps not eliminating it in its entirety but to reducing its role substantially and emphasizing the role of delegating responsibility and authority to the line departments rather than through the Planning Secretariat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to debate at great length because you see I think the fact of the matter is that this is precisely the kind of area of contention in which you can argue with considerable validity on either side of the coin. I want to indicate to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that indeed one could accept the premise that if you staff up enough at the policy planning level in each line department, and if you have an elaborated or fleshed-out enough planning section in each department, that you can conceivably then do away with any kind of executive council located policy planning mechanism. I think that argument, that premise certainly stands up; but then on the other hand the converse stands up because the counter argument is that if each line department is permitted to staff up with a full-fledged planning section, that there is bound to be certain advantages lost as a result of not having them co-ordinated. And you can argue on the other hand that if you have them all co-ordinated, then depending on the nature of the case certain kinds of specifics still do require at least some incipient policy planning capability in each line department. So it really is an unending argument.

I would say if it's any comfort, to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that we have if not cut, we have at least plateaued this particular appropriation. And we have plateaued it, I believe for two, if not three years running. So we have not let it get out of hand. I believe that those who are of a professional and technical level in the Planning Secretariat, are really putting out in terms of workload and time in a way that compares favourably with the senior echelons of the public service generally.

The next point I would make is that this appropriation here relates not only to Planning and Priorities in the old sense, but it also provides the planning service support, analytical support, to, for example, the HESP sub-committee of cabinet, and the RED sub-committee, by RED I mean Resources and Economic Development.

The final point, Mr. Chairman, is that we have avoided, and I think we will avoid

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) in the future, any further elaboration or growth of this particular apparatus. We have resisted - resisted isn't the right word - we have not adopted, for example, the structure as adopted in Ontario, where they have I think four or five policy cluster planning groups now, including social policy and justice. There is a separate planning apparatus there. And Health and Education is another, and Resources and Economic Development is another, and they have fleshed it out really quite elaborately. We have maintained it pretty well at the 1973 level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 5(a)--pass; 5(b) Other Expenditures--pass; Resolution 5, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,054,000 for Executive Council--pass. Resolution 6, Management Committee of Cabinet, (a) Management Committee Secretariat (1) Salaries \$1,559,700--pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$295,800--pass; (3) Development and training \$82,000--pass; (4) Special studies--pass; (b) Computer Centre (1)--pass; (2)--pass; (3)--pass - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: . . . a clarification. I understand that the costs that were shown for a Computer Centre last year are now delegated to the individual departments. Is that a correct assumption?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: There is a footnote which explains it, Mr. Chairman. The reason that we do not have to show the gross cost figure is because that's transferred to the Manitoba Data Services. The line departments of course as users have to pay. They did even under the previous arrangement. So this was a gross figure, and there was recovery from the line departments on the basis of use. And I would simply say as a matter of management, or Treasury Board, that any other arrangement isn't too practical because unless line departments are charged a user fee there is no way of disciplining or restraining the amount of use. At least that's the theory and I believe it has some obvious validity to it. Whether or not that is a strong argument that was the practice to gross an amount of appropriation for the service providing a section and then recover by means of user charges to the line departments. The only thing that's changed now is that the date services will recover from the line departments.

MR. CRAIK: I wonder in that case whether it might be possible to obtain what the total might come to of purchase of the services from MDS. Perhaps you don't have it right before you but if you could provide that to us, the amounts provided, which I presume aren't broken out in the other departments but fall under general expenditures within the department, whether there is some estimate can be provided of the cost by the government for computer services for the coming year.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is quite right. The amounts that are estimated and appropriated in each of the line departments for computer services are really diversely distributed through the various departments. I'm not sure offhand if it would be under the general heading of administration in each department, I suspect not. In any case the approximate aggregate total for computer utilization services of all the line departments would be in the order of 5 to 6 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. Resolution 6: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,937,500 for Executive Council--pass.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, are we dealing with the Resolution item 7 or 4?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member would just wait until I sign this resolution. Resolution 7, Registrations and Elections \$38,700. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I just rise on this particular question because I believe it's of some note to indicate that from time to time we have discussed the possibility of a permanent electors' list in the Province of Manitoba. I think some of the difficulties that we arrived at in the election of 1973, without casting any aspersions on the jobs of the enumerators done during that election and the work that was done, but nonetheless I think we can indicate that there seems to be a growing support for the concept of having something coming close to a permanent electors' list, recognizing that the list has to be constantly modified, constantly changed, constantly taken account of

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. ENNS cont'd) the fact that we have a very mobile community, and a very mobile population.

But the concept of having to start from scratch with every election, with rising costs attached thereto, I think gives us room for considering, as we have considered different changes from time to time in our electoral process, about the giving of some serious consideration by this government to the establishment of a permanent electoral list, which I take it to be, would be legitimately discussed under this item.

I would ask the First Minister to perhaps in his own and personal style of musing to give us the benefit of some of his thoughts as to whether or not he thinks it is feasible, whether or not there has been any contact with the federal agency to meld the two lists together in some way, and indeed you might even add the municipal lists to that as well, that in fact we develop over a period of time a group of people with a little bit more permanency than we have up to now. And I recognize, Mr. Chairman, when I say this that I am probably talking about the abandoning of one of those few areas of pure political patronage that is left in politics of Manitoba, because it is to be put on the table and said very straightforwardly that in the question of the nomination of enumerators, or the nomination of returning officers, that has been one of those few untainted preserves where we pride ourselves in political patronage. But unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, we've also found ourselves with some difficulty in this process, particularly when governments change and a lot of inexperienced people you know have to do the job. --(Interjection)-- As the Member from Morris indicated from his seat, good servants of the party but poor enumerators.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think it's possible we're not dealing with the question at this time with the pressure of an immediate election on our shoulders, or on that of the Clerk of the Legislature that is worried about it right now. It's perhaps time that we should give it some consideration, some thought, as to whether or not there can be an improvement in our electoral process, particularly with respect to enumeration, registration, appointments of electoral officers, returning officers, and the like. I invite the Honourable First to give us some thoughts on that subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I certainly would like to treat the suggestion with the seriousness that it deserves. There is no policy or philosophic basis for us to react negatively to the suggestion. I think I would have to confess that we have simply not given it the systematic in-depth analysis and consideration that it would certainly seem to deserve. I have, on the basis of just snatches of conversation, ascertained that while the concept seems logical enough, there is no reason to believe that in the initial few years that it would be any cheaper. The hope would be that in the long run that it would be cheaper, but in the short run it would not be cheaper.

It is also complicated by the fact that in some constituencies there is a much greater turnover than others and so the on-surface appeal of a permanent electors list in a rural constituency or in a suburban neighbourhood, although not a brand new one, would be very great. On the other hand a permanent electors list in a constituency in the inner core or in new suburbia, would be a practically wasted effort because it would have to be updated annually and certainly before every election. And so it's six of one and half a dozen of the other in that latter regard.

On balance it may have merit but as the Clerk advises me, and that may well be the most perceptive view of it, that it would certainly have merit if it could be jointly done by really tri-level agreement, municipal, provincial and federal. Certainly provincial and municipal. And so I will undertake this much, that one of my colleagues will certainly somehow be asked, and hopefully find time, to do an in-depth review on this and I invite my honourable friend to perhaps take the time to put his thoughts on paper in this regard as he is able to elaborate on this. And hopefully by next year we can come to some resolution of it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable First Minister for his comments on this. I made the comments in a spirit and he returned them in a like spirit, in the sense that it's worthwhile, certainly among many other things, recognizing not necessarily at the top of the priority list of his busy schedule to burden himself with, but

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. ENNS cont'd) certainly worthwhile to look at in conjunction with other members who have to work with this system as their main responsibility. I, in fact, if invited to would be pleased to participate in that kind of an examination.

However, Mr. Chairman, I think there is also another question that I could ask under this appropriation, and that is, has the Minister given serious thought to the calling of a by-election in Souris-Killarney, because the Honourable Chief Clerk of the House should be aware of it; he's eager to have his electoral machine moving and working to find perfection, and I ask the Honourable First Minister whether he is now prepared to indicate to us the date of the by-election in the Souris-Killarney constituency?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, Manitoba is blessed with having successive chief electoral officers who have been able to carry out all of the administrative load, who have been able to carry out all of the administrative procedures necessary for the staging of a general election province-wide in 35 days, plus one hour. I don't want to mention the year that that happened, but it happened and therefore I assume that he will have no problem in dealing with one by-election in at least as much notice.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, while we're dealing with elections, I think it's only fair that we should talk about some other problems that may be arising. And I want to bring the First Minister's attention to the fact that four days from now there will start to flood into the Federal Government of Canada immense amounts of information dealing with population shift, the entire attempt of the Government of Canada every five years to ascertain the relative population disposition throughout the Dominion of Canada. And, Sir, it's on that basis that we here in Manitoba every ten years approximately, decide that we should reassess our electoral boundaries on the basis of the information that has been collected in that particular census. And I think that it's only fair to state that in the past, rightly or wrongly, we have more or less given that authority to three people, to the Chief Electoral Officer, to the Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba, and the third party has been the President of the University of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it's quite within the realm of wisdom to allocate that authority to whoever we want to in this province. For many years it has been done by the - I shouldn't say the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council - I would prefer to say it was done by the Legislative Assembly, whether there was dialogue on that particular aspect or not, I haven't studied Hansard to any great degree to find out. But I am a little bit concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the present practice that we have, and that is assigning that to the Chief Electoral Officer, to the Chief Justice and to the President of the University of Manitoba. I find no fault with the Chief Electoral Officer being very intimately involved in that. I think that the Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba is probably a person who has a wide degree of experience in the Province of Manitoba. But we find that in our universities in Manitoba and universities in general that the presidency of a university can change at almost any time. And it seems in the academic world that it is a great plum to any university to bring in a president from say Maryland or Washington or Montreal or Bangladesh or wherever. It seems that the further away they are the greater their qualifications become, and I sometimes wonder whether the lack of knowledge of the affairs of Manitoba is an attribute with respect to the establishment of electoral boundaries.

So I would at this time ask the First Minister whether or not we should seriously consider having a three-man commission established comprised of the Chief Electoral Officer, the Chief Justice of the Province of Manitoba and, for argument's sake, the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. I don't know who that man will be next year or the year after, but I say to you, Sir, that whoever the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities may be, he is going to be a man who is very closely associated with the problems of Manitoba, who is going to understand the geography and the functions of Manitoba, and particularly rural Manitoba, and I suggest to the First Minister that perhaps we should be seriously considering the appointment of a person of that stature to a position which has great significance in rural Manitoba, and that is the establishment of the various electoral boundaries. I throw it out to the First Minister at this time for consideration, it may be a subject that is very worthwhile of debate at

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)this particular time. And I say that I don't do this lightly, I have considered this for many months. I have not caucused it with members of my caucus nor have I discussed it with members of the opposite side, and that is why I suggest that it perhaps may be a question for debate in this Chamber. So I invite the comments of the First Minister on that particular subject at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Before the Minister replies, I would like to deal with this subject too, or at least a subject that is somewhat related to the remarks that have just been made by the Member for Birtle-Russell, as one who has suffered through several boundary changes. I am always amazed and appalled at the kind of decisions that are made by those who are so far removed from politics, that one always wonders why they're even considered as experts in the redefinition of constituency boundaries. I would concur with the suggestion that was made by the Member for Birtle-Russell in that respect. I think that someone who is a great deal more familiar with the electoral process would be far more qualified than those who simply because they have high academic qualifications seem to be considered as suitable for appointment to the position of Boundaries Commission executives. I've always felt that if I have to be dismembered I would much prefer to have that done with the fine finesse of a political expert rather than being hacked to death by an amateur in the form of an intellectual giant at the head of the university.

I want to also suggest to the First Minister that another thing that has somewhat disturbed me is the referral to the Law Reform Commission of the consideration of the changes in the Electoral Act. I felt at the time that the First Minister made the announcement that it was a mistake to send it to the Law Reform Commission, because here again you have a group of people that to my knowledge have had little or no experience in the conducting of elections, although they sought opinions from people who are interested. And I might frankly suggest to the First Minister that my response to them when we were invited to appear was that anything we had to say about the changes in the Electoral Act would be much better said in a committee of this House, and that's where we propose to make those recommendations. I would hope that the First Minister could in some way delay the report of that Law Reform Commission so that it can gather dust where it rightfully belongs and allow the Committee of Privileges and Elections to deal with changes to the Electoral Act so that it can be done in a manner that will be suitable and appropriate and be acceptable to those who are going to be most directly concerned with any changes in that particular Act. And failing that, I would hope that the First Minister, when the recommendation of the Law Reform Commission is submitted, that before precipitously acting upon those recommendations, that he would allow the Committee on Privileges and Elections to have an opportunity of examining those proposals and making recommendations before they are embodied in the form of amendments to the present Act.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, not taking anything away from the positions and arguments presented by the Member for Birtle-Russell or the Member for Morris, indeed rising briefly to support the suggestions made by the honourable members, it would nonetheless seem to me that it's incumbent upon somebody to comment on the fact that we have been not all that badly served by that group of gentlemen that have indeed made the decisions with respect to electoral boundaries in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, Manitoba likely is one of the better provinces in our consideration where there is very little room for gerrymandering of political seats, where there has been pretty honest and straightforward attempts made at representation by population, and I think that jurisdictions that have chosen to ignore this fact do so, and fly against the popular sentiment, and sooner or later cause more difficulties than holding off the day of representation. So I would like to say that - and I wasn't in the House, I wasn't part of that, I think there were honourable members here that perhaps were. Perhaps the Member for St. Johns, perhaps the First Minister was available at the time that the present commission, that is the Chief Justice, the President of the University of Manitoba and the Chief Electoral Officer, that are currently serving on that commission, was established. But they served the province well, and I speak as one who also has had his seat reorganized by that

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. ENNS cont'd) commission and lost the traditional seat of Rockwood-Iberville of which I was a proud member in my first service in this Chamber.

I suspect that the remarks made by the Member for Birtle-Russell carry particular weight because things have changed of course. One has to question why the President of the University of Manitoba - we now have two other universities in the Province of Manitoba - we now have two other universities in the Province of Manitoba, Brandon and Winnipeg. And indeed, Mr. Chairman, it may well be an appropriate time to consider some changes along the lines suggested by the Member for Birtle-Russell and those suggested by the Member for Morris, to restructure this committee that deals with something that's very close to all our hearts, namely the boundaries of our constituencies.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, if I may say a few words on the subject matter that has been introduced by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. I believe that it was in the late 50s that former Premier D. L. Campbell introduced a bill to take redistribution completely out of the political arena, and Mr. Campbell has always been very proud of that bill. Even today, 15 to 20 years later, there are very few States in the Union and very few Provinces in Canada that have such a bill that has completely disregarded the politicians when it comes to redistribution. And while I believe the Member for Birtle-Russell has a point, that perhaps there may be a time to look at the makeup of the independent commission - and I refer now to the President of the University of Manitoba, I believe he has his hands completely full on a 12-months' basis when he has - what? - a 4 million dollar deficit in his operation, that he may be quite happy to be relieved of this onerous duty which occurs for a few months every five years, I believe it is, the mid-census period of the ten-year period.

So while I think the government and this House could look at some changes, I would hate to see the changes made where it came back to the, with reference to my friend for Morris, finessing hands of the politicians. Because after all, anybody who has any small form of self-interest of course cannot help but place that self-interest, at least have it in the back of his mind at all times, and I, like the Member for Lakeside, suffered severely under redistribution. I had the honour and privilege to have added on to my constituency about 1,500 or 2,000 Conservative voters by historic tradition, and it made it very difficult for me I might say, it made it very difficult for me. And I see the Clerk of the House is smiling away because he knows some of the story there, but the right thing was done, the right thing was done. The Commission did invite members of the House and any other interested person to make a presentation to them, to express their views and so on; I did not, although I felt like it, but I didn't think it would do any good so I didn't do it.

Now, if it was an all-party committee, which has been suggested, of course the government has a majority on that committee and of course the temptation would be there. The temptation would be there when representations are made by members or other interested people; that because certain of their members could be affected, the temptation would be there to lean a little bit. I know it's not a very nice thing to say, but the temptation would be there to try and help a friend, especially if he had been a good friend and a loyal friend. But I think that our system has worked very well and provinces on either side of us look with envy at what has been done in Manitoba - for various reasons they have not been able to do it such as we have done, and I think now of Saskatchewan in particular where they're not very proud of their system but they have a difficult time in changing it. And I think that no changes should be made in the principle that was established by Mr. Campbell and his group at that time.

One suggestion I would make that I know the Federal Government is taking a very close look at, and that is the establishment of a permanent voters' list. I know that the Chief Electoral Officer for Canada has called in about a half dozen of what he considers to be his more able Returning Officers from across the country and this matter has been discussed at great length, and there is a hope in their hearts that the government of the day will take their recommendations and establish a permanent voters' list. I believe Australia has such a system. Australia has in every federal constituency or riding two

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) permanent full-time staff, and that's all they do, is keep the voters' list up to date, keep an ongoing record and keep an office open for inquiries all year and every year in between elections, and I think Canada is moving in that direction. I think that we in Manitoba should be looking at a permanent voter's list, and there can be some co-operation between the municipalities, the province, and the Federal Government in this regard, that there could be some form of cost-sharing; there could be some getting together between the provinces on the rules or the requirements for voting, a voting requirement, and I think that it wouldn't be a bad idea for Manitoba to offer to the federal authorities that sort of co-operation whereby a permanent voters' list could be established that could be used by the municipalities, by the province and by the Federal Government for a permanent voters' list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, a number of concrete points have been raised and I can try to touch on each of them. I think that the last subject matter raised by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie is in the same vein as I replied to the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. There is no reason why we should not want to take a close look at the relative merits of a permanent voters' list. I confess we have not done so in any way that could be regarded as adequate up to now. Indeed I think that the intention would be to make contact with the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada to see if there is any possibility of proceeding, if not on a nation-wide basis, at least with some provinces. And in that context, if the advice is that it is practical to proceed even on a some-provinces' basis, Manitoba I would like to think would be willing to be in there, willing to try it. But I repeat it would seem to make sense only if there is at least a two level of government involvement and, ideally speaking, even three. Perhaps with respect to the municipalities their input could be by way of a per capititation that might amount to 25 cents or 75 cents or something like that.

I believe that although the suggestions put forward with respect to possible changes in the composition of the Electoral Boundaries Commission are put forward in the absolute best of good faith. I tend to agree with the Member for Portage la Prairie that it is perhaps expecting too much in the way of human nature on the part of those who were at one time seasoned politicians once removed from office. One would like to think that they could be realistic and objective, but on balance and with great finesse measured in the balance, there would always be the lurking suspicion, particularly if one is losing a part of his or her constituency that is subjectively regarded as being the best part, if it is lost, then I dare say that there would be protestations that it was the fine work of an old political person who was mistakenly put in on the active Boundaries Commission. I would like to think otherwise, but I believe that that would be the reality of it. We have, I believe, as good a concept of an Electoral Boundaries Commission in Manitoba as the human mind is able to conceive of. What kind of improvement? Yes, I would say to the Member for Birtle-Russell it is possible to seriously think in terms of someone other than the President of the University of Manitoba, but I'm not so sure that we would be comfortable with the idea of putting in a President or Vice-President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. Some of them are old veterans of the political process, although perhaps not in a directly partisan way, but I ask the Member for Birtle-Russell if he would feel comfortable at next redistribution time if the Reeve of Shoal Lake were to be on the Commission, because I think --(Interjection) -- yes, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I would be very comfortable with the Reeve of Shoal Lake Municipality sitting on that commission. I know the man personally, I have the highest regard for him and his integrity.

A MEMBER: He must be a Liberal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I'm glad to hear that said of a long-time stalwart supporter of the NDP. It is an indication that we have at least recognizable numbers of persons regarded as having integrity, and that is a gracious statement on the part of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. But the fact of the matter is that as

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) long as someone can believe and correctly believe that somebody has a political involvement, there is more probability of dissatisfaction in the event of a decision that is not exactly to the liking of an incumbent MLA seeking re-election. Maybe it could be someone other than the President of the University, but I would tend to agree with the Member for Portage la Prairie, it is tempting the odds to suggest that it could be someone who holds elective office. Anyway I don't make too much of a point of it because that is very highly in the area of subjective feeling and judgment.

I do want to take this moment to pay tribute to the former Premier of this province whose government introduced the non-partisan electoral boundaries commission concept. I believe it was, if not the first, one of the very first of such in Canada, probably in the democratic world, I'm not sure. It deserves continuation, I think we're all of one mind on that. Maybe - a very remote possibility - but maybe some slight change in the composition, that remains to be perhaps pondered, pondered, mulled over in our minds a little bit further. If the President of the University is too busy, I would suggest so to the Chief Justice. This is always a problem, but it's not to say that the Chief Electoral Officer isn't busy, certain times of the year he is more busy than at other times.

We have an interesting suggestion from the Honourable Member for Morris that maybe with respect to the Elections Act, other than the Boundaries Commission, all the other aspects of the Elections Act perhaps ought to be looked at in detail by a committee of this House, if that's basically his suggestion, instead of necessarily adopting the Law Reform Commission ideas. I say it in a half facetious way, but I rather thought that referring the Elections Act to the Law Reform Commission would remove it from the area of partisanship, that any ideas could not be said to have been partisanly initiated, which in a way raises an irony because that is to assume that Frank Muldoon, Mr. Muldoon has no partisan past or connections whatsoever - and I don't think that he would be necessarily chagrined at my making mention of him in that context because I think it's possible for one to be objective, once removed from actively seeking office which I suppose comes back round to the point that maybe it is possible for a former politician no longer actively seeking office to be objective enough. Well obviously one can worry out loud about the probabilities. I would like to say that if the Honourable Member for Morris is suggesting Committee and Privileges in elections be charged with the task of looking systematically at the Act, it is an idea which I will certainly take back to discuss with colleagues and perhaps under the new rules and under the certain sections of the amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act, we may be in a position to do just that later this year.

One last point, the Act does provide for redistribution in 1968 and every tenth year thereafter, so the Member for Birtle-Russell I believe is under a misapprehension if he believes that it takes place a year after the census. It is based on the census information, but it would not take place until ten years after 1968.

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

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, I first want to allay the fears of the First Minister. I was not under misapprehension at all, I was fully aware of the fact that redistribution would not occur for several years yet, but it would be based on the information that is going to be collected this coming week. And we know that the mechanics, the sheer mechanics of the assimilation of all that, even if you wanted to make a redistribution next year, would be almost physically impossible on the basis of the information that is going to be collected in this coming week. Now I was fully aware of that time frame, and I am also fully aware of the time frame that exists in legislation in this Chamber, that there are things that are brought forward for discussion at this time which may not become part of legislation for two or three years. But I think that it is prudent to be discussing them when we have ample time to think about it so that we do have the time to think about it in the coming year, maybe discuss it in the next year and bring the legislation forward in the year after that. So it was in that context that I raised the issue at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, again I want to reiterate that I have no personal

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd)animosity whatsoever towards the President of the University of Manitoba. I would sincerely hope that that has not been interpreted in anything that I have said. The point that I tried to make was, that in the University of Manitoba, it may very well be that when we call on that office we may have a person in that office who is a complete stranger to Manitoba, may have only taken office two or three months previous and has relatively little knowledge of the history and the geography of the makeup of this great province. And the reason I suggested, and it was only a suggestion, that possibly a person such as the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities might possibly be considered as one of a three-man commission stems from the fact that at the present time roughly 50 percent or slightly larger percentage of the population of Manitoba exists in the urban area of Winnipeg, and the composition that presently occurs on that commission, if I am correct, encompasses that area entirely with no input from that three-member commission which represents by far the greatest portion of Manitoba geographically, and when you start to establish electoral boundaries in rural Manitoba, geography has to become a consideration. I know in my own constituency for instance, I have 19 constituents who live in a fairly remote area in my constituency and yet on paper it's a square area; and they exist in an area immediately adjacent to the Town of Welwyn, Saskatchewan, they get all their mail in Saskatchewan. It causes some concern to the Chief Returning Officer when he sees things addressed to Saskatchewan when he's conducting an election in Manitoba. But those are some of the facts that are a reality of life, and so that is why I suggested, and it was only a suggestion, that perhaps there should be some representation from rural Manitoba on that three-man commission. I made a suggestion that it be the President of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, but that was only a suggestion. I'm sure there are many others that could be considered and I raised it for debate at this time because we will, of necessity, by statute, be dealing with this issue in a matter of one, two or three years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 7: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$38,700 for Executive Council--pass. Resolution 4(a) Premier and President of the Council's Compensation - Salary and Representation Allowance - the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to make a few comments. Firstly I'd like to mention that having worked with the present incumbent whose salary provision is now being discussed, for some seven years in government, I think it only fair to say that I feel that he has done an exceptionally good job in relation to leading his Cabinet, to leading his Caucus, and indeed I believe, in representing the people of Manitoba in those non-political areas that are on the Federal-Provincial scene and the international scene. I think it's only fair to make the comment; it's not the reason I rose to speak, but it would be remiss on my part if I didn't make that comment, having seen the work he did and the manner of presentation he has had on these various extra-provincial conferences.

I did want to mention, however, something else in relation to the salary of the Premier and of his colleagues. Having been a Minister for some five years out of the last seven, I have had the opportunity to reflect on the comparative remuneration paid to an MLA and an MLA who is a Minister, and I would like the Premier to know that I think that he is underpaid in his ministerial task and I think that so are his colleagues underpaid. Now that doesn't mean that his colleagues will be running and deserting the Cabinet because they're inadequately paid, because the fact is you have to be a peculiar type of animal to aspire to and to continue to hold a ministerial post, but certainly it is not to anyone's financial advantage to put in the hours of work that they do, carry the responsibility they do, and carry the abuse that they have to receive and do receive as compared with the satisfaction they have in their jobs.

I'd like to point out that although we have recognized cost of living increases and various increases throughout the years in all jobs in the Civil Service in this Chamber for all MLAs, the fact is that Cabinet has not seen fit to increase its own remuneration since prior to the New Democratic Party coming into government. In addition to that is the fact that - it is known by many and should be known by all that the amount that had

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) been received by the Ministers of the prior government, \$15,600, was split, as I recall it, 13.6 as remuneration, 2,000 as an expense account which was not taxable; and as of 1969 the Federal Government enforced its interpretation declaring that \$2,000 former expense account as being taxable, the net result is that Cabinet Ministers of this government for the last seven years have been receiving a net of \$1,000 less than their predecessors in Cabinet. Now I'm not saying that in any accusing way, except probably to the First Minister and to his colleagues, because the Department of National Revenue interpreted the expense account item of \$2,000 for Cabinet Ministers as being taxable, but because they've been arguing about it for some years and because there was apparently a verbal conversation between Gurney Evans, the then Minister of Finance, and I think it was Mitchell Sharp, the then Federal Minister of Finance, that it was understood that it would be a tax deductible item. So those members present who were recipients of Cabinet remuneration in the Conservative Government should know that their successors on this side of the House are receiving approximately \$1,000 less in take-home pay, after taxes than were their predecessors.

Now the Member for Arthur says that "we were worth it". And I suppose it would be difficult to differentiate between the value of the various people involved. I am of course expecting to have the kind of response that the Member for Arthur makes, especially in the latter part of the afternoon of the end of the week, but this is the occasion when I have to mention, that as MLAs remuneration has increased to a level which I think is very adequate, the commensurate work involved in being a Cabinet Minister is not recognized in relation to that, and I think it should be known. I want to tell honourable members that the time I spent outside of the Cabinet has been rewarding to me just to realize the way I've been able to shrug off the worries and responsibilities, just straight hard work that a Minister has to do.

The Member for Swan River, who lives on I think three different pensions, is now talking about my not being able to take the work. Let me tell the Honourable Member for Swan River, it's pretty hard work, and when you get to be as old as he, and I hope I will, that you've got to have the opportunity that he has had in his lifetime of relaxing much more than any Minister could do. So I say that quite seriously. I want to mention that when I left the Cabinet, I did not decide to go back immediately to earning other income to replace that which I had given up, and that is because I did not feel the need to do so because of my own family circumstances. But as I look about, those people in the former Conservative government who to their great dismay and surprise, and I shared the surprise with them, found that they were out of work, and when I've looked at them - and a number of them are people with whom I'm friendly enough to know and to have observed their adjustment into, shall I call it civilian life? - I found that they were having a difficult time

MR. BILTON: That's politics.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Member for Swan River says it's politics, that's what I'm talking about, I'm talking about politicians. I think I have a right to say it and I think that other politicians should listen to it, or need not of course. You know, I don't want to mention names, but there are professionals in the former Conservative government who had to go back to school, who had to go back to readjusting to a new life and I think it was a hardship. Now I do think it was a hardship. The Member for Swan River may not think so but I really do note . . .

MR. BILTON: I never said that.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . Oh, good. Then he may agree with me. Well good, I'm glad that he may agree with me. And he did not say it, it's true, I mistook the way he shook his head because I couldn't hear from here what he was indicating.

Mr. Chairman, so I speak of former Cabinet members of the Conservative Government and I look amongst my colleagues in the present Cabinet, and I can't think offhand of any who will not have a difficult adjustment period. Now I do recall the debate that took place a long time ago about pensions for Cabinet Ministers, it was pretty fiery, and I think -- (Interjection) -- pardon? I recall then that it was in my opinion badly presented and discussed in a poor way. But in any event it's not the pension that I think is so important, nor do I think it's the pension that we have on the books for MLAs that's so important, I'm really thinking in terms of a Cabinet Minister having to adjust to a change in jobs. And I want to suggest that \$15,600 is not that much money which cuts off any

SUPPLY - EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)other opportunity to earn which will make it possible for him to set aside enough money to take care of an adjustment period which may well take a year, two years. So I don't know whether I really think it ought to be a pension, which I'm not sure it should be, or a separation allowance, which is not unknown in many jobs, or an increased income for Ministers so that they are able to do one of these things in preparation for their change. Now I'm just saying that Ministers, and nobody in the opposition as I recall it ever said to this side of the House, "you people are earning less than were the Ministers of the Roblin and Weir administrations", in the sense that they're being taxed for moneys that they didn't get. I don't recall people saying on that side, "now you people should be looking ahead to where you stand now", and I don't think we on this side have said it, so I've taken this opportunity where I can say it without anybody accusing me of being self-serving; and I suppose I could still be accused of that, anybody can accuse me of anything they want to, but I feel in all fairness I should say what I did say, and having said it I have nothing further to say on this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4(a)--pass; Resolution 4: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$719,600 for Executive Council--pass. That concludes the Executive Council.

. Continued on next page

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that we will now go back to Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. Resolution 87 (a) Mineral Resources - Administration (1) Salaries and Wages \$438,300--pass . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, we intend to deal with this section with some dispatch. We had some debate on it, the Member for St. James has some other comments that he may wish to pick up at a later date, but we intend to deal with this section with some dispatch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) Other Expenditures \$367,700--pass; Petroleum (1) Salaries and Wages \$156,000--pass; Other Expenditures \$291,100--pass; Mining Engineering and Inspection (1) Salaries and Wages \$363,300--pass; Other Expenditures \$127,300--pass; Exploration (1) Salaries and Wages \$639,600--pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$563,600--pass. Geological Services (1) Salaries and Wages \$410,100--pass; Other Expenditures \$241,700--pass. Resolution 87 Mineral Resources: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,598,700 for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management--pass - the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the dispatch that was given to those Estimates. I know there will be discussion on the Water Department, but I did have some things that I promised to honourable members. First of all, with regard to the questions that were asked of me this morning relative to the Assiniboine River, I have a memo which I'll read in full: "On May 21st the flow over the spillway ceased at the Shellmouth Reservoir and adjustments to the gates were necessary to bring the discharge through the conduit to 1,500 cubic feet per second to draw the reservoir down to the summer elevation of 1402.5. On the morning of May 21st, 1976 the gates were closed for two hours for necessary routine inspection, and the gates were then opened and the discharge adjusted to 1500 cubic feet per second." These adjustments would have caused fluctuations in the river level below Shellmouth but do not represent any change in the operating plan for the Shellmouth, the reason being that the operating plan would involve routine inspection, that's what was done. "The river flows are continuing to the primary channel and the elevation is approximately 2.5 feet below the flood stage." Now I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, that the river is going down regularly and steadily, that it is below the flood stage. I can understand the anxiety of some people in the area who saw it stop going down, but they should see that change at the present time. I would appreciate it if the Member for Virden would have contacted the Member for Brandon West and advised him. --(Interjection)-- Well, I can give him the original of this memo. I have also for honourable members the material that was requested yesterday by the Member for Morris, and that is the details of the Water Resources Division Reconstruction program. This is the proposed program for 1966-67, and honourable members will appreciate it that not all of it is necessarily done, but that's the program that we are planning on doing.

Also for the Member for Arthur, I have several copies of the Souris River Basin Study that he indicated that I did have, and he was correct. As I said, it is a preliminary report really indicating the mechanisms that are being used to deal with what questions are being dealt with. He will certainly find it informative, but it is not a report which would indicate any decisions having been made at this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 88, Water Management (a) Administration (1) Salaries and Wages - the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the message from the Minister because there was a lot of anxiety on the Assiniboine in the last few days. If you can realize a farmer that has 1,000 or 1,400 acres completely surrounded by water, had some thought of trying to get his machinery in over that water, but with the threat of more water coming it would have been dangerous, and the fact that possibly the press may use that reply and in that way get the message out to those people down the Assiniboine that were concerned what was going on.

Also, I would like to bring to the attention of the Minister our problem north of Souris. Now this is not one that I am necessarily familiar with, it's been brought to my attention by the local farmers, by the councillors, of an overflow of the Souris that is

SUPPLY - MINES and RESOURCES

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)lying in sort of a basin of highly productive land, and they have certainly been coming to me because they are north of Souris and I'm probably the closest member. While I haven't seen this physically, it has been explained to me. No matter what is done, if they would relieve a Mr. Keith Davidson - and it goes on to a Mr. Palmer and then on to someone else; and what their request is, that a member of the staff that's with us - and I know I've been with him at Miniota, and sometimes those kind of meetings are tough, but there are times when the top civil servants can tell the reasoning of why this has - and these people are willing to put up some of this money to get the trench or some way to get this water, that it isn't the first time it's happened, but it is serious.

And then Mr. Lloyd Robertson came to me last Sunday night, he has 115 acres of a half section that he can crop, and I can certainly appreciate how a farmer that hasn't been farming that long has tied up to that kind of economy to operate a farm when indeed a channel or a ditch of a minor nature could be built. So I would request through you, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Wiebe could consider some time in the next month or six weeks of arranging a meeting, I think an explanation would relieve a lot of the anxiety with the people such as Mr. Palmer, Davidson and Robertson and the councillors - and I'm sure they're only representing a group of people, they are the ones that have spoken to me directly.

The other area, certainly my constituency, the Assiniboine comes in an angle across the constituency and every year it's a problem, how much water is coming and what do they do. And this year I thought was an exception because over the years I think anyone that knows me, I always find it easier to defend the better points of anybody, be it a civil servant, of a member, no matter where he comes from, but this year I have to be of considerable concern, but a few weeks the water was running freely, most of the snow was gone, I continually was phoning, and the Shellmouth was going to hold it, we only have to have a small amount coming out of the Shellmouth, and then within ten days, and it wasn't only me talking to the people, it was my municipal clerks in my constituency and then suddenly the floodgates have to be opened, the natural spillway is running water over, and the question is in that time area there wasn't one solitary drop of rain to compound those who were estimating or the machinery that was used. I've tried to think that each year they're coming closer to estimating the amount of water that's coming into the Shellmouth and further down the Assiniboine, but this year, as we are quite aware, the snowbelt was a very narrow thing, it didn't go very far west until you run out of a lot of this snow. And the question is whatever kind of machinery was used calculating the amount of water, something surely has to be done to upgrade this to become a more accurate thing, because I wouldn't like to really represent what many farmers in the valley are saying today and have said many years, because I think we have to do things progressively, even though part of the job sometimes looks as no job at all If you canvas the farmers in the Assiniboine valley they would honestly tell you almost to a man, get rid of that Shellmouth and let's have that one quick early flood and get the dam water down out of our road. Today it's not so, it's held back, the river is kept reasonably full, that the dams along the river, the waters behind those dykes, until the water gets down to a certain peak the floodgates don't operate properly to allow the water to get back into the Assiniboine valley.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the Minister and his staff have the resources to somehow come up with a better calculation. If we couldn't have calculated closer then we did this past season, then it's reasonable to assume we'll never, because we didn't have the rains, we didn't have great globs of snow further upstream, we did have it here and we did in my part of the province, but it was very limited. And it would be my thought that these sort of things . . . maybe more dams have to be built, and maybe a channel somewhere to somehow encourage Saskatchewan to have better control of the Qu'Appelle, but my basic thoughts would be for what involvement the treasury of Manitoba has, let's spend it in protecting the good agriculture land and let's be less concerned with purchasing that land, because then the beneficiary would be of all Manitobans. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether we should be bringing this up now or should we bring it up in planning, it's up to the Minister, of course, have to do it somewhere so . . . Of course my area is another one of the major flood areas in Manitoba at the present time, and it isn't something that is just started happening, it's been going on for about the last six years. I think the Minister and the staff are quite aware of what the problems are there, what the drainage area of central Manitoba has involved, practically from McCreary down to the town of Carberry, and the water is restricted as in a funnel and ends up at the village of Woodside from which there is a very limited outlet. Over the past six or seven years and longer than that we are having a continual flooding problem in the spring where people are having to leave their homes, and it's becoming very frustrating.

I've been talking to several members of the water district and I find that they do have a plan that I think will work, which is starting at the south of Gladstone and running directly to the lake, which would bypass all of the existing problems. There's no doubt in the world it's going to be expensive but it will be something that will be permanent, and compensation year after year and inconvenience caused to the individuals certainly is something that can't be put up with too much longer. I know of about ten families in my constituency that are dyking continually for about six weeks in the spring and in many cases they have to move out and their houses are wrecked year after year. And as I stated earlier, there is no outlet for this water except a very limited restricted channel under the railway bridge at Woodside, and the water that is coming in through the Whitemud, through the various drains in the Big Grass River, there just is no way.

I know that the argument has always been that the cost ratio is not beneficial, it might be cheaper to buy the land, evacuate the people, but here again I don't think that this is the cure. I would think that possibly a long-term plan of five, six years, spreading this thing over that it could be alleviated, Woodside, Westbourne would be protected. Gladstone is no longer - with exception of flash floods they're not really this deeply involved, and if a channel was started from the south side of the town, why the water would never go into the town at all. Basically the more water that comes down the river the less goes into Gladstone because it jumps south of the town and doesn't go in at all. Gladstone is a local problem, but the area from Gladstone straight through to the lake is being flooded every year, and there's no way that it will not be under normal snowfall, because it just has no place to carry the water. So I would hope that the Minister will, and the Cabinet, will give this some consideration under this . . . I haven't had an opportunity yet to look at the planned program for this year but I don't see anything for watershed No. 1 on it. I would be very interested in what the Minister's comments are towards developing a long-range plan and just see what his thoughts are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON; Mr. Chairman, I just briefly wanted to ask the Minister in regards to Rock Lake, if there is any contemplation of changing the level for that lake. I ask that as a very simple question and probably the answer I receive from him may-be cause further debate.

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

MR. GREEN: My colleagues said I should refer you to last year's answer. I'll deal with the . . . well perhaps I'll deal with the questions in the order, in reverse order, to the Member for Rock Lake.

There was another delegation to see me, the honourable member is probably aware of it. There have, I think, been delegations to see me about Rock Lake on a bi-yearly basis perhaps since I've been in the portfolio, and there have been discussions between us and the Department of Tourism as to whether anything could be done vis-a-vis Rock Lake. First of all it's not as if nothing has been done. As the honourable member knows, there was a program which was financed by the government on an experimental basis to determine how to alleviate the algae problem, and that they found that with copper sulphate there was some results achieved and the program terminated, the municipality was then left with the responsibility of dealing with the program. The Provincial Government financed the experimental program and the municipality was left to carry it from

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)there, because the lake is in the same position as other lakes in the Province of Manitoba.

With regard to major water works on the program, there is no economic basis for the department to be able to do major water works on the program because there is no cost benefit that could be established through the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management; the plea of the citizens is that this is a good tourist area and that cost benefits would result from having another major tourist area in the Province of Manitoba. Now if that is the case, and I'm not arguing with that, then really the questions that the member is posing to me should be posed to the Minister of Tourism and Recreation because I cannot justify these expenditures, I cannot justify it in the expenditures which normally fall within the ambit of water operation. So the latest is, I think, I seem to recall that the delegation was told that tourism and our department would again look at the possibilities to see whether they can justify it or whether there could be anything forthcoming for this lake. Now that's kind of a stock answer, and I really have to add because I don't want to be misleading that I don't think that there should be any enthusiasm generated. We are going to look at it again, we will look at it conscientiously but there has been no basis in the past and unless the Department of Tourism has a major thrust for the lake we don't want to raise any false hopes with regard to what will be done.

Now that may generate, as you say, further debate but I'm not going to go to the Member for Gladstone and indicate to him that under appropriation 12(4)(b) there are listed grants to watershed conservation districts, and the fact is that I am advised that those people who have formed watersheds are getting a little better financial deal for their overall water and conservation program that is occurring in other areas and I would think that part of this \$560,000 would be allocated to the Whitemud Watershed Conservation District. I think it would be also true to say that the only advance that we have made in our drain reconstruction program, which I acknowledged when I go up at the beginning, is the one thing that has remained relatively stable in the department and by being stable perhaps we have not moved it along as fast in terms of doing the same amount with equal dollars, because inflation would have eaten away some of the money. But what we have added has been through the watershed conservation districts, and that has possibly kept us at least at an equal pace with our drainage reconstruction program. So there is that figure there. I am also advised that the department is aware and has discussed with the watershed conservation district the type of long-range plan that the Member for Gladstone is referring to and I would say in the view at least of our department, he is right about what he is suggesting and that they are now looking into such a program with the district, and the funds would be part of the funds that are allocated to watershed conservation districts.

With regard to the Member for Virden and the Assiniboine. The Member for Virden who is a gentle man in both senses of the word, that he is a gentle person and a gentleman, must be really annoyed with our flood forecasting because I think as harsh words I've ever heard him say were said on this issue, and even they were very mild words, to indicate the gentleness of my honourable friend. --(Interjection)-- He can get pretty rough sometimes, is that right? I believe that they do a good job, they do the best they can, but they have a peculiar situation and that they were not able to predict the kind of water problems that they experienced on the Assiniboine River, both from the point of view of precipitation and secondly, from the point of view of the weather conditions, of the thaw and how it took place, and how quickly it took place, and what was coming . . . there are I suppose hundreds of variables that go into it.

If you will look at the total flood forecasting that was done, and on every river and stream I think that probably the one substantial miscalculation was the Souris Valley and Assiniboine River, even though they indicated that they will be flooding. I think that the first words possibly were used was something like "limited flooding" or "moderate flooding," words to that effect, but they quickly corrected it as soon as more information became available. So I couldn't really fault the forecasters because we have this dilemma. If we don't forecast people say you're not giving out any information; if we do forecast

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) we are bound to be wrong. We cannot be right. And therefore people will say you forecasted wrong. Now we have chosen to be criticized in the second way, that we forecasted wrong rather than not make any effort whatsoever, because it's just impossible to make an accurate forecast.

I want the honourable member to realize that whatever flood programs we plan we cannot economically plan for a one in three hundred year flood. I'm suggesting that the Assiniboine River flooding was one in 300 years. Mr. Weber is nodding. One in 300 years. There is no way we can provide flood protection works on the basis of protecting against a one in 300 year flood and that's the kind of flood that we had on the Assiniboine River this year. I think it was 52,000 cubic feet per second at Portage. We are studying flood works in the Souris River. I can't agree, although I'm going to refer the honourable member's remarks to the Department, I can't agree that there is anything unusual about the Shellmouth Dam or the operation of the Shellmouth Dam, I think that wherever you have an artificial waterworks and you have a problem, that you are bound to associate that problem with the artificial works, even when you do not have artificial works and you have a problem, there is a tendency upon people, it's a psychological tendency, perhaps sometimes correct, but it can't always be correct, to suggest that it is other than natural forces which have created the water.

Now natural forces are powerful enough and I don't know why people should look for other forces. Generally, it is natural forces that create the problem and every time we try to do something to alleviate the problem we run into two possibilities; one that by alleviating one problem we are creating a problem elsewhere - the Member for Portage la Prairie is one who represents certain people who are glaring examples of that statement - or you create the impression by having the artificial works that something is happening that would not normally have happened. I believe that what we experienced in the area that you're talking about is largely due to natural conditions, some of it can be alleviated by certain flood works but certainly I couldn't promise that we would be able to provide flood protection for protecting against a one in 300 year flood.

It would be wasting your constituents' money. In the last analysis, the amount that they would have to pay for doing it all over the province would not return them the benefits that they would get for having done it in their own area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all I would like to say that in my area we consider ourselves very fortunate this year that we did not have any flooding. We usually have very serious flooding--(Interjection)--Very good, Well I must complement the Minister and say that they did prepare for a flood and that due to the kind of a spring thaw that we had that we did not experience this flood and I think that his particular department did an excellent job this year in flood protection.

But it's some time now since we've heard anything on the Pembilier Dam and I wonder if any progress has been made in that direction. I wonder if the government has reached a decision yet as to whether they are going to participate in the funding required for the construction of the Pembilier Dam and I hope that the Minister will be able to give me some indication as to what has been happening.

Another area of course in which my area is going to be affected is the Roseau River Basin project carried on by the Americans and I wonder if the people who are living along the Red River, if they have any guarantees that they are not going to suffer extra losses through the activities which are carried on by the Americans. One of the things, of course, which is going to be necessary is going to be improvement of the drain on the Marsh River, if we're going to get the water away from the low lying area, we know that the water will be coming 30 percent faster than what it has heretofore and I wonder if the Minister could tell us whether any improvements would be made on drainage, especially on the Marsh River.

I am very pleased to see that in the program that we just received that Dead-horse Creek is mentioned. I notice that double dyking and channel construction through Sections 19, 20, and 24-3-5W that construction is supposed to be carried on in that

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. BROWN cont'd). . . . particular area. I wonder if the Minister can tell me if the bridge is going to be constructed this year through the No. 3 highway. This of course is going to be essential. It's not mentioned over here and I know that this possibly is the Department of Highways, I don't really know, but whether the Minister could comment on that particular area.

Some of the other areas, of course, which are not mentioned and one of them I believe which the Council of Rhineland was pretty certain on was that there was going to be some improvements made to the Rempel Drain, the Rempel Drain. So I hope that the Minister can give us some comments on the Rempel Drain. Also, on the Plum River Watershed, whether any improvements will be made on the Plum River.

As the Minister knows that my area receives all the water from the higher area and we do have very very many drainage problems and I would like to thank the Department for the work that has been done but so much still remains to be done and I hope that the Minister can give me some comments on these areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: The last water route that you mentioned, the Home River?

MR. BROWN: Plum River.

MR. GREEN: Plum River. Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has sort of displayed pretty graphically the effect of the distribution of the program; you get both the good news and the bad news. The honourable member says he was pleased to see the program, because he saw something in it. He's also displeased because once you see what's in it you also see what is not in it, unfortunately. And the ones that were not in it are the ones that he has mentioned.

I am certain that the honourable member is somewhat aware as to how the department operates with respect to the drainage program. For the type of program that we are doing vis-a-vis the area that he is speaking of, we have approximately something just over \$2 million which is divided into four quadrants: the northeast which is roughly north of No. 1 east of the Red River; southeast, south of No. 1 east of the Red River; northwest, north of No. 1 north of the Red River; and southwest, south of No. 1 south of the Red River. We have been looking at what is the best sort of cost benefit drains in the area. In other words by spending a dollar how much do you receive in benefits in the area, and the priorities are chosen in accordance with that list. You can fault us for not being over \$2 million or you can look at the programs and tell us whether we have not picked the right priority, and certainly we hear from lots of people all the time on this area. We will have to look at the ones that you mentioned and see whether we can get them onto the priority list at any stage. I don't think that we ever will catch up to the amount of work that is required to be done. I think that the Manitoba program is a good one. More money spent for this type of work than in any other province in the country. My Deputy Minister sort of cautions me from belaboring that point to our advantage because he says we are also the lowest area which requires the most drainage and that I shouldn't be making too much out of it. But nevertheless our drainage program has been spending a lot of money; we're going to have to look next year to see whether we have kept pace with inflation and kept pace with some of the needs.

Insofar as the Pembilier Dam is concerned, I understand that the latest is that the American authorities, I think it's the Corps of Engineers, has presented a report to the authorities in Washington, that if it goes through their authorities then there has to be a meeting between Canadian and provincial authorities to decide on apportionment as to what benefits are being achieved by which group. That portion of the Pembilier Dam which involves an expenditure of between two and three million dollars - there is another sort of the Pembina Dam concept, a concept involving 26 million dollars, or it used to involve 26, I'm not speaking of that one, I'm speaking of the limited program involving an expenditure of roughly two to three million dollars. It's not imminent but it's still being pursued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Chairman, I just go back to some of my original

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd)remarks. If I left the impression that I expected the government or the taxpayer to complete the control flooding that was not my intent but the flooding in the major ones such as the Assiniboine. And the other question that I would like to put, Mr. Chairman, if it only floods every 300 years, I may be ancient but I'm far from reaching that and I've seen water from one edge of the valley to the other just too many years in recent years; if that isn't called flooding, I'd like to know what you designate flooding. Only yesterday morning I was having coffee with some Oak Lake citizens, just happened to be I was needing a ticket for the hockey game last night, with the parents of Teddy Taylor who got the only Houston goal, and they were relating the same subject to me --(Interjection)-- That's all right, I'll do my job. But anyway they've lost a crop four to six years because of flooding and I'd like the Minister to go, Mr. Chairman, and talk to people at Oak Lake and say you've never been flooded or once in 300 years. I think of flooding when the river goes over its banks and goes from one edge of that valley and I've seen it many many years. In this case in Oak Lake is a special one, a block of 1,400 acres that they have not got a crop four out of six years, so I just don't want to go on the record that I agree with the Minister only once 300 years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the honourable member. I didn't intend to say that they were only flooded once in 300 years.

MR. MCGREGOR: That's what you said.

MR. GREEN: Well if I said that then I will now correct myself. I do not think that I said that but I will now correct myself if you say that I said that. What I tried to say is that the kind of flood that they had in 1976, the level of the water on the Assiniboine, and I believe on the Souris as well - Souris was higher - the level of water that they had on the Assiniboine was a once in 300 year flood, that that kind of flood will recur once every 300 years. Now it may happen next year, then it's supposed to not happen for 200 years more. It's like a person rolling the dice. If you roll 3 sevens in a row, the probability that you will roll another seven . . . 4 sevens in a row is very remote, but each roll you could roll a seven.

So I didn't intend that. I appreciate that there is flooding in the area, there is flooding in many parts of the province and particularly many of the rural members and I really enjoy this discussion with the rural members because I think that this is the one area where we can agree that it's not for the individual to spend the money to drain his land, that the best way of doing this is for the public to get together and build up a fund and try to on a collective basis see to it that more land is made available for cultivation. I call that drain socialism.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that I had a lot of drainage problems that I listed over there but the Minister did not comment on the Roseau River Basin project. We know that the water is going to come about 30 percent faster and more than likely it's going to hit us at the time when the Red River is going to be high already, and it seems to me that one alternative way of which we could be getting rid of some of this water at least would be by improvements on the Marsh River. I wonder if the Minister would have any comments on this.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, that the Marsh River improvement is one of the programs that's referred to in the study board report from the International Joint Commission.

Let me say to the honourable member that I don't know whether any of the works that I mentioned in that Roseau River report are ever going to be gone ahead with, I would expect that some of them would because they have been wanting to do these things, but there shouldn't be some misunderstanding about the position of the government, which I have heard some rather peculiar comments as to what we are supposed to have done. The position of the government with regard to the Roseau River is that we have not approved nor accepted nor desired any of the changes that are being contemplated in the United States. But we aren't able to tell other people exactly what they should do nor are other people able to tell us exactly what we should do, and where the water crosses the

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd) boundary, Canada and the United States have gotten together and said that when that happens, this is the type of procedure that will be followed. What happened with the Study Board is that the American authorities said these are the works that we think we would like and the Canadian authorities said these are the works which would be necessary to deal with the problem resulting from any activities that you engage in, we do not approve of what you are doing, we are saying that if you do these things these are the problems that we will have.

I think the Study Board report is a pretty well thought out document and the way of dealing with it whereby at least if the works are done there is a good chance that the people who engage in them will have to compensate us by building other works is at least a sensible way. If we didn't have that authority, if we didn't have that possibility then I suppose the people in the United States would build whatever programs they want to and say, let whatever happens happen. We can't have that type of situation, nor do the United States authorities want that situation. You know, I read that some councillor, one of the constituents there, some councillor is going to hire a lawyer to get an injunction against the Roseau River program. Interestingly enough, it's the councillor who ran against the Member for Emerson in the last election campaign. But I would say if there was ever an irresponsible waste of money for purely political reasons, that that is an example of it. There is no program going ahead and furthermore, if there was, an injunction on that basis is about as remote as the same councillor flying to the moon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that there hasn't been anything in the planning for the area of Carman and the Boyne River and in particular, the McEachern Dam which I had thought was on the work program before and isn't even on this year, and I'm wondering what's the explanation of that.

I think it was a very fortunate spring for the people in my area because they didn't have the flooding experience that was forecast even by your own department, because they forecast the flooding would be the worst this year, or probably worse than any year yet. As it turned out the weather was just exactly the best for them and there was no flooding problems. That doesn't say that that is going to happen again another year and the people of Carman, which has a population of about 2,500, is very concerned that nothing has been done there. I know you had a survey and you had the Water Commission meet out there to listen to the people but all you did is shelve the project on account of a cost-benefit analysis. I think there can be different considerations when you have a survey like this, and it isn't every time it's come up with saying well the cost-benefit ratio isn't good enough because sometimes things are done which don't pertain to a cost-benefit ratio. In fact your government has an awful record as wasting an awful lot of money that hasn't a very good cost-benefit ration in an awful lot of different ways. I feel that if you'd put a little bit more money into protecting these people from floods and improve their drainage that your money would be spent a lot more wisely and I would like to see you doing this. I'm just wondering if you would in particular comment on the McEachern Dam and the Carman area at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Mines Minister.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Boyne River Diversion around Carman, I dealt with that. We are not going to knowingly go into a program where there is just no relationship between the cost and the benefits. The honourable member says we have done this. I urge to the honourable member that we do not do it knowingly and with knowledge that we are going to have this problem. And the honourable members have not congratulated us for doing it, so I do not know why they are now urging us to do it. We try to base our programs on economic grounds and there has been no basis to proceed, on the basis of the historical flood levels in Carman, to proceed with the diversion of the Boyne River to protect that particular community from flood problems.

The honourable member speaking as a member for his constituents can easily make that claim, but I'm going to indicate to you now that the Member for Gladstone will be able to show that we spent similar money in his constituency and there will be a

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)similar result; and the Member for Arthur will show you that if we spent similar money we could have avoided the floods in Melita and in Souris this year. And the Member for Roblin will be able to show you that in the Birch River area if we spent similar moneys we could prevent a lot of floods. And each one of them could have an equal claim. And if we add them all up then we will be taxing everybody in Manitoba for all of those programs and they will be paying for things much more than the benefits that they are receiving, even your own constituents, unless you got it and nobody else got it. Unless your constituency got it and nobody else got it. Then everybody else will be paying for your constituency. Well sometimes governments are charged with doing that. I'm telling you that we are not consciously going to try and do that.

With regard to the McEachern Dam, the honourable member has a stronger point there. That program did not proceed as quickly as it should. Apparently there was some difficulty in acquiring land, that as a result of the difficulty we are now in a position of having to rejustify the agreement at Ottawa and I sincerely hope that that will be expedited, and I assure you that when it is expedited, if it is, that we will not then talk about getting the land. We will expropriate the land. That may cause the honourable member some problems from the people who are complaining about the expropriation but I'm not going to let the program fail through a lack of agreement to get a piece of land. If the program is necessary we will expropriate the land, and I can assure the honourable member that we won't let this occur again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, he says that they have had problems and they have to clear it with Ottawa again to rejustify the program. I don't understand this at all and I've been inquiring about it. I have been given the impression that it is cleared with Ottawa and it is the expropriation of the land and it says this, that you're holding back on it, there is only a few parcels involved and you've hesitated and haven't used your expropriation and that is the hold-up on the McEachern Dam at the present time. I wish you would check on that and correct.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I indicate to the honourable member that he is correct, that we did not expropriate the land that we should have, that we shouldn't have attempted to negotiate, but because we haven't expropriated the land, there is apparently some suggestion in Ottawa that we have to rejustify the cost benefits of the program. I hope that that will be expedited, and I tell the honourable member that he is correct. I will have to acknowledge that we did not do what we should have done, and that when this thing is expedited at Ottawa we will expropriate the land and proceed.

MR. HENDERSON: Well I hope you do this time because you didn't do it before as you admitted. So really you were saying at one time that you would expropriate when it was finally cleared but the thing is that it was cleared and you didn't expropriate the land and you have admitted this now, but I do hope that it hasn't delayed the project so as now it won't be one of Ottawa's things that they will go ahead with maybe because they're trying to control inflation. But if we lose that now for the very fact that you people didn't expropriate a few parcels of land when you had to, there's nobody out there that's going to like you very good about it and it's not very fair treatment to an area. What's the purpose of an Expropriation Act . . .and I've known of many times when you refused to expropriate for roads or something and that's the whole idea of the Act. It gets down really to you hate to do it because of politics. I think that's the very purpose of the Act and I know myself as a member, if there's somebody in that area that doesn't like what happened to them because of expropriation I'm not going to take their side. And I think there's others that won't take their side. This clears it up as far as the McEachern Dam is concerned but I certainly hope we don't lose that project on account of your own delays.

Another thing in your cost-benefit ratio, you know some things are taken in dollars and cents and it depends, if you do it just from a straight economic sense, probably you wouldn't have gone ahead with the floodway. I don't remember what was the cost-benefit ratio there, but I know that the floods have been far more recently on the Boyne River and through Carman in this last few years and your period in which you run

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) your cost-benefit ratio was over a long period of years, which made it quite different. I say that that area out through there has had lots of bush west of the Town of Carman, where the bush has been cleared it doesn't hold the snow in the spring and the sloughs are drained and in fact every ditch along by the highway has an extra drain put into it so that the water can get off the land. So every time there's a quick runoff and thaw with a reasonable amount of snow we're going to have more problems. This has been happening more recently and I think it's going to continue to happen. I think that the people of Carman - sure they'd like it whether the others get it or not, but I think the people of Carman have helped pay for the people around Morris that had the flood protection and the people of Winnipeg on the floodway, and the Portage Diversion, they paid this and they haven't been complaining. I'd say that your government would be far wiser if in an awful lot of places they did something, even if it was divided up. Their turn will come eventually if they have a drainage problem where they'll be helped. I just wish that you'd put a little more of your priorities on something like this rather than going into some of the business you do go into and . . .

MR. GREEN: Morden Fine Foods.

MR. HENDERSON: Pardon.

MR. GREEN: Morden Fine Foods.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, well I don't see what Morden Find Foods has to do with the drainage that we're talking about now.

MR. GREEN: You're talking about it.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, well do you want me to talk about Saunders Aircraft?

MR. GREEN: I said Morden Fine Foods.

MR. HENDERSON: If you want me to talk about Saunders Aircraft or Motor Coach or some of these other things, you know the things I'm referring to, and you're losing lots of money there. You could have built this thing here many times. The people of Carman aren't always complaining either when they have to spend a few dollars, but if they could be kept from paying their portion of the money that you waste in other projects they'd probably dig their own diversion ditch. But things aren't set up like this so they aren't free to go ahead and do it because they're paying towards everybody else's, so when they want theirs done they think they should get help from the government, because they contributed to the other good things as well as bad things that the government has done.

So I just hope that some way or another that something can be done in the future because as we talked before about the Pembilier Dam and that area down there, it's a very fertile area and can grow a lot of special crops and row crops and this country down through there is going to really become very important for that, it's got a real fine soil and it can be used for this. And right now, even though you have excesses of water in the spring at the time of melting, after you have extremely dry weather like we've had now and hot days and wind and this, the top soil dries out and people with special crops do have problems. So if a little bit more money could be spent on proper drainage and dams to hold back the water in the right places at the right time and then use it for irrigation, and that, you could spend a lot of money down there that would be money invested and well spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 88 - the Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): I have a few remarks on this item. But first I'd like to ask the Minister a question. I think the Member for Virden is correct when he interpreted the Minister as saying the Assiniboine River flooded once in 300 years because I believe he said that last week.

MR. GREEN: No.

MR. WATT: Oh yes, Mr. Chairman, I think Hansard will prove that the Minister did . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies . . .

MR. GREEN: Well on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. I said that it is a

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)one in 300 year flood, that that is the frequency of the flood. But I never said that the Assiniboine River flooded once in 300 years. I was here a couple of years ago when it flooded. I mean, if I said that it was an obvious slip. I was talking about the frequency of the flood. They measure floods by their frequency. I said it would be a one in 300 year flood, that's the probability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: I wonder if the Minister then can indicate, and he has Mr. Weber here with him to help him to give me the answer. Has the department got or has the Minister got data on the Assiniboine River for 300 years?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the department has data for a certain number of years and as I understand that engineers work - you will ask the Leader of the Opposition - they will take those years, they will define a set of probabilities from those years and then they will extrapolate it forward and backwards and they will determine. I do not know the term one in 300 year flood, it is not a lawyer's term, it is a hydro engineer's term, a water engineer's term, and that term was given to me by Mr. Weber and I am now giving it to you and you can check it with your colleague.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I still say that the Minister made the statement that the Assiniboine River flooded once in 300 years. However . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I tell the honourable member that I made no such statement. I believe that he should accept that or else show me where I made it. If I did make it then I will apologize for having made a boob. But I tell him that I didn't make such a statement.

MR. WATT: Mr. Chairman, I won't argue at this late hour. At 10 minutes after five on Friday night I don't want to get into an argument over a technical point on whether . . .

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words. I would like to have discussed at length the Souris Basin Manitoba-Saskatchewan study which was . . .the agreement was signed in 1974 between Manitoba and Saskatchewan. And I notice, Mr. Chairman, that the interim progress report that we have just received indicates that the study is on the Souris Basin which includes that loop of the Souris Basin into the United States into North Dakota which, just looking at the map roughly and from my own knowledge, comprises more than half of the Souris Basin in North Dakota. My understanding has been up to this point that the study that has been going on since 1974, which was signed on October 28th of 1974, was between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and just a few days ago the Minister reportedly made an arrangement with Governor Link in the State of North Dakota to include North Dakota officials in . . .well I'm going simply by what I read in the press and I guess maybe I should not read the press, that the press do not adequately report, that Mr. Link is quoted as having said that he has reached an agreement with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in Manitoba and a representative, I believe Mr. Byers from Saskatchewan, that they would be included in the study and it would include the whole Souris Basin from the watershed in Saskatchewan to its final source where it empties into the Assiniboine at Treesbank. But the map does show and it does say here that the Souris River Basin study, a massive study area, and the area shows North Dakota. And it was not my understanding that there was a study being made by the Manitoba-Saskatchewan study commission on the river in the United States.

However, apart from that, Mr. Chairman, the problem in Manitoba as I see it and as the people in that southwest area see it, really has no real connection with the headwaters of the Souris River in Saskatchewan; that the problem that is created in Manitoba is not as a result of the headwaters or the . . .that's not correct. The headwaters of the Souris River are in the Weyburn area which is approximately 140 miles and enters into the United States, roughly 140 to 150 miles, from where it re-enters Canada in Manitoba at Melita. But our problem in Manitoba with the Souris Basin lies primarily in an area from about 10 miles south of Melita to about 10 miles north of Melita or northeast in the Lauder area. And I think Mr. Weber and I think the Minister is probably aware that we have a problem from there to Hartney where there is no real problem with the flooding of the Souris Basin from there as the fall is more rapid than

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. WATT cont'd) the water drops down and is emptied into the Assiniboine River, where there is a blockage, Mr. Chairman, between an area, approximately at Lauder, I would say it's approximately 15 miles through the sand hills to the Hartney area, which is causing water to lie in the Souris Basin and which has constantly over the past six or seven years covered approximately 20,000 acres of good farm land. Many hundreds of those acres have not been sown four years out of five.

Now the argument has been, of course, that the cost-benefit study does not warrant the cost of either taking out loops by way of diversion, by constructing or dirging or widening of the river basin if you want to call it that, that it doesn't warrant the cost. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the basis on which the cost-benefit study has been taken over a period of 50 years should not apply as of today as it did 20 years ago probably. Through the past 15 to 20 years over the whole province a network of highways of market roads have been established which has caused runoff much more rapid in the spring than it normally did prior to say 20 years ago. There have been drainage programs put in, local, individually by farmers, there's been land clearing, everything in the past 20 years has contributed to a more rapid runoff than we'll say it was 30-40 years ago.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the prices of agricultural produce now and the cost of farming, total cost to operation, that the cost-benefit study now has no relation whatsoever to what it had 20 years ago and that we should be now talking in terms of cost-benefit studies based on say some 20 years back rather than 50 years or rather than talk about one flood in 300 years on the Assiniboine River.

I'd like the Minister to explain to me, first has there been or is there an agreement with North Dakota that North Dakota would now be involved in the present Manitoba-Saskatchewan study? Well I gather that that was the arrangement with the meeting with the Minister at Bismarck some days ago, and that the estimated time for such a study would take from three to five years. What I would like to know from the Minister is if the report, and the Minister has indicated that no action will be taken on the Souris Basin in Manitoba until the report of the Manitoba-Saskatchewan report comes in in 1977, which would mean that nothing would be done on the Souris River insofar as the southwest area is concerned until possibly 1978, 79, 1980. If the North Dakota authorities are going to be involved in this study, and I'm quoting Governor Link as saying that it would take them three to five years for such a study to be completed, would we then be looking at probably 1985 before anything would be done on the Souris Basin that would give some relief to those farmers who are trying to farm what may be termed as prime agricultural land, it is prime agricultural land. Out of the past six years I have observed hundreds of acres down there that have not been seeded because of a blockage between the areas that I've referred to, between Lauder and Hartney.

I'd like the Minister to make some comment on what the intention of the department is in respect of the problem, and it is a problem, on the Souris River in that particular area. The Southwest Manitoba Souris Basin Flood Control Committee have come up with what appears to me, as a layman, to be a reasonable proposal to make cutoffs, to do a certain amount of dredging on the Souris River in that area, which would clear the water out of the land of the area that I'm referring to and would make that land available for agricultural produce which is our basic single industry in the Province of Manitoba. I wonder at this time if the Minister could make comments on . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Souris River Basin study is scheduled to be completed by December 31, 1977, that's in his book, that's in the Souris study indication. Sometimes you don't complete when you say you are going to complete. If that occurs it will have nothing to do with our meeting with Governor Link, nothing whatsoever.

The meeting with Governor Link was open to the public and to the press. Everything that was said was viewed by, I believe, cameras from CTV or CBC, I can't remember . . . CTV was there. What was said at the meeting was that we recognize that we are part of one basin - and by the way, in our Souris Basin Study although you show that the map takes the Souris into the United States, I can't conceive of how engineers could be doing a study of a river basin leaving part of it completely blank not

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. GREEN cont'd)knowing what is happening in that basin. So I imagine that the present study of the Souris Basin done in Canada has to know something about what is happening in the Souris in the United States. I would assume that if the Souris was being studied in the United States they would have to know something about what is happening in Saskatchewan. All that was said at our meeting with Governor Link was that we recognize that we are part of one basin, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and North Dakota, with respect to the Souris River, that we are doing work on the Souris River, that we would be quite happy to make any information that we have available to them if it will help them in their studies, that they would be happy to make such information available to us as we request, which are not included in our material, or they would facilitate the giving of material, and that if joint meetings of officials would facilitate either of our two countries with regard to what we are doing with the Souris Basin, that such joint meetings would be held.

Now can the honourable member imagine anything to the contrary being said? In other words would he, as head of a delegation, go down and say, "We will not make any information available to you, you will not make any information available to us and our people will never meet to see whether they can be of joint use to each other." Could he imagine such a thing? No. So that if he can't imagine such a thing then obviously what we said was almost so obvious as to be trite. Not quite because we did have a meeting and we discussed these things and those things are good, it's good to get together and the basin is a basin which we are both interested in and both had problems with this year. But there was nothing that was said there that the honourable member wouldn't say is exactly what should have happened. Our study is not being delayed by our meeting to North Dakota, if anything it will be to some extent facilitated. I think that if there are very knowledgeable engineers at the Souris River in North Dakota that our people are getting together with, that this will be of use to us, it will not be harmful to us. But there is no change in the Souris River Basin Study Agreement, either between Canada or Saskatchewan and Manitoba as presently envisaged. So that is the answer to the first question.

With respect to the Souris River and its problems, we acknowledge there are problems in the Souris River, Canada, Saskatchewan and Manitoba are devoting over a million dollars to this study. I think that our share is something in the neighbourhood of \$250,000 to \$300,000 - \$200,000, in that area, which means that the Souris River is a high priority because there are areas in the province where we haven't been able to dedicate \$200,000 to a study. So the honourable member is able to report vis-a-vis that particular area, that more is being done vis-a-vis the Souris River than many other areas in the Province of Manitoba, that the studies will be complete by 1977 and the type of works that he has discussed will no doubt be made more intelligible by the completion of the study.

MR. WATT: Studies were made prior to 1974 on the Souris Basin in Manitoba, studies were made, and as a result of the studies there were projected our proposed programs including the Coulter and/or the Patterson Dams, and it was established on what basis the province should share with the Federal Government on the Patterson or the Coulter Dam, the Coulter Dam was the first priority of course but because of railway problems there it was then reverted to the Coulter. My understanding at that time, as of 1969, studies were made on the basin, studies were made on the possibility of alleviating the flooding problem within Manitoba, a combination of either and/or the Patterson and the dredging through the Lauder sand hills. What I'd like to get from the Minister is why are we spending now up to our share of a million dollars on a study that was previously done and a report did come out. I'm not sure of the exact year but it was approximately in '68 - '69, in that area, I'm sure Mr. Weber will know about the date of that report.

I want to ask the Minister further. Up until Governor Link proposed that Manitoba and Saskatchewan should meet in Bismarck with him and his people in Bismarck to discuss a joint survey of the whole Souris Basin problem, at the time that the Manitoba-Saskatchewan Commission was set up did the Minister at that time communicate with North Dakota on whether North Dakota would come into a total examination and a total survey of the total Souris Basin, including the loop into North Dakota?

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the first question, studies were done. The study apparently which was done previously in 1969 was a limited study affecting one feature which I guess led to the recommendation relative to the Patterson Dam. That study is being acted on, the Patterson Dam is being pursued. The Patterson Dam is one of the programs which we have been pursuing for Federal-Provincial sharing to go ahead and construct it. That program is not being delayed or postponed by virtue of the present Souris River Basin study. But the study that was done was not a Souris Basin study of the nature that is now under way, we are doing now a study of the Watershed. There have been various studies associated with different parts of the Nelson River but they are not in any way connected with the kind of study that we did for the Nelson River Water Basin which was a three province study, the Province of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Alberta and Ottawa, Was it the Churchill River or the Nelson? --(Interjection)-- Churchill, Saskatchewan, Nelson.

The question as to whether . . . when we were proposing the first study, the Souris, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ottawa agreement, there, at that time, and still was not considered to be any necessity to involve the State of North Dakota in the study, and it's still not involved in the study. Apparently, and I am not a technical person but they felt that this study could be proceeded with on the basis that it would involve Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Canada rather than trying to then link up with Canada and Washington, because I guess that's who would have to link, and then back to North Dakota. Now there are activities on both sides of the border with regard to the Souris Basin and all we have done really is to indicate that we will make the best of such activities as are going on in both parts of the border. I didn't get in touch with Governor Link when we were talking about the Souris Basin study, I was not advised that it would be of any importance and I understand that the technical people considered it and didn't recommend it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Chairman, I just have one brief question to the Minister and it is not necessary that I have an answer today unless he could do it very quickly.

The First Minister last night in his Capital Estimates in Water Control Works, and you did give me an explanation last year regarding Sturgeon Creek, but the First Minister last night when he was talking about the Capital made the statement "control structure at the mouth of the Sturgeon Creek." I didn't think it was that, or could you possibly explain it or give me the information next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: I'll give it to you right now. Sturgeon Creek: Gradient Control Structure location near the confluence of the Sturgeon Creek and the Assiniboine River in the City of Winnipeg. Type of structure - reinforced concrete gradient control structure. Purpose - to prevent the Sturgeon Creek channel from degrading and affecting adjacent private held lands and homes. Project details - Sturgeon Creek is a land drainage outlet for a substantial agricultural area outletting into the Assiniboine River through the City of Winnipeg. Within the limits of the City of Winnipeg it serves also as a drainage outlet for urban development. In a report entitled Sturgeon Creek Park Waterway Study prepared by the City of Winnipeg, August '74 several recommendations were made with respect to the creation of a major regional park within the city limits, Sturgeon Creek will continue to serve as an agriculture urban drainage waterway and with the envisioned park development would serve as a recreational waterway as well. The report prepared December '74 by the Manitoba-Winnipeg Waterways Committee entitled Sturgeon Creek Urban Road Crossing Structures and Hydraulic Considerations, one of the recommendations which were made was that a Gradient Control Structure be constructed at the mouth of Sturgeon Creek. The total estimated cost of the structure is \$200,000. That's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour of adjournment having arrived, committee rise. Call in the Speaker. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I know that by consent we could probably continue. If the Minister wishes to I think we'd be willing to carry on and see if we can finish this.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed by the Committee to continue? (Agreed)
 Resolution 88(a)(1)--pass; (a) (2) Other Expenditures--pass; 88(a)--pass; Resolution
 88(b) Operations (1) Salaries and Wages--pass; (b) (2) Other Expenditures--pass;
 (b) (3) Grants to Watershed Conservation Districts--pass; Resolution 88(b)--pass.
 Resolution 88 (c) Planning (1) Salaries and Wages. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have two or three questions to the Honourable Minister in Planning and I went through the program that was laid on our desk and I don't see anything for the Watershed on the east side of Riding Mountains at all. I also wonder if in fact that the department or the Minister is seriously considering including that at some time as having a priority. The one of the village of Ethelbert is the one that concerns me the most because if we don't bring that matter under control very soon that whole street is going to be ending up down the river. I know the municipality don't have the resources to deal with it, it's a massive project and I just leave it with the Minister and maybe he can take a look at it again and see if there's an answer to it.

The other one of course, Mr. Chairman, is the high waters in Lake Winnipegosis which again has been brought to my attention in the last couple of days, it's getting to be quite a serious problem and maybe like the Minister said earlier these flood cycles are going to be with us maybe for a long time. But this one that's concerning not only the one that he might have said but the Town of Winnipegosis itself, they're very up tight and wondering if in fact there is any answers, and maybe it can't be resolved, but I would hope that he would take those matters under planning and see if there isn't some answers to at least tell these people that in the next four or five years that the matter is under surveillance and we'll see if we can't come up with some answers for it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is perfectly right. The program that he has in the front of him is the construction and reconstruction program, it does not include the planning programs. And the subject matter of which he spoke is under active, not consideration but planning, in the planning division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 88(c)(1)--pass; (c) (2) Other Expenditures--pass; 88(c)--pass; Resolution 88(d) Canada-Manitoba DREE Agreement (1) Canada-Manitoba ARDA Agreement (a) Salaries and Wages--pass; (d) (1) (b) Other Expenditures--pass; (d) (1) (c) Grants to Resource and Watershed Conservation Districts. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on (c). How do they figure out this grant, is it on a mill rate basis or on a population basis, how is this grant based if you go into a watershed area?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I understand it is roughly 85 percent of an approved program. The program would be approved and then there would be . . . 85 percent is the amount that's given to the district.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 88(d)(1) (c)--pass; Resolution 88(d)(1)--pass; Resolution 88(d)(2) Canada-Manitoba FRED Agreement--pass; 88(d)(3) Canada-Manitoba Northlands Agreement (a) Salaries and Wages--pass; (d)(3)(b) Other Expenditures--pass; (3)--pass; Resolution 88(d)(4) Canada-Manitoba Rural Areas Agreement, a nil administration. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister will explain why this item now is deleted, has there been some other agreement formulated?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, we didn't get the agreement. We were promised that agreement, I have it in writing, and I'm raising hell, but that's all I'm getting is the satisfaction of raising hell. We have it in writing. They promised us that agreement but they backed out of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 88(d)(4)--pass; Resolution 88(d)--pass; Resolution 88, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,380,000 for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management--pass.

I refer honourable members now back to Page 40, Resolution 85(a)(1) The Minister's Compensation--pass. The Honourable Member for St. James.

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

MR. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Radisson; I'll be very brief. I just wanted to go on record that I would be making comments with regard to the Honourable Minister's department and Manitoba Development Corporation during the second reading of the bill in order to expedite the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 85(a)(1)--pass; Resolution 85, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$914,900 for Mines, Resources and Environmental Management--pass; That concludes consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

I would refer honourable members to Page 43 of their Estimates books, the Development Agencies. 1. Manitoba Development Corporation. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, a comment on this will be picked up on the Bill and at the Economic Development Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 89, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$537,500 for Development Agencies--pass.

Resolution 90, Communities Economic Development Fund. Resolution 90, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$555,100 for Development Agencies--pass. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry I was just indicating to the honourable members there are on Page 59 several items that have not been passed because they don't fall within normal departmental estimates, I just wanted to know whether they were wanting to deal with them, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would then refer honourable members to Page 59 of their Estimates books. Flood control and Emergency Expenditures. Resolution 115. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the government used to have a program whereby farmers were allowed to build a pad and move their buildings on them. Now apparently this program has been discontinued and the farmers were not notified; as a matter of fact, the program was discontinued as of January 1, 1975, and some people did receive permission from the department to go ahead and build these pads and later on these costs have not been approved. I wonder if the Minister could give us any comments on that particular item, is this going to be rectified or what is going to happen to these farmers who have gone to considerable expenditure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I can't remember the specifics of this, but I know that the program is still being considered. I wonder if the honourable member would permit me to give him a written answer to that question as soon as I can get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear him say that it was being considered. I was sorry to hear that that program had been dropped and I think it's a good program to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 115, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3 million for Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures--pass.

Resolution 116 Canada-Manitoba Planning Agreement. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: This item is down substantially. I wonder is there any explanation for it.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm not even sure that this item is going to be proceeded with. We are having difficulty with our negotiations with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I know that this planning agreement is one of the ones that may be terminated at this point; if it's not we need the funds in the Estimates. The reason that it's down is because Canada has drawn back considerably on its DREE grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, this is probably where the McEachern Dam

SUPPLY - MINES AND RESOURCES

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) would be cut out completely if this program was dropped is it not?

MR. GREEN: No, not under this item. I've indicated to the honourable member that I too am not satisfied with what has occurred with regards to McEachern Dam and I accept responsibility. I do not know why the department did not just expropriate the land instead of trying to sweet-talk the people into negotiating a sale, but they apparently do that. I accept responsibility, I'll see to it that everything is done to try to rectify the situation. It's not under this item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 116, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$250,000 for Canada-Manitoba General Development Agreement--pass.

Resolution 117, General Salary and Cost-of-Living Increase. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, under this item \$10 million is a figure that allows the government some flexibility in establishing something that goes along with negotiations with the public service, is that true?

A MEMBER: The MGEA will not accept that figure, they will not pass it. They will pass the item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 117, Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10 million for General Salary and Cost-of-Living increases--pass. That concludes consideration of Resolutions 115 to 117, inclusive. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

MR. Speaker, your Committee has passed certain Resolutions, directed me to report same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

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

MR. JAMES D. WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I wish to make a substitution. Substitute the name of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews for that of the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs on Economic Development Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we have an Economics Development Committee meeting on Monday at 10, with the report of the Manitoba Development Corporation. I am going to suggest that I introduce the extended hours motion on Monday afternoon, specifically so that we can meet mornings because I'd like to hold Committee meetings in the evenings at 8 o'clock, Law Amendments Committee, etc. So I want my honourable friends to be aware that I would move the extended hours motion on Monday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.