

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable members to the gallery where we have 27 students, Grade 5 and 6 standing of the Walter Whyte School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Irvine. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, the Minister for Renewable Resources and Rehabilitative Services.

We also have 20 students, Grade 7 standing, of the Isaac Newton School under the direction of Mr. Al Rathbone. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Burrows, the Minister of Continuing Education and Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs.

On behalf of the Honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, for Thursday night I would like schedule a Committee on Economic Development to discuss Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited and Leaf Rapids Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other Ministerial Statements or Tabling of Reports? Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister in the absence of the Minister for Agriculture. Could the First Minister advise the House whether the statements over the weekend are true, that 600,000 pounds of industrial milk were dumped as a result of an ongoing dispute between the cheese plants in Manitoba and the Manitoba Milk Producers' Marketing Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I have not got that information directly. I got it by news reports. I have been able to get information only with respect to relative price. I am advised that the price for industrial milk for cheese purposes in Manitoba is not high in relation to the industrial price for cheese milk in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and therefore, we cannot take the position that the price is undue.

MR. LYON: Can the First Minister undertake, through the Minister of Agriculture or himself, to make a full statement to the House on this situation at the earliest possible moment?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake to do that in conjunction with the Minister for Agriculture.

MR. LYON: Another question, Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister in the absence of the Attorney-General. Could the First Minister confirm whether or not Mr. Charles Huband is still retained as Counsel for the Government with respect to the continuing negotiations on ManFor or CFI?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is correct. Mr. Huband is still dealing with those matters which he was dealing with before, and I believe that that is coming close to culmination, but I am not certain.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, another question supplementary to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm the accuracy of statements made over the weekend by Mr. Huband with respect to offers that have been made for the purchase of the Forestry Complex at The Pas, and whether or not Mr. Huband was speaking in his capacity as counsel for the government or in his other political capacity?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, since that has not been specifically brought to my attention, I would refrain from commenting and will undertake to get the information directly as to whether it is accurate.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, on another matter, on Friday last the Acting First Minister took notice of questions with respect to an alleged work stoppage at Jenpeg with respect to an allegation that there were unpaid accounts for one of the prime contractors, unpaid accounts from the Soviet supplier amounting to some \$2 million. Is the First Minister now in a position to advise the House as to the

status of that situation?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, last week when I first became aware of this, I did ask for a report and was advised that specific arrangements had been made toward the bringing of senior people together from both the supplier of the turbines and the installation company. I believe that that is taking place now. I have not had a report in the last 24 hours.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to that line of questioning. Is the First Minister in a position to advise whether or not the alleged withdrawal of work force on behalf of the company has delayed beyond the already one-year delay, the coming on to stream of any or all of the turbines at Jenpeg?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there has not been any work stoppage because of that as yet and hopefully there won't be. If there is one, it is something which would take place only after the present direct discussions were to prove non-productive but, as of this point and up until now there has been no work stoppage.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, observing as we do the presence in the House now of the Minister of Agriculture, is the Minister of Agriculture prepared to make a full statement to the House with respect to the alleged dumping of some 600,000 pounds of industrial milk over the weekend because of the dispute between cheese producers and the Manitoba Milk Producers' Marketing Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HONOURABLE SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week, that discussions were under way between the two organizations, that is, the Milk Producers' Marketing Board and the processors and it is obvious that they have not resolved their dispute at this point in time. There have been proposals made but which so far have not been accepted and the discussions are continuing, so it is our hope that they end in a mutual agreement of some sort satisfactory to both sides.

I would like to point out that the price of milk shipped to industrial plants in Manitoba is quite a bit less than it is in Alberta and Saskatchewan and therefore it is somewhat mind-boggling to try to accept the concept that we have to have a lowering of that price here in Manitoba. It seems to me there is some credibility on the part of the Milk Marketing Board to ask for a higher price, the prices that they have indeed asked for. The price of cheese in Manitoba is selling at between 20 and 30 cents a pound below what it sells in other provinces and that too doesn't seem to add up to the argument that the cheese industry is unable to pay more for milk pursuant to what the rest of the country is doing. So, Mr. Chairman, we are not in a position to take sides on the issue. The Milk Producers' Marketing Board is trying to do its job in representing the producers of milk in Manitoba and, of course, it is their duty to try to resolve the present impact. At the moment we are diverting our milk to Yorkton, Saskatchewan in an effort to reduce the losses to the producers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. I wonder if he can inform the House whether Mr. Charles Huband has had instructions from the government to negotiate a return of, or purchase by, the ManFor property with Dr. Kasser — a return of money?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the question along that line has been asked already and I have undertaken to check directly with the source of the alleged reported quotes of the recent days and I shall do so.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is not the same question and, again, I ask the First Minister. Have instructions been given to Mr. Charles Huband to negotiate a return of money from Dr. Kasser with respect to the CFI complex?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, negotiate connotes some kind of *quid pro quo* and to the best of my knowledge there is no such instruction to negotiate a *quid pro quo*. Mr. Huband has been the solicitor involved for quite some time now and he is pursuing on the same basis as he was months ago.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the government has received any offer for the purchase of ManFor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge there has been no offer for the purchase of ManFor. What I understood the newspaper account to say was that at all times the government action constituted a receivership and anybody who has been received upon can wipe out the receivership by paying the amount of money which is in default. That's what I read into Mr. Huband's comments. There has been no offer that I am aware of to purchase ManFor nor has there been any instructions to sell ManFor to Dr. Kasser for a return of money. There has been, and continues to be, a civil suit against Mr. Kasser and related persons on which the lawyers are discussing all kinds of things, including possible settlement, but there has been no offer to my knowledge by anybody, including the Kasser group, to purchase the complex. If they made up their default then there is a possibility if things have not proceeded too far, and I think that that was one of the rights reserved to them in the original court action, for them to acquire the settlement by the payment of money but I haven't the

slightest doubt that they will not do that, that there is not any inclination on their part to do that.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether the government has a policy as to whether under any conditions it would sell the complex back to Dr. Kasser.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, that's quite a sweeping basis — under any condition. I can tell my honourable friend now that one condition that would not obtain is some kind of *quid pro quo* which would have something to do with the desisting of the pressing on with certain actions under criminal law.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Renewable Resources. There have been statements by the Wildlife Biologists that the nesting conditions were quite bad this spring because of water conditions. In view that there is going to be a very drastic result on the duck population, waterfowl population, is the Minister assessing the situation to see if there should be reduced, perhaps, limits in the fall, particularly Mallard population?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Renewable Resources.

HONOURABLE HARVEY BOSTROM (Rupertsland): Well, Mr. Speaker, the staff in the department are assessing this on a continual basis and will be coming forward with recommendations shortly.

MR. PATRICK: When does the Minister expect that assessment and will he be making a report to the House?

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to give the honourable member a definite time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of what appears to be a shafting of the milk producers on the part of processors would he now consider proceeding with the Crocus plant in Selkirk?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any need to proceed in that direction, that is something for the producers to determine if they so desire it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister. In the latter part of last week the Federal-Provincial Ministers met to discuss potential actions dealing with dry conditions in the prairies, and announcements were made that certain moneys would be available for water supply programs. Can the Minister indicate what allocation might have been made for Manitoba, whether in fact it is still considered to be necessary and what action might be arising out of those meetings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I will have a comment to make on that this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

ORDER NO. 39: On Motion of Mr. Brown Order for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the following information regarding the Department of Health and Social Development's nursing home waiting list:

I. What was the total number of patients approved by a panel of the Care Services Branch for urgent placement in nursing homes as of:

- (a) April 30th, 1977
- (b) April 30th, 1976
- (c) April 30th, 1975
- (d) April 30th, 1974

II. Of the total number of patients approved for urgent placement, how many were occupying Winnipeg hospital beds subject to availability of a nursing home bed in the week ending April 30th, 1977.

III. Of the total number of patients on the waiting list for urgent placement in the week ending April 30th, 1977 how many were panelled for:

- (a) extended care
- (b) Personal care

IV. What was the total number of patients approved by a panel of the Care Services Branch for placement (i.e. urgent and non-urgent combined) in nursing homes as of:

- (a) April 30th, 1977
- (b) April 30th, 1976
- (c) April 30th, 1975
- (d) April 30th, 1974

V. What was the total number of patients in Winnipeg hospitals awaiting placement in a nursing home as of:

- (a) April 30th, 1977
- (b) April 30th, 1976
- (c) April 30th, 1975
- (d) April 30th, 1974
- (e) April 30th, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, providing we can get the information I will be pleased to accept this, in fact, I might go back a few years earlier to give more information to my honourable friend.

MOTION approved.

ADJOURNED DEBATES - SECOND READING

BILL (NO. 62) - AN ACT TO AMEND THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you deal with Bill No. 62, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 62, proposed by the Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: I stood this bill for my colleague, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, before the Minister closes debate I just want to rise on a point of order and make sure that it is clearly understood that the Member for Flin Flon does not close debate by virtue of the fact that he adjourned it.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

MR. JORGENSEN: The debate is still open for anybody who wants to speak, outside of the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. But after the Minister takes the debate and I indicate that he is closing debate, after that there will be no more debate once the Minister speaks.

MR. JORGENSEN: I am quite aware of that, I just don't want a practice to develop in this House where people on the other side can take adjournments of debate ostensibly for the purpose of having that debate closed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on second reading, first I would like to thank those members who have expressed their views and participated in this debate, and I will attempt to respond to some of the points raised.

You know, in introducing the bill for second reading, Mr. Speaker, I think, I commented that designing governments, whether city or municipal, is extremely difficult, no one has a pat answer. Right across the country, in every jurisdiction, new methods are being sought, new ideas are being thought up and new approaches are being made. What I said in connection with this bill is that it provided for the refinement and the improvement of the legislative framework within which the City of Winnipeg operates. It would permit the City to determine its own administrative structure and the procedures to a much greater extent than ever before; it would improve the City planning procedures; and it would enhance the Province's ability to deliver provincial programs for which the Province is responsible.

Now in assessing the amendments some of the members opposite have adopted criteria which reveal some very fundamental differences of opinion with respect to the responsibilities of the Province for municipal governments. You know, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, the Province, every province, has a constitutional responsibility with regard to the municipalities. I suppose we could take the position that the City of Winnipeg should be on its own, look after itself, create a city state, let them run their own affairs, in which case they are entirely on their own, no provincial programs. If they want to take over all the responsibilities of Health, Welfare, Education, Transit, then I suppose that's the way to go. I think that would be the wrong way to go. I think it would be wrong and the incorrect thing for this Province to try to create a city state and I think the councillors in the City of Winnipeg would share that view. And yet that's the direction that we would end up in if we followed some of the thoughts suggested on the other side.

So, as I say, the Province has got the constitutional responsibility and therefore we have to live up to it for creating the legal framework for municipal governments.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing this bill, we consulted through the Taraska Commission with members of City Council who made representation there, with interested groups in the City who made

representation, with individuals who made representation, so the public and elected people had an opportunity to express their views, and the fact that there was no unanimity of views doesn't surprise me. It's obvious from the debate in this House there's a variety of views and differences of opinion.

So, Mr. Speaker, whatever we do, you know, we cannot evade our ultimate responsibility to the citizens of Manitoba, to all Manitobans, that is, for providing the legal framework which not only will permit, but which will encourage effective municipal government in Winnipeg.

I'd like to, perhaps, review the position with respect to Provincial-City relationships. Mr. Speaker, we have attempted very very, I think, effectively — certainly not through any lack of effort on our part — to work very closely with the City of Winnipeg, and I think we have worked closer with the City of Winnipeg than any previous administration. We meet with official delegations on a fairly regular basis. They come forward with proposals and ideas, we share those ideas, we review them, and I don't think any member of that official delegation or City council can argue that the Province has ignored them, or has held them off at arm's length, or has simply gone its own way and simply closed an eye to the City's problems. Because the fact of the matter is, the Province has brought about an infusion of funds to the City of Winnipeg, which had never never been matched in earlier years.

In Transit, in the taking over of certain services such as a major park, like Assiniboine Park, we have relieved the City of Winnipeg of great costs, the city taxpayer of great costs, and if you take a check list of all the things that we do in parallel with the City, one would find that in fact this government, the Provincial Government, has indeed gone farther than any previous government, and most provincial governments in relationship to their major urban centres.

What does Bill 62 really do? It gives the City council full powers. There's a great deal of criticism that the Minister somehow is setting himself up almost as a dictator over what the City will do and what it won't do, sort of an authority, but the fact of the matter is Bill 62 gives the City council full powers to approve the action area plans for development — that's plans within any community — the zoning by-laws, the plans of subdivision, all of these things. It totally removes, totally, totally removes the present power of the Minister, to whom matters can be appealed and are appealed, it removes the power of the Municipal Board, it's totally within the decision and the right of the City of Winnipeg to make decisions in these very major, and which actually amounts to the majority of matters which come before them with regard to development, plans of subdivision and so on. So there's no appeal to the Minister, and through him no appeal to the Municipal Board. There is a mechanism whereby, flowing from the community committee, executive policy committee, or some designated committee can hear these matters and once referred to council, council decision is final.

So to suggest that, in fact, the Province is setting itself up as an authority over the City in these matters is wrong, and perhaps it wasn't understood. What we are retaining are those areas — and it's retention — those types of plans which are not the detailed or the precise development which takes place within a community or within a city. This has to do with the broad aspects of a development plan itself, the statement of where one is going, where is the city going, what should be its total size, what should be the nature of the transportation, the broad principles of development? And that is something which the Federal Government is involved in, through cost sharing, the province is involved and of course the city itself. It is a considerable exercise.

A second, in the hierarchical structure of plans is what is known as community plans, they were called district plans. Again, they are somewhat more specific than the development plan, but again it is the broad principles of what sort of development would take place in a particular community? Would there be industrial development? If so, where approximately? What type of transportation should serve that industrial development? Should it be residential? What sort of density should there be? What sort of mix as between commercial, residential and industrial? These are the broad parameters. And of course, what is the transportation system to feed those. In those areas, Mr. Speaker, the province has to have a responsibility, because what happens in the City of Winnipeg in regard to their total development plan or the six community plans, will impinge upon outside of Winnipeg — on the areas outside of Winnipeg — because Winnipeg is the largest city in the province; and to simply say, "They will do their thing", is to suggest that there is nothing left but Winnipeg, that's the only part of Manitoba that counts. Well, that isn't so, and I think if we took that position we would be denying the reality of the situation; as well we would be very unfair — not just to Winnipeg — but to all of Manitoba. So, in those two areas, yes, the city would refer those plans before they are finalized, to the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Now why to the Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, they now refer to the Minister for Urban Affairs and the Minister for Urban Affairs can refer them to the Municipal Board for hearings.

It is my understanding that the City of Winnipeg Councillors and in former years, Metro, have never been happy and have always objected to the fact that an appointed board — responsible really to no one, and certainly not an elected group — would have a final and binding decision on City of Winnipeg or on council decisions. It was put to me that that is wrong in principle, that if there is to be an overview which there has to be, then it should not be three nameless, faceless people responsible

to no one. It should be someone who has to stand up in this House, or someone who has to respond publicly, and justify what he is doing and why he is doing it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the City of Winnipeg Council would rather go back, would rather still be under the Municipal Board, I don't care, I have no hangup on this. As a matter of fact, it is not a very pleasant job for the Minister of Urban Affairs. The pressure is intense, and for the sake of future Ministers of Urban Affairs, if the City of Winnipeg requests that they stay under the Municipal Board, I will amend it as fast as snapping my fingers. So we are responding. To suggest to the members opposite that this is somehow a plot, is just nonsense, it's just nonsense. It is of no consequence at all. —(Interjection)— I didn't catch that, I'm sorry. Do you want to repeat it? Okay.

Mr. Speaker, the province has a responsibility to ensure that the city's major plans therefore, and their programs, take into account the interests of all Manitobans, those who reside outside of Winnipeg. We believe that the province must endeavour to follow the city's policies and procedures, certainly, no question. The province must ensure in the final analysis that provincial programs and policies will not be rendered ineffective by municipal action or inaction.

In this regard I am referring to what has again been criticized by some — particular some of the city people I think — where the province has taken back to itself a power which every province has, and that is the royal prerogative with regard to provincial construction, provincial buildings, etc. Now, we have gone beyond that, we have said that where provincial programs are involved, provincial programs passed by this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, approved by a vote of this Legislature, launched by this Legislature, financed by this Legislature, where programs of that nature are involved, then surely, this Legislature cannot be thwarted by the action or inaction of another level of government. It's just not possible. So, there will be an amendment which clarifies — in case there are any fears on the other side — to clarify more precisely the nature of what we had in mind in bringing forward this amendment.

But in the final analysis it is obvious that in certain fields where the province is involved, whether it is in the fields of health, social services, etc., there has to be some way whereby the province can carry through its responsibilities, its voted responsibilities and not be thwarted. That doesn't mean to say that there must be and will be consultation, discussion and every attempt made to work very closely with the city. To do otherwise would be silly, and we know that. —(Interjection)— And, Mr. Speaker, he says, "total subservience". I suggest to him what he is talking about is total subservience in reverse — (Interjection)— a veto power over this Legislature by a municipal council, he wouldn't sit on this side for five minutes if he had to live with that, and he knows it, and he knows it. He's kidding no one. So, Mr. Speaker, let's not fool ourselves on that one.

You know, Mr. Speaker, Winnipeggers elect and are served by four levels of government, not just one. The fact is, Winnipeggers or Brandonites or any other community, there are four levels of government in which the citizens of a municipality are involved. There is the federal level of government which they elect, they help to elect the representatives of that government. There is the provincial level of government, which they also helped to elect. There's the municipal form of government, which they elect, and there are the school boards which they also elect. There are four levels of government all dealing in these areas.

Now, constitutionally the province plays a pivotal role here, a co-ordinating role, and in some cases has the sole responsibility. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the statements made on the other side, that somehow the province is trying to get a big stick to dictate to the city, just isn't so. In order to deliver provincial programs, we must have the freedom, the flexibility to do so. In order for the city to serve its purposes, it too, must have the flexibility to do so. They must work together and they will work together, because certainly the city knows, the municipal people know and the province knows that unless there is joint effort in these matters these things cannot be resolved, and the losers will be the citizens themselves.

Now, the other matter where the opposition seems to be very up tight is the question of the approval of capital borrowing. Mr. Speaker, it has always been a fact that capital borrowing had to be approved by the Municipal Board.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. MILLER: There had to be some level which checked on the capital borrowing, and I can tell you if it wasn't the case, Winnipeg would have trouble, any municipality, would have trouble selling bonds, because the purchaser of bonds wants an assurance that the senior level of government has, in fact, scrutinized and is satisfied that the level of borrowing is within the means of the city. And when the province goes through the market for its borrowing, it has to include in that, and will be including in that the level of borrowing of both the municipalities and the school boards within that province. You can't separate them.

Now, again why this change from the Municipal Board to the Minister? Well, Mr. Speaker, I can give you two reasons. Firstly, the Municipal Board itself, who feel that the City of Winnipeg, being such a large entity, that the Municipal Board really doesn't have the expertise to adequately scrutinize, evaluate the extent of the capital borrowing in the City of Winnipeg, the nature of the

capital borrowing. I can tell you frankly, they seek advice from the Department of Finance people.

As well again as in the other case, we were given to understand by City Council, by members of City Council I should say, that they would prefer again to deal with an elected person, a person who again is responsible to the electorate and not to a board responsible to no one. Certainly they are appointed but in the final analysis they are responsible to no one as an elected person would be. Again, we responded to that simply by agreeing that if this is what the City wanted, then fine, we would remove the municipal board and make the Minister of Finance the responsible person. Again, this is not a job that I particularly feel that the Minister of Finance is that happy about because there is a great deal of intense pressure, and will be, on the Minister of Finance when he has to deal with this matter, far more so than a board who, of course, isn't responsible to any one.

You see, the members opposite aren't questioning, at least some of them, are not questioning the need for control. I believe the Member for Sturgeon Creek agreed that there should be a control of municipal board — I don't think that was the issue — but they say it shouldn't be the Minister of Finance. Well, again, Mr. Speaker — (Interjection) — or maybe this Minister. Oh, I see, in other words, if the Member for Lakeside was the Minister of Finance, he should be the responsible one. But this Minister of Finance is obviously not the right one. Well, I can't argue with that; that's a very subjective decision or analysis.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MILLER: I can see now that the opposition to this whole thing is based, therefore, on where they sit. If they were on this side, everything would be fine but because they're not, well, that's a different story. Well, if that is all that we're talking about, we're talking about personalities, then if really that's the whole argument, I think I should sit down, we pass this bill and let's go on, if that's what it's all about. But you know I don't believe them. I really don't believe them.

You know, the Member for Fort Garry says that this whole thing, the exercise of provincial responsibility, is an anti-people measure. How he can make that statement when the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Cabinet have to answer all the time for their actions to the people, how he can argue that's anti-people is beyond me. Anti-people is where you name a board and you say that board is the responsible board and don't talk to us, that's the board, and if they make decisions, well go argue with them; except you can't argue with them because the Act is very precise, there is no appeal. So you slough off the responsibility to a board and then you say, well, you know, it's their doing, not ours. How he says that what we're proposing is anti-people is beyond me because anti-people is what really exists today. You name a board; you put the onus on them; you hide behind them; they are your buffer; they are your screen; and if somebody complains, you say, well, that's the law and that's the board; don't talk to me. Now if they're suggesting that our proposal is anti-people, I suggest they just don't understand what anti-people means.

As I said earlier, I don't think they are quarrelling with the fact that there has to be some measure of control, some say in the capital borrowings of the City and I think they would agree, and I think the Member for Lakeside has, inadvertently perhaps, but he has agreed that it would be totally irresponsible to give the City of Winnipeg *carte blanche* in setting its own capital budget or, for that matter, any municipality because in the final analysis, the province is responsible for all that.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Sturgeon Creek complained that the bill does nothing to give people more authority over the affairs in their local area. The Member for Fort Garry was concerned that six communities would diminish the individual local identity of which citizens are so proud, and justly proud.

The Member for Fort Rouge mentioned that the City had to be concerned about housing, water services, sewer services, public transit, as well as neighbourhood development. You know, I would add to that. I would say they have to be concerned with other things as well, substandard housing, social services, residential land development, industrial development, both of the land and industrial development itself, parks and recreation facilities, transportation corridors, all of these things have to be taken into account by a municipal government. But, Mr. Speaker, these kinds of problems that I have just outlined and the Member for Fort Rouge identified, cannot be dealt with adequately just by any one part of a single social and economic unit which is Winnipeg.

You know, the unified city was created precisely to permit the development of a comprehensive urban program and services and the marshalling of all the city's resources, not simply a part of the city's resources or a particular area of the city where they could afford it, they proceeded to have a level of services and programs of facilities simply because they could pay for it from within their small particular area, whether it be Tuxedo, St. James-Assiniboia, because their industrial tax base was so high.

Winnipeg will prosper and grow if all the residents, no matter where they live, can benefit and can share in both the responsibilities and the benefits that flow from the larger tax base from the marshalling of all resources for the total growth, the total development of the urban community of Winnipeg.

Now, certainly we should be concerned about preserving neighbourhoods, about protecting

individuals from the adverse effects of urban growth. No one questions that. Maintaining and improving the quality of municipal services, it goes without saying but, honourable members who would design an urban government to meet only those objectives would deprive Winnipeg citizens of the major opportunity to improve the quality of urban life and to share more equitably the cost and benefits of living in proximity to one another. They are all residents of Winnipeg; they may be residing in a particular area the northwest section or the southeast section, but they are all residents of Winnipeg and as Winnipeg goes, so do they.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the basic difference between 1971 and now, today, is that the transition from 13 governments to one is now being completed. Winnipeg now is one government, one administration, one tax base so everybody benefits from that tax base; one set of municipal programs and services which has to be justified by a common electorate. Bill 62 provides an electoral system, Mr. Speaker, which should permit and encourage communities to take a broader — no, not just the communities, it will permit and encourage the individual councillors to take a somewhat broader policy perspective than they have up to now. Unfortunately, there has been — and I guess it is human nature, particularly during the transition period, for a great deal of parochialism to have crept in to the decision-making process. Now, we are still retaining single-member wards in order to ensure that there should be a fair amount of accountability and responsiveness to councillors, his response to his electorate so we are still retaining the ward system.

One, of course, can argue for a different number of councillors. There is no magic in that, I suppose. One can argue for election by multiple-member wards, in other words, four, five or six or whatever it is, or three, to be elected at large within a particular community rather than by wards. You can even argue for proportionate representation if you go on a multi-member ward system. So a number of arrangements certainly are possible but I believe that the proposal we can take that are contained in Bill 62 represents an appropriate means of reconciling both the individual, neighbourhood and city-wide interests.

Now, with regard to the six communities, we do not believe that this change and this aspect of municipal electoral boundaries will diminish the citizens' sense of neighbourhood. Members opposite have come down firmly on both sides of the issue, with both feet planted on both sides. They agree that the size of council should be reduced. It seems there's no argument there, at least I haven't heard any. As a matter of fact, they may even think it should be smaller, I don't know. But, somehow, they argue, even though they agree to this reduction in size, they argue that the present community committee should be retained, and that the minimum number of councillors on a community committee should be four. Well, Mr. Speaker, 12 x 4 is 48. You either have a reduced council, or go back to 48. If you're going 48, you might as well say 50. So as I say, some members of the Opposition have come down firmly, squarely, with both feet on both sides of the issue.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it's mathematically impossible to do what is being suggested. If we reduce the size of council, then we have to reduce the number of wards, and therefore the number of community committees. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, if the new community committees were to take seriously their statutory responsibilities for encouraging citizens' awareness and participation in City affairs, then, Mr. Speaker, we would still have responsible government, we would still have response to neighbourhood concerns, we would still have response to the day-to-day concerns that people express, and that people would like to retain, and there's nothing in this bill which will alter that.

Mr. Speaker, we have made some changes which we think will improve the workings of the City. It will give them far greater control and authority on how to run their own affairs, in their own administrative structures, what committees will do, not prescribe for them, but what they shall do will be decided by council. What the administration shall do will be decided by council, the scope of their work, the scope of their responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, there's been some comment that somehow this particular bill is doing something to the Mayor. Mr. Speaker, I would remind members of the Act which is now the law. The Mayor is elected at large. The Mayor is the Chairman of EPC. But, Mr. Speaker, he is not a member of any other committee, and he cannot be a member of any other committee. Mr. Speaker, under these amendments the Mayor will be the only member of council, the only one, who by law, by statute, will have voice and vote on every committee of council at any time that he chooses to attend, whether every meeting, or only when certain issues are of concern to him. This bill recognizes that the Mayor is elected at large, and because he is elected at large, he brings to council a broader perspective than just the ward or community, and it is incumbent upon him to take that total view. That's why the bill today gives him access, and he's the only one who has access, to every committee that council may create, as well as to EPC.

I think it was mentioned that he has no power. Mr. Speaker, (a) he has a vote, he has voice, and the Mayor in every city in Canada has power by virtue of his electoral base. He has power because he speaks for the broad electorate, not a ward, not a community, but he speaks on behalf of the total city.

Tuesday, May 24, 1977

That has always been the Mayor's power. That has always been every Mayor's power. And that power, of course, is retained.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some amendments, which I hope to introduce, and I think those amendments will deal with some of the matters raised opposite. It will deal with some of the matters raised on this side of the House as well, because when I introduced the bill, Mr. Speaker, I indicated that I didn't claim to have all the answers — a matter of fact, there was no pat answer — and no one could say, with any assurance or confidence, that their design of a city was the ideal design. If that was the case, then we could have copied something that exists somewhere else, but I can tell you other jurisdictions are coming to Manitoba and are trying to now copy the City of Winnipeg bill that we have. Our form of government, our structure.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt the Minister. Can he give us indication what areas the amendments will be in before the vote is taken on second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Urban Affairs.

MR. MILLER: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the member is going to have to be a little patient. I'll bring them in at Law Amendments and we can discuss them there. There are a number of them, and I think they will clarify some things and therefore they will improve the bill to that extent.

Mr. Speaker, to finalize, I feel that this bill is simply the next logical step in the legislation which we introduced in 1971, and it became law in 1972. I think it will streamline the operations at City Hall; I think it will improve the relationship between the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba, and I can assure everyone that just as this government took the necessary steps to develop a rapport and a working arrangement with the City, to the benefit of the citizens of Winnipeg, this bill will strengthen it and improve it even more. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 35 senior students from the Rosholt High School from South Dakota. They're under the direction of Mr. L. Eggers. On behalf of honourable members, we welcome you.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Motion before the House is the adoption of second reading Bill No. 62, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

A STANDING VOTE WAS TAKEN the result being as follows:

YEAS: *Messrs. Adam, Axworthy, Barrow, Bostrom, Boyce, Burtniak, Derewianchuk, Desjardins, Dillen, Doern, Evans, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Malinowski, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Schreyer, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Uskiw, Walding.*

NAYS: *Messrs. Banman, Bilton, Brown, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, Lyon, McGill, McGregor, McKenzie, Minaker, Sherman, Steen, Watt, Wilson.*

MR. CLERK: Yeas 28; Nays 19.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion, the Ayes have it. I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

ESTIMATES — MINES, RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. William Jenkins (Logan): I would refer honourable members to Page 43 of their Estimates Book, Resolution 81 Administration (2) Salaries \$164,800.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. GEORGE MINAKER: Mr. Chairman I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise us what the SMY is for this division this year. Are we on (a)(1) or (a)(2), Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if we could just have a little less noise.

MR. MINAKER: We're on (a)(2) is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 81(a)(2). The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a reduction of one. In 1977-78 there are 11; in 1976-77 it's 12, so there is a reduction of one. The one that was reduced is that I had for some time an administrative assistant on environmental questions. That person has now been absorbed into the department as the secretary to the environmental review process but I believe it is a reduction of one. If you will note, 1976-77 it was 12 and we are now down to 11.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise prior to the new Minister of Renewable Resources' responsibility in the development of his staff looking after Renewable Resources, in this particular division, how many SMY were devoted to looking after the responsibilities of renewable resources and has there been a reduction in the staff since that transfer took place?

MR. GREEN: Well, yes, Mr. Chairman, there was a considerable reduction in our staff as a result of the change but you won't find those to any great extent in the administration section because the Minister's compensation, etc., would be entirely new, a new Deputy Minister is appointed and a new administration. Where you would find most of them is in the operations budget especially under Research, Land Use, etc. I will be able to and will get for the honourable member — because there was a paper on it at the time and it wouldn't be difficult to reconstruct — I will be able to give him the number of positions that were transferred from the Department of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management to the Department of Renewable Resources. I can't put my finger on it at this moment but I will get it for my honourable friend.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, then the Honourable Minister is saying that Administration under the portion, there wasn't any reduction when the responsibilities were changed with regard to Renewable Resources and that department had to set up its own administration of deputy ministers and so forth.

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say "no reduction." I said that you wouldn't find much of a reduction under Administration; you would find it more in Operations. There would be some administrative personnel that were also transferred over but the bigger number would be under the Operations section. However, my honourable friend, I think if he would be patient for some period, I will get the actual reduction for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(a)(2). The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to acknowledge the Minister. I had time to do research during the lunch hour on Friday and I didn't have a chance to get the floor to acknowledge the Minister was correct when he indicated that during his presentation of the Budget last year, he had indicated there would be forthcoming more dollars later on, a supplementary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(a)(2) \$164,800.00—pass; 81(a)(3) Other Expenditures — \$62,300.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise, are there any contract employees under this particular section? Would they be shown under Other Expenditures or what that would cover?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it is possible for contract employees to be located throughout the Administration. I am not sure that there are any under Other Expenditures, not in that particular appropriation. I merely indicate that it is possible but it doesn't happen to be under that particular appropriation. I can give him a list of the Other Expenditures in a moment just to give him an idea as to what falls under to this. . . \$100; Professional fees Office Equipment and Rental, \$1,200; Printing and Stationery, \$8,400; Postage, Telephone, and Telegraph, \$1,200; Computer Charges, \$2,000; Auto Rentals, \$1,100; Publications, \$500; Freight Express and Cartage, \$100; Travelling, \$11,400; Other Assessments, \$11,000; Other, that is than assessments, \$. . . ; Educational Assistance, \$300; Grants, \$25,000; for a total of \$62,300.00.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder then if the Honourable Minister could advise two questions I have, one, is there any contract employees that were under (b)(2), were they listed under there, or would they be shown always under Other Expenditures, or would they possibly come under the Salary section, as we go along? The other question I have is with regard to computer charges, will they be shown in different spots under Other Expenditures, or would that be the total lump sum for the section under Administration?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, they fall throughout the Administration, in other words, the Computer Services which I have read to you would be under Administration — Other Expenditures, and then when we come to Planning, you may find Computer Services under Other Expenditures again.

The other thing you asked about, (b) (2). I thought we are on (1)(a)(3), that is the list of Other Expenditures that I read to you, (1)(a)(3), that's right. (b) under Other Expenditures there would be a

similar list.

MR. MINAKER: My apologies, Mr. Chairman, I meant under (a)(2), was there any contract employees under that particular one?

MR. GREEN: Under (a)(2) I am advised that there are no contract employees, not that there couldn't be, but that there don't happen to be any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(a)(3) Other Expenditures \$62,30081/—pass. (b)(1) Administrative Services, (1) Salaries and Wages, \$427,900. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could advise what the SMY is, as compared to last year. I notice that in the Estimates that we approved last year there was something like \$350,500 for Salaries and Wages, there seems to be a 17 percent increase to what is shown here this year, I guess, which would relate to the Supplementary Budget. Also, I notice, there is another 16 percent increase as compared to that other increase, to 427. I was wondering what the increase in staff was required for, etc.

MR. GREEN: The SMYs for 1977-78, 32.26; 1976-77, 32.26, exactly the same. The increases, the reason for the increase, there will be a general salary adjustment, \$26,700; the collective agreement of \$30,900; you see the salary adjustment is what is flowing as a result of the old agreement, the \$30,000 is the result of the new agreement, with a total increase of \$57,600 in salaries. Nothing to do with increased staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(b)(1) Salaries and Wages, \$427,900—pass; (b)(2) Other Expenditures, \$99,900.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister advise if there is computer charges under this section as well as the other?

MR. GREEN: I'll have that list of Other Expenditures in a moment, but there would be computer charges in it. Fringe benefits, \$100; Furniture and Furnishing, \$2,900; Printing and Stationery, \$14,700; Postage, \$900; Rental of commercial aircraft, \$500; Computer related expenditures, \$60,200; Automobiles, \$1,100; Advertising, \$600; Publications, \$2,800; Travel \$8,600; Miscellaneous, \$500; Educational Assistance, \$7,000.00.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, then who would be collecting these expenditures with regard to computer charges? Who is the main supplier of computers?

MR. GREEN: We could buy them from the Manitoba Telephone System Computer Services; we could buy them from Cybershare; we could buy them from anybody supplying computer services. This particular group is Manitoba Data Services which is the MTS, I gather, it is the central computer service of the government. There are no private or other Crown corporations in this particular item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(b)(2) Other Expenditures — \$99,900.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I forget to ask a question with regard to (b)(1). I don't know if you will permit it or not, are there any contract employees in that section?

MR. GREEN: Under (1)?

MR. MINAKER: Yes. Not under 12(1)(b). No contract employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(b) Other Expenditures \$99,900— pass; 81(c) Manitoba Water Commission (1) Salaries and Wages \$30,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$22,300.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's not necessary for the Honourable Minister to recite all of the expenditures. I just wondered if there are any computer charges in that particular section.

MR. GREEN: No computer charges in that one.

MR. MINAKER: Are there any contract employees in there?

MR. GREEN: No contract employees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 81(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$22,300—pass; (d) Clean Environment Commission (1) Salaries and Wages \$108,300— pass. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: I'm sorry, we're on 82(a)(1) now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 81(d)(1) Salaries and Wages \$108,300.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Honourable Minister can advise, with the new Act being approved last year, where some of the responsibilities of decision with regard to spraying and also with regard to operation of land-fill sites being left to the various communities as long as they didn't infringe or go beyond the boundaries, has that constituted any reduction in the amount of energies or staff requirements?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe so. If we will take the statistics: 1976—hearings held 38; meetings held 33; orders issued 132. 1975— hearings held 36; meetings held 49; orders issued 112. Orders varied 10 in 1976; orders issued regarding cleanups 2; hearings regarding abatement projects 1; investigative hearings held 4.

Now, I would think that the 1977 figures will not be substantially reduced from that and I guess we

would only know by the 1977 figures whether there has been a real change. But the Clean Environment Commission is really so far from dealing with all of the individual emission problems in the Province of Manitoba that one phase of it, that is insecticides, would not substantially reduce their works. The honourable member will appreciate that the Clean Environment Commission, with regard to previous levels of emissions, is only dealing with matters as they can get to them. There are many many people who do not have orders at the present time who are not considered to be against breaking the law, but whom the Clean Environment Commission can subsequently deal with. I don't believe that the insecticide regulation has greatly altered the amount of work that is being done by the Clean Environment Commission. They are short a member now and they have been asking me for some period of time to replace him because of the work load so I don't think that they are finding that they have much less to do.

MR. MINAKER: I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise if there are any contract employees under this particular

MR. GREEN: No, not in that item. And we'll just get the Other Expenditures to see if there are any computer services in one second. There are no contract employees and there are no computer services. —(Interjection)—

MR. GREEN: In the Clean Environment, that's . right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 81(d)(1) Salaries and Wages \$108,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$105,200—pass. Resolution 82 Environmental Management (a) Administration (1) Salaries and Wages \$259,700.00. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, in the Annual Report for the Department, on Page, I believe it is 15 of the Report, there is an indication that the Garrison Diversion Project in North Dakota is receiving special attention in that the staff allocations were made to ensure that potentially harmful effects on Manitoba waters are identified and brought to the notice of the appropriate authorities. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could advise how many permanent staff time has been devoted to the Garrison Development Project.

MR. GREEN: I will have to get the actual figures but I know, Mr. Chairman, that we did have a problem with regard to our allocation of staff with regard to this diversion in two respects. We had to allocate people to the International Joint Commission Study Board and I would estimate that Mr. Weber's time for that period of time — which may have been a full year — could have been 25 to 35 percent allocated to that study board, and that would also be true of people working with Mr. Weber, Mr. Ness Mudry and others. Mr. McKay, I hope I am not diminishing the importance of the individuals by failing to know all of their names but I would say that three people were fully allocated to the study board for as much as half a year and we were of the opinion that this being an international problem, that the Federal Government should be the main source of funds for the payment of these people for that time.

Now, there was a federal contribution as well because their people were allocated to the study board and there was some allocation of funds to the province, but, any suggestion that the province was not called upon to play a major financial role in both the work which was done to the International Joint Commission, that is, the allocation of people to the study board, and within our own resources, that is, the work that we did studying data, etc., is not correct. To this study board, I would say three people for pretty close to half a year. Other work in the department would be pretty difficult to sift out because they are in various areas, wildlife, water purity, statistics, etc., but there was a major effort on the part of people in our department in this area of work which was not paid for by the Federal Government. I can try, and if I can't give it to my honourable friend I can certainly give it to him even after the session is over, to get an assessment as to what was done throughout the system on Garrison, but, it's a little difficult to give it to him at the moment. What I can tell him is that three people were allocated for up to half a year.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, also on that same page, there is an indication that the Clean Environment Commission provides some support services to the Manitoba Environmental Council in provincial programs in co-operation with municipal and federal government agencies. I am wondering, do they provide it automatically or are they requested? Do they only do it when they are referred and who makes the referral to them?

MR. GREEN: With regard to the Environmental Council, we started it. In other words, that was initiated departmentally, we provided them with office space and a full-time secretary, I think, virtually a full-time secretary at the present time in Mr. Keleher. We did that automatically, I think is the word that the honourable member used, and now we have a request every year and we still do it on request, but the requests are much higher than what we do. They continue to believe that the Environmental Council should be staffed-up like our department and we continue to tell them that it won't be. That as far as we are concerned, the Environmental Council is a citizen's group. Most citizens' groups are self-initiated and I have tried to indicate this to the Environmental Council, that that the Fishermen's Association, the Consumers' Associations, etc., they are self-initiated and generally get a pretty nominal level of public support. This citizen's group gets a fairly substantial

level of public support. If the honourable member will go down the figures he will see that under 12(2)(g) Manitoba Environmental Council is \$42,000.00. Approved 1977-78, \$45,000.00. Well, we give the Fishermen's Federation maybe \$7,000 or \$8,000, you know, \$5,000; we give the Forestry Service a donation of some — I can't remember the figure but it might be between \$5,000 and \$10,000.00. Now, here's a group that's getting \$45,000 in services. It's true, we are the ones who hire the services, they work in our staff, but I do not believe that there would be any suggestion that they aren't fully at the disposal of, and completely without any allegiance to — putting it mildly — the government. They operate completely on their own and like to think of themselves as the great confronters of the Manitoba Government. They believe that is their style. I'm not going to argue with that, that's the way they choose to make their positions strongest.

MR. MINAKER: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if, rather than repeat the questions, the Honourable Minister could have his staff, when we come to Salaries or to Other Expenditures, if they could indicate whether or not the amount of SMY included as compared to last year, and if there are any contract employees in that particular section, and the computer cost. Then I won't have to repeat asking those particular questions.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would look at the 12 Item, the total SMY for 1977-78 is 194.13. Total SMY for 1976-77 is 193.13, an increase of one SMY over the total department. I would think that that one relates to the environmental review process. I've guessed correctly. That's the one that I referred to earlier which was a reduction from a previous administration, so even that addition, Mr. Chairman — the honourable member is wondering about this "stand patism" — even that one addition has been cleaned off another appropriation. If you look at the previous appropriation, we were one less, in this one, we are one more.

With regard to Computer Services, I'm going to ask Mr. Podolsky to get them under each item that we have in Other Expenditures, and when they come up, I'll give them to him. Or maybe I'll give them to him at the end of the item. I'll give him the total Computer Services under each heading. And contract employees as well. Of course, the 193.13 SMY — there will be some in that 193 employees. We'll find out how many.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I have a question under this Environmental Management that I wonder if the Minister could give an answer to. It's something that has developed over the weekend. There has been much publicity about the dumping of milk throughout various parts of this province, and probably if I could shed some light on the story and then pose my question to the Minister.

I'm given to understand, Sir, that on the weekend, the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board phoned the various companies under the jurisdiction of Manco, that they were to collect the milk from farmers, and having done that, they were supposed to dump it. One particular manager I know in the area which I represent, Pilot Mound — and you know Pilot Mound has been famous in dairy subjects in the past few years — was asking me if this dumping of milk should become a pollution problem under the Clean Environment Act, whose responsibility is it? So I am wondering about this, Mr. Chairman. The Milk Producers Marketing Board instruct Manco, that is, that industry, to dump the milk, and I say — it could be somewhat hypothetical — but if the plant at Pilot Mound suddenly found their trucks loaded with milk, they're supposed to dump them and found they had no place to dump it, and if they were to dump the milk on the front street in Pilot Mound, there's a pollution problem involved.

I would like to ask the Minister, whose responsibility is it, the Manitoba Milk Producers Marketing Board, or is it the industry that is processing cheese, Manco? I'm wondering whose responsibility is it.

MR. GREEN: I would have no difficulty in saying that whoever dumped the milk would be responsible, if there was a pollution problem. I am fairly satisfied that, not that I am looking for this as a plus, that the milk would not be a pollution problem, particularly when it is dumped as I saw it being done on empty fields. As a matter of fact the honourable member will be aware that we handled the drought this year, he'll have to admit that we handled it with tremendous intelligence and perhaps the milk will be a feature in the drought as well.

I'm given a note which says the only pollution effect is the depletion of oxygen in water, and I do not believe that has been the practice in the dumping of the milk.

The honourable member raises a question which I would think is a phenomenon which is always regrettable in any free market system, that there sometimes is an argument between the producers, the people who are selling and the people who are buying. You will have had the same type of dumping or the same type of non-productivity when a group of employees decides that they are not getting enough money for their labour and the employer refuses to pay them any more, and then you have a lack of productive capacity for the time that it takes them to come to arrangements as to the price which is going to be paid and the amount which is going to be accepted. That is a phenomenon with regard to milk, it's a phenomenon with regard to many other products, including human labour.

which is also dumped and non-productive when it's not being purchased.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I enter the debate just briefly because I'm somewhat puzzled by the Minister's assurance that dumping milk can in no way constitute a pollution problem, because it would seem to me that I recall some time ago, a year ago or two years ago, when the same body, the Clean Environment Commission, issued instructions to some of the same plants that the dumping of part of the product of milk, namely whey, could, and in fact did constitute a pollution problem, and in fact, that argument was further advanced and used by his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, as one of the reasons why the government should enter into the milk processing business, the whey processing business and put forward the concept of the Crocus plant construction. I'm somewhat puzzled because the Minister has just indicated to us that dumping the whole product, milk, cannot constitute a pollution problem. Dumping part of the problem, simply the whey, it has been suggested to these same cheese processors, that they had better clean up their act because it's a pollution program. And in fact, that argument was used, with some effect, although not successfully, to enter into a different venture, namely Crocus Foods.

Maybe the Minister can explain to me, from his agricultural background and from his environmental background, how one cannot pollute if you dump the whole product on the land, but if you dump only part of the product on the land, then that constitutes a grave pollution problem.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has made the answer, that the dumping of all of it may not constitute a pollution problem, and I rather suspect it wouldn't if it's dumped on land, milk, whereas the dumping of part of it could constitute a pollution problem. That is the answer. The fact is that when one drinks liquids, they do not pollute one's body, but then the kidney works at taking out all of the impurities in that liquid and distributes a very very concentrated type of commodity which is a pollution problem, and the very same thing could be the case with regard to milk, that whey is a problem, pollution-wise, and the total milk product dumped on the land is not.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to extend the debate, but perhaps the Minister and I can agree that possibly it's not a pollution problem at all but rather a distribution problem, and perhaps even a moral problem.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, there is always the argument between environmentalists themselves, as to whether sufficient dilution removes the pollution altogether. Although some of them say, absolutely not, I can't see that argument as holding any water. Eventually the assimilative qualities of the so-called clean air, if there is enough of it, will take some pollution. The honourable member's cigarette is now letting smoke up into the air. If it was confined to a very very small quantity of air, I am sure it would constitute a much more serious problem than with the assimilative qualities of the total air. I will admit that I'm not certainly sure of the pollutive contaminant qualities of pure milk that was going to be sold to the dairies. I rather suspect that that is not a problem, whereas whey does constitute a problem, and I don't think that any of the cheese factories would disagree that it constitutes a problem.

Once you take the whey and use it in a different way, let us say by spreading it over fields rather than putting it into a sewage system, then it may have beneficial rather than polluttional qualities. Yes, I agree.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I posed the question to the Minister and I would like further clarification on his justification in the answer he's given me. I posed the question in such a way that one jurisdiction is giving instructions to another to do a certain thing and that jurisdiction who was told to do that certain thing, namely, could contaminate and that as a pollutant is going to be responsible for that action. I'd like to know how the Minister justifies his answer to me that that is so.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what jurisdictions the honourable member is talking about. If he is talking about the Manitoba Agricultural Marketing Board, if it is the one that is putting milk into the air, land or water, then it is the one that was responsible for the pollutant. If it is telling one of its agencies to do it, then it is still responsible, or it and its agent is responsible. But I really think this is a rather white herring, rather than a red one, because it has not been brought to my attention, any contaminant problem with respect to the dumping of milk.

I think it's a problem. I think it's a problem when good, nutritious food is dumped, rather than made available to people who would want it. But, Mr. Speaker, that has not been a selected problem in the Province of Manitoba. The honourable member will remember years ago when the west did not want to buy coffee that they had a song about it, "There's an Awful Lot of Coffee in Brazil", and they were dumping it into the ocean because we wouldn't pay the price that they wanted for it. And for years we have taken wheat out of production, which is the same thing as dumping it. We've taken wheat out of production, paid farmers not to plant wheat, in the United States and in Canada, and there have been people in the world starving for wheat. So if one wants to look at this problem in its isolated nature, one can do so. But the fact is that the market system has not found how to bring good resources to people who need them. That is not the single problem in the province of Manitoba. That has been a world problem for many many years, and has repeated itself in many many places.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I can see I could pursue this point and I would get a response probably five or ten minutes longer each time the Minister stands up. So I will leave it at that. He has not definitely confirmed, when he talks about a white herring, as to whether the Milk Producers Marketing Board is responsible, or whether the processing industry is responsible.

I would like to pursue one other question, Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor, and ask the Minister if he could inform me as to how things are progressing in the Town of Holland, where the Clean Environment Commission did meet with the group of people there in regard to their lagoon. I wonder if that has been settled, or could the Minister make any report on that.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, if they're holding a hearing with regard to the use of a lagoon in Holland, I have no involvement at all until the Clean Environment Commission makes an order. The Environmental Protection Branch could appear before the Commission and tell the Commission what it thinks with regard to the lagoon, but if it's a hearing with regard to the use of a lagoon, then I have no involvement in it until the Clean Environment Commission makes an order and somebody appeals that order. The honourable member has not understood, I have repeated it many years in this House, that I do not direct the Clean Environment Commission. The Clean Environment Commission is a quasi judicial board that hears evidence, and I have no involvement in the decisions of that Commission until they are appealed, after a decision is made.

If that's what is occurring in Holland — I am not sure — if the Clean Environment Commission is holding a hearing, then I have no involvement. If it is our department helping them to deal with the lagoon, then I will have some information on that when we come to that item of the Appropriations, which I believe is under Water Control.

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

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise us what kind of co-ordination his department has, say, with the City of Winnipeg's department. Because I know, in listening to the discussion with regard to the dumping of milk into the sewers, I know the City of Winnipeg has a standard that it allows industrial waste to enter the sewage system under a standard rate, and then they have an escalating surcharge depending on the amount of pollution.

I'm wondering, how does the Minister's department recognize this fact that you have, say, a city body regulating some of the standards with regard to pollution because it ends up being treated through its sewage plant, whereas in another case, in the case of Holland, it could be dumped in a field or into the sewer system. What kind of a correlation is there between the two with regard to standards of the quality that they will allow to be dumped without considering it a polluting effect; and also, what kind of co-ordination is there with regard to inspection, particularly say in the City of Winnipeg, where the city department has some of its own inspections and its own department officials looking after this. I've raised quite a few questions at this point on this subject. I have a further one.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, water within the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg, in my impression that is, is the legislative jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg, so they've set their own standards and what have you.

With regard to sewage treatment, etc., we have a responsibility for trying to co-ordinate our programs with regard to water quality, let us say north of the City of Winnipeg, with a program which is undertaken by the City of Winnipeg. It was the province many years ago, prior to this government, initiated the program whereby Metro government was to have all its raw sewage put through treatment facilities rather than dumped into the Red River, and I think it is only a year and a half ago or so that that became 100 percent in the City of Winnipeg.

We don't have a direct liaison between the Environmental Committee of the City of Winnipeg because that deals with many more features than the contamination of the air, land or water. The Environment Committee of the City of Winnipeg deals with zoning and other such matters which are much broader than contaminants. On all other questions relating to standards of water purity, air purity, etc., we have — my impression is — very close co-operation between our technical people and the technical people of the City of Winnipeg, and I can't think of any issues where there has been difficulties resulting in anything coming further than the technical people with the exception of one, and that is, water quality north of Winnipeg after it leaves the treatment plant. We were talking to them whether there is a possibility of getting up to a still higher level of water quality, bringing down the number of contaminants than the city has already done by their present treatment facilities.

The City of Winnipeg and the province are engaged in a joint study on disposable wastes in the City of Winnipeg — a long term study, yes, on the question of waste disposal. I believe that that will deal with their land-fill facilities, their incineration facilities. I can't think that there has been any areas of jurisdictional dispute with the exception of the use of pesticides, which has been dealt with in the last session of the Legislature.

MR. MINAKER: If I understand the Honourable Minister correctly then, his department and he himself are satisfied with the co-ordination that has been going on to date with regard to the control, at least, of the water quality within the City of Winnipeg, which the Minister has indicated is a direct

responsibility of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, by and large there has been, I believe, good co-operation. I have indicated several areas where there are ongoing discussions and on which there may be disagreements. But they are not disagreements of such a nature that I consider them a problem, the question of water quality north of Winnipeg, the pesticides, insecticides, the feud which my honourable friend is just as aware of as I am, and we are engaged in a waste management study. In other respects I think there has been generally good — well, in those respects as well as in other respects, I think there has been good co-operation between the two departments.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I understand, if I remember correctly, the quality of say the Red River coming into the City is monitored continually — I believe it still is — and it is monitored as it leaves the Red and I believe also the Assiniboine is monitored as it enters into Winnipeg. Is it still being continually monitored on an hourly basis or, you know, a daily basis?

MR. GREEN: It is monitored, I don't know that it is hourly but it is monitored fairly regularly. The last time that I know it came up was when they were discussing the Selkirk water supply and it was certainly determined that the water as it leaves Winnipeg is not of that standard of purity which is demanded federally for drinking water and, therefore, there are treatment facilities in Selkirk. I believe that it is monitored on a daily basis fairly frequently. In any case, it continues to be monitored.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, then has the Minister's department been able to see any indication because of the low level of flow in the river during the wintertime as well as this early spring, prior to some of this rain that we are now getting, in the Red River has there been any noticeable increase in any of the parameters that are considered as affecting the water quality of the river itself and has the Minister's department noticed any changes say in the Assiniboine River which was flowing relatively low? As he indicated earlier in reference to his discussion with the Honourable Member for Lakeside about a cigarette being confined to a small place that it could be considered pollutant but being diluted, it wasn't, and we were just wondering the fact that the amount of sewage that is being dumped into say the Assiniboine from various towns and cities along the way, similarly to the south of us on the Red River, if there has been any noticeable change in the river quality of the water?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that there is regular monitoring. I have not been aware that the low flows have resulted in any particular problems to be watched but I will check that for my honourable friend. I will take that question as notice to determine whether there are any serious things to watch for as a result of the lower flows in both the Red and the Assiniboine.

I was previously asked about the — I'm sorry the Member for Lakeside is not here — I was asked about the pollution problems with regard to milk and I am advised that the assimilative capacity of the soil for products such as milk is normally sufficient to handle the dumping of milk. In some cases, when really large amounts are dumped, it is necessary to restrict the amount dumped per acre. This is not considered to be the case with the dumping that took place over the weekend.

I am also advised, for the Member for Rock Lake, that the Holland sewage lagoon is being advertised for objections or no objections to proceed. I gather, advertised by the Clean Environment Commission who are holding a hearing. If that's the case, then I tell the honourable member I have no role to play in that until there is an appeal from the order of the Clean Environment Commission. What there will be is, there will be technical people likely from our department who will advise the Commission their views as professional people as to what the effect of the sewage lagoon would have but I don't have a role to play in that and it is a matter which is before the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his information. I am aware that he doesn't directly have a role but the Clean Environment Commission comes under his department and that's why he's the one I posed the question to as to where this thing stands, the hearing. That's all I wanted to know. I'm fully aware of his position as far as the department goes.

MR. GREEN: If he's merely asking me for the state of it rather than what our activities are, the state of it is that they have advertised for what we call a hearing so that the Clean Environment can set limits with regard to the sewage lagoon.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, getting back to the co-ordination of standards in terms of quality of water in the rivers and lakes and so forth, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can advise us the fact that the City of Winnipeg's waste and the Town of Selkirk and many of the other cities and towns in our province end up being dumped into Lake Winnipeg, is there a board of representatives that looks at the quality of the Lake Winnipeg water because it is quite a large recreational lake serving many people during the summertime as well as settlements along it? What kind of co-ordination is there with regard to the quality and the continual measurement of the quality of water in the lake?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, that's our responsibility and I believe that I signed today a recommendation for an agreement between the Federal and Provincial Governments with regard to a comprehensive water quality study of Lake Winnipeg which would involve an expenditure of \$2.6

million over a period of five years to make sure that we are maintaining and, if not, that we take proper steps to deal with the problem of Lake Winnipeg. But when he asks whose responsibility, I think that that is the responsibility of the Environmental Protection Branch who is looking after it; it is the administration of the branch, it is not a board. I would have to say that it comes under the responsibility of the Minister.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, and I have had occasion to say this outside the province, when we start talking about what terrible things the Garrison Diversion will do and when we set the parameters as to what we think others should do, we have to be very careful about being properly protective ourselves because the City of Winnipeg made a considerable noise about the Garrison Diversion, made a considerable presentation before the International Joint Commission. I am rather of the opinion — and I am going to ask my officials to listen to see whether I am saying anything horrendous — that what we in Winnipeg do, not the City of Winnipeg, we Winnipeggers do to the water north of the City of Winnipeg would be equal to or worse than what the Garrison Diversion would do to Souris water. I am getting a nod so I guess I haven't made an outrageous statement. The domestic use of water by the City of Winnipeg and the way in which we handle our secondary treatment, etc., is not less of a problem than what would be caused by the Garrison Diversion to waters in the Souris. For this reason, we have continued to talk to the City of Winnipeg about trying to continually improve the level of water quality after it leaves Winnipeg. Their consideration is financial. How much do you want to do? Do you want to be able to drink the water as it leaves Winnipeg? Do you want to be able to swim in it? I believe that what is able to be done now without any problem is boating and normal recreational use but use for fishing or use for swimming is still a problem just because of what the City of Winnipeg does to the water and less this be considered to be a criticism of the City of Winnipeg, it isn't. The City of Winnipeg has pretty good primary and secondary treatment facilities.

The question of whether there should be tertiary treatments and then — is there a word after tertiary, or whatever it is? This infection. But the people who have been concerned with the Garrison, look to what we do at home. I am not suggesting that that's an excuse for the Garrison or that we shouldn't take as strong a position as we have been taking but that is a fact for those Winnipeggers, and particularly councillors who have been wanting to become part of the presentation, which is fine. I have gone down to the United States several times and in my arguments against the Garrison Diversion, I have not been attempting to adopt a "holier than thou" position. I say, yes we do these things at home and we recognize that they will be done but where there is a treaty involved, and we are entitled to the protection of that treaty, we are going to invoke it and that's what we have done but it is not as if the Americans are doing some terrible thing. They are doing a normal irrigation type program which happens to affect us and which we have a right to complain about but if I was a member of the North Dakota Legislature I am fairly certain that I would consider this to be a normal program. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, if there was no boundary between the north and the south and we were all entitled to whatever benefits came from the program, as well as being a recipient of adverse flows, then I could not in conscience say that I wouldn't have to consider the program differently.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Minister then. He indicated that Lake Winnipeg water appears to be safe to swim in and I think he said to fish in. I am wondering what is the quality of the water with regard to the actual consumption of it. I know in some areas, like I believe down in Victoria Beach and some of those resort areas where they draw the water right from the lake, to what degree is this safe and can we ever expect to have water from the lake that can be consumed?

MR. GREEN: I wouldn't want to say that the water should be drawn from the lake for drinking water without treatment at all. The water that we get from Shoal Lake is probably much cleaner than Lake Winnipeg and we treat it before we drink it here in Winnipeg, from Indian Bay. I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I was in charge of the camp at Town Island on Lake of the Woods that the water was clear as a bell but every morning I as director of the camp would have to go to the water tower and put a teaspoon into Javex — Javex, that was the chemical that we used — but not do anything more than wet the teaspoon, I wouldn't even put any discernable quantity in, and put the teaspoon into the water tower and treat it with chlorine for the purpose of killing the bacteria before drinking it. On the other hand, my own cottage was connected direct to the lake and the water came in by pump directly into our kitchen and it was supposed to be for drinking water — not for drinking water, for dishes and for boiling, etc., but I drank it but that was my responsibility and I would not say to other people that they should drink that water. That was much clearer than Lake Winnipeg.

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I could continue on in this questioning. I appreciate the Honourable Minister's answer with regard to how he treated his water and we know that it can be treated with some kind of addition of chlorine to it but is the coliform count, or the bug count in layman terms, to such a level in the lake that even by trying to treat it with say chlorine or very simple filtering might cause a hazard to the health of people who consume the water?

The other question I have, Mr. Chairman, is, has the Minister's department had pressures from the Federal Government or agencies to do something about looking into the quality of the water of Lake

Winnipeg or otherwise they might have to take over control of the situation?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I didn't properly answer the honourable member's question. There is no problem about, at least as I understand it, swimming in Lake Winnipeg. It's a safe lake. With regard to the use of water for drinking purposes, that should always be a matter of clearing it with the health officials and with the municipality you happen to be in.

With regard to pressures, pressures have been directed both ways. We have been involved in trying to get the Federal Government to look at Lake Winnipeg as well, so it is not as if we have been pressured into doing this under some type of threat. We are concerned with water quality in various places and we have induced, if you will have it, which is a nicer word than pressures, the Federal Government to be involved in this water quality study of Lake Winnipeg which, I believe, is all done except for the signing of the agreement where it is being presented to Cabinet tomorrow for an Order in Council which will permit the signing of the agreement which is \$2,600,000.00. Is that money in here? Do we have that money in these Estimates? We will probably have to do the same thing as we did last year and that is ask for supplementary supply for that money.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, as we all know, Lake Winnipeg is a very important body of water in our province and I don't know — is it the 13th largest in the world, or something like that? — but has the Minister considered some kind of co-ordinated effort between say, the federal agency and the City of Winnipeg and its own department, of technical people to look at this. Not a board of political appointees, but has there been any thought given to using the knowledge that has been gained by people, say in the City of Winnipeg, through their knowledge of pollution with regard to sewage waste, and say, his own department and possibly the federal department to try and see if what's happening to Lake Winnipeg can be corrected. Has any thought or ideas been put into that?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, yes. I believe that the study that we are now engaged in would involve technical people from all categories to co-ordinate the intelligence for the use of the lake. I am not a fan of having it done by a joint jurisdictional board. I believe we are responsible, and we should be held responsible. We can get aid from the Federal Government, we can get technical assistance from the City of Winnipeg, but, once you split it up into three jurisdictions you tend to find that the process is complicated by what each jurisdiction is saying. I wouldn't be terribly unhappy — although it would be a blow to somebody's pride — if it was the federal jurisdiction that said that we are going to try to look after Lake Winnipeg. Then we could criticize them or make whatever representations, but they would do it. But I think that the program that we have now would still be under our jurisdiction, if that's my understanding of Federal-Provincial agreements, although they come in and they say, "We have jurisdiction over fisheries, or legislation with regard to fisheries." Although they have made the province the sole legislative authority with regard to payments for fisheries, they come in and talk about their own jurisdiction over fisheries.

Yes, co-ordination amongst the three groups, but an attempt to see to it that responsibility for the final decisions or actions rests with one jurisdiction, which I believe is now with the Province of Manitoba.

The honourable member wanted to know how many contract employees, there are 12 contracts in this Appropriation No. 12 all the way down the line. Appropriation 12(2). Yes, that goes from 12 to (2)(g) I believe. There are 12 contract employees. The Couter charges — and I'm going to read the only places that they're at. Yes, Subsection 12, Subsection 2, Resolution 82, Appropriation No. 12(2)(a) and the amounts of Computer charges are under 12(2)(b) \$87,100, under 12(2)(f) \$400.00. Total under 12(2) \$87,500 and 12 contract employees. .

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Talking about the environment and pollution, we could perhaps start right in the building here by preventing smoking of cigars and cigarettes. There are times when it's difficult to sit in Committee, in Room 254, for some of us who object and who are sensitive to smoke inhalation. But that's not what I got up to speak of.

The member was talking about water quality, and I recall, perhaps over 50 years ago, when I was just a young lad, there was a person who came to Crane River, where we were living at the time, and at that time I doubt whether there was a well in the area. Everybody depended on the good water of Lake Manitoba for drinking and for food. This particular fellow went out to the lake and got a sale of water and brought it over to the store, my father's place of business, and took one drop of water and pressed it between two pieces of glass and put it in his microscope and asked my father to look through at this water — I don't know how much supply of water you'd have between two pieces of glass — but the little drop of water was just swarming with little creatures, and some of them were ugly little monsters. I recall very well that there was a fellow by the name of Robert MacKay, just passed away, in fact, just a short while ago at the age of 92, and he said to bert, "Come and have a look at this water that you're drinking." He took a look at this water that was just swarming with little creatures, only a little minute drop of water, and Mr. MacKay really got upset. He said, "You mean to tell me we're drinking all these little creatures."

Now, I don't know whether the little creatures are harmful or not, probably they're beneficial to us. There are still a lot of people who depend on lake water for water for drinking purposes and for food

purposes.

I want, perhaps to make a comment on the quality of rivers that are man-polluted, our bodies of water, lakes, rivers, and so on. I was going to ask the Minister, if the department is, or has attempted to obtain information from say, places like the Soviet Union, where I understand they have made great strides in changing their polluted waters. They have reversed the process of the increase of pollution. I have read a few articles on what they have done there on some of the major lakes that had gotten to a very high state of pollution, and where the government in fact, even closed down major plants in the area of these lakes in order to stop pollution. That is one area that I did read a very, very enlightening article on, and more recently, I believe within the last month, I did watch a television program on the Soviet Union where they had reversed the pollution on the Volga River, which is a major tributary in the Soviet Union. In fact, they had completely reversed the ongoing increase of pollution. In fact, there had been a heavy depletion of fish population, particularly sturgeon which is a very prized species all over the world, not only in the Soviet Union, the roe of which sells for around \$200 a pound, caviar, in New York in the United States.

They have reversed the trend of pollution on the Volga River, and I understand, according to this program that I did see, was that the sturgeon population had bounced back, the water quality is much improved, the fishery of the sturgeon has increased. Perhaps we should take a lesson from other jurisdictions in finding out what is the higher priority, industry or pollution. Perhaps we should look at this a little more closely as to what the effects, and where we are really going with our lifestyle.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has posed the question which is only soluble on the basis of judgment, because it's not one or the other. It can't be. The fact is that I'm not sure of what has happened in the Soviet Union, but I can tell him that, in these jurisdictions, we have attempted to, in some cases, turn back the clock against the people who are engaged in pollution. I indicated the situation with the City of Winnipeg, which was probably the biggest polluter in the Province of Manitoba, *vis-a-vis* the Red River, up until the time that it started to engage in secondary and tertiary treatment of its sewage.

It's also the case that both Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting and Inco have been put under much more severe restrictions with regard to pollution of the air than existed previously. I'm not suggesting that that means that everything that can be done has been done.

Abitibi has still not obtained its pollution limits from the Clean Environment Commission on a final type of way. They are presently involved in studying what is happening with regard to that situation, with regard to the air.

The water standards are set by the Federal Government, and both Abitibi and The Pas complex have been asked to come under them. I know that The Pas made a considerable improvement, the Churchill Forest Industry, made a considerable improvement when the plant was first taken under receivership, but I still think that there are other improvements that have to be made.

In the last analysis the honourable member will have to accept the fact that there is not going to be purity one way or the other. It's not going to be a question of whether we can have industry or purity, we're going to have to have government adopt such standards for industry that the problems that will be associated with it will be such, / as in the society, judgment of society are capable of being handled. And that judgment will be continually a question of argument. I accept the fact that some people will be saying that the standards are too high, and some people will be saying that the standards are too low.

We have adopted the principle that the standards will be such as the Clean Environment Commission comes up with, with final appeal to the government, but I don't think we have reduced those standards. In many cases — somebody will have to correct me if I'm wrong — but I don't think that we have reduced any standards that have been set by the Clean Environment Commission, we've altered them to a certain extent. I know we altered the steel workers' standard, and we altered the standards that have been set once, with regard to insecticides by the City of Winnipeg. In some cases, we have been a little tougher than the Commission, although I don't think we would say that the Commission has been lenient.

The problem will be a continual one, and I would be one to agree with the honourable member that we have to place a higher value on clean environment than has been placed in the past, and that we have to reduce the level of value that we have sought to industrial development. The scale has to be tipped in the other direction. But, I'm not one to say that there will be no permission to alter the environment as a result of industrial development, because there will be some changes, and I hope that we'll be able to satisfy my honourable friend that the changes are ones which we can live with, given the fact that man will alter his environment in order to attempt to provide for his more material comfort. That is not something that I don't think can be reversed.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess we could probably argue this for some length of time, and probably for months and perhaps years. I believe, my own personal feeling is, that it's not good enough. It's not good enough to permit, to allow permission to pollute so much. We keep issuing permits, yes, okay, ManFor or Abitibi, or whatever, you are allowed to pollute so much in our environment, and then the next firm that comes along, you issue another permit. You are allowed to

pollute so much, and you keep repeating this process until you have something that becomes unmanageable. I don't think it's good enough to say, look we're going to issue a permit to put out so much effluent or whatever it is into a stream, such as we have witnessed on the Great Lakes.

Just recently, I think it was yesterday or the day before, they were showing another program of the amount of pollution that's going into the Great Lakes. I forget what lake it is, whether it's Lake Erie—the Americans are contributing a great deal to this pollution as well. But I think it's just not good enough. The Minister said that we are tougher on some occasions. I think it would be better to be tougher than less tough. We do have to do something.

Perhaps, again — I didn't get an answer on my first question as to whether we are finding out information from the Soviets or any other jurisdiction on how they handle and tackle this problem. I think it's time that we do something. Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the last question, I'm not aware that we have any direct contact with the Soviets. I am aware that the scientific community is in contact with each other. For instance, the United Nations met in the Argentine, I happened to be fortunate enough to be present, and the documentation is available to everybody, so therefore we have, in the international community, a fairly good liaison between its scientists. I'm not aware that we have something particular to learn from the Soviet Union, although I'm not saying that we don't. I'm not aware that we have, but I would expect that our scientific community, in our branch, is trying to keep pace with everybody.

With regard to the other question, that it's not enough to issue a permit, the honourable member will be aware that we changed the legislation, at least psychologically, to say that we do not issue permits to pollute, we issue orders which limit the amount of contaminants that can be released by somebody into the air, land or water. I see no alternative to that, Mr. Chairman. I don't know of any human activity which does not result in some alteration of environmental qualities. We couldn't, for instance, say that people will not live in houses and use plumbing. We can't say that because if we did that, then the outdoor privies would have a worse environmental effect. So we do have to try to set standards which nature can absorb without damaging the environment, and our attempt is to set standards which the assimilative quality is what nature can deal with. I will concede to the honourable member that it's a question of judgment as to what standard will be accepted, and I will agree with him that we should lean to the protection end rather than to permission end. I will agree with that entirely.

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

MR. MINAKER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I happened to hear the Honourable Minister say that he would work in conjunction with the three government agencies, because I would hope that the fact that Lake Winnipeg is really, I guess, the settling pond or the septic tank for the Red River and the Assiniboine River; and I was wondering if the Minister can comment on the quality of the water coming across the border. Is it such that it would have an effect on the lake, whether the City of Winnipeg existed or not?

The other question I have is, has there been any noticeable increase in the total number of dissolved solids entering the river between the south side of the City of Winnipeg and the north side? I am thinking of the salt being distributed on the streets which eventually makes its way into the Assiniboine or Red, whether there has been any noticeable increase and what effect it might have on the lake?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that there is any doubt that the water leaving Winnipeg is not in as good a condition as the water entering Canada from the United States. I will also agree that the United States uses the Red River as a domestic use of water, and one has to be reasonable in the kinds of demands one makes as to how other people deal with their water disposal.

The pollution that takes place in Winnipeg would include what comes out of the storm sewers and what comes out of the sanitary sewers, which will include the salt, dissolved solids that you are talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 12:30, the hour of adjournment, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and asked leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 12:30, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.