

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 15 July, 1980

Time 8:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Finance or to the Honourable Minister of Environment. I wonder if the province has been approached by the city of Winnipeg with respect to the 173 million expected expenditure to clean up the Red River in Winnipeg and whether the provincial government is discussing or considering giving assistance to the city in this massive clean-up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, while taking it as notice, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would also look into the situation where there is a report apparently given to the Works and Operations Committee yesterday to the effect that the city's present sewage treatment system only removes solids from the effluent and leaves the bacteria, because some of us have been led to believe over the years that we had a fairly efficient water and waste system in Winnipeg. I wonder if the government would be looking into this and advising us how serious this could be, please.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I can't take that part of the question as notice, but certainly if there is information available, we'll pass it on. I also have been of a like understanding with regard to the Red River in the city of Winnipeg; it comes as some surprise as to the questions that are coming forth in the last few days in this regard.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Labour in charge of Manpower and ask the Minister of Labour whether he'd be prepared to consider a works project to assist the communities of Dauphin River and Anama Bay in having their hydro facilities put into their community by having the community be able to do the brushing and clearing of the right-of-

way which would assist that community in matching the moneys that are required as part of their contribution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, it's with some hesitation that I answer the question. I'm not sure of the hydro development that has taken place within those communities, and if in fact there is, and I assume that the member is suggesting that there is a possibility of some Hydro development or some Hydro expansion into those communities, if in fact there is, I think he will find that, to a degree at least, there is an understanding or a policy of Manitoba Hydro or other major developers going into a community, certainly with our government, then I believe to some degree with the opposition, when they were in government, that they employed local people. Now having said all that, maybe the member could ask a second question and, at the same time, clarify really what he is saying or just pass on any other information to me.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister should be aware the community, as I understand it, does have diesel service. They are applying to have a line from the Gypsumville area put into the community and I would like to ask the Minister since Hydro does participate in some of the cost sharing, and the Department of Indian Affairs is participating in cost sharing to the tune of, I believe, 170,000, there is a remainder of approximately 90,000 left outstanding. One way that the community could likely come up with those kinds of funds is by way of a clearing project which kind of matches the amount of 90,000 which Hydro would require additionally, and if there were a work project which would encompass the communities of Dauphin River, Anama Bay, a reserve community and a non-reserve community, would the Minister consider such a program?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take the question as notice and attempt to justify or certainly explain to myself and get understanding of the assumptions that the member is making. I don't cast any aspersions on his assumptions except that I'm not aware of them, Mr. Speaker, and I'll certainly take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The unemployment situation in those communities is very high. The reason I am making that pitch and I asked the Minister and he has taken it as notice, and I appreciate that to look into it is because of the high unemployment in those communities in the area. This would be a worthwhile project as well as accomplishing an economic development and necessary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Has the honourable member a question?

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Natural Resources whether he has information for me dealing with the Fairford River area that he took under advisement last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): All that I have been able to determine at this point, Mr. Speaker, was that it was the previous administration that had made a commitment to the operator to close off the area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Highways whether or not he can advise the House as to his policy with respect to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. We can only have one person asking questions at one time, and I would ask all members to wait their turn.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Honourable Member for Minnedosa wishes to take part in debate or to ask a question, there is a way in which he can be recognized by the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we can separate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would ask the Honourable Member for Minnedosa to respect the wishes of the Chair.

The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, on my third or fourth attempt, perhaps I can co-opt the Member for Minnedosa in with my question. And that is a question to the Minister of Highways. Whether or not he has yet arrived at a decision with respect to either upgrading the approaches to the Selkirk Bridge, the flood prone approaches, or whether he has decided on a new bridge location?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister give any indication as to when a decision might be made with either of those two questions?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, we hope to have a decision on either of those two questions in the near future.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Resources. Can the Minister elaborate for me on the nature of his answer that he gave me regarding the Fairford River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, I'd be happy to, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that under the previous administration, that the gentleman who operated the campground in that vicinity had complained to the government about unauthorized use of Crown Land along the river, and had received a commitment, under the previous administration, to have that access closed.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister care to table in this House that commitment that was given. As I recall, Mr. Speaker, residents of Manitoba used that area for many years to be able to fish from that area. The land was leased out to farmers in that area, who did not object to those people using that area . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The honourable member is debating, if he has a question to ask, I wish he would ask his question.

MR. URUSKI: I ask the Minister, is it not a fact that it was his government that built a park and closed off the access to residents and people coming to use that area?

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker, it's not a fact and it's very difficult for me to be able to table verbal commitments made by the previous administration. What we have attempted to do is to arrive at a workable solution, giving consideration to the commitment that was made previously and to the interests of those people who have traditionally used the area.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister then confirm that the opening of the park that was undertaken last year, was just a sham to the people using that area since he was going to close that area off, in any event?

MR. RANSOM: No, Mr. Speaker, we don't participate in shams, unlike the previous administration. What we were attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, was given the situation that we inherited with respect to that campground and to the access to that river, given the assurances that had been given under the previous administration, we have simply attempted to work out something that is satisfactory.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister of Highways. I wonder if he might inform the House in the period from 1969 to, say, 79, when the approaches to the East Selkirk Bridge were under flood two or three different times, how many studies were undertaken on the particular approaches to that bridge and if he has had any recommendation from the engineering department on those recommendations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice, because I'm not aware, since we are currently studying the approaches to that area, that any previous studies were committed under the previous administration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour and Manpower. It appears by a press release from his office dated July 11 that he has an eye on middle-aged women. Would the Minister be good enough to define the middle-aged woman in terms of age range?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the Women's Bureau of which I am responsible for, I think, are very adequate, very well informed and very knowledgeable dealing with women's organizations and taking a survey of problems that women are having in various age groups within this province and I leave that to their discretion. I think it will be done capably, Mr. Speaker. I have a great deal of faith in that particular group of people.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I wish to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister did not answer the question posed to him, because I asked him the age range. My supplementary question to him is on what basis did the Minister select the 2,000, I presume, middle-aged women who will be receiving the questionnaire prepared by him which he is sending out to them to determine their social needs and other needs.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing a little bit of reference to the fact that I have my eye on middle-aged women. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I think our government and myself, as Minister responsible for women within the province of Manitoba, has demonstrated an interest in all age groups. I think that is an established fact and it's documented that we have, in fact, expressed interest in the well-being of women in the province of Manitoba. The selection in the mailing list will be made up by the Women's Bureau. Again, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I have all the confidence in the world they can do a good job.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows with a final supplementary.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister be good enough to table a copy of the questionnaire which he is mailing to 2,000 middle-aged women to determine their economic and social needs?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A follow-up to the question from the Member for Minnedosa (Interjection) after the Member for Burrows finishes, a question to the Minister of Highways. Several months ago, I had provided him with some documents from one Cooper with respect to Henderson Highway and the Perimeter and some of the traffic problems involved down there. Can he report to the House as to what has occurred and what he proposes to do to solve that problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, the problem that the Member for Rossmere refers to has eliminated itself.

MR. SCHROEDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the last time I drove past that area, there was no change made and there have been a number of accidents and a number of near accidents, and I am just wondering what it is that has made that problem eliminate itself. It may well be that everyone has left that particular area of the province for Saskatchewan. Is that the type of solution the Minister is talking about?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically, that everyone has left the area for Saskatchewan. What has happened to eliminate that problem is the phenomena which occurs every year, called summer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Can the Minister advise as to what he proposes to do for the coming winter?

MR. ORCHARD: That is a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. There have been many drastic things happen to this province as a result of that government but I trust that we will still get winter coming up some time in December.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been many drastic things that happened in this province such as a flood last spring and a drought this summer, and if the Member for Rossmere attributes us with the power to do that, then I am blessed indeed, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister to whom Manitoba Hydro reports. About a week ago the Minister gave an

undertaking that he would speak to Manitoba Hydro regarding the letter of intent with Nebraska Power District. Can the Minister report to the House on the result of that conversation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I have not had a reply from Manitoba Hydro. It may well be that they want their board to have a look at the request.

MR. WALDING: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise when he expects to get a response from Hydro on this matter?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, no I can't. I have indicated the request from the Legislature for the information. Of course I couldn't put a time frame on when their reply might be expected. I presume that they'll deal with it in their own time frame.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Government Services whether or not he has yet arrived at a policy decision with respect to permanent flood protection and/or compensation for the Seine in areas beyond the original areas designated under agreement with the federal government and the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the honourable member that with the good offices of the Minister of Finance, his officials have contacted federal officials requesting formalized agreement to the extension and the inclusion of the federal government in this program. We have concluded a number of things that were necessary for the expansion of that program, namely the consultation with municipal governments with respect to the application of zoning and building regulations that would have to come into force. I can indicate to the honourable member that a number of the municipalities contacted have provided us with the resolutions that we had requested. And that is the status of that program at this point. Formal request has been made by officials from the Department of Finance to give us some indication that they are prepared to cost-share this program. Mr. Speaker, without being unduly long in my reply, the members will appreciate that this government has some reason to be somewhat nervous about entering into programs with the federal government without having something in writing from Ottawa and thus, you know, I'm waiting for that written notice of agreement.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister could advise us as to whether or not the Brokenhead River and the particular applicant that was drawn to his, through a meeting in his office some time ago, whether that is an area that has also applied for.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the honourable member that is the case. In general it is those areas immediately adjacent to the Red River Valley that were canvassed and contacted first by the Flood Emergency Board, under the chairmanship of Mr. Boles, and I'm advised that those are the first extensions that will become applicable to the program. I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that the individuals involved have been advised that their applications are on file and that they will be, you know, that there's not a deadline date involved. The matter is one of getting agreement of cost-sharing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour responsible for the Workplace, Safety and Health Act, and is in light of the recent allegations that Winnipeg's water system contains high quantities of bacteria that are known to be resistant to certain antibiotics. I would ask the Minister if any study has been conducted by the Workplace, Safety and Health Division in regard to workers working at the sewage treatment plants, their potential contact with such bacteria and the effect it may have on their health?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I can't take for gospel everything that the member has said in his preface leading up to the question, but the answer to the precise question is, no.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well it is my understanding that the city has done a study that indicates there may well indeed be potential for a problem in regard to workers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the honourable member a question?

MR. COWAN: Yes. The question is in regard to workers employed at such facilities. Will the Minister undertake to direct his department to immediately investigate the allegations that there are extremely high levels of bacteria count in the sewage passing through those plants and the water passing through those plants, and would he also undertake to do a study to indicate if any health effects are being experienced by workers who may well be exposed to those levels?

MR. MacMASTER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we're prepared to review the reports that the member makes reference to and have a look at the allegations that he is making here this evening. There is no difficulty with us doing that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the allegations is that there may be potential for a problem. I'd ask the Minister if he's prepared to have his department discuss this matter with the Workplace, Safety and Health Committees already existing at those facilities, if they do in fact exist, for the purpose of

determining any efforts they have made previous to this announcement in regard to protecting their health in respect to contamination by bacteria coming through the plant system.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I committed myself to reviewing the entire questions that have been raised, the allegations which have been made and the references that have been raised. We're prepared to have a look at the entire series of questioning in the last minute on this particular subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister responsible for Natural Resources and ask him if he could bring the House up to date on the forest fire situation in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. I'm pleased that the Honourable Member for Minnedosa has expressed an interest in this important area. We're happy to say that the weather conditions of the past day or so have allowed the people who are fighting the fires to be able to reduce the number by about 15 to some 68 fires in total, Mr. Speaker. We still have four heavy water bombers at work, a number of lighter water bombers and helicopters, and also, I believe, more than 300 people are still working on these fires. Many have been working now for literally weeks on end, and some of the permanent staff as well as some of the fire fighters have served under very difficult circumstances for a long period of time and are certainly to be commended for the extreme efforts that they have put forward.

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the same Minister. I'm sure we're all relieved to find that there has been some small abatement in the hazard and some relief. I wonder if the Minister could give us maybe a ballpark figure in the number of acres that have been destroyed by the fires this season.

MR. RANSOM: I'm unable to give a figure, Mr. Speaker, in total, the number of acres, but we have had at least three fires I believe that have been in excess of 200,000 acres, and the total number of fires in the province is moving towards 800 now, which is well over twice as many as we had last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa with a final supplementary.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Minister for the answer to that question, which is important to the economy and to all of the people of Manitoba. I wonder if he could give some indication to the House what the Reforestation Program would be and how soon this might be able to be undertaken in order to start reforestation, the regrowth of this natural resource.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, we have of course not yet been able to deal with all the fires that are burning in the province, as I have just outlined, but we have started to prepare our plans for reforestation. We have been happy to note that the federal government through the Minister of Immigration has said on two or three occasions that they think that they would be prepared to share in the excessive costs of firefighting that we have incurred this year, and also, that they would be willing to share in reforestation efforts, as well. So we are putting these plans together, Mr. Speaker, and we're hopeful that the federal government will be able to come through on those promises.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. TOM BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Labour, while we're on the subject of firefighting. It must be two months ago I asked the Minister was there any chance of raising the wage they are at the minimum wage and at that time you assumed, and I can understand that, that you're paying the same as any other province. But since that, you know very well, they are the second lowest paid firefighters in Canada. Your leader has admitted disparity is great
(Interjection) Why don't you button your lip?
(Interjections)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Pardon me speaking, Mr. Speaker, with all these rude interruptions. Has the Minister made any headway towards raising that minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in the firefighting field that the Member for Flin Flon is making reference to, there are several considerations that come in conjunction with the wages being paid. There is, in fact, the amount of money that's charged for their food and their clothing, their transportation and a variety of other things. I'm not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that maybe per se, and I don't take it for gospel because the Member for Flin Flon said that we're the second lowest dollar-wise, that necessarily means that the firefighters in Manitoba are worse off than others in other jurisdictions. It would depend a great deal, Mr. Speaker, on the circumstances and the other conditions under which they are working.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, he's deliberately evading the question. He's had two months to look into this. He knows very well they are the most underpaid, and I request an honest answer to an honest question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways, although he's not sure that winter will arrive again this coming year, just on the assumption that it might come, what is he doing, just in case

winter will come, to prevent further danger to life and limb and property on Henderson Highway at the Perimeter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of my department to offer the same level of high degree of snow removal and safe traffic that we provided last year.

MR. SCHROEDER: Has the Minister considered providing traffic lights?

MR. ORCHARD: No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere with a final supplementary.

MR. SCHROEDER: Mr. Speaker, is it then the position of the Minister that the same unsafe conditions which occurred last winter will occur this winter because he's not making any changes whatsoever to the conditions on that highway at that point?

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I reject categorically the allegation that conditions last winter were not safe.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct this question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and ask him whether he's had an opportunity to peruse the correspondence and the allegations made by a farmer from within the LGD of Armstrong dealing with land use and planning in subdivisions within that area, and can he report on his investigations into those allegations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Minister, who in his department instructed the Department of Agriculture to withhold or water down their comments when the applications for subdivisions were going through in that area?

MR. GOURLAY: I'd have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George with a final supplementary.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like the Minister, when he is taking that as notice, to indicate whether or not the provincial land use policies that he and his colleague the Minister of Environment adopted after consultation with the municipalities, has been violated in the case of the applications that were processed in that LGD. (Interjection) Should they have been adopted?

MR. GOURLAY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Natural Resources. I wonder, on the question of reforestation and the terrible fire experience that we've had in the areas the members that represent that area don't seem to be interested I wonder if he might inform the House how many applications he has had for permit of cutting in the burnt-out areas, because the timber is obviously going to rot before very long. I wonder if he's had many applications for permits to timber out or to cut the areas that have been burnt over?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Natural Resources.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can't advise as to the exact number of applications that we have received, but certainly we have had it brought to our attention, especially in the Porcupine Mountain fire, that the nature of the fire this year was more severe than is normal, even in a forest fire situation, and that salvage operations might have to be carried out on a more urgent basis than is normally the case, so my staff are reviewing that situation now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour, and follows upon questions by my colleague, the Member for Flin Flon. I'd ask the Minister if his department has undertaken a comparative study of pay, working conditions and benefits for firefighters, by province, throughout the country, in order to determine if Manitoba does, in fact, lag behind the other provinces in the total remuneration as well as the conditions of work for firefighters?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. There was some comparative work done, and that's the rationale I was using for answering the Member for Flin Flon, but I don't have a document per se to establish that. I would suspect that the Member for Flin Flon and others had some basis for the allegations that we were second lowest in the country and I suggest that's not exactly the case.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not certain exactly what our relative position would be in regard to other provinces, and would hope that the Minister could table documentation that he has in order to clear up what seems to be a difference of opinion as to our relative status. Is the Minister prepared to table the results of the studies that he indicated were ongoing on informal basis so that we may be provided with such information, in order to determine whether or not the relative status is as mentioned by the Member for Flin Flon or the Minister responsible?

MR. MacMASTER: I thought I'd made it reasonably clear, Mr. Speaker, that documentation per se, certainly in the shape to be tabled in this House, was not available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a final supplementary.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While it is a subject of some concern, and some concern for the First Minister, as evidenced by his remarks previously, would the Minister be prepared to put together a brief summary of those comparisons and table those, or pass those on by correspondence to members of this House who have expressed an interest, as well as to the First Minister who has also expressed an interest in this matter?

MR. MacMASTER: If in fact, Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to go to that extent and prepare that documentation, that possibility might be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a fourth question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I would ask the Minister if he is prepared to give a commitment to go that far, to make that sort of a study, and not putting any time limits on him, because I realize we're now in a hectic part of the sitting of this House, but we hope that sometime shortly after the House prorogues, we could have such a study available to us. I'd ask the Minister if he is prepared to make that commitment.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive.
The Honourable Member for Churchill with a fifth question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the Minister then if he can indicate if he is making his decision solely on the basis of informal material that has been provided to him in regard to raising or lowering the rate of remuneration for persons fighting fires in the province of Manitoba.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the informal information that I had, that's the information that I was relating to the Member for Flin Flon; obviously his was somewhat informal too.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a sixth question.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, we haven't quite determined yet if the Minister is still actively considering increasing the rate of remuneration for people fighting fires in the province of Manitoba. We've had indications from the First Minister that it was under active consideration a number of months ago. I'd ask the Minister of Labour if it is still under active consideration and when we can expect a decision as to whether or not those rates of remuneration will be raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is repetitive.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bills Nos. 109, 112, 107, 56, 72 and 105?

SECOND READING

BILL NO. 109

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MINES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just request the indulgence of the House to have this bill carried over and not dealt with at this session of the Legislature. If, of course, the members insisted on it, we could proceed, but it's one of those bills that could just as well do with a six-month digestion period and we'll come back with it in this form or another form, perhaps at the next session.

Mr. Speaker, we could proceed with just not calling it. I'm advised by the House Leader that the more appropriate thing to do, as a courtesy to the House, is to announce to the House that we request its withdrawal at this time. (Agreed)

(Jean Coleman started here.)

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? (Agreed)
Bill No. 112.

BILL NO. 112 AN ACT TO AMEND THE INCOME TAX ACT (MANITOBA)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK presented Bill No. 112, An Act to Amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba), for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, this bill does effectively five different things. It provides for the 100 increase in the Minimum Property Tax Credit available to homeowners and tenants throughout the province, in essence the general Minimum Property Tax Credit is increased from 225 to 325.00.

(2) The 100 increase in the Maximum Property Tax Credit from 375 to 475.00

(3) The 150 increase in the Maximum Property Tax Credit for senior citizen homeowners and tenants from 375 to 525.00.

(4) The use of the Federal Child Tax Credit Income definition to calculate the income for needs related components of Property Tax Credits and Cost of Living tax credits, and;

(5) It makes the provisions in the Income Tax Act for the implementation of the Political Contribution Tax Credit, which is under discussion in this House under a different bill.

Mr. Speaker, these items have received a degree of examination in debate under other bills or motions in the House and, to give further information, I think, at this point in time would probably be a bit repetitive. Those are the five main things that are presented in this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister, Mr. Speaker. The question is simply I didn't understand Item 4. Would you mind repeating it again, please?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, it makes provision formally in The Manitoba Income Tax Act for the redefinition of income for use in order to use the federal child tax credit definition that is used in that federal income tax form. This adapts that definition for use in the Manitoba case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended nor was I prepared to speak but the Minister has just indicated that this bill does five things. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this bill does at least several more things than the Minister has told us about.

First of all, what it does is put many of our taxpayers in a position where they will not be entitled to rebates on their property taxes at all. I'll give several examples. Let's take the case of several people coming into the city from a rural area, going to university and living in the constituency of the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Health, especially. They decide to live together while they are going to school and they get an apartment for 200 a month and they split the amount. Each one of them pays 100 and at the end of the year each one of them will have paid 1,200.00. Under our existing legislation, each of them on that 1,200 would be entitled to a property tax rebate of 20 percent of that amount, which would be 240, and from that would be deducted 1 percent of any taxable income. What is happening under this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister is taking away from those two students the right of one those two students to make that claim. Under this Act, only one of those students will be entitled to make his claim and the other student will not be entitled to make his claim. The student who can make his claim will not be entitled to claim the other student's amount because he didn't pay it; all he paid was 1,200.00. So, in effect, in a situation like that the government is saving itself 240 at the expense of a university student.

There are many other examples of working people who live together, people in co-operative housing or whatever, all of those people will suffer as a result of this bill. So when the Minister says that there are five purposes to this bill, I suggest that there is a sixth and that one is it. But there is another purpose, as well, and that is the reduction for shelter allowance benefits. Under this bill, where a taxpayer has received funds under the SAFER Program, this bill made sure the government can take those funds or a large portion of them away from that individual.

I had asked the Minister this afternoon how many people in this province received more than 43 per month in shelter allowances. He didn't have the answer. But, Mr. Speaker, under this bill, if an individual has received the 475 in SAFER Program payments during the year, when it comes time to file

his income tax return and he applies to get his Property Tax Credits, he will find that 475 is taken away from him. So what, in effect, has happened to anyone who is receiving, say, 30 or 40 a month, and that depends on the amount of rent paid, obviously, those people will receive nothing back at the end of the year and so although the government can say, yes, we are giving you 30 a month, in fact, at the end of the year they take that 30 a month away from them and don't give them the Property Tax Credit.

So I would suggest that when the Minister says this bill has five purposes, he was wrong, he was counting wrong; this bill had seven purposes. One of its purposes was to take money away from the people who are least able to pay rent in the private sector and another purpose is to take away the opportunity which taxpayers had in this province up until this time, to take the Municipal Tax Credit and take that portion thereof for which they have paid rent, regardless of how many people live in a House. And when you talk about a house, we all know of examples where people who are separate family units live in one residential dwelling, and I suggest that this bill has some drastic implications for those people. It affects thousands of people in this province in a way which will cost them money, and for the Minister to suggest for one second that all this bill is is a Santa Claus bill, I submit is misleading the House. There were at least two purposes that he forgot to mention to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 107 AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD ACT AND THE MANITOBA TELEPHONE ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 107, the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the opportunity over the last couple of days to look over Bill 107 and review the Minister's remarks on the bill.

Bill 107 amends The Public Utilities Board Act and The Manitoba Telephone Act, and in reading through this bill, it appears at first glance to be rather superficial, Mr. Speaker. The second part of the Act repeats in slightly different language a bill that this House passed in 1977 having to do with interconnection to the system, and the first part of the bill says that the Public Utilities Board, a regulatory body, shall have additional regulatory duties to perform.

I believe that it goes a little deeper than that and represents, from the Minister's point of view, a commitment to a principle that gentlemen opposite have, I believe, had some difficulty in accepting, if we can at least judge by their remarks on the previous

Bill 57 that was passed two years ago but not proclaimed.

I am pleased to see this bill come through. I believe that it does accept the position that the previous government held and, in general, is in line with the attempts of the Manitoba Telephone System in setting up an electronic highway, the term was.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go into both of the parts of this Act and note how the matter has come forward. The steps that have been taken, I believe, were necessary, and had they not been taken that we could have seen the future of the Telephone System as a publicly-owned utility in some jeopardy in the future.

Members will recall that the government of the day, about some 70-odd years ago took over a number of varied telephone companies in this province because of the needless duplication, the amount of wires being strung by different companies down the streets, and rationalized the system, and I believe called it Manitoba Government Telephones at that time. For most of its existence, Manitoba Telephone System has been in the telephone business. That has been its major function up until the last few years.

It was recognized, I believe, by successive governments that in order to provide a very basic telephone connection for residences to the outside world, for whatever emergency purposes and social purposes would be needed, was an important social policy in this province and the monthly rental for that should be kept down artificially low by revenue coming in from other sources. That applies even to this day, Mr. Speaker. Monthly rentals for a simple black telephone would probably be at least triple what they are today if it were not for revenues that come into the System from long distance charges, on the one hand, and additional charges for such things as extensions, colored phones and things like that, on which the System makes a very substantial profit and does not apologize for it because it is able to use that revenue to keep the basic telephone rate at a low level.

Over the last few years, a decade or so, the Telephone System has recognized a problem with the advent of cable television and a number of the other things that the Minister did mention. He talked about the technology of tomorrow being available today. The System realized that if it were to keep to its traditional role of supplying telephone service, that these other telecommunication companies and methods would come into being and would provide a very important and a very dangerous rival to the system as far as telecommunication services were concerned. The System was somewhat concerned when cable television came into this province, recognizing that it was a means of communication one way only, incidentally, from the centre outwards and that unless each cable system had a monopoly, again you would soon have a plethora of poles down the street and companies in rivalry for positions for plant their poles.

There is an additional complication to this in that broadcasting is a federal responsibility and the CRTC has some jurisdiction. This has led to problems and disputes in many provinces and there is a sort of an uneasy truce between the cable operators and the Manitoba Telephone System in this province. In an

attempt to take care of that problem, at least partially, there was an agreement signed some two or three years ago known as the Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Telecommunications, or words to that effect, which recognized certain areas of federal jurisdiction and certain areas of provincial jurisdiction. The federal jurisdiction being such as pay TV and broadcasting, and what is the term, programming services. In exchange, it was permitted that Manitoba Telephone System would own the main wires or cables that took cable television to various residences throughout the city and on into the rural areas, and also that the province would have jurisdiction as far as closed circuit television was concerned.

The Minister suggested in his opening remarks that there may be a re-definition of the responsibilities coming out of constitutional talks now on and that this bill makes provision for the regulation of that by the Public Utilities Board, if and when that happens. We have no quarrel with that, Mr. Speaker. We would have liked perhaps some indication from the Minister of whether or not and what sort of guidelines would be applied by the Public Utilities Board in such an event or in fact whether it would be left to the Public Utilities Board to draw up these guidelines or whether the Board would be instructed by the government as to what powers they would have, what guidelines they would use, and how they would be applied.

The Minister is aware, I am sure, that the CRTC, in licensing and regulating various companies in the broadcast field, has developed quite a number of guidelines that it uses, guidelines that it has developed over a number of years. I don't share the Minister's optimism that control of broadcasting will be one of those areas that is designated, delegated to the provinces, but that is something that we shall have to wait and see.

As I mentioned before, the telephone companies of this country recognized that with the new technology, new telecommunications, cable TV and such like services coming in, if these new services were taken up entirely in the private sector that what would happen would be a number of private monopolies in the telecommunications field and that the telephone companies, particularly Manitoba Telephone System, would be continually pushed off to one side with its sole responsibility for telephone system.

The danger there was that these profitable other areas that the system was able to use in order to keep down the cost of the basic telephone system would be eroded and that the basic monthly rental for a telephone would, of course, go up and would probably go up sharply once these other sources of revenue were closed off from the system. The System's response to this, which was encouraged by the previous government and I believe by this government too, was to attempt to keep up with the new technology and to bring in, use and utilize such things as the IDA Project, coaxial cable, fibre optics, transmission between and to computers, and services of that type. In doing so, it held most of the means of providing cable television in the home, and I believe this one-way control by the System had bothered members of the Conservative Party. It certainly bothered the cable companies and other

people who were a little concerned about a government organization or a Crown corporation handling the means of information services. Gentlemen opposite, when they were on this side, expressed some concern about that particular facet. Although it was repeated several times by the previous government that what was intended was that the electronic highway it might have been called something different then was there, that the System would serve as a common carrier and would permit, under certain conditions and under certain terms, private companies to use them to provide these new services that were becoming available.

I believe that this Bill No. 107 indicates that this government has now recognized the worth of that policy and is prepared to go along with seeing Manitoba Telephone System continue to serve in a common carrier capacity, and that what we see here is a commitment by this government to carry on and allow the Manitoba Telephone System to remain in the forefront of new technology and to see that those advantages that will accrue from that new technology will accrue to the people of Manitoba both in the forms of an improved telephone system and, perhaps more importantly, keeping the monthly rates for connection down to a minimum level.

The few questions that we do have on this aspect of the Act are of a more perhaps technical nature and not the sort of thing that we would discuss at second reading so there will be one or two questions that we would ask of the Minister when he gets to committee stage.

The second part of the bill which deals with amendments to The Telephone Act recognize, as did the previous government in 1977, that the technology of telephone attachments was changing rapidly. We only had to look to the south to see what was happening with Bell and IT&T, with other companies attempting to get into the market by selling extension telephone systems and various other attachments. The system warned the government of the day that this was fast approaching in Manitoba and that steps ought to be taken in advance of this being a matter for the courts to regularize the matter, to try to protect the system against network addressing instruments and also to protect the revenue picture of the system by licensing or permitting under certain conditions various terminal attachments to be connected to the system.

The wording of this part of the bill is very similar to the previous Bill No. 57. It's been worded a little bit differently and I think a little more neatly than before. One main change that we see in there is that there is no longer the requirement for a dealer selling one of these attachments to advise the system or the Public Utilities Board, I can't remember which one, of a sale that was made. Instead there is just a warning here that the seller of the instrument must make it clear to the purchaser what the terms of connection to the system are so that the purchaser will at least be aware of it.

As far as the present revenue lost to the system is concerned, no one knows for sure what it is. We have asked questions on several different occasions and I have heard figures as far apart as 200,000 and 8 million to 10 million dollars, all in a year. There was a suggestion, and I say it was only a suggestion because no one knows for sure, Mr. Speaker, that

the rate increase applied for by the Telephone System, applied for and granted of just over a year ago, might possibly have not been necessary if the previously passed but not proclaimed bill had in fact come into account or something like this had been put into effect in that time.

The Minister indicates, as far as the whole bill is concerned, that portions of the Act having to do with programming services will not come into effect or would not be proclaimed until such time as the constitutional changes have been agreed to. We would wish to ask the Minister and perhaps he might be able to indicate whether he intends to bring the amendments to The Manitoba Telephone Act into being at a time earlier than that or, if not, just when he expects that to come into account.

One other point about this is that in giving the Public Utilities Board the responsibility or rather giving them the right to fix terms and conditions, the Minister has recognized a need for expert capacity by the Public Utilities Board in knowing what they are doing and being able to assess the various interconnected instruments and to be able to properly fix the rates and the conditions thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I have looked in the estimates for this year to see whether there is a large increase in the amount that is approved for the Public Utilities Board to see in there whether the Public Utilities Board expects to hire a large number of high paid experts but it would appear from the figures that there is no additional money for the Public Utilities Board this year to hire those extra staff. We would wonder whether the Minister intends to proceed before the end of this fiscal year in that particular direction or, when he says that these steps will be necessary, whether he is looking several years down the road. Perhaps he can indicate that to us when he closes the debate.

Mr. Speaker, we don't intend to hold this bill up and there is one of my colleagues who also wishes to speak on it, but following that we are prepared to let it go through to committee stage.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Lac du Bonnet, that debate be adjourned. I am sorry, if anyone else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge wish to speak?

MRS. WESTBURY: I want to adjourn it, but if someone else wishes to speak, I'll wait.

MR. SPEAKER: The bill has already been adjourned.

MRS. WESTBURY: Oh, I'm sorry.

MOTION presented and carried.

**BILL NO. 56 AN ACT TO AMEND
THE CHILD WELFARE ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 56, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a short speech. It's really not worth all that.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this because I haven't had time to really go through it and I was expecting to find something that I strongly disagreed with, however I was not successful. I will have some questions when it reaches committee stage. I will have some questions of clarification at committee level, Mr. Speaker, but at the present time I am quite happy to send it on.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I wanted to answer a few questions that have been raised by the Honourable Member for Wellington. Firstly, I have to presume, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition is basically endorsing the changes in the Act because the Honourable Member for Wellington primarily dealt with the different items relating to child welfare and family services, rather than directly with the bill.

I would just like to answer a few questions relating to items that were raised by the Honourable Member for Wellington. One of the subjects he raised was with regards to the Child Welfare Review Board, indicating that he felt that there was a need to establish this board. I would like to convey to the members of the opposition and specifically to the Honourable Member for Wellington that in my seven months as Minister of the Department, I have not had brought to my attention the need to establish this particular review board until the honourable member himself mentioned it and I have to presume that the former Cabinet Ministers, both of the former administration and my colleague, the Minister of Health, saw no need to establish the board as well. However, that does not indicate that the need may not arise with the fact that the federal government is looking at possibly bringing forward a young offenders Act which would establish possibly a younger age for juvenile delinquency, which might require the establishment of the review board, depending on what does develop.

I would like to deny categorically that there has been restraint in the department with regard to child welfare and the funding of this service and just draw to the attention of the honourable members opposite that there was some 10 to 11 percent increase in funding this year, even though the case load for the number of children in care has dropped off some 14 percent from the year before. I could hardly accept the suggestion by the Honourable Member from Wellington that restraint has affected the operation of this department.

The honourable member also raised that there are many children that are located outside the province because of the lack of the availability of service for certain children. I would like to just advise the honourable member, which I indicated during our estimates, that I think there are some 14 children that are located outside the province and that, as the

honourable members know, we are establishing a special psychiatric facility at Knowles School. We are presently negotiating with the Knowles School to deal with the very disturbed children and that is presently being established and hopefully will be established in the not too distant future to deal with and look after a capacity of ten children in this regard.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the other items that were raised by the Honourable Member for Wellington we can deal with during committee stage and I thank the honourable members opposite for supporting our bill. I look forward to answering any questions that they may raise in Law Amendments Committee or whatever committee this particular bill is forwarded to.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 72 THE SECURITIES ACT, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 72, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This apparently is an update of The Securities Act and since the Honourable Minister was very brief in his introduction and there were no explanatory notes we have not been able to determine the total depth of this bill, but we are going to have a very close and hard look at it in committee, where we can deal with each of the sections because, as a technical bill, it is very difficult to determine the principles of it, but we are prepared to look at it section by section in committee and to determine its thrust and the policies that it creates.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 105 THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1980)

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 105, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to make a few brief remarks on this bill. Mr. Speaker, one has to be very careful when one peruses The Statute Law Amendment Acts when they appear. They are a pot-pourri of many changes to many pieces of legislation, and if you are not careful, governments of whatever political stripe periodically throw a hooker in there, and a curve as well.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to debate the principle of a bill that deals with so many bills but I am going to try and attempt to deal with some of the amendments that have been proposed, and the first one I want to deal with is one that deals with the Employment Standards Act and, in view of the fact that we have seen changes to legislation dealing with the Department of Labour coming in one shape or form or another in this Session but none of them by the Minister; some coming via the private members route; some coming via the joint effort, evidently, between the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Labour, and now we see another one which has been introduced under The Statute Law

Amendment Act which is under the stewardship of the Attorney-General, dealing with The Employment Standards Act which takes away the right of people working in the construction trades for notice of termination of employment.

Mr. Speaker, I got in contact with the president of the Winnipeg Construction Trades Council, Mr. Léo Désilets, and asked him if the Minister had been in touch with him since this is the group dealing mainly with the construction trades industry here in the city of Winnipeg. I am not surprised by the answer that I received, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman in question didn't even know that such an amendment was coming forth.

We see one of the hookers that has been thrown already by the government in their proposed legislation and, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour has been trying to make it very obvious that he is not going to deal anything with The Labour Relations Act or any of the Acts affecting labour. But we find them, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, coming in as private members' bills, and you know, Mr. Speaker, it is ironical that I have never seen the government refuse an adjournment on a private members' bill. That is something ludicrous and it is going to be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, when we come to third reading on a bill, The Payment of Wages Act. We have yet to hear from the Minister of Labour; we have yet to see the Minister of Labour vote for the bill in second reading, and I can assure the Minister of Labour that we can only come to one conclusion, that if he is not present and in his place to vote when third and final reading is called on that bill then we can draw a wrong conclusion, and I (Interjection) The Honourable Minister of Labour says he doesn't duck any votes. Well, I don't know. He was not present in this House when a roll-call vote was asked for. He was not requested by his Whip, to me, for a pair for that day, so I don't know where he was. But anyway, to get back to the bill that is before us, that is one of the things that is in this Employment Standards Act.

The next one we find is The Garnisheement Act and again here is another change slipped in very quietly and unobtrusively, and while I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that I am not opposed to the enforcement of court orders for alimony and maintenance and duly executed separation agreements or The Family Maintenance Act, or The Wives and Childrens Maintenance Act, but when we see the proposed amendment here which does away with leaving at least the minimum of 250 with the person against whose wages the Garnisheement Order in respect to these will be set forth, or as to Section 6 of The Garnisheement Act, which states that in no case will more than 70 percent of his wages be taken away from him for that Garnisheement Order.

But now we find that the new Section 8, as it is proposed in this Act, will allow 90 percent of the wages of that person who has that Garnisheement Order standing against his name. We have a hard enough time now getting people to pay the alimony, to pay the Maintenance Orders, Child Maintenance Act under 70 percent. I could tell you that I know of people, I have had a constituent who has had a court order against him, who simply refuses to pay even on the 70 percent, he goes to jail. He goes to jail; he

goes there for two or three weeks or a month. The province picks up the tab for his keep and they have to pick up the tab for the keep of the wife and children. Now under this new amendment 90 percent, if he didn't want to work for 30 percent of his wages, I don't see how you are going to make him work for 10 percent of his wages.

I say that these changes that come in here in this pot-pourri of a mishmash of all these odds and sods and ends that we get into this. The Minister of Natural Resources says it is a mishmash. Well, I will tell you that some of the legislation that has been introduced into this House in this session is nothing but a mishmash, and it should have been all thrown in one bill, because it didn't make any sense; that is the kind of junk that has been forth.

Anyway, to get back to the bill that is before us here, Mr. Speaker, we now again come to the Oh, there is the Minister of Labour, he is still here Minister of Labour and I know that there are some amendments now to The Department of Labour Act. The Minister is no longer going to be responsible for certain acts, not according to the Act; they are going to be taken away and we are going to find out by Order-in-Council. He is not going to look after The Labour Relations Act, which states in The Department of Labour Act. That is taken away; we will have to find that out by Order-in-Council, who is going to be responsible. I don't know if the Minister of Labour is going to be responsible for The Labour Relations Act, because according to this amendment, they have taken a list of about 20-some bills, some that were repealed and taken out of his jurisdiction. I quite agree that perhaps the amendment is one that makes some sense but when we go back to The Payment of Wages Act, which incidentally is not one of those bills listed, I don't know who is responsible. We have attempted on various occasions to find out from the Minister of Labour just who does administer The Payment of Wages Act, whether it is administered under him or whether it is going to be administered under the Attorney-General's Department.

I have a further request to the Acting Government House Leader. In order that we don't get ourselves into hassles out there in committee and since this bill deals with so many departments, I would request that the Attorney-General and as many of the Ministers that are involved with these bills, since they deal with various acts under various Ministers, that if there are questions then I think the onus is upon the Government House Leader to make sure that the Ministers, who are responsible for the changes that are being listed here in The Statute Law Amendment Act, are there to at least answer questions that members of the committee may ask. I think that is fair comment. I mean if the Minister of Labour has some and he has some amendments in here, I would expect the Minister of Labour to be there. The Minister of Consumer Affairs, there are some there to do with him; I would expect that the House Leader would be there. I believe that the Minister of Natural Resources has some, too.

So I feel that when we get to committee stage there may be other members on this side of the House that wish to speak on other aspects of the bill, but I have only picked out two or three that I have pointed out to the House and to the Ministers

concerned and if there are any other members on our side who wish to speak, or any other member that wishes to speak, but we are prepared to have the bill go to committee, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Logan made reference to The Employment Standards Act Section. I think he was referring to 35(2)(e), the section the Member for Kildonan and myself have discussed and the member made reference to it tonight.

The reason that it is in there and I will just take 30 seconds to explain it is that we were going to go legalize a tradition and a custom that has been in place for 50 or 60 years in the construction industry in Manitoba. Upon further review, we find that this in fact would legalize that no notice is given, and no notice is in fact given in the industry. That has been a tradition and a custom; we can disagree or agree, but that is the facts.

The Member for Kildonan and I were talking about it, and I now understand that the unions themselves had negotiated a one-hour notice for clean-up of tools, so I find myself in the position where there is a negotiated one-hour by the trade labour movement, the trade unions in the construction industry, which varies somewhat from the tradition of being no time, though time in many cases was given. So I would like it stated here by myself, Mr. Speaker, that 35(2)(e) of The Employment Standards Act No. 12, that that be deleted from this particular bill; withdrawn, I think, is the appropriate word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, if I can just get clear. I don't know if the Minister at this stage can withdraw. If the Minister is indicating that when we get to committee he intends to withdraw that, is that what the Minister is saying? Because at this stage we cannot withdraw it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to waste the time of the House speaking to a bill which has been withdrawn. It is the section that the Minister has referred to that I wanted to speak to. I do, however, wish to, for what it is worth, indicate that I believe that there has to be a correction to the Minister's remarks.

The bill has provided and continues to provide a section whereby you do not have to give notice where there is a general custom in the trade, and therefore it would have been completely unnecessary to bring this section, to bring about a situation in the construction industry which recognizes the tradition of giving what he says is no notice.

I always understood that they were entitled to one hour's notice and there was a case in fact, Mr. Speaker, in the industry where the court held that

where they are paid by the hour then they are entitled to one hour's notice and that was the situation in the industry. I am not sure that is correct, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad the Minister is removing the section because it then allows for notice to be given when that custom has not been established and when there is a person working in that industry who is not on an hourly rate and doesn't work under those terms.

For the information of the Minister, it would appear that this section would make it unnecessary to give notice for anybody in the construction industry, which would include a secretary working at Poole Construction, and I don't think it was ever intended that those people would be subject to layoff without notice. They generally are not hourly paid; they could be paid by the month and there is no custom whereby they are laid off on an hour's notice. You put this section in and there is no notice in the construction industry.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is right to withdraw the clause, that it can create problems that perhaps he didn't think of and which none of us can think of at the moment, but it does create some problems that I can think of right here in addressing myself to it. In any event, the clause is withdrawn, so we won't have to worry about that.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill 23, and I wonder if my honourable friends will be disposed to dealing with Bill 74, and if we can pass that at second reading then we will go into Committee of the Whole on both of those supply bills. Bill 23, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I am just getting it straightened out.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, just call 23.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 23, standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 23 THE LOAN ACT, 1980

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I will be closing debate on second reading of this bill and it will then go to the Committee of the Whole for further examination and then back into third reading.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. If I could just make an announcement then, the Honourable Minister of Finance will be closing debate.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything at great length at this point to remark on the bill. It didn't receive any extensive second reading debate. There was a contribution by the Member for Inkster

that I think is worth remarking on, and for that purpose I adjourned the debate. I must say that having adjourned debate, I haven't got all my homework done to comment on it at this time, but I don't think it is that critical or important and anything that is germane to the bill can be handled at the committee stage or at third reading stage.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of things occurred to me when the Member for Inkster was making his comments, when he presented his legal style document where he referred to the government as the persecutors and the members of the Hydro as the objects of the persecution and so on and made his case for an appeal to the 'Court of Public Opinion.'

A couple of things occurred to me in listening to the Member for Inkster. I couldn't help but harken back to the CFI Inquiry Commission and the days of debate that were attempted in this House but at some occasions were denied, and I particularly want to refer back to the second reading on the same capital supply bill that took place in this House where I rose as a member of the opposition to make my contribution maybe that's not the right word contribution to the capital supply debate, but to take the opportunity under capital supply to talk about the CFI Inquiry Commission. I was ruled out of order, Mr. Speaker, by the Speaker of that day. There are others in this House who will remember. The Speaker's ruling was challenged, as I recall, and that's why I wanted to adjourn the debate. I wanted to go back and look up the history itself and read it back to this House, how under different circumstances a former government had denied a member of the opposition to come in and make his comments under what is generally considered in this House to be one of the most wide-ranging opportunities to say what he so desires, and particularly when The Capital Supply Bill provides the capital supply for the Crown corporations under Schedule A, and the Schedule A under this case has not included any for Hydro, Mr. Speaker, but that was not challenged.

The Member for Inkster had a chance to take his tilt at the Hydro age-old debate, and nobody attempted to intervene. I do want to again point out that at the time I stood in opposition to speak on the Capital Supply Bill and talk about the CFI Inquiry Commission, there was an item in there for the Manitoba Development Corporation who were funding, Mr. Speaker, the Manfor operation or whatever it was called; it may have been called still at that time CFI, I don't recall but it was ruled out of order because the name CFI or Manfor did not appear on the bill. That was a technical reason for it. The Speaker, who was a bit dictatorial by today's standards, Mr. Speaker not a bit dictatorial, a lot dictatorial by today's standards ruled it out of order. And the very open and democratic government of the day supported the Speaker in his ruling. Now it wasn't like I had stood up on a moment's notice; I had indicated on several occasions and had acceded to the Speaker's wish that when Capital Supply second reading came along, I intended and wanted to speak on the CFI issue. That's point number one, Mr. Speaker.

Let's just compare the operation of what happens in this House under the second reading of the

Capital Supply. No issue has been taken with the right of a member opposite to have a wide-ranging debate say what he wants to say. There are multiple opportunities in this House for that to happen. It has generally been considered that under Capital Supply that can take place.

So the Member for Inkster made his contribution, took his tilt, made his case, laid out a pseudo legal document, that was laid out in legal form, whereby he would appeal to the 'Court of Public Opinion' in the case of the Tritschler Inquiry case into Manitoba Hydro. He had his chance, as he has had his chance in many other instances. That's, Mr. Speaker, as much a statement of a grievance as it is anything else, in the procedures of the House. That's point number one.

Point number two, though, was the contribution of the Member for Inkster in this regard, and as I listened to him I couldn't help but think of Walter Newman when he wrote his own rebuttal to the CFI Inquiry Commission. Walter Newman of course is no longer with us; he is deceased. He is a man that I had the highest regard for all of the time I knew him it never waned, I still do have. I picked up his book not long ago. I have a copy of it and I read through it. It's about a month ago. I didn't read all of it but I leafed through it. Walter Newman is a very competent writer, on top of being a very brilliant mind; a very straight-forward man who took apart the CFI Inquiry Commission.

I never took the opportunity since Walter Newman wrote that book, to stand in the House to try and make the points he made in that book, but, for those who are interested, he did a devastating job on the CFI Inquiry Commission. I can give you examples of what he did; examples where the commission did not take what should have been their opportunity to question for example a meeting that took place on a certain date, alleged by one person, denied by three, and later refuted by the person that it was alleged by, never reported by the CFI Inquiry commission, but went down in the CFI Inquiry Commission as one of the major meetings of decision-making that had taken place; never was withdrawn; never was commented on by the government; never was recognized by anyone publicly except Walter Newman, that it had happened.

You can go down through the major errors and omissions that occurred in that inquiry. A number of those major errors and omissions were undertaken by different people along the way, but I couldn't help but really revert back and think when the Member for Inkster was making his rebuttal, in effect, to the Tritschler Inquiry Commission; I couldn't help but think that this is the closest analogy that I have seen to the rebuttal, in effect, that was done by Walter Newman following the CFI Inquiry Commission.

The Member for Inkster keeps trying to attack the Tritschler Inquiry Commission. One thing I will say about the Tritschler Inquiry Commission is that Judge Tritschler made a fairly important point he made any number of important points; he pointed out a lot of important facts, Mr. Speaker, as time will test, I suppose, for those that are interested in the CFI Inquiry Commission one of them that he made that I don't think is very much of a public issue but may be important for those that are operational in

government, he said that government, in effect I'm not sure he used the word but he said that governments had a bad habit of falling into the trap of protecting the policy and the actions of their Crown corporations and vice versa. He in effect said that government can very easily fall into the trap of becoming an apologist for the actions of the Crown corporations. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the members of the Legislature, whether they are in government or whether or not they are in opposition, should ignore those kinds of admonitions by the Inquiry Commission.

The point that the Member for Inkster made in his rebuttal to the Tritschler Inquiry Commission . . . I don't intend to try and defend Judge Tritschler's comments either. Judge Tritschler in his own wisdom would probably not even advocate that somebody should try and stand up and defend the points that he has made in his report. Not that I would have any trouble in doing it; not that I would have the least bit of problem in getting involved in a debate as to whether the level of the lake should be one level or whether it should be at another level; Mr. Speaker, not that I would have any trouble standing up and saying that the wasted money is of a certain value or another value.

Mr. Speaker, we can go into those things at length and we can fight over them for days; there will remain no doubt, if it is the wish of this House to get into that kind of a debate, we can do it. If the Member for Inkster wants a demonstration of where the 600 million is, he will get it. If the Member for Inkster wants us to spend the public's time debating that, there is no problem in doing it. The only thing is that there are other important things that are happening, and time goes on. There are other important things that must still be done.

However, it is important to notice that the main thrust on this matter has come from the Member for Inkster. He seems to feel terribly sensitive about any of the actions of the former government being challenged. He is one of the very few people that do, and I don't mean it basically as a criticism of him for doing it. He was very much a part of those decisions, even though he was not involved and not in favour obviously of some of the decisions that were attempted by the former government; to give him his credit, he indicated to the public when he was not in favour of them. But he seems to feel compelled to get involved in supporting the position of every action of the former government, and not only of the former government but also of the decisions of its agencies, such as in the case of Manitoba Hydro.

Let's come back to one or two points in the argument that I think have to be said.

(Interjection) No we won't try them all, Mr. Speaker. There are only two or three that really need to be said as far as the public is concerned in all of this. As far as the Hydro debate is concerned, the one basic fundamental issue is, as far as the political debate is concerned, and the political debate will be attempted to be muddled, and as far as possible taken out of context in whichever way any particular person wants to take it any give time. The basic issue and the only issue I want to make, since we are dealing with Capital Supply, is that when our party was in opposition, made one thing clear. We hit the government as hard as we could but we never voted

against Capital Supply for Hydro. We hit the government as hard as possible to tell them that they were spending the money wrongly but they should not stop the development of water power in Manitoba. The only party that ever voted against and I'm not sure they voted against it because I don't know if they had enough numbers here to do it; there was one or two or three here all the time the Liberal Party was the only party that ever took a position against water power development in this province.

We hit the government as hard as we could because of their waste and mismanagement as far as Hydro development was concerned. We made our case as hard as we could, and it was very difficult to make that case. I don't think it was ever really listened to, but we never voted against the capital supply for the development of water power in this province. We voted against other things that are well noted in this Legislature, in the way of supply, we never voted against water power development moneys, even though we knew that the government was wrong in some of the decisions that were being allowed to be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say further that the government now recognizes and sees a party that was in government, now in opposition, take a far greater interest in this matter than they took when they were in government, and that is one of the most evident things that you can see from the changing of the sides of the House; that the numbers across the way that are now taking an interest in this topic, if they had taken that interest at the time that they were in power, I don't think that some of those things that were done would have been done, and I think that some of the things that would not have been done would have saved the people of Manitoba a lot of money. And that is what the basic issue is: It's not that water power was developed, it could have been developed at a lesser cost; it could have been developed at a price that would be less than the present price to the consumers of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster says, nobody said that. That was said so many times in this House; that thing was said over and over and over again, and nobody would ever say, would ever listen to the

(Interjection) Well, the Member for Inkster says that the Tritschler Commission never said that. It wouldn't have mattered, Mr. Speaker, it was too late then anyway. It was said by the members of the opposition in this House to a government that would not listen, basically that would not listen, that did not have the toleration to listen, who lost their tempers when you got into a fight, puked on your head, that kind of nonsense. That's what was happening in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and that's what things came to. Those incidents are very well documented in this House.

Mr. Speaker, the main contribution on the second reading of this, I say, was from the Member for Inkster. I tell him that I could not help but sit and listen to him as he brought forth his points. I could make the analogy to the days of the CFI Inquiry Commission. We never attempted, as an opposition, to come back on some of the major points that perhaps should have been made and could have been made. I couldn't help, as the closest analogy, to think of the rebuttal attempted by Walter Newman

in what I considered to be a document that I think will go down in history and will be a document that pulls up a number of the points that were made at that time into a light which they deserve, by a committee that I referred to at one time as being a kangaroo court and, Mr. Speaker, for which I have no regrets of ever having remarked and which have been referred to by others, and I think the Member for Inkster has used them, as well. But when the Member for Inkster appointed his law partner as one of the chief investigators and certainly one of the people most capable of delving into that matter, it became perfectly evident, Mr. Speaker, from that day on that it was going to be the kind of a court where a Conservative going to that kangaroo commission was going to be like, as I said before, a skunk at a garden party; that analogy was about as close as it came.

It ran its course. The government hired their counsel. They said it was a government counsel; it was also an NDP counsel. The Conservative Party had to go out, we scrounged together 10,000 for a counsel to represent, when it became obvious what the whole commission was about, and the rest is all history.

That didn't happen in this other, it wasn't a direct parallel, Mr. Speaker, that sort of thing didn't happen. But to a certain extent, there are parallels that can be drawn. And the one major parallel is this rebuttal. We have never questioned a lot of findings that could be questioned in that first report. The Member for Inkster seems to feel compelled that he has to go in and do the sorts of things, I think, that are closest to the parallel that could be drawn between his remarks and the efforts of one Walter Newman, who did a very fine job, in my regard, in analyzing in some detail and in some depth in a very clinical way, with the type of mind that he had for doing it, and putting it down in history what his assessment was of the review. I think that the Member for Inkster probably would be closer to the mark, rather than trying to do in a court appeal to have followed that kind of an attack; if he disagrees with it, fine, go ahead. The work of both commissions will stand on their own two feet and time will tell whether or not, in both cases, they were accurate and adequate for the assignment that was made to them by the government of the day.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks I recommend, even though there's nothing in here to do with hydro, but that's always talked about, as far as the Agricultural Credit Corporation is concerned and the other two items that are in here, I recommend them to the committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 74 THE SUPPLEMENTARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1980

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 74, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, after listening to the Honourable Minister of Finance, I should maybe go for about 40 minutes and indicate to him where he is wrong, but I don't intend to. His tale of woe and his crocodile tears almost tempted

me to send over a crying towel to him, and I just want to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that this may go on even after he no longer is in government. That's the nature of the person and he can't jump out of his skin. He's going to be crying it's the opposition's fault, for whatever goes on. So I am prepared to let this bill go to committee where we can deal with it adequately, in any fashion we desire, without having to stick to the rules of formal debate.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I mean there are numerous opportunities to debate the various questions that are before the House and if honourable members don't make an objection as to relevance then they can't expect it to be entertained. Frankly, when I was speaking on the capital supply issue, I was prepared to tell the Speaker that the reason I was discussing hydro is that hydro was relevant by its absence, that capital supply is not necessary because of the excellent way in which hydro has been planned up until the present time, and that for one of the only years that I sat in the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we did not have to vote capital supply to hydro. But if the honourable member felt that it was irrelevant, he could have got up and said so, Mr. Speaker, and the Speaker would have made a ruling, and I wouldn't have challenged the ruling, and I would have dealt with the same matter under another appropriate heading.

So for the honourable member to raise rulings of relevance that were made four years ago shows, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty of his position. And we will have lots of time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss this issue. The session is young. The fact is that we are in extended hours, we are not in speed-up, and we will be able to deal with the questions, Mr. Speaker, that have been raised.

What is significant is that my honourable friend is now trying to conjure up the CFI Commission as being tantamount and comparable to the Hydro Commission. Well, Mr. Speaker, he says in many ways; that's interesting, because I no longer have to criticize the Tritschler Commission. All I have to do is read back what the honourable member said about the Churchill Forest Industries Commission, and he's given me a good one, Mr. Speaker. You know, the First Minister always cautions me, he knows that I am a practising lawyer, he knows that I'm supposed to have a certain regard for the judiciary, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, every time I go into the Tritschler Commission, he says, be careful what you say. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I worded it in exactly the language that judges are appealed from in.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance isn't careful, he says, the Tritschler Commission, and I want to underline this, he says, The Tritschler Commission was a kangaroo court. He says, Mr. Speaker, that the two are the same and that he called the CFI Commission a kangaroo court and, if the two are the same, then he says that the Tritschler Commission was a kangaroo court; not me, that's his characterization. He made, Mr.

Speaker, all of those statements about NDP lawyers; the government hired NDP lawyers. I want you to know who the NDP lawyers are that were hired: Mr. Justice Scott Wright, a one-time President of the Liberal Party and a Liberal candidate in several elections; Mr. Justice Charles Huband, a one-time, I believe, President or officer of the Conservative Party, and then of the Liberal Party, leader of the Liberal Party, now a Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Manitoba.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives hired Dick Scott. The New Democrats didn't have a lawyer. We couldn't scrape up 10,000 to waste to appear before the Tritschler Commission. That's right, Mr. Speaker. We couldn't scrape up 10,000 to appear before the Tritschler Commission. And by the way, it wouldn't have been worth the effort, Mr. Speaker, because I was there at the Tritschler Commission, and I saw, Mr. Speaker, a man testifying and trying to explain Jenpeg and he was saying that the original estimates of Jenpeg were good, and that's in fact what Mr. Justice Tritschler found, and then he was saying other things about Jenpeg and then Mr. Justice Tritschler said to the man, and I was there, now let's face it, Jenpeg was Cass-Beggs' toy, wasn't it? And that will appear on the record, Mr. Speaker. That's the judicial nature of the commissioner who inquired into the hydro study.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, I have the report of the commissioner into the Grand Rapids Water Haulage Enquiry Commission. The Grand Rapids Water Haulage Inquiry Commission was a commission which was inspired when the Liberals were attacking Hydro between 1962 and 1966, before I got to the Legislature. And they made attacks on Hydro, bad estimates, wastage of money, all kinds of things, Mr. Speaker. Who conducted the inquiry? Mr. Justice, the Honourable George Eric Tritschler. Mr. Speaker, I invite honourable members to read this inquiry, where he makes statements that irresponsible criticisms have been made by the opposition, and Mr. Speaker, every one of those criticisms that are made by the opposition is challenged by the commissioner, who says that the Hydro people had to make settlements, that estimates going up is not unusual in the trade. Everything, Mr. Speaker, in this inquiry is a whitewash, which will be used at the time, of what Hydro did.

It's interesting, Mr. Speaker, that some of the very same criticisms are treated in exactly the opposite way. Well, the Minister has given us the answer. He says, not I, I say the learned trial judge, the learned Commissioner erred in having made findings that he shouldn't have. But the Minister of Finance says it's a kangaroo court. That's what he said.

Mr. Speaker, the circumstances were somewhat different, because . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, before it goes too far, two points of privilege. Never was it suggested by me that the Tritschler Inquiry Commission was a kangaroo court, I simply acknowledged to the House and reminded them that the Member for Inkster had said that at one point in time that I had referred to

the former inquiry commission as being a kangaroo court, and I believe that's the case.

Second point of privilege, Mr. Speaker . . . Point of privilege is that the Member says I referred to Scott Wright as and NDP lawyer. Mr. Speaker, I referred to Mr. Scott Wright as the counsel for the government, who also represented the NDP Party. And he also made reference to Mr. Huband. Mr. Speaker, the only NDP lawyer, and of course the most important one on it was Mr. Leon Mitchell, the Member for Inkster's law partner.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. Differences of opinion and the use of phraseology is not a point of privilege. It is a question of interpretation of the words of various members.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, let the record be clear. Nobody represented the New Democratic Party before the Churchill Forest Industries Inquiry. Nobody represented the Conservative Party before the Tritschler Commission. Unless my honourable friend says that Dick Scott was the lawyer for the Conservative Party before the Tritschler Commission, and let him tell us that that is the case. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, he can make that suggestion which I will categorically reject; but if he is saying that Dick Scott represented the Conservative Party in the same way as Scott Wright and Charlie Huband represented the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, I categorically say that that is false, but now we know where he stands. We know where he stands, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Scott Wright and Mr. Charles Huband did not represent the New Democratic Party, they represented the government of Manitoba. They were counsel for the commission. Mr. Dick Scott was counsel for the commission and there was no one there representing the New Democratic Party. Before the Churchill Forest Industries Inquiry, Frank Meighen represented the Conservative Party. He cross examined me. Nobody represented the New Democratic Party before the Tritschler Commission. And that is what I said, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable member said that the two commissions were comparable. He says the CFI commission was a kangaroo court. I say that he says, by virtue of him saying that they are comparable, that the Tritschler Commission was a kangaroo court.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the difference between the two commissions. We had no desire, Mr. Speaker, to appoint a commission to examine the alleged wrongdoings of the previous government. That wasn't the purpose of the Churchill Forest Industries Inquiry. When Mr. Schreyer announced that a receiver was going into Churchill Forest Industries, the uproar was that the New Democratic Party was nationalizing Churchill Forest Industry, that we were taking over this industry, and there was, Mr. Speaker, a demand that an inquiry be made to see what in fact happened. As a matter of fact that's what Frank Meighen said to me, lawyer for the Conservative Party said to me in cross examination, and it is on the record, Mr. Speaker, he said you considered that you owned this industry. I said, Mr. Meighen, all I knew was that the public of Manitoba put up 92 million and these people didn't put up a

cent. When I put up all the money, I consider it to be the owner of the industry. So you were taking what you considered to be yours, and I said, yes, I did, but we didn't want to do it. We had to do it because they were in default and we were going to lose money if we didn't do it, and one thing I don't wish to do for the people of Manitoba, is lose money, and that's the reason.

But the Conservatives, they accused us, Mr. Speaker, of socialistically taking this industry and the inquiry was appointed so that if this was so they would be able to determine it through an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. And who sat on the commission? Mr. Justice C. Rhodes Smith, Mr. Leon Mitchell, who was a former partner of mine. He was not a partner of mine when he was sitting on the commission. Mr. Speaker, I left the firm of Mitchell, Green, and Minuk, in August of 1969. I did not practice anymore with them after that. I continued to receive money that was owing to me for work that I had done, after that. I presume I am entitled to it. And, Mr. Speaker, a professor at the University, Mr. Donnelly of the History Department. And they sat, Mr. Speaker, and they disclosed things that we didn't know about. It wasn't as if we had appointed a group of people to examine my honourable friends. They have established, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't say a first, a second because like Liberal, like Conservative, the Liberals established a commission, a Spence Commission to examine the wrongs of the Diefenbaker government. Mr. Speaker, if the record were available they will see that I called that a terrible thing to do. I was very (Interjection) Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. We can only have one speaker at a time. The Honourable Member for Inkster has the floor.

MR. GREEN: . . . sent a memo to Mr. Schreyer, and, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Schreyer completely rejected what was said in the memo. That is what was disclosed at the commission. That's what was disclosed, Mr. Speaker, at the commission. That's what was disclosed at the commission. (Interjection) Well, I don't know what that means, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what that means. I mean, my honourable friends wish to say that my former partner in some way rejected me. I don't know what that means and I won't really go into that. If we are getting into another type of mud pie, let's get in and I will discuss it, but I don't know what it means.

All I am suggesting to the honourable members is that the two commissions were not comparable. The CFI commission was set up because there was a demand to know what we were doing and a demand by the Conservatives that we were nationalizing an industry, and the Hydro commission was set up to try to prove the validity of the Conservative criticism when they were in opposition. And I said, Mr. Speaker, that it was a second. The first political commission of that kind, which was a horrendous thing, was set up by the Liberals, Mr. Speaker, was set up by the Liberals, and I said it was a horrendous thing, set up by the Liberals for the purpose of trying to defame Mr. Diefenbaker, and that's in fact, what Mr. Sévigny said. That's exactly what he said after this whole thing was finished and

Mr. Justice Spence of the Supreme Court of Canada was used for that political commission. So they asked Mr. Sévigny what he thought of the commission. He said, Mr. Speaker, and he didn't use my words, he said, bull manure. And they said, Mr. Sévigny, that is not printable. So he said well try horse manure. And he didn't say manure, Mr. Speaker.

That's what he thought of the commission. And the fact is that the CFI commission was a demand virtually by the opposition who suggested that we were stealing an industry from a private owner. And we set it up, Mr. Speaker, and we found out what happened. Mr. Speaker, he says the first time . . . I tell you that that was, Mr. Speaker, that was the thrust of all of the questions that were asked by Frank Meighen, lawyer for the Conservative Party when he appeared before the commission; as long as he appeared. He suddenly realized that there was nothing in it and he stopped appearing but that was the position that he was taking throughout, that we, because we were socialists and we wanted this industry, had taken it over. (Interjection) Pardon me (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. This debate would be much better if we only had one member speaking at one time. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it would probably be shorter. I am not by any means finished, but I am going to sit down and wait further opportunity, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, and what is important, is that the Honourable the Finance Minister is the one who characterized the Tritschler Commission; he characterized by his definition of the CFI Commission that it was a kangaroo court and he said that they were both the same thing.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that Mr. Speaker, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself in a Committee of the Whole, to consider report of the following bills for third reading: Nos. 23, 74, and Bill No. 108, that's The Water Power Act.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole House, with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order.

Bill No. 23 page by page seems to be the routine. If there is anything on each page, I would hope the honourable members will stop me and we can speak on the specific item. Page 1 pass; Page 2 pass; Page 3 pass oh, wait a minute. There's no Page 3. Title pass; Preamble pass; Bill be reported.

Bill No. 74. Page 1-pass; Page 2 pass; Preamble pass; Title pass; Bill be reported.

Bill No. 108. Page 1 pass; Page 2 pass; Preamble pass; Title pass; Bill be reported.

Bill No. 75, page that's it? This one was in the pile. (Interjection) 108, I just finished it; 108, 74, and 23. Would you like me to try and slip through 75? I'll try.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole House has passed Bills No. 23, 74 and 108, and has asked me to report same.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Virden, report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Bill No. 23, An Act to Authorize the Expenditure of Money for Capital Purposes and Authorize the Borrowing of the same, be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILLS NO. 74 and 108 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that that bill is standing in my name, so I don't know how he can move it.

MR. SPEAKER: That's quite correct. Bill No. 7 is standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: I already adjourned it.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, let's try another one.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, that Bill No. 46, An Act to amend An Act incorporating The Regent Trust Company, be now read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This bill is also standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Government Services.

Order please. The bill has not been called for debate on third reading. If the Honourable Government House Leader wishes to call it?

MR. CRAIK: If the Minister of Consumer Affairs attempts to use my name as a seconder hereinafter, will you please refuse to accept it?

MR. JORGENSEN: Will you call Bill No. 46?

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON THIRD READING

BILL NO. 46 AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT

INCORPORATING THE REGENT TRUST COMPANY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite prepared to speak on this at this particular time, but I have had some serious thoughts about Bill 46 and for this reason take this occasion, admittedly late in the day and late in the bill, third reading of the bill, to express them.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is always that problem in our society that there are those who wish to do things to us that we don't want to have done by them, and it's a bill like this that concerns us when we have to marshal our forces to resist that kind of action that is being thrust upon us. However, I have perused the contents of this bill and I recognize the inevitability of certain action that we simply can't stop from taking place, although I wish to register my strongest protest that those people should not think that they can always get away with it. I, for one, will stand in this place, in this hall of freedom and democracy, to stand up for the rights of the individual, and I believe that that's an important case to be made from time to time, because it is them that we have to fear in the protection of our individual liberties.

Mr. Speaker, with those few comments, I pass on the bill.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that Bill No. 19, The Education Administration Act, be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILLS NO. 32 and 38 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you could call Bill No. 8.

**BILL NO. 8 AN ACT TO AMEND
THE FIRE DEPARTMENTS ARBITRATION
ACT**

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.
The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. ALBERT DRIEDGER: Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment on behalf of the Minister of Labour. Can I proceed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the amendment is made by the Minister of Labour. It's standing at report stage and the Minister of Labour has an amendment. I believe that he is the one who has to make the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there is a little confusion, I must admit. I understood when it passed through committee there was a word between myself and the opposition members at committee that we were going to propose an amendment. I understood when it got in here, it went back to report stage and that somebody, a member of the committee, had to move the amendment. That's why I wasn't moving it myself. I guess my understanding was incorrect.

I'd like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker:

THAT the proposed subsection 10(4) of The Fire Departments Arbitration Act, as set out in Section 5 of Bill 8 be struck out and the following subsection substituted therefor:

Clarification of award.

10(4) After an arbitration board has made an award, the Minister may direct the arbitration board to provide clarification of the award, or a part thereof, and within 10 days of the date on which the Minister makes the direction the arbitration board shall make a report to the Minister on the matters to be clarified.

MR. SPEAKER: Can I ask if other members of the Chamber have copies of the proposed amendment?

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, this amendment appears to arise as a result of a section which nobody really appreciated was in the Act, neither the firefighters, I take it, nor the municipalities, nor the Minister, nor myself, nor anybody else, which gave the Minister power under the Firefighters Arbitrations Act to request modification of the award and to submit new terms, which Mr. Speaker, was normal for a conciliation board but not an arbitration board.

It was raised at committee and the Minister promised he would look at it and apparently he has satisfied himself that the clause was not only not necessary but is not a good thing to have, and therefore he has removed it except for clarification. I, Mr. Speaker, am not going to create a great issue on this. I would have preferred to see him remove it entirely, because I believe that it's dangerous to try to get a judge to clarify a decision or an arbitration board to clarify an award, but it is certainly much better than what was previously in the Act and I think that it is therefore an improvement.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 8 was read a third time and passed, as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Natural Resources that Bill No. 39, an Act to amend the Social Allowances Act be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 59 was read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education, that Bill No. 84, The Lotteries and Gaming Control Act be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways that Bill No. 94, an Act to amend the Health Sciences Centre Act be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILLS NOS. 99 and 47 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Bill No. 76, an Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act be now read a third time and passed.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

BILLS NO. 79 and 104 were each read a third time and passed.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that this House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, may I announce the business of the House for tomorrow. It is our intention to come into the House in the morning, and beginning in the afternoon, Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders will commence hearings on Bill No. 83.

There is a possibility that later on, or perhaps in the evening, that a second committee will be called, Municipal Affairs, there are several bills that are before that committee, but I will announce that in the morning.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning (Wednesday).